

Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN working group (JIG)
TRANSCRIPTION

Tuesday 20 April 2010 at 1100 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN working group (JIG) 20 April 2010 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/gns0/gns0-jig-20100420.mp3>

On page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung - co-chair

Jian Zhang - co-chair

Yeo Ling

Sarmad Hussain

Rafik Dammak

Fahd Batayneh

Karen Hayne

Cary Karp

Avri Doria

ICANN Staff

Bart Boswinkel

Gabi Schitteck

Kristina Nordstrom

Julie Hedlund

Glen de Saint Géry

Edmon Chung: I have some problems...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes. You're right. They were on the 15th.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess we're waiting for the recording to start and then Glen will do a quick roll call and we'll get into the call so.

Man: Yes.

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you (Ruby). On the call we have Rafik Dammak, Fahd Batanyeh, Kristina Nordstrom; for staff, Edmon Chung, Jian Zhang, Berry Cobb, (Karen Hain), and Avri Doria.

And for staff we have Bart Boswinkel, (Gabi Shikik), Kristina Nordstrom who I have mentioned, and Glen de Saint Géry and Julie Hedlund.

Thank you Edmon, over to you. Have I left off anybody?

Thank you, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Glen. So this is the (J) call. This is a second call.

And I think where we left off last time there was a set of minutes that were prepared. Myself and Jian being the co-chairs have reviewed them and they should be sent out momentarily if they haven't. I'm sorry I - were in meetings and last few hours and just got back on so I haven't - I'm not sure whether it was sent out yet.

But they were - they just talk about some of things that we have talked about last time. One of the main topic for discussion on this call was for Tina Dam from staff to provide a briefing on the situation, presentation of IDN TLDs especially based on the IDN Implementation working team report on two main issues, one on the single character IDN TLD and the other on IDN TLD variants.

I understand that Tina has not joined the call. We received a - we received the presentation that Tina gave for the synchronized IDN ccTLD proposal about a few days ago on the 15th of April.

I - Jian have you - actually Bart or Jian if you have access on Outlook or email would you mind forwarding that to the group just as a background document for our discussion as well.

But overall I think last time we identified three items of discussion, (unintelligible) and a third one for the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. It seems like most - a lot of it depends on Tina's briefing for us on what (unintelligible) we need to take into consideration based on her report to further the IDN discussion here.

So I sort of regret to say that Tina was unable to join. So I'm sort of at a loss of where we want to take this, you know, this call today.

But Jian did you want to add anything to that?

Jian Zhang: Not really because I think a lot of things we're going to discuss further. This further discussion depends on, you know, the feedback from Tina. I'm sending out the email, forwarded email Bart sent to me and Edmon so everybody could see, you know, what's going on so far.

Bart what do you think? Okay?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's fine.

Jian Zhang: Yes, I think that'll be helpful.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

(Karen Hain): Yes (Karen Hain) - it's (Karen Hain) from Sydney here. I'm just wondering who on the group is attending INTA. And if there's a face-to-face (jig) meeting planned at all in Boston.

Edmon Chung: That's a good question. What's happening in Boston and what - sorry, I didn't quite get the - what was that?

(Karen Hain): It's the International Trademark Association Annual Meeting.

Edmon Chung: I personally won't be joining. Is any - if we have a lot of people joining, I think we - it's a good idea to set up something there.

(Karen Hain): Well if anybody is attending, I mean I'm happy to sort of - I'm attending so if anyone wants to email me or let us know but I just thought it might be a useful forum if there are some of us that are going to be in the same place at the same time.

Bart Boswinkel: When is this meeting scheduled? This is Bart.

(Karen Hain): It starts on the 22nd of May.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

(Karen Hain): So as part of that meeting we will have - I'm on the Internet Committee for INTA so we - as part of my sort of role is I'm on a group looking at country ties, IDNs. And so we'll be doing that anyway.

