

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 29 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 29 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-20140529-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Petter Rindforth – IPC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Ephraim Percy Kenyanito – NCUC
Zhang Zuan (Peter Green) – NCUC
Peter Dernbach – IPC
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Justine Chew - Individual

Apologies:

Rudi Vansnick – NPOC

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Amy Bivins
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: ...recording has been started.

(Terry Agnew): Thank you, good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the translation and transliteration of contact information PDP working group on the 29th of May 2014.

On the call today we have (Peter Green), (Chris Dillon), Jim Galvin, (Petter Reinforth), (Jennifer Chung) and (Justin Chu). We have apologies from Rudi Vansnick.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself (Terry Agnew). I would 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 for that. And I'll just say at the beginning of the meeting that there aren't very many of us today but I think probably the best thing to do is to continue going through these various documents. We have a lot of them and I think we need to use these meetings to work our way through them. Now if - well the other thing here is that the mailing list can be used at any time to suggest comments or corrections, inputs for these documents.

So I think that's a way of opening it up a little better anyway. If we move into agenda point 3 the statements of interest this is an obligatory agenda point so I need to ask everybody where there has been a change of statement of interest since the last call.

I see nothing in the chat or on the phone so that means we can move forward and that means that we're into the responses and in fact we're still working on the document we were using this time last week.

And specifically I think that we have got to number 31 so we can perhaps pick up there. And number 30, number 31 is a new SU6 that's SU number 6 and this is when should any new policy relating to transformation of contact information come into effect?

And I'll just work through the various responses we have for this so you should be able to scroll on your Adobe connect screens. It's working well I was on the Adobe earlier and we had all sorts of problems.

Okay, so the first response number 31 is the Thai GAC representative and basically the summary of that is, you know, at the earliest possible timeline.

And to read the response it's rather interesting because it's just mentioning that phishing is a major problem so that's what's driving that and they regard a transformation policy as being phishing mitigation.

Okay now would anybody like to make any comments about that one or should we move on into number 32? I don't see anything in the chat so let's just do that.

Number 32 is the NCSG and the summary of that is the - after the conclusion of the two post expert working group PDP's. Now this may just be me but my understanding and I'm, you know, very willing to be corrected by as far as I know I thought there was only one PDP.

This is the board directed one, which happens after the expert working group on directory services. So obviously I'm quite interested I don't know Jim or Julie whether you know whether that's correct but, you know, yes I'm just quite interested to - okay so I've got both of you with your hands up. Jim would you like to say something about that?

Jim Galvin: Yes I'll just confirm that the internationalized registration data working group is just an expert working group we're not a PDP and Julie will probably confirm this.

So the directory services working group but they're just an expert working group too it's not a PDP.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you very much, Julie is that - yes and I can see you agreeing in Adobe connect. Yes it may be that I just heard that there was a rumor that there would be a board directed PDP but okay if it's a rumor then we probably shouldn't - in fact that does mean that that comment should be changed.

So we can legitimately say that, you know, that we aren't expected PDP's or, you know, I certainly have heard a rumor but we should probably discount it. Jim would you like to continue there?

Jim Galvin: Yes and Jim for the transcript. I'll just observe that my expectation is that these other two groups the directory services and the IRD working group are more than likely to finish before this group does anyway just as a practical consideration.

So, you know, while it's a valid concern to be aware of wanting those groups to finish before this one as a practical matter I really don't think it's going to be an issue, thank you.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you very much. Yes I think you're probably right there, okay thank you very much. That does mean that we need to rewrite, you know, just rewrite that particular comment and say, you know, just say or maybe we might (unintelligible) the point.

So, you know, that officially there aren't other PDP's and, you know, the likelihood at the moment is that we will be going after they have finished. And Julie is in fact typing in the chat that she's made that change so thank you very much for clearing up all of that.

Any other SU6's to do if that comment or shall we move forward into number 33? Okay off we go then so this is the IPC and this is basically the same as the Thai response so it's as soon as possible and that, you know, they're just saying that the (unintelligible) that should have been in place before the release of the new gTLD's in their opinion.

Lastly we've got (FICP) and again they're actually saying the same thing. Okay any questions before we leave SU6 and head into SU7? Let's just do just that.

Okay so SU7 so it's basically who should decide who should bear the burden of transformation to a single language or transliteration to a single script.

