
STEVE SHENG: On the call we have Takao, Nishit, Dennis, [Noako 00:05], Jim and myself. Today is August 13th at 9:00 am Eastern Daylight Saving Time. Over to you, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. We have apologies and regrets from Jody, correct?

STEVE SHENG: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I just sent a note to the mailing list, five minutes ago. For those who might have an opportunity to look at their email here, it would be good if we could take a look at that. We haven't met in quite a while. I think the first thing we need to do today is bring ourselves back up to date with where we are. Do you folks think that would be helpful?

Okay. I'm going to assume that would be a good thing to do. We have a final document here, with respect to requirements. Unfortunately there's a place where I want to open up a question in this document. I think the document's pretty stable, except for the question I want to open and have a little discussion about. I think folks have been reading it. We've been getting some comments. Steve, you've been pulling that together. Again, I think that document is actually in pretty good shape for the most part.

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.

Let me pause there for a moment and ask Steve, if you want to highlight anything in particular about the document that you think needs attention, or do you agree with my assessment that for the most part it's pretty much ready to go?

STEVE SHENG:

I think so. I think with Nishit's latest comments and proposals about the data elements, I think they would be a good and welcome addition. The one thing the document lacks is, in terms of the rationale given for choosing the particular model, I think we went ahead to choose a freeform text. That section needs some additional justification. I tried to put some, but I think that this action is not totally settled. That's what I have. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you. I'll quickly respond. The question I want to open with the group, which I described a bit in my email, is exactly the one you're raising, which is our choice there for postal information and the rationale that goes with it. We'll come back to that question. Does anyone on the call want to raise any particular issues with this requirements document? Do you believe we're generally pretty close, except perhaps for the issue that Steve brought up?

Is there any other issue that folks want to bring up, as believing that needs attention before we're done? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I think that's good. The second document, which produces a data model, which I'm not as confident is in as good shape here... We had a draft that Steve had produced some time ago. We haven't really had any real

discussion about it. I think that's still something we need to focus some attention and review on. Steve, anything you want to say about the data model?

STEVE SHENG: The data model is now in section seven of the final report. Once the Working Group goes through that, comments in that are would be good.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you. Any comments from folks here about the details of the data model? I guess I called it out first, before I was talking about the final document there, since it is listed in there. I'm not hearing anything from folks. All of this is good, in general. I think we've done a lot of thinking and had some really good discussion here about some of the details. I think we've really come around to having completed some important and valuable work here. I'm very happy about most of what we've done here.

I do have one open question that I want to bring up and reopen with this group. I've talked around it a few times when we've had our meetings. As I said in my email, I realize that the consensus of the group thus far has been for freeform text for postal information, which was option three that Steve was speaking about, that we selected for doing that.

However, separately, just as an individual member of this Committee, I've been putting a fair amount of time into talking to different folks and looking at this problem of what is the right thing to do for postal information? I'd very much like to reopen this discussion here in this

group and have some additional details here to add, that I'd given some thought to. I sent them to the mailing list.

I could go through that a little bit now, or it might be useful to ask if folks have all had a chance to look at that? Do people want to ask any questions, or should I take a minute to go through it? Does anyone not have their email available to them? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone asking for me to go through what's in my message. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you for the note. I went through the email in its entirety and I understand what you are saying, but let me just analyze your point number one. I think that's where the key lies. "Our goal is for" – I'm quoting your email – "Our goal is for internationalization with [unclear 08:54] barriers to localization. I think so far so good." This goes back again. I'm sure I have said this before. We have a user in mind, right? We recognize there are two types of users.

One is one that enters information, and one that consumes the information. We are enabling localization for the user that enters the information, right, so that they can use whatever script they're more comfortable with. Your second part of point number one, to consider transformation solutions, I think that will solve the problem of the user that consumes the information. Is that correct?

JIM GALVIN:

Actually, on listening to you, that's a very interesting and important distinction that I had not focused on even myself, as I write this. You're

drawing a very hard line between the producer and consumer of the information. I hadn't thought about it in terms of drawing that hard a line. As I think about it, as I listen to you, I think I like that distinction. Let me say yes. I agree with you.

Localization... Freeform text probably fits the need of the producer of the information. For the consumer to get the information you need to be able to do transformation on it, or somebody needs to be able to do transformations. That's where you get into the need for having the language end script designation.

