

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 08th August at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Wednesday 08 August 2013 at 1500 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-20130808-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon - NCSG

Rudi Vansnick - NPOC

Vinay Kumar Singh - individual

Apologies: none

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund

Lars Hoffman

Julia Charvolen

Mary Wong

Glen de Saint Gery

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Carol). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and welcome to the first meeting of the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter Drafting Team meeting on Thursday, August 8, 2013.

On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Rudi Vansnick. We have had Vinay Kumar Singh on the Adobe Connect. He will join us shortly again I'm sure.

We have received no apology for (Dave Corb) From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman, Mary Wong, (Judith Alvernen), and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Nathalie, and welcome to everyone. So in absence of a chair -- and that will be one of our first items of business is to select a chair -- I will initiate the call. And so thank you again for everyone joining.

We've had the roll call. And the statements of interest, I believe, have been submitted and are linked. But we generally ask at this time whether or not anyone has any changes to their statement of interest. Does anyone have any changes they'd like to note?

Chris Dillon: Yes, this is Chris Dillon speaking. Actually I edited my statement of interest today online. But just in case it hasn't gone live or something like that, I'll just explain why I did that. And the reason is that originally I put in my statement of interest that I was involved with evaluation panels.

And I've (unintelligible) actually the fact that I was involved specifically with the geographic names evaluation panel and the string similarity evaluation panel. That could actually be relevant, so I then added that earlier today, and it's just in case anybody hasn't seen it.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Chris. That's extremely helpful. Does anyone else have anything they wish to add?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick speaking.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Well as Europeans, we are used to have more than language in a daily business conversation. Translating different languages isn't an aspect that is part of our daily duties. And I think that based on that, I can bring some added value to this working group.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Rudi. That's extremely helpful. And I think actually, Rudi, you've moved into our Item Number 2 on the agenda voluntarily, and that is where we're asking people to make introductions and for the drafting team members to share information regarding their interest, background, skills, et cetera, which you have done with your comment just now, which is extremely helpful.

Do you or Chris, do you have anything that you wish to say about your background that could be helpful to the other members of the drafting team?

Chris Dillon: Again this is Chris Dillon. Yes, I would like to just mention, you know, what my background is and, you know, why I was interested in getting involved with this. So it's quite simple to explain really. Really from a very young age I've been very interested in foreign languages and scripts. And so at University I did Japanese and Korean and, you know, various other languages to lesser extent.

And, you know, over the years I've, you know, just picked up quite a lot of languages and scripts. And so with ICANN, as I said earlier, I was involved with two evaluation panels during the first round of the new gTLDs.

I then got involved with the Chinese case study part of the variant issues project, and then later on with the project 2.1, which is the procedure to develop and maintain the label generation rules for the root (unintelligible) in respect to (unintelligible) labels.

And I think the reason I was interested when I saw translation and transliteration is, you know, as I've been learning my languages, those have both been extremely important parts. So, you know, certainly during my degree I did a huge amount of translation, and of all sorts of Japanese and Korean, and classical Chinese as well.

And then doing various jobs over the years, I've done a lot of transliteration as well. So, you know, I was involved with the business information center, and so I had to transliterate a lot of addresses, usually Japanese addresses. So I know a lot about that.

And yes, so I think that's probably - oh, yeah. The other thing that I should mention, in a former job I was involved with librarianship. And I think there are some parts of librarianship that are really relevant to this, because in libraries there are concepts of things like name authority file also.

You know, it's basically, what is a name? So, you know, are we talking about Chris Dillon? Or is he Christopher Dillon? Or is he Christopher J. Dillon? Or is he Christopher James Dillon? You know, how do we decide what a name is? So that's name authority, and that's something that libraries are very strong on.

And also if we're talking about projects where there's a lot of existing data which is not, you know, which is not in the form that we would really like to have it in - so it does not house non-Roman script data in there, then you're talking about perhaps deciding that from a certain point you allowed that data.

But then at a later point you may want to do what librarians call retrospective conversion. And that actually means going through old data and making sure that it looks like the new data. So I just thought that that library experience I have -- it's a long time ago now -- is actually quite relevant to this. That's me. But anyway, I'm sorry it was rather long.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Thank you, Chris. That was extremely helpful. And, Rudi, did you have anything else you'd like to add to what you've already said?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, this is Rudi Vansnick speaking. Well based on the fact that we are looking for translation of contact details, and (unintelligible) we have this (particularity) that an address can be in two languages, which can make things very difficult.

