ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 01 May 2014 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT call on the Thursday 01 May 2014 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-20140501-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr

Attendees:
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Peter Green – NCUC
Peter Dernbach – IPC
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Ephraim Percy Kenyanito – NCUC
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Wolf Ulrich Knoben – ISPC
Justin Chew - Individual

Apologies:
None

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Amy Bivins
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 1st of May, 2014.

On the call today we have Ephraim Percy Kenyanito, Petter Rindforth, Peter Green, Chris Dillon, Justin Chew, Jim Galvin, Pitinan Kooarmompatana, Wolf Knoben, Ubolthip Sethakaset, Peter Dernbach and Jennifer Chung.

I don't show any apologies for today's meeting.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri Agnew.

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

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. This is Chris Dillon speaking. And we should have a look at Point 3 on the agenda which is probably a formality but we need to ask whether there have been any changes in Statements of Interest since the last call. Okay, hearing none and seeing none in the chat room.

We'll continue and move into Agenda Point 4 which is responses from the SOs and ACs. Now as far as I know there haven't been any, in the two weeks since I've been speaking, I did catch up with last week's meeting so I don't think there are any new ones but if I've somehow missed then please tell me.

Okay seeing nothing on that agenda point either if we then go forward into the work plan. And that is in the wiki, I don't know whether we can - oh yes, it's also coming up on the screen.

Okay so I think that the - I mean, obviously - oh yes, we need to be officially - there was the stock take last week which Rudi was doing and so we need to accept that document. Now let me just see if I can find it. Oh yes, okay.

So that's, you know, that's certainly one part. And we then need to move on into just a moment - it's the review of the relevant work. We have been reviewing relevant work as we've been having our meetings. So usually if something relevant has happened we have spoken about it.

However, just before this call I took the trouble of going right back through all of my notes and I have found some things which are relevant and we haven't reviewed. So, you know, obviously at a point in the fairly near future I think we should look at those.

And oddly the ones I am aware of were all under the last section of the stock-taking exercise that Rudi did last week so it's all about verification and validation. And this includes literally a one-page document by Margie Milam. I don't think we've spoken about that. It's basically about Whois accuracy.

Then there is the - some stuff in the RAA about validation and verification. That's rather longer than that, several pages we probably need to have a look at at some point. And then - now let me just double check. Then there is the interim report which came out recently. Try and equate that - it's the interim report from the Expert Working Group on Internationalized Registration Data. That has some specific questions for this group on Page 17.

So that is really urgent for us to have a look at I think. And now are there any other ones? I think - oh yes, also on the theme of verification and validation as far as I know we didn't have a look at the status update report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Director Services. And, again, this has a long section which Rudi flagged up last week. It's around about Page 23 to Page 30 that we need to have at least some kind of look at at some point.

I don't think that I found any other things so basically what I'm saying is that I think that the stock-taking document Rudi presented last week is accurate. I'm not aware of anything he's missed. But as I've just been saying to you there are four different documents that we do need to have a look at at some stage.

So I'm just wondering, Julie, what would be the process for accepting that document? I know we need to accept it. Can we just have a vote now or is there some other procedure we should use?

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, Chris, this is Julie Hedlund. I - sorry, I got some other requests going on in the chat. Evidently we have someone on the call who is not in this working group so I need to address that with our secretariat. But I'm not sure I understand your question; accepting...

Chris Dillon: So last week during the call Rudi was, you know, presented the stock-taking. It was just a one-page document. And so I outlined that I'd found four things - four documents that we needed to look at - well, you know, probably not all of them but, you know, certain parts.

But basically what I was saying is that, you know, it's a very, very good summary of where we are including some of the things that we still need to do. But he made the point last week that we needed to accept the stock-taking document so I was just asking a question about how we do that.

Julie Hedlund: So, first of all I'm a little confused. I was out of the office last week but it's my understanding there was no call last week.

Chris Dillon: Oh, I'm very sorry, I'm talking about the week before.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, I was hopeful that you were because I was thinking - I was thinking - I know I was out but I didn't think I was that far out anyway. At any rate so you're asking whether or not we need to formally accept the stock-taking document?

