Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 07 May 2015 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 07 May 2015 at 1300 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-07may15-en.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Attendees:
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Jim Galvin - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Justine Chew – Individual
Roger Carney – RrSG

Apologies:
Petter Rindforth – IPC

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recording has started, please proceed.

Terri Agnew: Thank you (Abby). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is

                   the Translation and Transliteration of Contact PDP Working Group on the 7th

                   of May 2015.

On the call today, we have Chris Dillon, Amr Elsadr, Sara Bockey, Roger Carney, Jim Galvin and Justine Chew. I show apologies from Petter Rindforth. From Staff, we have Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund 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 that means we can move into Agenda Item 3 which is the Statement of Interest. So basically if yours has changed since our last meeting then please mention that now.

Hearing nothing and seeing nothing in the Chat Room, I think that means we can move into Agenda Item 4 which is the last version of the Public Comment Review Tool.

And you're probably wondering why we're looking at the Charter. And it is actually the right document to have on this. I think it might - oh yes, it might have been the right document to have. But anyway, it's now actually turned into the Review Tool.

Now basically what I've done is I went, you know, I went through last week's meeting and I added all of the edits that we made during last week's meeting for the document. Also, you're probably looking at the document thinking this looks really different, and the reason it looks different is because I removed the two agreement columns. So it just makes it - it just gives it a lot more space and I hope it makes it easier to read.

And so one of the things that comes out of this, and I'm not actually intending to spend very much time on this document this week because I'm hoping that basically it really is the result of having, you know, what we agreed last week.

However, one thing is quite clear. As soon as you start to read this document, you just get the same phrase coming up again and again, and this is the phrase not in scope. And the reason I was thinking that we had the charter up before was I think Lars would like to say something about, you know, the scope of this. And I guess the reason the charter was up was that something to do with what Lars wanted to say.

But anyway, Lars, would you like to do that piece now?

Lars Hoffman: That would be great. Thank you so much Chris. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you.

Lars Hoffman: This is the last of the record. Pull back the charter back up. Thanks for giving me the focus.

The reason is that if you recall from last week, I expressed - concern is a big word, but we scope about the scope of the working group with regard to a couple of points that came up in the Comment Review Tool. And I went back to the charter to kind of look into this in a little greater detail.

I was particularly interested in issues related to the pecking (sic), to the possibility of having two sets of beta entry possibilities so that the system would be able to cope with two sets of data entries, if so which were needed and also the machine readability . I think if you go to the Comment Review Tool, there points 27, 23 and 46 respectively.

And I obviously appreciate the (unintelligible) scope, and its' very important and I completely agree with the points raised that we shouldn't go beyond what we are chartered to do.

I just wanted to point the group's attention to - I'm going to scroll down here for a second - to the charter where it says here on Page 2 there the two questions that we are considering, and just above it it says in fact we should consider at the minimum these two questions that obviously would open up a little bit of wiggle room, if you want - I believe that's a technical term.

And there's another issue - and I will release this in a moment if you want to go through by yourself.

If you see here on Page 4, there's a few points or suggested outcomes that the ID Working Group pointed on their report. The last one especially, the NQs of the registration data translate and transliterate, the contact information. So it's essentially something that we would potentially recommend that, you know, data entered in the original format and the consumer of that data would need to translate and transliterate themselves.

And then if you read the next line, the PDP will not be limited to considering the above alternatives but will be encouraged to consider all possible alternatives. Again, giving a little bit more wiggle work and a little bit of maybe why the scope and just the two (unintelligible) questions.

I appreciate that this might obviously be subject to interpretation and that there will be certainly different opinions on that. But especially on those three points that would, you know, be marking off fields that would be easily be recognizable and the machine readability, I just feel that they are really good suggestions that the group has come up with.

And if there is generous support to recommend something along this, and the only reason to not doing that would be scope, I'm wondering that based on these two formulations, you know, the group couldn't go back to GNSO Council and kind of clarify whether these issues could be considered in and out of scope.

And I would encourage the group to do that rather than to potentially pounce onto future PDP. It might take obviously considerable time to be established and to conclude.

