**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 06 November at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 06 November 2014 at 1400 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-20141106-en.mp3

Attendees:
Jim Galvin - RySG
Jennifer Chung – RySG
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Wen Zhai – NTAG
Justine Chew – Individual
Peter Green – NCUC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Wanawit Ahkuputra - GAC
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC

Apologies:
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Ephraim Percy Kenyanito – NCUC
Peter Dernbach – IPC
Lindsay Hamilton-Reid – RrSG
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Emily Taylor – RrSG

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Good morning, good afternoon. Please go ahead. This call is now being recorded.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group Call on the 6th of November, 2014.

On the call today we have Wen Zhai, Chris Dillon, Jennifer Chung, Jim Galvin, Justine Chew, Peter Green, Mae Suchayapim Siriwat and Wanawit Ahkuputra .We have apologies from Peter Dernbach, Amr Elsadr, Lindsay Hamilton-Reid, Ephraim Percy Kenyanito and Petter Rindforth.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to (Chris).

(Chris): Thank you very much. Now I have a couple of other apologies just, you know, within the last couple of hours in fact and one of them is (Rudy Vonsnik) and the other one is Emily Taylor. I think that is a complete list as far as I know, okay. Thank you very much.

All right, well in that case let's move on and just move into the Statements of Interest Section and I need officially to ask you all whether there have been any changes in the Statements of Interests since the last meeting. Probably not, but just watching the chat room. Thank you for that.

And then we can go into the main part of the meeting which is the Draft Initial Report and we have got in front of us now in the chat room a new version of the report which was circulated a few days ago and I would like to, you know, to ask for, you know, comments people have on the report and I was actually quite surprised when I did the slow re-read of the report. I found quite a lot of

things. There are certainly some comments I have to make about the report so we can do those too.

And then perhaps if we can - I will send this out to the list after the call but if we can then have a deadline for comments on this version which would be sort of Wednesday next week and then we can pull together things and have a discussion on Thursday's meeting next week.

All right so I just might as well come up to the top of the document and just perhaps it is good right at the beginning to say whether anybody has some general comments about the draft before we go into detail?

All right, I do have one or two general comments so I will just bring those up before we plunge in. So okay, I think one thing is that obviously there is no summary of the report yet. I think we are leaving that until the last minute so that is just one general thing to notice. And then there is also I think possible general weaknesses here - is that we are still - we still need to spend more time on really why transform - I think that is one possible weakness.

And because we still have the mandatory transformation arguments in this version we, you know, if they are there then we possibly need to spend more time considering who pays because obviously if there is mandatory transformation that is a key question and obviously because the straw man I drafted some time ago now was saying that transformation should not be mandatory. Obviously if it is not mandatory you don't need to worry about who pays so it is really a mute - it is mandatory that becomes key.

The other sort of general comment is that just before last week's meeting (Patu) sent around a very interesting email and it contained several points we could - we may want to pick up again. But one of them is a point about that whatever this contact information is, whether it is transformed or not it really needs to be machine readable.

Now to be honest that is something that we have perhaps been taking for granted so, you know, the thought that there may be, you know, other ways of inputting the data either into image files or something like that perhaps, hasn't really crossed the mind but I thought that was an interesting point and it may be worth being more over to that rather than actually including something that, you know, whatever happens it really does need to be machine readable - that really - it is almost a recommendation we could make whether or not transformation is mandatory - it comes before the other recommendations really at an earlier stage.

All right, now if there aren't any other general points about the document then it is even - I think those are the only general points I wanted to bring up but anyway if there aren't any others then we can gradually start going through and possibly, you know, if it is actually easier to do the points as they come up in the document. Perhaps that is the best way to do it, say - let us just scroll down and pick up points as they arise. I can - got to about page five and I don't think there is anything until page five. Oh yes, but there is something on page six so I will just go down there.

Okay - so on page six we have got this last bullet point, "When should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?"

Now one of the interest - one of the other interesting things that came out of (Patu)'s email I think effects this quite - in quite a major way because (Patu) was writing that there has been a debate about basically transformation should go into a - that there should be a transformation into (ASCII) and there is quite a lot of information in his email about the 2013 RAA and for me what came out of that was really that if, you know, certainly if we were to say that transformation should be mandatory when in fact probably the other way as well, that probably we are talking about replace - the replacement system that really - so the current RAA already has policy in place and it would be difficult for us - or difficult or impossible for us to change that.