Chris Dillon: Well, I know that Rudi made the comment during the last call that we needed to accept it. And, you know, all I'm doing is saying, okay, how do we go about accepting it? I mean, it may just be possible for us to say, you know, yes this is a good summary.

Julie Hedlund: I think that's all we need to do, Chris.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I don't believe there's any need for a formal process since it...

Chris Dillon: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...it's simply an informative document for use within the working group as
                   opposed to a formal document that, say, the group might be sending to the
                   Council or something like that. So I think it's simple enough for people to
                   agree that it's useful.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you very much for that clarification. I mean, certainly in that it
                   highlighted two or three things that we haven't covered and which I wasn't
                   aware of I think it's been very useful for that reason alone.

                   So - okay so I think basically we can then say that we've fulfilled the stock-
                   taking part of the work plan. That comes under the 24th of April in the work
                   plan. The other part of that is the review.

                   Now as I was saying, the four documents I just mentioned I think we probably
                   still need to review; not all of them but certain parts of them. And then we
                   need to ask other questions about what we're going to be doing in the near
                   future with the, you know, with other elements of the work plan.

                   And I think the major issue there is the production of the initial report. And so
                   we need to have some thoughts about how we, you know, what the
                   methodology is. So we have obviously collected a lot of data from many
                   sources; not all, so we are missing some input, for example, from the
                   Registrars and possibly from the Business community. But we have collected
                   a huge amount of data. And it's all there in the wiki as far as I know.

So part of it will, you know, I guess that we need to put the data that we have received into the report. And so practically speaking that means that we need it an editable format.

So at the moment quite a lot of the data is in PDF format. So that format is actually quite difficult to work with so, yes, I'm very glad to see Julie's hand go up there because I'm really interested in where we go with this. Julie, would you just like to pick this up?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you Chris. This is Julie Hedlund. I think it would be useful if the staff could extract data from the various responses and perhaps even put them into some type of a chart. Perhaps one that shows each of the questions and then summarizes the response to each from each of the responding parties.

And I think that having it all in one chart would help to distill, you know, or help us to see perhaps correspondences among the responses and where we have, you know, some deviations and may aid the working group in its thinking as it develops the preliminary report. So that is a task that staff would be willing to take up.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you very much for that. You know, it looks like quite - I can see somebody clapping in the Adobe chat room. Yes, I think that would be hugely helpful. After that process there is then a thing about prior - well, I guess it's - I'm just wondering whether the order matters. So perhaps we should start off just by using a random order for doing that so it might be something like just the order that the thing came - that the thing came in and you would just order by the category of organizations submitting.

But - do you see what I mean? There are issues here about, you know, which organize - which sorts of organizations come in which order. And in fact the interesting thing about this is that it is working on one of the axes of the

matrix that we have spoken about. So effectively perhaps one of the axes of the matrix, you know, we have considered using for answering questions - there is actually the list of questions we put out. And so that would be one axis.

The other axis would then by the sort of organization so it might be registrars and - I don't know, security community, business community, you know, all sorts of stakeholders like that.

Just stop for a moment and see whether there are any opinions about that sort of methodology. I'll just be quiet for a moment and see if - I mean, I mean, I think one of the difficult things here is actually to do it in a neutral way so that all of these, you know, the matrix effectively becomes established in a good way. And so basically the questions are answered and that each of the, you know, each of the organizations are adequately represented.

Well, the other possibility is that, you know, if we have part of the community that has not said anything then we actually, in the interim report, may end up some white space and, you know, this is again something that you talked about last week. So, you know, we're expecting that to happen.

But, yes, I think perhaps if we could get as far as that it would be something that would be, you know, certainly very much worth seeing. And it may be that at that stage some of the methodology would become a little clearer. Now, one of the documents coming back to, you know, we were talking earlier about the review, so we did the stock-taking, also the review.

One of the documents there may be - may be suggesting additional questions. So that may, you know, that may just end up adding blank space conceivably but that will become clearer once we, you know, once we have a look at that document.

And certainly of the four documents we haven't looked at so far I think, although it came in relatively recently, I think that we should probably deal with that one first because, you know, it really is asking us quite directly for input. And as I say, it may, you know, it may conceivably add questions.

