Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 29 January 2015 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 29 January 2015 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-29jan15-en.mp3

Attendees:
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Jim Galvin - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Peter Dernbach- IPC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Jennifer Chung – RySG
Roger Carney – no soi

Apologies:
Emily Taylor - RrSG

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Howard Li
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

(Man):   The recordings have been started. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and
                 Transliteration Contact Information PDP Working Group Call on the 29 of
                 January 2015. On the call today, we have Chris Dillon, Rudi Vansnick, Peter

Dernbach, Jennifer Chung, Jim Galvin, Roger Carney, Petter Rindforth and Howard Li. I show no apologies for today's conference. From staff we have Lars Hoffmann, 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. Now I need to just cover most of 1B on the agenda which is just whether anybody's statement of interest has changed since our last meeting? Hearing nothing and seeing nothing in the chat room that means we can move forward into the review tool that last has put together which basically summarizes the comments from the public comments we've been receiving recently and I checked just before the telephone call, there hasn't been any last minute ones so the document is completely up to date. Just remind people that the public comment closes on Sunday, the 1 of February at 2359 UTC. I don't know if I've got the time wrong. I think that's right.

Before we go into the document, we're going to take a fairly thorough look at it but just one or two things before we start with it and that is that I'm going to be focusing on arguments that we've not talked about before and one of the interesting things is that the public comments have brought a few of those in. So obviously I'm going to concentrate on those and take a similar approach during our meeting in Singapore in fact but we'll talk about that under the heading on the agenda just a bit later.

Today, apart from the things which are new to us, the other things I would like to stress are perhaps arguments that are a bit on the weak side. So there are some arguments there which I think it's a good thing to mention that there are issues with particular arguments. I shall flag those up as we go through but I'm not going to speak to all of the points. I mean, we've got about nine pages to go through. We wouldn't have time to do that anyway. So what I'm doing is I'm leaving out things that we already know about, picking up new things and then also picking up the odd thing which seems to be quite weak and in some

of those cases, it may be necessary to actually to ask for clarification. That may be another thing we want to do.

Because I'm taking that approach, that means that I'll gradually be scrolling through the document and I'll stop in certain pages but if you've read the document and you would really like to flag up something else, of course, you are very welcome to do that. So basically, just stop me at the relevant point and we can certainly pick up other elements because there is always a certain amount of personal opinion. Is this something we've seen, is it new or is it related to something else? Even the aspect of is this a strong argument, is this a weak argument and to some extent it is personal opinion. Would you like to bring something up at this stage?

Amr Elsdar   Thanks Chris. This is Amr, Yes. I was just going to add that apart from going through the tool and addressing every issue item by item, it's also helpful to look at the comments as a whole within the context of the entire comments. So perhaps after we're doing going over everything, we can just make a revision of each comment separately in its entirety. Thanks.

Chris Dillon :   Thank you. All right. So let's get going and so just scroll us down. Nothing really to say on number one I don't think. Number two, I think there's some highlights and quite strong language there. So this particular comment is using the word extensive which I think is not one we've seen before. So I'll just draw attention to that and that's the idea of transforming into English and why English. So that was something I shall flag up briefly. Nothing on number three with the one exception that there are some comments here which don't have attributions. So usually you've got the person or the organization attributed but there are some comments which are coming from people in individual capacities so that's why you've got the blank column. I think it's usually registrars and (Almer) is teasing me in the chat room and saying, if you know (McCailee) - actually, the word isn't particularly strong. Wow. Okay. Right.

So nothing on four and I think I might come back later about things like payment but I know I'm going to do that further down. So I think I shall skip for all and then a little movement. It looks good and then, goodness. Yes. I'll do this now. Actually, in the wording of the comments up at the top there, there's this reference to the term registration directory service. Now, the ITC picked this up and said you really have to sort out your nomenclature. I agree with them completely and I really wanted to do that before the current draft of the report and we just found different people using different terms and it was very difficult to unify them but actually looking at that particular report, I believe the term that we should be using -- and it's quite a mouthful -- it's the domain name registration data directory service and I think I'm really going to struggle to remember that. It's just so long. DNR, D-DS. It's a practical suggestion after looking at the chat earlier. Okay. (Almer), would you like to pick that up? (Almer), I think we've got a technical problem. Are you on mute?