DENNIS TAN:

Correct. Let me pause you for a minute. I tend to agree with that. For the producer you need to be flexible as far as what type of characters you allow them to use. For the consumer, and the priority for the producer... Let's focus on the producer. The priority for him is to be able to use the character set or language script that they're most comfortable with. If you go now to the consumer side, what's the driver for this type of user?

Is it being able to read the information presented to him, or is it accuracy? If he's looking for accurate information, is he looking for convenience of how the information is presented? I want to say that I'm looking for accurate information. That could be in the native language, because that's what the producer uses to enter the information.

I just take that information as is and take it to a translation service, or whatever, so that I can get the information that I want. I rely on

someone else to translate that information for me, knowing that the information is accurate in the beginning.

JIM GALVIN:

I agree with you in the following way. I agree that the emphasis on the consumer side should be on accuracy. I think that's the right thing to do. There are going to be different consumers. If we follow what the Directory Services EWG has done, there are a variety of consumers. They have different purposes for the data and different needs. I agree with you that what we should be focused on is providing accurate data.

I think a component of accuracy is being able to correctly identify the language and script that's in use, so that that consumer can get at the data in a way that is most convenient for them. Would you agree with that?

DENNIS TAN:

Yes.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. I'll continue.

DENNIS TAN:

I think in this discussion we need to agree whether we're writing the requirements for the producer or the consumer. That will help us drive the prioritization of those requirements, and as an end result, the data model that we're trying to get to. If we prioritize both consumer and

producer needs at the same level, then we end up in this... I think we're going in circles with this, because we cannot prioritize the needs or requirements of [one or the other 14:36]. I'm going to stop here so that others can weigh in.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. Nishit?

NISHIT JAIN:: We've discussed three proposals at this time, so we all know that each of the proposal has pros and cons associated with them. I think in our discussions we've almost ignored the third user [unclear 15:14] possibility, which is the consumer of the WHOIS record and the possibility of the consumer expecting the data to be in the language or script similar to the language or script of the domain name.

I think the larger part of the subset of the user could be [multilingual 15:38] users of that language or script, and the [making of] language or the script is of utmost concern.

JIM GALVIN: I apologize Nishit. Your discussion was breaking up quite a bit. I'm not sure that I got your point. Let me first ask if anyone else, Steve, for example, was able to hear enough that you could get the main points out of that?

STEVE SHENG: No, sorry. It was very unclear to me.

NISHIT JAIN: Let me try once again. Is it clear now?

JIM GALVIN: No, it's very choppy. You get that thing of the other words get chopped off on the end.

NISHIT JAIN: Can you go to [unclear 16:40]. There I mentioned my point of concern, in the last paragraph.

JIM GALVIN: Going back to the message you sent on the 16th of June, you are emphasizing that for the consumer side, making the registration data available in the language and script of the domain name, you're asking the question or potentially making the case that ensuring that the registration data matches the language and/or script of the domain name might become the most important aspect of this.

NISHIT JAIN: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I apologize. I want to be quiet while I think a little bit about what we've been saying here.

NISHIT JAIN: I was saying this because there is a large probability of WHOIS records consumers wanting the WHOIS report to be in the language or script that's similar to the language or script of that particular domain name.

JIM GALVIN: Here's one thing that's occurring to me at the moment in all of this discussion. It's something that I've learned along the way here recently in talking to folks about this problem. I think that there's one important distinction that we can make. One is what's possible – in other words what's the most practical thing to be doing – versus what really is the right thing to do and what really should be present.

That's one of the things that concerns me in this space. I think there are some things that we simply can't do. The technology is simply not there. That's one of the things that occurs to me in trying to make a choice between the consumer and producer of the data. Taking a step back, I think it's important for the producer to be able to use whatever they're most skilled at. That's what the system has to support.

I think what we need to support on the consumer side is simply the ability for the consumer to make the data meet their needs. I'm going to phrase it that way. We don't provide any transformation, but we make it possible for them to do the transformation. That means the burden somehow falls on or between the registrar and registry, to be able to properly label the data, tag the data, and store it in a manner that makes it possible... That's what internationalization means to me in all of this space.