But anyway - oh yes, Wolf, you've just put your hand up in the Adobe Connect.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thanks, Chris. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, I have a question. Since I couldn't participate in the last meeting so just - personal issues - so I wonder how we are going to deal with the input documents we got from different - ALAC and European Commission, all these things, so to combine those documents related to the questions we have sent out.

So did you talk about that already? So, and did you find (unintelligible) is it like a kind of - that we're dealing with - like with a public comment document, you know, where all these diverse answers come in and somebody has - more or less staff has to combine that or to find a combined document for that. So that is a question for me how we deal with that because that is a lot of work to do.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. My understanding is that all of the data that came in will be organized by question number. So, you know, you'll be able to look at Question Number 1 and then you'll be able to see the various responses we got. And the responses will be grouped together by community. That's my understanding.

Now we may also decide to put the originals there in an appendix. That's really easy because that's just using the original PDF.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay if I may? So Wolf-Ulrich speaking again. So are we go - so from the working group side well to try well to comment on - from working group's perspective to those different questions as well, or the answers. So I

understand your proposal is, well, just to take the answers grouping that question by question and then putting that together and saying, okay that's it how it is.

However, so to come to recommendations in the end so that is the question how we deal with that. This is one question from me. I have just not (unintelligible) I would like to ask Julie in addition whether this document from Rudi - this stock-taking document is available? I couldn't find that by myself so that would help me as well. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. I think certainly it will be helpful for us to - because, you know, some of the answers may be quite long. And, you know, we are dividing them by community. I think there will be occasions where we might provide the summary or, you know, we may, you know, we may state that there is something missing or that there's something not clear conceivably.

But, you know, there is some sort of issues but, yes, I agree there is some distance between that and recommendations. I mean, effectively, I suppose, by summarizing we could be saying that a particular constituency is recommending a particular course of action that then, you know, if another part of the community is asking for the opposite action then we're not really - we're not really going anywhere.

This actually is sounding - it's actually sounding more like options than recommendations being slightly provocative here.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. So if I may, Wolf-Ulrich speaking again. I understand that. So, you know, from my experience with working groups so - and with the process and going up to the Council so it is - and the Council is, let me say, either, let me say, expecting some recommendations with regards to the charter the Council has set out for the group.

Or if the - but based on consensus, so that's the model we have, the consensus-based model so if you cannot find consensus on some question we call it diverse answers and there is no consensus. And we have to say okay there is - there are questions, we have diverse answers. We tried to find consensus if they are very, very much diverse.

If you couldn't there is different levels of consensus, you know, that is set out always in these working group papers. And rough consensus or whatever on this, on that. And that's how we see that so that is the result we can provide and Council, well, so we bring it up to you.

So I think for the interim report we should make some comments with regard to that process so that's my only understanding so how we should deal with that.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. That, I think, that, you know, my impression is that - is that that is the situation we are - that we are looking at that, you know, as we go through these things it will be clear whether there is agreement on particular points or whether there isn't.

And so, you know, if there is agreement then maybe that does become a recommendation but then if there are voices that haven't been heard then one is slightly reluctant to go down that avenue.

I notice in the chat room that, if I understand the, you know, the symbol correctly I think Pitinan is not happy with that. Would you like to say something, Pitinan? I think we may have some technical problems there.

I mean, I mean, basically what Wolf has just been saying is very, very close to my own understanding that - and it will become clearer - oh yes, okay, Pitinan is actually saying in the chat room now that she didn't intend to disagree and it may be that I misread that symbol anyway.

So I think as we do this operation it will become clearer whether we have agreement in which case, you know, perhaps the recommendation could be - could be suitable. But otherwise, you know, certainly at the initial report stage that we may be talking about just the various options that are coming - that are coming out of the creation of that initial report.

And, heavens, Julie has already posted the - now the - it is the stock-taking document in the wiki so that's really lovely to have that in there because it also has some very useful links that we'll be using, you know, perhaps if we have time a little later in today's call.

Okay so that - I just wonder it's very difficult to talk about things which don't exist yet. But I wonder if there are any other thoughts about the initial report or the drafting process or whether we can come back and just pick up one or two other things in the work plan?

