Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 05 June at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 05 June 2014 at 1300 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-20140605-en.mp3

Attendees:
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Zhang Zuan (Peter Green) – NCUC
Justine Chew – Individual
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Wanawit Ahkuputra – GAC
Wolf Ulrich Knoben - ISPC

Apologies:
Jim Galvin – SSAC

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Amy Bivins
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recording has started; please go ahead.

(Terri Agnew):   Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is a

                  translation and transliteration of contact information PDP working group on

                  Thursday, the 5th of June 2014. On the call today we have Justine Chew

                  Chris Dillon, Peter Green, Mae Suchayapim Siriwat, Wanawit Ahkuputra,

                  Rudi Vansnick, Petter Rindforth, Jennifer Chung, and Wolf Knoben. We have

apologies from Jim Galvin. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman, and myself Terri Agnew.

I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, (Chris).

(Chris Dillon):   Thank you very much indeed. Okay, so let's move into number three on the agenda and this is just the usual point on statements of interest, whether anybody has a change in the statements of interest since last week. Okay, seeing none I'll just move into the next point.

And this is the responses from SOs and ACs. And a couple of points I'd just like to say before we start with this because I think it will be most of today's call. One is just to say that Jim did have a few questions about the summary that we were discussing last week and he's not on the call this week, but I'm just making the point that I haven't forgotten about that. So I will be back on that case next week. And specifically I know that he was interested in response number 39, which I think is one of the ones from the Thai GAC. So I think he will want to ask questions about that quite soon, possibly next week.

And now the other thing I'll just -- other general thing -- I'll just say before we get down to work going through documents is that we have a major new document this week which was circulated on the mailing list but I will just draw your attention to it now. And that is the study to evaluate available solutions for the submission and display of internationalized contact data. And that's quite a long report -- it's about 50 pages -- its extremely interesting and it is relevant to what we are doing.

Now, it is -- although saying it is quite a long report -- and so what I would like to suggest is that - I'm going to do it in order, so we'll just work - we'll work through the documents that, you know, are already in the queue for retention

and then we'll come to that - that one. But I think the earliest we - okay, I think that we could, you know, come back to that one later in the call.

And so apart from just generally reading it -- because it is a long document -- I would like you to pay particular attention to any parts of that document that are about scripts that you know. So there are specific parts of document on the HAM script and on Arabic scripts and various other scripts. And the reason I'm flagging that up is because those are the parts of that document that we can't really spend very much time on as we go through it. So if you can be ready for any additional points on specific scripts, that will really speed us through the document.

And what I was trying to say earlier -- and it didn't come out right, I think -- was I think the earliest we would get to that would be next week, in fact, because we - you know, we do have quite a pile of stuff to do today. But - yes, I was also (unintelligible) stuff in the wiki here -- Julie is just showing people where it is in the wiki -- and I think I put a couple of links in the wiki as well just a couple of days ago.

So okay, I think there are one or two points of - now, let me have a look. I think there were some things later. Yes, so there - apparently there are a couple of things of any other business, so we'll move - I'm intending to sort of run until about 10 to 3 British time and then we can deal with those. So that's about 45 minutes from now.

Okay, any questions about any of that or shall we just return to what we were doing last week and then move on from the end of that document to other documents? Okay, well last week we had got about halfway through the interim report from the expert working group on internationalized registration data. I'll just see if I can find a quick link to that. The chat room. Oh, yes, apparently it will come up in a moment.

Now, we got -- in fact, we're only looking at two pages of that report -- we were looking at page 17 last week and we're going to do page 18 this week. And we'll start at the top. The various bullet points actually aren't numbered, but I'm giving them numbers because, you know, we really need numbers that we know which point we're talking about. So the point at the top of the page is - I'm going to call number six. And - now, let me have a look. Okay, and - alright, we can actually see that coming up on the screen.

And I reckon that number six for me is a relatively simple question. Eventually there had to be something simple here and I think this is it. It is - it says - so it actually says - oh, yeah, we can see it. If there are two versions of the registration data, which version should be considered primary or authoritative if there is a mismatch? And I'll just put one - just put one little explanation here, but I guess what we're talking about is we're talking about a version of the data which is perhaps in the original script.

So we might use Chinese characters, for example. So say we've got one that - we've got one version which is in Chinese characters and we've got the other version which is in the - one of the Chinese Romanization, Pinyin. So in a case like that, which is the authoritative version? And what I would like to say is that for me the answer really and truly is that the original Chinese script version is authoritative.

