20140226_WHOIS_IRD_ID8578

Steve Sheng: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to today's call on the Whois review team internationalized registration bid expert working group. We will be going through the draft interim report.

On the line I have Naoki, Dennis, Nishit, Takao, Jody, Sarmad. Did I miss anyone? Okay.

So we'll start. I will moderate until Jim comes on. Could the working group open -- we will be using the Google Docs today, so we will not be using the Adobe Connect.

Does anyone on Adobe Connect know there are people on Adobe Connect but not on this call?

Jody Kolker: It looks like everybody on Adobe Connect is on this call. Dennis, Naoki, Nishit and Sarmad and Takao.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So let's just use the -- then Jody, could I -- could you keep an eye on Adobe Connect? If there is someone on Adobe Connect not on this call, refer them to open the Google Doc.

Jody Kolker: Absolutely.

Steve Sheng: So that we can get in sync. Okay. So we'll be going through the Google Doc document. In this revision I have added executive summary, added an index and then revised a few sections based on the input from the working group per our last call. I have been working -- I had a chance to talk to Nishit yesterday and Sarmad to understand their comments better. And to see if they're okay with how I addressed their comments.

So you can see all of those in the comments on the right hand side. If you click on comments it will show you all the comments and then how they are resolved. I noticed Naoki and Dennis also resolved some comments. So you can review those and see whether you're okay and with resolving those comments, the way they've been handled. So if you've got any questions, we can certainly reopen those comments.

And for now, let's just go over the documents. Perhaps before we dive into details, I want to get an overall sense from the expert working group, are people comfortable with the document, the direction it's going? And then if you're not comfortable, what area you want the document to be improved on? So that's kind of the overall high level question. Let me just give the working group like a minute or so to skim through and raise any questions.

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad. I'd like to make a comment.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Sarmad.

Sarmad Hussain: So I guess one small comment, this is something I have not raised before, is that it may still be useful to separate organization and name -- sorry-- address information from city and state information. Those may be two different categories. So I'm saying I go to one category and to the (inaudible) of the categories. And (inaudible) because I understand that they could be lumped together in the same category because their spellings are -- some of the spellings can be really arbitrary. However, perhaps cities and state and provinces, it may be easier to translate across a grid versus addresses. Because within the category addresses seem to be much more arbitrary than the city names and the state and province names.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So Sarmad, if I understand you correctly, what you're proposing is in the address field or registrar technical and administrative contact, separate out the address field versus the city, state and province. Is that right? Separate that (inaudible) --

Sarmad Hussain: Yes.

Steve Sheng: -- to address. Is that right?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes, so address is separate category and city and state and province are separate categories. That's what I'm saying (inaudible).

Steve Sheng: Okay, that was good. Let's park your feedback here and we'll come back to it. But I want to give a chance for others to raise some overall comments with the document first. Is that okay with you?

Sarmad Hussain: Of course. Sure.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Thank you, Sarmad. Anyone else kind of high-level comments on a document. The direction it's going, anything you're really not comfortable with. And is he back? Very good. Let me quickly do a roll call here. Naoki, any thoughts, any feedback on the overall direction and organization of the document?

Naoki: I did some comments in the -- my comment are already applied I think.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Naoki: Okay.

Steve Sheng: So you think the -- are you okay with the overall structure and organization of the document? Or do you have any suggestions on how we might improve them? Okay, let me just give you a minute. Dennis, any thoughts?

Dennis Tan: No, I'm fine. I've seen the organization format of it and it's fine.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Nishit?

Nishit Jain: I'm okay with it.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Takao and Jody? Takao?

Takao Suzuki: It's good.