Okay, well, as far as I know it's always very difficult to look into the future. And we have had one or two delays. As far as I know the delays aren't enough to blow us off - to blow us off course badly. And, you know, the final deadline is still December. But, yeah, well it, you know, as I say it is very difficult to look into the, you know, further into the future.

Now, any other comments about the work plan before we head into any other business? Okay. So any other business specifically? I would like to suggest that we start chewing away on reviewing some of the work in other groups because as I was saying earlier there are some things that we haven't - or, you know, unless my memory is incorrect I believe we haven't dealt with. So I'm intending to start doing some of that now.

And specifically Page 17 in the interim report from the Expert Working Group on Internationalized Registration Data - for me that's the one that really demands quite urgent attention from us. So just - I'll just find the URL for that and post it. Okay so that's the - that's the link.

And, I mean, I'm not saying, you know, there are other areas of this report that are interesting. I mean, it's a very interesting summary of all sorts of areas. But the area we really need to look at I think is the one on Page 17. And normally I would - I like to ask people who have been involved in the production of reports to present them - now. Jim, would you like to - would you like to say something?

Jim Galvin: Well, maybe you should finish your sentence.

Chris Dillion: Oh, well I was going to - I was going to say normally I like people who have been involved in the production of reports to present them. But today it should be an exception because you were on a very dodgy telephone line earlier. However, you're sounding very clear now. So I can undo what I was going to say. If you would like to present Page 17, then I would be very grateful.

Jim Galvin: Certainly. I mean I confess I don't know what Page 17 in particular has it but I know what the one question is I'd like - and the document now appears. And for the transcript this is Jim Galvin. I guess I should say that. I'm hoping you're talking about the address issue.

Chris Dillion: No. Yes, I think that's part of it. But basically on Page 17 there is this - basically a list of questions for this group. And some of them we, you know, we have got in our Wiki. Some of the others I'm not sure that we have adequately covered. So that's the thing that's really being, you know, drawing my attention tremendously.

But I mean don't get me wrong. I would be - I would be really pleased to hear your comments on any other part of this document as well. It's just that Page 17 seemed to have particular relevance (with it).

Jim Galvin: Yes. So thank you Chris. Again, this is Jim Galvin. As it turns out I'm actually Chair of this particular Expert Working Group. These questions are actually - they're very specific questions. But in fact what the working group would most appreciate is there is a section where we're talking about our requirements for postal address part of the contact information.

And these questions all relate to that actually. In that section we actually talk about three different proposals for a postal address. And we're very interesting in community input about what you would recommend and why with respect to those three suggestions.

Chris Dillion: Yeah. Okay. Now that is - I'm struggling to remember - I think that's an earlier part of the report. I know there's a great big Japanese example. No, wait a minute. Oh. I think it - no, just really struggling. I have seen this and it's just a matter of tracking it down.

Jim Galvin: Yeah. Can you - can I actually move this. Oh, I can.

Chris Dillion: Oh.

Jim Galvin: Okay. You made it possible for me to move it. Okay.

Chris Dillion: Right. Okay.

Jim Galvin: So - we want to do is move to Page 5.

Chris Dillion: Five, aha. Okay. Thank you.

Jim Galvin: And at the bottom of Page 5 and the last one is at the top of Page 6. There is an address of registrant technical and administrative contacts. So in the context of those questions the specific question that is of great interest to the working group is what you would recommend with respect to those three proposals.

I will say that Proposal 3 in fact I believe - the working group believes is - no, it's not - we reordered these things. Proposal 2 in this particular - in this draft. Proposal 2 is driven explicitly by what his group - the (TNT) Group might decide. Okay. Because it speaks to the fact that - maybe what I should do is describe what these three proposals are. And then, you know, ask if this group has an opinion (unintelligible) they comment.

The first on up here says free form text and then the language or script of the address should be appropriate for the region in which it is located. So the idea here is wherever I am living, whatever country I am in, that country according to the UPU standards has particular requirements on what an address is supposed to look like both in terms of a scripted language and the elements that are there.

And it would be incumbent upon the collection point - the input point - most typically a registrar to be aware of that language and script requirement. And thus about (unintelligible) the address that's entered based on that. So that's one.