So I thought that the arguments in his email were actually affecting this point - this, you know, this thing about when the policy should come into effect. I don't know whether anybody else has feelings about that but I thought I would like to raise that.

Okay, and just continuing down let's see where we need to stop next. Oh yes and we don't get (unintelligible).

Man: Do you want to (unintelligible)?

(Chris):   Oh sorry yes - Jim would you like to raise something on that?

Jim Galvin: So - this is Jim Galvin for the transcript. So I am not sure if - trying to - I was trying to follow you train of thought there in talking about (Patu)'s message but in talking about his comment about the RAA and I - is it appropriate to make a comment about the idea that transliteration to (ASKY) is encouraged or desired in the data? I mean he makes that point in there and I have a comment about it if it is appropriate at this time.

(Chris):   That sounds very appropriate to me. As I was talking about his email I was actually becoming increasingly aware of a, you know, it is a, you know, that part of it is important so by all means do pick that up.

Jim Galvin: Okay, so, you know, I don't even want to pretend to be an armchair lawyer in all of this but I think another interpretation of what is going on in the 2013 RAA is quite - not quite as far reaching as I think what (Patu) is proposing. In particular I would say that what they are really trying to get at here is that 443 by definition in the protocol really is a new US (ASCII) base particle and part of what is going on is trying to insure that is what is really there so that the particle is usable as it is defined.

I did not automatically jump to the idea that this is suggesting that, you know, all output has to move to US (ASCII) and they are going to require that. I mean on the flip side you are only taking in US (ASCII) anyway or at least you should be so, you know, I don't think that it is an extension of what is required there. This is what - and so maybe the larger point here is that there is a lot more nuance going on in what that requirement is or what it should be - concern that, you know, we not over interpret that ourselves here in this particular group. That is my comment.

(Chris):   Thank you Jim. Yes, so actually that fact that because of the protocol it has to be US (ASCII) so in fact it is not as simple as it being linked to whether it is an existing system or existing RAA, it is actually more complicated than that. But I think there may be some sort of ramification - there is some sort of network of dependencies there but I think it still leaves things open for us to describe a system where there aren't those technical limitations, where people could put their data in the non-roman script and it still leaves us with the question whether that data need to be transformed or not.

Jim Galvin: So yes, continuing, I think the way that I would approach this, you know, in our discussions and in our document is leaving open the possibility that there might be data in another form. In other words try to not focus on the particle that is in use.

(Chris):   Yes, okay.

Jim Galvin: Because I think that there is an expectation that the protocol will change. I mean if you look at what is going on in the ITF in the (WERDS) Group. We have the International Registration Data Working Group, you know, some thoughts even out of the Directory Services Expert Working Group (unintelligible). Clearly a change is coming. I think that if we reference that a change is coming and not - and try to separate ourselves from the choice of protocol then I agree with you (Chris) we leave ourselves with the question

and discussion about the circumstances and that would be appropriate I think.

(Chris):   Indeed, yes, thank you very much for that. All right, returning to the document, let's just see - oh yes, we don't get very far before something else in fact.

On page seven, I will just scroll down. Now - I mean it is almost a proofreading level thing but there is a clause here I am not completely happy with and that is considering that the first overarching question that the working group was chartered to answer is binary - whether or not it is desirable to translate - transliterate. The group spent considerable time.

Now - well actually it is not as far as that - it is the considering bit as far as the contact information. It makes it sound as if we wasted a lot of time and we probably did waste sometime. These things are, you know, unavoidable but I was wondering whether we could actually miss out that clause and just start with the group spent considerable time, you know, I am sure there is going to be lots of, you know, there is going to be lots of criticism of this report but, you know, I just feel that by leaving that in the, you know, it would nice to avoid that criticism.

I see Jim is agreeing with that so perhaps it is - perhaps it is okay to remove that clause. I would quite like to but if anybody would like to keep it then by all means make arguments or, you know, if there is a solid reason for keeping it then by all means.

