Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 18 December 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 18 December 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-20141218-en.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Attendees:
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan)-NCUC
Jim Galvin - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Wanawit Ahkuputra – GAC
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual

Apologies:
Justine Chew – Individual
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Wen Zhai- NTAG
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP
Peter Dernbach- IPC
Lindsay Hamilton Reid – RrSG

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Gery
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is a Translation and
                 Transliteration Contact Information PDP Working call on the 18th of
                 December 2014. On the call today, we have Chris Dillon, Jim Galvin, Amr
                 Elsadr, Peter Green, Ubolthip Sethakaset and Wanawit Ahkuptra.

                 We have apologies from Justine Chew, Lindsey Hamilton Reid, Petter
                 Rindforth, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben and Peter Dernbach.

                 From staff, we have Glen de Saint Gery, Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund 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
                 you, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, indeed. We just need to look at point 3 which is the
                 Statements of Interest. We need to ask if that's changed since the last time
                 we met. I'm seeing nothing in the chatroom and here, nothing. That means
                 we can move into the main part of the agenda.
                 So point number 4. As everybody knows public comment is now open.
                 Unless something has changed very, very recently since the last half an hour
                 or something like that, we have had no public comments yet. However, one
                 thing I would like to suggest is that we could consider - I think we could
                 consider going back to some input that we received from the International
                 Federation of Intellectual Property attorneys -- refer to them as FICPI from
                 now on -- but we might want to have a look at that because effectively,
                 although it came in during the periods of the review tool, we may be able to
                 look at that at last. It's a long time ago.

                 Okay. Now a couple of hands have gone up. I think Lars - he was first.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. This is Lars. Just really quickly in case you go onto the
                 public comment side, you will notice there is no reply period. And so just to

remind you that forces much stronger than those that I possess have decided that the reply period will be phased out, so there is just a common period that will be as long as the usual comment and reply period combined so that the reduction in time - it's just that they got rid of this preparation. It says 45 days all together which is more than the 42 recommended.

Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you for that. Amr, would you like to pick up something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. Actually Lars did bring up one of the things I wanted to ask up. And I was wondering why there is not a reply phase. I do note that the comments phase is quite long. I was just wondering if there are any thoughts about having a long common phase and not a reply phase, and I was wondering if perhaps that has something to do with the holidays being in the middle of the comment period.
My other question is -- unless I'm missing it -- I don't see a link to the actual initial report. But there is an unusually large amount of text on the actual page. But I'm just not really sure that all of the text in the report is there. The recommendations certainly are but I'm also wondering -- because this seems slightly irregular to me -- I was wondering if there is a reason why that is as well. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. As regards to the public commentary, I mean, although we have not gotten it on the -- yes, actually we can - I guess we can talk about this now. We really have to work out, you know, exactly what the best methodology is in what we do as public comments come in from various courts, as you know. However are we going to handle that? I mean my suggestion would be that we discuss the comments on the list and we then decide what we're going to say and such as do it like that. I'm open to suggestions.

Then on your second point on the announcement, now this is puzzling me hugely because certainly the page I saw did just have a link to the initial report. So I don't know whether they've updated this and for some reason removed the link, but that seems to be quite unhelpful. If it has gone, I think we certainly need to request that it be reinstated.

Okay. Anything? Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr again. Just to maybe clarify the purpose of a comment phase followed by a reply phase. The reply phase is not necessarily a given and normally I guess there would only be a reply phase if comments are submitted in the comment phase. But the purpose of a reply phase would be for the community to give inputs on costs that were submitted in the comment phase.
To be honest, commonly this is also used by some to - if their initial comments when they were - it has taken a longer time than it should have to prepare those. But it's not a bad practice to have the reply phase just to clarify that there may be some comments that are referring - some responses that are being referred or associated with comments provided in the first phase, which is the comment phase. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. I'm guessing Lars want to pick up something on that.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, Chris. I want to thank you for the point you raised. It's much appreciated and the same thing I am going to share to a degree.

So two things to start with. It's not (unintelligible) petition to get rid of these appropriated, that something that I have no - I can't do anything about this. So we would have to go to a different department and it's being applied to all public comments from 2015 onwards. I believe the reason for this was that when they looked at the public comments over the past two years, there were very few, if any, extra replies.