Let me try and say that again. I think that a contribution we could make here is to think in terms of what we think an ideal system should be possible to do. Then we will find where the gaps are in the overall system and make recommendations that meet what we can do today, keeping in mind that we have areas of further study, because we don't think the ideal model is achievable yet today.

I think the ideal model is that the producer of the data should be able to use whatever language or script they're most skilled at – with one caveat, that I'll come back to – so the registry/registrar has the obligation to take that data in. We need to have a way to store it, to normalize it, to validate it, to store it, and then to be able to present it in an international form to a consumer, so that the consumer can localize it. Let me ask first if folks agree with that, or not?

DENNIS TAN: Could you state that again please?

JIM GALVIN: Sure. I'm thinking that the ideal model for the overall system is that the producer, the registrant, should be permitted to use whatever language or script they're most skilled at. They'll enter the data. The registry and registrar, somehow between them, have the obligation to take that data in, to validate it, normalize it, store it, and then on the consumer side when they present it, they need to be able to present it in an international form, which primarily means all the data is properly labeled so that the consumer can localize the data. That's it.

TAKAO SUZUKI: I have a question on the last statement. When you say so that the consumer can localize, what does... A consumer is someone in a local region and then... Localize meaning to their native language or script? I'm sorry. I'm confused.

STEVE SHENG: Takao, I'm unable to hear Jim. My sense of localization is that the consumer of the data may want to take the tagged data and do some transformation on his end to make the data more suitable for use. For example, if the data is submitted in Japanese, an English user consumer of the data would take the Japanese data... Hi Jim. You were off for a while.

JIM GALVIN: Yes, I missed the question. I said, "Please go ahead and ask your question," and then I went dark.

STEVE SHENG: Takao's question is when you talk about the consumer of the data localizing it, he's asking what you mean by that. I was trying to explain. My understanding is the consumer of the data, for example an English user looking at a Japanese WHOIS output that's properly tagged, he or she may choose to do some transformation to translate the labels on the Latin side; transliterate the WHOIS data in a form that he or she, the English user, can process. In that sense it's localization for the English user. That's how I understand it.

JIM GALVIN: Yes, thank you.

TAKAO SUZUKI: That sounds right. I just wanted to confirm. Thank you very much.

JIM GALVIN: Nishit, go ahead.

NISHIT JAIN: One of my concerns in this is how can we expect a normal user, consumer of WHOIS data, to transform WHOIS data into a native language? Maybe the consumer of the data is unknown to the language or the script in which the WHOIS [unclear 27:12] very much unexpected to expect them to transform the data into their native language.

On one side we're [unclear 27:25] provider of the WHOIS record, in his native language. On the other side we're expecting the consumer to transform the WHOIS data in his native language, by any mechanism that there is. I don't know.

JIM GALVIN: If I understood your question Nishit, you were asking how we would expect the consumer to be able to transform the data to make it useful for themselves. Would that be correct?

NISHIT JAIN: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: My answer to that would be “it’s not my problem”. To have a more useful, tactful answer, I would simply say that it would not be the responsibility of the system, meaning the registrar or registrant, to transform the data. The primary responsibility of the registrar or registrant is providing accurate data. If we present the data in its native, producer form, properly tagged, then the consumer would have the responsibility of doing whatever they need to do to that data to make it useful for them.

We provided accurate data. If they need to translate or transliterate, or whatever they need to do, that’s a responsibility that they take on as part of the system. At least speaking personally, I’d suggest that’s the way we describe this system as a whole.

STEVE SHENG: May I come in? I think these considerations are useful to lay out in the document. These are guiding frameworks. Whose responsibility is it for different pieces? Some of these are already going to policy, right? One thing you may want to consider is in terms of the responsibility there’s also the issue of incentives. What I mean is that although...

My sense of how the system works is that although people talk a lot about WHOIS, people don’t really care about WHOIS in that sense. I’m not sure the incentives are all well aligned for the registry and registrar,

and also for the consumer. I think that would be a consideration; something to think about when designing the framework. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you for that Steve. I think I'd expand a bit on your comment that people don't really care about WHOIS and don't think about it. Actually, what I think is that I agree with you in principle. I think the reason for that is what's important, and that's that we're basically working in a monolingual system.