Steve Sheng:	Jody?
Jody Kolker:	I just had -- it doesn't look like we have anything for section 5 and that was one of my -- one of the things I think we need to get in print, I guess, or addressed.
Steve Sheng:	Yes. Section 5, good feedback. Yes, I tried to add, but I wasn't really able to reach anyone. So I mostly leave it empty. Section 5, okay. Good feedback. And Sarmad, any other comments you have on the overall organization of the document?
Sarmad Hussain:	Just a small, minor thing. I think the -- perhaps the working group composition, that can go -- be in an appendix rather than up front.
Steve Sheng:	Working group composition can go into appendix. Okay. That's a suggestion. Okay, good. What do other people think of moving the working group composition into an appendix? I think we've done -- that's what we usually do for other reports.
Jody Kolker:	I'm fine with that.
Steve Sheng:	Okay, (inaudible). Any objections? Okay, well let me move that to appendix. And then we can come back. Okay. So thank you. The feedback I have here is section 5 needs to be filled out, working group composition to be moved to the appendix and then Sarmad raised a question about the city and state category.
	Okay, let's go to the overall feedback I guess. With that, let's go into comment by comment so that we can go through these and address them. So the first comment is from Dennis. Dennis, you want to explain a bit of your comment here? I think --
Dennis Tan:	Certainly. So the overarching charter of our group is to come out to enable localization, right? So that the end users are able to use their local language to input names, addresses or whatever information they are asked or request from a registrar in their local language. So when I read that name freeform text, I'm okay with that, limited only by what registrar support that seems to me that it's going to be up to the registrar whether there are going to be allowing unregistered the UDFA characters and not a subset of it. So that at the end, the end user won't be able to -- or they are going to be able to type whatever they're in, but there is going to be some sort of disconnect what the user inputs because they are using a keyboard or whatever they are able to do that. But in the back end, the information is not saved as it was supposed to saved. I don't know if I make myself clear.
	So all I'm saying is that saying that registrar support is, we're leaving that up to the registrar to support (inaudible) if it was specific languages or a specific character set, should we open that to be unrestricted?
Steve Sheng:	Thank you. I think you explained -- at least I understand it perfectly.
Jody Kolker:	Hi, this Jody. I just have a comment on that.
Steve Sheng:	Okay, go ahead. I'm going to maintain a queue, Jody. Go ahead.
Jody Kolker:	Okay, thanks. So I guess my question is if this is more of a business requirement or if what we're is that every registrar has to allow a customer to be able to enter in a freeform field with any Unicode or any characters they want, I feel like forcing registrars to do that is more of a business requirement that -- I guess I'm just opening that up for discussion too. Is for instance, registrars don't have to allow customers to be able to renew their domain names for 10 years. It's a business decision that they can make, whether they

want to only support one-year renewals or 10-year renewals. Requiring them to enter -- to allow customers to enter Unicode characters in, I'm not sure if that's something we want to force registrars to have to do.

I guess I'm just curious on anyone else's comments or opinions on that. I mean it's like a business differentiation for the registrars. If they want to be international, okay, they can be international, but if they just want to support their language character set, then they could do that. But this is forcing them to require them to support all language sets. And I'm not sure if that's the direction that the working group wanted to go. I'm just curious on others' opinions.

Steve Sheng: Okay, Jody? (Inaudible)

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad. I'd like to (inaudible) I'd like to get in the queue please.

Steve Sheng: Okay, Sarmad, I have you on the line. Anybody else? Okay, Sarmad go ahead.

Speaker: (Inaudible)

Sarmad Hussain: Okay. So yes, I do agree with the initial comments that we shouldn't open the -- arbitrarily allow the registrar to decide what to support. I also agree with the second comment that registrars should not be bound to support all the possible scripts. However, I think there could be a middle way forward, in which we at least say that the registrar should allow the character set from the script for which the -- if it's an IDN GTLD, that is the being supported. So if the registrar is allowing registration for (inaudible) domain for a TLD it is for (inaudible) input. If the (inaudible) allowing Chinese, have a history in Chinese TLD, it should support inputting Chinese, at least that much. Wouldn't that some -- is that something which would work?

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Sarmad. It's hard to hear you. If I could kind of replay back what you're saying is to propose a middle ground for internationalized domain names. Allow the registrar to submit internationalized data. Is that the gist of the recommendation?