You can have your address, especially in Brussels, you can have the street and the village name in Dutch or French. So whatever language is used, it can mix up a lot when you consider contact details of, for instance, the registrant. So that experience then, I think, help in the work we have to go through.

And the other side, being close to the EU and have been working with and for EU as an evaluating (reportoire), the use of different languages in contact details is very often also an issue where people don't really understand the reasoning why you have to stick to the original language or one that you're allowed to use a translation. I think that experience can probably help in this working group.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund speaking. Thank you, Rudi. That's also extremely helpful. And I think at this point we still just have - oh, I do see that Vinay Kumar Singh has joined us. Vinay, are you on the line as well?

I don't hear you, but I see that Nathalie is typing. Perhaps we're still trying to engage you on the phone. It would be good if we had a few more drafting team members to join us. So maybe let's take a moment. I see that I sent - thank you, Rudi, for your question in the chat room.

We do have seven members on the drafting team, so right now we are missing four members. So I'm not sure exactly how much we'll be able to

accomplish today, but of course the meeting is transcribed and perhaps others may be able to join.

We have found that, in the last couple of weeks, several community members have been on vacation -- as we call it, vacation fatigue. I'm not sure how it's fatiguing, but at any rate we are missing some people, I think, because people may be out.

I see that Vinay was typing, so perhaps we'll give a moment and see if he can join us.

While we're waiting for that, perhaps I could move on to the next item which is the principles of transparency and openness. And this relates to the core values per ICANN in its bylaws. And these do specifically talk about the principle of employing open and transparency policy development mechanisms, promoting well-informed decisions based on expert advice and ensuring entities most effective can exist in the policy development process.

And this does also relate to the fact that as you all may know, this is an open list. The drafting team list is open and is publicly archived. And also the wikis are available to anyone who has a (comparable) wiki account, not just to the members of the drafting team.

So at any rate, we do expect to follow these principles of transparency and openness. We do transcribe and record these meetings. We'll make those recordings and transcriptions available, and they also are accessible to the public as well. And so I would just ask if anybody has any questions with this item on the agenda, or if staff have anything they wish to add.

Thank you. And I see that Vinay has some issues on his end. Hoping to resolve them shortly.

The next item on the agenda is that we need to select a chair or co-chairs for the drafting team. Now I note that we do not have all drafting team members on this call, so there may be others who may wish to volunteer. But I will ask for those who are on the call - and I'll ask Vinay as well as soon as he's joined.

But for those on the call, Chris and Rudi, consider whether or not this is something that you would like to do. And of course we can, following this call, make a request to the list also, asking if anybody would like to volunteer. And I see in the chat room that Rudi is proposing Chris.

Chris Dillon: Well...

Julie Hedlund: So this is what you get for showing up for the meeting, Chris.

Chris Dillon: That's very interesting. I mean I'm really very interested in this, but it's the first PDP I've ever had the involvement in, so I'm not sure I'm ready to be chair. I think I could be a co-chair, but possibly not chair.

Julie Hedlund: Well I see that Rudi is willing to co-chair.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, well maybe that could run. Yeah. Maybe that could run.

Rudi Vansnick: Well two heads normally know more than one head. And for me, too, it's the first task in a PDP, as I'm coming from the at-large advisory committee from eight years, and finding much time to move to policy as I know how advice works now -- or doesn't work -- and how I can help in policy, making policy more active. So I'm willing to co-chair if such is needed. But maybe we can look for some other people.

Julie Hedlund: Well what we can do...

Lars Hoffman: (Unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead. Sorry.

Lars Hoffman: It's yours Julie.

Julie Hedlund: I was just going to suggest -- this is Julie Hedlund speaking -- that what we could do is say to the list that Chris and Rudi are willing to co-chair, but to open this up to the list and see if there are other volunteers. Would that be an approach?

Chris Dillon: This is Chris speaking. I'm really happy with that.

Julie Hedlund: And...

Lars Hoffman: And yeah, this is Lars Hoffman, if I might. If I might just really - just one quick note. I completely agree with what Julie said, and I think it'll work just fine. Technically though this is still the drafting team, I believe, so there will probably even be another call formally for a chair once the charter's adopted and the working group properly starts, for they - often it's, I believe, the same person or the same commission of persons who carries on the personnel obligations.