Okay and so we might as well move and start with number 35 and so (unintelligible) is saying all of that took parties - okay so I'm giving examples registrants, resellers, registrars, registries.

There's a slightly exasperated note from me there saying, who makes the final decision that's - yes I don't know whether we're likely to get to the bottom of this but okay any other comments about number 35 or shall we move into number 36, which is the IPC in fact.

Okay and in fact they are doing the same I'm just checking that they've not started anything else but I think that's really the - yes it's the tenor of it and they've got the same exasperated comment from me.

Okay and then if there aren't any comments about that we can move into number 37. And yes this is a radically different opinion so this is saying that the registrant should be the only stakeholder making this decision so that is just totally different.

And then there is the thing that this shouldn't be a policy requiring a specific stakeholder to bear the costs because basically it's - I guess because it's basically the - it's really up to the registrant.

Very, very slight contradiction there it strikes me because they are a stakeholder. I think actually the meaning is clear. Now if any comments about that perhaps.

Okay thank you very much let us - let's just have a look at record 38, which is again (FICP) and they are saying, okay they are saying divide it between the registrants and the registrar.

I haven't put them in the final column because they aren't actually one of our stakeholder groups. Okay any questions about SU7 before we leave it for SU8?

Well SU8 is who does your stakeholder group or constituency believe should bear the cost bearing in mind the limits and scopes that's in the initial report? Okay and then we've got quite a long response from the Thai GAC representative.

So the summary of it is just that the cost should be borne by the - sorry so it's the cost of conversion from local language into common language it should be the registrant and the cost of validation should belong to registrar's and Jim is asking a question.

Jim Galvin: Yes so Jim Galvin for the transcript, probably should have been saying that before too. Just a priority question I in thinking about the (tie) response to these questions I guess I'm a little surprised and, you know, the official language of Thailand does not include English does it?

I mean and is there a - that's one question and the second question would be is there a broad base of English speaking people there? I'm just trying to understand sort of where their comments are coming from.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you very much for that. No I don't believe that English is an official language of Thailand I don't think we've got any Thai representatives on the call today but as far as I know it isn't.
It is in Singapore but not Thailand and then the question as to, you know, just how many people have a good knowledge of English in the country and my impression perhaps not, you know, not all that many.

So that is the situation as far as I understand it, it may be slightly out of date. I had a loss of contact with Thailand a long time ago.

Jim Galvin: So just a follow up question then I mean it really does strike me as, you know, I'm trying to find a soft word to use because I can only think of words like, you know, conflict or disingenuous, you know, just I don't know I'm completely opposed to what I would expect from, you know, it's kind of a sovereign state like that to be making comments the way they're making.

I mean so I'm just curious does anyone have any hints as to what would be the source of why they're saying the things they're saying? I just find it so interesting.

(Chris Dillon): I think this is (Chris) again I think that they - the answer to it may be in the - there are a couple of quite long documents that they posted they're on our responses page.

And there they went to considerable - into considerable detail about, you know, various suggestions and I think certainly they seem to be very keen that the, you know, this transformation would occur in one place and that it be basically organized by the government.

I think that was a suggestion they are - they have and also that there is quite in the suggestions there is quite a lot of talk about transformation and whether translation or transliteration should be used that's how I remember it.

But I think really (ignores) I'm saying now I suspect the answers are in those two long documents on the responses page.

Jim Galvin: Okay so thank you I mean I'll go back and take a look at that and see if anything comes out at me. I just, you know, from a community often times you understand the why they have the view that they have and I'm just looking at this and I'm thinking about their comment and I just - it's not immediately obvious to me, you know, why they have this particular position.

It just feels that there ought to be a reason for that and I don't know what it is but okay thank you.

(Chris Dillon): You're welcome. Okay so if we come back to this I'll just double check that there's nothing major in there that we should comment - other things that should be commented on.

Yes and so they are, you know, they are saying this is key that the transformation be economic and instead of advocating a demand (orientated) approach and that's - yes that's certainly a new thing.

Actually come to think of it that should be added to the summary that they are talking about the demand (orientated) approach. Okay (Peter) would you like to say something about that?

(Peter Green): I just wanted to say I think Jim's point is very well taken and that (Pitinan) and (May) have actually been quite active in the working group throughout our meetings.

