Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 06 March 2014 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 06 March 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/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-20140306-en.mp3

On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#mar

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Attendees:
Jim Galvin - SSAC
Ahkuputra Wanawit – GAC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Peter Green - NCUC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Rudi Vansnick – NPCO
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP
Amr Elsadar – NCUC
Vinay Kumar Singh – Individual
Peter Dernbach - IPC

Apologies:
Justine Chew – At-Large
Ephriam Percy Kenyanito – NCUC

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Amy Bivins
Glen de Saint Gery
Lars Hoffman
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This conference call is now being recorded.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is a Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 6th of March 2014.

On the call today we have Wanawit Ahkuputra, Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Petter Rindforth, Chris Dillon, Mae Suchayapim Siriwat, Peter Green, Jennifer Chung, Vinay Kumar Singh, Rudi Vansnick, Peter Dernbach, Amr Elsadr. We have apologies from Justine Chew and Ephraim Percy Kenyanito.

From Staff we have Julie Hedlund, Amy Bivins, Lars Hoffman and myself Terri Agnew.

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

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. Now just for - it's a formality thing really, but I need to ask you whether your Statement of Interest has changed since the last call. If it has, just put up your hand in the Chat or just make that known now.

Seeing no hands up, we can then move on into the next agenda point which Item 4, Responses from SOs and ACs.

And I would like to have a look at what has been going on in the At-Large Translation and Transliteration Wiki because they've started to post some things and there are also some comments.

So yes, I'd like to bring up that now. And I'll see if I can find a URL for that; that would be handy. I'll just post that into the Chat.

Okay, so if we have a look at the URL, I don't know whether it's possible to display it in the middle there, but just have a look at what they've been saying. And you know, they've been answering our questions basically.

Well one small thing, but it's quite useful, they've actually started to use the word transformation, and they use that to mean either translation or transliteration and I think it's really useful shorthand because translation and transliteration takes a very long time to say. So I think that might be a bit of an improvement to all the vocabulary.

And Julie has just displayed that on the screen; great. So if we just scroll down a bit, I think the - now let me see where it really gets going. It's a slightly (suddenly) document.

I think - yes, so from the first drop Submit Other, that looks right; yes. Okay, and some rather interesting comments here about the fact that both translation and transliteration could be viewed as privileging the uses of that language which, you know, in practice is probably going to be English over, you know, other uses.

And so, you know, I almost feel looking at the top of this document that there is a question, "Should, you know, we be doing this at all? Should we be transliterating or translating?"

Then and likewise, it moves on just a little bit further down to say, "We believe that it is unreasonable to assume that registrants will be able to enter contact information and scripts or languages other than their local scripts and language." So that is rather an interesting opinion.

Okay and then moving down, I should explain as I'm going, if there is anybody who would like us to bring up a particular point on any of this then, you know, please do say because it may be rather tedious just listening to me chatting about it.

Okay now as we move down, you know, there is this sort of debate about translation and transliteration. And since At-Large created this document, there has been quite a lot of correspondence on the mailing list. And so basically, there was a large Taiwanese piece of correspondence which Peter Dernbach sent in.

And in there, the interesting thing is that the very often on this group, you know, we have been saying, "Well, you know, perhaps what we might want to suggest is that organizational names would use an English translation if one exists, then otherwise transliteration. And that addresses would use transliteration."

But what is coming out of looking at some of these submissions is a category of city name particularly where that sort of simple approach is unlikely to work because you've got, for example in Taiwan, you have what is normally known as Taipei, but you know, under strict transliteration would actually be (Taibei) with a B.

You've also, even more dramatically in Taiwan, another big city, is the city of what is usually known as Keelung, K-E-E-L-U-N-G I think. But actually, if you were to use the strict pinion transliteration, that would be (Geelung) which is just completely unrecognizable. And then if we go a bit further afield, in the south of Korea there is a city which always used to be Pusan with a P, but these days is very often (Busan) with a B.

So there seems to be quite a long list of cities where we probably would not - well we may not want to advocate transliteration because the cities are, you know, they're known under a more common form. And in those cases I've just been telling you about, those are basically old Romanizations.

But there is actually another related case and that is where the English form has almost no connection to the original form. And the same - so I don't know

whether we want to call it a translation; I'm actually struggling for a term to refer to this phenomenon.

But the common example is actually the City of Bangkok in Thailand because in Thai, it's known as Krung Thep, so there is no connection between the Thai form and the form that is usually used. And so under the policy that we were sort of thinking about, actually we would be writing Krung Thep, but this is possibly not very helpful when everybody knows the place is Bangkok.

