

## **Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION**

### **Thursday 22 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 22 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-20140522-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recording has been started. You may now begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Noe). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody, and welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group call on the 22nd of May 2014.

On the call today we have Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Chris Dillon, Petter Rindforth, Rudi Vansnick, Jennifer Chung and (unintelligible). We have apologies from Jim Galvin and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen and Peter Dernbach.

And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman 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, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. Before we start I will just repeat what we were saying before the call started and that was that we are aware that we've only got about half of the group on the call. As we are keen to make progress because we've, you know, we've got quite a lot of documents - I think it's about four documents to work through.

But because there aren't very many of us on the call the idea is that we will keep a list of any decision which needs to be made because we don't really feel we can make decisions without a greater percentage of the group being present so that's what we were saying just before the call started.

We are also aware that we are waiting for other responses so I think Wolf Knoben indicated that there is at least one response to the, you know, the tool that we are looking at - we're waiting for that.

So anything we do today the idea is just that we build up our knowledge about the various responses; we beef up the, you know, we beef up the document but we're not making any sort of - we can't really make decisions, what we can do is just take a list of the decisions.

Okay any comments about that before I proceed? Okay seeing none let us move into Agenda Point 3 which is the usual thing about statements of interest. We have to ask whether there have been any changes in SOIs since the last call. Okay seeing no hands that means we can move forward.

Agenda Point 4 we're then looking at the responses from SOs and ACs. And I guess effectively the tool that's on the screen falls into that. Okay so two weeks ago we had got as far as Record 9. I refer to the lines in this document as records so we got as far as Record 9. So I'm intending to start at Record 10.

And okay so I've circulated my own responses to the various records but obviously I would like to go through and ask for each record whether anybody has anything to add or whether we can just move forward with it. Okay so let's just get to Number 10 on our screens and then pick up their.

Now I have added - you might notice that having done - having got the experience of a few more records I've added this note field so sometimes - the note really is just aimed at us, that's all it is.

So, you know, it may be that there's something about this record that needs clarifying or it's really something like that. But we haven't done that for the first nine records so conceivably we may need to go back and add notes. But

anyway I think the thing to do is go to Record 46 and then just see what happens.

So anyway if we come to Record 10 we've got the - and we are just continuing with answering The question and we better make sure we know what question we're answering. It's actually Question 2, Issue 2. What exactly the benefits to the community are of transforming contact information especially in light of the cost, that's really what we're talking about.

And so we have here - I'm saying that the policy applies - the working group policy applies to the current Whois if implementable and to replacement systems. So that's the first major comment I made there.

And that's - is actually - it's actually - that's rather new so I'm almost wondering whether anything in this responses thing really needs okaying by the group because I think until now we've said that the policy actually applies to the current Whois system and to future systems.

But almost by its nature anything in another script or in most other scripts cannot be put in the present Whois system. So the only thing you could do would be to link out of it into some other system. And of course at that stage it all becomes very complicated and, you know, really probably not a structure that we would really want to recommend. But this particular response is really highlighting that.

And then - and it's actually new so that might be - that might be something we do want to highlight when there are more of us. So just take a note of that applies to future definitely but, you know, to what extent it applies to current systems could be debatable really. I mean, it would be easier to say it only applies to future systems; just come off the fence there.

And then so that's one thing. And then the other one is - I think is not controversial. We've already spoken about, you know, there is no intention to

disobey the 2013 RAA. That is a piece of legislation, you know, there's no way that we could take any decision that breaks that - that's something that we've discussed before.

So we regard Record 10 as being in agreement so that's why there's a yes there. And then we've got the - with the question. And there's just a bit of explanation. Oh yeah and I have actually picked up this thing about current or future systems in the note as well. Okay.

Oh yes, before we - you know, before I ask you for your opinions on this I will just end by saying that I think in some ways the system we are using here to indicate agreement is quite primitive. I'm rather concerned about it. You know, I wonder whether there may be a better system. I mean, using just yes - I think what we're actually doing is yes, no or non applicable. It's very, very primitive system.

So, I mean, I don't know whether anybody more, you know, experienced with other working groups whether other working groups have used a more sophisticated system for indicating agreement. And I don't know, Julie or Lars or Rudi, whether there - I mean, the system we are using is very primitive. I really wonder whether there is a better system.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Chris, I don't know that there is a documented system for reviewing the input that working groups receive. I'm sure, actually, that there isn't a system that's documented in the Working Group Guidelines.

