ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 17 April 2014 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT call on the Thursday 17 April 2014 at 13:00 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-20140417-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr

Attendees:
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Peter Green – NCUC
Peter Dernbach – IPC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat - GAC

Apologies:
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Ephraim Percy Kenyanito – NCUC
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Wolf Ulrich Knoben - ISPC

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Amy Bivins
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 17th of April, 2014.

On the call today we have Mae Suchayapim, Rudi Vansnick, Petter Rindforth, Peter Green, Jennifer Chung, Pitinan Kooarmompatana, and Peter Dernbach. We have apologies from Chris Dillon, Wolf Knoben, James Galvin, Ephraim Percy Kenyanito.

From staff we have Amy Bivins, Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Terri. So welcome on this call. As you know Chris has been on travel these days and I was on travel the past two calls so sorry for that.

I've been looking into the agenda so we did the roll call and the third point on the agenda is statement of interest. I think I didn't see any new statements of interest. If there are some to mention please speak up now. I'm not hearing any comment on - or changes on the statement of interest. I think we can proceed with the next point on the agenda.

And as I had to travel back in the calls and the information that was put together, thanks to the marvelous work of Chris, and looking into the work plan and the agenda of the work plan. We are coming close to the date that we decided to have - take stock of the situation, have some inventory. And that's the reason why I have put together a small overview summary of what has been done (unintelligible) today.

In the past week we got a new input from three sources if I'm not wrong. The first one was from Peter Green and it's an interim report on the internationalized registration data. Maybe, Peter you can give some additional

information if you have some on the inputs that was delivered to that interim report. Are you available on Adobe or are you on the phone bridge, Peter?

Petter Rindforth: Petter Rindforth here. I made comments on the last meeting but of course we can go through them again if you want to.

Rudi Vansnick: Well if you have then sorry, I probably missed that information. And myself went through the Page 1.7 of the summary where there is an overview of all the data categories and example data elements. And I think that it is important that we see (unintelligible) I don't know if there was any particular discussion on that specific format in the previous call.

Petter Rindforth: Well we had a discussion. Were there any specific questions you have there?

Rudi Vansnick: Know just be sure that has been handled; that I didn't forget too take that on our work list.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, okay.

Rudi Vansnick: If not then we can proceed with the other two inputs we received. And one was from IPC. And the information we got from them and trying to go through the correct documents. Maybe we can have a short overview of what their view on the questions - what exactly the benefits to the community are of translation and/or transliteration contact information.

And then even to the - their view they in fact state that if there is no translation - proper translation or transliteration of contact information the Whois record system will lose its clarity which may cause difficulties for the domain holders and concerning that they have updated and correct contact information.

I think that that's the case for any of the Whois records. But the clarity in itself seems to me a point where we can have a quite long discussion based on the fact that today it is clear that a lot of Whois information really up to date or is not correct and as such the result of translation and or transliteration could indeed become very fuzzy.

I don't know if someone has a particular view on the comments that we received from IPC. I see Petter; you have the floor.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, thanks. We discussed this also last time and unfortunately I had to leave the meeting a bit early because of the GNSO Council meeting that followed. But just to state again that I think from what we discussed was from an intellectual property point of view that we think from the IPC that it's important to have one - you can call it the official ICANN translation into English but to have the possibility actually to make a global initial note and translation of the contact information.

And if I may say personally point of view of that dealing with a lot of domain disputes that actually we can avoid some of these disputes. You can make a quick rather clear view and translation of the contact information to identify the holder of the domain name.

Then of course the clean that legal action especially if you have to go to the national court or send official letters with a perfect address it must be the address that is with the so-called local language.

But, I mean, in order to actually have an easy initial search to identify the holders we think it's necessary to have some common global translation of the contact information.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Petter, for this clarification. And indeed that is the basic information is that that of the translation will probably be. And as you said may be the correct way is to have a global standardized definition and translation to avoid that some data or translated in less valuable information especially for trademark holders that can be very important.