So you could even take this as a test run, you two, as your first chairing. And if it scares you off, you can step aside. And if you like it, you can continue.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Lars, thank you for that very helpful explanation. Yes, this is indeed the drafting team, so Chris and Rudi could be co-chairs of the drafting team and then decide differently after they've had that experience or not.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick speaking here. I think that in the future when the draft is done and the work group really starts up properly, you have more people cropping up as they go, more sympathize with the working group, and will be back

from vacation. I have no vacation on my list for the next three months, so I can be steady.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund speaking. Thank you very much, Rudi for that. That was very helpful. Then I would propose that after this call I can send a message when I send out the actions from this call to the list.

I can indicate that we do have interest from Chris and Rudi to co-chair, but we certainly do encourage other members of the drafting team to indicate whether or not they wish to chair or co-chair the drafting team, and indicate that this is indeed the chair or co-chair of the drafting team, and we can of course find other leaders for the PDP team, the PDP working group, once the charter is approved.

Chris Dillon: This is Chris speaking. Yes, thank you very much. That's clear and I'm really happy with that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Chris. Then our next order of business is to look at items for review. And we have in particular the task of the drafting team. It is - and this is the document that you see in front of you in the Adobe Connect room.

The drafting team is developing the charter for the PDP working group on the translation and transliteration of contact information. And I won't read through all this stuff. I think you can see the document if you're in the room.

But essentially there are two key issues -- whether to translate into a common script or transliterate into -- a common language, pardon me -- or transliterate into a common script; and who should decide who should bear the burden for translating or transliteration - transliterating this information.

And if you have reviewed the documents that were sent out to all of you, these issues arise from the recommendations in the final report of the Internationalized Registration Data working group.

As a bit of background, the IRDWG was a joint community working group with participation from the GNSO and the SSAC. And that group met and worked for more than a year on a report. And they were not able to solve the two issues that we have stated here, that is that they presented several models on whether and how to translate or transliterate contact information.

They discussed issues concerning the burden for translating and transliterating, but they did not come to a consensus on a model, and who should do the - should take the burden of translating and transliterating contact information.

So that is why these issues are now put out in this PDP. And, in fact, a recommendation from the final report was that these issues should be addressed in a PDP. And so where we are now is that, as you know, the GNSO Council agreed to go ahead with the PDP, and we're drafting the charter.

And the charter should include the elements in the working group guidelines. And there is actually a template that I'm just going to put up on the screen now, that aids in the drafting of the charter. So essentially it has all the elements that you would need to have in a charter. And then, of course, it has to be made specific to this work of this particular working group.

So I've put the template out on the screen, but I'm going to stop talking now and allow time for some questions. And I think we'll probably have to cover some of this same ground, perhaps, when we meet again. But at any rate, let me stop now and ask if there are questions.

Chris Dillon: This is Chris Dillon. It's just a very simple question. I tried to go through all the documentation before this call, but the one thing I couldn't track down was this template. It's actually the first time I've seen it.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, okay. This is Julie Hedlund speaking. Thanks for that, Chris. I thought we had attached it to the message that we sent out.

Chris Dillon: Yes, the - again this is Chris speaking. There was a message that went out that said it had an attachment, but this - there was an attachment. The (UCL) email system got rid of it, so I didn't receive it.

Julie Hedlund: I see. It also is posted to the wiki.

Chris Dillon: Oh, yeah. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: But still, it also exists - and we should have made this more clear. I'm sorry for that. It also exists as part of the working group guidelines. And the working group guidelines are - they are both part of - incorporated as part of the GNSO operating procedures, and they are also called out separately on this site where the operating procedures are listed.

We could have sent you a link to that document. So there are a number of places that exist. We just didn't tell you what those were.

Chris Dillon: No problem.

Julie Hedlund: But thank you for that. So any other questions, please?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick speaking. Well it is clear when I am looking through the details of the report that the struggle is probably based on the fact that data can be stored at two different locations, especially the registrant data. The Whois data is in principle, in general database, but is also stored at the registrar's location.

And when I look into Europe, it depends on which registrar they're using to register your domain name. And that registrar can decide on a language

profile for registration of the registration data that is not familiar with all over English language, I would say.

And I just was a bit surprised that there was no consensus from the group to have a proposed solution for this, so it's probably going to be a quite difficult task to get the final conclusion on this. I don't know if there is a date for this working group to have the work finished.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie Hedlund speaking. There are dates, and I should probably pull out those. There's essentially a set of guidelines that talks about how much time should be spent on each part of the PDP.

