

**ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 13 March 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 13 March 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-20140313-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Jim Galvin - SSAC
Ahkuputra Wanawit – GAC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Peter Green - NCUC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Rudi Vansnick – NPCO
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP
Amr Elsadar – NCUC
Ephriam Percy Kenyanito – NCUC

Apologies:

Justine Chew – At-Large
Peter Dernbach – IPC

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Amy Bivins
Glen de Saint Gery
Lars Hoffman
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recording has started. Please go ahead.

Terri Agnew: Thank you (Nori). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working group on 13th of March 2014.

On the call today we have Pitnan Kooarmornpatana, Wanawit Ahkuputra, Chris Dillon, Rudi Vansnick, Peter Green, Petter Rindforth, Epraim Percy Kenyanito, Jennifer Chung, Jim Galvin, Mae Suchayapim Siriwat. We have apologies from Justin Chew.

From staff we have Glen de Saint Gery, Amy Bivins, Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund and myself, Terri Agnew.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. This is Chris Dillon speaking.

This so if we move into the agenda items three we need to ask whether anybody's statements of interest have changed since the last call. Speak now or forever hold your peace.

Okay. In that case, let us just move into agenda Item 4 which is the responses from the SOs and the ACs.

And we have had two responses, one from other Peoples Republic of China and actually a continued response from At-Large. So they are continuing to write interesting things in their wiki. However, the At-Large response is very long.

So what I'm intending to do is to have a look at the People's Republic of China response and then do the At-Large response at the end if we've got time. I think that's possibly the best thing to do there.

So that means that we need to display that Peoples Republic of China response. Now there's something coming up on the screen now.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. I'm working on that.

Chris Dillon: Yes, that would be...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I need to navigate to that page.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Rudy Vansnick: Chris if I may, in-between. It's Rudy speaking.

Chris Dillon: Yes?

Rudy Vansnick: Maybe we should try this call to have a look into the methodology of the process we will go through after we've got all the answer from the SOs and ACs so that we can start planning the work afterwards?

Chris Dillon: Yes I think we can certainly return to methodology under any other business.

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Chris can you remind me where the responses are?

Chris Dillon: Yes now just a moment. I'll just post the link that that's - that would be quick. It's under Section 4 and then in four again. And then it's the list the correspondence received which I'm just posting that now. Okay (unintelligible).

And right at the bottom of that page. It's got a short response in fact.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Chris. Can you all see that?

Chris Dillon: Now I just - yes, that's the right page. But we just need to be right at the bottom.

So basically this is just really quite brief and talking about the fact that the contact information is collected by registrars. And I think could probably would mean under any system could ensure the accuracy of the registration information.

Then we've got the fact that the registration information in the Chinese script is really the basic requirement.

I think that is hinting that transliteration or translation would be, you know, if that's the additional thing go on top of that.

And then there's a mention that Chinese registries should check and verify Chinese registration information. So that's a sort of simple pyramid like structure whereby, you know, each layer in the pyramid checks the layer below.

Then in the last paragraph there is something about the intent of the Whois. Now this is related to something that will be coming back to later which is the whole aspect of desirability.

So this is, you know, they're saying that the intent of it is accurately to record and check the registration information and that Chinese information can better serve the Chinese community. So that's really a summary of what that particular input is saying.

Any questions about that?

Oh it's looking actually as if there may be technical problems. So if you can't see that page then just use the link that I posted into the chat room. You just

bring it up in the browser and that should get around the problem.
(Unintelligible).

Okay, so any comments about that or should we perhaps move into the next agenda point?

As I was saying and I'm intending to come back to the ALAC stuff later if we have time. But it's quite long. Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hey Chris?

Chris Dillon: Yes?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich speaking. May I?

Chris Dillon: Yes by all means.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just a question to the answer of the Chinese colleague, (unintelligible) colleague. I wonder whether they are referring to the evidence made the Chinese script is down to a different script in Chinese.

You know, it's only one in the modern one. Is there made any difference because I remember that was - or are they both in parallel so as we have, you know, it was the discussion of the IDNs?

Chris Dillon: Well that is actually rather an interesting point. Because this response is coming from the PLC I think it's largely talking about simplified characters.

However, it is conceivable that traditional characters could also be included because Hong Kong actually uses traditional characters but actually within this particular response I don't think they're referring to that distinction.

I mean it's an additional level of complexity when the same language can be written into rather than different scripts.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes my question is just do we see many requests coming from different Chinese sites regarding this issue?