We've actually lost (Almer) on that so I think we'll have to come back to that a little later. It wouldn't surprise me if there was something about that. Anyway, yes and Petter is making the comment and the main thing is that we have a description and identification that is clear to all. I think the IPC suggestion that we just use the (SAC51) definition is an extremely good one. That's what that document is. It's a list of definitions. So if we can possibly use as many of those as possible, that would really seem to solve that problem. Yes and Jim is confirming that. I'm rather, rather relieved to see it. Petter, would you like to pick up something?

Petter Rindforth: No. Thanks. Just quickly just so that we use a description that is not only for our document but that can be easily understandable for people outside this group, that is what we discussed within IPC and a description that is also used in other working groups and if possible to find that kind so that we all know what we're talking about. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes Petter. That's really what we're talking about. I mean, ironically, we have a link to the document within the wiki but we've linked to a lot of things and it

just wasn't at the top of my mind when drafting as I remembered then that would've saved that one but nevermind. Okay. Coming back to the document, Number 10. I'm intending to skip number eight and number nine but number 10 has - I think it may be something that we're aware of but I don't think it got into the drafting and that's this thing about the importance of selectable text. So basically the text in the database should not be images of some of the script or I think images generally really. They have to be selectable or machinery and that really does seem to be an improvement to the document and I don't think that's controversial. Just machine readable text is just generally a good thing.

All right. Let's then come down and have a look, I think, at - now, there are - I think we're going to come back to 15 a bit further down but if we look at 16 for the time being, I think this may be new and so it's saying about recommendation three, registered name holders into their contact data in the language or script appropriate for the language of registrar operates then and in Comment 16, we have this suggestion that the recommendation would hinder competition between registrars and hinder the transferability of the (mains) and what's really good about the comments is that it's actually suggesting a solution.

So it's suggesting the change instead of writing operate under that we might want to use supported by instead and that brings us to a decision whether we are prepared to make that change and possibly arguments on both sides but I don't know whether anybody would like to speak to either side of that argument. My own feeling is it requires further thought but I think I have a slight inclination to adopt the supported by but that is something we could possibly have a discussion about in slower time. All right.

So moving on from 16, I think probably the next time we need to stop is 21 which we've still got on the screen so I won't go scrolling for a minute. So we've got recommendation for -- which is quite a long recommendation -- and so I think what originally drove this recommendation was that the target - well,

if my understanding is correct, the tagging that we're talking about is basically to say this data is in Korean and that just means that you don't have a database with - it's effectively data and you just don't know what language it's in. So you'd actually have a tag which says this is Korean text and so in that light, then the comment is quite interesting because it's saying this should be strictly optional.

Well, I think we are profoundly in trouble if the people putting the data in don't know what language it's in. So I would really say that all Korean speakers know that handle is the Korean script. For me, it's not unreasonable for them to say this is Korean language, this is Korean script and so what comes out of this is whether we actually need to simplify the recommendation so that we just bring it back to the fundamental purpose of it which is to indicate the language of the data. Jim, would you like to pick that up?

Jim Galvin: Yes. So Chris, this is Jim Galvin. I just wanted to comment that I guess I'm not as sanguine as you are about whether or not the registrant knows what language or script they're using and I also think that it's difficult for a registrar to be able to figure out what language or script someone is using.

Chris Dillon: Yes. I mean, certainly. Effectively, I would say that it needs to be something that the registrant puts in and says, I am registering something Korean and the language is Korean. I would not expect a registrar to be able to do that. I mean, that's one of the reasons for the tag.

Jim Galvin: Right. Well, I think what I'm saying is I'm also being a little bit cautious about whether or not a registrant would actually properly be able to identify that and that might seem odd but I think about countries with lots of scripts and lots of languages and India is probably a good one.

Chris Dillon: A good example.

Jim Galvin: Yes and I don't know. I'm just - I know that this is a problem that has to be solved so I don't have a particular suggestion to make here except to say that I don't think it's 100% given that even a registrant is going to know for sure what language or script they're using. I believe that a registrar should be responsible for figuring that out but I also don't think that there's 100% solution for them either. So there's going to be a learning curve here really on a backend in requiring that we tag these things and figuring out how one knows how to do that in an international environment. That's my comment. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Jim and I'm sorry for interrupting you. Yes. I think in reality and this came through (McKaylee's) comments very strongly. People who speak languages and actually particularly people who speak smaller languages tend to be very, very keen. If we return to the Indian example for a moment, if you are a Canada speaker -- which it's actually not a particularly small language and there are many millions of them -- but people are typically very, very willing to say this is not Hindi, it's Canada or (unintelligible) or one of the other Indian languages.