And probably with regard to the discussions when there is a dispute one can use the translated version (unintelligible) so I agree that that is still something we have to put on the list on how to tackle that issue at the end.

The other input we received was coming from the International Federation of Intellectual Property Attorneys. And they are in fact not part of the SOs and ACs and as such I would say that we will keep them in the comments we receive and will probably have a look into it. But I think that it is actually too early to go through their comments and their remarks (unintelligible) and we're going to discuss more in detail a first draft of the perceptions we got.

As I said, I put together an overview, a summary of what has been done in with regard to questions that we have been putting together and especially (Trish) has been putting together.

When I look into the different questions in the wiki for the Question 1, what is contact information about taxonomies are available? There is quite a lot of information on the wiki. And I think that at this stage we can consider that we have enough data to go to that question.

For Question 2, why are we doing this? I think that's quite - also it's well documented in the wiki. And there is still work and progress of course. On Question 3, who gets access to what information? It looks like we are missing

some data for that question. And that probably have to pull out of the list of information we are getting together from the other questions.

Question 4, who are the stakeholders who is affected? That also was quite clear. That is the list of SOs and ACs we have been doing outreach to. Question 5, how much would a particular (unintelligible) cost? And how to weigh the costs versus the benefits? There were four extracts from inputs that Chris has been trying to summarize in order to have a view on the received data.

I see in the chat a question from Petter. Just a question has been received now received in from comments from all possible groups of interest. That's a good question. As far as I have seen the list the responses I - we got something from the Registrars are still outstanding and I'm just wondering the business community did we receive the responses to all the questions? (Unintelligible) the links that Lars was putting in the chat that we have the - the European Commission had responses from Thailand being one of the GAC members from China.

We have from NCSG. So we are still missing - well we have ALAC also; they have given a lot of information back to us. But the Registrars are still missing.

And if I'm not wrong the business community has not responded yet although I further have seen a message from Marilyn Cade, and I'm not sure because I have so many emails in the past three weeks to - that are still in my list to handle I'm not sure but the Registrars (unintelligible) somewhat on this call - have some input from that community.

Is there anyone having input from the Registrars or from the business community? Please raise your hand and speak up if you can. Not hearing - not seeing any hands coming up.

It looks like we need to address the Registrars Constituency in order to get their input. At least they don't have a finalized version that - at least they give us some indication from guidelines that start working on the next step of our work plan.

Okay so we didn't have one from Marilyn Cade. That's probably another message that I've been (unintelligible) this list and from the Registrars so there are still two quite important groups that we need to have input from. Perhaps what we could do is do we know when Registrars have a conference call in the next two weeks so that we could eventually try to get in touch with them on their call?

I'm asking this for - Julie or Lars, do you have any idea if there is a conference call scheduled in the next week or two so that we eventually could trigger them over there?

Julie Hedlund: Rudi, this is Julie Hedlund. I don't know the schedule for the Registrars' conference calls. I would suggest that it would be helpful for perhaps for you on behalf of - you and Chris - on behalf of the group to send a reminder email to perhaps Michele Neylon, the Registrar Stakeholder Group Chair reminding him of the request and copying I think probably James Bladel and Yoav Keren who were both, you know, interested - said they were interested in, you know, providing a response in Singapore.

Lars and I could help you put that message together. We should probably include also the letter that had the list of questions on which we want input.

And remind them, you know, that we need input, you know, as quickly as possible.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. But I remember that we have already sent reminders not so long ago. I think it was before the Singapore meeting. Well I know Michele also so what I could do is try to catch him. I think we will have a conference call early next week from another working group really is participating I can ask him sideways if he could pick up our request and respond as soon as possible.

We need to go forward otherwise we will still wait for input and input and at the end we will be (unintelligible) in a lack of time to do the work we really need to do for a preliminary report and recommendations at the end.