While they don't say how long it takes to develop the charter, they do say, "Well, you know, this is roughly how long it might take to produce an initial report." And, you know, that could be, you know, several months, depending on how much information needs to be gathered and so on.

And then that report out of the working group has to go out for public comment. There's a set time for that, as well as time for a reply comment if there are initial comments. Then there's another, you know, there's another time frame for producing a final report.

And then there are certain constraints. And this is in the PDP manual, actually. So what I'll do is I'll send you all a link to that so you can see where that is stated. But there's a certain amount of time that the GNOS Council has to take to deal with the final report, and voting on it and so on. And if they don't vote on it, then there are various parameters to that as well.

So I don't have a quick answer for you on exactly when this work needs to be done. Suffice to say we are expecting it to take some time. We do expect that there'll be a certain amount of engagement in the community, because there are a number of parties that could be affected by any decision, policy decision, in this matter.

So and I agree. I was actually the staff member, one of the staff members, supporting the IRDWG from its initiation. So it certainly did weigh a number of issues, you know, and tried, you know, it did actually come up with four different models for how to address this issue. But the difficulty is that ultimately it is a policy decision, and the IRD working group was not a policy process. It was not a PDP. So once they, you know, determined that really this would be a policy issue then it's more properly dealt with in a PDP.

And I agree that it certainly is an issue that will take some time and some consideration and have its challenges. But so the first order of business then for this drafting team is to develop the charter and if you'd like I can just walk you through briefly the various pieces of this - of the charter in a template.

And I've unsynched the document so you can feel free in a (unintelligible) connect to move through the sections yourself. Right now I'm on page one of the document -- in section one Working Group Identification. And this is just, you know, the name of the group and referencing the version of the working group guidelines, the chartering organizations -- which is the GNSO, the date the charter's approved -- which we won't have right now.

But as you may note in today's program agenda number six the deadline is for a motion to be submitted at the next GNSO council meeting to approve the charter on that 30 September 2013. So that's our initial deadline that we're working towards for approval of the charter.

Once the charter's approved then another call for volunteers for the working group will go out and the working group will be formed and we'll start the work of the PDP.

So the charter would contain the name of the working group share -- again we don't know who that will be -- some of these will be blank. So as we

develop a point of liaison - that is liaisons to the GNSO council -- again we don't know who those are.

So some of these will be blanks until really until the working group is established. Although if there's someone who has said that they want to lead the working group and, you know, someone who's part of the working group or co-chair of the working group we can put that in in the charter and that can be approved with the charter.

And the same thing for the liaison if we have - if we know of a particular GNSO council member who would be an appropriate liaison we can include that in the charter. If there any advisors (unintelligible) also the workspaces and so on.

So that's also the administrative matters in that first section. Any questions about section one? And please tell me if this is more information, less information than you need. So the next slide is section two The Mission Purpose and the Deliverables.

This - these are sort of key elements of the charter and these are tied to a certain extent to the issues in the PDP. In that the working group is, you know, chartered to look at the specific issues identified in the final issue report and the goals and the deliverables and so on are tied to that.

The deliverables and timeframes -- that gets back to what I reference as far as to the PDP Manual has some specific timeframes for how long things might take and Staff has guidelines there as well. So the charter drafting team would look ahead and try to make a guess as far as when, you know, how much time might be needed recognizing the fact that more time might be needed. But at least to get something in the charter as a parameter.

And as you see the objective and goals talks about the issues -- the issues are the ones identified on in the final issue report and perhaps other issues that might be sub issues that might be identified there as well.

And as you'll note certain working groups -- and this one in particular -- if it's a PDP working group then milestones and timelines are prescribed either in the ICANN bylaws for in the PDP manual -- and so that can be pulled in here as well. Any questions about section two?

Section three is Formation, Staffing and Organization. And a lot of this has certain - a lot of this is very specific to the issues on here. So for instance, this is a - these are fairly technical issues I think Chris and Rudy both have highlighted certain areas of expertise that are very important for a group such as this.

Those are the types of areas that we want to highlight under membership criteria that would be helpful, you know, to have people who have expertise with non-asking scripts, for instance, non-English scripts, with translation, with transliteration and so on. Those are all items that can be placed here.

And group formation and dependency dissolution, relationships with other groups for instance it might be that this working group could be interested in having specific input from the ESSEC perhaps in technical issues. Yes we're very much involved in the development of IRD working group report. So we may not - not state that here.

