

Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine

February 20, 2014

8:00 am CT

**ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 20 February 2014 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT call on the Thursday 20 February 2014 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-20140220-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#feb>

Attendees:

Amr Elsadr - NCUC

Jim Galvin - SSAC

Jennifer Chung - RySG

Ahkuputra Wanawit – GAC

Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC

Peter Green - NCUC

Peter Dernbach – IPC

Petter Rindforth – IPC

Rudi Vansnick – NPCO

Sarmad Hussain - SSAC

Apologies:

Justine Chew – At-Large

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP

Ephriam Percy Kenyanito - NCUC

Chris Dillon - NCSG

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund

Lars Hoffman

Amy Bivins

Glen de Saint Gery

Nathalie Peregrine

Terri Agnew

Coordinator: This afternoon's conference call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This is the meeting of the Transliteration and Translation of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 20th of February, 2014.

On the call today we have Ahkuputra Wanawit, Petter Rindforth, Amr Elsadr, Rudi Vansnick, Peter Green, Peter Dernbach, Jim Galvin and Jennifer Chung. We have apologies from Chris Dillon, Justine Chew, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen and Efraim Percy Kenyanito.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Glen de Saint Géry, Lars Hoffman, Terri Agnew and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Nathalie. Welcome to everyone on this call. I'm happy that I'm back and I need to catch up quite a lot of outstanding mails from the last call. Except that I didn't see any new statements of interest or changes of statements of interest. I don't know if there are any to mention. If you have please raise your hand.

I don't see anyone raising a hand for changes of statements of interest. We can move on to the next item on the agenda, responses from the SOs and ACs. So far, except the information that Chris has been posting after the call of last week, I didn't see any new responses. I'm just wondering - I will ask staff if they have seen any new response from last week? Yes, Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. No, I have not seen any other responses coming in to us. The deadline is the end of February the 28th. So - and I should note that Ching Chiao has gotten permission from the GNSO Council to include an update on the work of the PDP working group at the GNSO Council meeting next Thursday, February 27. And also one of the co chairs, Rudi, either yourself, or Chris, is welcome to join as well.

And so we can remind the GNSO, again, of the request for input that we've sent out. And I'd be happy to put together a slide or two that includes the questions in that input request for that meeting.

And keep in mind that when we sent the request we did ask organizations if they needed more time to - if they wanted to give a response and they needed more time to let us know if, you know, if they need more time. And it very well may be that some organizations might need more time.

So I guess my question back to the PDP working group is would it be worthwhile do you think for us to - for staff to send a reminder perhaps next week of - on these requests? And then also remind people that if they are planning on providing input that they could have more time if necessary.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Julie. Rudi speaking. Well I know that I have seen some messages in some mailing lists where they're trying to think about what responses they would give. I remember that I've seen some messages in the At Large Advisory Committee about the - our request for answers to our questions.

And yet I didn't have seen any discussion on their agenda. So it's probably good if we could send a reminder beginning of next week so that they keep it on their agenda and try to give us some responses early as possible.

I also think that if we don't get enough response that we will have to try to push something through during our sessions in the Singapore meeting. I think that it would be good if we were able to have a specific meeting with those who are - who have not responded at all in order to have a face to face meeting and check out the reason why they are not responding.

I'm just wondering if that's an approach that you all want to go for or do you think there is another way of progressing and having input from SOs and ACs? Yes, Julie, you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rudi. With respect to Singapore two things that relate to this point. First of all, all of the working groups - GNSO working groups have the opportunity to give an update to the GNSO during its working session on Saturday and Sunday at ICANN meetings. And so staff will schedule time for the co chairs to give an update and to urge, for instance, the GNSO if they have not provided input, to urge the GNSO to provide input.

And also there is a public meeting of the - the staff is in the process of scheduling a public meeting of this PDP working group for either early on Monday morning or early on Tuesday the morning. The time is subject to avoiding our other conflicts and availability of rooms and so on. So we'll have more information on that as the schedule firms up.

And that would be an opportunity also for organizations to join that meeting and we could extend invitations to particularly targeted groups. I can say that it would be difficult, I think, to get on the schedule of all of those groups that

have not provided input because - for specific meetings with this PDP working group because most organizations, you know, basically book up their time pretty heavily in the ICANN meetings.