So I guess by saying that what I'm really doing is looking out for opinions which differ from that. So if there are people out there who would like to make a case for a Romanization or some for which is not the original script -- original language version -- than that we are very interested in. But, you know, for me I can see PATA agreeing with that. So for me this is actually a relatively simple question for me, it really is the original version. But that said, obviously, you know, if there is a - if there is somebody out there wanting to make a case, it's not that we're not interested.

Okay. Moving on to the next point, which is number seven -- or at least in my system it's number seven -- then we've got if translated slash transliterated versions of the data are required, how will data be maintained simultaneously in multiple languages or scripts? Should there be additional matter level information?

So again, the suggestion here would be that - I think very often what would tend to happen would be that perhaps there may be a change in the original script version and then some other version -- a Romanized version -- may change. So often it would be that way round, although I suppose one could imagine a situation where there was an obvious typo in the Romanization. So I don't know, somebody had written paging in sort of Beijing, so that just needs to be fixed. So that would be a situation where the Pinyin or the Romanization -- which is not the original form -- gets changed.

And then we have the other question, should there be additional matter level information? And here really and truly the answer one would expect would be yes because otherwise, you know, actually how do we know what these versions are, you know, particularly something that's Romanized? You know, what kind of data is that? It is actually a very important if view. But later on when we come to have a look at the study to evaluate the available solutions for the submission and display of internationalized contact data -- probably next week if we continue to make good progress -- then that, you know - oh, lost track of what I was saying.

So, you know, generally that, you know, that would be the case. But in fact they - that study has looked at a survey of what is actually happened and one of the interesting things about the survey is that nobody is using matter data so far. So, you know, this means that, you know, if we do say that matter data is required, that is substantially different from what is happening at the moment. So that's really the point I wanted to make about that.

Anything else about number seven? I think we've got a few technical problems. It may be better just to copy the URL out of the chat and get the URL going in a separate browser window; that often works quite well if we've got technical hiccups. I'm sitting here with paper copies. Really have not gone - I have not gone electronic at all, it's all paper here.

Okay. And so if there aren't any other points about that question then we end up with number eight, which is the last one. And this is something that we've actually already spoken about previously, but it's saying for company and individual names, should translation or transliteration be required? And heavens -- twice in one meeting -- I think this is an easy question because in the case of names, usually we really do want transliteration. There may be some exceptions, but translating Beijing into northern capital is profoundly unhelpful. So often it will just be translation Beijing. We don't want to translate that - we don't want to translate names.

But again looking at the report that I was referring to earlier -- you know, the study to evaluate available solutions -- that does actually highlight a few cases where -- I think there's a Russian one in there -- and it says sort of, you know, transliterating into ((Foreign Language Spoken 0:13:55)), which really what you want is something like Lenin Avenue. But actually if you transliterate you get this other form which is rather more difficult to understand. So it's not completely black and white -- this one -- but, you know, very often -- I think predominantly perhaps -- the answer is transliteration. That there are some issues.

I would suspect that the universal postal unions rules on postal addresses will solve many of these problems because they actually have dedicated rules for addresses in many countries. So I guess probably a summary might be that most of the time it's transliteration but there may be cases of translation and there are also cases where the order of an address is changed.

So I think one of the addresses was some German street where you had something like ((Foreign Language Spoken 0:15:10)) which actually - and that's the same order - oh, I know what it was. It was ((Foreign Language Spoken 0:15:17)) followed by a number - number eight or something like that. Actually it was 23, but oh well. And that becomes 23 Linden Street or 23 ((Foreign Language Spoken 0:15:29)) in English. So there's actually a change in the order and that sort of thing is quite common.

We're having quite a lot of technical problems today. All I can say is just copy the URL and then fire up the report in a separate window and that means you're not relying on Adobe Connect's problems. And that actually brings us to the end of this particular document that we've been looking through, so that's the interim report from the expert working group on the internationalized registration data.

So before we move on to the next document, I'll just ask whether there is anything else we want to say about that. I mean, actually we've really only picked up quite a small part of that document as well. But it did - I think we have to address all eight of these questions and they have been copied into our page on this subject, so they have been added to proposed questions and taxonomies, which is number four in our wiki.

Okay. Seeing no comments in Adobe, we can now possibly move on and this then ends up being - I think it's the status update report. So this is status update report from the expert working group on GTLD directory services. I will presume that we may still continue to have technical problems, so I will just copy the URL straight into the chat so that you can use them as a tab in your browser.

