Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 11 December 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 11 December 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-20141211-en.mp3

Attendees:
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan)-NCUC
Jim Galvin - RySG
Justine Chew – Individual
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Emily Taylor – RrSG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Wanawit Ahkuputra – GAC

Apologies:
None

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good afternoon and good evening. This is a translation and transliteration

                  contact information PDP working group call on the 11th of December, 2014.

                  On the call.

Man: Excuse me. Mr. Rindforth has joined the conference.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. On the call today we have Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Chris Dillon, Rudi Vansnick, Emily Taylor, Peter Green, Amr Elsadr ,Jim Galvin, Petter Rindforth and Wanawit Ahkuputra. I show no apologies for today's conference call. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. And we can then move into the point on the agenda number three. I need to ask whether anybody has changed statements of interest since the last meeting. I'm seeing and hearing nothing. I think that means we can move further down into what we'll spend most of today's meeting on which is the latest version of the draft initial document. And what I am proposing is that we start - there are two major lots of adverts. So one is that we've gotten rid of the recommendations for mandatory transformation and the other thing is that we've added an executive summary at the beginning of the document. But what I would like to do is to start basically round about page 16 and then do those changes first and then we can go back to the summary because obviously to some extent the summary depends on this. So I feel that's the right way to do it.

                    Obviously if anybody has anything they want to raise about a part of the document between the summary and page 16 that is absolutely fine. But I think most of the changes are between page 16 and page 22. So that's where I would like to start. Right and I might have found a spelling mistake. I suspect there are probably quite a lot of typos at the moment because we've moved, you know, quite a lot of stuff around and they tend to happen. But anyway yes but if you do spot one then we're, you know, it just help the editing if we're aware of them. So thank you for that.

All right so now there should be a paragraph here starting at this stage. And in my version it's on page - the paper version I have it's on page 16. But I guess it moved down a little bit here. Oh yes. It is there. It's just the second line not the first line. Okay so there are quite a lot of changes around here. So I think probably it's a good idea if I - I'll read this out in a minute and then we can just check that we're happy. But before I do so (Omar) would you like to bring something up?

Amr Elsadr;   Thanks Chris. This is (Amr). Yes I actually before we get to page 16 I would have like to suggest some language changes on page five.

Chris Dillon: Oh yes okay...

Amr Elsadr: And I think this would also - yes and it doesn't really change the meaning of anything. It just slightly reinforces what the last bullet point on that page is trying to say. And I think this would also if this change is accepted then it would also require a change on page 18.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Okay...

Amr Elsadr: But for the last bullet that says mandatory transformation would require validation of both the original and transformed contact information every time they change a potentially costly duplication of effort. Responsibility for accuracy would rest on registrants who may not be qualified to check it. I would have liked to elaborate this by removing not to be qualified to check it and replace that with something to the effect of lack the language skills to accurately validate the transformed contact information. This could create unresolvable difficulties in fulfilling contractual requirements between registrants and registrars as well as between registrars and ICANN. So I think that's just adds a little bit more description to what the problem may be here. And I can put the text in the chat box if you like.

Chris Dillon: That's really kind of you. I can see Jim's agreeing with you in the chat room. I certainly do as well. That sounds like a really nice improvement. Thank you. As I said having it in the chat room is helpful because yes just it makes it slightly easier to do the other things. So thank you for that. Emily is - Emily Taylor is just pointing out that names seem to drop out of the document very often. I am sorry about this but we'll make sure you're reinstated anyway.

Okay. So unless there are any other points before page 16 I shall just pop back down there. But, you know, as I was saying really I'm only starting at page 16 because that does seem to be the start of most stuff. But yes. Okay. So at the top of page 16 we have a lot of changes. So I am actually going to read that because I think that's the quickest way of doing it and it's this paragraph that starts. At this stage the working group have decided to summarize this discussion and put the arguments it has gathered to the community. The summary provides - ah now there's trouble here actually isn't there? The summary provides those detailed arguments but there's an S missing there. Since we go. Provides both detailed arguments in favor and opposing mandatory transformation. And the working group hopes that community feedback will maximize its consensus levels for the final report. Therefore working group members strongly encourage the community to provide additional arguments in favor and opposing mandatory transformation, contact information data further to facilitate the working group's consensus building process.

Okay. So I'll just move a little stuff going on in the chat room. I'll just check that we're up to date. No it's just (Omar) adding text for the early part of the document. (Omar) is your hand up because you want to raise something or is it - or has it been forgotten?