Okay, Jim would you like to add something?

Jim Galvin: Yes, so Jim Galvin for the transcript. And similarly the next sentence then in many ways seems to state the obvious and makes me curious about, you know, maybe we should delete that sentence too, the one that says, "the group prioritize, you know, arguments so that we can understand what was

brought forward by the community." Well, I mean haven't we already said that? We spent considerable time talking about community input. Just a thought - I mean I don't want to over editorialize while we are on this call here.

At some level something you can just edit to document and take this stuff out and we can and, you know, if you leave the red lining in when we are all reading it later we can see if anybody disagrees or doesn't like it but there you go.

(Chris): Okay, thank you for that. Yes, I am very sympathetic to that. I mean anybody who has had anything to do with this group knows that that is what we have done so I think especially if it is made clear elsewhere in the report it can certainly come out. But again, yes, so should we perhaps say that we take out both clauses but just wait a moment to see whether anybody would like to - oh yes Jim is suggesting some text which is always useful and to that. Uh huh, yes, okay, yes that sounds as if it may - thank you (Justine) as well.

All right, I think that is enough to get a better draft there so leave that with us and we will try and take this all into account in the next version. And returning to the document let's see how far we get this time -- ooh, we are doing well.

Okay, yes, so just make a very brief comment as we passed. It is not a - it is really not a major one at all. There is something on page ten - now have I gone too far? Oh let's see if I have. Now there is a lot of talk about registered name holders, technical contacts and administrative contacts. Now under some models there may be other contacts so I don't think it is worth editing - I think this - I cannot imagine that adding a few more content is going to change anything structural but, you know, just to be completely accurate that does seem to be the case.

Oh, and (Justine) has found a typo - that doesn't surprise me at all. And the last para - now let's see if I can spot it. Oh yes, I knew what happened there.

It is - originally it was - is and I swapped it for are and yes, okay, thank you for that.

All right, let's see how far we get this time. Yes, so as we go on to page 11 this is actually possibly a more general comment that I should have made at the start but anyway let's do it now. And it is that in Los Angeles we had a brilliant meeting because we, you know, we really discovered some pretty weak arguments. We also discovered one or two strong arguments and this draft is very much based on the discussion we had in Los Angeles, however, the weak arguments tended to go out completely.

So I mean it may be that there is some minor parts of those arguments that got tossed out that actually need to be brought back in some way, possibly in other parts of the report, so that is just a general comment. That is one thing that would not surprise me.

Okay, and so scrolling down, the change that I did make here is this last point, the mandatory transformation would avoid possible flight by bad access to the least translatable languages which again is something that came out of (Patu)'s email. I, you know, I thought it was a very important idea.

Now after adding this point I then wondered whether it could have been amalgamated with bullet point two above which is the transformation would to some extent facilitate that thing but if you see in the middle of it you have got, "makes bad practices more difficult."

At the moment I think I am sticking to my gums. I think it is such an important point that I quite like the fact that it is a separate point on its own but, you know, if somebody would like to do something about that then I would be quite interested in hearing. Jim would you like to add something?

Jim Galvin: Yes please - Jim Galvin for the transcript. I am concerned that the last bullet point might be incomplete. What I mean by that is, you know, if there is a

mandatory transformation then presumably tools would have to come into existence until that transformations could occur. And so that - I mean that is just sort of a natural progression of things and it would seem to suggest that then that certain languages and scripts would not be usable until there was a transformation tool.

(Chris): Mm-hmm, yes.

Jim Galvin: All right, it seems to me that same logical progression of events is true even in the context of that last bullet. I mean if you open the door for any language to be used it - they - that those languages and scripts can't be used if there is no tool to transform them.

(Chris): Mm-hmm, yes.

Jim Galvin: So it is not - so I mean it just seems to me that regardless of which side of the - whether it is a - I am thinking that if the language and script are not transformable then it won't be used because you can't use it because you can't transform it which means you can't really migrate to non-translatable languages they are not permitted.

(Chris): Yes I - that is true when one is considering automatic tools.

However we can also argument, we can also argue that one of the big problems with the mandatory transformation argument is that the tools do not exist.