But perhaps also ensuring that the working group has representation from registrar's and registries on ccNSO and so on or ccTLDs -- because these groups could potentially be affected in some way or another. And I think I note here in the chat room Rudy that is a good point to IDN and it'll be interesting too and I think that is absolutely correct.

And we can also indicate that perhaps we would like someone in the working group who has experience in IDNs and/or that the working group could consult with staff and ICANN who are working on the IDN issues they're also our tech members who have some specific expertise in that area.

With respect to working group roles functions and duties there actually are - there's quite a bit of information in the working group guidelines on the various roles and then, you know, for instance roles are in fact 2.2 of the working group - guidelines state that there is a chair and a (unintelligible) to the chair and co-chairs, vice chairs, secretary, liaison -- the roles of the members and staff.

And so actually we can, you know reference this section -- working group guidelines and it says here that that section could simply be a reference in the charter rather than duplicated in the charter.

And then statements of interest that would provide the guidelines for working group members to provide the statements and interests and what those would contain on those could link to the GNSO operating procedures Chapter five which is the statement of interest procedure. Any questions about section three?

Rules of Engagement section four. This has to do with decision-making methodologies -- how the working group reports and how often it reports its work. Generally reports at the (unintelligible) GNSO council and they specifically say the working group for instance could provide a report at every GNSO council meeting.

The decision-making methodologies is also described in some detail in the working group guidelines - and I will indeed send a document around - the guidelines document around to you. But there is a very specific standard methodology for making decisions -- section 3.6 the working group guidelines -- are described.

What is full consensus, for instance, or otherwise known as unanimous consensus, what is consensus, strong support with significant opposition on how that suggests divergence or no consensus and how minority views are addressed.

And so what one could do in this charter is if we incorporate by a reference Section 3.6 of the working group guidelines or the working group can decide to deviate from the standard methodology but it should then state why it's doing so.

And then what to do if there are problems or issues with respect to the decision-making and again these reference sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.7 of the working group guidelines -- how to close the group and how to assess the work of the group.

So a certain amount of this information here is referencing already existing information in the working group guidelines. And may not need to be duplicated other than by reference and the drafting team would decide that it simply wants to have the references in and not do anything different.

And then document history -- how you track the changes to the charter. And I'm now I'm actually now if you wanted to move ahead - and thank you Rudy I see and just to note this for the transcript Rudy has noted that he thinks there's no need to use other rules than those of section 3.6 of the working group Guidelines.

Are there any questions before I move forward? I was going to go ahead and move to the actual template just to show the layout of the charter and I'm just emphasize that much of the filling in of the charter is linking to existing information -- really the heart of the charter and where it differs is the mission purpose and deliverables.

And, you know, so the objectives and goals and mission scopes and deliverables and timeframes -- all of those which would link to the actual issues being studied in the PDP. And then the membership criteria would vary again based on issues being addressed. And to a certain extent the dependencies and dissolution but the roles and statements of interest are essentially pulled from the working group guidelines.

And actually if you scan through the template you'll notice section four Rules of Engagement are simply - is pulled directly from the 3.6 of the working group guidelines as is the issue escalation resolution process.

So I think I've gone through all of the pieces of the document and I guess I will stop here and ask if there are any questions from anyone concerning the charter and how any information it contains. Unless I have put you all to sleep -- I hope not.

Then, next order of business -- to develop - a work plan to develop the charter. Given that the deadline is 30th of September 2013 to have a motion and a charter ready - and actually it's really then 10 days before that the motions are due so the 20 September 2013.

So we have a little bit more than a month to develop a charter and I have a suggestion - and I'm certainly happy to be overwritten. But one suggestion would be that I could take a first cut at getting all of the bullet point information here, putting in information that I know relates to the issues at hand - the issues in the PDP because I worked to support the IRD working group I'm quite - and I also helped write the preliminary issue report on the final issue report.

I'm fairly familiar with the issues so I'd be more than happy if that's - to produce a draft for the drafting team to consider and discuss on its next call.

Chris Dillon: This is Chris (unintelligible) I would just like to say I really welcome that -- that would seem to be a way of getting the maximum time for certain people to look at what you did and approve that. So I really welcome that. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible) Thank you Chris. And Rudy does that sound like an acceptable approach to you?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes (unintelligible) speaking. Yes thank you Julie. It's much appreciated that you would guide us and help us through the first phase of finishing this charter. As we both are doing this work it would help us - I mean when I look into the report which is about 24 pages, you know, not long.