I don't think either of them are on the call this time but I propose that maybe (Chris) you could make a note of this to come back to this question in the next call because they have been very active in the working group this far and I think it would be great to hear from them in terms of where their thoughts or their commentary are coming from.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, yes I'll do that thank you very much. Okay, now unless there are other comments about number 39 we can move into number 40 the EC. And okay and so they have this it's a pyramid system it's just like or it says registries should bear the cost of translation - I'm sorry of transformation of registrar data and registrar's should bear the cost of translation and transliteration of registrant data.

Okay and I think, you know, one note, you know, the note that I put there in the column is, you know, often people talk about, you know, registrars and registries carrying charges but, you know, there's always a tendency for registrants to end up with them so that's why that note is there.

Any other comments about that record? Okay and Julie is just saying that she thought that that demand (orientated) thing for last record . Okay record number 41 is a ALAC and the summary here is - yes okay so these are - so ALAC are actually coining a major new concept so they have this - these concepts of general or specialized use.

So it's a useful concept there so, you know, general use would be or basically I think specialized use somebody is paying for it to be transformed I think that's the distinction but, you know, the comment I made here is, you know, the SU may be how is it possible to define whether a particular use like security for example that's probably specialized use.

But, you know, as with all definitions are, you know, I suspect that might, you know, that might be quite a bigger SU whether it's clear whether a particular use is special or general.

So I'm going to just go back to that so available to the general public without charging a fee the Whois general use and specialized use could be some data request - choosing the language of required data so that's, you know, that could even be it's not just English or (unintelligible) it could be other languages.

And examples of specialized use so I'll give them as more enforcement IP yet security that sort - those are the examples that as I say yes I mean and also in the chat (Petter) is typing, you know, there could be quite a large gray zone so, you know, there might be a challenge here just to build up examples of, you know, what we understand by general and what we understand by specialized that could be the way I answer for this.

Okay any comments about number 41 or shall we move into the next one?
Okay and the next one is the IPC and they are saying the costs should be divided between registries and registrars and also bringing up the point I made earlier about, you know, final responsibility lies on the registrant.

Is there a response to that one, any comments about that or shall we move on? Okay number 43 is the NCSG and they are saying that it should be the end user of Whois and again here I've got a clarifying note saying, you know, are they actually, you know, are they saying that, you know, all uses, you know, or maybe this is exaggerating it but all use of Whois should be charged.

Okay I mean that, you know, that saying that anything apart from that is just going to be moving the charges from one stakeholder to another. I'll have one last look at that yes the end user who is - should bear the cost (unintelligible) okay.

Any questions about that one or should we move into the next record, which is (FICP), very simple but I'll just say the cost should be divided between registries and registrants and that brings us to the end of that SU, which is number 8.

And we're then into the any other information section and it is in sight and we have NCSG and using some pretty strong language actually. They are saying it would be destructive and (unintelligible) competitive to burden new IDN registrars with additional costs, which discriminate against (unintelligible) domain names.

So yes certainly it's certainly very clear and quite robust and I think, you know, you can see the frustration there that we've waited a long time for IDN and registrars and, you know, do we really want to clobber them with these additional costs and I can really - can see that point of view.

Any comments about that or shall we - okay and I think that brings us to the last record and this is a Chinese GAC representative record. And they are just making a point which in fact we've seen before and it is about basically in the Chinese case collecting and verifying information in the Chinese language.

And I think that's not surprise at all like in the case of doing that but we have heard other people saying, yes but, you know, if we don't know Chinese how are we able to verify information.

So there are differing opinions on this point but this is just putting the case for doing everything can be effectively presumably in the original language. Okay, well any comments about that record or in fact about anything that we've done now because that is the end of this document?

It's taken us a couple of meetings to get through it. Okay, thank you very much. In that case we are free to move forward and there is a - quite a - there are a couple of short documents, which I think we might do well to get rid of and let me just sort them out quite quickly.

And one of them is the Margie Milam document a model for exploring Whois accuracy. I'll just real quick go up some - okay I just posted that particular document into the chat and it is just a very short thing just a couple of pages but I thought it would be good just to have a look at that.

Wait a moment - whether it's possible to display it on Adobe connect but just so that you can get it on your screens anyway. Okay and this according to the document it looks as if we can't display that document but just a minute something's happening.