But if anyone is going from this particular working group that would be useful time to meet up so let me know.

Edmon Chung: Okay, sounds good. I guess as I mentioned a lot of the work - (Chris Disspain) last time pointed out a view, good point about us - work in this group should be built on the existing work of the very extensive set of work that's already done on this topic.

So I think we - on those two items, the single character IDN TLD and the IDN TLD variant which is now also includes the IDN ccTLD, a synchronized IDN ccTLD implementation plan and as part of that action I think a lot of it depends on Tina.

So Tina's briefing for us is where we should start. Because both the implementation plan and the report does not readily provide a good set of items that we need to consider as a policy decision matter for both the ccNSO and the GNSO.

So on those two items I think it would still be better for us to wait for Tina to give us a briefing on it so that we have a better - a clearer direction forward and we don't overlap or redo or undo any of those things that was already done.

Does anyone...?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon.

Edmon Chung: ...think otherwise?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. I think what we got to - I fully agree with regard to variant management because that is really a moving target at this stage.

I don't know to what extent that is true for the single IDNs.

Edmon Chung: Single character IDN TLD you mean.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: It is - if you say in preparation of this call I looked again at the recommendations and that is included in the email from the -- what's the name of the group -- the IDN Implementation working team final report.

And as to my knowledge there is no further documentation or document or reports with the exception of say the public comments on that report to build upon. So maybe that's a good starting point or at least the recommendations from that working team.

Edmon Chung: You're quite right. And that's the critical reason why because I'm not sure if there's a good overlap between that team and this group here. I personally was not on that team.

So there was a reference, well I shouldn't say reference, in that report - in that final report it just mentions that the working team felt that there were some policy discussion or requirements necessary for single character IDN TLDs.

And what I failed to grasp is what those policy discussions or considerations should be. What - and so the question is to Tina to sort of give a briefing on what was discussed there to provide that particular indication that there is - there are policy considerations to be further made for IDN - a single character IDN TLDs.

And I guess that's the reason why we were hoping that Tina would be on the call and to, you know, to address that. You know what was discussed in the team leading towards the recommendation that called for the policy development or discussion needs to be made.

Bart Boswinkel: So what I could do is at least forward this question or these two questions to Tina and see if she can provide a - because that's more specific. See if she can provide an answer to that by email.

Edmon Chung: That would be very useful as well because, you know, I would assume or I'm sort of I'm guessing that there must have been some discussion at the Implementation working team leading towards that recommendation.

And we should base our discussion on those discussions so that we know where to get started, what aspects of the policy we should take into consideration.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. So what I'll do is...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, so what I'll do is say as an action item for - from this call I will send Tina an email and include you and Jian for, you know, to seek input from Tina as quickly as possible. Yes.

Jian Zhang: Okay, thanks.

Edmon Chung: That sounds good.

Jian Zhang: Bart also because actually I'm reading the presentation you sent to us about the synchronized ccTLD. That's only - so even the synchronized IDN ccTLD, that part will be resolved. Still we're going to have to learn, right, or kind of separate those things, right?

Bart Boswinkel: Well I'm - look I don't feel very comfortable in dealing with this topic. So I'm not so much involved. The only thing is what I understand the whole synchronized IDNs is one aspect of the whole variant management discussions taking place.

Jian Zhang: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: And if you look at Slide 9 that makes it very clear I think.

Edmon Chung: Right. And this is Edmon again. Adding to what Bart was saying, the synchronized implementation plan was very focused on IDN ccTLD. It made no mentioning of the IDN variant issue for gTLDs for example. And that clearly needs to continue to be discussed.

And at the end of the day when the ccNSO PDP - IDN PDP comes around and when the new gTLDs with IDN TLDs come around I think some consistency over the continuum of IDN TLDs might be useful.

And I know I'm jumping ahead here but at least as a starter it might be useful and that's why we're discussing this item in this group.

