
UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Welcome, everyone, to today, on the 24th of September, 2014, the call on the WHOIS Review Team Internationalized Registration Data Expert Working Group. We will be using the document in Google Doc, going through the various changes and discussing some people's comments.

So, with that, over to you, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thanks. I want to do a quick roll call here. So we have Jody, Nishit, Naoki, Takao; and myself, Jim, along with Steve. Okay. Thanks everyone for joining us. I know our progress seems a little bit slow at the moment. We seem to be stepping through in sort of chunks, but we are nearing completion, and this is a good thing.

What I was going to propose to do for today is just to step through from the top, moving down through a few things, and close a couple of comments, maybe ask a couple of questions here that we have going on. But only down as far as I've done my detailed review here, at least from my point of view, looking for comments in here that we can deal with.

And then we'll end – perhaps a bit early, but I think that's pretty much where we are at the moment. We need people to look at the document in the suggesting mode, make changes in there, or add comments. We all just need to go through and try to resolve these things.

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.

That's my plan for today. I apologize for not publishing that agenda in advance, but let me just open up and see if anyone has any other suggestions, other things you'd rather do, a different way of doing this.

Okay. Something did occur to me, though, to add to this, is we did have a bit of discussion going on on the mailing list. In particular, Jody had a question which I responded to. Did you get a chance to see that, Jody? Would it be good to just take a moment and touch on that, quickly?

JODY KOLKER:

I think so. I just got done reading it, actually, and from your comments, I think it would be important for us to be able to state that no working list exists at this time to be able to – what do I want to say? – for registries or registrars to validate a script with a region, and that that's kind of a requirement before we could actually set this as a requirement, in the same way that you mentioned that we have language and script tables. I don't know if that makes any sense.

JIM GALVIN:

It does to me. I agree with you. I think that you and I are on the same page here. I'm fully aware of the fact that the idea that we want the address information to be in a relevant script and language is essentially problematic in today's environment.

I think that the idea here is to expand the text. And this hasn't been done yet, so there's some work to be done here, and I have an action to do that in a comment here, to simply explain why this is a good thing, and then, equally, have to explain well why we can't quite do it yet.

What are the things that have to happen before this can be a valid requirement?

JODY KOLKER: That sounds good to me. These are the things that would have to happen before this can be validated, or a valid requirement. Otherwise it's an idea, but it does need that list.

JIM GALVIN: Right.

STEVE SHENG: We could add Jody's text in the section of the document that talks about the considerations section. So, in particular, I was thinking in section 3.3.2. Currently it says the use of language and script text for all registration data requires that a standard list and definition of languages and scripts exists. So we could add Jody's text in the e-mail to here, as well ISO and the need for that list to exist prior to any of these can be implemented. How does that sound?

JIM GALVIN: I think that's fine. I think we should absolutely put that in there. We'll editorialize it later to make sure it fits, since I have some other clean-up to do in some earlier sections and we want to make sure that all of this fits together. But yes, please do that.

STEVE SHENG: You okay with it? Is that okay with you, Jody?

JODY KOLKER: Yeah, it is. I guess I had one other comment. And I'm not sure that this is called out in here, and that's why I'm asking. So, we're recommending that it needs to be in the localized script of the region, or was there a secondary text that it could be in? Did we say that it could also be in English?

JIM GALVIN: From my point of view, speaking just as an individual here, I don't think that's for us to say. I think that it's the Translation and Transliteration Working Group that would speak to that issue. So, we could make reference to the fact – I guess, taking a step back here – maybe we could make reference to the fact that this other working group is speaking to this question, and it might affect this recommendation.

JODY KOLKER: All right.

JIM GALVIN: I mean, I guess I'm not really sure – I'm not sure which one of us is going to finish first, us or them, because they're getting pretty close to being done, also. And it turns out that they're getting pretty close to being done and they're actually not going to recommend the use of a single language or script. So, assuming they continue down that path – and

since they're not done yet, there's always the possibility of change – there won't be such a fallback position anyway.

But we could still speak to the issue. I don't see any problem with that. I suppose we can find a way to more generically speak to the question of whether or not there's a fallback, or some registries might want to consider that and do that for themselves even if there's not a uniform requirement of registries. Would that be something you'd like to see?