So if we were to recommend that transformation be mandatory effectively what we're saying is that in the case of languages which there are no automatic tools we are mandating manual transformation.

So that come to think of it I'm not sure we've stress that argument enough.

Jim Galvin: Well even if it's manual, you know, the point is if they can be if they can be transformed then it's going to be transformed. And I don't believe that this argument applies.

If it cannot be transformed then what I would expect is that the language and script cannot be used. And therefore you can't move to using the least translatable language.

You know, even if you had something which is not automated and it's done manually and so you migrate to that because you're trying to overburden and create work I think that that would force the rules to be changed in such a way that it would, you know, that would not be an action that one would take.

(Chris): Okay. Now I'm wondering if this actually raises another element of (Peter)'s email which is the possibility which we really haven't discussed very much about whether we would actually have some kind of limitation on languages.

And in (Peter)'s email he suggests either the UN languages or a - so well some kind of small number that the Figure 20 was mentioned.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I mean I guess...

(Chris): Yes.

Jim Galvin: ...I'll just jump in here. I don't actually know how to respond to that at the moment.

You know, I - there are many things that jump out at me when I think about suggesting a list of things. Because, you know, the list has to come into existence. You know, who is going to do that? Does that force us to then delay all of this because then it becomes a timing constraint as to whether you need it before you do this.

You got the whole issue of who decides what's on the list and what's not on the list and maintenance of the list yes. So I'll just stop there. I'm not sure how to respond to that suggestion.

(Chris): Okay well that actually sounds like part of an argument against transformation to me and it's not one we've seen much of so far.

All right (Petina) would you like to add something to that?

(Petina): Hi. It's (Petina) here for the transcript. I'm not against anything that we are talking about. I just want to add that the tools we're talking maybe is not something that automatic tools.

But it can be like for that procedure or if you require what is expected result of the transformation of one language to another language like if you say if you want to translate - if you want to transform from Thai to Latin script then we base on this (unintelligible).

Then that could be the tools in my understanding. So somehow you have the common expected result so that's what I want to add.

I might propose some quick (letter) but yes, I'm thinking what should be the text now. And that's all.

(Chris): Yes thank you for that (Petina). If transformation occurs and just for the moment let's talk about transliteration then transliteration has to occur using the rules of a particular standard.

There is a straight away an issue there because there are languages with federal standards. We've spoken about Japanese would fall into that case.

There are also languages without standards. So it's quite a minefield.

Now okay so the situation as I would perceive it on the transliteration front. But if transformation were to occur along the lines that we have discussed before then actually, you know, most of the time we are talking about transliteration.

Translation this is really quite a difficult area because one can legitimately transform, you know, the word (Tabashi) in Japanese could legitimately be translated either as right or correct. It's a really means either. And, you know, you get this situation over and over again.

So it's, you know, the idea of having translation which is controlled as well, you know, it's not impossible. You can create controlled vocabularies. So you can have a controlled vocabulary early where a particular word is always translated in a particular way.

But it is quite yes, it is quite difficult but yes it's certainly another piece of this jigsaw. Thank you.

All right unless there's anything else about that let us just go down a bit further and see what we find lower down. I think we've got off Page 11.

Oh, I think we've got a good Page 12 as well I have a Page 13. I have discovered something.

Basically the - is this long bullet point so it starts off talking about accurate transformation.

And then in the middle there is a thing on now basically it's - it is actually sort of intelligence. So it means that machines doing the transformation would have to know when to transliterate and when to transform.

You know, there is this whole business about in the case of Beijing you transliterate. But in the case of Bangkok ideally you would translate. And you

would, you know, you'd use (Crumtape) which has no relation to Bangkok at all. So there's that point.

Now what this raises is that I am wondering whether this bullet point is actually covering two different areas and it should be split.

So what's going through my mind is that we might want to split this bullet point just before four purposes in the middle of it because you then have one point on accuracy and another point on the intelligence of transformation. You can almost think of it like that. So I don't know what people feel about that.

Need a bit. Okay yes, now Jim just before picking up your point I'm just going to check the chat room because I think (Petina) has been typing something.

Oh yes. So she's just saying the thing about the standards and that the language order needs to declare which standard they're using. Yes that's exactly what I was saying. Okay Jim would you like to pick that up?