There's a certain assumption and expectation that everything is, always will be, and will continue to be in English – setting aside those few exceptions in those few countries that have done other things. I think people don't care because it's one of those things they expect to just continue to be the way it is.

STEVE SHENG:

Sometimes, yes.

JIM GALVIN:

That's what worries me. As we do this work and think about this, that's what worries me. I agree with you that the way I just described the system, you called it a framework. I like the use of that word. We should have a guiding framework for our recommendations, just as we have our first principles; the user capability principle in particular. We should also have a framework in which we describe the overall system.

One of the interesting implications of the framework as I described it is it also drives the translation and transliteration PDP Working Group in a certain direction. We can be careful about how we describe our framework so as to not define their final work produce, but we also have an opportunity to drive them quite specifically in a certain direction, depending on how we describe our framework. Let's come back to our question here of the framework. Steve?

STEVE SHENG: To go back to your proposal and hear others, I know Dennis and Nishit and Takao weighed in. Others have commented on your proposal.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. We actually have two open questions here at the moment. We're talking about our point one in the email I sent. I've also now described this framework for the information. Does anyone want to say anything about either one of those two open questions at the moment? Steve, as an action I think we need to add some words around this framework idea I've just described. Do you feel comfortable that you could do that for us, for our next meeting? Put into words this framework I just described?

STEVE SHENG: I can try.

JIM GALVIN:

Let me take a minute. I wanted to jump to my second point and talk about the validation stuff for a moment. Let me talk about the caveat. User uses their language. The rest of the system has to maintain that, normalize it, keep it appropriate, and then we simply present it in an international form for the consumer. The caveat that I had really is a nice segue into the second point I was making about validation.

Users should use the language they're most skilled at, except that when it comes to postal information there's an inherent conflict here. If I'm an English speaking person living in Japan, presumably my address has a Japanese form. Arguably, that address should be written in Japanese, and my postal information and postal address should be in Japanese.

The way the postal address rules are written, as I understand them, the only real requirement that's most important here is that the physical object be deliverable by the final postal person who executes that delivery – the last mile problem, if you will. Maybe Japan is not a good example, in the sense that many people will know and understand and be able to read an English or Romanized address. Maybe there are other countries or languages that would be a better example here.

What concerns me is that in an ideal system the postal information really has to be usable by that final postal person, and if it's not usable by that person then it's not an operationally valid address. We already have problems with the syntax of an address, because of a lack of ability to normalize characters, no standard language tables, no standard script tables... Syntactic validation is already not possible.

If we don't ensure that operational validation is possible, then I would question whether we even have accurate postal information. I'm back again to this point that I don't think that freeform text is enough of a requirement on postal information. I really think it has to be freeform text in a language and script that's appropriate for the region. Coming back to the user capability principle, the person using the language or script they're most skilled at.

However, if I'm an English person living in Japan, I should know what my Japanese address is, in Japanese. In the worst case, it ought to be possible for me to copy and paste it into any place I need to. I need to be able to do that and I don't think that's an unreasonable requirement on a producer of information. Let me pause there and give people chance to comment.

I don't know if I have amazed people or frustrated people. Maybe someone could give me a hint. Are you thinking, or are you disgusted?

JODY KOLKER: I'm sorry I'm tardy to this meeting. I was wondering if you could repeat what you just said?

JIM GALVIN: Sure. Have you had a chance to look at my email that I sent a few minutes before this meeting?

JODY KOLKER: No, sorry.

JIM GALVIN: Do you have the opportunity to look at that?

JODY KOLKER: I will look at it right now.

JIM GALVIN: If you could do that, and then rather than repeating right away, let me ask for those who heard, if anyone wants to comment? Otherwise I'll come back and repeat myself.

DENNIS TAN: If I may add something? This is about the need to tag the type of information, so tag the language or the script. I understand why we're thinking about that – so that consumer has an indication of what the language is dealing with. I think what would make most sense is that the country of the information that you're presenting in WHOIS, we'll have a country or postal code or something. That might be an indicator to what language the WHOIS information has been reading. Why would we need to tag the language or script?

I think that in most cases – and I don't have hard data to back this up – but I think that what would make most sense in most cases, the registrant will write in the language where he is located. For example, you brought an example of a US registrant living in Japan, who would register his domain... Yes?