JODY KOLKER:

I think so, Jim. I believe that there needs to be some kind of fallback, as far as, if you have somebody who happens to be living in France, and I've spoken to Takao and a couple other people saying that they're able to send e-mail to people in Russia that has a completely English address on it, or into France, or into Japan. I'm trying to be respectful of the people that have moved to these countries. I guess I'll take that back – that have moved there and – well, I guess my train of thought isn't quite there yet. Never mind.

JIM GALVIN:

No, I know how you feel, because I've been struggling with this business here for a while myself to try and logically have a straightforward train of thought, as you call it, and it's not easy.

If I were to try down this path, I think the issue which I always bump up against is we've got this user capability principle. And so, on the one hand, we're saying that someone should not have to use a language or

script that's not already typical for them. Right? It's what they're most skilled at.

So, if I'm a Russian who moves to France, that user capability principle, the first thing that it would seem to say is that I ought to be able to enter all of my contact information in Russian. Right? And so that feels like the right thing, just from that point of view.

But what I bump up against, in my mind, at least, the direction that I come from is I then say, "But wait a minute, you have to think about this from the point of view of what's required by the postal regulations. What are the postal requirements?"

The purpose of the address is to deliver a physical letter or postal object of some sort, and therefore, it has to be operationally useful in that context. To me, this becomes the one situation where that has to be the requirement, that the address should be in French, not in Russian.

And then you get to ask the question, "Well, if I'm Russian, how am I going to write a French address?" My only response to that, from a practical point of view, is, "Well, I ought to be able to copy and paste. Surely I can at least do that much, because it would simply be wrong to write my French address in Russian."

But it doesn't feel elegant at all. But I'm not sure what else to do, know what else to say. I guess that's kind of where I'm falling. Any reactions?

JODY KOLKER:

I would agree. We should allow the user to be able to put it into whatever script that they are most comfortable with. But, as you said, it

doesn't make sense to put a Russian address – to translate French into Russian when I'm living in France, for the address.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. It's the validation requirements, it's the overall [RAA] validation requirements that registrars are subject to that comes to bear in this context. So there's two things. It's postal regulations, it's the validation requirements that registrars are going to be subject to, and in particular, it's the operational validation of the address. How do you make all those things work and play together?

JODY KOLKER: And the biggest one that I see is the operational validation of the address, as we've had multiple issues with that as a registrar.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. Okay. Anything else, or can we jump to the document here?

JODY KOLKER: I'm ready to jump to the document, if anyone else is.

JIM GALVIN: Any comments from anyone else? Okay. So, just starting at the top of the document and scrolling down, I see a couple of editorial things from Steve in the first paragraph here of the executive summary, and I'm inclined to just accept those. Steve has been good. We should all, for

changes that anyone makes, just a reminder to use this suggesting mode, which I so very much like in Google Docs now, I've got to say.

But if no one objects, I think we'll just accept those changes up there at the top, Steve's changes. And then I had a comment here to check a reference, and I think that that's fine. I'm not quite sure what I was thinking about when I had selected this.

I wanted to check the phrase that's used in the solution study, Steve, but I think this is fine, because I'm pretty sure you took all of this text and these definitions right from there, right?

STEVE SHENG: Regarding internationalization versus localization?

JIM GALVIN: Correct.

STEVE SHENG: I think this is what we define in this document.

JIM GALVIN: We made these definitions? We didn't take them from their solutions document?

STEVE SHENG: Which solutions? The solutions study?

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, the solution study, the transformation solutions study that was done. I mean, that's okay. It's just, I actually thought the definitions came from there, but that's fine if they didn't.

STEVE SHENG: I can quickly check.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. While you do that, we'll keep moving down, here. So, there are a couple of deletions here as we get to the table, which I think they're fine, which we can accept. I added text this morning in here about the languages and scripts appropriate for the region in which the address is located, as we get to the top of page six, here, for the address of the registrar and technical administrative contact.

One of the things I want to call out is, when I was fixing up this – and we'll have to fix it up later on, and the text, too, and then add some text to explain this – I didn't say "a language or script." I said "in languages and scripts appropriate for the region." I was phrasing this in a way to explicitly allow for mixed script in the address, and we'll have to talk about that more in the actual text later on down below. But I wanted to call that out for folks.

JODY KOLKER: Jim, I think that also gives it the ability to be able to say "in regions." Saying, "appropriate for the region" could mean that there's a fallback

for a script, or for the postal address, for the language that it's in. I think it's good.

