

20140228_WHOIS_IRD_ID8587

- Steve Sheng: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to this additional call on the WHOIS review team internationalized data working group. On the call today we have Jim, Dennis, Sarmad, Jody, Nishit on the line. Did I miss anyone? Okay. That's five of us. I also saw that Takao -- okay, not Takao. So, that's five of us here. Let's begin the call.
- Jim, before handing over to you would it be okay if I kind of go over what changes I made to documents since last meeting so that the working group will be updated on this?
- Jim Galvin: I think that would be great. Let me also ask that you just confirm that the schedule that were working under here what are drop-in time is for finishing? Just so we have a clear picture of what's in front of us. Because I am a little concerned that we only have an hour today. Maybe we'll need some discussion about that before we hadn't.
- Steve Sheng: Okay. In order to have these documents be discussed in Singapore we need to get them published by Tuesday of next week. I think that's the timeframe were working with. The working group can also choose not to publish. Then we will just see what we can do for Singapore. Those are kind of the options.
- Jim Galvin: Just to kind of clarify here what you mean by publish means the ICANN publication engine won't be able to make it available and start a public comment period or announcement or anything after Tuesday, right?
- Steve Sheng: Right.
- Jim Galvin: The discussion during the ICANN meeting you just mean without it having it published we can have conversations about it.
- Steve Sheng: Right. Because people cannot have read it to be able to provide us with feedback. We publish for public comments what we have and then allow people to provide feedback so they'll be more discussion in Singapore. But it really is a working group choice.
- Jim Galvin: Right. The particular detail I was focused on was the fact that were not actually having a meeting in Singapore, any kind of public meeting. There's no discussion. There will be no timeframe in which will sit in front of people and talk about what we've done or anything like that.
- Steve Sheng: There is a session gathering all the related efforts on the internationalized registration data. There is a study that's going to give an update on the GNSO PDP is going to give an update. If the working group chooses, we could ideally hope the working group will be able to give a quick update at that session as well. That will be a public session.
- Jim Galvin: Okay. I guess the greatest value in that session would be obtained if we got our document out the door. If we don't it's probably not as important that we have something to say at that particular meeting. That's just my opinion but the group can think about what they want to do there.

Steve Sheng: Okay.

Jim Galvin: Thanks for that. Sorry to take a little too much time about all that. Please go ahead and tell us what you did with the document.

Steve Sheng: Sure. So, from yesterday's meeting -- from Wednesday's meeting there were a few things that I get out. The first thing that the working group discussed extensively on the registrar support of internationalized data. It seems that we have to test it here and people seem to agree that the registrar should all localized data be provided by the registrar but then there are cases where registrars, it's a business decision on the registrar's part to deviate from such a proposal.

So, with that, on page two, what I wrote in this category is registrars should all that localized data be provided by the registrant and then in page -- let me scroll down here, on page ten, I added a lengthy discussion capturing the points raised during our discussion on Wednesday. That's kind of the major change here. I'd like to get some feedback on whether I characterized the discussion correctly and what people -- things people want to change. That's here.

Another related point that some raised which I think is valid is the goal of our working group is to propose options and even make recommendations but the very fact that our working group is not a PDP working group, these are just suggestions and need to go through a formal process for that. I would add some text here and in front to make that point clear.

Those are the most important things I raised here. I want to open up to comments from the working group on this particular issue.

Jim Galvin: Comments from anyone? I do want to ask a question and I guess this is directed to the group. I know from Steve that folks had kind of an extended discussion about this on Wednesday. So, Sarmad, I think you'll have the most context here because you were part of the IRD working group a few years ago, the joint GNSO working group that talked about this issue too. What we're saying here with this requirement -- because the IRD working group as I recall had a perspective that users, registrants, should not be required to do anything other than make use of their own local language and script, whatever that may be.

To me, that translates into a requirement that registrars have to allow a registrant to be able to use their local language and script. I'm trying to understand in my own mind the new shape we're giving to this here in all this page ten text -- I'm not sure I have a good question here. I'm just trying to make sure I'm getting this and I understand what's going on here. We're clearly trying to separate business decisions from technical decisions.

And so a registrant is not being required to do anything other than use their local language or script and a registrar is being told that -- Well, if you want to reach registrants who are in this particular place, then you really should support their language or script, otherwise you're limiting the set of people who may communicate with you.