Amr Elsadr: Oh sorry Chris.

Chris Dillon: No trouble at all. Okay let's just dwell on that one for a moment. And then gradually move down. Ah yes okay because when we come into the

argument on both sides of the argument one issue that came up with the - with I'm struggling to remember exactly which version it was to tell the truth. But one of the recent minor versions, one of the things that came up was that we were starting to move arguments around. So we were trying to get the more important arguments to the top of the list. So in fact we are on the other list. So this is the mandatory list we're looking at now. But on the non-mandatory list we actually moved four arguments from the bottom to the top. So really with both of these lists there is the sort of general question is have we roughly got the order of heaviness right for these two lists. So have we got the most important things up at the top? Which is an open question really.

(Omar) is saying in the chat room he thinks we have. Now Petter is typing something about this and, you know, I'm certainly very happy to move arguments around. Okay and Petter is saying that she's happy with the mandatory ones. So that's - I think that all goes well for that aspect actually yes. And yes. Ah yes. We're - well (Omar) is saying oh he thought it was only about non-mandatory. It's actually both. So first of all we're looking at the mandatory ones and Petter is saying, you know, those are okay. We could just pop down briefly and look at the - now here we've got the non-mandatory ones.

I mean here's an idea. I don't know what people think of this but I actually rather than saying working group's arguments opposing mandatory transformation, I actually have a slight preference for saying working groups arguments for non-mandatory transformation. But I don't know whether there are - there's some unexpected thing that - some sort of issue that that may raise. But for me non-mandatory transformation is quite a positive thing you see. So I would almost prefer to have it stated like that. Jim would you like to say something about that perhaps?

Jim Galvin: So thank you. Jim Galvin for the transcript. My only reaction to that is it just feels to me like a - kind of an English speaking idiom if you will. You know, non-mandatory I mean I get it. I suspect the English speakers would. I worry

that it's a phrase that isn't natural for non-English speakers. I guess that's my only comment about it. I'm not sure if others feel differently. Maybe some folks here for whom English is not their first language would want to react to that comment and see what they say. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay. I take your point there. There is no doubt that the more negatives one puts in a sentence the more difficult the sentence becomes to understand. You know, if you put three negatives in then you really don't know what on earth's going on at all. So yes I'm tremendously sympathetic to that and I don't feel strongly. So maybe that's - maybe we should just actually leave it. But Petter would you like to bring up something on that one or something else perhaps.

Petter Rindforth: Petter here. Well just raising my voice as one of the non-English speakers here. I thought actually it was kind of a good idea that you had. It seemed to be more - I would understand the two different use maybe a little bit better than its. I mean it's used on the negatives and positive sides with both. But it's not just and I'm I know I'm not the person that should make any comments on this opposing mandatory but I think that the new title you suggested shows it better actually what's - what we're describing on these points. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Petter thank you very much for that. That's really appreciated. Okay. Well hmm. I - my instinct I think in a case like this where there are strong arguments on both sides I'm almost thinking possibly leave it. But I do appreciate what you've just said. And I think yes I would, you know, we don't have to make all decisions immediately. You know, that's the sort of thing that we could think about in slow time. I'm laughing because (Omar)'s got lost where he was typing the comments. Oh dear. Yes. Okay. Right so I'll leave that one as just one that we're still thinking about. I mean as I said I don't, you know, feel either - I don't feel strongly about that but I just thought it was just worth bringing up. Okay. Then if we just gradually scroll down to page 18 we've got a small one. But (Omar) would you like to raise something before we go there?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thanks Chris. I'm - I also had a comment on one of the bullets on page 16. I hadn't realized we moved past that. This may be an old item, maybe something we've discussed before. I'm not - I don't recall precisely but on page 16 the last bullet in the documents that I have in front of me in version 7C regarding law enforcement purposes and cost referencing who is search results, the fact that it may be easier. As it says it may be easier to ascertain whether the same registrant is the delineated name holder for different names as the contact information or transformed according to standards.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: This bullet doesn't make much sense to me. And if it's not going to be changed I'm wondering if we could add something in the arguments opposing specifically addressing this bullet because even with standards I think we've given examples of how transliteration of names from certain languages to English script could be done accurately but in different forms. So I'm going to go ahead and guess that law enforcement agencies are going after bad actors or...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: ...domain name holders who are registering domain names with the intent to misbehave online. So if they want to hide their identities or at least make cross referencing difficult they could register domain names using different registrars and using accurate information but transliterated differently...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: ...when registering these domain names or using different accounts with different registrars. So the argument itself here doesn't really make much sense to me. And if we're going to keep it here I would think it may be

worthwhile adding accounts for arguments to that and the reasons opposing mandatory transformation.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: But does what I'm saying make sense or?