Sarmad Hussain: No, what I -- is it any better now?

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Sarmad.

Sarmad Hussain: Okay. So what I'm saying is that even if a registrar is not supporting text in all scripts, because that is unreasonable requirement I think, then but the registrar should support at least the script of the TLD the registrar is offering. So if registrar is offering Arabic or -- sorry -- Cyrillic domains, then the registrar should allow Arabic or Cyrillic input.

Nishit Jain: Hi, this is Nishit. Can I comment?

Steve Sheng: Yes, Sarmad, got it. Okay. Nishit, go ahead.

Nishit Jain: So (inaudible) on going to register a Chinese domain name under a Chinese TLD, so does it mean that I'm not allowed to put my addresses in my local language? I mean if I'm interested in putting the addresses in Denali, let's say. So I'm not allowed for that because if the registrar is only supporting Chinese TLD.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Nishit. Anybody else?

Takao Suzuki: This is Takao.

Steve Sheng: Takao, go ahead.

Takao Suzuki: So let me just reiterate what Jody mentioned. So what it is is really like it should really have to (inaudible) go (inaudible) to say that determining, yes. What do we want to support because the -- and then also I understood that the idea of IDN support versus the others. But I mean even in terms of IDN support, we do support Cyrillic. We can let our customers register Cyrillic domain. But it doesn't mean that we are allowing them to enter their addresses in Cyrillic or anything. And then that seems again -- I'm with Jody on this -- it should be really like a business decision maker. We want to support those, but it costs and then how are we going to -- how much are you going do. It seems like an issue really up to each one of us to determine.

                 And then we like to support that brings more business but is that -- if this becomes the enforcement, it does -- I guess we're not comfortable with that.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. Anybody else I have not heard from? Naoki, any thoughts from you on this subject?

Naoki: I have no comment right now.

Steve Sheng: Okay. All right. So this will be a -- I personally think this will be a very important, a major issue or a point of -- seems a point of contention and disagreement. Does the working group have any thoughts on a way forward?

                 So what I'm -- here, let me quickly summarize the discussions here. What I'm hearing, a couple of different opinions. The -- on one side is our -- the goal of the working group is to enable localization, therefore it would -- to adopt a more inclusive approach in terms of letting users submit localized data. And this is also one of the principles that we have articulated. That users should not be unduly burdened to submit something in a language they do not know or recognize. So that's one argument.

                 On the other hand, the argument that forcing -- this is a registrar business decision. A registrar should make that determination and forcing registrars to support doesn't seem the right direction to go. Then there are a kind of a middle ground being proposed that recognizing the tension that one way forward is for a particular IDN, for example, a Cyrillic IDN or an Arabic IDN allow localized data to be -- localized registration data to be submitted in Cyrillic or Arabic.

                 So those are kind of the different continue of viewpoints I heard expressed here.

Jody Kolker: I have just have another comment for that. And I'm not sure just on what I believe Sarmad said about supporting the IDN. I think that that might be a good middle ground. Is it all right to speak? I guess -- I'm sorry.

Steve Sheng: No, no, let me quickly finish.

Jody Kolker: Okay.

Steve Sheng: So I would really encourage the one party to debate, deliberate and really think about ways forward. So with that, Jody, go ahead.

Jody Kolker: I think that what Sarmad had is a good idea. I'm not sure if it's the best place to put it in a working group. Is that -- I'm wondering if that's more of a registry decision to make that call to require registrars to enter -- to allow registrants to enter in Arabic languages for an

Arabic TLD. Or for a Chinese TLD being able to enter in Chinese characters on their website. It seems like that would be more of a registry requirement than it would be in the RRAs that the registrars sign. I'm just curious on what Sarmad's opinion of that is or just -- out of curiosity I guess.