Okay there it is, thank you for that Julie. And one of the things that come out of the document is that there seems to be several definitions of accuracy

that's the point. So, it's in syntactic accuracy, operational accuracy and identity accuracy. So, yes. Okay. The examples here are the syntactic accuracy would be the data satisfies specified syntactic constraints and so that would mean, if this email address - (four matters an email address). So I guess an example of that would be does it have an at sign in the middle. So that's just - that's just a syntactic aspect.

Then you've got operational accuracy and this is assessments of data for intended use in a routine or in routine functions. So that would be in the email example I just gave you. It would be can an email address actually receive email. So off your operational or off the operational aspect and then last but not least, identity. I guess this is the difficult one. Assessment that data corresponds to the real world identity for the registrant. So I guess it is does this email really belong to this person who's address we know is that sort of thing and would have to be done manually.

Now, I'm not an expert on this so before I go any further, I'd just - I would just like to ask whether anybody has any comments about that because if I misunderstood something there, I would really like to know now and (unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: So, this is Jim Galvin. Yes. I just want to observe two things. One, the origin of this validation taxonomy is from an (NSAC) document and there's another criteria that the (NSAC) document talks about, about how to distinguish these three types of validations -- syntactic, operational and identity which is probably just worth mentioning here so that we have complete information -- and that is whether or not the validation can be done manually or can be automated.

The observation in the (NSAC) document is that syntactic validation is expected to be largely automated and in that respect, syntactic validation should probably be performed by all relevant and appropriate parties because you do it once and then it's always there. Operational validation is probably

semi automated. Some things can be automated and some things cannot. So, for example, you can probably do email address validation in an automated way that's done today in a variety of -- at least, well, not too many but -- a couple different mechanisms for which that can be relatively automated.

In contrast, identity validation is something which would be expected to be largely manual if not entirely manual. So, you want to confirm that an identity really represents a real world thing. A variety of ways of doing that but again, probably involves a physical person and physical contact and things like that. So, just whether or not something can be automated or manual is another characteristic of those three types of validations that are useful to be aware of. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you very much Jim. Okay. Now, it's quite a short document. I'll just have a quick look and see. Okay. It may be that there has actually been some progress made on this project since this document came out but anyway, I think for the time being, that's more or less the summary of that. Any other comments about that before we move onto various other things that we have received? Okay. Thank you very much.

Now, the next thing is actually not on our agenda but I would like to deal with it anyway because it is very short and this is the National Arbitration for, actually, some - there was a correspondence with them. Unfortunately, it's an email correspondence but I'll just bring that to your attention. I think - I think we need to be (seen) to be aware of what was going on there and they - I think the summary of that recent email correspondence -- which you can find just by looking on our email list -- is really that from their point of view, from the National Arbitration Forum point of view, they already copying and pasting data (of displayed and who is).

So as far as they are concerned, it's irrelevant whether the information is accurate or (unintelligible) of the script and if you go down and look at the

correspondence in greater detail, then I think we may even be able to - yes. We can actually see that. So yes. It's quite colorful the way it's written because if they do get an address something like Mickey Mouse 1234 Main Street, they're not going to query that but that's rather a colorful way of indicating that that's the procedure that's happening at the moment there and I hope that - I think there was an inquiry about exactly what was happening there a couple of meetings ago. I hope that makes sense and clear. I'm just doubling checking through it to see whether there's anything else we should briefly mention. Not as far as I can see. Okay. (Peter), would you like to pick up something?

(Peter Dengate Thrush): No. Just that short explaining of follow-up. I was the one that raised the question so I wanted to see how they were actually dealing with it so thanks for asking them and getting it out.

(Chris Dillon): Not at all. Thank you very much. Okay. So, that's - we've just got through those two short documents and so, we need now to have a look at longer documents. Just make sure we do these in the correct order. I think the next one is the interim report from the expert working group on internationalized registration data. There's some sections in there which I will just go link into the adobe. It's a very strange address. I hope that works. Things are happening on the screen.