Rather what had happened very often -- and I think in almost all cases and I don't have the specifics ready at hand -- in almost all cases comments were submitted until the very end of the reply period. S they've waited the 40 days, obviously they got the groups (unintelligible) and needed some time to form their recomposition. They would need the time and they would submit it at the end of the reply period because it didn't have to essay or reply to something -- anything was accepted.

And so I think what they said is we have noticed one period -- that is at least 21 days -- which is normally the comment period. But in cases like this for initially some reports, we by default have the 42 days. So what we would have normally as far as there is no time lost. Community members obviously are still invited to either propose comments or to react on comments that other people have made. So essentially I think it's just in the (unintelligible) of things that they've moved this barrier out and so they don't have to do a manual sift on the Web site from one to the other.

I can get more information if you want and I can see what I can find out for our next meeting, but I understand how the situation evolved and what we are at the moment. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Well certainly I guess what it means is that we'll need to turn things around as quickly as possible and just run as many meetings as we can from the 8th of January.

Amr, would you like to bring something up?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. Amr, again. I would just like to note that I'm not saying that there is anything particularly wrong with this. There is a stipulation for public comments in the GS offering procedures of a minimum of 30 days. There is no mention of a reply phase or a comment phase or how the public comments period would be broken down. So Lars is absolutely correct in that.

It's just something that I caught and I thought it was a bit odd. I would assume that something like this -- which is common practice although not required -- would be communicated more openly than it has been. So it's just something that caught my attention, that's all. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. All right. Well, if we - I see something going on in the. Oh, yes. I was just checking the chatroom. Okay so what I am suggesting now is that we -- and, you know, certainly continue to do this during each meeting -- that I think now may be the time to do with the FICPI comments. So I have a link to those which I shall paste into the chatroom. I know it's a long, long time since this was relevant. There it is. In fact, I think we were dealing with this in mid-April or something like that.

Anyway, because - basically the agreement back then was that we would treat it at this point. It's even conceivable that they may add to it, in fact. But I would suggest is that we just try and keep on top of these things as we can. It's just going to leave us more time in later meetings as well. Just leaving you a few minutes just to load up the document and realizing that.

Fortunately it's really easy to read. So basically what they've done is they've quoted all of our questions and then they've given their replies to them. So it's - most of the replies are really easy to understand as well. So if we come over to that, they're talking about - they have a reply to our main charter question -- whether it is desirable to translate and all the rest of it.

And so they are saying, "Who Is information should be globally available." It's a slightly vague statement. From a legal point of view it is important that the address and server contact information can be recorded and readable both in each local language of the holder as well as translated or transliterated to a single common language that can be easily readable and such internationally. So basically that would mean if they had a vote, then the vote is very, very clearly on the mandatory transformation side.

Moving on, I can see activity in the chatroom but I'll continue and we can come back to it.

What exactly the benefits to the community are of translating onto a transliterating contact information, especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation and/or transliteration? Okay. I'll pick this up in a minute. I'm just saying that in terms of standpoint they're making. I think if you go to the link that I just pasted in the chatroom, then you can see that document. That's probably the easiest way around it.

What they're saying is actually quite typical of responses we've seen before. I think there is nothing particularly - yes, we are looking at the FICPI document now. It should be at that link unless I'm mistaken.

They're asking about benefits. Okay. So they're saying the Internet is a global communication system and it is important that the Who Is information is safe, correct and globally readable. Okay. Without a clear and general translation and/or transliteration of contact information in the Who Is system, record system will fail. I would like to say that again this is content that we've seen similar opinions from other groups. It's nothing particularly new.

Perhaps one comment we could make is that, you know, without clear and general translation the system will fail. I think there are some people who would say that actually the current system in some sense is failing. I think like lack of validation and things like that. Again, extremely uncontroversial stuff.

But then there is a question, "Should translation and/or transliteration, contact information be mandatory for all gTLDs?" And they say yes and this is just - as far as I know there is nobody who is making some sort of distinction there.

Amr in the chatroom is saying the remarks on the requirements are vague and questionable. Yes, I think that's probably a fair criticism. I mean several of the terms here, I wasn't very sure exactly, you know, really precisely what

they meant by things like globally available and Who Is information is saved correct and globally readable. So, yes, I don't know. We can even consider - then this is a general thing getting back and saying, "Very interesting but more detail, please."

Anyway, pushing on.

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr. May I make a comment...

Chris Dillon: By all means.

Amr Elsadr: ...while we're still discussing it? When they say from a legal point of view, first of all they don't specify what legal jurisdiction they're referring to. I find this to be a little strange.