Sarmad Hussain: Okay. So I think I'm not thinking about this (inaudible). But I'm thinking about this from the user or registrar's point of view. And I'm saying that if somebody registering for a particular script, (inaudible) IDN, wanting to view that the person would have knowledge of that script, but one (inaudible) much more than that. And that was why I'm suggesting what I'm suggesting.

As far as a (inaudible) requirement is concerned, then it's really a different requirement that is something then the registrar and the (inaudible) really to in a way find a way to resolve. And if that means that the registry needs to translate (inaudible) transform that information, maybe that's a requirement that the registrar really had to (inaudible) to submit the data in the right format for the registry.

In essence what I'm saying is that the (inaudible) is requiring (inaudible) script for whatever reason. And there's a Cyrillic domain name, then the registrar collects the data into the mix from the user, assuming that he would obviously would only knows Cyrillic. And then transforms the data in Latin and submits to the registry.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Sarmad. Okay, this is good. I think this is almost the first time the working group kind of disagrees on things, which is extremely healthy actually since this is a very important issue.

Jody Kolker: Say, Steve, I just have one more comment. This is Jody. I guess taking this a little bit further, if this is a proposed requirement that all registrars have to do this, where would this type of thing stop, I guess is what I'm wondering? Is because would now registrars be required to translate their websites into the several different languages? Because I mean could you see that happening also? I guess I just see this as a business decision.

For instance, Go Daddy doesn't translate the website into thousands of different languages, it's only picked a few. And so I see that as a business decision. So requiring registrars to support the entry of these different labels I think is -- in different scripts is a little heavy handed I guess. Like I said, it should be a business decision and that'll be my last comment on that. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jody. Noted. Any other comments? Okay, let me think. Any suggestions or how to move forward?

Sarmad Hussain: Steve, this is Sarmad. I'd like to comment.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: Just a suggestion about how to move forward. I think it would be -- as a starting point I think it would be very good if we can document on these options and then once we have the options in front of us we can just have the (inaudible).

Steve Sheng: Sarmad, by options you mean the kind of the pros and cons of the argument?

Sarmad Hussain: No, actually. So one option is to only allow English. One option is to allow all languages. One option is to allow just the language of the IDN, the script of the IDN for inputting the data. And there will be other options. I was for example thinking we allow only the

scripts which are supported by the UN (inaudible) scripts. So they could (inaudible) possibilities. But in any case, I can -- it's probably a good idea to have those options sort of in the document and then we can decide which one eventually we take on after discussion and then we can also document the reasons we take that option.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Sarmad, would it be possible for you to list those options on the -- kind of put them on a mailing list? Describe them, send to the mailing list and then we can discuss and kind of settle on things. Is that okay?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes, sure. No problem.

Steve Sheng: Okay, thank you. Any other comments on how we might move forward?

Dennis Tan: Hi, Steve. Dennis for the queue.

Steve Sheng: Dennis, go ahead.

Dennis Tan: Some very good comments. So quick question for you, Steve, first. Should we qualify future performance with it's a must or a should? Because I think the way forward could be in this type of data element or free form text the registrar should allow unrestricted characters, so UDF characters, but if I should. So that opens -- leaves opens to business decisions whether they want to allow unrestricted setup characters if they, for example, Go Daddy may, I'm just sorry to pick on Go Daddy, but Go Daddy has -- most of the customers -- I believe most of the customers are in the US, so it doesn't make good business sense to allow several languages to be allowed into the research process.

But if they decide to go international and they want to provide a better customer service, I think that's a business decision to allow different languages to be used in the registration information. So if we leave it as a should offer or should allow unrestricted set of characters in the registration information, that leaves that the room for the business decision that I think Jody was mentioning.

Steve Sheng: Okay, sounds good. Yes. Thanks, for this actually very much. Jody, any thoughts on this, on Dennis' proposal?

Jody Kolker: I like it because what it does is it says that this is what the working group's feeling is or opinion, but it allows the separate registrars to make their own business decisions on whether to support it or not without requiring them to support it. I like it.