So does anyone want to add anything on these two points because it does seem to me that Tina is a critical person to update us on this.

Does anyone want to add whether, you know, they were part of the working team and want to add to this discussion now or anything about these two topics, the single character IDN TLDs and the IDN variants at the root?

Hearing none, I'll - and in terms of arranging for the call, just feel free to jump in until it becomes chaotic. We'll take a queue at that time.

So I guess that comes to the third item which is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

Perhaps we can spend a little bit of time getting some thoughts from people on the call of what this group might be able to do and what this group might be able to recommend back to the ccNSO and the GNSO on what types of efforts the SOs might be able to put in or the SOs might want to request staff for - to help.

Anyone want to speak to this? I see that Avri's on the call and at one point I think Avri mentioned whether this is a matter of discussion at all. I think Rafik had some thoughts while - I don't know if anyone wants to speak up at this point on this particular issue.

And just to characterize it carefully, universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, we know that there are situations where applications or even ISPs might stop or block or not allow TLDs that are long or in a different format than the traditional or the long time ago TLDs.

And when IDN TLDs are implemented that might create further issues because of the punycode length and because just generally of the - how it looks.

So the intent is that - is GNS - it used to be because new gTLDs had a problem with a GNSO side of issue but with the implementation of IDN ccTLDs this would become relevant for ccNSO as well. So that was the reason why this was brought into this group.

And wonder if anyone wants to speak to the issue.

Avri Doria: Hi. Since you called on me...

Edmon Chung: Hi.

Avri Doria: ...I wasn't going to say anything. I don't - I guess I don't remember what opinion I may have had before about whether it was in this group's role to do something. I don't know how much the SOs could do.

I'm not even sure how much the staff could do. I mean it's somewhat outside making sure that application, you know, and as I say I do see as the main problem is that application may not have been written clever enough to accept something as new as an IDN and some will and some won't and that'll be an issue.

I'm wondering though whether Advisory Committees like ALAC, like GAC are the ones that can be sort of informed of this problem especially like ALAC in terms of hey it's the users that are being presented this opportunity here. Yes, it's important to registrars and to the variants, the TLDs and the variant's new registry.

But it's the users that this is being directed to. So do they have any suggestion? I really don't know what one would do, you know, is it a publicity campaign, rah, rah? Application people fix your application, IDN starts here, or what?

And it's certainly nothing that ICANN or SO can do like policy making that will make application people fix something.

And so it has to be some sort of awareness and bully pulpit and government telling the application users in their house to do something about it, etcetera.

So I guess it certainly wasn't something where I'm saying it's not our job. It's something where I'm saying I don't know what we could do. And I think that's where I'm still at, at the moment.

Edmon Chung: Right. And Avri you're right on that. And I think if I remember correctly the response there was also yes. I don't think this is a policy development issue. Because the question at this early stage in this big group is that whether we keep it on the agenda and continue to not treat it as a talking matter but treat it as an outreach matter and get to those people. Because ultimately yes, our - from GNSO we also have

the ISPs, not talking constituency anymore and the word keeps fail - the stakeholder group where we can reach out to.

And I think a lot of the ccTLDs also do that in their own region as well. So just utilizing this group as a platform to further outreach was the idea. Don't intend to create any policies.

And I agree with you that it's not a matter of creating policies that could help address the issue but about raising awareness and utilizing the channel that this group can reach out to, to make the problem known so.

Berry Cobb: This is...

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry here. I'm the guy who invented the six character TLD label, something coming up on ten years ago.

And the problems haven't stopped. The simple fact of the matter is that if it's ten characters long, ten (ASCII) long, it's not a TLD label.

And now we're talking about a situation where 20, 30 even 40 is by no means inconceivable.

So the scope of the problem which I indeed don't regard as a policy one, it's somehow the word has to be gotten to every single coder on every level of every kind of software that looks at the TLD slot.