I see Julie and Lars, yes, Julie, you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Oh just that I would agree that it would be very helpful if would reach out to Michele. It is true that we sent reminders prior to Singapore but then we also did meet with the Registrars - you and Chris had met with the Registrars in Singapore. And, you know, they did - they did say they were interested in providing input. So I think a personal reminder from you to Michele would be most helpful.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Indeed we had that meeting. And I was a bit surprised that I think what - the statement that he didn't...

Julie Hedlund: Excuse me, Rudi. This is Julie.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: ...we probably have to (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: You seem to be cutting in and out, Rudi. I don't know if others have noticed that.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, it's the same here. This is Lars.

Rudi Vansnick: Oh sorry.

Lars Hoffman: Yeah and can I just...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Oh very sorry.

Lars Hoffman: ...very quickly something on the note on the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Just to let you know...

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: ...Rudi, Michele actually reached out to the secretariat via Marika last week and I just forward him again - he asked to have the request for input forwarded to him. And I just checked my inbox; I sent that out to him on the 10th.

So if you write him a note and say - I will prepare a note and make sure he's reminded but he actually was reminded already because - post-Singapore. But it seems to indicate that they're at least on the case otherwise Michele wouldn't have come forward (unintelligible) and asked for it. So that's somehow good news.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay thank you very much, Lars. Can someone tell me if the audio is better now? Am I still cutting off or is it better?

Julie Hedlund: That seems better now, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay perfect. Well I know that they had some (works) going on in the neighborhood and it could - the bandwidth goes up and down. I still have Petter in the queue. Yes, Petter, you have the floor.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Just a quick question about our agenda and time limits. I mean, I perfectly agree that we shouldn't wait too much longer to get the initial responses. And if we can - I mean, if it's a couple of weeks and at least we can get some initial comments from the group of groups that have not responded at all.

But my question was - and sorry for that - not have it in front of me. When are we presuming to take the next step? And London is approaching so thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Petter, for that question. Well indeed we have this - the work plan that you can find on the wiki. And I will drop it in the chat so you can - oh thank you very much we have - so we have really marvelous staff helping us. They're evening thinking our minds - to our minds.

Actually there is a milestone on the 24th of April which is the next week call where we will try to figure out where we are, what are the key issues that we need to discuss. And (unintelligible) of the relevant work that is taking place in other relevant efforts.

I think the second point is an ongoing process and we did already a lot of work at that point especially having in Singapore the chance to have a chat with other working groups and being participating in other working groups.

But regards where we are well the reason why I was trying to put together that summary in order to allow us to see what fails, what do we miss and can we start working with what we have. And probably that's material for the agenda for next week try to figure out where do we need extra information also defining the importance of the information we are missing.

If it's really critical we need to push forward to have that data. I had a chat early this morning with Chris before he left for the airport. And that, yeah, we should still wait for some responses. And I told him that, well, we'd say there is a deadline and we have to respect that deadline first of all. And secondly if we always say that we're still allowing them and we postpone the deadline well you never get the information if you postpone all the time.

That's the - let's say the experience I have with allowing people to have another deadline. So I would strictly stick to the dates that we have now and go for let's say a stock take at next call. And then really define if there is urgency in getting data from specific groups then try to officially ask for responses, otherwise we will not take them into account in the time slot we are working on the data.

Eventually we could but that's something I have to go back to - or ask staff, if we consider that there is a second time slot that we define where we would allow people to have a second time slot of response to questions. Or maybe to what we temporarily are putting on the table. I don't know if that process we can use in the working group. Julie, do you have any thoughts?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. Well, there will be an opportunity for people to comment when we put our preliminary report out into the public comment forum. And we could indeed ask for specific input to questions where we might feel that there are gaps as part of that report.