I don't have any experience with any other systems. I don't know, Lars, if you have noted any other approaches in any of the working groups you've supported?

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, Julie, this is Lars. No, I think it's - although it might be basic I think it's the way forward. In the other couple of working groups that I've been

doing this with, you know, the group will discuss the various issues or the points raised and then they record the reaction.

And essentially the chair then (unintelligible) when it comes to the eventual recommendations the discussion proceeds and the chair will make a sort of call if it's contested issue what kind of consensus it is. There's obviously categorizations for that and then opening up for any minority statements of people who disagree with what the consensus is or the, you know, the consensus level obviously doesn't have to be full consensus every time on each of the charter questions.

But I think the way that the group is proceeding on here or the way that Chris has laid it out I think is, at least for the time being, for sure the best possible option. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that, Lars. That makes me feel a little bit better. Certainly the next stage, so in the charter there is information about what to do at the next stage so I guess once we get to Record 46 in this and we've waited for the additional responses which we know are coming, at that stage we can go to the charter and we can summarize, you know, where there's agreement or disagreement.

And then there is quite detail - there are quite detailed rules in the charter so we can use that stuff. I suppose part of this is just being sure that what we are now collecting is enough to fulfill the various criteria in the charter. Okay so (unintelligible) that and have another look at the charter at the end of this.

Okay so in that case are we happy with these, you know, the way that this record has been filled in? Are we okay to move to the next record or would somebody like to add something or disagree with something? Okay Rudi is saying he agrees.

I think we may do well to continue to - thank you, one or two hands going up. I think we'd do well to continue to Record 11. Okay and this is IPC. And what I'm saying here is that fundamentally this is a list of benefits and therefore it gets a yes. It's in agreement and, you know, we could have a - we could have a look perhaps at the various benefits. But that's fundamentally in agreement. Avoiding domain dispute cases, that sort of thing.

Oh, and then Rudi is actually saying something in the chat which I have missed. It said, "Be good just to proceed with the comments which will be in the document for review for the next call."

Yes, that might be, you know, that might be another way of doing this. So, Rudi, would you like to say something about that?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, Chris. Rudi for the transcript. Well last time also we had the problem of not having a quorum. We have at least a few people more now today.

I would suggest that you have been doing great work in commenting on the earlier points already. I would suggest that you go through each point and bring up your comments and that will be then edited in the document itself.

And maybe to make it easier for others to participate in modification of the wording of the responses we could eventually use Google docs where you have a track who has modified what or which comment has been added in order to have a review possible at next meeting. But that's just a proposal.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Now the system we currently have is using the wiki. And I actually have direct access to the wiki so I could go into the wiki and change one thing or another. But I - my own instinct is actually to continue with the existing system which is that we use the mailing list for comments and then staff update the - update this main document which is stored in the wiki.

Julie, I wonder if you have any feelings about this? Is that the - is that the best way to do it or would Google docs encourage people to be more active perhaps?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. First of all staff doesn't have access to Google docs, that's not a document exchange or sharing system that ICANN currently uses to support working groups. We do use the wikis for collaboration. And the wikis do have the option of people adding to them and people can set, you know, their notifications so they know when things have been added and who has added them.

And also of course we can do as we've been doing which is to have comments go to the list and in some cases that's easier for some people; some people don't feel comfortable using the wiki for various reasons. And, you know, then staff can take the comments as I have done in this case and add them to the document.

If we do want to indicate, you know, who has added that - I did not do that in this case because all of the comments in the document right now are from you, Chris, but if we have comments that come in that we want to label as being from, you know, various people we certainly can do that in any number of ways. We can, you know, indicate that as, you know, in the document as things are added.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Yes. Thank you. I think as soon as we get comments from other people we may need to put initials or something like that in there. And, you know, the other thing here is that we're actually using the PDF format rather than the wiki anyway. So although the PDF document is in the wiki it's not possible to edit PDFs directly.

So I think probably - I'm certainly happy to continue using the present - the current system. I think that's - I think that works quite well because at least

when somebody does add something everybody knows because an email goes out so that - I think that system is - I think that system is robust.

Okay now let us anyway return to the document. And just see how much more progress we can make with this. So if we're back roughly to Record 12, now this is quite different so this is a simple no. So this is disagreement with this question.