And we certainly could try and, you know, if you wanted to see if, you know, if ALAC, for instance, if they hadn't provided any input at that point if they might have some time, you know, we certainly could explore with ccNSO. We do have time, as I noted, to meet with GNSO. And perhaps others could join the public meeting.

The GAC will be particularly problematic because generally their schedule is extremely full at ICANN meetings. And requests - usually one can only get a meeting with the GAC if the GAC requests the meeting from that group. So I can certainly explore that but I'm not optimistic, let me say, frankly, whether or not we could get on that schedule. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie, for all this important information. With regard to the At Large I consider them being a quite important group as they are present in every region in the world. And some have, if I may say, do we present - represent regions that are on the list of important (unintelligible). So what I could do is call on Olivier as he is also a colleague at ISCO and ask him if there is any possibility that we could have a face to face session in Singapore.

I'm just wondering if when sending out the reminder that if some SOs or ACs don't want to send responses back by mail to propose them that they can have a face to face what us in Singapore and have a deeper chat than just responding to the questions. I'm just wondering if that's a possibility that we could integrate in the reminder. I'm not sure if that's a valid question. Maybe, Julie, you have some to add to that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Just one note on that, one of the difficulties - and I'm sorry I keep raising these issues - but logistically there are some things to consider and that is that this PDP working group will not have a meeting room available to it to have people come to the working group to have meetings.

So we would have to then - the group itself, you know, ALAC will have a meeting room so if they want us to come we could come to them; ccNSO will have a meeting room; GAC has a meeting room and so on.

So I just wanted to point out that absolutely we can suggest in the reminder that we could have face to face meetings but it would be then, again, subject to that group's schedule and whether or not they have time in their schedule for the PDP working group members to come to them.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Rudi speaking. Yeah, I understand that the physical space is not that easy to organize and it looks like in Singapore there's still a lot of questions to solve at the logistics side.

I think that we - if there are no other comments or questions about the responses that we could move - oh I see Amr, yes, Amr you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. I was also suggesting that - well I hope we do get more feedback before the Singapore meeting because that would already be about a month beyond the deadline that we were hoping to get the feedback.

But perhaps instead of trying to arrange members of this working group or perhaps the chairs attending meetings with each SO or AC, or each constituency and stakeholder group within the GNSO even, we could try to send some emails out to the different community groups to invite them - or at

least circulate amongst their groups for non-English speaking members to come to the working group face to face.

I think these working group face to face meetings are pretty cool because it gives an opportunity for the working group members to discuss what we're doing with others who are not part of the working group. And that's (unintelligible) benefit I guess as opposed to these regularly scheduled weekly calls and we should take advantage of that if we can. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr, for this complementary information. Yes, I think that's a good approach, that's a good idea to invite them to our working group face to face meeting if they are willing to do so. I'm just wondering if we have been clear enough when we reached out to the SOs and ACs as I consider that they are all aware of the importance of this PDP.

But I'm just wondering why is there not enough response? Is it because they're all overloaded with a lot of other tasks? Or is just out of their interest? And it's probably going a bit in the direction of what we have on the - as the next item on the agenda about the refinement to proposed questions and also then what is posted by Chris Dillon on February the 14th under the link List of Correspondence Received.

The backgrounds there are some very interesting questions there. And maybe then back into our question list in order to attract the attention as we see that there is a clear definition of separation of responsibility between registry, registrar and registrants.

And registry and registrar can easily be found in the SOs while the registrant is rather at what I would call the Advisory Council levels, except for part of the work we do in NCSG, NCUC and NPOC. I'm just wondering if we could put a

few people from ccNSO, GNSO and At Large together to discuss the point of the responsibilities, the requirements and who is going to pay for it because those are the three very important questions we have on our table.

And try to get some consensus about what approach is acceptable and which is not acceptable. Are there any other thoughts on this I would like to hear from you if this would be a point we can address in the next few weeks also.

I'm just thinking about making the page that is mentioned under the title list of correspondence received putting them in more public view so that they can see the discussions that - and the information that is available there which triggers at least, for me, it triggers me to think about what the best approach to do so aside the technical issues we have on the table.

So I'm wondering if there are any other thoughts about addressing that document and trying to get already some reactions from SOs and ACs currently on that perspective.

Jim Galvin: Jim for the queue.

Rudi Vansnick: I'm looking to - yes okay. Is it Jim that I hear?

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, Jim, go ahead you have the floor.