Jim Galvin: Oh thank you, Jim Galvin for the transcript. I was just going to comment that I'm neutral on whether we split it.

I mean on the one hand I take your point Chris and so there's some value in the fact that we are making two different points if you want to look at it to that level of detail.

On the other hand, you know, the point here is about accurate information and there's sort of two things one can say about accurate information. And in that context you could leave it in one bullet.

To the extent that we also have a bullet on accuracy further down, you know, which might be I think it might be duplicative since we already have the comment about the number of languages that are supported. So we might be able to remove that.

But I think other than that all the rest of the bullet points are unique. And that would suggest to me that we keep it together if we remove the one duplication at the end rather than split it. But overall I'm neutral on the point. Thanks.

Okay. Thank you very much for that. And you read my mind to some extent because I was looking at the bullet points further down. It would be near impossible to achieve accuracy and transforming.

In fact I was even wondering whether we chose the right word there, accuracy because you could - one could equally well say achieve consistency or accuracy.

It's actually referring to both of those. So okay yes there is certainly an issue there.

Now I feel in a situation where I have a dislike of putting majorly different things together, conflating things.

So I think I am tending to split that bullet point, the one at the top. And I'm - and then the other one is more a thing about consistency or, you know, it's it is both but so that may mean that we can keep it.

Jim would you like to pick up now that I see that you're typing something...

Jim Galvin: Sure.

(Chris):   ...yes as well.

Jim Galvin: Yes, Jim Galvin for the transcript and I was kind of typing my comment. I figure while you were talking I'm going to type - and I'll finish my second sentence.

But, you know, I was thinking if we keep the bullets, you know, as they are rather than splitting it we could use a footnote to just to define what accurate transformation is because we can draw on the definition from the solution study the ICANN did and have a...

(Chris): Yes.

Jim Galvin: ...reference to it that way too.

And then my second sentence that I was typing here and I'll finish it just so it's in here too in the chat room...

(Chris): Yes.

Jim Galvin: ...is so then we could have just the sub bullets in there. And, you know, we're talking about accurate transformations. And here are the three points if you will if it turns into three points that are relevant under the context of accurate transformation.

In a way I mean I guess I'm kind of currently although I said I was neutral before, now I'm leaning towards the idea of, you know, there are some major bullet points to be made in favor of, you know, this particular recommendation.

Just like in the previous ones, you know, there's some main bullet points of recommendations to be made.

And, you know, we'll stick the details inside the main bullet points rather than trying to grow the absolute number of, you know, supporting points for a particular recommendation.

(Chris): Yes. Okay well I guess I'm sort of I'm heading slightly in the direction of keeping it together I think. Yes, yes okay. Well certainly it's an area that requires looking at.

And also certainly we know about things to define the, you know, define accuracy and consistency.

All right now looking at the chat room something is going on. Oh yes we've got a request to go back to Page 12 second bullet from the bottom. It would be more efficient. Okay. Yes waiting for that comment to come through.

Oh, yes so we've got this would provide greater accuracy than transformation and it would provide those wishing to contact name holders to identify there.

So okay so here this is the possibility which is already happening with ccTLDs apparently whereby they don't transform the non-Roman contact information. They just leave us in the original scripts.

But what they do do is they transform. In fact they translate the names of the fields in the database. So this, you know, point should be flagging up that CC approach as being quite attractive. I think that's the idea behind it.

Provide greater accuracy than transformation in the sense that, you know, it's the original data it's more likely to be accurate and it would provide those wishing to contact name holders.

Yes, yes it is certainly does that. Because it is the original data so it's most likely to be useful for contacting. I think that's the way I read that. I wonder if that's all right?

Jim would you like to pick up something there?

Jim Galvin: Yes. So Jim Galvin for the transcript. I was going to let this one go for right now but since (Justine) raised the question and got us focused on it here I figured I'd raise it later when we were doing comments about the document.

I'm actually not sure. I think the word efficient is probably not the right word to use here. It's not about efficiency.

I think that, you know, it's certainly more convenient for actual domain holders to be able to use their own local script, you know, and language.

And, you know, it's only - and it's not really efficient per se but certainly maybe this is the efficiency point, you know, that if you had to transform it well there's work involved in doing that.