Oh yes, I did put the comments that although it's a no and it's a clear no, it does actually recognize certain benefits for certain stakeholders, you know, usually IP rights or law enforcement.

Okay if anybody has comments just interrupt me, no problem at all.

Then we have - oh yes, Petter, would you like to...

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Petter Rindforth here. Well just I think that shocked me when I read this, I mean, from IPC point of view you are perfectly right that we - we're looking on a benefit when it comes to disputes and so recognition the right address for the holders.

But, I mean, it's not just the IP holders and their attorneys. One thing that came on my mind here is also the dispute resolution organizations like NAF and WIPO. How will they do when they check out that the contact information is correct be in the dispute for instance? I think that must be benefits also from that point of view to have both versions to check on.

Chris Dillon: Yes, I mean, I think all we can do is - I think all we can do is wait for - I mean, I think that sort of opinion is going to have to come in as a written opinion. I don't think that's really something we can add as I understand it. I mean, it may well be that that does come in as an opinion that I - but, you know, it's interesting because at first this does look like just a plain no.

But actually, you know, this is a, you know, this really goes back to what I was saying earlier about the system because at the moment we've got yes, no and non applicable. So, you know, if we end up in a situation where it's basically no - you know, in certain situations then we really do need a better system than this.

Yeah, Petter, would you like to add something?

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, well I was not just thinking about this apply - it come to my mind that it might be good to also give a quick question as to dispute resolution organizations to see if they have any points of views on this when they collect and check out the contact information is correct.

Because they got the information from the trademark holders that start disputes and then they have to check it out with the organizations that registrars themselves. It could be interesting to see if they have any practical point of view on this aspect in general. That's what I thought of.

Chris Dillon: Okay so thank you very much for that. Lars, would you like to say something about that?

Lars Hoffman: Yes just a quick note on that. I'd be very happy on the working group - the other working group that I'm working on we have someone from NAF who's on that who I could reach out to. I'm wondering though whether they may indeed feel that it's just (unintelligible) whether they mainly deal with registrars rather than individual registrants and they leave it up to the registrars to do the contact with the registrants.

So I'm not sure whether they actually deal with the Whois data to contact individuals. But I'll send Kristine Dorrain an email and ask her about this and I'll report back to the group if that's okay.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, that - it'd be good to have that as an action in this meeting. Thank you. Okay, so let us come back to - we're just about to have a look at Record 13 which is the GAC representatives of the People's Republic of China.

And okay so this is - I view it as a no because there are several occasions where in the document where GAC is saying, you know, for Chinese purposes really everything can be done in the Chinese language, it isn't necessary to transform. That's how I read this.

And it comes up a couple of times in here. This isn't the only occasion it - that answer comes up as the answer further down a couple of times. Okay. Any comments on that or shall we move on?

Okay now then the last one is (Thick P) which they are not stakeholders and that is why there is no yes, no or anything like that because they, you know, they cannot, you know, they cannot say yes or no here so all we're doing is just noting what they're saying that they're not, you know, it doesn't actually affect agreement.

And, you know, they're basically, as you can see in my note, they're basically saying that, you know, it is their opinion that Whois will fail without transformation.

Okay thank you for that. Unless there's a comment let us move into Issue Number 3. And this is - should - well should transformation be mandatory for all gTLDs? Okay. And we kick off with Record 15 which is the Thai GAC.

And they are basically saying yes. So - oh yes, there's a slight linguistic thing here so it's saying - saying something about - now what is this, let me try and - oh yes. So the transformation of local language to common language should be established in each country. I reckon that's implemented in each country.

Yes, I mean, some verb like - probably like done or implemented, something like that. But I think that's just about the - I think apart from that one word it's pretty clear as a response. Any comments about that record?

Okay, well we can move into Record Number 16 which is from ALAC. And this is a yes so they're saying should be mandatory for gTLDs that allow registration of domains.

So there is a clause there which is saying that obviously it's only for non-ASCII ones but I think basically I've taken that very much to mean a yes. I mean, there's, you know, it isn't possible to transform English into English, that's what that's about.

Okay and then unless there are any comments about that we can go into Record Number 17 and this is IPC. Yes, and again that's basically a yes. And just - there is a comment in there saying that clarification is likely to be more necessary in future in replacement systems in the future but it is basically a yes.