So I would say - I mean, we may have to do some drafting but I do feel that the responsibility - overwhelmingly, I would say 95% perhaps over that would actually know and I'm a Canada speaker and I'm using Canada, not Hindi. Luckily the scripts look totally different as well. So I would say that we need to draft it so that that's where the responsibility is. Jim, would you like to pick that up?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Just one last comment. I'm fine for the discussion so I know you have a lot you want to go through here and go through. I just want to be clear about what my position is. I am fully in support of tagging with the language and script all data. Now, the way in which that happens and how we know and who's responsible for it, sure, but that's more discussion and see what falls out of that but on a technical level, that tagging is just essential for the future

of internationalization. So we just have to figure out what the right way is to make that a practical thing. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much Jim. Yes. It's essential but I feel it's not as onerous as that particular recommendation perhaps makes it out to be and so I think perhaps a little bit of redrafting may sort that one out. All right. Moving down. We go a long way this time. I reckon we get as far as 31 before the next one. So my original invitation stands open. If you've got something that you feel strongly about, stop me but I am intending to go all the way to 31. All right.

So now, again, this is about recommendation six and as many languages as possible. So this is the field names and that is incredibly important. So we're talking field names and not data and again, it's quite a similar comment to my last comment because translating the fields of the database into the UM languages or ideally setting up a system whereby perhaps as it comes out of the tenant of (learned) languages that it's fairly easy to add another set of field names in another language.

I just feel here that we need to stress that actually we're probably talking about 50 field names or something like that. So this is a small one off project. I would really hope that there might be perhaps something from somewhere. It's the sort of thing which would just make a huge difference. I don't think it's going to cost very much. Perhaps this could be one for ICANN. (Rudi) is commenting in the chat room that ALAC may have some comments about this.

ALAC certainly are - they haven't submitted comments to the public but they have written some quite interesting comments and moreover, those comments are overwhelmingly on the mandatory transformation side. So they make rather interesting reading and as (Rudi) says, they are in their voting process. So if you go to that document you'll find their first draft and then what they're calling a final draft that they haven't voted. Jim, would you like to pick up some aspect of that?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Thank you. So this is Jim Galvin. I'm supportive of being able to change the labels and put them in a language. I hope that as we continue our discussions here, one of the things that I'm sensitive to is whether there should be a complete set of translated labels or if the door should be open for registrars and their output to be able to add additional translations or localizations that might be more appropriate for the regions. I think that's a topic that deserves discussion. I'm a little cautious about the idea that we'll specify the six or seven now that ICANN uses and we'll have standardized labels for those and you can't use anything else because that just feels limiting in the internationalization context. So I just want to be cautious about that and then I'm interested in more discussion about where we want to take that particular recommendation and rule in response to this. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Thank you Jim. To a great extent, this actually depends on how easy it is to do the database. So if it's easy to set up the system where you could just have more labels coming in for new languages then we would go that route. Otherwise, I guess what we're going to have to do is say, well, as the system is set up, the easy thing to do is to do it now and then it may be possible to do it later but it may not be quite so easy. Thank you (Rudi) for putting the link to the ALAC information in the chat room. Jim, did you want to come back on any aspect of that?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Just one last comment. The thing that I want to be careful of in this recommendation related to labels is the way it's phrased will have some effect on contractual obligations and that's what I want to be careful about. To be fair to whoever might have to do this -- whether it's a registry or a registrar -- I guess it'll ultimately fall on registries if we go to purely thick registries and registrars won't have to do this anymore but I want to be careful about obligating people to have to do translations, to keep up to date tables. There are just implementation effects for folks in that space.

So anyway, yes. I don't want to belabor this. We're going to have more discussion about it and think about it and see some new language so we'll have plenty of time for discussion but although I'm supportive of the idea of both for labels, I'm just cautious about what we actually recommend because of what it means down the road and in terms of what the requirements might be versus what might be optional in support of a community. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. I'll try and reselect it. (Rudi), would you like to pick up something?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Thank you Chris.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: I think that this recommendation is one of the easiest to implement in the near future as we know that there will be some modifications on the real data and by implementing it in it, there is a parameter that indicates which international language it is. It would also enable easier automatic translation as there would be an indication of which language it is and based on the labels itself, it makes it easier for (unintelligible) speakers to have a good interpretation of what the data is that is in the fields behind that label. I think that it's something that we should try to emphasize that this recommendation could be a first step in the process of moving towards a little bit more affirmation of translation or transliteration of transformation of data even for law enforcement could be easier to see what kind of data is in the field itself. I have a strong feeling for this recommendation.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. Yes, I think we definitely need to get the substance of this recommendation over. I think that's important. And I think later on I will probably make comments about just how difficult, you know, this area of transformation is.