And, you know, that's whether or not I mean that just gets to one of the other bullet points here about whether or not you can do that and whether or not you can do it.

I'm not even convinced about the greater accuracy, you know? I mean the greatest accuracy is not doing anything to it because if we really need to get into this the bullets come right after this one about accurate transformation is being expensive and the difficulties that go with that.

And then I'm not even sure why do we have an example in this particular bullet that because we don't have examples than anything else?

And I'm not even sure if that example follows. I'm not sure what I'm looking for in that example that's justifying the other two sentences.

Anyways so what's my overall comment? You know frankly I didn't like this bullet. But I guess I wasn't prepared to argue for or against it at the moment. I'm sort of inventing this on the fly here while we're chatting.

I was going to wait and take some more time and put a comment in the document as part of commenting on it...

(Chris): Okay. Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: ...(unintelligible) here we are.

(Chris): Thank you for that. I think just pick up - if I pick up one thing you said before - I know (Petina) now is waiting to say something.

But to pick up one thing on that is I think the fact that there is an example there for me is actually quite a positive thing.

In some ways perhaps we should have more examples under other bullets. So I feel it's quite positive that we've - we do have the example there.

The - now let me see, so yes so I think it doesn't, you know, the idea isn't that in some way that example adds to the weight of it. But it would be good to have more examples.

Although obviously the effect of that you probably end up with a substantially longer document. But yes I think that price may be worth paying.

(Petina) would you like to make a comment?

I think we've got...

(Petina): (Unintelligible). Yes you hear me okay.

(Chris): Yes. Yes I can.

(Petina):   I think I'm not sure but I guess this bullet is applicable very much for a ccTLD. But for that gTLD the register has a large possibility to do with registrants like (unintelligible) right?

              So I'm not sure if it quite practical for not ccTLD. That's my comment for now and yes.

(Chris):   Okay. Yes...

((Crosstalk))

(Chris):   ...that sounds yes that's worth taking into account.

              There's quite a lot going on in the chat room so I'll just check we're not missing anything.

              Okay. And there's a grammatical problem with the word this which I will - (Justina)'s flagging this up. We're starting to timeout so I think I'll do that in slow time.

              And then Jim is making a point about the examples yes. I think it is unfortunate that it's - that it - there aren't enough examples. And it is looking a bit lonely. I would agree with that okay.

              All right, I will get back to the grammatical problem later because that may take me some time to unpick and just have a look and see if there's anything that we want to look at a little bit further down Page 13?

              Can't no - oh yes okay. As we go over on to Page 14. I'm on the wrong page. Page 14 is down here. It should be something like the working Group recommends that every current, okay.

When I read this sentence alarm bells went off inside me. The Working Group recommends that every current and future gTLD registration data entry that is provided in non-Latin script be transformed into Latin-based ASCII.

The alarm bells went off very loudly in my ears because this is just such a massive thing. I mean it's just, you know, the amount of work that this demands is just huge.

I have been in previous situations where, you know, organizations have had to do huge amounts of work to database records and specifically in library situations in fact.

I've been in situations where we've had ASCII records for Japanese books and then there has been a project and we've gone out to Japanese records for these ASCII records.

Now in a library context that would always be done with two projects. So you would say first of all any new Japanese book would be catalogued in Japanese with ASCII.

And then if we ever get the time we'll go back and have a retrospective project and do all of the earlier ones.

But basically what I'm saying is what I'm saying is that there may be a better way of handling this. Rather than doing all current and future you may want to do the future one first and then go back and do past ones. So that's a sort of a way of getting out of that.

And I - okay and I think oddly enough that is more or less the last comment I wanted to make. Oh no, just a moment.

Yes, and unfortunately I also have to go to another meeting now. So I realize this is a bit tantalizing but I think we should probably - we are almost at the end of the hour anyway. I think we should probably round off this meeting.

And what I'll do is produce with colleagues another version which we will then attempt to pick up all of these points for next week's meeting.

Sorry to rush off on you but I think that's the best thing to do. So see you all again same time next week. Thank you very much.

Jim Galvin: Thanks.

Woman: (Francesca) if you can please stop the recording.

END