

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 20 November at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 20 November 2014 at 1400 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/gns0/gns0-transliteration-contact-20141120-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Jennifer Chung – RySG  
Chris Dillon – NCSG  
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC  
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual  
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan)-NCUC  
Jim Galvin - RySG  
Justine Chew – Individual

Apologies:

Petter Rindforth – IPC  
Amr Elsadr – NCUC  
Emily Taylor – RrSG  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund  
Lars Hoffmann  
Terri Agnew

(Terry Agnew): Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is a Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP working group call on 20 November 2014.

On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Rudi Vansnick, Ubolthip Sethakaset, James Galvin, Jennifer Chung, Peter Green and Justine Chew We have apologies from Emily Taylor, Amr Elsadr, Petter Rindforth and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri 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 indeed and we have the obligatory agenda point three, which is statements of interest. I need to ask you whether anybody has a change in statement of interest since we last met. Hearing nothing and seeing nothing in the chat room that means we can go into agenda point four, which is basically a continuation of what we were doing last week and that is working through various comments that we had received on the draft initial report.

Now there is unfortunately because we did a lot of work, there have been two versions of the reports since last week, so that means that, you know, they may look slightly different because the one you can see on the screen there actually is attempting to address the comments that we went through, so just be aware that there are two versions kicking around at the moment. Now the other thing is - so as I said we're going to just continue working our way through the comments.

It's looking as if I have mislaid a comment by Mr. (Tanaka), just talking to Julie before the call started. For some reason it doesn't seem to be on my desk. Now I remember the comment. I have been through it. It might just be that we - I'm just hoping that somebody can find that during the call. Julie, yes?

Julie Hedlund: Actually, Lars kindly reentered the comments from (Dennis). They're at the bottom of the - if you scroll down in the...

(Chris Dillon): In that area. Lovely. Well in that case, I won't do it this second because I know that we need to start with general comments, which I'm very grateful you were able to find that and what on Earth I did with it, anyway. Okay. So into general comments, and we touched on them slightly last week in fact, but some of the points Emily is making here are really very important. And fundamentally she's asking what is the scale of this problem, you know, how many domain names will be affected by this and do we have stats?

And then there are various areas of stats, which she then raises in these next few points. So referring to the IDN world map in the recent EU document, for example. And - yes, I mean I think all we can say is that the point she raises are very - are valid points and to address them, it really would be necessary to get more research on some of them. You know, that's really what it comes to. And of course as soon as you say that, there is the concern that, you know, we'd end up having to wait for that research.

But, you know, essentially without having a clearer idea of the scale and the statistics involved, you know, that is, you know, there isn't a clear idea of whether we're speaking about relatively small numbers of domain names that would need to be transformed or whether it's a far larger thing. I think that's the, you know, that's probably what that one comes to. I don't know whether anybody would like to raise some aspect of this. Okay. I'm slightly relieved because I think, you know, with these things there really is the possibility of delay. That's rather alarming.

Okay. And then I think the next thing I really need to draw your attention to is actually under specific comments further down where there's - stop - I mean anybody stop me if you can see something you'd like to raise, and by all means raise it, but this concept of ease of search comes up. But in fact when we have a look at the document a little later in the meeting, the document in

the right-hand window, there are very substantial comments on ease of search.

I think we might hold back fire on ease of search and then just address them when we look at the comment, the new comments, in that document, and they come from the ICANN legal committee. But that's certainly one area where they have quite a lot to say. So my intention would be to cover that, the ease of search issue, a little later.

Okay. Moving further down, I find the first bullet point unconvincing. It's like saying why doesn't everyone just learn English. I think it's - this is such an interesting thing and, I mean, I actually feel that we need to leave that first bullet point there because okay to some extent it may be addressing the fact that, you know, if there is a, you know, if things are transformed into ASCII or even transformed into English, less likely, then, you know, to some extent there could be some delays, you know, we're just used to English so we'll use that.