Before I go any further, does anybody have any feeling on this issue? Does anybody have an opinion on this? I find it very interesting, I would really welcome other people's input on this matter.

Okay Amr, would you like to say something about that?

Amr Elsadr: Hi Chris, this is Amr. Actually my comments are more general than it is specific that you were just referring to. And that is that I'm getting a sense from the comments that we're seeing that there is some confusion on what it is this PDP is proposing, perhaps not so much in the ALAC statement but others.

When you say that this is a PDP meant to determine whether translation and transliteration of contact information is desirable or not, it does not mean that we are advocating a registrant (unintelligible) submit their contact information in their native languages and native scripts. We are just actually asking the question of whether we think that this should be translated into a unified language and transliterated into a unified script.

And I'm getting the impression that the responses we're getting are based more on yes, we would like to be able to have our contact information submitted in our native language and non-Latin based script.

I'm not sure how but I think it would be prudent to reach out to those submitting comments and maybe make a distinction between the two. That is my personal feeling, at least I'm not sure if others would agree with me or not. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that.

Yes, I think it is possible to view those questions in several ways. And yes, I mean I would really welcome comments on that. I mean certainly, you know, my own approach, you know, has been to look at it and it's really to make suggestions that, you know, we are recommending that the original languages be used.

Another thing which has come out of this is that Rudi sent in a post earlier today which was saying that at the moment, the data model doesn't seem to be talking about separate fields.

And I think that is a very, very important issue because if we are talking about a system which has the original script, then we really do need effectively for those addressed fields and for organizational names, it is certainly the case that we need two fields each. You know, one in the original script and then one which, you know, to continue as I was saying before in the case of addresses, would probably be a transliteration although there may be some exceptions in the case of cities as I was just saying.

But the other situation is in the case of organizational names, it's even possible that three fields would be required. And the reason for that is that there might be a rule which says, you know, if there is, you know - if this Chinese organization has an English translated title, then put that in. But if it doesn't have an English translated title, then that needs to be a transliterated title of the organization.

And what I was suggesting earlier is that you would probably actually need three fields there because depending or not whether it was a translation or transliteration, I don't think you would want to keep that information in the same field.

Anyway Amr, would you like to pick up some of that?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks Chris.

Regarding the lack of separate fields for same names and different languages, if I'm not mistaken, I think Rudi was referring to (unintelligible) of the Expert Working Group's status updates.

Chris Dillon: Yes, that's right.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, I don't think the intent of that example was meant to address the issue of translation and transliteration. I think in that specific example that was just an example of how gated access to the registration data services would be done.

So I don't think they were actually trying to address translation and/or transliteration contact information in that specific example. So that might be why they have overlooked doing that because they weren't actually making a recommendation to do so. So it might not be the best example to use.

However, in the IRD Working Group's final report, they did state that it would be perfectly fine and feasible to display certain elements. I think all elements in Registration Data Services in different languages, in different scripts, possibly except for the sponsoring registrar which would be the only limitation in doing this. So even though it wasn't included in that example of (annexa) of the status update report of the Expert Working Group, it shouldn't be a problem.

However, I feel it would be a better idea for us to focus more on the question of whether we feel it is desirable or not, and whether we are able to display or not is not necessarily the issue we need to be discussing right now because that has already been addressed by the IRD Working Group from which the issue report for this PP came from.

But we should really be focusing more on what we think is the best course of action to take. Do we feel that all contact information in all gTLD registries for all registrants, do we think that all of that should be translated and/or transliterated for the purpose of end-users of Whois lookup because they would like to have access to Whois data in a specific language. And I'm guessing that they don't want access to all of it, but they want the option to be able to have access to whatever it is they want to have access too.

That's what I think we should really be addressing more closely. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you very much for that.

Now a couple of people with their hands up, and I'm afraid I don't know which order their hands went up.

Rudi, would you like to say something?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Chris, Rudi speaking.

I agree with Amr that our focus has to be among effectively our charter, our mission, defining if it's required to have translation and transliteration of contact information. And I think that due to the fact that we are definitely discussing on this is the proof that there is a need to have a translation and/or transliteration of contact information in order to be able to manage in a descent way relationships with registrars and registrants on domain name space.

However, I'm just wondering if it is our duty, our task, to inform other working group. And when I say inform, to really push them to look at the issue and think about solutions as for instance the Expert Working Group is proposing data models.

