

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION

Thursday 08 May at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 08 May 2014 at 1300 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-20140508-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Petter Rindforth – IPC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Peter Green – NCUC
Ephraim Percy Kenyanito – NCUC
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Wanawit Ahkuputra – GAC

Apologies:

Peter Dernbach – IPC
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Julie Hedlund - Staff

ICANN staff:

Amy Bivins
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the - good morning, good afternoon and good evening, this is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 8th of May, 2014.

On the call today we have (Arush Pedegrandis), Chris Dillon, Rudi Vansnick, Petter Rindforth, Jennifer Chung and Peter Green.

We have apologies from Amr Elsadr, James Galvin, Peter Dernbach and Julie Hedlund. From staff we have Amy Bivins, Lars Hoffman 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 back over to you, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, Terri. Okay so let's move into the agenda. And we have Point 3, the Statements of Interest. And this is really a formality, it's just in case somebody's statement has changed last time because we have to ask this officially. So speak now about that or raise a hand or let us know.

Otherwise we can move into Point 4 which is a very - I think it's a very quick point because as far as I know there's been no input from SOs and ACs since last week. I think we are completely up to date as far as I know. I'm seeing no questions about that. That means we can get as far as Point 5.

And so last week we were reviewing the work plan and basically we were looking at the review of relevant work. And so there are three or perhaps four documents that we haven't reviewed or not, you know, not to the necessary levels. So we may do that work today.

But the other part of - and they're listed those documents at the bottom of the agenda page with links fortunately. So that's the page if you display that URL I just typed into the chat then all of that comes up with links to the relevant parts.

But if we come back to Point 5 the other thing is consider next steps. And this basically after the meeting, after you've probably all seen, Lars circulated a table of all of the responses.

And Petter is asking the question, you know, whether we can expect any further responses. As far as I know we are still waiting for input from at least the Registrars, possibly other communities. And I think we should certainly continue to accept that if it comes in.

But, you know, there is quite a lot that we have to work through so, you know, I think we can work through the documents and then hope that that and possibly other responses come in.

So okay. And, yes, so Rudi is typing in the chat that he knows that there are various discussions going on so yes I think it certainly makes sense. Oh, so yes, so he knows there are discussions going on but he hasn't had input from Michele yet so obviously that, you know, that could happen, you know, over the next few weeks.

Okay, so I think - So Rudi's also typing that he's going to have another go at that, you know, having worked with Michele on, you know, just hastening that response tomorrow so that would be - that would be really worth doing. Thank you for that.

Okay so I'm just going to come back - so I'm going to come back to Lars's table. And this was quite earlier on before the call got going I was saying that I wanted to - because what I'd like to do is do at least some preliminary work on the table that Lars circulated.

I should say - I said I think in the, yeah, on the mailing list, you know, just repeat that for the minutes of this meeting as well and that is, you know, just to express gratitude for the amount of work going through all of those PDFs and pulling out the relevant pieces. It's just - it's lovely to be able to see all of that content together.

And I think - oh it's looking as if we may just at the crucial moment have lost Lars in the chat room. Lars, are you still on the telephone perhaps?

Lars Hoffman: Absolutely. I'm so sorry yes I had a...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: No, no it's just, yeah...

Lars Hoffman: I'm back in right now.

Chris Dillon: It's technical - it's all sorts of technical trouble around today, long story. Now what I wanted to do is I just wonder if you could give us a couple of, you know, just a sort of a brief introduction to the document because there were one or two questions - because it's great having it but I'm not completely sure on what methodology we should use to go through it so it's things like how is a table like this being used in working groups before. If so then, you know, that gives us some sort of precedence and it helps us know exactly how to work with it.

If it hasn't, if it's a brand-new thing then, you know, it's conceivable that we might want to add perhaps a column. I mean, I was wondering if we could, for example, add a column about, you know, some kind of measuring of agreement.

So it's obviously not going to be as simple as just yes no but something along those lines because we were talking about this matrix which I've always imagined would have some sort of indication about agreement. And I'm actually not completely sure how best to do that. So if you have any background stuff addressing any of those points I would be very grateful. Sorry to put you on the spot.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Thank you Chris. No worries about the spot putting. Well a quick intro to the document I'm just wondering whether we should put it up to the AC room.

Chris Dillon: Oh, yes, I think there is a link from that thing - that URL I put in the chat room links to it near the top I think. And now I'm not...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: ...does so just a moment, I will just...

Lars Hoffman: Do you want me to put it up?