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you. This is Jim Galvin. I apologize, I'm not in Adobe Connect here today. Three quick comments; I'll comment that SSAC is not going to provide any additional comments. That's just - not trying to provide an official position there but we did circulate the comment internally and, you know, there was a - at least a consensus at the time that, you know, SSAC has said everything that it needs to say on this issue so we won't get any additional advice there.

Second comment is Amr was talking about this working group having a face to face meeting and I thought I heard Julie say that this group does not have a meeting room and will not have a face to face meeting, so that's a question that I put out there unless I misheard one person or the other.

And before somebody answers my third comment is, with respect to getting comments back from some of the other SOs and ACs, they all do have some level of representation on this working group, right? Maybe a path would be to use the individuals here more directly and proactively to engage with their communities to see if they can get advice or comments from them. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Jim, for your comments. They're quite important and interesting. And pointing to your first comment it's good that we know that there will be no extra response coming as we know that you're bringing in a lot of value already so I'm not really upset if there is no response coming from that side.

And indeed perhaps it's a good question of addressing the colleagues in the working group and eventually do a similar approach into your groups and come back on the next call with eventually a response or an answer to our questions.

I see Julie's hand raised and then we have Petter Rindforth. Julie, you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Yes thank you. Just to clarify on Jim's second question, there will be a face to face meeting of the working group either Monday morning or Tuesday morning. What the working group will not have is a - sort of a home room scheduled, you know, where people could come and meet with the working group at any time of the day.

So certainly when staff sends a reminder we can invite people to come to that face to face meeting. And, you know, we'll have to provide further details on that. I don't know that we'll know the time and location next week when we send the reminder. So we definitely do have an option for a face to face meeting.

But also I should note that - and this is something staff will update - the affiliations - the list of members of this PDP working group and affiliations. We do have good coverage. Just so that you all know we have representatives from NCUC, Registry Stakeholder Group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, the SSAC, the GAC and the Commercial Stakeholder Group. What we do not have is we do not have anybody from the ccNSO. So we would have to do a special outreach there.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Petter, you have the floor now.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, just two comments, thanks. First of all if you - I mean, we have our next GNSO Council on Thursday next week. And I guess this will not be a formal issue on the agenda but there's still a possibility to, if you have specific questions that we can send out on the list and just get some at least informal comments back for - during the upcoming week.

And then also I have recently got some questions from IPC members and other interested individuals if there is a possibility to join this working group - just got today the - from general note that it's fully possible. So I will at least get some - maybe two three more active members to this group that also represents different kind of interest groups. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Petter. Rudi Vansnick speaking for the transcript. Well, regard the ccNSO I have a colleague in the ISO Board who is active at the ccNSO level. It's (Keith Davidson). I can also try to reach out to him later today and ask him if they have been discussing this already in the ccNSO, yes or no, in order to know if it's on their agenda or not.

I remember that in LA we - I had a short chat with him on this but there were a lot of other issues that they have on their agenda. So I will reach out to (Keith Davidson) in the ccNSO later today and ask for some responses.

And regards to your question about having other individuals participating in the working group, as far as I remember it is possible to join the working group and eventually be an observer. I don't know if we can just refuse participants to this working group. I'm looking to Julie or Lars to give any information on if individuals can join this working group and have a voice in it. Yes, Julie, can you give some answers?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. Thank you very much, Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. And indeed individuals can join the working group - anyone who is interested can join the working group. It is open and we do welcome participation. And we do have at least one person participating in the working group as an individual, that's Vinay Kumar Singh.

And so we certainly do welcome anyone to join. And we simply have to get them in touch with Glen de Saint Géry so she can get them added to the list. And they would, of course, have to complete a statement of interest as all working group members have to do.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Julie. So that's clear we can reach out to people we know and we think that they can be - bring out the value to the discussions so I would encourage you all to do so. Perhaps it's good that we're looking to the sectors or groups that we are still missing in the discussion and try to get them in. It looks to me a good idea.

The proposed questions, are there any refinements? Are there any additional information we have to add to the questions? I remember that we have four. The first question being quite well responded. But so far I didn't see any (unintelligible) on the question, "How much would the particular feature cost?"

Perhaps it's too early to discuss this. But maybe it's good if we have some clarification of what do we expect being a feature in - and what would be the value of the feature in itself? I don't know if someone has been thinking about that question and has some comments to add or remarks to bring?

Jim Galvin: Jim for the queue.

Rudi Vansnick: Sorry. Yes, Jim, you have the floor.