So I think it's important that we can trigger them and say, "Hey please, keep an eye on this and look for possible solutions." Otherwise, the implementation of our recommendation at the end would most probably be a year or two before it would be implemented and then we are just out of the scope of our mission I think.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Rudi. I think that's a very good point, and you know, effectively, you know, the fact that the possible lack of fields issue came up. And it may be that that issue came up for, you know, rather strange reasons.

I think the fact that that issue came up is actually really important, you know, because obviously, you know, if the data model could not accommodate it anyway, then that's a serious situation. And you know, we certainly do need to be bringing that to the attention of the relevant parties.

Peter, would you like to say something at this point?

Peter Dernbach: Thank you, this is Peter Dernbach.

And I just wanted to come back to the point that I think Amr made a moment ago. In some of the comments, it seems that in response to the questions we posed, there was a response that reiterated a desire to ensure that registrants can enter their contact information in their native language.

In my reading and understanding of our charter, is that we're looking at the first person of whether it's desirable to translate contact information into a single common language or transliterate it into a common script. But there's nothing in our charter that suggests people - registrants - will not be able to

enter their registration information in their own native language and native script.

So I just want to follow-up on Amr's point where we want to make sure that the responses we're getting aren't based on a misunderstanding of our question.

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you very much for that.

Amr, would you like to say something?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thank you Chris. Peter, I completely agree. Our charter questions are not designed to answer the question of whether we think registrants should submit contact information during the registration in their native language of the script.

What we are asked to address - the issue as addressed whether we feel that after this contact information has been submitted in their native languages and native script, whether it is viable to translate or transliterate it.

But I have been getting the impression from some of the responses we're getting, that folks are confusing the two issues. And that is why I feel there is a bit of communication breakdown in what we are asking and the responses we are receiving.

So in terms of should registrants be allowed to submit their contact information in their native languages, personally I think yes, absolutely. But that is not the question we are being asked to address. We're just being asked to address whether all of these need to be translated and transliterated or not, and that is a completely different question serving a completely different purpose.

So I think you and I are on the same page, and I just feel that we need to make this clarification to the members of the community who have been submitting responses.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr, I agree with that totally. I think we possibly should have made it clearer that we were not talking about, you know, whether or not input a native script would be allowed or not.

My own understanding was, you know, very much that, you know, we are presuming there will be that input. And then the question is once we've got that input then, you know, what happens in the case of these various categories, you know, these various fields effectively.

So yes, you know, I agree with that. And it may be necessary to, you know, possibly to make that clearer because I think it's true to say that one or two of the replies may sort of indicate a bit of confusion in the area.

Okay, thank you for that. Sorry Petter, would you like to say something about that?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, just a quick question. Would it be possible to send that out like today or tomorrow because it could also be an excellent reminder that we are looking forward to see comments from all groups.

Chris Dillon: Well yes, I mean I think possibly - I actually feel that that might be too soon a timeframe because I've actually only hastened the various SOs and ACs. So I think, yes, it's just a bit too soon after my having done that.

And I think also we need to think, you know, exactly how we phrase that. So I think we may need to do something, but not absolutely immediately; possibly sort of sometime next week. That would be my instinct.

Okay, well shall we perhaps come back to what we were discussing earlier. I think in fact, you know, the issues that have been brought up may explain some things which in the At-Large document, you know, were rather confusing. I think that may in fact mean that it won't take quite so long to get through it.

Okay, in fact, we were just talking about translation and transliteration and were just about to go into Section 2 which is now at the top of the screen. Because originally, it was really looking at, you know, the At-Large document was questioning whether this should be done at all which, you know, was basically a bit of a challenge for us.

But later on, you do get things like if facilitating people taking action to protect and use as other justifications for translating or transliterating. So actually, there is an understanding that there is a benefit there.

And also promoting consumer trust in the domain name system is another motivation. Allowing users worldwide to see who the domain name registration holders are, so that's another part of that motivation for doing either translation or transliteration.

Now there actually a bit further down which I didn't understand when I read it and it may be because of the sort of conversation we have just been having, but there is this thing about transformation possibly being necessary even with ASCII. I don't really understand what that - I mean it might be that - oh yes okay, actually I got it in just thinking it through.

And what it is is you could imagine a situation where there was a language like Vietnamese which was using ASCII, but it's using ASCII in a very unusual way. And so you actually need some kind of translation or some form of transformation to explain what the various parts of that Vietnamese address mean. I think that may be what that is referring too.