And I regard that as - I don't know what the word is. There's got to be a word for something that's just an inconceivably daunting task. But this is it.

And the very thought that some policy statement might even begin to make a dent it is I think a bit on the optimistic side.

Edmon Chung: Well good Berry. But I guess we should keep trying.

Berry Cobb: Oh but that's the only way it's going to work. I mean what's going to happen is after the battle has been fought to get U label - sorry, a label TLDs in the root zone, the prospective operators of these zones are going to be looking at the kinds of headaches that folks such as yourself and myself Edmon have only seen a small version of.

The four label TLD is okay because (ARPA) requires it. But once you get passed four it's no man's land. There are a couple of us in six and it's pretty headachy and again when we're looking at double digit label lengths, boy oh boy.

Avri Doria: Berry one thing that might help, this is Avri again, is that you who have the early warning or bit of a canary in mind - in the mine, not the mind as it were, might actually start a list of, you know, what some of the problems are. I mean you're right. I totally agree with you. There's no policy statement.

But there's certainly perhaps though outreach. For example there could be outreach to the Linux development world. And in countries that have a very strong Linux base as many countries in Africa from what I understand have started to develop, those Linux countries may

find themselves being able to use these things quicker at least it's in a local way if they can impress upon the (unintelligible) Linux developers.

And getting to them might be a little easier than getting to every, you know, variant application that one uses.

So I think that if we know what the problems are, someone has experienced them and is still experiencing them, and then someone comes up of who do you have to make an outreach to. And can we use the GAC representative to help us make some of that outreach, and to use the ALAC people?

Many of the ALAC groups are, you know, the (unintelligible) country or the ISPs of country and yes, the ISP constituencies.

So maybe a concerted outreach on, you know, when it was just (museum), you were sort of lonely and almost orphaned in doing this. Whereas more and more of these get out - come out the power of outreach could get larger.

Berry Cobb: Well I would also think that there's an element of governmental (talk) behind this too. I mean if a sovereign state that really needs a label that then proves useless or of extremely unlimited use decides to do something about that. There's actual - I don't know if threat's the right word. But legislative action could dictate some aspect of at least the national software base that's...

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. I think I'm wearing - I'll put on my ccNSO hat for a minute. I think that the idea of Avri's is a very good one because so looking at this ccNSO constituency I know a lot of them have links with their

government, have links with the localized (Bs) and with the industry at large and with at large communities.

But I'm not sure if they are aware of the issues that you are aware of. So it might be very good just as a starting point to list some of the problems you've engaged in getting say a TLD with more than four characters and make it function. Because I think most of the CCs and probably the operators or the Managers who will run IDN ccTLDs are not really aware of these issues. And that could be quite helpful to assist them.

But then again SSU is huge because they have the local, yes, they have the local knowledge.

Edmon Chung: Right. Okay, I think that's - if I sort of try to consolidate some of the comments that at least first of all it's safe to say that this is a good topic of common interest and we should keep it as one of the topic items for this group. We do understand it is not a policy development issue. It is an outreach issue.

And if I understand from a few people that we need to try to get perhaps even a list of groups to outreach to, compiled and we can float it on the mailing list so that we get a good group. And also we might - maybe it would be a useful thing to get participation from ALAC.

And Avri you mentioned some of this as well, but anyway ALAC and some other advisory groups in ICANN to participate. I hear that James you're also on the call. You're currently on the ALAC. Did you want to add anything to this? I think this is definitely an issue that could use a

lot of help from ALAC and reaching out to the various stakeholders in the community.

James? Was James Seng on the call?

Jian Zhang: I don't think so.

Edmon Chung: Oh, I heard - for some reason I heard Glen said James Seng. I apologize. I - but in any case I guess it comes back to that, you know, perhaps we should actually, you know, if James is not here we should probably ask him to join this session or somebody from ALAC.

And Avri you mentioned another group besides ALAC.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) I was thinking of GAC (unintelligible) someone to approach also.