Chris Dillon: I mean I think effectively, you know, this is - it is quite a general issue. But if you have a language which can be written in more than one way, you know, you're always going to have different community saying, well, you know, we require this form of it or we require that form of that.

What is interesting in the Chinese case is that, you know, certainly people who use traditional characters may struggle to read simplified characters and vice versa.

So we can't just presume that, you know, that there is no difficulty that they're just, they're two quite close representations, especially I think especially young people in the PRC find it quite difficult to read traditional characters.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay.

All right, and let us - unless there any other questions about that input shall we perhaps move into effectively into the next point which is agenda .5. And we're then looking at refinements to questions.

And so I think if we go into maybe it's - I think it's probably quicker if I just get that particular page up. And it's actually under - it's under Number 4 and then why are we doing this?

That one yes, okay. So I'll just post that into the chat room in case we continue to have problems with display.

Okay. It's this page here that I've just posted. Please get it up in your own browsers in case we can't display it. I think that's probably easiest.

Okay. And again we're right down at the bottom of the page.

Actually before we get into this document I'll just respond quickly to a question Amr asks in the chat room.

And Amr was asking about the MCSJ response. And I'm not sure whether I put that in the wiki. So I will try and find out what's happened to that response.

Okay.

And we still have technical problems with displaying that screen so just use it in a separate browser tab and that should be okay.

And the bit we're looking at is actually the bottom of the screen which is the post that Amr sent in recently about basically about the variability.

So there was a correspondence on the mailing list. And so Amr is saying is the consensus that translation, transliteration is desirable? If so, I'm in the minority posing this consensus.

So far I have yet to see one convincing reason to make me think that is desirable. Could someone please point one more out to me? So yes that's explained nicely.

So in response to that we can, you know, we could actually have a look at, you know, there are various reasons, which are mentioned on the page that we were just looking at.

So, you know, the People's Republic of China mentioned some benefits. And there are other benefits in that page. But we, you know, we've spoken about those during the earlier calls. So I won't repeat that.

I know that Lars is working on some document to do with this area. I don't know whether Lars you would like to talk about that now.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Rudy. This is Lars. I think that if you're happy I can share with the group but since it's a work in process, as it were I don't think I should give it to you in a summary.

Basically, you know, what I thought might be happen for the group is to gather some information about the various use and commentary made by the wider ICANN community, different stakeholders and different policy initiatives inside and outside the GNSO and other stakeholder groups and support organizations about why contact information should be translated or transliterated or why shouldn't it be as well as so just being that there - different viewpoints, starting points of discussion and then also a document starts to speak a little bit into the overall purpose of contract information.

Because only I suspect it might be useful to be - or if group agrees to what it's purpose for contract information is why it should be gathered than it'd be easier to determine why it should be transliterated and why it shouldn't be transliterated and what aspects of it should be transliterated as well.

So I think that might be some good starting information to then start the debate on the threshold question of the need to translate or not translate and not (unintelligible).

And but as I said, I am happy to share the document if the (unintelligible) agree and it's a work in process, and I hope to finish it before Singapore.

Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes. I think, you know, that there are some very interesting very important ideas in there. So I think, although it is still a draft that would be very helpful. Thank you.

Lars Hoffman: No problem. I'll share with the list right now.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you.

Lars Hoffman: So this is Lars again. Just to double check did you want me to send it out or do you want me to put it onto the screen right now? I'm so sorry.

Chris Dillon: If you can put it on the screen that would be better because I think that, you know, checking email is difficult during the call and just hoping that it we'll be able to display it.

Oh, Amr has got his hand up. Amr. Would you like to say something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr. I just want to go back to your points about correspondence from the People's Republic of China.

Chris Dillon: Yes?

Amr Elsadr: And from what I could tell they're stressing the point that when Chinese registrants submit their contact information for the sake of accuracy it's best that they submit that in Chinese as opposed to other languages.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: But I don't see how that's still poses any sort of advantage in translating work transliterated this contact information.

Okay we've established that it's good for them to submit it in their local language. But where is the advantage in translating or transliterating this?

I still fail to see the correlation between the two points. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you. Let's just -I'll just revisit that quickly before we dive into Lar's document.

Actually, I think you're absolutely right. Basically, they're saying accurately record and check the registrar information. But that's all in Chinese. You're, right. In fact, the Chinese, that particular Chinese piece is not highlighting advantage and that's correct.