Jim Galvin: So thank you, Rudi. Jim Galvin. A question, a bit of clarity, I mean, ICANN has recently commissioned a study to look at translation and transliteration options and the costs of those options. But it sounded like perhaps you were suggesting that we might consider what the requirements of translation and

transliteration options could be or should be and perhaps then that would be input to the study which ICANN is conducting. Or did you have something else in mind? Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Rudi, if you're speaking we are not hearing you or perhaps you have lost your voice? Nathalie, could you see if Rudi is still on the line?

Rudi Vansnick: Hello, do you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: Oh there you are. Good.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay sorry, yeah, it looks like my - must not responding to the unmute. I started coughing so I had to mute my mic. Yes, regard the comments and question from Jim, I'm thinking this about adding some extra information especially when I look how some of the studies are handled. And based on what has been done earlier already on this issue I think we need to refine as much as possible our questions.

And maybe give a kind of direction to what we want to get as results out of the study and the survey they are going to do in order to enable us to take a position. Because at the end we have to make a proposal; we have to make some guidelines. And if we don't have enough information we can end up with some recommendations that are lack or repetition of the earlier ones.

I'm just wondering if this typical - how much would the particular feature cost and needs clarification on what does that feature - would be and where would it be used. That's at least a question that I have in my mind what kind of feature are we thinking about.

I see Amr's hand raised. Yes, Amr, you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. I'm not - I'm looking forward to seeing some of the outcomes of the study Jim was referring to. If I'm not mistaken we should have something - some sort of initial report by the study group by mid-April if I recall correctly.

I'm also - I remember when going through the information on this study that there were cost implications that were part of the scope of the study. But I think these cost measurements were going to be more on the different types of solutions used for display of contact information in different languages as opposed to individual costs of individual features.

If Sarmad is on the call I believe he is on the study group. Maybe he could shed some light on this. But if the case is that the cost measurements are going to be on different solutions I'm not sure it's the same thing as the question this working group is asking but perhaps it might be something we'll be able to build on. And initial report by mid-April isn't too far off, I think it's a convenient time for us to use whatever comes out at the time. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr. Rudi speaking. Yes, well it's a good idea to address maybe Sarmad, and if you - oh, he has no voice connection on this call. But perhaps you can drop some words on the chat or send them to the mailing list so that we can get some input.

I would encourage us to try to add some extra feet to this question and send it over to the study group so that they can take it up in an early stage rather than having that question at the end when they are trying not close their survey and their report.

And I think that it is important if we could give it a direction of in the sense of when we have been addressing the question earlier on whose responsibility it is, registry, registrar, registrant, that in fact the cost should be also validated at the three different levels. I think it's quite important that we have that information too.

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

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Rudi. So I'm just going to send around to the list information that Steve Sheng sent several weeks ago when we asked for information concerning the parameters of the study.

At that time he noted that they were preparing a survey to go to the registrars and registries. And they asked for our feedback by the 12th of February. So I don't know if the survey has been completed or whether or not it's too late for us to get - to get input into the survey.

But anyway I'll send that around so we can see - and I'll check with Steve to see where it stands as to whether or not it's possible to alter the survey at this point. If it has already gone out I don't think we'll be able to alter it at this point. But perhaps we might be able to see what information is gathered from the survey and then maybe see if additional questions or additional points could be raised for input. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Rudi Vansnick speaking. Well I'm just wondering has someone seen the questionnaire that has been sent out? Maybe based on what we have seen in the questionnaire we can already have an indication if

there will be value in the responses that could help us. I don't know if someone has seen the questionnaire that the study is using.

I don't know, Julie, if you have your hand raised again?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, and actually what I'm sending is what Steve sent to this list and that was on the 3rd of February was also the draft survey so I'll forward that on the list as well.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Julie. Rudi speaking. That will help us certainly in looking to the question if we have to add some more content to the question about the costs.

Perhaps we can then go to the next question and that's a quite interesting one too. When would policy come into effect? I consider that the one would probably be once the Board has accepted the - wants to execute the recommendations that we have been bringing to the table.

And with regards to the moment that it has to be implemented I'm just also wondering if that could have impact on new gTLDs that has already started in crossing registrations and would have to integrate a new feature. So I'm just wondering if we have some ideas about the timing we would suggest to bring this policy into effect. Has someone any idea about how that could be best addressed?