But actually I think it's still worth making - well making the point that if there is to be transformation then really the only horse in this race is ASCII fundamentally. So I think probably we need to leave that there. But that said, there are organizations, so, you know, if you're operating in China you may want to transform into Chinese or if you're operating in Russia, you may want to transform into Russian.

So I think these are things we have spoken about in the past, and I have a little bit of a concern that this version of the document is not adequately raising the sort of, you know, making this point that transformation probably means ASCII rather anything else. So I think I have rather an intention to beef up that part of this document. Jim, would you like to add something to that?

Jim Galvin: Thank you. This is Jim Galvin for the transcript. You know, I have to say that I actually agree with Emily. I apologize that I have not submitted a document

with comments in it from me, and I do want to try to get that done but while we go through what we have here. You know, I liked the second half of that first bullet much more than the first half. I find the first half, you know, unconvincing is the word that she uses.

You know, I mean there is an argument in favor of uniformity which is, you know, where we started in the second half here that uniformity, you know, does create a certain standard in and of itself. But to suggest that just because it's transformed, it's more transparent or more accessible, those are characteristics that seem to me independent of whether it's transformed or not. And, you know, searchability, there's a part of me that actually wants to agree that if it is in the single script, it's more searchable but only if that script is English.

The problem that you have today is because of issues with variants, without trying to get into a discussion of what exactly a variant is, you know, searchability becomes a real problem on a technical level. So, you know, I agree with Emily on this point. I do find that first bullet unconvincing. I think I've been fairly consistent in saying that as we come along here, although maybe not quite so carefully as she put it.

But I just wanted to put that out there. You know, I would delete the first half of that bullet and expand a bit on the second half if I were going to keep it. But again, that's just my comment among the many here in this working group. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you very much for that. That is, you know, that is certainly heard. And as I was saying earlier, we will certainly come back to the searchability and quite possibly to that as well. All right, well let's just move on a little bit further. Okay, yes. Okay so further down we've got the fourth bullet, define least translatable for whom.

So I think there might have been a fear that if it was possible to, you know, if there wouldn't be any transformation that people could pick very, very small languages and then basically use them rather more than one might expect. But in fact, there is this thing about the language used being appropriate to the area. So I think to some extent that actually undoes that. Again, that is something which has changed a little bit in this version so we can have a bit of a look at that later on. There have been new suggestions about exactly how that text on appropriate areas should be looking. Jim, would you like to pick up that?

Jim Galvin: So having -- Jim Galvin again for the transcript -- and having given that particular bullet a little more thought, I suspect the answer here is to find a way to balance these kinds of things in some way but, you know, and in that context my balance against the idea that mandatory translation or transformation would, you know, prevent, you know, flight to the least translatable language it seems to me what's really going on here is you're trading off, you know, flight to the least translatable language to flight to fraud or flight to inaccurate data, you know.

I mean they're just looking for a way to hide themselves and, you know, that's all that you do. I think you're trying to argue about what is more traditionally called an arms race. And so I also don't find this bullet particularly compelling because I think you could make equivalent statements on the other side.

Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you, Jim. I agree with you. I actually don't think this bullet is very convincing either, yes. So that's certainly something that there is worth bearing in mind. Okay. Now, right. Now there is a continuation of the argument. So Emily is talking about cyber flight and saying in general people tend to register and host locally. I'm just wondering what should be said about this, because you see that is absolutely true.

If one looks at the statistics, in fact people tend to register locally. So that really undoes the argument. But the problem with it is that of course it isn't enforceable in any way as far as I know. So at that point it just ends up being frustrating, because yes the reality is that people actually register locally but it isn't really going to be something that's going to help if there is no way of well effectively making people, sort of saying, you know, if you're going to register and just pick a random language (unintelligible) a rather particular location, if you're going to register in (Kumar) then you must do it Cambodia or, you know, if it was possible to restrict things like that then it would be possible to stop cyber flight, but it isn't so it isn't.

