

---

STEVE SHENG: ...On the call, I heard Sarmad, Takao, Nishit, Jim, Jody, Steve, [Naoki 00:12]. Did I miss anyone? We also have, in the Adobe Connect room, where we'll continue discussing the Draft [00:22]. So you can scroll in the... for the data model yourself. For that, Jim, I'll hand the call over to you.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you. Let me just comment quickly with respect to the Translation and Transliteration PDP Working Group, which normally meets on Thursday, last Thursday I made an ask of the Group to see if they would comment on our Interim Report in any way, and in particular would comment on the address options. I guess the thing to say is it's a PDP Working Group, so they operate and function rather formally.

In that sense, the answer that I got was a fairly formal response as well – that it would really not be possible for them to draft and submit a comment and an opinion with respect to the question on the options for the postal address, or any of the questions that were in the Interim Report at all, because that would be tantamount to them finishing their work altogether, so that before they could actually respond as a group, and have a group consensus position.

So although they certainly appreciate the work we've done, and we've certainly added to their discussions and provided them a lot of useful information, we're not going to get any comments from them, which is kind of unfortunate. So at some point we're going to have to deal with that too, I guess. I'm fairly certain that we're probably going to come to

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

a concluding point before they will, and our questions about translation and transliteration, I guess we'll have to discuss at some point in time exactly how to deal with those and what we want to do about their position.

So I wanted to just put that out there, and ask if there are any comments or questions about that from anyone? Okay, I'm hearing nothing. I am concerned once again. We ended up not having a meeting last time. We didn't get a quorum, although we had a very nice discussion about some issues, just an ad hoc discussion. One of the points I was making before – and I guess I'll just make it here again – is I am concerned that we're kind of at a sticking point here, because I do think it's important that we resolve this issue about postal address, and I'm a little concerned that we're not getting any additional community input.

So that's a question that we're going to have to figure out a way to resolve, and I'm concerned we're going to have to resolve it without any additional insight from anyone else. I do have a bias that we come to a resolution. I absolutely do not want to issue a report, which does not have a single proposal and some rationale for it. Obviously I have my own bias about which one we pick, but more important than the one that we choose is the fact that we choose one. I really just want to put that out there to this group here.

My concern is, I was Co-Chair of the last group that was looking at internationalized registration data, what was called the IRD Working Group, I guess three years ago now, almost. We left this question open then. At the time we left it open because, from my point of view, we didn't have the right people in the room. We just did not have the right

---

stakeholder engagement of people that we needed in order to have a really good discussion about what was appropriate.

I'm much more hopeful that we have the right set of people here; at least a good representative sample of people. With that, I think we have to come to some closure and find a way to get through this. So that to me is a really significant question that's in front of us. I'm not aware that we have anything else that's very compelling. We still have some things to talk about. I'd be interested in people commenting if they can identify anything in particular that concerns them about this data model that we have, that Steve very nicely drafted together for us.

If anybody else has any significant standing issue about the data model, other than the address issue? If anyone has any comments about the address issue, I'd appreciate that too. So I guess that's two questions. Let's see who picks up first. Silence. I know people care. Does somebody want to at least say they agree with the questions? I'm not alone, am I?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Jim, this is Sarmad. I can maybe make a comment? Okay, so I'm [06:17] also involved in this study, which is looking at translation and transliteration of [06:25]. One of the things that will probably be coming out [Bolivia 06:33] [unclear] is all the language [06:42], and so for example in Chinese, normally you get high-level information and then lower-level information. [unclear 06:58] you get low-level information, so apartment number, and so on, and then higher-level information, which is the area or the [07:10] like that.

---

I understand this is [07:16] right now, but I think for data to be [07:26] data perhaps [07:27] more [regular?] those sequence information, or sequence issues, [unclear 07:34] address. Apparently the addressees are generally [added 07:39] address one, address two, kind of thing. That allows people to decide on their own what they need to put in address one. For example, in many cases I would just put my whole address in the address one field, if it fits in, and leave address two blank, and so on.