I leave it at that. I just wanted to put that out there. I see Amr already has got his hand up. Thank you for the floor Chris, and if you have any questions obviously I'm here.

Chris Dillon: Not at all. I'm sympathetic to his point of view.

Amr, would you like to raise some point?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. Yes this is Amr and thanks for that Lars.

Yes, I have two points I'd like to make right now. The first one is when we were drafting this charter, several members of the charter drafting team had expressed a desire to sort of look further into the data elements in contact information whether there were certain elements within those that may want to be transformed as opposed to others and possible solutions.

At the time, the impression we were given - and maybe Julie can correct me if I'm mistaken with this because she worked with the Charter Drafting Team. We were given the impression that there would be another PDP that would address these issues.

Now this leads to my second point which is based on this understanding, we haven't really delved too deeply into these issues. I mean we've considered them; I would say we've considered them rather superficially and we haven't done as much work as we would need to, I think, to provide actually PDP recommendations or policy recommendations.

But that for me right now is a bigger concern than just the fact that it is out of scope. So although we do have some ideas that I personally believe may be valuable and are worthy for consideration, I think that there is a little more work that needs to be done on these issues. And I think this opinion was also reflected in several of the public comments that were submitted.

So that's another reason why I would think that it would be better to sort of pug these to another PDP rather than take care of them here.

If we do want to get into that here, I think we'd have to prolong the work of this PDP working group and maybe come up with another report and open it up for public comments. And maybe somehow inform the community that we are going beyond the scope that we had determined to go through initially and we may actually need extra expertise and opinions and inputs on what we may be recommending.

But for now, I still believe that it would be a good idea for the final report of this PDP working group to say that we've considered these things, we think that there is possible potential value in them, and we think that another PDP should look into those more carefully.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Lars, I can see you have got your hand up. Would you like to get back to that?

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Chris. Yes just a review, thank you very much Amr for the comment. Obviously I really appreciate that and understand that, you know, this scope obviously somewhat limited even with that language.

The reason why I think on those particular points on the marking, if you want, or making fields easily recognizable whether that's taking (unintelligible) and the machine readability, is that I would disagree that that would go beyond the scope simply because I would see that as a qualification of the

recommendation (unintelligible) so if the group says, "Transliteration and translation should not be mandatory."

However, to facilitate because at the moment, obviously who is this mainly asking (sic) both if we recommend that both the future Whois system would intake other scripts than ASCII, we would recommend that those scripts are machine readable and that they are easily identifiable. So it would be - or could they be at least interpreted as a qualification of our overarching recommendation. So I leave it at that. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Lars. Amr, would you like to reply to that?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks Chris and I'll keep it short this time.

Well first, I do agree with the intent of those recommendations, and I do think that they are worthy to look into. But like I said, I don't think we've done enough work on them.

But I disagree with framing them as qualifications to the recommendation of not having mandatory transformation. For me, this decision is irrespective of whether we make those other recommendations on machine readable or tagging different fields or marking them in different languages. So I would disagree on that point.

But I would again say that the intent of those recommendations I think are good ones and I think they should be explored more thoroughly than we have done. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that.

All right, so I don't know what people feel on this or if anybody else wants to raise some things or insights express agreement with Amr or Lars on that.

Okay, Jim would you like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: Thank you Chris. This is Jim Galvin.

I guess I'm not sure who I specifically agree directly with. Let me first thank Lars for calling out the opportunity when he went back to the charter and was, you know, making some notes.

I would state my position as follows. In general, I'm more inclined to want to provide, you know, a final solution, if you will. So what I mean by that is I don't want us to set things up so that there has to be yet another PDP with yet another detailed investigation of what's going on. I mean I appreciate that we're near closure here.

But if we really are taking questions which we're just going to declare out of scope because we're looking to finish, that just doesn't feel right to me. I'd rather see us take the opportunity to talk to the Council and explore whether or not those questions, you know, could or should be relevant, and I guess that means we probably have to form our own opinion about what we would like from the Council in that regard so that, you know, we can provide an answer here that's relatively complete and doesn't require additional work.