I think some of the other pieces, particularly the Thai piece that we went through quite slowly a few weeks ago did highlight benefits.

I mean, you know, we could revisit that. But, you know, we did speak about them at length during that call. So and we have, you know, really quite a lot to look at during this call.

So I think probably if we have a look at the, you know, document that Lars is drafting now but by all means, you know, pick up pieces.

There'll on that page to do with the correspondence we've received. I mean, it may even be helpful if we go through and put benefits in bold or something like that anyway.

Okay now so looking at the document that Lar's has just displayed I would like to just pick up a few things.

Now in fact, one of them is you see of this list of 11 purposes. So this is domain name control and all the way down to malicious Internet activities.

Now there is a lot of information about this in the initial report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD directory services and so in fact that comes out of that as to that report.

But really to get the full benefit of it, you need to read at least Pages 12 to 14 of that long, you know, that quite long report. But 12 to 14 just outline all of the - you know, so basically what that is it's a much expanded version of these 11 reasons.

And so what I would really like to suggest I personally I cannot see any reason why we shouldn't use on Pages 12 to 14 which really document those various usages in great detail. I can't see any reason why we shouldn't use that as part of what we're doing.

However, I would be really keen to ask people to have a slow look at that document and just see well, you know, there is - is there something in there that we don't really want to recognize or, you know, there's some reason why we don't want to take it up?

But, you know that - so what I'm really saying is read - those three pages is there any reason why we can't use it?

I mean I don't know Lars whether you feel as I do that we would probably do this quite well today, you know, that is - it's actually the work on scenarios we were intending to do.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Chris. Yes, this is Lars.

Yes I think I mean if you were to post the link to the document that as well. I think you're obviously correct I just take out the (unintelligible) the list. And fact is what the Expert Working Group then gives a detail, an example of how these purposes come to use and why therefore and data contact information should be available in one way or another.

Chris Dillon: Yes, yes.

Lars Hoffman: And so I think for example, for the - for domain name control I mean from a personal, you know, on initial thoughts when you read it, you say well for domain name control it doesn't need to be translated, transliterated because if I control - to control my own domain name I don't need to be in a different group than I personally use right? So it can just to make the script it doesn't have to be translated or transliterated.

With the last point being malicious Internet activities well for that, you know, it shouldn't make it any easier. And so therefore it shouldn't be translated and transliterated.

So those issues that they bring up might be quite easy to answer with yes or no.

And but I think the group it would be helpful if they went through these various issues. But they're saying, yes, because obviously there's others that it's not so complicated and their the usefulness will become much more apparent.

And so I think may be that that would be something to work through after the Singapore meeting. But that's just an idea.

Chris Dillon: Yes indeed. Okay thank you for that.

Well, let us just scroll down the document.

Now at the bottom of that page there are certain questions, that in fact we can just move down to the top of the next page where the questions are answered.

Okay, just a minute short (unintelligible) if we can just scroll. Here we go.

And so we've got ten ccTLDs allowing users to register domain names using non-Roman scripts.

We've - and the interesting one is ten of 16 of the ccTLDs support English in addition to a local language.

I suppose, Arabic, Chinese and Japanese are the interesting ones there because German and the other languages are using sort of modern, you know, accented ASCII. They're - you know, they're the same script, but they're just using a large character set. Rudy would you like to say something at this point?

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you Chris, Rudy speaking.

I think that essentially with the second bullet ten out of 16 that are supporting English aside the local language. And I consider that that in this case, it's not about translation or transliteration. It's the person which registering that allow - that is just putting in English wording for what he or she considers being an interesting or important for the registration.

I don't see it really as a point of where it is defined being a translation or a transliteration. So it would be nice to have some clearance on that.

Chris Dillon: Well thank you Rudy. That's a very good point. Jim would you like to say something about that?

Jim Galvin: Yes so two things speaking as one of the co-chairs of the working group that did that survey and has that data there.

The situation is, as I recall, what Rudy just said. And that is the registries take in the data in both forms allowing the registrants to enter them. But they don't do translation and they also don't verify that the two versions match.

And in fact in the Expert Working Group on internationalizing registration data, making recommendations, which I am currently chairing we've asked ourselves the same question again.

And based on this would just be in an ad hoc sample if you will representatives on the group there are only eight of us on this group. And people that we've talked to the same situation as what we've been reporting to ourselves that registries that we know of they take both just take both but they don't confirm that they match. And they don't create the other if the registrant doesn't provide it. They just store it and keep it if they get it.