And the second thing is, I'm not aware of any laws in any jurisdiction that are specific to domain name registration data. And from my rather well, I would say, limited experience in this, I think that - well some of the strongest laws on user data, I guess, would be in the EU perhaps and those are particularly related to privacy and data protection. But even those don't have laws that are specific to domain name registration data. I think that if they're going to present a comment like this they should provide some reference to what it is they're referring to. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Amr. Lovely, yes. I really just spotted that from a legal point of view which jurisdiction that is. That is very, very noticeable. Well, of course, it's the usual problem with proving negatives. It's very difficult to prove that things don't take first. It's a real shame (Emily) hasn't time to call. I think particularly with her EU experience that she'd be able to add to this. Yes, I think fundamentally both of those are very fair criticisms.

All right. So if we have a look at the next one which is, "Should translation and/or transliteration contact information be mandatory for all registrants or

any of those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?"

I'm afraid this answer is rather difficult to understand, in my opinion, but here we go. They say translation and/or transliteration of contact information should be mandatory for all registrants, so that's very, very normal stuff. And then they say, "Which may also solve some problems in the ASCII Who Is system related to a country with only a few national letters that does not fit into the system today."

I'm guessing they're probably talking about, I don't know, European languages -- French and German -- where they're basically using ASCII but they've got a few accents so that's probably what they mean. Yes, probably should not make too much of it. So they're fundamentally saying mandatory for all registrants and that again is very similar to replies we have had from other parties.

Amr, would you like to pick that up?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, Chris. This is Amr again. I apologize for repetitively interrupting you.

Chris Dillon: No problem. It's good to have a discussion, believe me.

Amr Elsadr: Just to add to my view that these answers are really, really vague. I'm wondering if when they say that transformation of contact information should be mandatory for all registrants, are they also saying that registrants who do input their registration data in ASCII should also have that information transformed into other languages? That kind of looks like what they're trying to say here. And they're saying that they may resolve some problems in the ASCII Who Is system. I'm really not sure.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. I think this has been a problem right through this whole project. Actually when somebody makes a statement, "Should be mandatory

for all registrants", personally I have always understood that to mean all registrants that don't use ASCII. So what I'm saying that there is no point in having somebody, you know, using ASCII and then just moving the ASCII from one part of the database and copying it to another.

I mean, actually it isn't a transformation. So I guess the transformation almost becomes a matter of coping the data from one part of the database to the other part of the database. However, I am using the term ASCII in a very, very strict way which, you know, maybe we need to pick this up. I'm really talking about very, very basic. It's literally A to Z, no accents at all because as soon as you start talking accents -- okay there may be small number in ASCII -- but there are an awful lot of accents that are not in ASCII.

Okay. I'll just come back to - there are some things going on in the - yes, okay. Amr is just typing that he's having a hard time making sense of them. I think some of them are a little on the vague side, to put it mildly.

Actually the useful thing that's coming out of this particular thing is that it may actually be worse in the final report. Where are we just talking about, you know, copying? So perhaps if we're saying, "If somebody is already using the Roman alphabet with no accents, then really there is no transformation involved. What you're really talking about if copying." But it might be just worse.

Just enlarging on this a bit because I guess to some extent it is something that has been taken for granted -- taking things for granted -- in a project like this one tends to be a bad thing to do. Just read as it says. Do we want some kind of exemption if there are languages which are not using accents? I mean, certainly I guess with ASCII I'm just wondering if you can - you probably can type French and German. As you say, as soon as you go up to Scandinavia, you're going to be struggling.

Okay. Moving on. Then the question, "What impact will translation and transliteration contact information have on the Who Is validation of (unintelligible) under the 2013 RAA?" If you come back and they say, "It is necessary to keep the Who Is validation system workable on an international base." Right. So, again, maybe, more or less saying criticism. It's really quite a vague statement.

Amr, would you like to pick it up?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr.

I would like to say -- and this is my personal opinion -- although validation is a requirement in the 2013 RAA, it is a somewhat useless requirement as far as I can tell in terms of being able to contact a registrant. I can see where verification would be more useful. But validation basically means that you need to validate that; for example, an e-mail address -- is a real e-mail address or a telephone number is a real telephone number or a home address or office address is a real address as well.