So I'm looking at the [sources 08:05] of [inadequate] fields, arising from translation and transliteration data, that we are [08:12] most languages. One of the things that was commonly in my mind was, was there the ability to manage this, maybe some [08:22] within the [structure].

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, Sarmad, thank you. Let me try to say this back. I still struggle with understanding you. Your microphone always seems to blur it, or something. I think you're bringing up a new issue. You're actually bringing up two issues, I believe. One is you were talking about the sequencing of address elements, and you're suggesting that we might want to say something about that.

In particular, you're observing that in Chinese, address elements are normally presented in a less specific to more specific way, and then in American, in English, for example, they're typically presented in a more specific to less specific way. So address one, address two, city and state, versus the opposite for Chinese. I think that was one thing that you were describing. Then... So the sequencing. I confess, I lost track now of

---

what the second thing was. Steve, did you catch it, or should we ask Sarmad to repeat it?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Okay, so what I think is that first of all, is there a way to manage that? Because that has a very direct impact on quality of transliteration or translation of data.

JIM GALVIN: Is there a way to manage the sequencing, because it will affect translation and transliteration. That's what you're asking?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: Let me ask a related question. I don't really have any direct experience with this, so I would think that, well, with translation and transliteration, context is everything. You always need to know what context you're in, starting with knowing the language that you're working with, knowing the script that's in use. Sometimes you can intuit those things. You would need to know that you're dealing with an address, and I would think if you know that you're dealing with an address, you would then know how to interpret it; to translate and transliterate it.

You'd know which order the elements are in, or should be in. Wouldn't that be true, or not?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:           Actually, though we've not [unclear 11:45] yet, but eventually we will. One of the things we observe is the tools which we are testing. They show that that is not the case. There is no reorganization of data in the tools, which automatically do something like this. Or even when there is reorganization of data, because of such significant reorganization needed, especially the addresses that are very long, those tools start failing in their address [12:17].

JIM GALVIN:                 Okay, so the tools that are in use today don't properly reorganize. They just don't. You highlighted a couple of things. They either get confused, because the address is too complicated, or they just outright make mistakes because they don't recognize what they're really dealing with. Is that correct?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:           Yes.

JIM GALVIN:                 Do you have a suggestion for what you think we should say about that? I guess I agree that that's a translation and transliteration issue, but I'm not sure what kind of requirement or suggestion we would make about that.

---

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Basically what I will say was that currently we have very [inaccurate 13:16], like address one, and address two, but we don't really suggest what should go in address one and address two. So if two people are maybe typing the same address, one person may write the whole thing in the address one field, and another may break that into the address one and address two fields, and so on.

So I don't have a solution at this time, but this is a problem, which is at least getting highlighted from the tools we are testing, that this thing should maybe be managed a little better somehow? The accuracy of these tools gets significantly enhanced.

JIM GALVIN:

I see. So given that we don't actually state precisely, in some cases, what should go in postal address fields, and you're highlighting address one and address two, the accuracy of the tools varies because they will make mistakes, because two people will enter their address. Even if they have the same address they might enter it in two different ways, and that would be valid from an input point of view. Is there something we can do about talking about what content belongs in address one and address two? That would improve the accuracy of translation and transliteration tools.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yes, something to that effect.

---

JIM GALVIN: Let me make the problem even more complicated. One thing I had not looked at – I've only looked at summaries, because I guess you have to pay for these things – is the [UPU documents 15:08]. I wonder if you've looked at them in detail? I always like to fall back on this idea that countries are allowed to specify for themselves what they want addresses to look like. Is there actually a uniformed idea across the globe as to what would go in address one and address line two? Of are different countries and regions allowed to say different things?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Again, I would imagine it would be [unclear 15:50] and [the same 15:54] a country, but if somehow we can suggest people do [divide 16:03] address, [unclear 16:04], rather than write it as one long string in the [16:07] field. So if they are just using address one, if they can divide it up into address one, address two, address three, somehow? That might make it better, then it will still be [unclear 16:20]. I am not really what the solution is.