Chris Dillion: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: The second proposal is again free form text except that the script or language that's used should be whatever is used for the TLD or in U.S. ASCII. What we mean by whatever is used by the TLD is the TLD itself of course might be in a particular script or language. You know, like a Chinese or an Arabic or something like that.

And so the expectation would be that everything would be in that. Or it would be a default of U.S. ASCII. And this is where I come from the idea that if this group decides that there should be a single common script language for all contact information, then that would (drop) his proposal to here, you know.

And then of course the last proposal is that there really are no requirements on the address. It's just free form text. Whatever the user enters is whatever it is.

Chris Dillion: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: Now I can speak to what the pluses and minuses are of each of these proposals if you're interested. But let me pause there and just tell you that again, from the working group's point of view, the most valuable input would be a consideration of how you would order these proposals or what you think of them in the context of the questions that are asked later. Thank you.

Chris Dillion: Thank you Jim. I think that in the case of Number 1 the registrar - you need to be aware of UPU - the UPU rules. Now there is an issue with the UPU rules because they are - I mean it sounds very easy. Just say UPU rules. But actually they are different for each country.

And so, yeah, to be aware of all of those is a huge body of information. So that's just one comment I would like to, you know, to make about Option Number 1.

But on the other hand, there is - also there is a suspicion that people are relatively used to using the UPU rules for addresses in particular countries. So that's the good side to it I suppose. The upside is that people know this stuff. The downside is that it's quite complicated. So that would be what I would say there.

Then - so then the second…

Jim Galvin: May I respond?

Chris Dillion: Yes, by all means, yeah.

Jim Galvin: Okay. I would agree with you. But if I may I'd like to characterize that a little bit differently, okay. And that is to say that on the upside it's business as usual for the registrant. So there's…

Chris Dillion: Ah, okay.

Jim Galvin: …nothing for the registrant to do.

Chris Dillion: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So it's not so much about the UPU rules because you are correct when you were stating the downside it's not so much about UPU rules. It's about - the UPU rules are that each region - each, you know, sovereign region is allowed to decide for itself what it wants its addresses to look like.

Chris Dillion: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: And although that sounds restrictive and it sounds like an issue, it's important to keep in mind the balancing side of that from the user point of view is - that's business as usual. Right. I mean a user or registrant they know their address. They know the right way to do it. And it's sort of the way that you do things.

Chris Dillion: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: It is a potentially technical complicating factor because it does mean that as a registrar if you're going to do business in a particular country, and of course you run into this issue that on the Internet there are no sovereign boundaries, if you will.

                   You know, you need to know in that country what an appropriate - there is that gap of how do you know what is the appropriate language and script in a

country and how do you know that for all possible locations in which you might have to accept an address.

And so what that means from a business point of view is it's possible that a registrar might get a registrant coming in who says I'm in this little tiny country over here and the registrar is going to have to say well, gee, I'm sorry. I can't do business with you because I don't know how to deal with your address.

Now another thing to keep in mind is yes, that's a gap; yes, that's a technical issue; yes, that's something registrars will probably jump on. But it's important to keep in mind that in order to do the validation and verification requirements that are being placed on registrars anyway, and that's happening as a part of your RRA, you're going to have to know how to deal with addresses.

Chris Dillion: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: So this problem's going to have to be solved in some way. And, you know, these set of requirements are not creating any additional burden that doesn't already exist. They're simply - that particular requirement another way to characterize it is it's simply acknowledging that this is the way the world works. But on the technical side oh yeah, there's this gap and by the way you got that gap already when you had to do validation. Thank you.

Chris Dillion: Thank you Jim. Well I was earlier today looking at the status update report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD directory services and thinking oh great, if we have a lot of work to do, heck, you know, it's almost ten pages of stuff on validation and verification in there.

But I think that - if I'm not wrong, I think that there is an idea of (hacking) so that would be that any, you know, that any language would have to have tagged from say - you know, for example if you had contact information from

Singapore, it would have to be tagged as English, Malay, Chinese or Tamil, that sort of thing.