But validation does not actually mean that this address or phone number actually is the one that will lead to keeping contact with the registrants. So although it is a 2013 RAA in the response by FICPI, when it says it is necessary to validate Who Is system, I don't think it is actually necessary. From a contractual perspective it is, but it doesn't actually help a Who Is lookup user to contact a registrant in any way.

Verification is a more effective way of doing that and that is normally done by registrars, I think, verifying that a registrant or someone who is registering a domain name is actually contactable using an e-mail address, for example. But validation is not. Although it is required contractually, it's not actually necessary. So I would challenge this response as well.

Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes. I guess in the last one we had issues with things which were being taken for granted. And now we have issues with the use of words like validation and verification which it can sometimes be used quite loosely, so yes. As soon as you use them, you really have to define them further, it strikes me.

Then moving on, we've got the next one, when should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contract information come into effect. And they're saying as soon as possible and at least within the next 12 months. Well, you know, there are things that are, you know, like the fact that the system fundamentally has to support non-Latin scripts. I mean as soon possible I think makes sense but 12 months is really extremely unrealistic.

In the chat room, Amr is questioning how necessary validation is. I think it's a bit relief that that probably isn't - well we may have opinions on it but it's rather outside what we're doing and that feels to be quite a relief. Then Amr is typing: "Assuming there isn't nationalized registration data in 12 months." Yes, I think - I do think that's a bit unlikely really, just too many things needing to be done, not just enabling the future system for non-Latin scripts but also the tagging. That seems to be quite a series of things.

All right. Then we come back to charter question two. So that is who should decide who should bear the burden of translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating it to a single common scrip. And the 6b view is the burden will have to be divided in between the registrants and the registrar, which is a beautifully clear answer. Yes.

Amr, would you like to pick up some aspect?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks, Chris. And I do apologize about just jumping in. I was trying to...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: It's much more interesting on these calls when people get involved and pick things up in and there's sort of a dialogue, so really what you're doing is very much appreciated. It's (unintelligible) at all.

Amr Elsadr: Thank you, Chris. Yes I just - again, I don't feel that this a clear-cut response. They obviously do have an opinion that registrants and registrars should bear the cost of transforming contact data. But they don't in any way say why they think that registrants or registrars should bear this cost. And so just stating that this is their opinion with no reasoning to support it just makes no sense to me at all. And so I wouldn't really characterize this response as terribly clear-cut. That's all. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you for that. Yes. In a sense why, you know, some reasoning would have been useful. And also I think there are some situations where registries could be picking up costs as well. So I thought it was quite interesting not to see them mentioning them. But yes, okay. Recorded anyway.

                 Then to use a very British idiom we say over the bridge to (Wigum), which means next page. Horrible, isn't it? On the next page we have the final question which is who does your SG or AC believe should bear the cost, bearing in mind however the limits and scope set in the initial report on this issue. The cost - and then the reply comes back: "The cost should be divided between registries and registrars."

                 And now the registries have raised their hands and we've lost the registrants. So yes I think this ends up feeling quite strange to me. So what they're doing is specifying actors who should be picking up charges, and that - I actually quite like it when people come off the fence and say, you know, who they think should pay because at that point at least it's very clear. But yes, without why and sort of giving sort of slightly different answers to these questions is quite puzzling really to put it mildly.

Yes I'm just waiting for a moment because I can see there's typing going on. Oh yes. Registries and registrars don't benefit from the transformation so I don't see why they should bear the costs. Yes that's - in fact Michele Neylon on one of the lists was saying exactly the same thing. In fact I think he was saying registrants, registrars and registries don't benefit so why do it. Although I'm slightly over summarizing what he was writing, but yes that's...Amr's agreeing. Okay yes.

All right. So thank you for that discussion on the 6b thing. And yes, so that's certainly something that we can consider now and exactly how we respond to that. But I think overwhelmingly it's probably going to be along the lines of thank you but much more detail and a matter of following up some of the points made during this meeting.

All right. Unless there are any other points about that we may be able to get into the next two points which are on the possible webinar. And again there is a page in the wiki to do with, you know, concrete suggestions for the webinar. So I'll just paste that into the chat room so that you have it handy. And Amr is saying my overall impression of 6b's response is that they are uninformed on the reasoning behind what they are advocating.

Yes so I think certainly as, you know, you said before that they're not putting why, you know, reasons behind these things. So when there aren't things like that then those tend to be a suspicion. Fundamentally why is a question that needs to be answered.