So and I apologize. I should have said that I'm Jim Galvin, when I started speaking. So thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, Jim.

Okay now anything else in those points that we need to pick up? All ccTLDs support too is 443 character set dependencies are set display. I don't think either of those if that's what we are doing.

Okay. And then we have I - it's a summary of some parts of the final report of the IRD Working Group. Okay.

Lars would you be able do - to just flush out these benefits and potential problem areas?

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Chris. This is Lars.

By flush out you mean just go through them briefly or to elaborate on them in the next draft?

Chris Dillon: Yes I mean to be absolutely honest I only just received this document. And this was a part of it that I was sort of slightly struggling to understand completely. So I think it's going to save time if you just flush it out and wait for people to ask questions between the various points.

Lars Hoffman: Okay I will do my best. So this is from the final report of the IRD Working Group. And they're obviously not marked and that I should say this is for editing purposes and also to provoke thought.

And these points are listed there but they're obviously not marked clearly as benefits or potential problems but they're just say, you know, this is what implication might be.

And so it's obvious that if you were to translate or transliterate contact information users who are only familiar with ASCII would be able then to access or translate and transliterated material.

And many users are monolingual so when they type in their data they would be able to in their own script and they wouldn't have to do it in a script that they don't know and they might not even have a keyboard to do so.

And another possibility to do this is not necessarily a benefit as is obviously we discussed this earlier in the group certain transliteration standards that might be useful for this that could be used to kind of achieve the uniformity of transliteration at least of various scripts and characters.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: And I put a little footnote in there. I think it might be beneficial for the group to discuss too if we transliterate into say from a Thai script into ASCII whether that's translated or transliterated.

For somebody who's speaks Hindu and is monolingual obviously that is translation transliteration will not be useful.

And that might be a problem or benefit but it's definitely an issue I think that should also - or the group might well want to discuss.

And then problem areas this obviously - well not problem areas but I think what it is more is that, you know, why it might not be necessary to translate or transliterate is that at the moment it's not done and the Internet is working basically but it's got many million of domain names and users are submitting their data in ASCII although their primary language is not that script.

Using just one script at the moment will make the operation appear as much more easy and accessible.

And obviously something else the bottom (unintelligible) the group talked about as well the problem of if you start to translate and transliterate you immediately come into a problem of consistency and making sure - how do you actually make sure that the data is one to translate and transliterated consistent and therefore usable essentially is what...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: ...report - the report is asking.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: And I think I'm going to leave it at that.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. That was a really good summary. Now as you were speaking there was quite a lot going on in the chat room so I'll just check that we're up to date with that discussion.

So Amr is just saying that he has no objection to addressing the items in the table and then saying that matching from one language script to another is problematic, very true.

And then there's something about uniform single language or script chosen per registry which could be another model.

So, you know, it might be that there are areas of the world where there is more useful lingua franca. I mean I think even now in Eastern Europe there are very, very large numbers of German speaker for example, could be a lingua franca theoretically.

Okay and then registrars providing services in different languages and script validating in those scripts with no need for translation.

Yes I mean again it's another possible model that's what Amr is writing there.

And then Jim has got a long post here by the nation state, information requirements all set by the nation state that a registrant should reasonably be expected to enter their address in a language appropriate for the region. Yes okay. so that's an argument for that being the primary consideration.

Okay anything about what Lars was just saying or the, you know, the various summaries I was making of what - of the various posts in the chat room?

Okay. Hearing none let us continue to move down the document. We're getting fairly close to the end and in fact the last page of it if I'm correct.

Yes so if we just display further points of consideration on the last page there.

Oh yes so desirability to use scripts different from US ASCII we've just been talking about should be balanced against the desired uses of the data while domain name - sorry while domain registrant name may intend only to their domain locally. The nature of the Internet itself means that any domain is available globally.

So, you know, if we did have a situation where, you know, the main records were I don't know in Chinese for example and they were translated or transliterated thing, you know, those domains would be, you know, available on the Internet.

But somebody without knowledge of written Chinese it would be quite difficult to contact those to contact those people.

Okay. And then Jim is posting about registrars. They have a global presence and that is how do you restrict or manage an arbitrary registrant? Could it be that you reject registrants who attempt to contact information from regions you can't process?

Yes. I mean obviously if you have a registrar who - well this really raises whether issues.

But if you have a registrar without the knowledge of specific language - of specific - of the languages specific registrations then we certainly can't check it manually because they just don't have knowledge of the language.