Okay. And then, you know, she also towards the end of it, you know, talking about the registrations clustering strongly around popular scripts. Well again, this is very interesting and similarly, I think, frustrating because, you know, there could then be the idea that we could draw up a list of scripts, you know, the UN languages, some other list, and that could be a way of proceeding. But of course it's a bit of a mirage because, you know, the reality of it is it sounds like an attractive idea, but when you actually try and do it, it certainly gets very difficult. But that's just worth picking up that point.

All right. Just pop down further in the box and look at - oh yes and we've got - I think that's the last ones I want to up until we come to (Tanaka), from (Dennis Tanaka)'s point. I'll just double check. Oh yes, okay. Right. Now, this is the one which is not on my desk for some reason. And then this is about language tags. Oh yes, yes, yes. This is actually very, very interesting because it's saying that EPP has some support and then saying well, you know, why is it that language tags are necessary and, you know, is this just not adding complexity.

Now you see if we are - if we were in situation where we were recommending that transformation should not be mandatory then we would not want to be in a situation where we were saying you must never, nobody must every transform, that's a completely different thing. So what we - probably what we

may be saying is transformation should not be mandatory; however, you know, for those players who do want to transform, then we have to sort of, you know, we have to consider, you know, are there some basic things that would be necessary for them to do so, and language tags really file under that. So, you know, if you don't know what language it is then you're going nowhere fast.

So that's really why that is there. However, by the time, you know, for example if we were to say transformation should not be mandatory, at that stage, the question that comes up very quickly is whether the transformation should be done within the new DNRD or whether it should be done elsewhere. If it's to be done elsewhere, then it doesn't really - we don't really need to worry too much about it, possibly. So, Jim, would you like to raise that?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Jim Galvin. I actually want to present an opposing view to the last statement that you made. I think that you need a language and script tag regardless of whether transformation is mandatory or not. You know, if it's mandatory, you're going to want to remember what was the original and, you know, should always be able to identify that and you need to know as you move that information around what its source was.

Similarly, even if transformation is not mandatory, that would suggest to me that transformation is going to be some additional step done elsewhere, you know, outside the system, well you can't really do transformation at all if you don't know the language and script that's in use. So, you know, it seems to me that that has to be there and that's the argument that needs to be articulated about adding a language and script tag regardless of whether transformation is mandatory or not. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you, Jim. Yes I - actually I agree with you completely. Not having tags just feels profoundly wrong. One is in a situation where one, you know, certainly people may be able to realize what language it is. I mean there's no

way you'd do anything automatic at all. So yes that's - I think these are ideas which need to go into the next version.

All right. Well I think that is all I want to pick up from those comments. However, I'll just ask whether anybody would like to pick up anything else before we go in and we have a look at the law enforcement content in the document in the right pane. Jim, would you like to ask something about that?

Jim Galvin: My apologies, old hand.

(Chris Dillon): Oh it's all right. Okay. That means I think that we can head off down the new version of the document. Let's see how far we get before we need to pick something up. Page 5 seems fine. I mean obviously if there's something burning that you want to raise then by all means do it, but I reckon we get to Page 7 before we - let me see if I can get to Page 7. Eleven, oh dear. Fourteen? How on Earth did that happen? Excuse me for driving so badly. Oh yes that's it. That's where it starts.

Okay. So basically quite a lot of text changed on Page 7 and really I'm just double checking that what I've done is what people wanted. I did use the recording, but I wasn't totally sure about bits and pieces of this, so if it looks wrong that is why. So just give it a quick reading, and if you spot something, just pop your hand up. I tried to what was suggested. I'm not totally sure I succeeded. Okay. Have I got away with it? Yes. I thought it made sense, anyway, the way I understood it.