Some of the comments really do not display that. They sort of write very quickly or we can probably just use a particular system and not worry about this too much.

But in fact as you say, the key thing here is to look into the long-term. So at the moment the systems we have are a bit of a mess. They're not particularly good - well, not right across the board. They're good for some languages and they're non-existent for others. That's a typical situation.

But what we have to do is look really long term and, you know, we have watched tools which in their early days produced extremely amusing results. We'd have a good laugh at automatic translation.

But as the years have gone by, we've been laughing less and less because actually they've got better and better. So I think that's the way we need to look at it.

Okay, right, I think we probably need to continue our trip down the document and let's see where the next stop is. Right, 45 I reckon. Oh, I'll get there. It's a bit further down. Okay, arguments and questions. So contact ability of registrants is always guaranteed by the presence of the e-mail address data.

This was too much for me. So you've got one guy who speaks Hindi in Canada and you've got another one who only speaks Japanese. And you know they've got each other's e-mail addresses, but I don't think very much communication is going to happen there. I really wanted to flag that. Rudi would you like to pick up something or one of the other comments I skipped over?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. This is Rudi for the transcript. No I'm picking up on Point 45 - the compatibility of (unintelligible). Always guaranteed by the presence of an e-mail address. That sounds really strange because having had a level of

experience already in trying to contact them, it looks like most of them it just mailbox and the compatibility is really very, very low.

So I think that there is strong need for a better way of identifying the compact. I'm not sure that is actually a good one.

Chris Dillon: Mm-hm, yes, okay. Thank you. Right. Then we pop down as far as 47 and translating proper nouns is impractical if not impossible. And obviously this is not new. We know about this, and so really the reason I'm flagging it up is that we've no intention of doing it.

One thing I did feel I possibly should raise - it comes up elsewhere - is that, you know, the example of Bangkok is actually given as a place name which, you know, is actually a translation. In the original it's Krung Thep. And of course Krung Thep if you're Thai you know it, but if you aren't you don't.

So that's - you know, there are certainly some place names like that which ideally would be translated because normally we do talk about transliteration. There's no doubt about that.

However, with perhaps a more important category -- because Bangkok could be regarded as an exception and in fact that word is used at some point in the comments -- but in fact just simple things like, you know, I would imagine very often in Japanese addresses they often have something (dawdy) or you're going to find similar words in other languages or, you know, like in Hindi they would say (unintelligible) "road."

And strangely it's sort of - it's, you know, the transliteration will spell that differently, so it won't be R-D. It won't be R-O-A-D. It will be probably in the indicator would be R-O-D and then you have to indicate that it's (unintelligible) consonant. So I don't know, a dot or something to do that.

(Dawdy) is the Japanese word - or one of the Japanese words - for road. These address terms meaning streets and road ideally you would actually want to translate those. But the simple solutions will have them transliterated. Those raise the level of difficulty.

So what I'm actually saying is that okay Bangkok may be an exception, but the road/street thing, this is something we run into many, many times. So just flag that up.

All right, I think it's time to move further down and let's see how far we get. Okay, so 49 - well, I actually more or less said this earlier that, you know, we've got here, "Will there be rules or standards?" Well, there has to be.

There's no doubt about that because otherwise you've got a chaotic situation and if you want real chaos then get people to do it voluntarily. Everybody will do it totally differently. And the data are in such a mess that they're of almost no use.

So okay ideally, you know, we do have to have standards and then it moves on to say, "Can it be done programmatically?" Yes, absolutely, but that involves people coming together and saying, "Right we're going to use this standard," or in some cases people coming together and saying, "There is no standard so we will have to create one."

So then we've got, "Will a common system be used or are we all just relying on free services like Google translate?" which is essentially what I was telling you about earlier. That was the system I was talking about. So here Google translate - wonderful for some languages. And it's really quite accurate, quite useful.

You know, other languages - Yiddish is the example I've always used - you are actually told do not use that because it seems to have a very strange database at the moment. In a few years' time it will probably be very different.

So okay I was slightly provocative there. Wonder whether that's generated any comments there.

All right, okay, well let us continue down the document. And then we have a whole lot of things. I think it's five different -- from 50 to 54 -- which I actually regard as reasons for not doing transformation because these are just really difficult problems that happen and are really difficult to sort out.