And that then raises the other issue about machine translation or hand translation so, you know, whether we are talking about machine translation or whether it's got to be done by hand.

And I don't know if anybody has any opinions about that. Oh yes now two hands up. I'm afraid I didn't see the order. Amr would you like to go first?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks Chris. This is Amr. Just in response to Jim's last comment in the chat yes I don't see why it would be a problem where you have registrars in for example developing countries who provide services in their local languages and scripts to sort of have one way or another have an edge in their own local markets where they provide these services in these local languages in their local languages and scripts and so attract more local customers.

And if registrars from other regions would like to compete with them for those registrants then I'm sure they can also try to provide these services in different language and transcripts.

I don't see it as a possible limitation. It's truly market forces I guess. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that Amr. Yes I agree completely so unless we are in the situation where we are, you know, where we have very, very high quality machine translation then basically if services are to be offered then an investment has to be made in people who understand those languages.

I think that's really what that comes to. And sorry Rudy would you like to add that to this?

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you Chris. Rudy speaking. Well as I mentioned in the chat a registrar is not equal to a country or a language. That's already in a first initial point we have to keep in mind.

At the other side the registrar can only provide translation or transliteration if the Whois data allows to store that information.

If that's not the case then the registrar is limited to local storage of information that is independent of the official Whois data.

And that's maybe another way of looking at the issue is the problem is there would be a separation of information from the list into registrar data then we end up in having two databases.

And I'm just afraid that that would be maybe the better solution anyway. But I would like to come back to what Amr was also saying that when you have one registrar working on the region and that registrar when it is on a local - in a local region can indeed promote a lot for the local community with regards to domain name registration.

But it all depends also what is the registry, what is the TLD for which that registrar is going to do the business?

So it is really depending on different levels, registry and then registrar and not the other way around.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. Again there is quite a lot going on in the chat room so I'll just try and pick up a few of the things of there.

So Amr is writing that it would be problematic to transfer registrant contact information if no other registrar provides services in a specific language or script if there's nobody available to do it. Yes that's an interesting point.

And Jim is saying that it's a market or business issue. We are probably not going to have enough time to have a look at what At-Large has been writing recently but they actually talk about this.

They talk about I think it's general use and specialized use. And specialized is when a service might, you know, such as translation or transliteration may be done for a particular business use.

But this is feeling quite familiar from what they were writing but not the stuff that we looked at last week. It's new stuff.

Okay and the point the registrars will care about because it creates a restriction they don't have today if they have to allow the language script appropriate for the region of the address.

Okay and so if we then if there aren't any questions about that we can perhaps return to the document.

And there are a few things from the GAC notes about sufficient and accurate data about registrations and registrants being subject to national safeguards promoting supporting, stability, reliability, security and interoperability.

Okay. And then and working on - oh yes well there are several initiatives in this area of improving accuracy of Whois data. And then finally the idea of, you know, reducing the incidence of deliberately false Whois data.

Okay and a little bit of a debate going on in the chat room. Amr is saying he doesn't see it as a restriction but a competitive issue.

Okay. I think okay Amr's technically there is no restriction. A registrar based in Germany could hire staff in China if they've thought the Chinese yen registration market is worth it.

Yes that sounds very likely At-Large, what was going on the At-Large wiki.

Okay any other comments about this document before we move on to other things that have come into us? We should certainly say a big thank you to Lars for drafting it. It raises important issues.

Okay well one of the other things that came in was from as you probably remember from (Farmat Tussain) who picked up we were talking about the English form of Bangkok and the Thai form. So if you transliterated Thai you would end up with (Crung Tape).

And so basically (Salmad) suggested that we adopt the technical term for this. So he says that Bangkok is an exonym fact. Actually I will just because there are very peculiar words.

I'm just typing exonym so that would be like Bangkok. And then you've got endonym which is the transliterated Thai maybe something like this use a one-handed typing.

So to cut a long story short that was a very helpful suggestion and I've added that into the wiki. So basically those are two very useful definitions which I, you know, I've added to the definition part of the wiki.

And there is, you know, there is an issue because the United Nations is very against using exonyms like Bangkok. So under the United Nations guidelines you would very must be talking about (Crung Tape).

And I was raising the possibility that actually things like Bangkok are very helpful because we know what they mean whereas (Crung Tape) is, you know, you really have to know Thailand before you can know what that is.