Now, for those of you who have - who have access to the document, it's page 17. These are more specific than - right. Yes. I think it is just (unintelligible). Yes, 17 and 18 that we're going to be looking at. Not the whole document because it's only that which is relevant. Yes. Thank you very much. That's exactly the correct place. So, it says a bit about the working group did note the following (views) related to translation and transliteration. I think we probably need to go through this quite slowly because we need to be - I think we need to address these questions now. Some of them we may already have addressed. In which case, fine but we will need to make a decision

about what we do with anything that we haven't addressed. So I'll go through this at a quite slow rate.

So it starts - its registrants are allowed to submit localized registration data. What languages or scripts are registrars or registry operators expected to support? Yes. I mean, we - we haven't really looked at things from this angle. We - we have looked at it from which - how should things be registered, which languages should be used. So, for example, we've had people saying Chinese companies should just be able to register in Chinese without using any English at all but we're not - perhaps we haven't looked at it from the registrar and registry point of view quite to the same extent and if registrants have got total freedom to register in any language, then that really implies that registrars and registries are also going to have to be able to cope with all of those languages. So, the question is what do we do with this questionnaire? Now Jim has something he would like to say about that.

Jim Galvin: Yes. So, Jim Galvin for the transcript. I would also add something to think about with this question is to consider what support means. On the one hand --from a technical point of view at its simplest level -- support could be that everyone is simply required to be able to accept some kind of (UTF8) coding and a registrar then just has a little bit of implementation to ensure that whatever they get from a registrant, they can encode in that way and then that's what gets passed around and that covers it and then there's no real obligation. There's no real difficulty regardless of what's input.

On the other hand, support might be providing relevant information in the local language for the registrant and going forth with that and then as a specific detail that might be interesting in this, one of the issues that we're focusing on a great deal in the internationalized registration data working group is we've made the observation that contact information -- postal addresses in particular -- are the format is defined by postal authorities which are typically aligned with sovereign states.

So now you get into an interesting question of if I'm going to support a local language, does that mean I have to support the local postal authority requirements in that country that uses that language? So again, my question to this group is to consider whether or not you want to talk about what support really means. Thank you.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you very much. I think - I think both the original question and the document and also the support question are really - are really interesting and I think we - I think we should be discussing both of them and I think that they should be added to our list of questions in fact. Obviously, I have no intention to keep on asking questions endlessly. We'll never - if I did that, we'd never finish but I think both of these are - I mean, it might be possible to modify existing questions just to extend out this area but I think - I think both of those aspects are highly relevant. Yes. Both the question - both viewing it from - viewing it more from the registrars and registry operator's point of view and also this exactly what is meant by support. That would be my suggestion. Does anybody have any comments about that?

The other thing here is just for ease of administration, in the report, these are given bullet points but I would like to (first) them with numbers because otherwise, it's going to be very confusing which point here are we talking about. So I'm going to be calling that last one number one because that way at least we know what we are dealing with. So any other feelings about that one or shall we move down and consider the next one perhaps? Okay.

So number two is registrants are allowed to submit internationalized registration data. There certainly seems to be some demand for that whether to require that users submit a corresponding single common script version of the internationalized registration data. Okay. Now, I feel this is a different case because this - these issues we have spoken about many, many times. So I feel this is safe not to add this question. We've got something similar. We've spoken about it at length. So that would be my recommendation to you. I don't know whether anybody agrees or disagrees but I think this is

quite a different case from the first one. We spoke about this sort of things particularly in our early meetings in fact. Okay. If there aren't comments about that then let's just move into number three.

That is if registrants are required to submit a single common script version of the internationalized registration data, are users expected to submit a translated version, a transliterated version or either? Okay. Again, actually this is pretty close to what I've just said about question number two because we spoke about this at length particularly in our earlier meeting and in fact, the options here aren't the only options. So I think it really, to some extent, depends on what part of the address we are talking about.

So when we were discussing this on the list, quite often we said that addresses are really best transliterated. However, organizational names are often best translated. However, people then said, well, in China, for example, there are a lot of companies which just do not have translated English names so it's not possible to translate or at least it's possible to translate then but we wouldn't recommend that because there isn't a standard translation so this is a high risk activity and so, perhaps transliteration might be the way to go in the case of those - for example, Chinese companies with no standard English translation of their name and I'm just using them as an example but I hope that's - I hope that's - I hope that makes it clear.