Sarmad Hussain: I'd like to make a quick comment. Can you hear me alright?

Jim Galvin: I am hearing you but I have to admit you sound muffled you always seem to sound a little muffled. I'm going to try to listen attentively and see if I can get it. Please go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: So, I think the discussion last time in which we had the discussion basically starts from the fact that a GTLD is basically giving options open to the -- open to everybody. So, basically you can potentially have a registrant who can speak any language and use any script. So, it is -- we -- the objective of GTLD is a registry making a level audience, it

should support any and all scripts. That's where the discussion started from. There was a comment that may actually be too much to expect from a registrar and it may actually be a business decision to the registrar depending on how much support the registrar feels it needs to provide for the registrants.

At this time my personal opinion is if a registrar is providing the main names for a particular TLD it should support at least the script where the TLD is and it could still be English or Latin but it should be at least that script. It should not be entirely up to the registrant to not provide any support for any language. I think the two different options we were discussing and I think last time we basically left off the discussion with I was -- those three options but I'm not sure we'll be able to conclude this activity. That's all from my side at this time.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Sarmad. Now I have a more clear question to ask. But first let me ask if there's anyone who wants to comment here on what Steve has done or anything Sarmad just said?

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. I have a comment. I think the second option Sarmad had mentioned was requiring the registrar to support the script that the TLD and the GTLD is in. That seems like it should be a registry requirement. I'm not sure if that should be a requirement by ICANN. I don't know if I'm splitting hairs here but I just wanted to add that comment.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Jody. That's actually helpful to the question I was going to ask. But first, anyone else want to comment or ask a question?

Okay. So, let me offer the following comment. I think I'm beginning to get a clearer picture of what's on my mind in this discussion. In the category of splitting hairs, to borrow a phrase, there clearly are some interesting lines that one can choose to draw here and then it's a question of what you want to say about what's on each side of the line.

The scope of this working group as I understand it and we get to collectively decide here where we want to go with it is we're supposed to talk about the registration data itself. So, the requirement on the data. What's interesting to me now as I think about this is that's one line. So, you can have a line here which is this is just the data. The data is obviously has some storage requirements, then it has to move through the system and so you can go to the other side of the line and say -- Okay, how does it get into the system? It's coming from a registry. It's going to pass through a registrar, it's going to pass through or come from a registrant. You can draw a line to each one of those places and talk about what are the requirements of the data in each one of those places.

And that's -- as I think about what we did in the IRD group a couple of years ago, we were headed down the path of a registrant should only be required to use whatever their local language or script is. At the other end of the spectrum, registries are only set up to use certain languages or scripts because they make those requests of ICANN and those things get approved and when they want to add a language or script they have a process they have to go through in order to be allowed to do that. And then in the middle you have registrars that are dealing with customers on one side and those requirements dealing with the registry on the other side, those requirements, and now we have this translation and transliteration working group off there on the slide which is going to impose rules on how we're going to make those two endpoints meet.

I think I've just created a picture of where all the -- where there are different requirements and we've got to find some way to talk about how data moves through the system with an interesting plus sign if you will, translation and transliteration at the top, the storage of the registration data at the bottom, registries on one side, and registrants on the other side.

The question is how do we set requirements that don't restrict the other three parts of the system. If we're the database at the bottom, how do we set requirements that don't change

anything at the top and the other three points and we have to provide some discussion that highlights the challenges of the other three points.

Now, have I totally confused everybody? Or have I actually said something useful?

Jody Kolker: I was just wondering if you could repeat that one more time?

Jim Galvin: I'm imagining a picture that is a plus sign or a cross if you will and we are -- requirements for registration data and we're at the bottom. So, we have to talk about the characteristics that the data has to have and I'm observing that there are three other points on this even if you want to imagine it as a diamond as opposed to a plus sign and we're the bottom point on the diamond and now there are three other points above us. At the point on the left is the registry which is bound by certain requirements it has asked for. So, registries have to arrange and contract with ICANN to support certain languages and scripts. And on the right-hand side you have registrants.

Jody Kolker: Jim, when you say the registry has to contract with ICANN to support scripts, you're just speaking about the actual domain name, correct? Not about the data?

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Jody Kolker: Okay.