Alternatively as we compile the responses we have so far, which staff can certainly help to do, we could see if there are some gaps and if there are some groups that we do still want to speak with and gather some input from we could do that as we are compiling the data to put into our preliminary report. So we have a couple of options.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Julie. And I consider that once we are sending out a preliminary report that we will not allow to - coming to a stage where at the end we have to redo the work due to the fact that we are getting supplementary information from a group that didn't respond earlier.

Then we are probably going to be in a lot of difficulties to match the end deadline of the working group as well as I remember it's around mid December that we have to finalize that one.

So when I'm going back to the summary at Point 5, Point 6 is the - the Question 6 is when would policy come into effect? It's clear that that will depend on the final decision and recommendations we are going to put forward and also depending on what is done in other working groups.

And I'm looking especially to the Expert Working Group on gTLD directory services I think are now in states where they are trying to finalize (unintelligible) for a public comment period.

So we probably would be able to have some input coming from the public comment period too that would help us in aligning some tasks.

I don't know if there are opinions on that question?

Then the next one is what should be mandatory and again that goes back to the Expert Working Group where we have been learning a lot about their progress.

And there are a lot of opinions with regards the fact that translation should be mandatory. From some we learn that it should absolutely be mandatory and others are saying well please keep us away from that.

I think that the link to that question is most probably the question about who is going to pay the post office. And that is probably one of the matrixes that are going to influence some of the recommendations.

I don't know if someone has some comments or remarks or additional inputs to that question what should be mandatory?

From what I heard from Petter it's clear that there is a need for it but again the question is if it's mandatory there is a cost link to it and the question is who is going to pay that cost?

From what I learned in Singapore is the fact that in a lot of countries and if I remember well we get a message from the Minister of in Singapore (Linda Arcinaden) saying that the privacy, data privacy regulation and law was voted and implemented in Singapore. And it looks like that law is even more strict than the one we have in Europe.

So I imagine that think that due to certain restrictions sometimes translation will be really needed or transliteration will be really needed.

In other cases it could be that (unintelligible) due to the fact that you have the data privacy law.

I don't know if someone else has some thoughts on this point. It's something that is bouncing in my how to handle if you're not allowed to transfer personal private information which could be a contact information of a domain name when travels through regions where it not allowed to go to.

So I'm wondering if that is something we have to keep in our discussion or is this something we can drop off the plate? I'm just wondering.

Has anybody some reactions to that one? I don't see any hands now but maybe it's something that we really need to pick up in the (unintelligible) discussion.

There are countries that are very strict in privacy law and could as such influence the fact that data is going to be translated or transliterated.

I haven't yet seen any law is saying that you cannot translate but if it's used in a legal context I think it's quite important.

I see Petter raised his hand. Yes Petter you have the floor?

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. I am as part of it but if we're talking about showing the contact information overall I know that they are problems and limitations in some countries. And I mean just to take the easy example with the EU regulations.

But on the other hand as I see it right now I don't think that's an issue that is on our board on our table right now.

We can of course have it in mind. But I don't think we should focus on that unless we hear others from other groups of interest.

And I mean there are - there - isn't it still other working groups dealing with related issues on the contact information? That's a question?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Petter for this additional information and then your point of view with regards to privacy.

I was pointing to that fact due to the questions what should be mandatory. If it's mandatory and it's a breach of law as we just discovered at the EU and the courts decided that the data retention regulation is a breach of the data privacy regulation.

So you imagine if we are saying that it is mandatory and it has to be done and there are laws that no you can't then we have an issue.

But I think it indeed something we can wait to a later stage to handle the question. But we may see that in the back of our mind I would say.

And I see Petter reacting to your second or your last question the Expert Working Group is taking a look at this issue. Okay good, that's perfect. So we're not the only ones who are trailing that one.

And we will probably wait till we got very strong from that, probably the best thing to do now.

And coming back to or the (unintelligible) I think what closes the point seven, Question 7 which would be mandatory I think that we have to wait for some inputs of specific working groups in order to enable us to take a direction.