(Unintelligible). Yes, that looks right. Oh, no, that URL is actually - is broken, so you need to actually remove the content before the www and then it should work. Actually maybe it's okay if I fix it. Okay, that looks more as if it

may be helpful. And I'll just wait a moment whilst we fire up that. And specifically this time we're looking at pages 23 to 31 which cover validation.

Adobe Connect seems to be happy with us, let's hope that continues. Oh. Yes. It is looking less pleasant. Yeah, I think the old fashioned approach is preferably paper but failing that a tab in the browser is the way forwards. Well, the report starts off with a list of what we can consider to be the benefits of validation. So, yeah, we have unfortunately we still - or at least I have problems seeing the report in Adobe Connect, so I'll wait on it. Things are happening, perhaps it will come right.

There's an hourglass now. Yes, that looks really good. Nope, but it's fallen over again. I think - no, we still have technical problems there. The - I think the best thing to do is just to open it separately. I mean, the only problem is that it does become more difficult to see what's going on in Adobe Connect, but at least we can have a look at that document. I think we might - it might be some kind of memory issue.

Coming back to it, we have basically quite a list of benefits of validation on page 23. So this is things like increased accuracy of contact information by using pre-validated contact information. And this - the benefit there is to reduce error and fraud. Then the other possibility is avoiding the need to validate registrant data each time a registrant registers a new domain name, because I gather a lot of the time registrants are registering quite a lot of domain names. So, you know, there could be some sort of system where that data was only validated - those data were only validated once and that would be an improvement.

Then at the bottom of the page avoiding delay in the processing of the domain registration. Yes, if it's done before it then that would be the benefit.

Then we go on to page 4 - ah, and we are seeing things - may this continue. And we're up at the top of page 24 now. And this is really - and that's

displaying beautifully. Good, good, that makes things much easier. This is displaying just really more detail. So it's saying that often there are primary contact points to several (unintelligible) - it really could be quite a few (unintelligible). And so the idea would be to allow the easy - the use of contacts like that.

And then at the bottom of the page there are recommendations for a pre-validation process. So we've got things like syntactic and operational validation carried out by the validator. And I'll just slide up; so the syntactic validation is doing things like checking whether an e-mail address has an at sign in it and the operational validation is can the e-mail address actually receive e-mail. That sort of thing.

That then takes us on to page 25 and then we've got the identity validation which is not as optional. And this is the thing that can only really be done manually. The other two can be done automatically. So, you know, there may be a case for this to be done by validators. And then there is the specific suggestion that unique identifiers be used for validators. There is just some concrete suggestions about how that may work.

Then if we go forwards on to page 26 there are suggestions about processes. And you've got self-correction is one of them. That's if - so basically validators allow to update information. Or -- or and/or -- seems to monitored process where validators conduct periodic validation. And that then sort of slips into a system whereby you could have a registration data flagged as inaccurate. And then inaccurate - the inaccurate flag would be replace - well, would be removed if the data were updated so that it was - so that they were again accurate.

Nothing very much on page 27 and then if we go on to page 28 this is really a - it's a summary of some of the things we've just been discussing, but it adds new things. So I think probably the safest thing to do is to just go through this. And so this is the numbered sections on page 28. And so they're talking - in

number one they're talking about the unique contact identifier that we already spoke about.

Then in number two it's being more specific and saying that they would be associated with discreet blocks of contact information. They would be -- in number three -- accredited entities by validators - registrars, registries, third party validators. And then to be associated with a domain one would have to have a contact ID under this model. And they can be assigned to the multiple rows we were talking about earlier in number five. Then this - and then the contact ID would be created as part of the domain registration process. I think that's the idea there.

And validated at the three levels, syntactic, operational, and identity, which we were just discussing a moment ago. I'll just - going through. And then possibility of multiple levels of authentication - oh yeah, okay, so sort of no validation to high validation; I think that's the idea there. And then this thing about it could have a status of inaccurate and that would then disappear if it were fixed; number 11.

And all the data elements have to be validated at least at the - or at the syntactic level, you know, e-mail addresses having an at sign; that sort of thing. And then number 13 we got (unintelligible) the three dates (unintelligible) dates (unintelligible) must be validated operationally. Oh yes, it is things like does the email address work, before it can be used in relation to a domain name and then we have got contact holder may seek higher levels of validation rather than just the minimum requirements.