I'd rather see us do that than set ourselves up to, you know, push this out even longer with additional study from an additional team. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

One aspect which I would like to raise over the marking issue is that in some ways often we have spoken about marking as being something which is desirable whether or not there is mandatory transformation. So the idea would be, you know, whichever way that decision goes that at least the fields, you know, would be in the database for anybody who did, you know, want to do it.

And I think certainly reading the first draft of the final document some of the arguments in that earlier today, you know, I was aware that, you know, setting up fields like that is of itself, you know, that that is actually spending money. So perhaps we have to be a little bit careful about suggesting things which cost unknown amounts of money. You know, so that was just a bit of an impression I had from reading earlier on, so another slight layer to the complexity.

I'll just have a bit of a look at the Chat Room because there are a few comments in here. Yes, actually there are one or two things I want to pick up as well.

So Amr is saying in there, "I haven't had a chance to look over the document."

I feel I need to apologize to you. A lot was happening this week; we were working on two different files and they distributed them rather late, so sorry about that. And you know, obviously we try and make as much progress as we can with the rest of the meeting.

And then also he's saying, "Public comments especially from contracted parties indicates to me that more work is necessary before these recommendations are made." Yes, I think it may to some extent depend on the recommendation there.

And then also I like the way Chris puts this that marking machine readability is desirable. Yes, well of course now I've qualified my stamps (sic) a little bit on marking out. You know, I don't like the idea of suggesting something without knowing how much it's going to cost.

Now machine readability is of another matter. So, you know, the idea of having a database where you've got data in there which can't be read by a

machine as filled out seriously bad thing to do. Some (linears) possibly more difficult because I think often in databases it's more difficult to have images in there than to have, you know, just data; it just tends to take up more space.

Maybe there are other forms of data which are not machine readable. But yes, but perhaps slightly different (unintelligible) on those two.

I can see Justine is typing something but perhaps - okay, I think perhaps it's a good idea to wait because the next thing after looking at the charter, we're going to be doing is a brief look at the Review Tool.

So Justine, "Do we have an idea of how much more work is required to consider the marking question?" Okay.

And Lars, I'm hoping you may have some information on this subject.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Chris. Yes, this is Lars for the record. Yes, just to briefly speak to Justine's questions.

So there's the IDN EWG report that has been out for public comment and that we've been discussing in this group. If you look at what I says in the proposed, I believe that the fact that the input will be automatically - I mean Jim will be much better to explain this technically but I'm giving it a whirl.

The input will be transformed if you want automatically into a uniscript. And the uniscript, as part of it, a tag that indicates the script of the language. So whatever we recommend or not, information that will go into the post IDN EWG who assists them will be always identifiable; at least the script will be automatically regardless of (unintelligible) group.

As far as language scripting/tagging is concerned, that may or may not be necessary obviously because for transliteration - and Chris might intervene

here very swiftly - but for transliteration, the script already gets you a very long way I believe.

So I'm going to leave it at that. But for sure, script marking if you want to build into the future system budget (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Thank you Lars. Now, okay.

So if we're talking about the script of incoming data, so a registrant writes some contact information in the Arabic Script. Now this is actually not very helpful because although, you know, typically Arabic Script may be used to write the Arabic language. But it may also be used to write the early (sic) language or the (falsey) language of probably - not probably but many of the languages.

So, you know, this is a possibly large issue with Romanization - or sorry, the Russian (sic) Alphabet and the Cyrillic Alphabet both of which are used for huge numbers of languages. And so just knowing earlier this is Cyrillic, you know. Typically it's likely to be Russian or Ukrainian or Bulgarian, but there are lots of less likely - Mongolian, it could be Mongolian. It could be all sorts of things.

Yes, there's really nothing like actually saying, "Yes okay, this is the Arabic Script but it's actually Urdu language," or something like that. We really need to know what language that script is being used for.

And I'll come back to the Chat Room and just pick up a few things that people are mentioning.

So Sara, we use this with marking because, you know, we were worried that tagging was limiting us in a way that we didn't necessarily want to be limited. So the idea behind using the word marking is - well here we are wiggling. We're just saying, you know, we need to know what this language is and, you

know, if tagging is the best way to do that, great, but if there's a better way, even better. So that's what's going on there.