JIM GALVIN:

I agree. Yeah. So, certainly, it does allow that interpretation, too, so we can have some discussion about that later. Okay.

A new question has occurred to me. As I was looking at this table here, so the next comment down from me is, I had highlighted the postal code of the registrar and the technical administrative contact, and it suddenly jumped out at me – I don't know why I didn't notice this before – but, why isn't the postal code just part of the address? Why is that a separate line item?

STEVE SHENG:

Jim, I can answer that. In the table, there are three columns. One is the data category and example data elements. So, here the previous [inaudible] address of registrant. This address is mostly very unstructured, free-form text. Address one, address two, city, state, and province. Those are kind of more subject to language and script.

For postal code, you could – it seems to be more or less standardized around the world, there are special postal codes that people will use. So that, in some way, is categorically different from the address one, address two, city, and state, where you are to enter more free-form text.

That's why I was developing this table itself to separate those, because the latter one is easier to standardize. The former one is going to be much more challenge. So that's the reason.

JIM GALVIN:

What occurs to me in listening to that is – I get what you're saying. So a postal code actually has a defined value. There are, essentially – someone gets to specify what the postal code is and what it can be. So it occurs to me that that's a big – well, I don't know. No, I take it back.

Okay, I'm sorry. I'll finish my thought first so that other folks can get an opinion from other folks here. There's essentially – what I think I heard you saying, my interpretation of what you were saying, is that postal codes, there are well-defined tables of postal codes. And so, to a first order, where I was going is, "Oh, well, then we should simply reference the fact that there are tables of these things and that's where the postal code comes from."

So, it might be free-form text from the point of view of a principal, but in fact its actual scope is limited by whatever the postal authority says it should be. But the reason why I hesitated – so that's where I was going to stop. And then I hesitated as I started to say that, because it suddenly occurred to me that, "Oh, but wait a minute, postal rules actually say what addresses are allowed to look like, too."

Some regions of the world have real databases of these things so that you can actually do syntactic validation mostly conveniently in many parts of the world. In fact, even the U.S. Postal Service, for example, you

can enter an address without a ZIP code and they'll tell you the ZIP code for that address.

So you can do mappings between these two sets of tables. So it's not clear to me that these things are categorically different. Anyway, I'll give you a chance to comment to that. I'm interested in what other people think, too, but go ahead, Steve. Do you have a reaction?

NISHIT JAIN:

I just want to add on to what Steve said. Unlike the address part of the registrant, where he will be allowed to enter the address in his or her language, the postal codes, as far as I know, have got some specific format. Like, in India, we have got I believe six letter or numeric value. So each of the countries has got a definite format to specify the postal code.

JIM GALVIN:

So, Nishit, that said, shouldn't we say something more than free-form text here?

NISHIT JAIN:

I don't know. I have just heard it – I found it on Wikipedia, and I just [inaudible].

JIM GALVIN:

What I'm struggling with in my mind is I guess I accept the idea that it's categorically different than the address. But if it is, then it feels like that

somewhere along the way here we need to make reference to the fact that it has well-defined values. I don't think we do that in the text. I'm okay, I think, with the requirement being free-form text for this, but we need to explain that free-form text, but values are restricted by country, or something. Shouldn't we say something about that? I'm just not sure what to say, because not everybody has postal codes, right?

STEVE SHENG:

Yes. Not every country has postal codes. So, for example, I look at the Wikipedia list of postal codes, they have this specified area format for each of these postal codes. So, for example, Angola doesn't have postal code. Bahamas doesn't have postal code. So there are a few countries that do not have postal code.

JIM GALVIN:

Here's a related question that occurred to me in this. Lower down, the next set of things we have here is this country and country code. I had asked the question elsewhere – not right here – that, shouldn't the country and country code, shouldn't we say something about the fact that these things should be the same? They should certainly be equivalent values, if you will.

Now I'm stuck here wondering a similar kind of question about address and postal code. Shouldn't the postal code in some ways match the address? If we call it out separately, don't we have to speak to the issue of whether or not it matches the address? But I think if you make it part of the address, we probably don't really have to say anything about

that, because it seems much more implied that it should go together.
Am I making sense?

STEVE SHENG: Isn't that going down the line of validation?

JIM GALVIN: Yes.