All right. Okay. So then I think we need to go to Page 11. Whoops, eight. I'll go slowly because it's better than darting everyone and it also gives us a bit of a chance to stop things if we want to. Okay Page 11, and I think this gets pretty busy. I have removed some of the smaller comments because otherwise it's just incomprehensible. Okay, as we were saying, this thing about easily searchable was picked up, and there's quite a long comment from (Mike) about searchability.

So he's saying Whois isn't exactly intended to be searchable, although some companies aggregate Whois data so that it can be searched. I wonder if they mean that it's more readily interpreted. Searching suggests you could query for a registrant and the domain names so this name would be presented. Querying is more what people do with Whois when they enter a domain name and results appear. Perhaps it doesn't matter.

Yes so I guess the question is whether we mean searchable or interpretable probably. Okay. Jim, would you - now, Jim, I think you already picked this up last week, but by all means, pick it up again.

Jim Galvin: Yes so -- Jim Galvin here -- I - it might be appropriate then for us to define what we mean by searchable or to reference a definition of what we mean by searchable. I mean, certainly the new applicant guidebook, the gTLD applicant guidebook, has a definition of searching and it might be appropriate to reference that to use it. And that would at least, you know, give us a basis on which to evaluate this statement.

When I think about searchable, I don't think about readily interpreted, I think about the other half of what he's saying here because that's what documented. I mean the ability to look up, you know, all the domains registered by a particular registrant or, you know, all the domains at a particular address kind of thing, so searching in a more traditional, you know, pure sense. Maybe we can, you know, deal with this question by, even if it's just a footnote, defining what we mean by searching and pointing to a definitive reference. And the best one that I can think of is the applicant guidebook. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you very much for that. Okay. This certainly requires more attention, but anyway at least we're onto that, we're aware of it. Okay. You know, because obviously there was the whole thing about whether it's easy to

search in one language, so yes we definitely need to come back to this.

Okay. And then there is another - oh bother. Got it.

So we've got this one here. Unfortunately it's truncated. I'll actually read it out. I just wanted to confirm that we're certain this is the case, so I think a system might create logistical problems in the long run but isn't it. Maybe someone from technical services could verify. If it's true that all data is in U.S. ASCII, it would see that this is actually an argument against non-literal transformation. Actually, no it isn't. It's not referring to the last bit, it's referring to whether all the data is in ASCII. Jim, would you like to pick that up?

Jim Galvin: Yes. I mean the rules say that the data is to be collected in U.S. ASCII. So it's not that it's already been transformed, it just happens to be in that state at the moment. And that's just a carryover for legacy reasons more than anything. You know, we have all of these activities now. You know, this one, the internationalized registration data working group, you know, references from our data director services expert working group, which are considering this whole of issue of internationalizing contact information.

So there's a historical legacy of everything being in U.S. ASCII. You know, perhaps we need to make that distinction in our statements here about whether we're talking about the past, what exists today or what we think the plans are for the future. That might be helpful in the context of this phrase here. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you. Now quite a lot of things changed around here, so there's a new bit of text which is reflecting stuff that happened last week. At this stage, ASCII English are the most effective script language choices, but this is new so I'll just plug it up. And then there's also the thing about English deterring participation. The ideas are slightly contradictory there, very slightly. Jim, would you like to pick that up?

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin here. I'm not sure I would use the phrase "most effective script language choices." You know, that's certainly a judgment call and one would need to support that with some particular characteristic that you're really referring to. So I think I would in general, you know, object to that characterization and that phrase at this time in this document.

(Chris Dillon): Yes effective is...

Jim Galvin: (Unintelligible)

(Chris Dillon): Thank you, yes. I think effective is the wrong word. Now what might we - right okay. Well I think we just - it's probably better to consider in slow time.

Jim Galvin: Perhaps the word to use is common, you know. It's the most common language used, you know.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, yes.