Then Amr has a comment which looks interesting and he's speaking to Lars and saying, "Not necessarily. Until last week, I wasn't aware that our meeting has its own script."

So, you know, there are some relatively small languages with totally individual scripts. That's certainly a phenomenon out there.

Also occasionally, you know, you've got a language like - sorry, you've got script like Cyrillic which, you know, typically it's probably used for Slavic languages - Slavonic languages. But, you know, it just happened to use for Mongolian which is, you know, not at all Slavonic or Slavic in any sense.

And moreover you can get situations where, you know, script to view - so the same language has different scripts that, you know, can be used to represent it.

And what used to be called - often there's a political dimension. So what used to be called (Serbo-Croate) has, generally speaking, turned into - now a days, people think more about Serbian and Croatian has separate languages. And they aren't typically the same because they're actually distant dialects. And the Serbian is usually Russian and Cyrillic and Croatian is usually written in Latin.

The Cyrillic which is used for Serbian is quite peculiar, and they've got some really, let's say, peculiar. They've got some really nifty letters which in normal or Russian Cyrillic, you have to write, you know, a consonant then the soft sign. But in Serbian it's really neat because you've got the consonant and the soft sign together in one letter. So in some ways rather an improvement I think.

Anyway, Japanese, yes Japanese breaks all the - this is a comment in the Chat Room. "Japanese breaks all sorts of rules because Japanese, for a very long, many hundreds of years," - no, that isn't actually true. Japanese used to be written a very long time ago just using Chinese characters. But this was really an efficient survey, then created to different sorts of syllabaries; one used by Monks and one used by ladies in the court.

And then eventually, modern Japanese, these three systems were all brought together. So Japanese is especial excuse. Japanese; yes, these people they use three scripts to write their language at the same time. And that's even before they start using Arabic numbers of the Latin alphabet is actually (unintelligible). So on a bad day it could be five scripts, but it's at least three.

And those are the names of them. So you've got the Kanji which are the Chinese characters and you've got two sorts of kana; Hiragana was the one used in the court and Katakana was used by the monks. So that's a sort of slight detour that we linguists really love; let us get back to things.

Okay, I sense that we probably need to discuss this issue more, and you know, take the necessary decisions as a result of it. But probably it's a good time to move on and have a look at the - we'll have a brief look at the Public Comment Review Tool.

Lars Hoffman: I switched the - this is Lars; sorry Chris. I'll put up the other document.

Chris Dillon: Yes, yes, okay. Okay, more than anything else, I'm just putting this on the screen to give anybody who has read the updated document an opportunity to say, "Oh you've missed something out, or why is that in there?" So, you know, you're welcome to do that now or to do that sometime during the week on the list.

As far as I know, I did this immediately after last week's call, so as far as I know it's an accurate record. But obviously it may well be the last version of

this tool which will appear as an appendix in the final report. So I'm really just raising this as an opportunity to pick up something.

And Amr, yes. Would you like to say something about that?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. I did try to look into the input provided by (Unintelligible) in roll in number one. And I see Justine is asking in the Chat what succession means.

I haven't really been able to figure out what Volker meant when he provided this comment. But my own interpretation would be and my own impression would be to possible for us to understand this is to replace succession with a word like maybe acquisition.

So it would read the burden of acquisition and understanding or acquiring understanding contact information is best placed from the side of the beneficiary of such data.

And that is just a guess on my part. I'm just trying to figure out what the message is actually trying to say here.

Having said that, I'm not necessary sure that it will alter much of our recommendation because I think...

Chris Dillon: You know, there are some things here where frankly we got a little bit stuck. And you know, the word succession is really not very clear. So, you know, I think certainly I would prefer something, you know, with a clear meaning rather than something we're not too sure about. So, you know, that said, that's certainly something that gets my okay.

And you know, basically what I'm going to say is that if there are similar things - and it may also be incidentally that we want to change the wording

because this is just full of not-in-scope, not-in-scope, depending on the outcome of our previous discussion, we may want to change that wording.

But anyway, what I'll do is keep a list of changes we want to make. And so it's actually looking as if the last version of this may be Version 10 rather than Version 9.