Then moving further down into six, there is talk about, "Well when does the policy come into effect?" And then we've got this rather interesting answer. "After the policy on internationalized registration dates that have come into effect." Interesting answer there.

And I think I don't have much to say about Number 7. But please anybody jump in if you would like to add something.

And then as we go further down, there is this talk about general use or specialized use. And then we are well into the whole debate about cost and who should bear the cost. And if we have time, I actually put a new page in the Wiki about cost because, you know, this is something that's coming up in all of the answer now. I thought it's a very important area and so we need to really have a look at that information in one convenient place.

And so, you know, then you've got things like sharing costs between those collecting the information and those requiring specialized use of the information. I think that's really the interesting part there.

And if we go further down, we start to have a look at the comments-- specific comments in fact. And here, you know, they're talking about specific parts of Whois. That's a very similar approach to the one that we have been taking, you know, that we are looking at individual parts of Whois and saying, you know, "Well this one we may want to translate, this one we want to transliterate." Now what are the problems? I think that's quite similar.

Okay and that I think is all I was wanting to say about the At-Large Wiki today. But they seem to be adding to it quite actively so we may want to come back to the At-Large Wiki in a future meeting, you know, as they add comments. I really just need to remember to come back to this in the future because I suspect it will grow and grow.

Okay, and that takes us into this sort of talk about cost benefits I was just mentioning before. That is Question 5 in Section 4. I think there are eight questions and this is actually Question 5 in there. Yes, they've got the Wiki up, so if we go into the Number 4 and then it's Question 5.

This is a much expanded look at costs. And so I think what I really want to emphasize is that, you know, this is an area where we are looking at what people are saying. We absolutely have made, you know, we have no policy; we are just looking at various possible ways of doing things. I think that needs to be stressed.

Unless as others go through these things in chronological order, so the first opinion we got was from the EC. So this is "Registries should bear the cost of translation and transliteration of registrar data and registrars should bear the cost of translation and transliteration of registrant data." Okay, so that's basically a sort of almost like a pyramid, so that was there approach to it.

Okay, if anybody would like to bring up any points about these opinions, please do so. But if I don't see hands going up, I'll just go through to the next - oh yes, Amr, what would you like to say about the EC?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, I just want to say that the (common mix) makes no sense to me at all.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Once data is translated or transliterated at the registrar level, then it will automatically go to the registry - and it could potentially go through a registry in all languages and scripts that exist. So I'm not sure the European Commission is recommending that the same data be translated and transliterated twice or not; once by the registrar and once by the registry, you know.

Chris Dillon: I don't think that was their intention. And I have a feeling that one of the other responses is quite similar to that so we may want to compare and contrast. It may be that the other response is just a bit easier to understand.

Amr Elsadr: So another comment I have on this point is that it is my feeling that if registrars and registries are required to bear the costs of this, one way or another, this cost will be shifted through the registrant because either are businesses, and they are in the business of making money. And if you increase their cost, they're going to increase the price of their service. And in the end, the customer will end up paying for it.

So if registrars and registries are required to bear any costs, I think it is reasonable to assume the registrants will be also required to at least bear part of the burden if not all of it. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. Yes, I think that is, you know, in the real world, I think that is highly probable. And in fact, one of the other responses makes that sort of very, very clear.

Okay, well let us have a look at Thailand. I mean in fact we did look at Thailand last week, but you know, just for the sake of completion we'll go through this.

Okay yes, so they're saying, "We would suggest considering demand or (into) approach for this matter. So in this case, the demand to translate and transliterate and maintain contact, address information, belongs to the data owners or registrants from the demand for address validation could be from registrars. Therefore the cost of converging from local language into common language should belong to registrants and the cost for validation should belong to registrars."

So the first bit of that is very similar to what Amr and I were just saying. You know, so some of that cost is certainly hitting the registrants. But the

interesting thing is that validation would then be hitting the registrars under that model.

Okay, and so if we continue and have a look at the At-Large approach, let's have a look at this one. So the decision on who should bear the burden should be informed by the views of all affected. Well that's fair enough, which would include these various people; registrar, reseller registry, and then - okay, and then there's just a whole list of stakeholders here.

In determining who should bear the cost, it would be important to consider whether the transformation, contact information, is made for general use or specialized use. So here we go again; okay.

And if - oh yes, but it's explained; brilliant. So if the transformation is required for general use, the cost should be borne by the process or the entities that collect the information. So there could be actually two levels there; that's the point of it.