As I said, we [unclear 16:29] and we just [sum up 16:32] problem, not a solution. I [unclear] maybe we can look at what a solution would be.

DENNIS TAN: Hello Jim. This is Dennis for the queue.

JIM GALVIN: Dennis, please go ahead.



---

DENNIS TAN:

Sorry I came late. I had trouble connecting. I'm remote today. I'm not sure how this conversation got started with address one, address two. In my opinion, without the background, I think we're already complicating the thing. I think as the whole address, line one, line two, postal code, country code, as a unit, if you will... The second thing is I think we should care, but I don't think we have to overthink that we have to allow... Or, we put [ourselves 17:37] a requirement so that the information that we collect is subject to translation or transliteration.

I think that's not our scope. We have to remain true to our Charter, which is to enable localization. I'm not sure why we're discussing what's going in line one, or line two, and whether the inputs have to be entered in such a way that it's easy to be translated or transliterated.

JIM GALVIN:

Just a quick summary – the issue that Sarmad was highlighting is based on his other work in investigating tools for translation and transliteration, he's part of the team with that study commissioned by ICANN. He was observing that the lack of requirements for what goes in those address fields has a fairly dramatic effect on translation and transliteration tools.

The way that I interpret that, and what I'm coming around to in having this little discussion here with Sarmad, is realizing that, as you say, Dennis, our scope is to worry about facilitating localization, which necessarily implies some translation and transliteration of content. So the question really to us is specifically, is there something that we can or should say about the address fields, in order to improve the accuracy of

---

these tools that do the translation and transliteration and make it possible for them to do that?

Sarmad actually noted two details. One was just that the variability of the content has an effect on the accuracy of the tools. The other thing that he noted in the very beginning was whether or not we should say something about sequencing. This particular example that he gave was, for example, in China, there's generally a preference for putting your address down from less specific to more specific, and that's the way that you would enter your address information.

In America, in English, there's a preference for putting your address information from most specific to least specific. Is there something we should say about that? He was observing that what they've noticed in the tools, as you'd expect, is that context means everything in trying to do translation and transliteration. The tools make mistakes. In fact, the more complicated the address, the more dramatic the mistakes are. Is there something that we can or should say about that, within our scope?

So sequencing and quality of data, again, comes to bear in what can or should we say. Having said that, let me ask you if you want to add to your comment or say something different?

DENNIS TAN:

Yes. I politely disagree that we need to care for how the input looks like. What you're saying is we should be taking into account that... The requirements to localize the registration data is one thing. On top of that you're saying we should put a requirement so the information is subject to a transliteration or translation tool, which we don't have, and

---

as far as I know, there is no authoritative body that says, for example, Chinese has to be transliterated in this way, or Russian does.

As an anecdote, last week I met with the CEO from Yandex, the search engine, and we were talking about how names in Russian are translated to Latin characters, and there are several ways to do that. There is no single way to transliterate Russian to Latin characters, if you will. Maybe some characters have a one-to-one relationship, but in many cases, what I got from him, is there is no standard way to do that. I think that's the same for Arabic languages, and other languages in the world.

All I'm saying is that stepping into that subject area; translation and transliteration, I think we're going outside of what we're supposed to do. That's my opinion.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, let me try to piece apart your comment a little bit. Were you commenting about us putting requirements on the tools, or putting requirements on the data input? You seemed to suggest both of those things, and I just want to tease that a part at bit, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN:

I think it's the other way around. I think you want to put requirements into how the data is inputted? So it's inputted in a certain way, so it can be ingested by these translation tools. What I'm saying is that as far as contact postal information, today we have RFC 5733, which provides a way to collect information in [unclear 24:37] character, which is the [Thai 24:40] local, right? Local allows you to collect [24:49] characters, so that

---

will meet the [UDP 24:53] requirements and [principles] that the user is able to enter contact information in whatever script they choose to do so.