Steve Sheng: You like it, okay. Any objections to this? So let me see, how will I change this to? So I would change to registrars should allow localized data be included by the user. Is that the temperature, is that the sense of the working group? So let me, while you can see it, let me just put it down here. Registrars should allow localized data be provided by the user. Is that the sense? Are people okay with that text? Registrars should allowed localized data be provided by registrars. That's -- I input that on page, let's see, on the second page. I put that in a -- here -- different color.

Jody Kolker: Hi, Steve. This is Jody.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead, Jody.

Jody Kolker: Just want to make sure that the definition of should means that it is highly recommended that they do it, but not required.

Steve Sheng:	Yes, so what we need to do is that here use of "should" should comply with the -- in the beginning we need to have a section here of must, should to explain those requirement levels, right? A "must" is must do it. A "should" is you should do it, but there are circumstances where you can make a decision -- deviate from this. Right? That's kind of the way to indicate requirement. Is that okay with you, Jody?
Jody Kolker:	Um.
Sarmad Hussain:	This is Sarmad. I'd like to get in the queue as well.
Steve Sheng:	Okay, Sarmad. Let me wait to hear Jody first. Jody?
Jody Kolker:	Should it be "should" or should it be "may" I guess? Just asking the group. Takao has just sent me -- or I mean in the RFCs we define "should", "should not" and "may". And I'm just wondering what the group thinks of may or should. Which one would we prefer?
Steve Sheng:	What would you prefer?
Jody Kolker:	I'm thinking.
Steve Sheng:	Okay. Let me give you time to think, because there are -- I think we are -- we need to be mindful of the fact both this has implications for registrar and registry operations. In the same time, the community we are serving is becoming more and more international, so it's kind of balancing the two demands in mind. But let me wait to hear others. So before we go I have Sarmad and then Dennis. Anybody else wants to be on the queue?
Takao Suzuki:	Takao.
Steve Sheng:	Takao. Anybody else? Okay, Sarmad, go ahead.
Sarmad Hussain:	Steve, I have a different comment, so if you -- if somebody else want to comment on this for the (inaudible) I just go to the end of the queue and come back.
Steve Sheng:	Okay, go ahead Dennis.
Dennis Tan:	Yes, so it's the difference between the should and may. So the "should" looks like that it's a recommended, like you say a highly recommended requirement. So that puts that closer to our objective of the charter of our group. The "may" is an optional requirement and it's closer what the business wants.
	So let me just read now through those definitions. So the should is -- these were or the objective recommended to mean that there may exist valid in particular circumstances to ignore a particular item, but the full implication must be understood and carefully weighed before choosing a different course.
	On the "may" side, it says it's optional, meaning that an item is truly optional. One vendor may choose to include the item because a particular marketplace requires it or because the vendor feels that it enhances it but while another vendor may omit the same item. So in this case, I think "may" applies to what we are trying to achieve. Although if we want to be closer to the objective, it can't be "should" then. And I think registrars can - that there are reasonable reasons to -- not to implement because of business decisions.
Steve Sheng:	Thank you, Dennis. Takao?