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: There is - there is a link in there. I can also...

Lars Hoffman: I'm just going to put it up on the computer...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yeah, that sounds if you...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: ...that would be great.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, just one second. Coming right now. So what it is is I collated all the various responses that we had. And as others may or may not trickle in, as Chris said earlier the Registrars are still outstanding, there is a document at least. I'm going to release it too so you should be able to scroll through it by yourself.

So, yes, the Registrar Stakeholder Group still outstanding. I contacted Michele, the chair, and he said it's with the ExComm which I suspect is good news so I suspect there's something forthcoming sooner rather than later.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Lars Hoffman: What it did hear is that I used the - I didn't say "questions" because obviously I used the term "issues" because, I mean, does it make a real difference. But, you know, there's basically questions come up in our part of the charter officially that the group would like to discuss these because they're relevant issues and hence the term.

I've taken those directly from the letters that were sent out. And I just copy and pasted the - no editing has been done so this is the original from what people submitted.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Lars Hoffman: And what I also did like in some cases especially from the government representatives that are maybe not as well used to dealing with these as the SO - the ACs and the stakeholders - stakeholder groups might be, they have written rather an open reply.

And so what I've done I've copy and pasted relevant issues - relevant responses to the various issues. Sometimes there they're overlapping or they're...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Lars Hoffman: ...so Issue 3 and 4 might have the same response, it just means that they didn't provide anything else. And their viewpoint might apply to both of these

issues and especially (unintelligible) for the time the Chinese government representatives.

As to how to use this I think I'm very happy to add a comment to this as it's no problem at all, the group can proceed as it wishes. What is normally - happens with these in other working groups or my experience is that the group would go through these ideally (unintelligible) before the call but otherwise a quick read-through on the call.

And then the floor opens on the various comments and so whether people agree or disagree with it, whether it's just - the group just acknowledges that it was submitted. And then to (unintelligible) and adds it to the agenda or whether to just agree and take those points on board.

I think it's important to bear in mind also that these are viewpoints from the - from outsiders to the group that are also relevant to community members. But it's essentially the working group that should take this on board but it's not something that, you know, three comments say this and two comments say that that doesn't mean that the group has to go with those three comments, right, it's a background - it's a background viewpoint that should be taken on board and that it's important that should shape the discussions.

But if the working group says well actually on this case for these and these reasons we disagree with the majority of the comments received then that is fine. And, you know, bearing in mind also that whatever the group will recommend in the end will go out for public comment and all these groups will then be able to, if you want, come back on the argument that the group moves forward for the recommendation it might make.

Sorry for having gone on so long.

Chris Dillon: Not at all. That's answered many of the questions I was asking earlier. And in fact we have rather more freedom of movement than I thought we might have

so that is - you know, that's extremely useful. And it also means that to some extent we can try things as we go through the table. And, you know, just find what might be the best way of indicating agreement.

And, you know, by working through it we can actually make some of these issues rather clearer I think. Now in fact we have already been through most of the comments during previous calls so that should mean that it shouldn't take all that long. Well, you know, not as long as it would do if we'd never seen this stuff before.

There is - there is an exception and the comments from (Thick P) who are not actually, you know, they're not members of SOs or ACs but, you know, those comments are there and so this is actually the first time we're looking at those.

But so that bit will be slower because, you know, as I say it's nothing we've ever formally looked at. But the rest of it I guess we can gradually chew our way through.

So I'll just pause for a moment and just make sure that people are - people on the call are happy. Oh, Lars, would you like to say something about this?

Lars Hoffman: Just a little addendum to what I - to my introduction. I forgot to mention that I'm just going to bring everybody to the same page. You can see here Comment 7 is slightly gray and not very easy to read.

The reason is because the group, as you remember, received this submission and it's not from an SO AC or an SG or constituency. So I put it in there and I highlighted it or low-lighted it as it were. And so, you know, you - it's in there and it's useful but it's slight somewhat different from the other (unintelligible) that's all.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, okay. Thank you very much. I, yeah, I think it's useful to have that there because it may well inform, you know, our discussions, you know, even if that's informally. Okay.

Now I'm just double checking that there's nothing else that we need to be doing. I mean, obviously we do have to, at some time, review those documents. I haven't forgotten about that but I'm just making sure that there's nothing else that's going to trip us up.

I think the only other thing that comes to mind is and, you know, we can do this under Any Other Business at the end so I just need to remember to mention just before we finish something about requesting meetings; I think that's the only thing outstanding - at the London meeting.