I see Petter responding, "Asap" yeah, well of course. But we know that there will be a certain delay after we have been dropping our recommendations to the GNSO Council where it has first to be approved and then it has to move upwards to the Board.

It can easily take a few months. And we know that our mission has not yet ended either so it will also take some time before we have some clear recommendations on paper.

The question I have with regards - the one with policy coming to effect is that maybe we can also start suggesting that in the - there are changes - big changes in view for registries or registrars that they try to keep in mind that there could be an eventual feature to add to the process of registrations.

I'm just thinking about the EPP if there is any change. And I thought I have seen - and I'll see about changes in the EPP that it would be good that we can all start giving indications. But that's my personal thoughts. I see Amr's hand raised. Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. I recall Chris had added this question or had suggested adding this question during the drafting of the charter for this PDP. To be honest I don't remember exactly why but I would imagine that there are other issues we need to take into consideration when asking - answering this question of when do we think this policy should come into effect.

And I say this because I'm guessing we're going to see a change in how contact information - the Whois information is displayed in general. These are the two expert working groups, one being on the gTLD registration services, it's just that I guess the landscape for Whois is changing so much right now and we don't know what it's going to look like.

Following the conclusion of the expert working group I suppose there will be some form of PDP based on that. And some of this - this might take a much

longer time - probably will take a much longer time to resolve than this ever would. So I'm just guessing that that might be the reason why we have this question in our charter. But I would check with Chris to refresh my memory. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr. Well I remember that we discussed that during the charter - the drafting of the charter that we wanted to know when is it required? When can it be introduced and be used in new features of the Whois? As I said, I think it's quite important that we are able to give a direction to that group too that I think we are convinced that translation and transliteration will be featured in the future; that is somehow required.

But if we don't give a sign at an early stage I'm afraid that they cannot take up the action to integrate it in their plans and as such I think it's quite important that they are informed at an early stage. Yes, Amr, I see your hand raised, you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. I also just remembered that one of the issues when we were considered adding this question to the charter was that - and Julie can correct me if I'm a bit fuzzy on this. But I do believe that there was also the issue of a separate PDP determining what items of contact information would be translated and/or transliterated.

When we were drafting this charter the items to be translated were expressed - were said that they would be on a different PDP so maybe that was also one of the things perhaps with the conclusion of that PDP that whatever policy comes out of this one - that's just one of the partial answers I suppose. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr, for this additional information. And indeed it brings up a lot of other thoughts we need to go through. What is the mandatory data that we want to put into the translation phase and what should be additional information that is not mandatory? That's in fact the last question.

And I think it's the most important one in order to define the responsibilities of each other's input. If it's mandatory for all the data, that could require a lot of effort to go through. If it's for the name of the registrant that we want to have translated or transliterated that changes quite a lot and it could also change the approach of the mechanism.

I don't know if there are any other thoughts on those two questions and especially with what should be mandatory. It's probably a question where we can really indicate very quickly what is the minimum and should be mandatory and what is additional information that can be translated but does not need to be translated. I don't know if someone has some...

Jim Galvin: Jim for the queue.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Jim, you have the floor.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. Jim Galvin. Some things that occur to me in this discussion of what should or should not be translated transliterated and, you know, mandatory versus optional, the Directory Services Expert Working Group is obviously going to have some recommendations that I think are related to answering this question because they are concerned with what is visible and what will be available to various user communities.

They've been developing the recommendation - their recommendations based on the purpose of the data. So I think it's going to be important for us to take note of that when it comes out, that'll serve as very good input to our processes.

I also wanted to comment on the expert working group on internationalizing registration data. It has two objectives in that expert working group. One is identifying the requirements, what it means to internationalize data elements.

And so it occurs to me that as we think about what needs to be translated and transliterated we will to give due consideration to elements that have international requirements. Elements that don't probably don't fall into a category that we would care about here. I offer that as a comment for consideration.

The other deliverable from that expert working group is going to be a data model - a proposed data model for consideration by the community. And I think that there's probably an opportunity there for this group and that group to have some discussions and be able to help each other in this question.

You know, what the data model looks like will certainly have an affect on what can and cannot be transliterated and translated - it might look like so that'd be something to think about as we move through Singapore that might be a useful agenda item and a discussion to have with folks from the group. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Jim, for these additional comments and information. I also consider that having those two working groups sitting together in the face to face and having some more discussions about both of - both side of the work I consider also that the new contact data model would take care also

of the fact that if you define a data model you will have to define fields and a field could be the translation of the native data so it will probably enter into the data model too.