All right. So if we have a bit of a look at the - well I mean first of all I suppose the question is does everybody agree that we should be having - considering a webinar perhaps sometime in January. I think that was the idea. Presuming we do, what we'd be looking at would be obviously quite a short webinar, so probably about 20 minutes, and it would give background to the working group.

You know, I think you have to do that because it's really, really dangerous to presume that people know what we've been doing, and the talk about discussion in the group. So, you know, outreach and feedback, arguments, and then later on the straw man and the initial report. I guess the majority of it would be spent talking about recommendations and, you know, just answering the two main charter questions, and then just a bit about the future, so about public comment, about face-to-face meeting in Singapore, which we'll discuss under the agenda point, time for the final report, and then, you know, just saying that the working group is open to everybody.

So that would be the idea behind the webinar. So I don't know whether anybody has any comment. Perhaps we've missed something out. Or should we just get busy and get on with it? Amr, would you like to make a suggestion about the webinar?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, Chris. This is Amr. I suppose if we do want to use a webinar to elicit some more active inputs in the public comment period then we could do that. Or if we feel that the report itself, the initial report seems really self-explanatory then yes by all means. But apart from that, I don't really feel that a webinar is actually necessary at this point. I'm just wondering if there's anyone who's expressed any difficulty understanding what the working group is recommending or even what the deliberations involved that would warrant a webinar at this point. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. No, we haven't had people saying, you know, we don't understand the report, certainly not. Okay there has been some unofficial feedback outside the groups. So for example, Michele was writing a few things, but I regard as, you know, they're interesting things but those unofficial. But no I think the idea behind it was really more just drumming up interest.

I mean it's very, very difficult to know what silence means and especially because we've opened for public comment and nothing very much has happened so far. I guess that just slightly raises the importance of - I think we just have to - for me I feel we have to do what we can to make sure the people are aware of the report. Lars, would you to pick up something within this context?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you. Thank you, Chris. Yes just very briefly, Amr, and picking up what you said, so yes I think you're right. The idea was to raise the profile really of the report. It wasn't because of the timing that this falls in. It was simply that by the time we get to Singapore, obviously the comment period will be closed. And so to maximize, if you want, the exposure of the report to the community and to stimulate responses rather than because it's a difficult document that needs further explanations.

And in addition to that, I think so obviously ICANN and Singapore will be very busy which will be coming to the next - on the next point, because we don't have an opportunity to present to the community during our ICANN meeting that might be helpful. And then there was another point where we thought this might work very well. No, that's it. Sorry. So yes, the ICANN busy public comment period is finished by then and to raise the profile.

And it would be just really what we had in mind would be just a 20-minte, 15, 20-minute webinar, not a whole hour, just to get them - give some overview of what we recommend, what we've discussed and have a question and answer session. That would be it.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you for that. And Amr is typing in the chat room that he says, "I don't mind holding a webinar for those purposes." Yes my instinct is that we should hold on. And the only other comment I would make is I think it tends to be more interesting if you have more than one speaker. So basically I don't mind doing some parts of it, but I think it would be more interesting if we did have more than one speaker.

Okay. And there's a little bit of stuff going on in the chat room but I think I would quite like - I'm not - don't worry I'm not putting any pressure on people to speak, not at this stage anyway, but I just think with things like that 20 minutes, even 20 minutes is quite a long time. You do better if you have more than one person. Okay.

And so we can gradually start - and (Olaf) is saying too late to be wriggling out of that one. Yes okay. So if we then think a bit about the Singapore meeting, because actually with that there's a bit of a surprise. Because I was thinking that, you know, because we've produced an initial report that it wouldn't be too difficult to have quite a high profile meeting, a face-to-face meeting, in Singapore.

However, the logistics in Singapore are very difficult. So I've been told that the likelihood is that we're going to end up either scheduled at the same time as one of the major topics, probably IANA transition, or we will be very early in the morning or very late in the morning, and so we really have to think quite carefully about what we do to maximize the possibility whether, you know, whether we actually have a public meeting, which is going to be clashing or very early, or whether we have an unofficial meeting. But obviously we can, you know, we can invite people to it.

But to cut a long story short, we need to be thinking what to do about Singapore. That's really the situation that we are in. Amr, would you like to pick up something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I would certainly suggest that if we do want broader participation in the face-to-face meeting that we do no schedule it at a time where it clashes with something like the IANA transitions face-to-face meeting. Because well then it would be very unlikely that we do get anyone else out of the working group and perhaps not even all the members of the working group will be in the room.