Okay well in that case let us go to the top of this and just see what kind of progress we make with looking at this document. (Unintelligible) in the right place. Oh here we go. Problems here.

Oh actually it's easier to (unintelligible). Okay so looking at Number 1 and so this is a comment from the Thai GAC representative. And so it's saying English is the de facto language for inter-cultural communication and international business transactions. And so clear that it is desirable to translate contact information or transliterate it. Okay. And so - and it says preferably in English.

Now the thing there is that obviously transliteration would just be into the - would be into some sort of Romanized transliteration; that's the way I read that. Now so what kind of a response would we - I mean, we could just add the comment that, you know, translation, you know, it'd probably be to the Latin alphabet.

I mean, it's - the other thing is that this is, you know, if we were to add another column then this is a vote for doing. That is that this is a vote for transformation (unintelligible) transliteration.

So I don't know even at a very simple - this - that would end up being yes, I mean, these are people who are saying, you know, they are voting for doing this and then we have a clarification which is that transliteration would be to the Latin alphabet.

I mean, okay. Recommended action, I don't think - I don't think there is one here. I mean, obviously all of them, at some stage, they will be, you know, they will be looking at this document and so it's important that, you know, that they're happy with the understanding that we have so there is a recommended action the whole time that what we have (unintelligible) of their (unintelligible) and also that we have actually understood what they're saying correctly. So, you know, that's a recommended action that goes with all of them. So have we understood would go under that perhaps.

And then we've got some sort of vote yes and then we've got a clarification which is the Latin alphabet. Okay sometimes the first part of these things is often the really difficult ones and really watching for - okay I can see in the chat Rudi is seeing no specific direct action. Yes, so basically it's a general one, have we understood correctly. But that's going to apply to absolutely everything.

Okay let's go to the next one if there are no other comments about that. And then we're talking about Number 2 which is registrants should be given the opportunity to submit data to the registrar in their own language when registering a domain name.

So this is - as far as I'm concerned this is the sort of foundation of all of this. So this, you know, transformation whether or not we transform depends on

the fact that there could be a system in the future which will be allowing data in all of those languages.

So, yes, I mean, that's - I mean, maybe it's worth clarifying that and so, you know, a future system will definitely have the data in the other scripts. And then the question is whether there will be transformation as well. Rudi, would you like to say something about that?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Chris. Rudi speaking. Well I think we have to be very careful with what EU is proposing and asking and in some sense requesting saying that it should be in their own language as we know that in the EU we have so many different languages a registrar that has a contract with ICANN can (unintelligible) one EU member state and so all other member states in that way they would be obliged to have, for each language a kind of profile or template to allow the registrant to register in their own language.

And that seems to me a step too far in the requirements. But it's just a personal perception and open for discussion of course.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Rudi. That is a - this is a very good point. So there is a question here, you know, whether it's - okay the way I understood it I was thinking more of a case something like a Greek, you know, some sort of Greek application. So, you know, that would end up, you know, having a Greek URL and, you know, the data, you know, the data on that domain name being in Greek language and Greek script.

But actually, you know, it would also mean that, you know, you could have German applications in German. Now the script is more or less the same, there are a few additional letters but basically it's the Latin alphabet. So, yes.

Okay yes so, you know, there are, you know, possibly different ways of reading that. That's what's coming out of that. Rudi, would you like to bring up something else on that?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Thank you, Chris. Well in addition to your sample don't forget that in Europe we have already several IDN TLDs that have been started up. It is not just the Latin script that we have to think about like Romanian, Ukrainian and the Russian language, the - they have an IDN which means that there is a need for translation if you want to translate what's in the data.

So it's a very difficult point I think to handle and to bring a response back to the EU. I would rather suggest that the EU gives us an indication on how they see a legal binding concept that they think about to propose to the registrar in order that the registrar is not going to be tackled by law enforcement because of translation or transformation of data. So my suggestion would be that we make a call to the EU and give us more details on how they see this implemented in each member state.

Because, as I said, one registrar can be located in Belgium for instance and serve the whole EU. If it's - if that to offer the possibility to register in every language of the EU member state that makes it really, really very complex. And it is actually not the case for the registrars accredited by ICANN. It is the case for agents and of resellers. So it's something (unintelligible) if we have a good indication with the registrars try to have a meeting face to face.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you. There was some problems with the audio but I could basically understand what you were saying. And I think effectively that ends up being quite a long recommended action and I've now got a version of that in my notes for that.

Okay now any other points about the European Commission entry there? Or shall we perhaps move on to ALAC which is Number 3?