Okay I shall just return to the chat room because there's a continuing discussion going on in here. Okay in fact It's just discussion about restrictions in the business model.

Okay and that brings us on to well there - and starting slightly to run out of time. I think that we should pick up where Rudy was saying earlier and - oh yes so there's a whole methodology thing.

So it is how - so this means effectively we're into any of the business. And we I don't think we're going to have enough time for the At-Large thing but if we do then we may have a quick look at that.

Rudy was suggesting that may want to refine our methodology and, you know, exactly how we prioritize questions.

Well certainly coming out of the input which both Amr and Lars have given recently has been that we need to put a far greater emphasis on desirability.

So in fact we may even want to change the structure of the wiki slightly to reflect that. I don't know whether there are any other suggestions about methodological. I think there was also a question come to think of it about how we write the reports.

And yes I doubt - I mean I'm hoping to be honest that, you know, if we work well with the wiki things would be quite logical and report writing should be quite straightforward. But I don't know whether anybody would like to add to that?

Okay I think it certainly is quite difficult to prioritize those questions. Amr would you like to say something about that?

Amr Elsadr: No thanks Chris. I was just going to make a recommendation about writing the reports. Yes we should certainly include all of the responses that the working group has received in the report which would make it rather lengthy but that's all right.

But in terms of the working group recommendations those I would say need to be separate based on the consensus that we develop. It's just the way I would recommend going about it. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. Yes I have no trouble at all. So effectively what we are doing is building up a volume of correspondence.

And I actually what I should have said -- I meant to do this -- was that we are expecting a couple of other replies and certainly one from Japan and one

from MarkMonitor. I've had emails telling me that, yes those things are on the way.

So, you know, it may well be that we have a larger corpus of correspondence. But yes I mean, you know, recommendations will be, you know, quite separate from that. And yes that would certainly be what I would intend there.

Amr would you like to reply to that?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr, just a question about the response from MarkMonitor.

Is this a response from the IPC or not or just from MarkMonitor? And I'm wondering why someone would submit a separate response?

Certainly we could provide the feedback in the public comment periods. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you. That's a fair comment. I suspect that is just one of those cases where somebody has two hats and I picked up the wrong hat.

But the point I was really wanting to get over is that there are a couple of responses that we are still waiting for.

I mean, you know, obviously I hope we will have responses beyond, you know, the ones that we know are coming. But, you know, obviously Singapore will be a chance to, you know, to go out to colleagues and try to get them more involved.

Okay we have not got enough time to have a look at the At-Large comments. They're just too long. So I think we can just use the remaining five minutes on any, you know, anything that's been missed out whether anybody would like

to pick up anything about, you know, the Singapore meeting or really any issue?

Julie would you like to add something?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I just with respect to the next meeting I just would like to remind everyone that the next meeting is actually scheduled in Singapore.

It is scheduled for 7:30 in the morning on Monday the 24th. It is a public meeting and we do very much encourage people to get the word out that anybody who's interested in this topic should join.

There will be coffee to make sure people can wake up. And we will not have a meeting next Thursday because many people will be traveling to go to Singapore.

So I would like to suggest then that because of travel schedules that we skip next week's meeting and that we focus on preparation for the meeting in Singapore.

And you all will be receiving from the secretariat the logistical information as far as the timing time zones and locations of that meeting.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that.

Julie Hedlund: And I see in the chat room you're asking -- this is Julie Hedlund again -- about the 7:30 time. The reason this is and work parties in general, it's not the only work party scheduled at 7:30. There are other work parties scheduled at 7:30.

The reason is because we are not allowed to schedule against any of the public, the large public sessions.

And so what this means is that on Monday effectively we have to get the meeting out of the way before the welcome ceremony and the rest of the public sessions get started so there's no - so essentially we as staff cannot schedule something in conflict with the other public meetings.

So unfortunately that does mean that it has to be scheduled at an early hour. I apologize for that.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you very much for that. We do still have a couple of minutes left but I think probably we could just wind it down because unless there is anything else about Singapore and really just - I must to say, you know, look very much forward to seeing most of you at least in person for once in Singapore.

Oh and I need to wish you a bon voyage those who are traveling.

Man: Bon voyage to you to Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Okay until Singapore then good by then.

Man: Thanks.

Man: Thanks (unintelligible) see you all. Bye.

Man: So we can stop the recording?

Terri Agnew: Thank you. (Nori) If you can stop the recordings please.

Coordinator: Sure.

END