Edmon Chung: Yes, right, yes, so ALAC and GAC. Does any - is it okay if we try to I guess as a group to reach out to them to get some participation from ALAC and GAC as well?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If I can add, getting the list - a description of what the problem is may be helpful also early in the outreach so that we can start telling them not only that we are outreaching but explain to them why.

And we don't have to scare them like some people do. But it might be good to at least, you know, give them an explanation of, you know, what we foresee the problem (is).

Edmon Chung: Okay. Like some people do, that's interesting.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: But yes, I understand that clearly. And that's a good point. That was my point.

I think I'll base it on - perhaps I'll take a look at the universal acceptance of TLDs and base it on that discussion.

I haven't looked at that site which staff I think put together quite sometime ago.

And perhaps look at that and on the staff side I wonder if anyone knows who is overseeing that particular asset being universal acceptance of TLD or can help me find out so I can, you know, liaise with that person and build something specifically for IDN because that makes it relevant for the ccNSO.

Bart Boswinkel: I can check for you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thanks Bart.

Berry Cobb: And it might be worth noting in all of this that from the perspective of the DNS and any process that looks at the length of a label, IDN (shmidian), it's not relevant. These single character U labels that we're all talking about, the shortest of them is going to be seven characters long as far as the actual processing of labels is concerned, again under DNS.

So it's seven and up. And the upper limit is going to be approached I would suspect, that's 63. No, it's not. It's 59 (actually)...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Okay. Yes. And I guess sort of one of our selfish reason for making an IDN is to (list) the support or help from the ccNSO which hopefully can get more participation from GAC representatives who are - who suddenly becomes relevant. You know this issue becomes relevant as well, hence the IDN.

And Berry you're completely correct in that it's not an IDN only issue, that IDN does think it's a ccNSO and GNSO issue.

So I guess that's - given that as I'm not trying to put Tina on the spot, is I understand that because of the synchronized IDN ccTLD implementation plan, her time has been quite difficult. And but without her it's probably difficult to move forward the two items of discussion.

So I think it's sort of at the end of what I wanted to cover today. We have a good - I think we have good progress on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, a little path forward.

Bart you would help me identify who I could work with on the universal acceptance of all TLDs to make a outreach piece out of that (group) IDN or have a spotlight on IDN and we would reach out to GAC and ALAC for a little bit more participation group especially on this item.

And also start to build a list of groups that we could - we should reach out to as well beyond groups or stakeholder groups or constituencies.

So that's sort of (where we're) today. Jian or anyone else, want to add anything?

Jian Zhang: No. That's pretty much it.

Bart Boswinkel: So this is Bart. I just had another incoming call. Is - Edmon is somebody preparing say the overview of issues?

Edmon Chung: Apologize. You were breaking up a little bit Bart there.

Bart Boswinkel: Is somebody preparing the overview of issues on the introduction of say more character TLDs?

Hello?

Edmon Chung: Yes. That is the universal acceptance of all...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...TLDs. That is - I think staff had a special page and a set of tools and recommendations and materials on that topic.

The request was if you can help me connect with the person who's overseeing that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I will do that. But let's say from the people, say like yourself and Berry who've been involved from the practical side, what are the issues if that would be possible?

Edmon Chung: Well the simplest issue is that some ISPs, DNS even just was - you know, won't resolve those names. There are applications like web databases or sign-up sheets - sign-up forms that doesn't allow TLDs, you know, of that length or in IDN case won't accept IDN TLDs at all like if you put in an email address or a web address for a sign-up on let's say I don't know, Facebook.

Bart Boswinkel: And is...

Edmon Chung: I don't know whether Facebook is an issue. I'm sorry, I (can't help but)...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: No. But is that included in that overview say the staff overview as well?

Edmon Chung: I haven't looked at it for quite sometime. Berry do you have - do you recall?