That's one thing. Going beyond that, putting in a requirement of, "Registrant, you should enter your address. If you are in this country or this region, you must enter the address in this way," in free-form text fields, I think we're overcomplicating it.

STEVE SHENG:

I think essentially this is a trade-up here, right? By specifying how a registrant enters information into an address field, you're adding inconvenience to the registrant as well as to the registrar. The benefit of that is more uniformed data that could be helpful for translation or transliteration. I think that's a trade-up. More of less it's really a policy question.

In this report, or Sarmad, in your report, if you can show how the accuracy of the translation or transliteration improved, if it's ordered in that way, I think that would enable a more robust policy discussion on whether that needs to be done. Because that needs to be weighed against the benefit that it has, versus the cost that's imposed on the registrant and the registrar. Dennis mentioned, are we really trying to stipulate what registrants should or should not do? That's how I see this issue.

---

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you Steve. I do want to be careful, I think, to separate a few questions here, to make sure that we are carefully talking about the right thing. I believe we're all in agreement that we don't want to put requirements on a registrant. It should be possible for a registrant to work with what they're most skilled with. We used a phrase like that in our Interim Report. Responding a little bit to Dennis, even in what I'm phrasing – I'm trying to pose a question – but let me try to rephrase it a little differently here.

The question in my mind is not about what to impose on a registrant. If anything, it's a question about what we might or might not propose for a registrar in the way that they work with the data they get from a registrant. As I understand Sarmad's question, it's about should we say something about behavior of the form that a registrant enters their data into? Is there anything a registrar should have to do with respect to sequencing the address data elements?

Now, that might be something the registrar does when interacting with a registrant. It might also be something they do just as part of converting the data to an EPP transaction to push up into the registry. I still haven't quite tuned in my own mind exactly what the implementation consequences are of what we might say, because I haven't quite decided even myself what we might say about this. That's about the sequencing issue.

The accuracy issue that Sarmad was raising again, I didn't interpret that as a requirement on the registrant. It's more about recognizing – this is just my interpretation. Sarmad you should probably respond first as to whether or not I've understood correctly the point that you meant to

---

make – that there really are not requirements about what goes in address lines one and two.

There's a separate requirement about sequencing those things, and about their existence – that gets to the sequencing issue – and then underneath that there's another lower-level requirement about what should actually go in those fields. There is no uniformed rule about what goes in those fields, and because of that, people tend to write their address in different ways.

That's valid, from a postal point of view, but it does complicate translation and transliteration tools. It does make it more challenging for them, and they tend to make mistakes. The question is, is there something that we can say about what should go in those fields and how they should be used. I added the extra question to that, when Sarmad suggested this, about countries can have their own requirements, right? The UPU standards say that countries can have their own rules.

I wondered, is there a uniform rule that we could even suggest that would apply globally, or is this really a question that we should highlight for countries of the world to care about, if they want translation and transliteration to work effectively? I'm sorry. I dumped a lot of stuff out there. Let me go back around and see if you want to comment. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Okay, so I really do [unclear 31:59] problems about the way the [unclear] posted on the [32:08] between the [unclear 32:09] and so on. What [unclear 32:13] requirements [unclear] are a bit slack. I think that's

---

probably something we should think about, so I think [32:32] what I was saying. I was thinking if you divide up the data somehow, it would be possible.