STEVE SHENG: Let me see in the RAA what it says. Some of these are specified in the RAA. So let me just pull up that.

JIM GALVIN: Now that's a good question, sure. Does the RAA speak about whether or not postal code needs to match the address? It probably doesn't. It simply says the address as a whole has to be valid.

STEVE SHENG: So, for example, the RAA says, "Validate the postal address in the proper format for the applicable country or territory. Validate that postal address fields are consistent across fields. For example, street exists in city, city exists in state/province, city matches postal code, where such information is technically and commercially feasible for the applicable country or territory."

So it seems that the RAA already addressed some of that. Let me pull that into the [inaudible].

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, we should have a reference to that. That's a good point. So actually, the issue, the question that I'm raising is covered by the RAA, because it actually says all four of these things really do need to relate to each other.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah.

JIM GALVIN: There is a relationship here between an address, a postal code, and the two country things. I have to say, I'm inclined to pull the postal code inside of address. Free-form text appropriate for the region in which it's located, and then underneath that, you have the validation requirements that the RAA requires anyway.

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

JODY KOLKER: Pulling that validation requirement in from the RAA, I've always been a little leery of that requirement in the RAA, almost to the point of where it says where it's commercially feasible, which in most countries, it's not commercially feasible to do. So I'm not sure. Prolificating that RAA

requirement I think is difficult, because it will be difficult for registrars to fulfill that verification or validation.

JIM GALVIN:

I take your point, Jody. I didn't mean to overstate what I meant by "pull it in." I think that, in general, we're going to make a validation reference just to get at the operational validation of an address. I don't want to "pull it in" as in to remind people of the requirement. I want to reference the fact that this issue is covered by validation requirements.

I guess I'm not sure, until I actually start to write the text, exactly what this is going to look like. I don't want to pull it in in the way that you're speaking about it. I want to pull it in in a way just to suggest that these four elements right now, these four categories right now, operationally, belong together, and operationally, their validation is done together. And some reference to "as defined by the RAA" without maybe saying specifically what that is.

JODY KOLKER:

Yeah, I don't have a problem with postal code being pulled into address, combining those.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. So there are actually two things that we're talking about there. I wanted to respond directly to your concern about pulling in the validation requirement, and I wanted to specifically say I'm not trying to pull it in as a hard requirement, just as a soft reference.

JODY KOLKER: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: If that distinction makes sense.

JODY KOLKER: Yeah, it does.

JIM GALVIN: And then, separately, I am bringing up the question of whether or not that postal code should be part of the address. I took your point, Steve, that it is, at some level, categorically different. But, on the other hand, I don't see a compelling reason to keep it separate.

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: But I'm interested in what other people think. Jody seemed to suggest that he thought it was okay to pull it together. Does anyone else have any strong feelings about keeping it separate, and can you give any kind of reason as to why, or comment as to why?

STEVE SHENG: Jim, I'm okay either way.

JIM GALVIN: In some sense, I'm trying to keep the set of requirements minimal. I don't want to create any more categories of things than we have to.

STEVE SHENG: Right, right.

JIM GALVIN: That's the only thing that I'm after, here. If we can reduce the list by one, I see that as a feature. Unless there's some kind of really good, compelling reason to keep it separate, then I certainly don't object. But I'm not hearing one at the moment.

Okay. Now, the country and country code things, what compels me to want to keep those separate is there is actually documentation and there's a specific reference of what the values should be there. So it's not free-form text applicable to a region. Those have well-defined values, and in that sense, that at least compels me to want to keep them separate. That's my motivation there.

So, continuing on down. We're down here to the identifiers, now into page seven. So at the middle of page seven we have a set of identifiers, and we make the comment that there are no internationalized standards because the actual values are assigned by IANA. And Naoki points out that there actually is a type specified for them in the EPP, and wonders if that should be the requirement if we need to make reference to that.

Steve, you asked for discussion. So I'll jump in first. I agree with Naoki. It certainly would be relevant for us. I think our comment about no internationalized standards is okay, but we should certainly make reference to the fact that there is a type defined for this in EPP.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. But Jim, my question is does that type apply to all identifiers? This is a general category. Domain ID [inaudible] the registrar ID, registrant ID, registrar ID. Most of those are kind of internal objects, internal values assigned by registrar registries. So, do all of those comply with the RC5730? Question for Naoki.