Okay so there aren't any comments about that. We can move into Record 18. And this is the NCSG and then this - as we would expect from their previous comment it's a no.

Moving into Record 19, this again is the People's Republic GAC rep. Again this is a no and it's fairly similar to the earlier Chinese GAC response. You know, they're just basically saying, you know, for Chinese domain names, Chinese scripts. Information in Chinese is all that's required.

(Thick P) are saying - well would say yes but we - but under this system we can't record that.

Okay and that takes us now to Issue 4, should transformation be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries or using specific non-ASCII scripts?

And then we're into Record 21. And we've got the Thai GAC representative saying that, you know, it's not, you know, there's no point in arguing this for those cases based in non-ASCII script countries. So effectively it means that they have the priority. It's really an issue for them.

So it's - really this is only an issue in non-ASCII countries, that's what this is saying. And so I've marked it as non applicable. Just make sure that's correct. I'm almost wondering if that should actually be a yes because what they're saying is that it only applies to the non-ASCII ones.

But I think maybe non applicable there may be that's me being too logical. I think actually the spirit of this is more a yes. What do other people think about there? Would anybody would like to argue yes or non applicable for that? Petter, would you like to say something?

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, two things. First of all it's different to note I guess for no because the question is two points to choose between. But one thing that I wonder about when I - especially when I see the GAC representative is from China and it may also be the Thai representative.

Are they specifically discussing this from their respective country and respective language point of view or in a general point of view? Because, I mean, when it comes to the organizations they're spoken from a more general point of view. It could be interesting in order to see what - how they look at each issue in a more broader way.

Chris Dillon: Yes. I - looking at the way these responses are written, for example, the Chinese response they are saying in our case dealing with Chinese this is what, you know, we are - I would say they are basing their answer on their

own case because they are saying, you know, for example if you look at Record 19 it would be appropriate that the registration info in Chinese script is the basic requirement in the area of China. They're not talking generally.

But I take your point because you end up actually using the agreement system meaning different things. So they are saying no because they are talking about Chinese but they, you know, conceivably that's not, you know, the no means something different from, you know, perhaps somebody else who is just talking about all languages.

So I think that may be something which needs to go in our summary. So, you know, whether they are talking generally or just - or I think very often they are talking about, you know, their own languages. And we have to be very careful that we do not interpret that as being a general thing. So when we write up we need to stress that it is just, you know, they are saying that for their own languages so that could affect things later.

Coming back to this particular one I think in Record 21 we should go for yes rather than not applicable. I think that's more - I think that's more accurate. And Rudi is agreeing to that.

It's quite difficult to do these comments. You know, I found myself - I found as I was doing these comments that, you know, you get rather hypnotized so - or, you know, it is quite good to go through these records again because once you've done 20 of them you're no longer as fresh as you were when you did the first one, that's really what it comes to. Thank you, Julie is just agreeing to make that change.

And on into Record 22 which is the - wait a minute, ALAC, okay. And I think the interesting thing is they are saying no but they raise this interesting thing about the possibility of automated transformation. So, you know, so theoretically this is something that might change over time.

And, you know, as my own background is in linguistics I have to admit that I tend to be quite skeptical about automated transformation. But that said, you know, I've watched things like Google Translate for example, going from a situation where it was a joke, and it is still a joke in some languages, for example Yiddish, to being something that, you know, is actually, you know, can be quite useful; it can save time.

But, you know, it is an interesting point. So what is not very useful now will probably become more useful in the future whether it is useful enough to be relied upon time will tell.

Okay so just have a last look at this before we okay it. Okay, any other comments about Record 22 or shall we continue? Okay.

I will warn you that a thunderstorm has just started in London so if suddenly I get cut off that is why.

Okay so down and the next one is IPC. Should be mandatory for all. Glorious. Simple. A yes. And we move into Record 24.

And this is the People's Republic GAC representative. It would be appropriate that the registration information is in Chinese script is a basic requirement. And this is another case so this is - they're talking about Chinese so that means it's a no in that sense quite similar to some of the other answers.

And then we're into Record 25, NCSG. And as we would expect it's a no because of reasons already stated. Should not be mandatory for any registrant in any country so it's quite - I think it's quite clear.

Okay. And then we have (Thick P) right at the end. And now what are they saying? Transformation should be mandatory for all registrants. Okay. And that's just making this thing but, you know, this could solve some issues even

with the present Whois system. I mean, I guess that may be talking about European languages, that they're basically using ASCII with a few diacritics.