'

And Amr is just saying in the Chat that acquiring; yes, I think (unintelligible) English is often good isn't it. Acquiring sounds good to me.

Waiting for a couple of things to happen in the Chat. And Lars, get ready to upload the final document or the second draft of the final document. So that's going up now.

Oh yes, and Justine is saying - oh yes. The word word is missing; thank you very much. Yes, thank you. There are probably some other typos in here because after a time you just stop seeing things. Thank you for spotting that.

And the problem is that particularly with track changes, you can really lose, you know, you're often looking at a document with many different colors and it's really bad proof or bad typos.

So people are very welcome to raise anything like that. Just email me and it's the same list. All right so as I was saying I'm not intending today to spend a lot of time on that document but people are really welcome to just check that I've not done anything too horrible with it before we send it off.

And what we can do though is have a look at the second version of the final report. So this is the draft version. What I should have said to you when I sent this out yesterday was that some parts of it really are horribly incomplete and should possibly be in another document it was that bad.

And this when I originally sent out the first draft of this document I said, you know, really the recommendation section is possibly better off in another document.

And so when I sent out the second draft actually I should have sent the same government (unintelligible) with the document saying, you know, really we know that there are some parts of this that are really not very ready.

So I forgot to do that when I sent it out rather hastily yesterday. In fact there's some, you know, just to make clear that that is very much the case. All right as usual you are very welcome to start anywhere in the document but I am not intending to stop until page 4.

In fact so I'm wondering if I've got control. I'm hoping you're now seeing it scrolling up and I'm going to use my normal trick of going a little bit slowly so that if you happen to spot something you can just indicate this.

Lars would you like to pick something up?

Lars Hoffman: Yes just for clarification Chris it's currently un-synched so everybody can do their own scrolling...

Chris Dillon: Okay.

Lars Hoffman: ...and they won't see what you are doing.

Chris Dillon: All right I think it might be better if everybody is watching me scrolling because it just makes it a bit easier. If you can do that that would be best because that just means that we're all literally on the same page.

It just makes it easier for people to raise things. As I was saying I'm actually not intending to stop until page 4 but I'm very persuadable. Okay page 4 now - what I can do about this.

Yes so first of all we've got to be inserted there and that's probably going to be Section 5.2 but it's a bit after that, which I'd like to draw your attention to. If the GNSO council approves the final report ICANN staff will prepare a GNSO council report which will accompany the final report to the ICANN board.

The reason I'm highlighting this is just that I think anything which gives us an idea of what's likely to happen next tends to be a good thing. So I'm just making sure that you are aware of that.

And we've got the date wrong on page 4 (unintelligible). Anything else about that or shall we continue? I'm not going to stop until page 6 unless somebody convinces me I should.

And Omar is saying he is not sure I understood my comment on page 4. So what I was saying is that on page 4 we've just got a little bit of information about ICANN staff writing this council report which will accompany the final report to the ICANN board.

And the reason I brought this up was just so I think anything that we - it's very, very good to know what's likely to happen next and this little bit of this paragraph actually indicates what's likely to happen next so that was why I was keen to raise this.

So I think, you know, the more time you have to think about what's happening next as possibly you're getting ready for it. A sort of technique one uses in an exam actually.

And here we are on page 6. So exam's all around me today since I let UC out so I'm very much thinking exams, exams, exams. We're lucky we haven't been told to shut up for making too much noise in fact.

Right, now okay we've got - I'm not going to do very much on page 6 because this is basically just a quote so we're quoting the charter here. So I think, you know, we really can't edit this even if we want to.

I mean to some extent it is pointing out this is wiggle room but all possible alternatives so this is actually what Lars was saying earlier. It's nice to have it in there but as I was saying we can't actually edit this.

Okay, and then we go a little bit further and it's just a very brief mention of something on page 7. So we're looking all the way of this next text and again this is just getting ready for the future, getting ready for what the next stage is.

It was only the last, it was only the last version of the draft final report that was subjected to a consensus call. So although this sentence is written in the past tense when this report comes out it will be - so at the moment this is in the past tense but it's actually talking about something that hasn't happened yet.