Berry Cobb: No. I'm afraid I can't point to documents that would provide instant relief on this or at least get the ball rolling.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Because that will be I think very - as I said that will be very helpful for those who are not directly involved or new to this topic to understand why it is important to do the outreach.

So as Avri said just describe the issues and the problems you will engage in the near future.

Avri Doria: Maybe we could just start this topic. And maybe, you know, I suppose and since nobody really wants to raise their hand and say I will write such document, and I'm certainly not raising my hand to say I will.

But maybe we could just start generating on this list, on the email list a set of issues.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Avri Doria: And, you know, that could roll on for a couple days. And then from that, someone can then craft words around it.

But if we just, you know, start cranking out that, you know, and just roll a list that way, it might work.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And then I think at least for say from a CC perspective just it doesn't need to be a fully documented well written paper or report. But as a staffing point say just bullets. So we can engage them.

Edmon Chung: That's a good idea. Berry can I - do I see a volunteer, a hand up, you know, just start that ball rolling, some of the things that - some of the issues and we'll, my self and others would add to it and get the ball rolling?

Berry Cobb: Let me give you a qualified yes to that at this point. There are a couple of other discussions I need to have with people who are very close to this issue before undertaking any such commitment.

But I can easily enough imagine some - setting that up in a manner that has me holding a pen on the C document.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Berry Cobb: So I will acknowledge the fact that I'm very interested in seeing such a statement come into being. And I will do what I can to make myself involved in that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. That would be - yes, that's great.

Edmon Chung: Great.

Bart Boswinkel: And I will look into what is available. Say who from staff is dealing with this and if that person can retrieve the documentation that is floating around somewhere.

Berry Cobb: Well I mean there is a certain element of sensitivity to this because if it turns out that in the context of ICANN's own documentation of all of this some statement is made of just how frail this process is, at what point does this fold back in a - in the discussion of contracts. What exactly is being delegated, the hope that you'll have a label that may work.

So I mean this is tricky, really, really tricky.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess we have a few action items. That's good.

And last time we talked about potentially splitting up into subgroups, I don't think we're at that position yet. And we're - but I think we should

keep on with the two weekly meeting schedules so we should try to meet again two weeks from now.

And hopefully Tina will be able to provide us with a briefing either through email before that or be able to join our call in two weeks time.

This time is okay for me. I don't know - I think we went out with a doodle to identify this time. I see that we're missing (Chris) and a few others from especially from ccNSO.

I'm not sure whether - how this time was finally decided. Was there another better time for those who weren't able to attend and whether we should rotate the time?

(Karen Hain): No. This was the most optional time for everyone. I mean I gave them quite a broad, you know, choice. And there was just one person that indicated they couldn't make this time and this was (Dawn Shicamoni).

So for those who participated in the doodle I think it was nine or ten people, they could all make this time.

I'm not sure why (Chris) wasn't here or ccTLDs are not attending.

Bart Boswinkel: I know (Chris) had another engagement so.

Edmon Chung: Is it a recurring one that we need to move this topic?

Bart Boswinkel: I don't know. I know he had one this to date and normally this is a very convenient time for him.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Berry Cobb: It's probably a fair guess that with the implementation plans for synchronized ccTLDs on the Board agenda for their meeting the day after tomorrow that Tina is probably extremely occupied simply preparing for that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Yes. Yes, I can totally imagine that.

But I'm just worried, just slightly worried about the timing for California and staff there. Is that something of concern?

Or the ultimate question is whether we should keep this time and keep the schedule and try for at least a few times as we lean towards Brussels or we should alternate.

Bart Boswinkel: I think - this is Bart. I think to improve the chance Tina joining I suggest we move this say for in two weeks, we move the time ahead one or two hours because this is 11...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: ...because that's 4:00 am in Marina del Ray, 11 UTC.

Edmon Chung: I'm happy to do it. Was it (Gabi) that helped?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, (Gabi) did.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So (Gabi) do you think you can - perhaps let's just move it ahead three hours. Are most people okay? Does that then make (Chris)...?