Jim Galvin: But -- yes. I'm sorry. I'm just sort of thinking through something here. The registry in a thick registry is responsible for directory services, so the WHOIS protocol if you will. If the data is in or allowed to be in different languages and scripts and the registry actually is supporting for domain names, what effect does that have on directory services, if any? I'm going to leave that question out there for a moment and finish the description of my pictures.

So, you have a registry which has certain languages and scripts it supports. Thank you, Jody, on behalf of domain names, not actually the contact information. And on the right-hand side we have registrants who want the domain name in a particular language or script but that's different than the language or script they're going to be using for their contact information. That's where I was getting the finding. If we assume the registrant only has one language or script available to them because they only speak one language and use one particular script, then it's probably safe to assume that they're trying to buy a domain name in the particular script that's of interest to them which has to be one the registry supports for domain names.

Or perhaps it's not. Maybe they are just buying a domain name they speak just enough -- we'll use English since it's the obvious example. They speak just enough English that they want to use an English word and they want to buy a domain name in .com or some other dot ASCII name and they want that. And so it's not really a relevant issue.

At any rate, to complete my picture then, at the top of the diamond we have translation and transliteration as a function. The question is how does that function fit in all of this? Does it? Do we have any insight into what we want there? Keeping in mind that there's a whole other working group, a PDP working group that's going to be making decisions about who is supposed to support translation and transliteration and when and how.

I'm trying to figure out what we're really saying here in this requirement. Because I'm concerned that -- I'm concerned about what the clear recommendation is. I'm not sure I get it. I'm sorry I'm being a bit obtuse here. But -- to me the requirement should be that the registrant should be allowed to use and only be required as a practical matter than can only be required to use whatever their local language or script is when entering contact information. So, a registrar needs to be able to allow a registrant -- it actually is a

requirement. Maybe it's not a requirement. I guess that's kind of the issue here about what we're saying.

Jody Kolker: Jim? This is Jody for the queue --

Jim Galvin: Yes, Jody, go ahead. I'm just rambling here because I'm having a little bit of trouble with clarity of thought. I know there's something I don't like here but I can't quite put my finger on what it is. Please, Jody, go ahead.

Jody Kolker: I think I'm just going to rehash what I probably said before. Just for the group. Is requiring the customer to be able to enter in -- or the registrant I should say, but the registrant is a customer, it is the same, requiring them or requiring registrars to allow that person to enter domain names or to enter contact information in their local script, as I've said before, I think that's a business decision for registrars to take on, whether they want to support that or not. But requiring it, and I think this is where I get a little -- I'm not sure what our group or our policy is suggesting because if I'm a Brazilian registrar and I want to support Brazilian residents but I'm not too concerned about residents in Germany entering their local script, that's a business decision for me.

I'm not concerned about supporting Germany, Germany registrants. I'm concerned about supporting Portuguese registrants. Putting something in there to say you must require that -- the customer is going to do -- maybe this isn't that big of an issue. I think it's a business decision. Because it seems like you could shut down a registrar because they weren't allowing someone to enter in a German registrant in that German script. Or in a Chinese script. Maybe I'm taking this too far because the working group is not setting policy. It's just suggesting.

Jim Galvin: I agree with you, Jody. I really do believe it is a business decision on the part of a registrar whether or not to support a registrant. And I think that the requirement here -- I think what concerns me about some of the text we have here is the only real requirement I think for this data field is that it should be freeform. And it should be freeform and it must be known what language or script is being used to represent the name. Because I think the requirement on data in general that we're going to have is the language or script in use for the name needs to be documented, needs to be a known characteristic.

Jody Kolker: I think I agree with that, Jim. That parts of these -- some of these data elements, we need to know what the script is that -- the language that the registrant is entering.

Jim Galvin: The rest of this discussion is important discussion, right? It's both interesting and important but I don't think it's part of the requirement here. I think that in general we probably need a place where we talk about I'll call it the balance of what it means to be internationalized. There's going to be -- I'm going to go back to my little picture of a diamond here. You've got a registrant on one hand and a registry on the other and the data is going to move around. It's going to have -- different people are going to be able to do different things with it. But what is the minimum set of requirements we need on the data so that each one of those stops along the way? The registrant, the registrar, the directory, and the registry service out there so they have options with respect to what they can do with the data and make it useful to their particular community.