On what we should be doing in the face-to-face meeting, I think we have a couple of options. One option could be going through whatever has been submitted through the public comment period, which as Lars has stated previously will be closed at that point, so we could do that if parts - especially if we don't have too many people from outside of the working group participating.

I suspect that even if there are non-working group members in the room with us it wouldn't be much use doing anything other than going over what has been submitted in the public comment periods, because at that point there would be no method for anyone to provide further input at that stage.

Another thing we could think about doing and especially if this meeting is taking place before the GNSO council public meeting is discuss something perhaps you and Rudi could present to the GNSO council, especially at the initial - both the initial report and the public comment period will be over. So you might want to think about maybe presenting something. And I don't think that the schedule for the GNSO council meeting is set just yet but I think they are working them.

So we might want to think about whether you would like to spend a few minutes talking to them about what's happening, especially if it's going to be on the council agenda following the final report's publication. So that's something else you might want to consider. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Thank you very much. Yes, certainly. So we need to put in place a mechanism for talking to them briefly about the initial report. Lars, would you like pick something up? Oh no, Lars did have his hand up but...

Lars Hoffman: Sorry I was speaking to myself.

Chris Dillon: Were you on mute.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, yes. I'm halfway through my speech. What I'm trying to say is that I don't want to put Glen on the spot who is I can see in the AC room on this call. I'm wondering whether for the meeting Amr said, you know, it would be unfortunate to schedule opposite anything IANA or accountability related. And I fear from what I've heard is that that will be pretty much everything. I think even fighting - that even fighting for the GNSO council meeting to not opposed by anything related to them.

So it's going to be tough. So there might be a possibility of maybe having a non-public meeting, which would just mean that it's not on the agenda so anybody could come, but it would give us also more flexibility in terms of rooms so if it's just the working group we could then maybe see, you know, we can schedule for Monday but, you know, if we then decide shorthand notice that we'd rather meet on Tuesday then we might be able to move it if we find a room, and if it's a small group we might be able to do one if they have not rooms and a promise to be early and to sign up in the south area for that.

I'm just putting that out there. I'm not saying that's the best solution. I see that Glen is typing. And yes for the GNSO council agenda again it will be very pressed on the weekend but I absolutely agree we should get a little update and maybe just a five, ten-minute spot for Chris and Rudi to give a quick overview of the recommendations and maybe a quick overview of who submitted public comments so the council knows where we stand and indicate the timeline so they know when roughly to expect when we will have the final report, which I suppose we can gauge at that point by the amount and the diversity of the public comment that we will receive. So that is that. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. So okay. And Glen is just confirming in the chat room that accountability will take up all the space and that a private would be easy to schedule. Okay. And Amr is saying that he meant the weekend sessions, not

the public council meeting. And will we be there on Saturday. Yes. Oh - yes, yes. I think basically I think I am there all Saturday. I think there was some problems getting tickets from London to Singapore, but I think it's all right.

I'm waiting for a moment for typing to submit that. Okay. So the person who's organizing the agenda is Volker. Let's schedule an update on Saturday afternoon. Oh yes, it's fine. I got that badly wrong at the last ICANN meeting so I've learnt my lesson. So yes that would be - yes that would be possible.

All right. Well unless there's something else. I mean, I think we probably will have to continue discussions about this on the list because it's important to get it right, but probably more or less all I can think of to say about Singapore because it's a difficult situation.

Oh yes. And Lars is saying let's do that. Yes okay. Yes that's fine. So Lars will contact Volker and coordinate with Glen and me and Rudi. Yes that should be fine, and yes. As I say that should work. Brilliant. Okay. Then unless there's anything else about Singapore then we can move onto next meeting.

And you will be very pleased to hear that the meetings on Christmas Day and New Year's Day are cancelled. And the next scheduled meeting we have is on January 8. And I've never seen that logo before. Amr is - yes I thought you'd like it when I said we cancelled over Christmas meeting. Okay.

So that brings us into any other business. So for once we've got a good few minutes for any other business. Hearing none, we can always do these things on the list anyway. In that case the only thing that I need to say to you is have a merry Christmas all of you. Thank you for all of your work this year. And have a great New Year's as well, and we'll meet again on January 8.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, Chris. Happy holidays, everybody. Have a good rest period.

Chris Dillon: Best wishes, Lars. Goodbye.

Terri Agnew: Happy holidays, everyone. Bye-bye.

END