So you know, who's responsible for doing it? It's just really not clear. 51: "What if they don't know what it should be?" Heavens. What if the third party disputes the accuracy? Well, particularly if we've got everybody doing it in their own way, that's going to happen a lot. No particularly obvious way of sorting that out unless you have some sort of police force.

Then 53: "Is the registrant's consent required before a transliteration is published?" Quite possibly, but that's at another stage. Then we've got 54: "What if a registrant wants to change an approved translation?" Well probably under a lot of systems they'd be responsible for it. So actually that one probably is okay. It should be fine.

And then lastly 55: "Is there verification required every time one of these transliterated fields are updated?" And the answer to that is almost certainly yes unless the future RAA is changed on that account. And again I have been slightly provocative in my comments there, just to encourage you to come back on any aspect of that.

But I do regard about - I feel there are about five mini-arguments here for which are all anti-transformation arguments. A slight view of the time -- we are still fine I think.

All right, coming down a bit further we get to star 56, which is still on our screen at the bottom. And here it's quite a complicated comment, but I think just - you know, there's no - well, let's wind it back. It's difficult enough and

expensive enough to make arguments for transforming into ASCII. And most of the time it's transliterating into ASCII.

In the past we've mentioned that country names may be an exception. So the country name - it may be useful if that was translated into English but I think as far as I know our opinions were along those lines. So we're really talking about transliteration and - you know, we are talking about a transliteration into ASCII.

That does mean for some alphabetic scripts, they're all very good ways of pivoting into Cyrillic and Greek for example. But then with other alphabetic scripts - Thai for example - you know, that would be much more difficult. But just I think it's useful to flag that up.

All right. And then we come down to just very, very briefly - and I need to do some steering, so we'll just come down to 58 briefly. It's quite (unintelligible) jumping quite a few and I'm just looking over, bit of a skim read as we get there. Okay just a nice statistic there. It actually rather surprised me.

Only 5% of the world are native English speakers. So English seems to be a language where relatively few people have it as their native language, but a lot of people have it as a second language. In Europe, German is actually in that position. You know, the world's a stage until quite recently where there more German speakers in Europe than English speakers. A lot of people didn't realize.

Right, all right. Then we go down to Number 60, and I'll pick this up because I think in the past we've really been saying that searchability is possibly easier in one script. And to be honest that's to some extent saying that, you know, part of it is just if you're searching in one script you don't have to sort of load half a dozen bits of software so that you can search in India and Chinese and Korean and the other languages. So it would include things like that.

But actually at least if you're dealing with original data, I think there is an argument that the original data often is more consistent, that once you've transformed it, it's not original and tend to be more ways of doing it. So I think on reflection my own opinion has changed rather on that. I used to be saying, you know, ASCII is easier.

But I would say there are actually arguments on both sides. But certainly there is something to be said for the original, that it's not been messed up by some transformation process.

All right, unless there are other things let us go down to 63 and okay so here we have the IPC putting forward an argument that I've not seen before but it's quite an interesting one because until now we've always said well, we're just going to use the word "transform" because it covers translate and transliterate and life is too short and we haven't got enough time to explain these longer concepts.

But here they are actually picking that up and saying there are arguments for keeping them apart. That said, it's a new argument, but I don't think it's very strong because as I was saying earlier when we were talking earlier on in our discussions about should it be transliteration or should it be translation, I think the consensus was that overwhelmingly it's transliteration and the translation part is just so small.

And so at that point it doesn't really - it doesn't really mess things up too, too much just to talk about them together because effectively to a very great extent you are talking about transliteration. (Jim) would you like to pick up something there?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you. Jim Galvin again. I just have trouble understanding and it would be helpful if at some point here there could be a little more discussion of this I suppose. But it's not obvious to me how translation or transliteration

somehow enhanced transparency and accountability in the DNS. That leap just does not logically follow for me.

So if there's more to say about that I'd appreciate hearing it or at some point here if we're going to go down this path of trying to adopt this comment in some way. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes I'm not sure whether transparency is on my hit list of things I want to bring up today. It should be. And that - yeah, I have huge sympathy for what you're saying, you know. As I mentioned earlier, there is something better, there is something special about the original data. It tends to be clear.

One question one does need to ask is now who does this adjective apply to? Transparent for whom? And so certainly for English speakers then you could argue that it's more that - having something that they can get a hold of. And it's more transparent to them but then looking at this in the longer term, if the Internet is to develop and cover increasing numbers of people without English, then the more of those people that take cover, the less strong this argument becomes.