STEVE SHENG: Sorry, Jim is disconnected. If you continue I can summarize it for you when he comes back.

DENNIS TAN: As I was saying, for an example of a US registrant buying a domain name in Japan, he will likely use Japanese characters or a Romanization of Japanese to enter his WHOIS information. I don't think that even though he'd maybe be proficient in Russian, it wouldn't make sense for him to write his address in Russian even though he's living in Japan.

Do you know what I'm saying? I think those are correlated cases. The country code of the information would likely be a key indicator of what language is being used for that data.

STEVE SHENG: Dennis, in that case, what you're suggesting is that the country code will be a close approximation of the language and script the registrant is likely to use?

DENNIS TAN: Correct. That's what I'm getting at. I don't think we need to be a one-stop shop or try to solve consumer needs, because we're providing him or her with accurate information, and the country code will be a likely indicator of what language is being used for that. Yes. Basically that's my point.

STEVE SHENG: In that case, the country code... Okay. Wouldn't that be supporting that the address should be in a format for the region that is appropriate to use? I'm trying to connect the two together. You used an example of a Russian living in Japan, registering a Japanese domain, he's likely to use Japanese characters in his registration and not Russian, which is his most familiar language.

Wouldn't that in that case in fact be arguing for...? The address itself should fit in the norms of that country code? I'm just trying to understand here.

DENNIS TAN: No, I'm just saying that because he's living in Japan, perhaps [unclear 44:17] at least to write his address using either a Japanese character set, or Romanization of Japanese.

STEVE SHENG: I agree with you.

DENNIS TAN: For the regular registrant, he will not say, "I'll find a way to translate my Japanese address into Russian." I don't think that will be the case. He's likely to use a Romanization, even though Russian is his native language. He will not find a way to translate that information into Russian.

STEVE SHENG: I agree with you. Thanks. Jim, are you back?

JIM GALVIN: I'm back and I heard the end of that. I think that means you're agreeing with me then. Let's go to Nishit here and get his comment.

NISHIT JAIN: Dennis, are you saying that just by identifying the country code we can figure out the language [unclear 45:40] particular [unclear] who's recorded all the address [queries].

DENNIS TAN: You are choppy, but I think what you were saying is that I'm saying that having the country code or the country information, it's a sufficient indicator to know what language is in use in the contact information, so that we don't need to add another language or script tag to the information.

That will, by the way, add another complexity to the system. Is that language accurate, for the information that's being given to us? Is a registrant actually saying that he's writing in Japanese or any character set? Now if we have that information then we'll need to verify, "He's [unclear 46:42] in Japanese, he's writing in Japanese." How do we make that connection?

NISHIT JAIN: My point here is that I agree that this will work good in cases where countries only have one official language or script, but what about cases like India, where we have 22 different languages and ten different scripts? How can we identify in which language or script, and who will record this, just by looking to the country code?

DENNIS TAN: Right, I understand what you're saying, but still it's just like you said. I don't think 22 different scripts would be hard to define, to determine.

JIM GALVIN: Let me just jump in here and say that in principle I agree that the country code and name gives us a lot of information. It at least binds at some level the problems faced, the scope of the problem. That's a good thing. India is an interesting case, with 22 languages, because of the different languages being used in different regions.

I'm also not convinced that every country has an official language, so there probably are some nuances there. I'm wondering what point you're trying to make, Dennis, and where we're getting ourselves to. I think you're jumping into one of the details I had in my second point. I apologize – I missed the first part of what you were saying. Let me come back around to the high-level point here for the moment, and then ask Jody if he's up to speed here, or wants to comment, or needs us to say more about context.

I'm trying to press on the point that I think the postal information needs to be in a language or script appropriate to the region. The country code

certainly gives us a pretty good indicator of what's likely to be valid. It at least scopes the problems faced, we believe, for the most part. I will agree with that point.

Dennis, were you agreeing with my point about the postal information not just being freeform, but being freeform in the language or script of the region? Or were you trying to make a different point? I apologize, but I missed it if you were.

DENNIS TAN:

It was a different point. I was using your example of the American, US registrant, registering a Japanese domain name in Japan. He's from the US, living in Japan, so he's likely to use Japanese or Romanization of Japanese to write his address. Make it more extreme. With a Russian registrant living in Japan, he will likely use either Japanese, if he's proficient in Japanese, or Romanization of Japanese. He will not use Russian to write his Japanese address. I don't think there's a connection there.