Takao Suzuki:	He just said everything I wanted to say too.
Steve Sheng:	Good. Anybody else? I want to hear before Nishit and Naoki. Nishit, any thoughts on this?
Nishit Jain:	I don't have any (inaudible) from that. I --
Steve Sheng:	Okay, do you think it should be a "should" or a "may"?
Nishit Jain:	I think "should" since like Dennis said that "should" and give it more close toward the registrar what we mean to say or hear. So "should" looks final here.
Steve Sheng:	Okay, Naoki?
Naoki:	I don't have strong opinion here. Thanks.
Steve Sheng:	Okay, so Naoki is fine. Jody, any thoughts?
Jody Kolker:	I think I agree with what Dennis has said that the purpose of the working group is to recommend what users should be allowed do to. And I believe that I'm fine with "should" being the optimum word here, as long as registrars can still make a business decision on whether to support it or not.
Steve Sheng:	Okay. So it seems that we are in agreement or am I being to optimistic here? So we agree --
Speaker:	We agree here.
Steve Sheng:	We are? Okay. So here's what I'll do. I think I will glean from the transcript this discussion and put it in the discussion section for this data element. So this would indicate how did we come here. Does that work for people?
Speaker:	It works.
Steve Sheng:	Okay, sounds good. Well, that's a very good discussion. Sarmad, you said you have another point on this before we move forward?
Sarmad Hussain:	Yes, thank you, Steve. I (inaudible) that a separate -- just thinking about the current options. I was questioning -- I was whether this is a (inaudible) in our scope. Or is our scope just limited to making this be internationalized in a way that all options are possible? And let the GNSO PDP actually decide which level should actually be (inaudible) through the policy.
Steve Sheng:	So, sorry. Are you suggesting -- I didn't get what you're suggesting, Sarmad. So you're questioning whether it's in our scope to determine? Is that --?
Sarmad Hussain:	So it is in our scope to recommend that this thing should be internationalized and how it should be internationalized. But we are recommending that it should be internationalized in one language or five languages or it should be that internationalized or should not be internationalized. I'm just -- I think it's better that it is really in our scope or is that a PDP process and should be done by this other group, which is working on the -- on (inaudible) and (inaudible) efficiency stuff.

Steve Sheng: Yes, I think the working group can make recommendations, right? And those recommendations need to be viewed and debated by the community, including the GNSO and the board. Right? So we are here to provide ideas. We are not here to decide. I mean they could simply overrule us I mean. So that's --

Sarmad Hussain: Well, okay. So --

Steve Sheng: It's within the scope of --

Sarmad Hussain: (Inaudible) follow-up comment on that?

Steve Sheng: Yes. Okay, but I do --

Sarmad Hussain: So I mean just a follow-up comment on that.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: And that is if that is really the case, then we should probably have another column in this table.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Sarmad Hussain: And to report why the comment should -- that it's really addressing the internationalization requirements and then that should cover the recommendation column, which tells how to probably fill in those international (inaudible).

Steve Sheng: I'm sorry. The extra column would --?

Sarmad Hussain: So we need a separate column for recommendations and not probably put them in the same column as proposed requirements.

Steve Sheng: So what would that recommendation column say?

Sarmad Hussain: This discussion is (inaudible) that registrars should allow localized data in data (inaudible). So that recommendation -- the proposed requirement obviously is that the screen be internationalized to support different scripts.

Steve Sheng: Right. Yes, I mean it almost seems to -- what you're suggesting is an extra column called requirement level. And there you should say "should", "must", per element. Whether it's a should or must. Is that more or less (inaudible)?

Sarmad Hussain: No, so what I'm saying is that the requirement is more on the (inaudible) and if we are going to do -- talk about anything which relates to the (inaudible), that this (inaudible) work.

Steve Sheng: Sorry, I'm hard to -- difficult to hear. Could anyone summarize Sarmad's points onto here? So you are saying a requirement is a framework. A recommendation is --

Sarmad Hussain: I will (inaudible) recommendation is not on the framework, but on the content which was inside the framework.

Steve Sheng: Okay. So what is the framework?