(Chris Dillon): But then we could also add, you know, a little parenthetical phrase, if you will, suggesting that it's most common but, you know, that's probably for legacy reasons. There really hasn't been any, you know, as many alternatives. Because then I think it does go on to make the appropriate comment which is we certainly expect the number of, you know, non-English speaking users to grow. There's every reason to expect that's going to be the case, and so.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, that's the aspect Emily was picking up. But I think, you know, I think we are safe to presume that or even if we don't have too detailed statistics. Okay. There's been some changes in the text as we go down here, but I don't - I think they're not too controversial. Now we've got this - we've got flight by bad actors to the least translatable languages. It should be noted that transformation tools may not exist for such languages, and so transformation would need to be manual until they did.

And then there's a note about how difficult it is to limit languages along the lines we were mentioning before. So I'm happy with the end bit of that. Let me have a look at the earlier bit as well. Oh yes, no. (Mike) has picked up some things. Oh yes, so this is about the for law enforcement purposes paragraph so that's actually one before the flight by bad actors. And he's saying so for law enforcement purposes when Whois results are compared and cross-referenced, it may be tough to ascertain whether the same registrant is the domain name holder for different names. If the contact information is transformed he's saying I think this might not be true.

If a registrant registers domain names at multiple registrars for example, the registrars might be use different transliteration or translation techniques, making it harder to identify registrations by the same registrant. It seemed like this is really saying that English-speaking law enforcement once Whois in their own language. I think it's - yes I think that strikes me as being an interesting point. Jim, would you like to pick that up?

Jim Galvin: Yes actually because I'm looking at - the copy of the document I have doesn't have that particular comment in it.

(Chris Dillon): Oh yes, that's - you may be on version 3. Version 5 has that.

Jim Galvin: Although I have some of the other (Mike) comments which is why I'm particularly struck by - oh wait a minute, never mind. There it is. Things are a different color in my version, so sometimes I can't always see them. Okay. In any case my point here is this is interesting. I think I agree with what you just said, (Chris).

It would seem to be arguing in favor of not transforming the data, because unless part of mandatory transformation includes standards for the transformation, which I think is an issue too, right? So I guess I'm agreeing with you. I wanted to say yes. As I listened to you speak that out, it occurred

to me that that's actually a very good point and we probably need to find some way to expand on that text and say that out explicitly.

If transformation is going to be done, one of the consequences of it is the need for standards in the transformation process. Otherwise you simply create problems rather than in any way minimizing them or setting a bar for the problems that you're willing to deal with. Does that make sense?

(Chris Dillon): Yes it not only makes sense, I think I tried to do it later on and interestingly when one tries to do it, that in itself is very interesting because - well I think we're just about to have - oh here we go, yes. We might as well do this now. I mean, you know, we're - I think it's more or less the next thing we were going to talk about. Right at the end of the screen - however, it should be noted that transformation tools may not exist in such languages. Oh bother, no.

So not that sentence I read to you - there is something further down which is much more specific. And I'll just see if I can't find it. It might be quite a bit further down, but I think it's there. Ah yes. Oh no. This is bizarre. I could have - oh here, maybe it's in the recommendations. Ah, yes, yes, yes. So okay here it is quite a bit further down. The working group recommends that further work be done to guide how transformation should be done. This may include for example the establishment of a knowledge, the designation or creation of transliteration standards and a networks of linguists covering all world languages to maintain and implement them.

I mean this is - I mean it's just so expensive, it's not possible. But effectively if, you know, if we go the mandatory route this, you know, what we're talking about would not be a million miles from this sort of thing, and as soon as you see it in black and white, it's just really you wonder to what extent is this actually possible. Very, very expensive. Anyway let us pop back and - oh, Jim, would you like to - or (Rudy) would like you to pick up some aspect of that?

(Rudy Vansnick): Thank you, (Chris). (Rudy) for the transcript. Well as I was asking in the chat, are there really standards of transformation that exists which we could present as being a standard for the work that has to be accomplished in the translation of transliteration of the data here? Is there something that we could really use and say this is the standard worldwide?