Okay, yes by the time, you know, by the time this comes out this will be correct. You may get a slight surprise when you read that sentence at the moment.

Then just on the next page we for some reason we don't have a statement, we don't' have a - we have a colon. The (Pascale) Affiliation is not filled in so I don't know whether anybody happens to know that but that's just something I have liked during the proofreading.
Then we go to page 10 I think...

Lars Hoffman: Chris, Jim had just raised his hand I don't know...

Chris Dillon: ...that I hadn't - Jim would you like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: Sure, thank you this is Jim for the transcript. I was just going to type it in the chat room but as this thing was scrolling by I certainly noticed that we've got Sarmad Hussein listed as from SSAC but in fact he's not an SSAC member anymore.

When he joined ICANN staff last year he necessarily had resigned his membership. I'm not sure what the right way is to handle that in this document but it appears to me there is probably something that we need to say there or do differently, thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for identifying that. Yes I knew passively that that had happened and just didn't spot it. I know what to do with him. Okay, so if we - page 10.

Now I'm not - there's quite a lot of explanation added here. I'm actually intending to say anything about it but I'll just leave it on the screen in case anybody does but I think it's probably all right to continue.

And this is actually the same on page 11. The next (unintelligible) text in (NYO) actually I think mostly on page 11 it's just a few deletions that I think probably not much we need.

And thank you (Amara), he's suggesting suggestions so he's making suggestions in the chat room that (Pascale) probably can be listed as an individual. That was my instinct as well, thank you for that.

And then unless there's anything else on page 11 I think we get to go to page 12 and this is the flow of business because I think there's quite a lot of text and I think we need to go through this quite carefully because basically this is the argument supporting mandatory transformation.

These are additional arguments though I think we have to be very careful that we (unintelligible) with them and correctly worded and that they represent these arguments well.

So okay we've got three things we'll go through them rather slowly. The main burden, financial or otherwise to provide data (unintelligible) should lie on the parties collecting and maintaining information i.e. registrar, registry, re-seller because the maintenance of an accessible registration database is their responsibility and should be part of doing business.

So with all of these arguments that we're going to look at now we are not talking do we agree with these or not we're just saying, you know, if, you know, does this argument exist, is there a better way of phrasing it.

So another argument a mono lingual mono script who is database would enable the listing of all domain numbers registered by a specific entity, e.g. identifying all domain names registered to a recently emerged company throughout the second possible addition.

Omar would you like to pick up something about either one of those additions?

Omar Kaminski: Thanks Chris this is Omar. Yes I'm fine I'm perfectly fine keeping all the arguments in favor of mandatory transformation in the final report. However it may be helpful for folks reading the report to be clear on the fact that we may want to put something here with this bullet that this (PAP) is not actually mandated to decide who will bear the burden just who will make the decision on who will bear the burden.

This bullet although it's not an actual recommendation it does present an argument on something that is slightly out of scope of this (PAP) and maybe that should be somehow clarified, thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, it's very easy to forget that that phrasing is quite (unintelligible) in some ways and it's easy to follow that. Okay so yes I think something will need to be added to make that clearer there.

Yes I think that's fair enough because, you know, it is one of our main questions. All right then we have this other one which is transformation would facilitate identification of and response to fraudulent use of legitimate data of domain names belonging to another registrant using reverse query on identities on the data.

All right so hearing nothing else I think we've got to go quite a long way this time down to page 15. Okay too quickly just in case somebody spots something.

I think there's a slight versioning problem here. What is 16 in my version may be 14 in yours because I've got all the arguments printed out. Yes I have, yes I'm pretty sure but anyway at the bottom of page 14 not 15 probably needs to go - we need to go through it quickly.

Now Omar is saying he's struggling with that last bullet we were talking about so I'm just going to whiz back there quickly. Transformation with facilitated identification of and response to fraudulent use of legitimate data for domain names belonging to another registrant using reverse query or identity valid data.

So we've got fraudulent use of somebody else's data and the idea is that transformation could make it easier to make that it clearer that there is skullduggery going on using reverse query.

The wording is a little bit torture so I'm really open to improvements. The wording here. Omar would you like to raise something?