JIM GALVIN:

I want to take it a step further. I'm trying to take things a step further, even in my email message, and observe that I'm not convinced in the general case... It will probably work in a lot of cases, but I don't believe that a Romanized address is valid in the general case, for many countries.

I think if you don't get it into the local form for that country it won't be deliverable, because the final delivery person, that postal person that

has to deliver is, won't understand the Romanized form and they'll just return it. That's my point.

STEVE SHENG: That's the system today.

JIM GALVIN: Yes, it is.

STEVE SHENG: That means the system today is utterly useless.

JIM GALVIN: I don't think so. I don't think that's fair.

STEVE SHENG: I'm just trying to play the devil's advocate.

JIM GALVIN: There's lots of ways to slice this bread, to look at this in different ways. It's fair for a sovereign nation to have whatever postal rules it wants, and the postal system allows for that. That's just the way the system is constructed and the way it's there. The odds that that's going to change any time soon and in any of our lifetimes is slim to none. Maybe at some point in the future it might, but I don't know.

STEVE SHENG: I think what Dennis is suggesting is a variation of [St. Marks 52:34] proposal too, where [unclear] proposed the language or script of the address should be the language or script of the IDN TLD, or in Roman form. I think what Dennis is suggesting is [unclear] script of the address should match the language and script of the country of the address – so in the region that is appropriately [omitted 53:07], or in Roman form. That's how I understand it.

DENNIS TAN: No, that was not my point. I was not trying to propose that. It was just an example. My point was that... [unclear 53:3] should be freeform text. What I'm saying is that the second point of Jim's text... We need to tag the information so that if we enable localization for the consumer part, that's where I don't want to go, because you're now adding different kinds of problems into the path we were given.

If we don't have to tag the information because we have other values in the WHOIS data, such as the country code, that will give us an indicator to the language being used.

JIM GALVIN: Let me say Dennis that I think as a practical matter I agree with you. In terms of what we can implement today and what's likely to be successful today, I agree with you. I think I'm back to the place of it would be interesting for us to describe and idealize frameworks about what is most likely to be most successful in the most general case, where one can completely tag all data with a language or script.

We describe that as the model we want to strive for, and then we realize that model is not achievable and there are multiple gaps of here. One problem is that the XML and EPP simply doesn't support it. That's a fundamental change to our system overall. There's the more practical issue of do we really need all of this?

I think the point that you're making, Dennis, that I agree with, is to a larger extent you want to put the burden on the consumer to sort it out, and there's probably enough information there with just the country code that it at least bounds the problem that they have to deal with in localizing internationalized data. Maybe we don't need to solve the 100% problem, let's just solve as much of it as we can and burden the consumer with doing more. Would you say that that's fair for the moment, Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: It is, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: I'm conscious now of the time. Jody, I apologize that I didn't repeat what I had said before. I'm wondering if you picked up some context, and maybe I'll give you a chance to get the last word in here, or last question, if you have anything?

JODY KOLKER: I don't think there's anything we can cover in 60 seconds, honestly.

JIM GALVIN: That's fair. I'm just thinking that I think we should continue this conversation next time. I think it's finally starting to take good shape, in my mind at least. I think we're finally honing in. We're diving into the specific issues that we're trying to resolve. I've been feeling awkward about this whole conversation for quite some time.

I'm feeling much better about it now, so even if we end up on freeform text I think we have a lot of rationale and discussion to add to justify that. If folks are okay, I'd like to continue this discussion next time. Does anyone object to that?

JODY KOLKER: I don't.

JIM GALVIN: I think Steve, with that, let me suggest that we adjourn and turn it over to you to tie us up here?

STEVE SHENG: Sure. We'll meet next Wednesday at the same time. I have an Action Item to put some words into the framework, breaking down into the producer of the data, the consumer of the data, and then the registries and registrars, and assign some responsibilities for each of these. Then I'll send that text back to the Working Group.

I'll just send the raw text to the mailing list, not put the document in. I'll want to reach consensus on that text before I put it into the document.

That's the Action Item. Then we'll meet next Wednesday. With that the meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]