Okay, goodness - perhaps it is a good moment to pause. We are about halfway through but I am just wondering there are any comments about this or whether it is just hopeful for me to continue to go through and try and summarize and explain the rest of them.

Well let's continue. I think we are about more than halfway through in fact. The idea of cross field validation say to some extent data in wrong field may be backing up her data in another. I think that is the idea of that. And then there may be a minimum of a certain number of fields that would be cross field validated.

And then talk of, you know, contact data should be re-validated every, you know, on a regular basis. That is number 17.

Oh yes, then this talk of a mechanism for economically disadvantaged applicants to receive validation. Certainly - I mean that is just eluding to the facts that this could cost money of these processes so that is sort of anticipating that.

Okay, and then the validation state should be tracked and published when accessing the information. The list of possible status is in the notes but be quite, you know, some rather interested ware that is being published how it is being tracked. (Unintelligible) ideas last.

Okay, then if a contact holder provides optional information to collection they must be at least in (unintelligible) validated. Okay, and then oh yes, now this is interesting, number 21 - a contact holder may choose any particular validator - hmm - that is - I think that is quite interesting from a security point of view because there is a bit of a feeling that if there was somebody wanting to register something, data, in some misleading way they may choose a particular validator, so yes, hmm (unintelligible).

Okay, and then that moves us into number 22 - oversight and accountability policies would need to be developed. Okay, and then some sort of procedure for changes to complex data here so would need to be made by the contract holder via the currently designated validator.

Yes, and at the end we have got, oh yes, so in order to combat impersonation in these - so it is abuse of the contract holder. Oh, may designated that their data are unique and should not be used by other claimants so I am not a legal person, I am not especially sure about the implications of that - on with (unintelligible).

Then on page 30, (unintelligible), the 26th around there - I think number 26 is just referring it is further down so we will skip that just for the moment and have a look at number 27. And this is talking about potential levels of control so public would be anybody can designate the contact ideas - the contact so the domain is verified with the holder of the contact id must be contacted. Restricted - contact's id can only be used by the contact holder.

Okay and then last but not least we have got number 28 which is the contact holder should be able to request the use of the contact's id be tracked or reported - hmm.

I am lightly concerned about number 26 so their analysis below - hmm - I am actually rather puzzled by this. Well this go to the end of the section and this fact isn't picked up. I might need to come back to this. It is not particularly clear in mind.

There is a thing on key benefits and so this would be a more accurate RDS, greater data accuracy. Then on page 31 increased ability for individuals to control their data - then improved efficiency if there are multiple domain names - efficiency improvements for the entire system and okay, reduce abuse occurring by impersonation and that brings us to the end of the section that I was intending to cover but actually I don't think I have explained number 26 adequately. So unless somebody on the call actually understands what number 26 says then I will put a note to myself saying we need to come - that I need to come back to you with (unintelligible) - looks as if that may be homework for next week, okay.

That being so any questions about this document before we move on to the next one?

Okay, as I say I will come back to this one because I don't there being things in something that, you know, which I really can't begin to explain and that did draw - happen with this document despite my best efforts.

The next document we are intending to look at is a small snippet of the, you know, it is basically the 2013 RAA and it is only - it is actually the bit on the Who is Accuracy Program specification and it is very short and it just has some information on validation which we have been meaning to look at for many weeks so it is really great to be in the situation where we can at last do this and I will try and find - yes, I have got an URL for that so I will just past that in the Adobe Connect so that it is (unintelligible) in case we have any more technical problems. It does not look as if it is going to work, yes.

Okay, so that is the document we are looking at. Now the pagination is rather strange in this document so what you really need to do is find the bits which is on who is accuracy program specification which I think comes soon after page 41 but it doesn't actually have a page number. Okay, I realize this is difficult so I will just wait. Where (unintelligible) be looking at - I think it is one page of this but I will just wait a moment for you to find it.

Ah and Rudy is writing in the Chat Room that actually the URLA gave - jumps you straight to the correct place so that is a top quality URL highly to be recommended so if you can get that into the top in your browser we are all quite literally on the same page.

Okay, right, so and it is just looking at, you know, the current RAA validation specifications and some - the number one, validate the presence of data for all fields required under subsection 3.3.1 in a proper format so the applicable can (unintelligible), right. Forgot to think about UPU initially - I wonder if it is talking about (unintelligible) maybe, but anyway let's continue.

Validate that all e-mail addresses are in the proper format and there is an RSC which specifies what that is. Something on telephone numbers which we don't need to worry about. Ah, yes, postal addresses under (unintelligible) and this is used in the so called S42 template now.