Okay so this is a thing about translating to a single language privileges, the users of that language and the same with the script. So, you know, if you transliterate to a single script. So ideally the registration information would be

available in languages and scripts reflecting the global diversity of Internet users.

And again there are several ways of reading that. But I think it's not necessarily that you have to make all information available in every language. That's a slightly alarming reading of that one there. I don't think that's what it's saying.

And then - then there is talk of the current Whois implementation. So, you know, there is this whole issue about what, you know, what do these, you know, what do these things apply to. Is it the existing Whois system or is it a future Whois system? Existing system or future.

That - and - quite a long entry. So the future system is where (unintelligible). And then there's this thing about verified contact information must be accessible via that database or the Whois database. And then there's the thing about consumer trust so, you know, without that it really undermines consumer trust so that's the sort of benefit effectively.

And then oh yes so this is quite interesting because it's then looking at how you might get the current Whois system to deal with this situation to answer - so this would - and it lists various options, I think it's three options or something like that.

So using scripts that are representable within the constraints of the current Whois, that's a very strange subset isn't it? I don't know how viable that would be as an option. So ASCII based Who Is record pointing to a non-ASCII based record - that's the sort of temporary solution that ends of being a long term solution. So that doesn't seem a very desirable way to go in my opinion.

And then - what is it - maintained by the registry, okay. And - oh yes - then it sort of - it's going into this area of probably the transformation would involve both translations and transliteration.

And this is stuff that we've spoken about many times before. So it's the proper names or nouns would tend to be transliterated. You know because if you translate them you get very strange things happening.

Okay. And that's roughly what this thing is proposing. So I think our response is basically - I think we're agreeing with most of this. But the, you know, this idea of the script that our representable within the constraints of the current Who Is is rather a strange subset. So I don't know how feasible that would be as an approach.

I mean I suppose - I'm not sure which scripts the current Who Is actually does support. I guess it's probably Latin with all sorts of diacritics. There may be some of the other alphabetic ones. But yes, I think that could be quite an odd solution when looked at from an international perspective.

And then this idea that you point from the ASCII based Who Is into another system which is - or systems. So I think we might need to highlight that. You know again, that would be very messy - so yes.

And then recommended actions on this one - I mean effectively I suppose what comes out of it is that we need a new system which will support all of these scripts as soon as possible. Because if we don't have one then we're in a very difficult situation with trying to get an ASCII based system to do the work, or we're linking from the ASCII based system out somewhere else.

Okay, I see that Rudi is typing something. Any other points to be made about that in the record? Oh, Rudi is saying missing parameter - would it be a task of the registry only or also registrars? Right. So yes, okay - registry only or registrars? So that goes under our response.

Okay. Oh yes, Rudi, would you like to say something about that?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Chris. I try to save my voice as much as possible. Additional comment to what I was first in the Chat issue is about if it's a registrar's responsibility also, it means that the registrar will have to produce software and templates and solutions. While if it's the registry, it should be included in the EPP procedures. So it - there are two ways of approaching it.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Okay. So when we put a response about this in that column, then we need to perhaps put something in brackets. So, you know, after registry we'll, you know, put EPP, etc. on the registrar's templates. It will just be more specific about that.

Okay. Unless there are other comments about that, perhaps we should move on to number four which is the IPC. So let's have a look at this. So local Who Is information should be registered in respect of each language script related by country address of each holder.

Yes. This is also desirable and legislated from late contact information to a single common language in order to keep Who Is information easily searchable and readable for all global Internet users.

This is basically a vote for doing this. So...

Man: Correct.

Chris Dillon: ...this is a vote for transformation. Actually on that front we probably should just consider, you know, the extent to which the ALAC contribution is, you know, which we were just looking at. We probably need to consider, you know, to what extent that is agreeing with, you know, the desirability of transformation.

I think my understanding of what they're saying is that they are saying it is desirable. But, you know, they are then looking at specific areas which - or technical things - which make actually doing it difficult. But I, you know,

certainly I think this - I think overall it's again - it's a yes although it's quite a complicated one.

Okay. So that brings us back to the IPC and whether we want to - I think our response is - nothing we really need to pick up there. And for me it's just overwhelmingly a yes vote. That's what's coming through this.

Rudi is just typing as he will allow comments for the document after this call. Yes, I've got some comments as well.

Now perhaps onto number five which is from the People's Republic GAC representative. And it's saying it would be appropriate that the registration information is in Chinese script which is the basic requirement in the area of China which is - I think that's fairly similar to the European Commission's thing, number two.