(Chris Dillon): So it's one of those questions where it's not a yes/no answer. The - I would actually like to say that the answer is much nearer to no than yes. So what I mean is that there are languages like Japanese where you've not only got one transliteration standard, you've got several seeing there are issues there. So, you know, do you for one transliteration standard, do you go for another. Certainly there are more standards that are more common than others.

A lot of people sort of seem to multiply some existing standard, you know, sometimes slightly, sometimes considerably. So there's a situation like that. Now if you go to other major languages, then, you know, the situation is very difficult because it may be that there isn't a standard so you'd actually have to make one, or there is a standard that nobody knows, nobody's very familiar with it. So I think that certainly the short answer there I feel it is more or less a no. It's not a complete no but it's pretty close to it. (Rudy), would you like to continue?

(Rudy Vansnick): Yes thank you, (Chris). (Rudy) for the transcript. Well in that case, we have to really be very careful in putting forward the mandatory translation or transliteration of contact information as if you endanger what's around in translation and transliteration and could be used as a case, a sample case to say look ICANN decided that translation and transliteration will be mandatory and it is not based on real standard, it seems to me very risky. Maybe a personal opinion I have here.

(Chris Dillon): Well, (Rudy), no I agree with you completely. It may be that the current document actually doesn't reflect the weight of this argument. You know, it's

certainly a heavy argument against the transforming and perhaps that isn't coming out. But yes that certainly needs to be stressed here. There's some information on it but possibly not enough.

Okay, now - we are now quite - we are now approaching the end of today's meeting and so we should we find time for that straw poll, although yes, I think we, you know, we haven't got to the end of what we were doing today unfortunately but I think we need to make room for that poll. So just to be clear about the straw poll is about at the moment when you look at the documents, you've got - we've got recommendations for mandatory transformation and also recommendations saying that transformation should not be mandatory.

In the case of the transformations, the arguments for transformation not being mandatory that is not saying that no actors should transform, it's just saying that it should not be mandatory. Anyway, so the poll we would like to ask is who on the call today thinks that we should just have one set of recommendations, so instead of having options we just have - we keep all the arguments but we just have one set of options that we keep the non-mandatory recommendations?

Now just to be clear to be about that, we're not talking about removing content. What we are talking about is just having one set of options. So yes, (Rudy) has voted yes and I need myself to do that. It's going to be embarrassing if I can't remember how to do it. Whew. And Jim is asking a question which is fine. Jim, would you like to speak?

Jim Galvin: Yes. I just want to understand. Is there going to be another question? I mean are you asking two sides of a coin here? And I would just appreciate it if you would, you know, lay out all of the questions and then go back and ask for a count for each one, if possible.

(Chris Dillon): So what we're saying is that - so we have a document here which is laid out so we've basically got two options. So we've got the alternative and basically everything is two sided. The suggestion is that before we go to the initial document, so we come away from the draft document, which has the two alternatives that we go forward with only one option and that is the that transformation should not be mandatory.

Now I then - I'm keen to make clear that we are not getting rid of any content from the document. The document effectively will continue to in a similar way we will continue to debate things. But what we are saying that is rather than putting two sides where we could do either this or that, we will be recommending the non-mandatory side. Now is that clear?

Jim Galvin: No, I mean maybe it's just me. I apologize, but I guess what I was looking for it still sounds like you're asking two questions. One question is are we going to only put one recommendation in and then a separate question is which of the two recommendations are we going to put in. And it sounds like you're putting the two of those together. So the question you're asking is let's go with one recommendation and let's make it the one that's not mandatory.

(Chris Dillon): Oh yes...

Jim Galvin: (Unintelligible) correctly or...?

(Chris Dillon): So yes actually that - yes. Effectively we can split that question into two questions. So first of all I propose we - and you're right it's simpler to - I think it's simpler to say - so okay the first question is do we agree with the mandatory or the non-mandatory and then we say do people agree that we only continue with the non-mandatory recommendation, or the mandatory one depending how it goes. Lars, would you like to pick up something?