I know it's not possible at this time, perhaps, but if we can divide up the address field, I think there are probably some positives. Not only on the translation and transliteration issue, but probably they do make it even better for the [relegation 33:05] of data use, for addresses, because [unclear]. Even within the local language for [33:19] we will [unclear] the user or [unclear]. So generally, what Jim said, that captured most of what I said. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you Sarmad. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN:

Let me put it this way. Our Charter is to enable [inaudible 33:50] basically we are... We are solving this problem for the three billion Internet users in the world, and so they're going to be able to enter their information in the language they choose to. Who's the user of the translation or transliteration information? Who are we solving this for, and why should we care about it? Is it lawyers or government agencies? I don't see the average Internet user wanting the transliteration or translation of registration information.

Again, I think stepping into translation or transliteration, I think we're going outside and imposing ourselves into more requirements that may

---

be cumbersome for the players across the DNS ecosystem, and put more work into that for very little value.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you. Steve?

STEVE SHENG: I don't have anything else to add.

TAKAO SUZUKI: I may be the only one, but I'm not totally convinced that we've all agreed on the purpose of the address, or have we? I'm having difficulty getting that, because if we know what the address is for, it seems we can clearly understand what it should be. To me, like Dennis has just mentioned, what is this for? Is it for customers or lawyers? I don't know if we've all agreed. Sorry.

JIM GALVIN: I'm just taking a moment here to collect my thoughts. We have multiple questions on the table here. Steve, I want to make sure that we don't lose track of this here in our notes. I think we have multiple things in discussion here. I want to recap them quickly so I can find my way through this discussion to get to what Takao's talking about too. I asked the question about resolving the three choices for the postal information and the need to resolve it.



---

Sarmad raised a sequencing question. He also raised the question of, is there anything else that we should say about what goes into the address elements. We've raised a scoping question about how far to go in saying anything about the two prior questions? Because we certainly don't want to speak to tools or registrant requirements. Now Takao is asking about the purpose of the address. That's five questions, I think. First let me ask Steve – as the person who's taking notes here, do you agree we have those five questions on the table here?

STEVE SHENG:

I think two and three – sequencing and what goes into the address element are two sides of the same question. That is whether we should specify additional requirements for the address one or address two field. That would include sequencing. I think those two are the same question, but two sides.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, thank you for that. I'm fine with that. Anyone else want to comment on the five questions? Are we in agreement that we have those five, or four, questions on the table here? Jody?

JODY KOLKER:

I believe that the fifth question is probably what needs to be answered first, before we can continue with the other questions. I'm curious – what do we need out of these fields? That's what I'm wondering also. Is the address field for legal purposes? I'm not sure. Or is it an address

---

so that the customer can receive postal mail? I'd like to discuss that further.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you Jody. I have an answer, which I guess is just my view on what the purpose of the address field is. The way I perceive our work – and maybe this is the question that we should be answering here – even in the Interim Report, one of the things we proposed was to talk about categories of data elements, in order to talk about requirements. We have here a category of contact information, and now it's a case of we're developing the data models, so we're getting into some of the specifics of what the contact information looks like.

Going back up to the category of contact information, we're actually not answering the question of what specifically the contact information is for. We're actually putting out there the idea that if contact information is needed, for whatever its purpose, these are the requirements in the contact information, and this is what the data model looks like for it, to support that. The purpose of the registration data is a question that's being answered by the Directory Services EWG.

It has made statements in its Interim Reports, and we're expecting its final reports soon. I'd expect that its final report will be available before we're done. That should give us an opportunity to consider known purposes of the contact information, but the thing that I want to be careful of, if we can be, in this group, is registration data needs to be extensible, so we should be looking for, as much as possible, minimum requirements to serve a broad set of purposes.

---

Try not to create requirements that might restrict purposes of the information, since that would cause someone to have to invent another category of information in order to satisfy their specific needs. Having said that, focusing on that last question about what the purpose of the address field is, let's focus on that discussion for the moment here. Anybody? Does anyone object to my answer? I'm going to interpret the silence as suggesting we're in agreement on the purpose of address information.

JODY KOLKER: I agree with you Jim. I'd like to discuss what the purpose of the address information is.