JIM GALVIN: Naoki, do you know offhand if all of those particular example identifiers are subject to that particular syntax?

NAOKI KAMBE: Yes, I agree with Steve's opinion. If [inaudible] or registrar ID or registrant ID, but not for domain ID.

STEVE SHENG: So it's only used for contact identifiers?

NAOKI KAMBE: Yes.

JODY KOLKER: The IANA ID is supplied. All the others, as you've stated, are internal IDs to the registry.

JIM GALVIN: Well, I think part of the answer for Naoki's comment is that I don't think it can be a requirement – not a requirement from this working group in this table. The question that I don't know the answer to yet is it does seem to me that there's probably a way to make reference to this definition in the data model, and I'm just not prepared to speak to that just yet. I have to study this and think about this more.

STEVE SHENG: In the schema itself, for registrar ID, registrant ID, domain ID, at least put a footnote saying – the data model is one example. The schema specified is just one example. Registrar or registry could use others, because essentially it's whatever each registry or registrar internally decides. So in the data model we should not give people the impression that that is the one everybody has to use. But for IANA ID, yeah, it's well-specified, the value, in the IANA registry.

JIM GALVIN: I think I'm okay with that. But I think that if we start down that path, we have to make sure to do that consistently. Where there is a syntactic definition, we should at least reference the fact that it already exists and where it is. That's sort of the path that I'm headed down, but I want to see what that starts to look like and think about that some more.

Does anyone else have any other comments? Let me add a comment here to that effect, right here in the document.

STEVE SHENG: So we will not change the text in the table, right?

JIM GALVIN: Well, actually, it occurs to me that I think I want to say something a little different than the text, because I think that we need to say more than that there is no internationalization standards. What we should say is that the values are assigned by an authority, so we only speak about the IANA ID. We should say where the others come from.

So there's no international standards, but the values are assigned by an authority. That's what makes it an identifier, the fact that there is some authority that defines what the identifiers are supposed to be. So the category of identifier is something which has an authority that manages the values.

STEVE SHENG: Yes, but Jim, those are in section 6.2.4, those explanations. The table is just a summary.

JIM GALVIN: All right, so that's probably fine in the table. Yes, you're right. So the table can just say that there's no international standards to be applied.

STEVE SHENG: So, specifically, in section 6.2.4, is that identifiers are usually a registry or registrar internal object. Therefore, no internationalization standards should be applied.

JIM GALVIN: Right.

STEVE SHENG: And then, for IANA ID, it should be the numeric ID assigned by IANA for a given registrar or registry. So there are some text there. Maybe that actually needs to be reworded a bit to make it clear.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, I think so. That sounds good to me. Any comments from anyone else?

Okay. So I added a comment there in the document, right there at the table, as a reminder of what to do going forward. Okay. So, continuing to scroll down here, now in the middle of page eight, I just found an RFC reference in brackets and I just wondered – oh, you already deleted them, Steve. Okay. So we're good there. So we can skip past that.

Editorial comment about referencing the data model in the executive summary, I think we should probably should add a forward reference that's at the bottom of page eight. Okay.

Continuing to scroll through, unless someone wants to jump and speak up as we get into the background on page nine, we have some editorial

notes from Steve and I'm okay with those unless someone wants to speak up.

And, Steve, moving on down to the bottom of page 10, Steve made some changes to some text there, and I'm okay with those, too.

So, at the bottom of page 11, I had highlighted one thing and made a comment that, shouldn't these English labels be in Japanese. And Naoki, you were kind enough to change the one label. But I guess what I was looking for was to change all of the labels, so domain name, registrant, name, postal address, and that word fax down there, too. Could we get all of those changed to be Japanese? Would you be able to do all of those, Naoki?

NAOKI KAMBE: I will do that.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you, that would be great.

STEVE SHENG: Jim, I think, in terms of the domain name, for example, there are two columns, and so two rows. One is the U label, the other is the A label, right. So if he wants both labels – the label part to be in Japanese, we can simply copy whatever up there, the first row, the U label.

JIM GALVIN: That makes sense to me. I'm okay with that.

STEVE SHENG: This is, in TPRS, what they input for anything that is English or Latin, they gave an English label. Anything that is Japanese, they gave a Japanese label.