There is a lot more about those in the study to evaluate available solutions and you can just see how those templates can be used and Rudy is making the interesting comment that validating the presence of the data doesn't actually give anybody much of an idea on the quality of the data so that is lovely. Yes, thank you for much for that. That is an interesting point.

Okay, and - oh yes, and as I was saying the S42 address template do also deal with - so if you have got an address where, you know, I was giving that German example early where the German address order is actually different from English so that is actually dealt with under that template and there is actually an example in the study which shows the German address and the order of it being changed by the template so that is all quite interesting.

And then we have the - validate that all postal address fields are consistent. Oh, I see so if the street exists in the city, city exists in the state, city matches the postal code. It - that is the practical thing.

Then at the bottom verify the email name is the registered name holder and that is actually by emailing them, (unintelligible) on the telephone number which we don't need to worry about too much. And I will just double check but I actually think that this was more or less all that I was intending to pick up. Okay, I think that is it. I have been meaning to do this document for so many weeks. I can't believe we have finally done it. Are there any comments about this?

Okay, now that means that - ah now Rudy is typing something, email address of the registered name holder rather (unintelligible). Oh yes, hmm so it would

be quite interesting if - whether that email address has the new domain name or not. Yes, I mean - oh yes, and there might be a necessity or, you know, at least not under this version of the RAA but in the future one - that may be a possible improvement but it - the email address would have to belong to the relevant domain. That is a really interesting idea for that.

Rudy Dekker: Hello, (Chris).

(Chris Dillon):   Oh sorry yes, we have got bright sunlight in London and I didn't see you put your hand up but by all means speak.

Rudy Dekker: No problem, (Chris). It is really for the transcript. Yes, based on the different documents and reports it looks to me that we have to do some close validation of what is put in the reports because in some cases I have discovered that there is a different interpretation in the different reports and we need to put them aside each other in order to avoid that we are taking a decision based on one or the other report where there is a conflict in interpretation of the text and with regards the last comment that I posted in the Chat Room about the verification of the email address - very often people are using the (unintelligible) registered name holder, the new domain name and their email address related to that domain and so I am wondering if that is - how do they do the verification? It is something I would like to know. Maybe some of the present participants in this call have any idea about how that can be verified.

(Chris Dillon):   Thank you for that, Rudy. I wonder if anybody happens to know the answer to that. Okay, well I will try and be as careful as possible and hold on to that so it is rather like, you know, there are a few things that we need, you know, to follow up. I think that just - and we have got number 39 and number 26 and now that. So I will keep a list of these things hanging over us and well it will be other sorts of things which tend to be easier to sort out at the face to face meetings and luckily we are only a few weeks away from one.

Okay, well we have a couple of minutes but I am not going to start going through the study to evaluate available solutions because I think we - I can't, you know, really it would be self-defeating. It is a very substantial document and I think it will only cause confusion.

The other thing is that, you know, there is a - there may be a case actually for asking somebody like (Steve) perhaps to present some of this. I mean I am happy to do it but also there is also - it is also good to have people who are directly involved because if somebody else does it there is always a danger that person reads it in a particular way.

Anyway I have hoped we will be looking at that next week one way or the other but I will just - I think that (Lars) you have something for any other business. So let me ask you if you would like to do that now.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks (Chris) this is Lars. Yes, I mean Julie and I both are just - want to make sure that we have enough time.

I think we have four issues altogether. The first one is the office of the report that you went through today specifically (Steve Shang) have offered to give a presentation to the group if that is desired - then maybe could be happening next week.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you. The short answer to that is yes. That would be absolutely marvelous. I have prepared what I think about it. You know, I always go through and I write (unintelligible) for the document so I have got lots and lots of comments but I, you know, it is really much better that some people do it, you know, if there is a rapport and they have been in the office and really that is the best approach. That is really welcome.

Lars Hoffman: All right, great. We will add it to the agenda.

(Chris Dillon): Thanks.

Lars Hoffman: And the second issue is the London meeting has been approved and has
                  been - is under (unintelligible) schedule for the group to meet on Wednesday
                  at 9:00 am to 10:00 am. Now having seen that I realize that in the room we
                  are meeting at nothing is happening beforehand and so I was wondering
                  whether the group would consider extending the session for half an hour by
                  starting at 8:30 and still going to 10:00 because sometimes during the face to
                  face meetings, you know, we are losing about 20, 25 minutes for
                  introductions, you are doing the round around the table, if there is people in
                  the room that are new to the subject often a general introduction is given.