JIM GALVIN: Please go ahead. I was actually thinking the discussion was closed, because we know what the purpose is, or as much as we're going to now about it, but please, if you have something to ask or say?

JODY KOLKER: Well, I guess my question is, what is the purpose of it? is it actually to be able to deliver a postal piece of mail to this address, to the registrant?

JIM GALVIN: Okay, at least I agree with that, yes. The purpose of the information is for use in the delivery of postal mail. It's contact information from the point of view from a physical piece of postal mail. I agree. That's what it is. That's my interpretation of its purpose and its role. A purpose

---

beyond whether it's for a legal reason or intellectual property reason or something like that, we don't know that specific purpose. It's a functional purpose. That's what we know. The functional purpose is for delivery of postal messages.

That's what I think. It sounds like that's what you think. Does anyone want to object to that?

JODY KOLKER:

Well, mine was a question. If that's what it's used for then I guess that's what I'd like to know. Yes or no. I guess I'm curious what Dennis thinks of that.

DENNIS TAN:

From our experience, the address, as you know, I think for registries we actually don't have that information. When we go [unclear 44:44] on the other hand, I think the answer is yes, but it's going to be secondary to the email address. I don't think our first option is to send traditional mail to our registrants, but I think that's the purpose.

JIM GALVIN:

Does ICANN agree that that's what the purpose of the contact address is?

STEVE SHENG:

I think the purpose of the contact information has a long history within ICANN, is suffice to say. There are various Working Groups, for example

---

the gNSO in early 2005 set up a Working Group to determine this exact question. The Working Group reached its consensus of what the purpose is, but GAC disagrees. So I don't think there is a final say of what is or what are the purposes of the data. The EWG is tasked to come up with this purpose. I think that's still to be decided.

For our work here, we should take those as almost somewhat given. I would say to start with one limited purpose, and take that as given, because I don't think... That's a community discussion; what the purpose is, and I don't think it's up to us here to decide what it is. That's my comment.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, I want to be a little bit careful about the question that we're asking here, to make sure that we're answering the right question. Right in this case means that you're asking the question that you mean to be asking. From my vantage point there are really two questions. There is contact information as a category of data elements, which is primarily postal address information, and then there's contact information applied to the purpose of registrant contact address. Then there's the question of what is the purpose of a registrant contact address?

Within this group, I believe we're focused only on the fact that there's a category of information called "contact information" and it's comprised of postal address elements. It has the functional purpose of being able to receive a physical postal letter. That's the scope of the discussion that we're having. When I say "scope" there, that is the scope of the discussion that I think we are limited to in this Working Group.

---

Asking about the purpose of registrant information is, I don't think, in the scope for this group, because that is taking the contact information and everything that we say about it, and applying it to a particular purpose, which itself has a purpose. I think that's what you're asking, Jody. I don't want to put words in your mouth, but I'll let you comment on that. Takao? Okay, please go ahead.

TAKAO SUZUKI:

I'm asking this question because if something just needs to be there so we need to be able to send postal mail to the address, that's fine, but then the validity of the address – I just don't know how much we need to confirm if that's right or wrong, because if it's written in local script and then we say, "Yes, it's free-form, we can enter whatever we want," how do we know that it's a valid format where we can reach that registrant? Then, we may say, "We don't care. It can be an invalid address, and if it's invalid, sorry, that's life. That's okay."

If that's something... Depending on the purpose, I think that requirement changes. That's why I think it's really... I agree that it might not be our Charter, but without knowing what it is, I do not know how the translate or transliterate would work with the address, and then what needs to be provided here.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, so if I understand the point that you're making, I just want to paly this back here. You're suggesting that there is a binding or a coupling between the quality of the data and the purpose of the data. We need to know what the data is going to be used for, somewhat specifically. So

---

more than just that it's used to deliver a postal message, in order to be able to specify requirements on the quality of the data. Is that what you're saying?