I mean it may even be more liberal than that. So those are just the national languages of Singapore. But we don't know exactly how the tagging would work. But so yes, you know, that seems to be a way round that. But we'd probably need to spend rather more time with that document before saying yes, there is a solution. I think that there may be but as we walk through that document then that may become clearer.

Coming back to the - so the other options now, Options Number 2 and 3. So fundamentally we just do not - at the moment - until we've crunched our way through all of the (unintelligible), we don't - we simply don't know the answer to whether there is a requirement for transformation.

So, you know, so that's Option Number 2 would only come up on that question is, you know, I suppose whether - if there were a requirement, then that would become an option. And then if there is no requirement we end it with Option 3. That's my understanding of that.

Jim Galvin: Yes. And if I may. Jim Galvin again. The advantage to Number 2, and it's setting aside what requirements may come from this EMT PDP. Its significant implementation advantage is the fact that it's really quite deterministic. As a registrar writing code, you know exactly what you need to do and exactly how to get there. So it relieves you of that burden.

The disadvantage though is it puts a greater burden on a registrant because it means that the registrant either has to - everybody has to know - in this case we listed ASCII or English. But it ultimately would be whatever the uniform language is that this (TNT) Group came up with if it came up with one. Okay.

Or you're suggesting that if I'm an American and I'm buying a domain name in an Arabic TLD, this requirement - this particular proposal would suggest that I'm an American who lives in America although I'm buying a domain name in an Arabic TLD.

I would have to be able to take my American address and somehow write it in Arabic and that's what I would enter in the contact information to buy that particular domain name. That's the implication of that Proposal 2. So you're taking the burden off of the registrar and putting it on the registrant. That's the distinction to draw between one and two.

Chris Dillion: Yeah. And this is also perhaps a (distinction) that we are less aware of these days because, you know, to a great extent ASCII is used a lot on the Internet at the moment. But as time goes by and the, you know, the addresses being registered are increasingly not in ASCII areas, then this, you know, this becomes more and more relevant I suppose.

Jim Galvin: Yes. And that would be exactly the point. And in fact that's why this is, you know, the working group on requirements for internationalized registration data in essence looking forward to exactly the circumstances you're describing. And so, you know, our goal here is to make recommendations based on what we perceive to be a perhaps quote ideal world unquote, if you will. Thank you.

Chris Dillion: Thank you. Thank you very much. Right. Now that - so that brings us back. Before we leave this document I want to really sure that there are no - that there are no other issues and specifically about my favorite Page 17 that we need to be looking at. Double checking because I don't want to close down discussion on this as we really can't do that.

In fact, yeah. Jim, are you happy for us to stop our review of this document now or is there some other aspect of it you would like to bring up?

Jim Galvin: No. This is fine. I would ask, you know, will this (TNT) respond and offer a
                  public comment? Will this working group offer a comment in the comment
                  period? And the comment period ends May 5. The reply period runs till the
                  27th of May.

                  You know, so I don't know what your - what the process is you want to follow
                  for that decision or whether you would expect to do that or now. But, you
                  know, that would be helpful to this other working group is to hear a comment
                  from this group. Even if you could provide something informal that would be
                  very helpful to our discussions. Thank you.

Chris Dillion: Thank you very much Jim. Now I wonder if Julie is about to say what I am.
                  Julie, would you like to talk for that one?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Thank you Chris. This is Julie Hedlund. With respect to your question
                  Jim, I think it would be difficult if not impossible for this PDP Working Group
                  to comment because of the PDP procedure.

                  Essentially some of the questions here and the options that are presented
                  strike at the heart of the task that this PDP Working Group is addressing; the
                  various issues of course related to the translation and the transliteration of
                  contact information.

                  It seems to me that in order for the working group to answer these questions
                  or to comment on the options the working group essentially has to do its
                  work; that is to analyze, as we are doing next, the responses that we received
                  to the issued questions; to develop the interim report; to put the interim report
                  out for public comment; and then to develop the final report; and to get that
                  report approved by the Council. And if it is approved then it would go from
                  the Council to the Board essentially having to go through its entire process.