I see Amr's hand raised and then I will go back to the two questions that I see in the chat too. Amr, you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. I would just like to reiterate again that during drafting this charter we were told that there would be a separate PDP on deciding which data elements within the contact information would indeed be translated and/or transliterated.

And we were told that this should be out of the scope of this PDP. So I don't think that makes much sense, to be very honest. I think that we should be discussing this here. But we were, at the time, told that this wouldn't be it.

And I don't believe that the last question on what should be mandatory - I don't think that it refers to the data elements in the contact information. I believe it refers to whether all - the policy recommendations coming out of this PDP should cover all gTLDs and whether it - or whether it should only - and whether it should cover all registrants in all countries or should some registrants not be required to adhere to this policy.

So I don't think, when we're asking the question of what should be mandatory, I don't think the question we're asking here is what data elements in the contact information should be mandatory. I think the question is a bit different and we should focus on that in attempting to answer this question. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Amr, for the clarification. I was just thinking up when I was looking to the work mandatory and indeed with regards - is it for all gTLDs and for all countries. I think that's a rather difficult question to give an answer to if we consider that registration is done across the world for certain gTLD, for a certain domain name in a gTLD it can be - coming from any country.

So already the question about are we going to limit it to a country is a very, very difficult one. I consider myself that being - as a very difficult one. And if we would address that question I think that the input from GAC can be quite important on this point.

They can probably address this in a way that it gives us an indication if we have to consider certain countries doing this in a mandatory way in order to avoid having unrecognizable information in the contact data. But I think that's for another - for another call.

And we probably fit more in the working methodology that we need to apply on what we do now in the next few weeks. I think that most of the question have already some guidance and have some basic answers. But we still need to provide a bit more details and get more details from our colleagues, from SOs and ACs, in order to be able to close that question list and answer list too.

I don't know if there is any other question on our comments on the question list. If none I would like to go to Number 6 on the agenda, the working methodology. And it's probably good that we have some indication what would be the best way to address the next step of work we have to do.

I don't know if there is anybody having experience in the process that has to follow this initial discussion sessions. I'm looking to the list if someone has any experience in having - giving us a guidance on what is the best way to go to move forward. I see also the question from Amr in the chat. He says, " I think the question of data elements in any PDP regarding this should be brought up during the next Council call by our co chairs. It would be helpful to know if that," No I haven't heard of any parallel PDP taking place or being planned.

Okay that's a good suggestion. I will pick it up and - with Chris depending on who is going to be on the call will be available for the call. I will certainly address that point. So back to the methodology, has anyone any proposal, any suggestion on how we want to proceed with - when we have gathered all the data and how we want to work out an initial list of recommendations? Is there anyone having any suggestion?

I see no one having any suggestions raising their hand. So I - sorry? Did I hear a voice? Is there someone willing to speak? You have the floor. No one, okay.

So I think that to that point I - as I was not able to listen to the previous call I don't know if there was any discussion going on on the working methodology. If none I would propose that then we take this up for our next call and maybe start with a - the point on the agenda instead of going through - except if we have a lot of responses coming back it would be probably the highest priority on the list.

But I see the response from Jim, "The work of the PDP will connect with the work that comes out of the expert working groups." Indeed there is probably a lot of information that will come back to us quite soon from other groups. And

that probably is a question we have to answer, are we going to address all the information coming in?

And which way would we like to have discussions on that? That's at least one of my considerations and how can we address the information when it comes to us from study groups or from other working groups? And is it information that would really point us to the beginning of the discussion? That's what I would like to avoid. But you never know, that someone brings information to us that obliges us to go one or two steps backwards.

I don't know if some of you have been thinking about that too, it suggests something that pops up in my mind. I don't know if there are any other comments on the actual discussion? I don't see anyone raising hands.

We are close to the hour. I don't see any further information coming up in the chat room neither. So I would like to thank you all for your participation. (Unintelligible) I couldn't participate in past two calls. And it delivers me a black hole in the discussion so I have to pick that up as soon as possible again.

And but I'm quite happy that my voice resisted for an hour talk now, that's quite good. So if no other questions I would thank you all for participation in this call and look forward to having some responses from some individually if you cannot (address) your groups in having some responses to our questions.

So thank you, staff, also for helping us through this.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, everybody. Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Have a great morning...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. Bye-bye.

END