TAKAO SUZUKI: Yes, so just as an example, if I just enter it in Japanese and say, "My address is in Tokyo, Japan," and then if others don't understand that's the right address or not, that might be okay, just so that people can guess where I am. How does this get validated though?

JIM GALVIN: Okay, so the question is how it gets validated if I don't have all of that information? Right, thank you. Jody, did you want to speak? I'm being sensitive to the fact that we're coming up to the top of the hour here.

JODY KOLKER: Jim, I'm a little – you said that there were three questions before Takao started to speak. I'm trying to process those three questions again. What were the three comments that you made before that?

JIM GALVIN: Actually, I think I said there were five questions. Steve had combined two to make it four questions. Is that what you're referring to?

JODY KOLKER: Not exactly.

JIM GALVIN: Well, we're talking only about in the address thing. Takao is talking just about the purpose of contact information.

JODY KOLKER: Yes, I probably should have asked the question before Takao spoke. I'm sorry.

JIM GALVIN: That's okay. Let me just try this – I was talking about what is in scope for us is just the contact information having a functional purpose of postal delivery, versus the question of registrants' contact information. That gives a more specific purpose for the contact information, being that it's for a registrant, and there's yet a more specific purpose one can ask about why one would need registrant contact information. I was trying to separate those three different things in the question that you were asking, Jody. Is that what you were referring to?

JODY KOLKER: Yes. I'm still trying to understand the three points you're trying to make there. The three differences. I know we're coming up to the top of the hour. Maybe this is a conversation to be done over email. It might be better to get the points out, rather than to have the questions repeated.



---

JIM GALVIN: Okay, fair enough. Yes, why don't we use this as an opportunity to wrap this up. I just want to make sure Steve, that you've got these four questions, one of which has got two parts?

STEVE SHENG: I have that.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, and then in the last question of, what is the purpose of an address, we are discussing contact information versus registrant contact information, versus the purpose of registrant contact information. That's the way I would phrase it. At least that will clue me into what we're doing.

STEVE SHENG: Could you repeat that? Contact information versus registrant contact information, versus what?

JIM GALVIN: Purpose of registrant contact information.

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: This is all inside the question of, what is the purpose of the address information, that Takao started to ask. Okay, we'll have to carry this

---

onto the mailing list and into next week. Steve, if you can make sure that you get a summary out here, as soon as you can so that we have those questions? Then we'll –

STEVE SHENG: Sure. One thing is we don't seem to have any feedback on the data model, so would it be okay if I fold it into the existing document, and then people can comment on it? Or shall I – wait, what shall I do?

JIM GALVIN: You mean into our Interim Report and make it one large document?

STEVE SHENG: Yes, to maintain one single document, going forward, instead of having two documents.

JIM GALVIN: I don't have a problem with that, but I guess... Let me ask that we just keep them separate for a little while longer. In fact, I think I'd like to keep them separate until the comment period closes and it's clear we're not going to get any comments.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. That's fine too.

---

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, I just want to maintain some focus on our data model for the moment and allow us to... In our discussions here. Okay, so good, we have some good technical substance here to be focused on, and this is a good thing. We'll continue this on the mailing list, and we'll meet again next week and continue to press on. Let me thank everyone for joining us today. Let me get one question from any other business from anyone? Okay, then Steve, I'll hand it back to you to adjourn.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you Jim, and thank you for joining the call. So the four major issues facing the Work Party are first, resolving the three choices for address fields in the Interim Report. Second, to discuss if there's anything else the Work Party should wish to say about the details of the address element. This goes into whether specific breakdowns for the breakdown of the address field, the secrecy of that, and third is the scope of the Working Group in answering those questions.

The fourth is the purpose of address. Those are leading to several sub-questions – the purpose of all of the contact information, the purpose of the registrant contact information. I'll document that on the mailing list and we'll continue to discuss it. We'll resume next Wednesday. With that, operative, could you stop the recording?

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**