Bart Boswinkel: No.

Edmon Chung: Does that make...?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: That makes things...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...makes it earlier for (Chris).

Edmon Chung: Okay. So two hours might be...

Bart Boswinkel: So noon 1 UTC would already be an improvement. I think both from the - that that would work for (Chris), at least noon would work for (Chris) normally and unless he has another engagement of course. And it's probably more convenient for Marina del Ray as well because at noon, you talk about 5:00 am and not 4:00 am.

Edmon Chung: I'm even okay for 1300 unless - Bart you have a better experience with (Chris).

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I think 1, so maybe he may want to do it. It's - let's just try it. I think the next call is far more important to have Tina on it than (Chris).

Edmon Chung: Okay so...

(Karen Hain): That probably rules me out in Sydney, Australia. But that's okay. But just to let you know that that's - yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's the same time zone - you're in the same time zone as (Chris).

(Karen Hain): Am I?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

(Karen Hain): Right, okay.

Bart Boswinkel: He's in (Melbourne).

(Karen Hain): Okay, fine. Yes.

Edmon Chung: But 12 UTC wouldn't be a problem or...

(Karen Hain): I think 12:00 is 11 o'clock, which is a little bit more doable probably for us down here. If you push it out to 1300 then it's getting onto midnight and I'm old.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Yes, okay. Let's try 12 UTC then. (Gabi) can you help set that up so in two weeks time to continue this discussion. And we'll see how, you know, the participation we get based on that.

I guess at this point really Tina is a critical person that we want to engage and get the discussion started.

So does anyone else have a problem? Would anyone have a problem with that to go forward with?

(Karen Hain): No.

Edmon Chung: Hearing none, then I think we have a good set of time for next time.

As I mentioned earlier in the call I did make some edits. We put together Minutes for last time. I think Kristina, was it Kristina?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Yes, Kristina helped put it together. And I - my self and Jian (unintelligible) the edits and feel free to send it out to the list as well and we'll - I'll try to be - I'll try to turn it around faster this time so we'll have a set of Minutes circulated before the next meeting.

Okay, I guess that brings us to the end of the call. Thank you everyone for joining. Thank you for your time.

Jian did you want to add anything before we close?

Jian Zhang: No. No. Thanks everybody.

Edmon Chung: All right. So thanks everyone.

Woman: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Talk to you in two weeks.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you.

(Karen Hain): Okay.

Man: Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Glen de Saint Géry: (Ruby)?

Coordinator: Yes. Hi. I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Hi (Ruby). Thank you very much indeed. I see that (Samd Hussein) did eventually get on by him self.

Coordinator: Yes. And the conference call completely different. It looks like 71 which I'm not too sure now which country is. But it's very different from the number he probably gave you.

Glen de Saint Géry: He's supposed to be in Pakistan.

Coordinator: Sorry?

Glen de Saint Géry: He's supposed to be in Pakistan.

Coordinator: All right. Well the country call I can see on the bridge is...

Glen de Saint Géry: Is different.

Coordinator: Yes, is different. So but it's also possible sometimes these dial-in numbers come through funny so I couldn't say for certain but I tried both numbers you gave me and neither of them went through.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay. Because he gave us his cell phone and there couldn't be a cell phone, that number that came through, could it?

I think it's actually a skype number.

Coordinator: Yes, it's possible because I don't - I haven't looked it up but I don't recognize 71 because I'm just looking at the phone numbers for all the others and it looks like it's not in that country.

So it's possible he came through from some kind of other - yes, skype or something. It's possible.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay. Okay, thanks very much (Ruby).

Coordinator: No problem. I'm just going to get the recording ready shortly so you it will be ready 2:00.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay. Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: That's kind of you. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Glen de Saint Géry: Have a good day. Bye.

Coordinator: You too. Bye.

END