To focus on the issue at hand which is this data element, I'm really back to the idea that the only requirement for this data element is that it be freeform and perhaps we want to say something like it should be of a single script or language, the entire content, whatever that is.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Jim. I'm trying to determine how to change the text. Are you suggesting we get rid of the -- we simply keep the proposed requirement as this would be a freeform text and delete the second sentence? Registrars should allow localized data be provided by the registrant? Is that the proposal? I'm trying to understand what to change here.

Jim Galvin: I think so. Because going along -- I mean, and I say that only because going along with the idea that it is a business decision, then I think that we don't really want to say anything that points in a particular direction or not. So, it should be freeform text and freeform text that includes -- I'm not even sure. We're going to have to come up with a phrase because I think we're going to use this same phrase elsewhere. It should be freeform text of a known script or language -- with a known script and language designation. I'm also thinking a single known script or language designation. Because I'm thinking at the moment -- and this might be an interesting question if we can get an interim report out and ask for public comment. It might be interesting to ask, would anyone reasonably have an organization name which might have half the name in one language or script and half the name in another language or script? Is that even a sensible thing? I don't know that such a thing exists anywhere. With a single known language or script. Language and script.

Zheng Wang: This is Zheng for the queue.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Please, Zheng.

Zheng Wang: The single language, I'm a little bit concerned about that. For example, I'm from Peru. I was born and raised in Peru. But my name, Zheng, is -- even though it's reading Latin script it comes from the Chinese and Japanese word. And also the native language in Peru is Spanish but companies decide to chose English names for their Company names. Then you have a name derived from Japanese and Chinese words and the Company name in English and other information in Spanish. You know what I'm talking about? There's no one language right there. That's happening around the world.

Jim Galvin: I think I understand what you're saying. Let me try to be more specific about what I mean by single language or script. What I'm suggesting is when I enter an organization name I'm going to chose to enter it -- there might be multiple representations of that name possible -- you're actually talking, when you use yourself as an example -- never mind. This is not just the Company name but the registrant name too. You could have your name -- you could represent your name in multiple different forms. You could choose -- what I'm suggesting here is you have to choose one of them to enter your name. Your entire name has to be either in Roman characters and using that appropriate language or script or you'd do it all in Chinese. You wouldn't do your first name in one language or script and your last name in a different language or script. That's what I'm referring to here. Does that help any? Or does that change what you're saying?

Steve Sheng: Jim, this is Steve for the queue.

Jim Galvin: I want to give Dennis a chance, if he wants to respond first.

Zheng Wang: We're not talking about language then. Great.

Jim Galvin: Okay. I'm not sure -- I'm working under the premise that every element has to have a language and script associated with it.

Zheng Wang: Yes.

Jim Galvin: I guess the important question here is I don't think anything I said is in conflict with what you said. It's a question of whether you agree if any organization or person could pick one language or script they're going to use to enter their name in this data field -- they might have multiple languages or scripts to choose from but they're going to pick one and use that same one throughout.

Zheng Wang: Is there going to be a validation against that? I say I'm going to use Spanish as my input language. Would the registrar or registry be expected to compare and validate that the Spanish is being used?

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Zheng Wang: Or just FYI on the label?

Jim Galvin: No. They would need to know that or set that. A registrar is going to take a bunch of stuff in and somehow as part of collecting the characters themselves they have to know what language or script is being used. That might be implicit. Maybe they just know. Or if they have lots of options a registrant may have to tell them which one they're using. Maybe they have to intuit the value, figure it out based on what's entered. I don't know. Those become programming issues, right? And implementation issues. The important thing is you're right about validation. Validation is a whole other set of issues on top of all of this. One of the things I'm thinking about is I'm thinking a little bit about validation and I'm thinking to myself -- Gee, if somebody has a name and they could enter their name in Chinese or in English, do I want them to give half the name in Chinese and half in English? Or should I require them to do the entire name in English or the entire name in Chinese? You could pick which ever one suits you but you have to pick one or the other. You cannot mix them.

Zheng Wang: Okay. I understand your point. I think we can move on.

Jim Galvin: Steve?

Steve Sheng: For some reason it's awfully hard to determine a given name, the language of the name.

Jim Galvin: I agree with you there. I'm wondering how this is going to work. That's why if we make the requirements here and put it out there, we get some comments, it will be really interesting to see what people say. I'm sorry. I interrupted you, please go ahead.