If the transformation is required to specialized use, the parties requiring that specialized service should bear the cost. So the question that would come out of there would be, you know, how do we define general and specialized? That's really going to be the key aspect of that.

"If transformation has general use and is crucial for particular specialized use, then the sharing of cost between those allocating the information is requiring specialized use." Okay, we've actually looked at that.

So yes; as far as I'm concerned, the key thing here is how we define, you know, if we were to consider that as a possible model, then the key thing would be the definition of those two words, general and specialized.

Amr, would you like to add to that?

Amr Elsadr: I'm just wondering - this is Amr. I'm just wondering if we can as a working group, make a policy recommendation to differentiate between the two. Now that would be interesting actually because then we would not answer our charter question by saying either "Yes, we feel that it is desirable to transform," or "No, we do not feel it is desirable." But we might then say that, "Yes we feel it is desirable in a certain specialized circumstances, and based on that we think this stakeholder should determine who bares the cost."

But I'm still a bit puzzled on how to react to this opinion because my impression was that we would recommend a policy that would be overarching to all the gTLDs or all registrars using at least a specific gTLD that we feel this rule should apply too. And then we would not be able to differentiate between the use and whether it is specialized or generalized in trying to determine who bears that cost. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. I'm very sympathetic to that.

I feel that it would be very good, you know, to get more information there. And I agree with you. I think it's really on the edge of our mandate.

So you know, eventually we are just going to say translate or transliterate. I'm not sure whether we could say, well either in this situation, you know, that there would be some situations where you may do something to - I think that's starting to be outside of what we should be doing.

But that may become clearer if we get a more fleshed out definition of general and specialized. I think that's possibly something we could say there.

Not last but not least in cost, and this thing is actually not - this is not a direct. You know, this is not coming from our letter to the SOs and the ACs. I happen to spot on the DNS - or sorry, NCSG. This is the discuss mailing list that Kathy Kleinman was saying something rather interesting. And also, yes, it's rather different from what we've just been seeing going through that.

So she is saying, "Who pays? IPNLE probably won't. And then she's talking about Africa. "To burden these new registrars in areas like Africa I suppose with additional costs of translation or transliteration seems not only burdensome," - and she's using the word potentially quite destructive - "Could also be anti-competitive."

So I feel that it's quite interesting to have this opinion in here. You know, just keeps us in contact with reality really.

Now I wonder if anybody would like to say anything about that or whether we move on to other questions from this cost one.

Okay, well I shall continue to collect all of these things as they come in. I really hope that the Wiki is helpful to you and that at least you can use the Wiki to find out quickly where we are and who said what.

Right, so moving on into other areas, so actually I think officially we're now moving further down the agenda that's into other questions.

And we don't really need to say much about (fix), when would the policy come into effect because we did mention that earlier.

Okay, and then Number 7 is "What should be mandatory?" Let me just check whether we need to pick this up. I think, you know, certainly that page number 7, Question Number 7, 'What should be mandatory?" there is quite a lot of overlap with the EWG on gTLD Directory Services.

Okay, so let us then move on to Number 8 which is the verification and validation. And there was quite a lot of discussion on the list about various aspects. And I think it's all linked to from here.

So first of all, there was a validation post by Margie Milam. I wonder if it's possible just to display that quickly. Okay, yes.

Now I don't know what other people felt, but I think for me the really interesting thing was this sort of idea of a scoring methodology that in some way, perhaps, particular fields in the database would be run through, you know, would in some way have a score attached to them. So you know, if the data is validated, then, you know, and it's completely correct, the format that it should be in and it gets 100%, but then perhaps if the transliteration is wrong or the translation is wrong or there are other fields which are empty or something like that, then that number starts to come down. But really, quite an interesting idea; quite practical.

I wonder if anybody else would like to comment about that article, and also whether anybody spotted something major in there which I have missed. I mean for me, that was really the highlight of that. But it may be there are other aspects in there that somebody would like to draw out.

I'll just have a quick look and check. I see nothing else. Yes, I think that really was - you know, the whole idea, what is an accurate Whois record and statistical analysis. Yes, okay.

Now if there's nothing else about that, we actually - earlier on, we did briefly talk about working methodology. But I think we can probably, the working our way through other questions because we have mentioned working methodology.

So one of those things that we could look at is actually Point 5 on the main menu. So we've got the examples of addresses.