                  However, I think that - and I think that this is a way that, you know, that these
                  sort of - two groups were originally conceived to work together is that what

your group has done - what the Expert Working Group on Internationalized Registration Data has done is help to bring out some of the key issues that this PDP Working Group needs to address and really illuminated the options as well as looking at Page 17, the additional questions around the translation and transliteration of information of contact information that this PDP Working Group is I think going to need to address in its interim report and its final report.

And in fact the options and proposals are also extremely helpful to this group. So I think - and I could be wrong and I'm happy to get clarification on this from the Council and from legal staff. But I believe that this PDP has to run its course perhaps before we can come to a conclusion on the key questions relating to how - what are the requirements around translation and transliteration of contact information.

And Chris, I don't know if I've characterized that properly. And Jim, I'm not sure if that is exactly your question. But hopefully that is a helpful explanation.

Chris Dillion: Thank you. Thank you (Julie). You said almost exactly what I was about to say. So yes, surprising I have very little to talk about. I think that's, you know, that's certainly my, you know, exactly my own understanding of the situation we're in.

Jim Galvin: So thank you.

Julie Hedlund: And might add Chris and Jim it's a little bit of the - sort of the difficulty of the fact that we have two groups doing similar things. And I know that the Expert Working Group on Internationalized Registration Data needs this input. But the PDP process has certain constraints.

Chris Dillion: Okay. Thank you Julie.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Thank you. This is Jim. That answers my question. Thank you.

Chris Dillion: We have a few remaining minutes of the meeting. And so really what I would like to do is flag out things that we need to look at next week specifically. This is really talking about the -largely about the verification and validation, as I mentioned earlier.

So, you know, in that (start taking) documents of (Rudy)'s. Next week we will be looking at part of the 2013 registrar accreditation agreement. And especially it's actually the Whois accuracy program specification part of that. That's all about validation and verification. So I think it's - I think it's relevant to.

And then also having a look at the status update report from the Expert Working Group of gTLD directory services. And again we're looking at validation. And that's round about Page 23 of that report. And round - up to round about Page 30.

And then last but not least - in fact we'll probably do this one first because it's very short. It's just a blog entry that Margie Milam did on data accuracy. So that's just a one page log entry and we'll start with that just to get it out of the way I think.

So yes. I think - I won't try and plunge into any of these now. But if we aim perhaps to have a look at those next week. And just ask for any other business. Julie, would you like to add something?

Julie Hedlund: Yes Chris. This is Julie Hedlund. Just to note we did capture and action item from the last meeting concerning trying to arrange some meetings with community groups in London, perhaps registrars and the ALAC and others.

We at staff will certainly work on that. I will note however that we may be somewhat constrained by the scheduled. As some of you may know, the

Thursday schedule is now being adjusted to allow time for the discussion relating to the IANA function stewardship transition issues.

And the Monday will be devoted largely to high-level meetings that will involve the GAC but also will be of great interest I think to others in the community.

So not only will we then have (someone that's on) when we can schedule with various groups. And the ALAC also has a major meeting concurrent with that ICANN meeting that may constrain their schedule.

We also may be relegated to that very early morning I know somewhat unpopular time to hold this PDP Working Group meeting on that Monday since we'll have to avoid some of the other conflicted times. So staff will work on these things and come back with a status as we get a little more understanding of the schedule.

Chris Dillion: Thank you very much indeed for that. I mean the other thing I'll just say very briefly is that obviously because it's happening in London, it may conceivably be used, you know, it may be possible to get some rooms actually in the university if we are stuck for space. The university is quite close to the venue.

Julie Hedlund: Chris, this is Julie Hedlund. We should not have a difficulty getting us space. It's the time…

Chris Dillion: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: …will be difficult. But the space will be there.

Chris Dillion: Right. Okay. (Unintelligible). The venue is certainly very spacious. So yeah. Okay. Well thank you very much for that and for another most interesting meeting. And as they say, we'll come back and just continue to

crunch our way through documents for review from other, you know, from other working groups happening at the same time. And, you know, conceivably we may have new documents in before this time next week.

So many thanks for the meeting. Goodbye then.

Man: Thanks.

Operator: Thank you everyone for joining. (Andrea), if you could please disconnect the recordings at this time.

Man: Sure.

END