Lars Hoffman: Yes. Thank you, (Chris). This is Lars for the record. Just so - because we're treading very closely to a consensus call, and I just want to avoid that. I think,

I mean Jim obviously raised a very valid point, but I think at this stage it might be useful to just leave it as it is or just see if people agree to have just one option and then leave it to the prerogative of the chair to decide what option that is. Because then when we do a consensus call, people then can say no or yes and then we can always go back to the other ones if it's, you know, obviously if a lot of people disagree with it.

So I'm just a little bit concerned if we ask people now if they agree that we should be in favor would then feel forced because they've already given their consent on this matter, and that's not what this is about, I suspect. So.

(Chris Dillon): Okay. Yes, I take that point. So effectively what we're saying is whether there is agreement to only put forward one option, and we're not talking about consensus.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, absolutely. I think the idea was that we facilitate the document for public comment, right? So we saw that there was a lot of divergence in the group and therefore we put two issues, two possibilities out, but there was some resistance in the beginning already and, you know, the chair's being on that when it might be, you know, eventually, you know, a near consensus vote in the group on what side or the other, the question is whether we just want to reduce to one option and then have a call on that option about consensus whether everybody agrees with that later on. So this will be - it's more (unintelligible) of the version, of the approach that we take rather than the substance of the document.

(Chris Dillon): Okay, yes. So in that case, let's run it again and just - let's run the straw poll again and say simply are we in favor of aiming at one option rather than current two options in the initial report. So that's the initial report, not the draft. Okay, let's do that. Again in my case it's certainly the same situation.

Lars Hoffman: (Chris), this is Lars. Just - you might want to call out on the record the voting outcome just because the Adobe room is not being recorded.

(Chris Dillon): Okay yes. I'll just wait a moment because a few people on the call - oh. It's - I mean I guess also possible that people - I mean you can obviously vote yes or no, and I guess zero is also a possibility. Okay. So what we have on today's call is we have one, two, three, four, five people who are saying that in the initial report there should only be one option. And the people are (Chris Dillon), that's me, (Jennifer Chung), Jim Galvin, (Justin Shoot) and (Rudy Vansnick).

And so what we're saying is that in that initial report that we will be working on this week, there is agreement that we go down to one option. And I possibly should mention that there were six participants on the call to be complete. (Rudy)?

(Rudy Vansnick): Yes, thank you, (Chris). (Rudy) for the transcript. Maybe it would be good if we could send out a mail later today with a question to all of the other participants in the working group to say vote and allow us to see where we get to a quorum.

(Chris Dillon): Yes that sounds like a good idea. Just waiting for things to happen in the chat room. Okay I think...

(Rudy Vansnick): And maybe give them a short time and saying okay we need a response by Monday at the latest so that we can start validating and really make progress and start having a decision.

(Chris Dillon): Okay yes, that's - yes that sounds good, we can do that. Okay. We're slightly over the hour now. People are going, but I'd like to thank you again for a good call. It's a shame we didn't get through quite all of the comments, you know, again it was a good meeting. And we're now moving into a time where we'll have to do a lot of work on the list however this goes really, so look for doing that and to meeting again next week. Lars, before we go would you like to pick that up?

Lars Hoffman: Yes very quickly. (Unintelligible) maybe because it's just because the end of the call and the meeting. Next week on Thursday it's Thanksgiving in the United States so I'm not sure how many people we have on the call that are actually U.S. based. From a staff perspective it's not a problem, but I'm just putting it out there whether we want to meet next week or do it the week after. I'd be happy obviously as a European based person to have it next Thursday, but I just want to put it out there.