And actually, Amr, before we leave this sort of validation, Amr is actually saying something in the Chat about getting input from registrars who have a lot of experience about that.

And in fact, in the RAA, there is a lot of very interesting information about validation. I did notice that.

Okay, let us have a look at the Point 5 which is examples of addresses; that's it. And then we've got the new one is the Taiwanese one there.

And actually, come to think of it, I covered some part of the Taiwanese ones early because if you go in there, you will find various documents. But what they're talking about is the local Taiwanese rules for what to do with various place names.

And I was very much bringing out the sort of Taipei and (Taibei) problem and Keelung/(Geelung) problem came out of there. But the full thing is in that system as you can see. And you know, an extremely interesting example.

And there's actually links quite neatly with another place that we need to go. And this is actually responding to what we had a lot of Thai input last week from Pitinan. And she was talking about the universal postal union and also the U.N. Geographical Name Organization. Now the acronym is UNGEGN. I can't immediately think of what it stands for but it's basically a database of geographical names.

So in fact, I think the Taiwanese we can really regard these documents as being detailed rules on local Taiwanese geographical names.

Now if we go back to our main menu, we can have a look at Point 11 which is a new point called Resources. And so here we have the two things. So we have that United Nations - there we are, those are the acronym; United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names.

And if we go in there, we find a database of geographical names. But looking at it, the number of the coverage is actually quite a major problem. So if you

actually look at the numbers of names, you know, there are really not all that many being covered. So that is a bit of a concern for us.

I mean really, if we were going to use a standardized database and just sort of pick the names out of there, then my own personal feeling is that the database would need to be a lot larger. I don't know if anybody has any feelings about that, but you know, that's really what I felt looking at this.

You know, as soon as you get down to the local level, you're just going to find the names; you're stuck. You know, if I'm right, then this isn't really a robust large scale solution. I mean it's very, very interesting, and hesitate to (find no). You know, I have used it in work before now, but I think it's just not big enough.

If we come back to the other possibility - so this is the Universal Postal Union. And here we are. Actually, let's just stay on this page for a moment before we go into the Universal Postal Union.

But the reason I am complaining about the small numbers is actually here because look, we've got quite a lot of country names. But the number of cities is actually quite more. If you think of the number of cities in the world - well, the differences, you know, the problem is how you make a difference between the city and the town.

So you know, the problem is that we are dealing with towns, cities, everything, and 3000 will be a very small number for that. That was a concern.

And now if we do go into the Universal Postal Union resources there, this was quite interesting because basically what comes through this, as you scroll down through it, there are two documents. I think the second one is not very interesting; address elements, that one is not very interesting.

But the guide to the heading is used in country sheets -- the English version there. That has some rather interesting things because as you go down into the examples on Page 16, the numbering is very strange in this document. It's actually 16 but it's actually any couple of pages down.

And there, really the key element is requirements of the country's postal authority. It's that expression at the top there under examples.

So what this really means is that, you know, you may think, "Oh, this is one really handy standard." But actually it isn't because what it's doing is it's pointing out probably hundreds of other standards. So you sort of come in here really feeling very optimistic, "This is going to solve all of our problems," and I'm afraid it doesn't.

So that is certainly my opinion, and you know, I'm really prepared to sort of talk this through. But I think, yes, we probably just need to continue to build up our resources. Perhaps there is something out there which will solve all of our problems. But I don't think either of these gets us particularly far.

You know, if we have to go down this route, then it is very - oh, that's interesting. Amr is saying that the UPU addressing system is the standard in the RAA. Oh that is interesting.

I mean all I would say is that, you know, if that is the case - it's interesting because it strikes me as quite a cumbersome standard in that case. But you know, if that is working, perhaps that is an acceptable approach.

For formatting, yes. I mean formatting is - actually formatting could mean several things. I think this is probably some homework for me. I will have a look at exactly how the RAA is using that. But it does very quickly become lots and lots of standards.

And so I was really thinking that our approach of just having relatively simple rules might, you know, actually be a better approach. But then admittedly under that system, you do end up with Krung Thep not Bangkok which is really the problem.

Okay, we are at the top of the hour now, so I would just like to ask whether, you know, there is anybody who would like to bring up any other thing and is there any other business.

Okay, well in that case, thank you very much all of you for a very good call. And as we have been doing, we will continue to process the various responses we get and continue quite an active mailing list over the next week. And I'll see you in a week's time.

Good-bye then.

Terri Agnew: Thank you everyone. Have a great day.

Group: Bye-bye.

END