But I guess it may have similar - perhaps some of the things we were suggesting for number two may also apply here. This is the legal aspect of that as well that Rudi was talking about.

So on the, you know, agreement front, I mean I almost feel like writing non-applicable here because they're, you know, they're talking about Chinese script being the basic requirement, but then actually not talking about transformation. So, you know, for me this isn't a vote for or against.

Peter, would you like to say something?

Peter Dernbach: I just wanted to state that when I read this - and also from European Commission - I see no contradiction. I mean it's - I think we all agree that the basic information is the local one. And then it's the question whether there should also be a general global translation - transliteration part of it.

So I mean this is just - I read this as just a general note that would be I presume exactly the same from each country, at least each country with some kind of specific national letters.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. I was under the impression that there had to - that we had received some input at some time that was talking about validating or verifying using translated or transliterated information. But for some reason I didn't spot that input when I was combing through this document. It may just be that my memory is faulty or I've read about it in some other document.

But yes, it's true. Here, looking at the input we have, everybody seems to be saying that it's the original language which is the main form. So in the Chinese case presumably that would mean that the form in Chinese characters is the basic form.

I think certainly most people hold that opinion. But I have a - I feel I have run across people who, you know, who did think that somehow it might be possible to validate or verify using transformed information. But I don't think that comes up here - makes our life slightly easier.

Okay. So moving on, so then we have the NCSG standpoint. And this is basically saying that there's no justifiable reason to create a policy requiring transformation. So it's suitable to internationalize the data elements, you know, I suppose along the lines that we've just been discussing.

And so talking about using native languages and scripts for registration - data purposes - and this should be available to registrants and should not affect validation requirements as stipulated in the 2013 RAA - so no basis for any assumptions that those registrants will benefit from transformation.

And then the people who would benefit are the intellectual property rights holders and law enforcement agencies. So the point about the RAA is a very good point because, you know, obviously, you know, there wouldn't be a

possibility of any policy going against that, you know, against what's in the RAA. I mean it couldn't be retrospective.

But probably the most important thing about this record is that this is a vote really no. So we've had a couple of yes votes. We've had a vote that we couldn't really tell which way it was going. But this one is definitely a no. So this is undesirable.

Okay. And now we just need to have a thing, so what's our response to that? I think - what do we actually need to make a comment on it? I think it's very clear. I mean some of these you just really need to have a summary I think because sometimes they're a little bit long.

But, you know, the opinion is very clear. Recommended action - whether anything comes out of that - again it's very clear. I can't think of a recommended action for this one.

Okay, so any - now any other comments before we move further down the document?

Okay, seeing none we'll continue on to Page 4. And oh yes, now we are in totally new content from (unintelligible) which we haven't officially seen. Who is information should be globally available from a legal point of view. It's important that we address in further context so information can be recorded and readable, both in each local language of the whole there, as well as translated or transliterated to a single common language that can be easily readable - each local language of the whole.

When one first sees that, one thinks oh goodness, you might have a country like India with 21 official languages. But I don't - no, it's not saying that this has to be available in all 21. It's just in the relevant local one. So again - so basically this would be a vote for, but because they're not in our

(unintelligible), then they - actually if they did have a vote, then it would be a yes vote but they don't.

Okay. I can see Rudi is typing something there. Official local language - so we might, yes, we might just put a clarification there and there and say it's the official local language. That would be a good thing to do - don't think there's an action there.

A couple of people typing in the Chat, so I'll just wait for them rather than plunging into the next record or the next question - in fact question two. I think people are agreeing basically.

Okay. So then there is this whole thing about benefits to the community. Okay. And so we have - the first one again is the Thai GAC representative. And so it's talking about the English contact information being inconsistent at the moment.

Then it's talking about particular standards that could be used for immunization, for example the Royal Institute or the Geographical Name Committee or UNGEGM. But also if used with standards not being widely known or adopted, so each government entity could be using different methods. So these are things we have spoken about many times (unintelligible). Our response here is very much just agree (unintelligible).

From the state of current conditions, if contact information needs validation - okay. Right. So there's a thing here where it's saying we have no objection with the approach from the working group. But this issue is tightly related to the role of government.

But I don't think that that's actually something that this group has decided. So that - I think there's a bit of a misunderstanding going on here possibly. You know I suppose it could have a connection to the role of government, but not

necessarily. And they are suggesting a single registry system - the contact in English. And that this would be the most economic solution.