Omar Kaminski: Yes thanks Chris, Omar. Maybe it would be helpful if someone could clarify
how transformation would actually facilitate identification and response
fraudulent use of data.

As is I'm not sure I understand how that would happen but maybe a
clarification that could actually be added to the bullet point would make the
argument clearer to those who read it, thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes absolutely. It's not, it is not - this one is not brilliantly clear and it would
be really nice to do something to address that. Bullet text is drawn from
comment number 17.

Yes incidentally the additional text should be based on comments and if you
look in the margin in this version you can see actually which comments it
says that should use (unintelligible) and we'll continue to do that. That would
be one for the IPC.

It's a shame (Petter) is not on the call today. All right, well let's, you know,
basically this can go on a similar list. I've got a list of stuff that needs to
happen to the review tool, I've now got one for this document as well.

So it's sitting on there and as usual I'm rather like an elephant with regard to
memory. Yes it's on the left and so we can come back to that. Omar would
you like to pick something up?

Omar Kaminski: Yes thanks this is Omar and thanks (Kristine) for pointing that out. I just had a
question. If we're going to include the public comment review tool as an
annex to the report and this language is available in the review tool along with
what people respond to the comment is it actually necessary to have it in the
language of the final report? Just wondering what folks think about that,
thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, so but this touches on quite a complicated issue because I think often the comments in the review tool do need to be reflected in the report and, you know, there may be some situations where you've got duplicate comments and you won't have, you know, it's not necessary to, you know, to bring, to address particular comments if they're covered elsewhere.

I also don't think it's necessary to use exactly the same wording. So I think, you know, we really just need to address the comments that we're quite free just to do it in the best we can think of.

And Omar is writing so will the working group response this might also be included in the language of the final report. So yes I mean because the, you know, because this argument is not particularly clear then, you know, something does need to be done to, you know, basically to improve the text of the document.
So yes I mean, you know, that does need to be changed but it doesn't - that's actually a case of building on something that was in the review tool so it's actually out there, you know, it's adding to it it's sort of taking that as a suggestion and then addressing it. That's really what's happening.

All right, let's do similar things but with the argument on the other side or other additional arguments on the other side and again I'll go quite slowly with these.

The burden financial and otherwise of accessing and the understanding contact information is best placed on the sides of a beneficiary of such data i.e. the data requests.

So this is actually the mirror image of one of the arguments on the opposite side of the fence which is more or less what we would expect. Incidentally I am aware that we are running out of time and maybe just leave a few minutes at the end to deal with any of the business and things like that.

And then we have requiring domain name holders to submit data in the script they are not familiar with be it (unintelligible) or any other could potentially lead to contractual breaches beyond the registrant control as they would not be able to verify autonomously the transformed version of the database submitted. So that's another additional argument.

And we've got Omar asking in the chat room so we'll - Omar (unintelligible) comment there jumping around in that. Okay I think rather than straying onto the next page let's just have a quick look and see if there's a lot of stuff there.

No actually there isn't so actually we can do that. Omar would you like to raise something?

Omar Kaminiski: Yes thanks Chris this is Omar again and yes again here where we're putting the same language from the feedback in the public comment review tool this time not in favor of mandatory transformation.

It wasn't my impression that we need to actually include all the feedback the working group perceived in the final reports and that's why the public comment review will be included in the annex.

But rather just sort of list the arguments both in favor and again mandatory transformation sort of conclusions by the working group. But it seems a bit redundant to me to actually go through all these comments, provide feedback on them, document those in the public comment review tool, add that to the annex then again include them in the final report the language itself.

So I'm just wondering why we're doing this, thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay, there are a couple of issues because if we have a comment in the review tool which is not a draft in the report then and it is an argument then we need to add this as an argument.

And we'd probably do well to use pretty similar language but it's actually, I think it's very difficult to say often, you know, are these two different arguments or is it part of another argument or is it covered by an argument.

It's a really gray area and often we've been erring on the side if we're not sure we tend to add it. So admittedly the process is a bit, so it is a bit heavy but the reason to come back to it is just to make sure that we are making the right decision.