Steve Sheng: In many cases, in the case of Japanese, you might have multiple scripts associated with it, the same in Chinese. An organization name would be a combination of ideographic with roman. It's fairly common in China. If you limit it to a single script, then it will be difficult because essentially that's two scripts. Very common in Asia.

Jim Galvin: Okay. You're offering some specific counter examples. This idea of just a single language and script, you're saying that's flat out not possible?

Steve Sheng: Yes. In some sense.

Jim Galvin: So, we've back to the requirement that it needs to be freeform script but the language throughout needs to be known.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody for the queue.

Jim Galvin: Yes, please, Jody.

Jody Kolker: I think -- I'm not sure how well we need to know what the language is. It will be difficult to determine that unless the registrant tells us what the language is. The script might be a little easier to do but I think language could be very difficult.

Jim Galvin: Jody, I actually agree with you. I really do understand the technical issue that's going on here. I mean, on the one hand I think from a technical point of view we have to know the language or script and that has to be stored as part of the data. I think if you don't know what it is, then just all kinds of other things are bad. Somehow when the data is stored, a language or script has to be associated with it. A separate question is where that language

or script comes from. That really is the problem. If the registrant knows, they should have some way to indicate that to a registrar when they're entering information. But that means that registrars have to have some way to collect that information or perhaps they infer it because this particular connection is from a market that's only in one spot. But then again, this is the internet.

Somebody could be coming in from anywhere over the internet. So, suddenly even that boundary is a little dubious. I want to separate the two problems I guess is where I am with it. We need to separate what needs to be true about the data and I think what needs to be true about the data is that we always know the language and script that goes with it and separate from that is the problem of how one determines that information. That's going to be become a problem. That's probably worth highlighting, that that's an issue that really going to fall on registrars to kind of figure out. I don't know how to fix that. I'm not sure what else we can say about that. Any thoughts about at, Jody?

Jody Kolker: I have more questions than thoughts, Jim. One is a very basic question, why is the script important to us? If it's a freeform text we just want to ensure that they only enter one type of script in per field? Is that why?

Jim Galvin: No. On a technical level you need to know the script and the language because you can't do things like matching without it. You cannot properly implement matching without it. That's one fundamental issue. But aside from that -- please, Nishit, go ahead.

Nishit Jain: One more thing that's asserted around defining the language of a particular element, unless we know in what language a particular element is we cannot therefore translate or translate to another script or language or work with it.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Nishit. That actually is extremely important too.

Jody Kolker: Could you repeat that, Jim? I didn't -- that didn't come quite clear through.

Jim Galvin: There are two very big reasons why you always have to know the language and script. I've been focused on the matching side of it. You can't properly do matching if you don't know the language and script that's in use. You run into all kinds of issues with the characters. The trademark clearing house hasn't even addressed any of those yet. And it's got this problem. The second thing that Nishit was talking about is you can't do translation and transliteration if you don't know what you're working with.

Jody Kolker: Got it. Thank you.

Takao Suzuki: This is Takao for the queue.

Jim Galvin: Yes, please, Takao. Go ahead.

Takao Suzuki: I agree with that, those two points. It does make sense that those are data associated with language and script. But one thing I notice is that the definition of a script maybe an issue here and for instance, in the case of a Chinese or Japanese, maybe if you say a hand script or here, I've got a script, katakana script for Japanese and then we have an issue. But if you say Chinese script or Japanese script, then there are problems if it's mentioned, it may not be an issue. Maybe that's a point we have to make. For instance if you say Japanese script, I could see that there's a combination of hiragana, katakana, Chinese, and then English -- four scripts together at least. And then if you say one script and we don't define the script, that could be an issue that was just mentioned.

Jim Galvin: From the point of view of TLDs the script definition if you will is part of the ICANN process. If a TLD -- again, we're talking about different things here. Going back to the comment Jody made to me earlier, with respect to domain names, when a registry is going to support a particular domain name, a particular script, the set of characters that

are allowed within that script and for use in a particular language are defined. The table ends up getting created and defined and documented and it becomes part of the contract that allows you to do it. So, you have validity and you can actually test for actual characters and validity. But here we're talking about contact information. So, you bring up a really good question. We're going to talk about needing a language or script but is that language or script going to be defined somewhere? And who is going to have the authority to maintain that definition?