So I mean certainly the idea that transformation was happening in one place, you now, that may well be the most economic way of doing it. But I think we can summarize this point of view without necessarily backing it I think.

Now one thing that is sure is that this is a vote for, you know, that there are benefits. So I would take that as a sort of yes vote - there are benefits. These are what the benefits are effectively.

Okay. Any comments? Any comments about that?

So then that brings us down to the next one which is number nine. And this is probably the last one we can do. And this is the European Commission. And so here they're talking about a homogenous Who Is or IRD resource is a benefit of - oh yes, it's just the homogeneity of such a system.

Using the common language facilitates registration when registrants do not share a common language. And it makes things easier for communities like law enforcement to have this common language.

Validation will be more cumbersome provided there is no translation or transliteration. Earlier on when I was saying that I thought I'd seen opinions which were, you know, were talking about validating transformed information, I think this is getting quite close to that.

So it's saying validation will be more cumbersome if there is no transformation. But I think a lot of the time validation really does need to validate data in the original script in the original language. So that might be a response that we want to have to that.

So that would be the response. And then the question is recommended action. We don't need - we do need to say something about that - about validation in the original language. And yes, the other thing is that this is a vote for - it's a vote for benefits of doing this.

Okay. As I said before, we're starting to run out of time. So I think this should be the last one we do this week. I'm sorry it's been so slow. But I think we really have to figure out how best to do this. And I think we probably have done that.

I'll just wait for any comments on - I can see Rudi is typing something. Okay. And so before we finish we need to just talk briefly about face to face meetings in London. So the suggestion is that it would be registrars, ALAC and any others.

I don't know off the top of my head whether any of those are arranged. I don't know. Lars, do you - ALAC will be difficult. But, you know, I mean it's quite easy for us to attend ALAC meetings.

Rudi is typing. Lars, do we actually already have any meetings along here - any of these face to face meetings in London already arranged I think is the question. I know we - I met the registrars last time in Singapore.

Lars Hoffman: Chris, if I may.

Chris Dillon: This is Lars, yes.

Lars Hoffman: So several points. First of all for the face to face meeting of this group, I've put in a request for the group to meet on Wednesday at 10:30 until midday. So that's an hour and a half at a fairly good time considering we are a working group. And this has not been confirmed yet. But the request is in and it's certainly hopeful. There is obviously going to be some overlap of our

meetings, but, you know, that cannot be avoided. So I will keep you posted on that development.

Julie will not be able - just as an FYI - Julie will not be able to take part as she's very busy with (unintelligible) the entire week. And so the only time she could have done would have been 7:15 on Monday morning before the opening sessions.

And while I don't mind meeting at that time and maybe working group members might not either, it's not a great time to attract outside members. So we decided that she will do her best to take part remotely or pop in briefly. But otherwise we will have to cope by ourselves.

And as for meeting other groups, there's obviously going to be an uptake - this traditional thing on the weekend to the GNSO working session on Sunday which is attended by the Council and by other interested people. It's an open session. So that will be probably between 20 and 30 minutes floor time.

And then I would recommend because we have no initial report ready for this meeting, I would counsel against scheduling formal meetings with the various other groups, and rather doing that when we actually have the report ready and can get a detailed feedback.

I think the groups will have provided us with what they think from the outset. I think it would be a very good idea what Chris just mentioned that you can join other groups - just looking at the time, I'm sorry, I'll finish up - that you can meet with other groups there on a personal basis. But I think a formal meeting at this point would probably be not the most effective way. And it will be difficult, especially with ALAC and with the registrars too at this sort of a meeting. I'm sorry for taking so much time. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: No, that's no problem. It makes it sense. That makes it clear.

Okay. Thank you very much for that.

Just to repeat, I think next week it's unlikely I can make it because I'm in India. I will try but I don't know what the connectivity will be like. So yes - so basically if we just contribute things to the document from today and continue (unintelligible) Rudi is just typing in the Chat that he'll be showing the next meeting.

Okay. Thank you very much for all of that support today. It's, you know, there is of course the review work on top of this. But it was great to have the meeting today, although not all that many people attending. But it was great to make the progress and, you know, really to start to make the best of this document. It would have been a real shame if it had been put off.

So yes again, many thanks for today. And I'll probably see you in two weeks' time unless I can manage to connect next week.

Good bye then.

Man: Thanks Chris. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Coordinator: Thank you. That does conclude today's meeting. You may disconnect all remaining audio lines.

(Marcella), you can stop the recording.

(Marcella): thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you.

END