                  So, you know, I cannot promise this at this time if the group wanted me to ask
                  (Glenn) who is in charge of organizing this - there is a chance it will not
                  happen because the schedule is already public but I could set this into motion
                  and see where we land.

(Chris Dillon):   Yes, I think that is a really great idea. Let's try it and, you know, with a good
                  wind nobody will (unintelligible) this empty room. Let's certainly try that.

Lars Hoffman: I will make sure that - will try this. We will have some coffee and maybe some
                  pastries available at that time but again I cannot promise anything but we will
                  see what we can do. (Unintelligible) London.

(Chris Dillon):   Delicious.

Lars Hoffman: Absolutely. And to the point the first (unintelligible) business putting Rudy a
                  little bit on the spot we had some conversations (unintelligible) in the week
                  regarding the presentation to the GMSO.

                  The weekend session - I know the council is coming together for its early
                  June meeting and the weekend session will certainly be on the agenda to
                  discuss that later tonight and I just wanted to kind of check with Rudy and

with you also (Chris) that you want to go ahead to a, present and b, have been in touch with (Faulker) about this.

(Chris Dillon): I mean I am certainly happy to, you know, at least be there or present - don't mind either way.

Lars Hoffman: Okay, I will (unintelligible).

(Chris Dillon): Now I haven't been in contact with (Faulker).

Lars Hoffman: If you could just drop - (unintelligible) if you just drop him a line just literally. I mean I can do this too and see if you wanted to but you will have to - you will want the confirmation from you too seeing that it is going to be you that would be doing the brief presentation. I believe Julie has already started on also drafting some slides and that is useful (unintelligible) as well.

(Chris Dillon): Okay that - I will drop him a line. That is fine.

Lars Hoffman: And then finally whether we can already today or that we have under eight minutes left or possibly have found (Jennifer) next week just to briefly discuss what we want to talk about in London because it is always useful for the meeting to have the agenda up even if it is just a draft that we change later and to have the agenda up on the general meeting because people who plan the London (unintelligible) they will go through this and set and so it would be good to have something up there that we want to discuss.

I would suggest then we can always - obviously the (unintelligible) roll call (unintelligible) as (unintelligible) would say the same then if you want to for the time being just put up a review of work so far, maybe a feedback on the - on (Steve)'s presentation from next week and then continue discussion on response from the SR &AC's and if you wanted to I would put that up and then we can change it as we go along if need be.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you that sounds like a really good start and we can then play around to this - add things as they come up.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, and that way it would be something (unintelligible).

(Chris Dillon): Yes, no that sounds very good.

Lars Hoffman: And then finally - sorry to take so much time but the final point would be whether we wanted to meet in two weeks time - I - so the 19th of June usually the week before the meeting people skip the weekly calls just because a lot of people will be in transit. I have a whole three hour journey from door to door this time so I could be done first and I suspect that (Chris) will even beat me to that and that is. You know, I put that out to the group whether you want it to be on the 19th or whether we should just meet next week at the presentation (Steven) and meet in London on the Wednesday morning.

(Chris Dillon): I mean in some ways - I will be absolutely honest and say that I wasn't expecting that we would need to meet every week for so long. You know, I think we have needed to do that but in fact I think my suggestion would be that we skip the 19th.

Lars Hoffman: All right, it sounds good if everyone seems to agree on the chat. I think is all from Julie and I for any other business unless Julie has something else and hand it back over to you (Chris) - thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Okay, thank you very much for that. Well, in that case, yes Julie is just confirming in the chat that she doesn't have anything else so I - unless there is anything else anybody would like to raise I think we can probably end this meeting slightly early and then we have got a week to have a slow read of (Steve)'s report before he gives the presentation next week.

As I say I think it is really good to be looking at the script specific parts of that report because there are quite lengthy sections on specific scripts so those

are the ones, you know, if you are involved with a particular script then really focus on that because that is just a way of covering it more quickly.

All right, well in that case thank you very much for today. We have covered really a huge amount of stuff. I am sorry for the technical problems but yes even so I think we made very good progress and I look forward to next week and dealing with the studies and report. Thank you very much indeed.

Man: Thanks (Chris) bye, bye.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Coordinator: Once again this completes conference call. Please disconnect all remaining lines at this time. (Dell) if you could please stop the recording.

Woman: Thanks everybody, goodbye.

END