Yes, I think what I would really like to flag up is just transparent for whom. That's really what it comes to.

I think - oh yes, now (Patter) is just adding something in the chat room which I'll just pick up briefly. Yeah, and he's just - I think he's just stressing that - oh no, in fact no, sorry. That's an old comment. It applies to something we were talking about earlier. Okay.

Now I'm mindful of the time. We've only got ten minutes, but I think we are very near the end now. I might just speed up slightly.

Okay so under 65 I think this is a very simple comment. It's basically why. So the alternative having data in an unlimited number of scripts is troubling.

Really why is that troubling? It's actually the same comment as well. It's troubling for whom? You know, if you're seeing data in your own language, then that's less troubling than seeing it in another language. So that's comment 65 near the bottom.

Oh, and yes, I would have picked up transparency under 66. But I won't repeat what I was just saying about transparency earlier. Okay. And then 67 is rather an alarming comment because it's basically talking about globally searchable languages.

And if you read this comment you sort of really start a pattern -- these sorts of things - how many languages are being suggested here for transformation of data? So I think the argument we're having is is there enough money to transform into ASCII? I don't know whether there is.

Maybe there is but I think the impression I have is that no way is the money to do separate languages. So just thought I would address that one. That one is rather an alarming one. And the same would apply to comment 68 - exactly the same thing where the alarming thing there is the plurality of languages and the scripts.

And you know it isn't just the money. It's also the lack of the tools. So the fact that tools need to be created, bodies need to be created to administer them and there are suggestions for those bodies. I mean one of the comments was suggesting that the GAC would get involved for example. It just makes it rather more practical.

Okay and then I think we get right the way down to 71 and we spent a long time on that screen so we'll go quickly now I think. And - oh yeah - and luckily actually my comments are very similar. So we were talking about, you know, this is saying that the main barrier is costs.

But also I think there is a feasibility argument, also lack of tools which I was just talking about. Desirability - do we really want to do this? Is this the best thing to do? Does it really make - does this transformation really make things more accessible and transparent? There are all of those arguments in addition.

And okay then 72 - oh yes, okay. Luckily we've covered this. The word "standardized" is used, so this is really what I've just been saying. Standardized implies standards which may not exist and tools and people as well I would say. Oh, and in fact this is where the GAC come into it. Yes, I thought that there had been a concrete suggestion of their involvement.

Then we come down. I'm afraid we're going to go over very slightly today. So then we come down to 74, which I feel slightly is discouraging registrants using what sometimes are quite major scripts, which have not been represented in gTLDs yet.

So if there's some sort of reduction of the languages owning to the languages which are already used in gTLDs then I think in some ways that's quite a controversial thing to suggest. That's really the comment for that.

And then we end it with a single comments - so 75 and 76 at the end, which is basically that yes - I mean, what these comments are saying are absolutely correct. These are stipulations of the current system.

And so effectively what it means is that our recommendations are applying for the future system - the (NR/DDS) as we were saying because there are already stipulations for the existing system and I don't think we can break those.

All right, I'm sorry for rushing those last few comments, but I don't know whether there's anything anybody would like to pick up either about the

comments I've just picked up in the last few minutes or in fact anything else that has been skipped over today.

Okay, well in that case we have a few minutes left for just details of Singapore - and our meeting, I don't know what room we're in -- but our meeting is 7:30 on Wednesday morning, so obviously very much looking forward to seeing as many of you as possible there.

And I would urge all of you to have a slow reading of the latest version of the commentary view tool. And again in Singapore we will be focusing on basically new arguments in fact as we've done today. And there is an intention to go around the table as well but with the emphasis on new things.

And Rudi is just saying that updated versions are likely to be available on Monday or Tuesday. But obviously we can use the - yes and (largely) is concerning that. Obviously we will tell you by the list as soon as those things are available and it just gives us something to read at the airport while we're waiting for planes to a large extent.

All right and I think the only other thing is just raise any other business. Just managed to get more done than I was expecting. Any other business during the last few minutes?

All right, well in that case I think for many others the next meeting will be in Singapore either face to face or virtually and so for those of you traveling of course I wish you safe travel and very much look forward to the next one. And lots of input on the list before then. Thank you very much indeed.

Man: Thanks Chris. Thanks everybody.

Chris Dillon: Good-bye then.

Coordinator: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END