Lars, would you like to say something?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. This is Lars for the record. Just a quick note on the Chinese, I've been thinking about this. I know that they're obviously referring here to the Chinese registrants that they should be allowed to enter it in Chinese.

But I'm wondering whether that, you know, although it's just relating to China but the generality of this working group means that by implication they probably mean that this should be true for any person in their own script, no?

Chris Dillon: Oh yes. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: Just for the record.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, yes I think that is true. The thing, you know, the thing in brackets here is that presumably if they are saying that Chinese should be dealt with in Chinese I'm sure that they mean that Thai should be dealt with in Thai.

And actually that part, that goes some way to answer the issue we had before because we were worried that the usage of yes and no was actually different here. But as we think about it actually it - although they are only talking about Chinese it is possible to generalize it. And I'm sure it does mean that, you know, that Chinese should - for Chinese only Chinese language should be used; for Thai only Thai should be used.

So, yes, I think it is possible to generalize it, which actually goes some way to allaying our concerns about whether the language was being used in the same way. So I think it's correct. The whole time we have to be extremely careful that we are using words with the same meanings the whole time. So that's why when something like this comes up I get rather worried and I think oh maybe they are using it differently.

But if we think it through logically actually I think it would be quite correct to say that, you know, if they are talking about Chinese language in China they are also talking about Hindi in India and Thai and Thailand and other cases. Thank you.

Okay and that - okay so we've then finished Issue 4 and we go into Issue 5 which I think we dare risk because we're starting to run out of time. But with a good wind we may be able to get to the end of this.

Issue 5, what impact will transformation have on validation as set out under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement? And so here - oh yeah, okay so here our agreement system breaks down because, you know, yes, no, non applicable is no longer appropriate here. And so we're having to have full text answers.

And here we've got this thing - so the Thais are recommending a single point of registration. And if you look at it more closely they're saying that is the cheapest way of doing this.

Checking - I thought they were also recommending that the government do it. I think they are but I don't think we actually say that here. Okay so that is their situation. That is what they are recommending. I think Pitinan may well be just about to add something on this in the chat room. Typing.

Incidentally, as we are speaking the storm is getting noticeably worse. Okay.

Oh yes, yes, so basically, yeah, Pitinan has made that totally clear so what she's saying is it should be a single point of transformation and validation for each country; she is not specifying that that should be a government. Okay so I think we probably don't need to edit this response. Thank you for that.

Yes, okay. And then that puts us into Record 28 which is NCSG. And they're saying validation should be carried out in the original language. As a linguistic I feel very relieved when people say that. You know, there is something, I don't know, authentic, more important as a linguistic now as an ex-librarian I feel quite relieved when people say things like that, you know, the respect of the - of forms in the original language that's how libraries work.

You know, certainly if you compare a translation with the text in the original language if we read in the Tale of Genji we definitely want to do it in Japanese, not in English because so much is lost.

But that said, I think if Yoav or, you know, if we had other colleagues on the call they may be saying yes that's all very well but what if it is a situation where the people concerned do not have - you know, are not able to function in that language then suddenly they can't validate. So actually it isn't - it isn't completely straightforward.

But anyway here, you know, this opinion is quite clear, validation should be carried out in the original language. It'd be interesting to see whether we get additional opinions on this.

Okay now would we like to say anything more or shall we move into Record Number 29? Okay. Record 29 is - very loud thunder here - Record 29 so this is basically IPC saying unless it's a global system the system itself will be threatened. There's a really substantial opinion. Yes. And, you know, just I think quite clear.

Do we want to add anything to that or shall we perhaps move on? Record 30 is (Thick P) and obviously they get nothing in the last column but they are saying yeah, necessary to keep Whois validation workable on a national basis which is very similar to what we've just been saying.

Okay and that then brings us to the end of Issue 5. I'm glad we got there. I'm not intending to go into Issue 6 until next week. And what we do need to have a look at briefly is if we pop over to the work plan.

And it might be worth just spending a few minutes talking about what, you know, what we do once we've completed this. I think the impression I have is that we need to wait for a few more responses to this, a few more comments on the list. And then the whole thing needs to be summarized with a view of the various stipulations in the charter.

I don't know whether anybody would like to add to that whether we - and thank you very much, by the way, for the various things being said in the chat room, that's very kind of you.