And so one of the options is to say no we actually don't need this comment at all it's already covered and we really do not need to do it. So that's, you know, that is certainly an option.

What we can't do, I think it was an agreement at one stage that we wouldn't delete arguments. So we can only add arguments and as far as I know that that agreement is still in place but that's really part of that.

A few things going on in the chat room and I'll do the chat room quickly first and then go to Lars I think. So Omar is saying I'm not sure why we are including the language not in favor of mandatory transformation in the final report.

Yes so I guess there could be an argument that, you know, if we're going to make - we're definitely going to make one set of recommendations so why are we leaving those sets of arguments in there.

Again I think we have an agreement that we would do that. So I imagine they probably will stay in there. (Justine) is then saying I think the second last bullet isn't really an argument because there is no justification given meaning why best - yes okay.

That's I think that's a really interesting approach. So, you know, we could take the line that we are less key in our argument with less justification and

we actually don't like arguments without justification. I think that feels reasonable.

Lars would you like to pick up something?

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Chris, yes very briefly. I think the reasoning is to have it in the report and in the public review tool just as a caveat I mean, you know, just shorter the report the more I would like it (Rick Gosset)'s offer of input.

I'm more in favor of getting rid of sections and putting it, you know, as concise as possible. I think the reasoning here is that this is part of Section 5. I'm just going to synch you all just to page 9 for a second deliberation and recommendations.

So that the report here reflects that what has been discussed. And so these arguments that are brought forward by members of the group during the discussions.

That doesn't mean that the group supported these it's just that that's something that the group discussed. This side of the argument there is argument and then the rationale would be and at the end this is probably recommended because these arguments (unintelligible) haven't convinced us.

And then the annex is the review tool because these are already part of the initial report and public comments have come back on this and this is how the group dealt with these public comments.

There's the rationale, having said that if the group feels it should be moved out here and just be referenced for the annex that's perfectly fine as well.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you for that. I sense there are slightly different approaches in the group here. Probably need to think about, you know, exactly what the best solution is.

I think what will make it easier is when we actually have a final version of the review tool, which can go in the appendix and so that then becomes a record which so, you know, this is what, you know, this is what the review tool was.

We are very, very close to that so I think, you know, a few more adds and it's done. Then, you know, as I was saying before, you know, these situations when if it's the same argument in which case we don't need to add that.

Is it different enough to be added? It's actually a justification for it. Now if it's different enough to be added and it probably should be added but preferably with a justification that would make it stronger.

We probably need to get some thought about these, about these aspects. The other thing which I was intending to raise having got through the whole version of this right at the end that we just said well, you know, the other thing is the possibility that some things in the review tool have been missed.

You know, that could also have happened. So I'm finding things like that tend to be more difficult because, you know, looking for non-existent, looking for negatives is more difficult.

So that's the other thing that we, you know, we will be needing to do but in my eye my suggestion is that we do that right at the end. And to any other business and there's one item I would like to just mention and that is that next week I am traveling and it's very unlikely that I can make the call.

I will hand over the notes I have on this document to Rudy who will take it. I think we will really benefit from somebody else's sharing. I've probably done rather too much of this right (unintelligible), you know.

On person tends to view things in one way and eventually it's really much better to get different views. So I think I look forward to listening to your meeting next week and, you know, hope that Rudy will bring his experience to it.

And we've - I don't know if anybody else wants to raise anything. We've gone slightly over the hour. But anyway in that case another thing I can't make next week (unintelligible) the call obviously and we'll meet the week after as usual if all is going well.

So many thanks we covered a huge amount of ground I think this week. And a last minute question. Chris am I still inviting feedback on the review tool? Yes this is now the - this is really the last opportunity.

However that said we are interested in typos, anything that was garbled and, you know, it is possible that we might change the wording on our scope but maybe slightly rewritten and it comes up several times so that's the answer on that question.

Okay, well many thanks for today and...

Lars Hoffman: And thank you Chris.

Chris Dillon: ...no problem. Goodbye then.

Terri Agnew: (Abby) if you can please stop the recording. Once again the meeting has been adjourned, thank you very much for joining. Include your number to disconnect all remaining lines. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

END