Sarmad Hussain:	The framework is that this will be internationalized to support all scripts. And then the business which comes in that there -- I mean registrars should allow (inaudible) script or a set of scripts and so on. And that's something which is probably the eventually a PDP process. And we can say that registrars should or something, but that's a recommendation about the point and not about the internationalization (inaudible).
Steve Sheng:	Okay. I'm sorry.
Sarmad Hussain:	So what I'm saying is that we need to separate in a way it -- we are saying the same things. We are saying that this really needs to be internationalized and then we are also saying that it needs -- after internationalization it needs to be localized in certain ways. And I'm saying that (inaudible) localization part and the globalization part needs to be separated out.
Steve Sheng:	Okay, great. I'm trying to (inaudible) how to do this. Can you make some -- can you provide the group with a proposal? Because I'm not confident just from this (inaudible) I can (inaudible) what you said. If you could come with a proposal it will be much easier for me and the working group to understand. Is that okay with you, Sarmad?
Sarmad Hussain:	Um-hmm.
Steve Sheng:	Okay, all right.
Sarmad Hussain:	Yes, sure. I'll follow-up on email.
Steve Sheng:	Sure. Please do. So with that, let's go down to -- let me see. We are almost running out of time. So there needs to a point of order here. What's the working group's feeling? We need to -- in order to meet the deadline for Singapore, to be discussed in Singapore, to gather additional feedback we need to have the document published early next week. The Monday or Tuesday next week. Does the working group -- so the options are we just continue to hammer it and do not release the document, so this will not be discussed in Singapore. So that's one option. The second option is we would try to release a document by Singapore, but we probably need at least one more teleconference call to hammer out the remaining (inaudible) comments. What are peoples' thoughts on this?
Jody Kolker:	This is Jody, Steve.
Steve Sheng:	Go ahead.
Jody Kolker:	Would anybody be interested in meeting maybe on Friday in order to try to resolve this or to get through? I know we only got through one comment today and we didn't get through the rest yet. Is it important enough to get it out before Singapore for comments?
Steve Sheng:	Yes, that's a good question. I mean I would defer to -- really defer to the working group on that. I think from a staff perspective, seeing what this comment is, I think it will be beneficial to have the community to provide feedback. So when this goes out, it will go off a public comment and therefore you have the community's feedback that you guys are -- when we do the second version of this document. So personally, I think it would be beneficial. But it's really a working group decision whether you think it's ready enough or you want to release it. So.
	Any other thoughts?
Dennis Tan:	(Inaudible) Dennis.

Steve Sheng:	Go ahead, Dennis.
Dennis Tan:	When you say we would like to have this draft during the Singapore meetings, are you envisioning having a workshop to discuss face to face with other folks? Or is it just an announcement of publishing this draft into ICANN's website so that everybody can provide feedback?
Steve Sheng:	So a combination of the things, Dennis.
Dennis Tan:	Okay.
Steve Sheng:	In general, in order for a document to be discussed in Singapore meeting, like to hold a workshop, I need to have a document in by the publication deadline. Right?
Dennis Tan:	Right, and that's what you envision (inaudible)? Right, okay.
Steve Sheng:	Yes. So I'm thinking, we do the document for public comment, then we'll be receiving comments from the community. And then we'll also hold a workshop in Singapore where additional input (inaudible) at the workshop. So that way you have like multiple venues of feedback to the working group.
Dennis Tan:	Got it, okay. So if that's the case, I'm leaning towards your second option where we allow us more time to go through the document, polish it out and play by ear whether we are ready or not to either announce it, publish it during the ICANN meeting or -- yes, we'll see where it goes.
	So I also agree with Jody. If we can meet on Friday to go through more of the comments that we have, I'm open for that too.
Steve Sheng:	Okay. Friday, anybody cannot meet on Friday at the same time? Okay, so this is important. I need to do a roll call. Naoki, can you make it on Friday at the same time?
Naoki:	Okay.
Steve Sheng:	Okay. You can, Dennis?
Dennis Tan:	Yes.
Steve Sheng:	Nishit?
Nishit Jain:	Yes, I'm okay with it.
Steve Sheng:	Takao?
Takao Suzuki:	Yes.
Steve Sheng:	Jody?
Jody Kolker:	Yes.
Steve Sheng:	Sarmad? Sarmad, can you make it Friday, same time? Sarmad, are you on mute? Okay, so we might have lost Sarmad. Okay, because it seems everybody can make it, pending Sarmad's feedback, so let me -- let's go ahead and schedule a call on Friday at the same time. And between these times, if the working group can work on these, really review the

document and see, really take a critical look at this and then we come Friday with additional points to discuss. Okay?

All right, with that let me call the meeting closed. Operator, could you stop the recording?