Most probably we will have an optional recommendation if such is allowed. (Unintelligible) the suggestion that we have two possibilities.

One if it's mandatory and the consequences, if it's not mandatory then we have other consequences to put forward.

And in Question 8 verification validation we also got input from different sources. And we had this information and very interesting presentation from (unintelligible) from Thailand that was very, very helpful also information from (unintelligible) from a blog.

There was also the Whois currency program specifications we can have some input from and the status update report from the Expert Working Group where Page 22 to Page 30 has been specifically addressed.

And that's what I tried to put together today to see if this list, this summary is contains enough information and enough answers to questions so that we can start next call figuring the - and based on the plan that has been put forward in the agenda that we could try to work on more detailed overview with the initial idea of using a matrix where we would be able to start having some concrete proposals in the (unintelligible) for each topic.

I remember that we discussed the data categories and that's an initial point that is coming from the working group as we start working on the definitions also in the matrix.

And as far as I remember today we didn't have yet put together a list of definitions.

I'm just wondering if it would be good to have a kind of lexicon on wordings and definitions that we will use in the matrix in order to avoid that we have long text in the matrix which makes it almost impossible to (unintelligible) and have a good view on what's good what's bad.

I don't know if someone has any arguments on our comments on - or proposals at that point. I don't see any hands up and then well being on the point of work plan which is Number 5 in the agenda today and maybe if we can have the work plan in our session here.

And actually we are on the second page of work plan so and today we are trying to finalize the reviews of all the stakeholder groups, SACs for their comments. And it's clear that they're still missing some. And I would - and daresay that (unintelligible) comments are very important in discussions we need to have because it's I think the group that is going to be the most effective one once we go to make some reporting and recommendations.

And then next week we should (unintelligible) try to put all together. and I think this already we have been creating an overview of what's present and what's missing?

On the 1st of May we look at the review of the work plan. And I suppose that the ideas that we have a look on the steps following 1st of May how are we going to handle the discussions on the open issues and the draft recommendations.

ICANN
Moderator:Gisella Gruber White
04-17-14/8:00 am CT
Confirmation # 2206135
Page 18

I'm looking to Lars or Julie as they have a lot of experience in doing this work. Is there - do we see that in separate groups or is this done all together?

I'm looking into the different elements we have to go through. I don't think we need subgroups but yes Julie can you clarify?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. I don't think we probably need subgroups on that. That's generally something we would do if I have a bit more time.

But what we could do is take each open issue one at a time and, you know, discuss them in sequence. I think having a document that summarizes the responses we've received or, you know, groups them into categories, you know, based on the issues could help to lead the discussion.

And then, you know, we could separate each of the open issues and address them one at a time. And as you see we have several meetings in which to do that. And staff also could help to draft recommendations for that discussion based on the inputs that we have received. So there are some ways that we can certainly can help to guide that discussion.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Julie for that information and clarification.

When I look into the work plan and the agenda between today and the (unintelligible) meeting while we have one month and a half approximately, maybe two months and if I'm taking it in a large way so that means that we have only something like three calls left to handle the first draft.

And as I remember that we have to make a presentation of that work that we achieved at the London ICANN meeting.

And I think it's important that at that moment we have a clear view of the directions we are going to give into the recommendations in order to be able to discuss with the other groups, the other SOs and ACs their point of view.

And I see - oh I thought that I saw Julie's hand up but it's probably the old one.

And I think it's important that we have the clear view in six weeks. Six months is going to be quite short I think but I can be wrong. As I've seen what we didn't obtained in the past few weeks with the great help of (Chris) we probably will get something done for the London.

I'm just wanting for the London meeting do we got to have again meetings with the other SOs and ACs if possible in order to discuss what we are presenting?

Because I consider the face to face still the most valuable way of handling this type of work as we discovered that in Singapore or there were bits of surprises at the - at one side. At the other side we have the marvelous meeting with other groups and giving us a lot of (unintelligible).