JIM GALVIN: Oh, I see what they're doing. Okay. That's interesting. That certainly makes sense, now. That certainly explains what's going on there. Okay. I guess, though, at least my suggestion – and given that explanation, folks may want to think differently about this – but I was, for illustrative purposes, thinking that the localization should be completely local and localized, and that's why I was suggesting to change the labels.

STEVE SHENG: Let's just do some real-time editing here, while we're looking at it. Is that what you're saying? And let's just quickly—

JIM GALVIN: Yes, that's what I'm suggesting.

STEVE SHENG: [inaudible]

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. So I'm not sure what to do with webpage and fax, but if we can fix those up too, unless people don't think that's a good idea.

STEVE SHENG: There is no webpage here, so we can just delete this.

JIM GALVIN: That works, too. Please, Nishit, go ahead.

NISHIT JAIN: This particular localized and Japanese [inaudible] content, two different [names] for the same thing. One is in localized [inaudible] in English, but I described [inaudible] English example qualification [inaudible] is the Japanese [inaudible] for the same [inaudible]. This would be good, I think, if the most complete [inaudible] which is [inaudible] English, which is beginning before [inaudible] complete localized WHOIS records.

STEVE SHENG: Nishit, are you suggesting to delete the English version completely? Is that what you're suggesting?

NISHIT JAIN: Yes, because that doesn't make sense for things that Japanese [inaudible] twice, instead of different [inaudible]. The label for registrant looks similar to [inaudible] in Japanese.

STEVE SHENG: Good point. So what Nishit is suggesting is to remove – in this example, remove the English version or the Latin version completely, so that it don't confuse the reader.

JIM GALVIN: I agree. That makes sense to me.

STEVE SHENG: Is that okay with you, Naoki?

NAOKI KAMBE: Yes, no problem.

STEVE SHENG: So that's how the latest would look like.

JODY KOLKER: Would you also want to remove the fax label, that says F-A-X?

STEVE SHENG: But the first one is telephone, the second one is fax.

JODY KOLKER: Oh, there is no translation, sorry. Never mind.

STEVE SHENG: I can, with my limited reading of Chinese characters, that's how I understand. Naoki, could you comment?

NAOKI KAMBE: I think it shouldn't be there.

STEVE SHENG: The first one is telephone, right? The second one is fax.

NAOKI: Yes, that's correct.

STEVE SHENG: All right, got it.

JIM GALVIN: One thing, though, to go back to, is with the domain name, one of the things that we do have as our own requirement here – so we should leave it here – is although we can take out the second label, we should leave the XX XN dash dash presentation, because we do have as a requirement that submissions can be in the U label form, but both U label and A label should always be output.

STEVE SHENG: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: So we can take out the second label, if you will, but just leave both values. Just line them up. We'll figure that out too. Yeah, just like that. Okay.

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: We're moving along here, so this is good. And actually as I look up and see that we are five minutes towards the hour here, I'm going to look on down for the moment. I think that's probably a good place to stop. Because now that gets us – the next section has some real work to do, and there's still work to be done there. So that brings us up to section 3.3 here, which is in the middle of page 15.

So I'm going to actually suggest that we pause here and adjourn at this point. Folks should continue to read, feel free to comment and edit really anywhere in the document. But we have some work to do here in the next sections. I know that I have some actions to do.

But folks should feel free to add and continue to suggest things for the document. I think that's it for now. Let's see, let me just take a quick look at the calendar. Any reason not to meet next week? Not hearing any objections. Let's plan a meeting next week. And we'll probably get one more in on the 8th. Steve, will you be available on the 8th?

STEVE SHENG: That's on Wednesday, right?

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, that's Wednesday. I haven't made my travel arrangements yet, but I'm guessing I'll be leaving on Thursday to head towards the ICANN meeting.

STEVE SHENG: Me too, so we're good.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, so we should be able to get two more meetings in and hopefully continue to progress through the document.

STEVE SHENG: Hopefully we'll be done in two weeks.

JIM GALVIN: We can certainly shoot for that. That would be a good thing. Any other comments, questions, suggestions from anyone? Any other business? Okay. Then let me thank everyone, and turn it over to you, Steve, to bring us to a close.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. The action item is we'll continue to edit this document. I will accept the changes that are accepted today on the call to reflect in the document. So people can please continue to work on this and we will

meet next week and the following Wednesday. With that, the call is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]