So it would be very good - I mean, perhaps we just need to set a deadline of the London meeting now and say that we will have, you know, that we will draw a line under it. Perhaps we need to say that we will have received all the responses; we will have this totally up to date and summarized by the London meeting.

Is that - would that be a good - oh yes, Rudi is suggesting a deadline of the 29th of May. Lovely, yes. Let us say deadline for responses the 29th of May. Yes, and Pitinan is agreeing with that. Good.

Now how - and we now just need to make sure that everybody is aware of that. Is it just good enough to put that on our list or do we need to publicize that rather more? Julie? Lars, do you have any opinions on that?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I don't have any opinions. I think there are just a couple of groups we're awaiting. A reminder to them wouldn't hurt. I saw Wolf-Ulrich Knoben said that they were preparing comments and I think he was anticipating forwarding them soon.

I have not heard whether or not there's been any response from Michele - maybe for the registrars - maybe Lars has information on that?

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Lars, if you've got something on that please...

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, Chris. This is Lars. Yes, I contacted Michele I think two weeks ago now. And he said they're still sitting with the committee so I suspect they're working on it.

Chris Dillon: Right.

Lars Hoffman: But what I would also suggest - and I think that should come from the chairs if you agree, is maybe also reach out to the registrars that are members of this group and just encourage them to be more active on the call and if not at least on the list so the discussion doesn't run away from them and they have to catch up and we have to catch up and, you know, it might lead to complications towards the end of the group. So I think it would be good to encourage a more consistent participation as it were.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Well I think perhaps we can have a brief email conversation about how exactly it's best to do that. But I think certainly the reality of it is that we want it all, you know, it would be wonderful if we could get all of this done by the beginning of the London meeting. And so I think certainly we need to promote that deadline of the 29th of May, you know, just make sure that people know about that. And, you know, certainly with the aim of getting it done by London.

And there are a few things going on in the chat room so I'll just - and it's just Rudi saying that he's been in contact with Michele. Yes, so, yeah, I think

that's the line we hold that we, you know, that we say to Wolfgang, Michele, registrars, that we would really appreciate it if, you know, that 29th could be the deadline. And also Julie is saying that we need to give an update to the GNSO Council which is fine.

Okay well I think we're more or less at the top of the hour but unless there's any item of any other business I think we can perhaps round off here. And it was good to make - it was good to make some progress with the document today. It was looking slightly daunting but we're now 2/3 of the way through which is good. And we've also set some deadlines for the London meeting so that I think is also solid.

Lars Hoffman: Chris, this is Lars. Can I just add something very quickly?

Chris Dillon: By all means, yes.

Lars Hoffman: Next Thursday is a public holiday in most of continental Europe, it's Jesus Goes to Heaven day, the unofficial name. And so I'm wondering what the situation is in other countries and whether we should continue with the call or not. Obviously in the UK I know there's no public holiday; you have the Monday after. But - in the US neither. But I'm just putting it out there that...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Thank you...

Lars Hoffman: ...on holiday and I think Petter possibly as well.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. So there is - Rudi is asking whether we would be able to move it to Friday to avoid that.

Lars Hoffman: I mean, to be frank, I'm sure people will take a (bridge) day. I'm perfectly happy with either. That's not a personal thing but along of people will take a

(bridge) day and also I have bad experiences in moving a group just for one meeting...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yeah. Yes. Right, that's my instinct as well. I think possibly - I think we should probably get a reputation for meeting always at the same time, that's what I feel. So, I mean, like today I would really like to run it if we possibly can if we could get to Number 46 or even into the documents which wait for us after this one there are three other documents. Then I would like to do that.

And I think probably what we need to do - I think what we need to do is monitor it and if we have a lot of people saying on the list during the week that they can't make it then we should cancel it. But if it's not too bad and we have numbers like today I would really like to see the end of this document.

So that's that I'm intending to do but we can just see how it goes over the week. Just waiting for a few comments in the chat. Yes, I think there's - I think people are - yes, people are agreeing. Good. Okay.

Well, in that case we'll, you know, we'll be in contact over the week as that one develops and, you know, perhaps we get a few responses and we forward information about the deadline of the 29th of May. But anyway I would like to thank all of you for a good meeting. And I hope to have another one same time next week.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you very much, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Not at all.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Good-bye then.

END