Now since then, our early discussion was very much along those lines. That seemed to be something that might have been quite useful. However, as Jim was just mentioning, the postal standards, it may also be the case because frankly, we spoke about something on the list saying perhaps that we wanted to transliterate addresses and translate organization names and we said, this is something we can actually say of all languages and it's actually quite a simple solution. However, if we've actually looked at the responses coming in to the various questions we've asked, I think that opinion is not a majority opinion and it's more likely that standards would be followed and in this particular case, we would be talking about the (UPU) standards.

So there - there are clear standards about what addresses look like. I don't think they covered organizational names but that would mean effectively, that it would be necessary to follow the (UPU) standards and they are different for each company -- I'm sorry -- for each country. That is why I was avoiding that card on the table because it is complicated, it's different for each country but the positive side of that is that the countries tend to be quite used to those standards and they are standards. They are clear. So yes.

So I think that's - so I actually feel that for number three and for number two, that we don't really need to add questions because we've - our existing questions have dealt with this and we have spoken at length on this on previous calls on this subject. So that's my recommendation but I wonder if anybody has any comments about any of that? Okay. Thinking about - Thank you very much.

That brings us down to question number four. Now we're starting to time out. Yes but I think we've probably got enough time to do it so I'll just speed up a bit. If registrants are required to submit a single common script version of the internationalized registration data and the user is unfamiliar with or unable to submit such a transformation, are registrars or registry operators expected to provide assistance and if so, how would such a system be manifested? Right.

I think - I think we are caught on this one. It's very relevant but we haven't really spoken all that much about this aspect. To what extent there could be a responsibility and the other issue that comes up here is whether the single common script version is obligatory. Yet another issue is with some scripts, it's actually possible to transliterate automatically. So rush - so relate script Greek. Some scripts you can do automatically but then others are absolutely impossible. Japanese would be a good example I think or nearly impossible. Okay.

I'll just update you. Julie is typing that she has (ousted) the ones I have suggested. Now, let me emphasize these are recommendations. My understanding is that what I just said but obviously, somebody can come in and say, no, actually this isn't adequate and perhaps number two or number three weren't adequately covered and we do want them in there but I feel that that is all right to skip those two or not to skip because we've already done them but anyway. Right. Okay. That's also fine Bonnie.

Julie is saying that she's actually added all of them which - but that's fine by me. I think we probably get off relatively lightly with them because as I say, we have that applicable time considering them but yes, as regards to number four, then I think we say it's a fair (unintelligible) but I think we probably do need to consider this as useful additional thing and really what additional systems - what can be done automatically and what can't. Okay.

Perhaps we still have a few more minutes so let us move into number five and this is if registrants are required to submit a single common script version and an internationalized version of the registration data. So this would be, for example, they're submitting Chinese script data but they're also transliterating into Pinion, should there be a requirement to detect whether both literally match each other? Okay. It's related to questions we've already considered but I think it's rather an interesting additional aspect.

I'm not very happy about the word literally because I think also it is possible to transform in several ways and the several ways are still accurate but I don't know really - I don't really know what literally means here. I suppose it's something that's very, very, very loyal to the original language but possibly not particularly good English. So it might - a specific example may be the use of something like (here) in Chinese which means (serode) or street. Actually, it's more like street and you're using (here) rather than street because (GA) is literally what the original was but it's actually still in Chinese. Maybe it's that sort of thing but anyway, I do feel that this is - this is an interesting additional element. I think I err on the side of including this. Okay.

We are very near the end of the hour and let me see. We can't - we can't complete this and it's actually - it's actually not such a bad thing because by stopping in the middle, we get to look at this in two different meetings. It just gives us a bit more time to think about it. Just coming back to the agenda briefly, I don't think we've got any amendment to the work plan I am aware of and then, I - the work plan is on the screen but as I say, I don't think there's anything I am aware of there and any other business? I don't have any. I don't know whether anybody else would like to raise something quickly.

In that case, I have been all over the place this last week so I'm just double checking that I'm here next week. I am here next week. Okay. So I think, in that case, if we just continue this again same time next week and we have one more document after this one to (proceed) and that's two more documents to go through once we go through this next week. So I thank you very much for covering such a lot of ground in just one meeting. It's really, really good because these documents have been lying on my desk. I've been really wanting to get through them so it's good - it's really good that we've got through so much today and I'll very much look forward to doing something similar with the rest of this document and two others next week. So thank you very much for attending the call.

END