(Chris Dillon): Yes okay. Again it's the usual thing. We have so much to do and we have some deadlines coming up, so the instinct is to run the thing, but then on the other hand yes, you know, it's not good to exclude input from that part of the world. The other thing is we have a lot of work to do. My instinct is that we actually do adjourn it and that we do as much as we can on the week on the mailing list, and that means that, you know, we can try and get this as good as we possibly can for the week after. I feel that's the thing to do. Jim, would you like raise something?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you. Whether or not you meet next week I don't feel strongly about, but I would suggest that we plan at least two more meetings since there will be some number who wouldn't be present next week if you do decide to meet. And then I was also going to ask that will there be a clean version of this document that will be issued in the near future? I know that I owe a set of comments and I have incorporated comments - I have not yet finished getting all the way through this thing with comments and I just keep having partial comments in different versions as we've gone along. But it would be nice to get a clean version, and then I promise I will get some comments in on that here.

(Chris Dillon): There is a clean version of it attached to an e-mail I sent this morning, but yes I mean from now on we'll send out the two at the same time. So we'll out the Word version which will have most of the recent comments, and then we'll send a PDF with no comments so (unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: The clean version - the version that I have from this morning, which is the one I opened up in order to go through this call, is not clean, it has comments in it.

(Chris Dillon): The PDF?

Jim Galvin: Oh well, I mean I want a Doc version if you want me to comment.

(Chris Dillon): Now on that e-mail there should have been two. There should have been two attachments.

Jim Galvin: Yes there was. There was a Doc and PDF. (Unintelligible)

(Chris Dillon): Now the PDF should be clean.

Jim Galvin: I understand the PDF is clean, but I was asking about whether or not there'll be a clean one to comment against or do you want to just keep adding comments on top here of the version that you had this morning?

(Chris Dillon): I think we need to use the Docx version, the Word version for the comments, because the comments in there are substantial now because I went through them this morning and removed the ones that weren't. So I think we, you know, we run with that, we add comments to that one, but then each time we'll release a PDF which has no comments at all. That's what I'm intending to do.

Jim Galvin: Okay that's fine. So you want to just keep putting comments on comments, okay. Thank you.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, until we get - I mean, oh well what I will do is I will remove anything that isn't controversial, but things that we're coming back to I'll leave there.

Jim Galvin: Okay. That would be helpful.

(Chris Dillon): I mean (Rudy) is actually suggesting that we start with a blank one. That's also possible. I could just accept all changes. Is that going to be easier?

Jim Galvin: Whatever works for you.

(Chris Dillon): I might just do that.

Jim Galvin: You know, I guess I was looking for, you know, whatever you would consider the cleanest version, if you will, and that can be everything gone, you can leave it as is or as you were just suggesting maybe you go through and remove some of the noncontroversial things that you think are settled. I just wanted to know what to work with and I was just asking that an official, if you will, clean comment on this be distributed, whatever you want that be basically.

(Chris Dillon): Okay. I think the decision on it is that I would like to do what I did today and that basically remove anything insubstantial but really use the Docx as keeping any substantial comments there until we're agreed that they can go and then each time I will send a totally clean PDF. But at some point we probably will have to zero it actually.

Jim Galvin: You'll - so you will distribute a new Docx relatively soon for people to continue to comment on? Thank you.

(Chris Dillon): Yes. Yes, we'll certainly do that. Lars, would you like to pick something up?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry that was an old hand, I'm sorry.

(Chris Dillon): Okay no trouble at all. All right. Well in that case, we'll meet again in two weeks' time, but I think I'll send around that e-mail that (Rudy) suggested about the Monday deadline and asking, you know, other opinions of people on the list. And I'll also send around a series of e-mail which are picking up

various other points that we didn't have time to cover today. And as I say, we'll aim for to get through all of that by the next meeting. All right. So thank you very much everybody for today's call.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, (Chris), bye-bye.

(Chris Dillon): Goodbye, Lars.

Jim Galvin: Thank you. Goodbye.

(Chris Dillon): Bye-bye, Jim.

(Rudy Vansnick): Bye-bye, (Chris). Bye-bye, everybody.

(Chris Dillon): Bye, (Rudy).

Woman: Can you please stop the recording?

END