So I'm wondering if we want to do this in the London meeting where I know that it's going to be very tight. Do we have to start figuring out if we want to have face to face is meetings over there?

I see Julie's hand. Yes Julie you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. Yes we certainly do have the option of trying to schedule a meeting face to face in London subject to the other group's schedules.

I think the sooner that this working group can decide which groups with which it wants to meet staff can help to try to get on those schedules. Because the earlier we make those meeting requests the better.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. Well I considered that this case a meeting with the registrar is most probably of high-value or higher important. so that I consider one of the groups we should try to have a face to face meeting (unintelligible) if others have indications of SOs or ACs that we really need to see to discuss with.

I remember that in Singapore that was very fruitful the ones we had with the IPC if I'm not wrong and another one - oh we have a lively discussion and very valuable input.

And maybe these at-Large as they have given a lot of information and they are let's say the group that represents the most of the Internet users and consumers maybe that's also a group you need to have a full understanding once we present our first thoughts to them.

And but the two groups that I see of in (unintelligible) schedule in the London meeting. I don't know if anybody else has other expectations from groups to have a chat with in London?

Don't see any hands up nor any comments in the chat room so I consider that there is no need for other groups to see.

I presume that we will have anyway the Expert Working Group where we will be added to - they probably will have also presentation in London having (unintelligible) will probably take the time to give some presentation about the work they have been doing.

And I'm wondering if they are going to be in the final timeslot at that month. I thought it was around June that they had to have the report done. Is that correct Lars?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Thanks Rudi. Yes I think based on a colleague understand from recently who's staffing the Expert Working Group. And she said the report is at the moment on schedule to be the final report to be published in time for London so it should be okay.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay so that's perfect and that allows us to have immediately all the input we needed. So this must (unintelligible) possible that for the call that we would have the 12th of June a preparation for London that we will have already the inputs from Expert Working Group to align with what we have been doing till then.

And that seems to me a very good solution. And I'm wondering is there any other question about the work plan that someone has any comments on the work plan that's currently have in front of us?

Not seeing any responses or reaction so I would say that we pick through that plan now and we prepare for the next call a kind of detailed overview let's say (unintelligible) overview of the summary they have put together very quickly and today.

And then we have three action items on the agenda. So I think we have already a lot of work in front of us for the next call to work on.

I would say if someone can bring any extra input it's always very interesting that - actually received from the International Federation of Intellectual Property Authorities.

I will probably have chat with the before I forget chat with UPU as they have a specific way of addressing the street names and (unintelligible) and so on.

There seems to be predefined rules of handling that. I'm going to try to have some input from them so that we could eventually have short reporting from what basically has been very useful when you handle addresses.

And they have a lot of issues that they have already handled so I think it's good if we could have input from them too.

And I see Jennifer Chung mentioning that we are going to have input from that Registry Group. Is that right Jennifer?

And okay I might as well I will have a chat begin of next week with the people from UPU and as I'm involved in a project in - at the European level with IPC regarding data privacy.

And I know that they have been trying to solve issues. That much probably we will encounter later on.

And I don't know if there are any other businesses we have to address today. And has anybody questions, remarks, comments additional information I would say speak up now.

And I see many are typing in the chat room. I expect some answers in there. And okay good.

Then if we don't have any other questions or comments to handle I would say that we can then come to an end of this call. And I would like to thank you all for your presence and participation in this call.

And further on in the mailing list I know that we are in a constant process of having handling information through the mailing list also. So I will now follow-up as I have no travel foreseen in the next four weeks.

Luckily I am otherwise it's messy if you have to handle all this backlog.

So I would like to thank and thank the Lars and Julie and (Terry) for helping and supporting us and (unintelligible) next week.

Woman: Thank you everyone.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks everybody bye-bye.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you everyone. And (Andre) if you can stop the recordings please.

Coordinator: Yes certainly...

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Barry).

END