It's a quite long report where there is a lot of information that probably is needed as some background information to the charter. I'm just wondering if that usually (unintelligible) you use some initial document, some initial report, some data that is dropped into the charter itself.

Julie Hedlund : Yes. This is Julie Hedlund. I would definitely draw from information in the in the issue report - the final issue report and also note that the final issue report drew heavily on the idea IRD working group's report as well.

So I think that in the heart of the charter where we're looking at the issues, the goals and so on I would at the first cut take a look at making sure that these goals and issues are consistent with what has been identified in the final issue report.

And it's the same for the scope as well and in one of the same things that we need to be careful with drafting the charter is that PDP does have a very generally prescribed scope. In fact if you look at the issue report the scope itself has been reviewed by ICANN legal staff to ensure that that the issues do indeed relate to the - to policy development and fall within - appropriately within a PDP.

So I keep these things in mind and - but what I would do also when I send around an initial charter is ask people to, you know, to take the time ahead of time to look through these final issue reports, to look through the IRD Working group report and just make sure that what I've put into the charter is consistent there. But that would certainly be my goal.

Then I will take is an action item to do this and my next question then would be -- is concerning our frequency of meetings. We can decide to hold them weekly, biweekly. I think given our deadline we probably should, at the least, hold a meeting every other week and/or weekly and I'd ask Chris and Rudy if you have a preference there.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. If I can just add very quickly -- if we were to have it weekly we would only have three more meetings before the council, I believe.

Julie Hedlund: Weekly so I see. Just looking now just to 22 to 29 And I no we'd have more than that if we had it weekly

Lars Hoffman: Oh no. I'm sorry this is August, absolutely. Yes I do apologize.

Julie Hedlund: Oh no please tell me If I'm wrong. Good. Weekly would give us...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Pardon me?

Rudi Vansnick: Hey Julie. I think we have approximately five weeks if we look to the date of 20 of September. We have approximately five weeks for calls so I think weekly is probably a must be as we will need to go through a lot of data. And perhaps in the meantime we will have a few other members in draft committee that will join us so that we don't have more (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: And Chris?

Chris Dillon: Yes this is Chris I was just going to say I completely agree. I think it should be weekly.

Julie Hedlund: Very good. Thank you to both of you and I see also that (unintelligible) has said weekly would be good. So thank you all and then what I will do is take as an action to have a draft of the charter out prior to next week's meeting.

I don't know that I'll be able to have it probably as soon as Monday but I would try to have it by Tuesday - a couple of days in advance of the meetings. I wish to give people a chance to read it prior to Thursday's meeting.

Recognizing that, of course this is a draft and it will go through some iterations. Meaning I'm saying that...

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: And this is Lars. Not just to be (unintelligible) on the (unintelligible). Just to confirm we're going to hold the weekly meetings at the same time, I presume and obviously on Thursdays too, yes?

Julie Hedlund: Think you Lars. This is Julie Hedlund I would assume at the same time unless others disagree but I think that was the exercise in doing the (unintelligible) list to hopefully set a line a recurring time.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudy speaking here. Yes. I booked already in my calendar every Thursday at the 17 (unintelligible) European time.

Chris Dillon: This is Chris speaking. I also have the same thing.

Julie Hedlund: Julie Hedlund speaking. Thank you very much then we'll settle with the same time. And meet next week then on Thursday and I will have a draft in

advance of that meeting for everyone to look at. I'm going to set myself a goal by COB next Tuesday.

I guess that really gives people only a day or so to look at it but it will take a little bit of time to do so we still have a chance to give it a quick read through. It's going to be a voluminous document and a lot of it will be boilerplate.

So hopefully what we can ask people to do is really focused on section two in particular -- mission purpose and deliverables and also section three the formation, staffing and organization. Any other thoughts or questions or comments?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudy speaking. I'm just wondering how few times the mic of Tijani hooking up - giving some censor and I would like to know if Tijani has a possibility to speak on this call now or that he just had no (unintelligible) connect?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Hi Rudy? Hello?

Julie Hedlund: Hello Tijani. We can hear you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Hello? Hello? Hello Rudy?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes Tijani. We can hear you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Hello? Can you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: Yes we hear you Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: (Unintelligible) may have some bad connection but (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Tijani. We do appreciate it. Hopefully we'll have your issue solved for the next meeting.

Thank you very much everyone and as its two minutes before the hour I do want to make sure that we end on time and so unless anyone else has any other comments I suggest we close the call and stop the recording and we will look for to seeing you all next week.

Man: Thanks.

END