Takao Suzuki: I'm familiar with this. Dennis and I had a lengthy discussion about this for the definition of language and script for dot-com registration, just FYI.

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Steve Sheng: We're about ten minutes away to top of the hour. Maybe some discussion of the next meeting?

Jim Galvin: Yes. So, here's my concern, two things. Let's focus on the one issue at hand here. I'm sorry, does somebody want the queue? No? Okay. I think this discussion in section 511, I think the discussion we have here is important text and I think now we've identified a section of our document where we have to talk about the life of the registration data and the issues that go with maintaining that life. So, a registrant is going to have one particular set of abilities. The data has to have certain characteristics. And the data is going to move around through the rest of the system and somehow we have to identify the fact at the data may have different forms at different times.

It occurs to me that this a motivation for identifying the fact t all data has to have a script and language associated with it. One of the characteristics of anything that's internationalized is that has to be know. We've identified the two reasons why that has to be known and we can take this discussion here in 511. We can fold all of that into that discussion. I think the only requirement in this particular thing here is it's free form text and it has to be labeled with appropriate language and script. But the appropriate language or script, one or more, that may be used in this particular data element. That's one thing I wanted to say.

The second thing is I don't think we're going to get this together by Tuesday because we're now getting into the meat of some of the issues here and I don't believe we've got enough of a cohesive document -- I don't think we're going to be able to put enough text together to want to release this just yet. That's my concern. I don't want to release anything that asks more questions than it tries to clarify because otherwise I feel like it makes us look like we're not really progressing. Let me ask that question here. Do folks agree that we're not quite ready to be able to have an interim report in time for Singapore?

Jody Kolker: I agree with you, Jim. This is Jody.

Dennis Tan: I agree.

Jim Galvin: Jody, Dennis, anyone else?

Takao Suzuki: Me too. This is Takao.

Jim Galvin: We're getting a nice consensus here.

Steve Sheng: I also agree. My question is how do we move from here to there? That's the challenge I have. I think to -- personally I think to move from here to there, the group really needs to come in and provide text. That I think is the way forward. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: Yes. I agree with you. We're going to have to really start thinking about some of this stuff and writing some of this down. I guess since I'm the one who focused on raising more questions here than answers, I guess I have to start trying to collect my thoughts for this group to review and think about. I didn't mean for it to work out that way. I'm very happy for anyone to -- even writing down some short paragraphs about questions or issues that are on your mind from this discussion and sending them to the mailing list.

I think we need to create a discussion section in this document, a larger discussion section which really walks through some of these issues we're starting to think about and document. It would be very helpful if people, if you have a question and maybe some of an answer if not all of an answer, or several questions about a particular issue, if folks could just take a few minutes, especially right after this call, to send them to the list so we have some starting text to work with and we can start to pull those paragraphs into the document and arrange them and work on expanding them. We have to grow our outline here so we know what we're trying to build out.

I'd appreciate if some of the folks who were speaking today could say a few sentences about some of the thoughts you had when you were talking today, if you could send them out to the list, make a point or two, that would be very helpful. And I will try to focus some time with Steve and see if we can't add another chunk of text in here before our next meeting on Wednesday. I think that's my proposed action for now. Anyone else have any proposed actions or comments? Steve, is that comfortable for you right now?

Steve Sheng: Yes. That's very comfortable. I think it will be difficult for me, just from the conversation itself, to capture what's on people's minds. So, if the experts can prepare some text it will be much easier for me to organize them together. I think if they start to provide text, express your concern and what you think, then me trying to guess what you think -- sometimes there will be information lost in between. So, I agree with you, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Let me just emphasize the text doesn't need to be finished product. Your text can just be a question, something you think we need to address. So, even if you're not quite sure what all the pieces need to be, let's not lose track of points that need to be covered. A set of bullet points, any text is better than none and gives us plenty of opportunity to shape it and turn it into things and others may contribute to it too once they see what you're writing. So, okay. Any other business from anyone? Alright. Let me thank folks for joining us on this extra meeting time and we'll pick up again on Wednesday and hopefully we'll have some new text in a couple other sections in here so that we've got some new stuff to think about and get organized. So, everyone gets five minutes of your day back. Have a nice weekend.

Steve Sheng: Thanks, Jim.