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes it does. I think that often with something like this using a different transliteration a human being would probably be able to look at the two transliterations and say oh yes I think this is the same thing. If a machine was looking at the two transliterations the machine may well decide no this is totally different. So yes it's quite - it is quite difficult to express but I take your point. Jim would you like to pick up that?

Jim Galvin: Sorry. I had to cough for a moment there. Yes Jim Galvin. Thank you. I think I said this before. I know I've felt it before. So perhaps I didn't use my outside voice when I was going through this. I mean I have to agree with (Omar) here on this. I mean in fact I'm not sure that I agree with either of these last two bullets because what concerns me, not just about the four law enforcement purposes bullet but the mandatory transformation and the flight to bad act - avoiding the flight of bad actors, you know, to me in my experience with law enforcement whether or not it's translated or transliterated, you know, these - it doesn't really get at the thing which is useful to them. You know, if it's - even if it's in some interesting script or language, interesting to the law enforcement person, you know, they can certainly compare those, you know, visually and technically if they need to.

What's most useful to them as I understand it in my experience is whether or not the data is the same. They are frequently less concerned with the actual contents of the data, especially if they think it's fraudulent. But, you know, being able to see because it turns out that bad actors tend to just use the same information they haven't jumped to being - finding it useful enough to just put in different data all over the place as in general. You know, I mean

most of the more common ones just use the same value. So it's not even clear to me how that four law enforcement bullet that doesn't even make sense to me because I'm not sure that I agree with it. But, you know, just sort of allowing - I'm not in favor of this particular argument. So, you know, including it for completeness I wasn't going to object to it. And I'm not even convinced that people who are bad actors would flight to a language which is the least translatable because like I said law enforcement just want to compare the values anyway. They'll figure out a way to translate it if that's useful to them and if it's not the fact that they can at least see that they're the same is a very valuable data point for them.

So where am I in this? I guess I'm - I would support (Omar). If we don't want to take these bullets out I support the idea that maybe we should make sure we say something explicit on the other side that speaks to these two bullets. But I'd actually vote for dropping them out because it's not clear to me that they add anything. That's where I am. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Jim. At this stage it is more difficult for us to drop out arguments because we have actually given the commitment that - well as I spoke there is a question about when the commitment starts. But at some point we will, you know, be committed not to dropping arguments. That means that we can add them but that it's more difficult to drop them. So that's one, you know, that is one issue in this. Okay a couple of questions in the chat - a couple of hands up and a question in the chat room. Emily would you like to raise something here?

Emily Taylor: Really just to support the comments from (Omar) and Jim that for me these last two bullet points are not particularly convincing. And from personal experience as well I would just highlight, you know, not as official law enforcement but I was involved in a large copyright infringement case where we were managing to link up a bad actor's activities by the same mistake in who is data across numerous records. And so it is actually not so much the raw meaning of the records but a bit - but often whether they're the same or

different that is the issue. However, I do take your point and I can see Petter saying in the chat room that he does want these in the initial report. I don't think that it does any harm to include them in the report but I probably would support the call for just dealing with those issues in the kind of counter arguments.

I would also just highlight that I think that the least translatable languages really depends on what your own language is. You know, and what you consider to be least translatable. It's not a particularly objective statement in my opinion. So I'd - I don't think that these are particularly convincing arguments but I don't think that the paper is worth for it because we're actually laying out to the community the arguments that have been circulating within our group. So it's just a long winded apology so that a long winded of saying yes I agree with the previous speakers on this that we should probably just include a counter argument under the relevant part if that's clear. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you very much for that. I think that's certainly the way this is going. Petter would you like to add something to that.

Petter Rindforth: Yes Petter here. Yes as Emily said it's - what we're doing here is we're collecting arguments that we have got from certain groups and both insider group and where we have got initial comments from some other groups. So this is more a summary of those arguments. And I - the way I read it it's actually specifically that argument that has been put forward in supporting. So it - whether we or any of you think that it's a stupid argument then it's weak and it does not fit but it's still one of the arguments that had been put forward. And as a summary of what different kind of groups have - are considering on these two different topics it should still be there. It's a completely different thing what we then came out with finally when we like our working group recommendations and such. But as long as it's a summary of what we have heard of the inside and outside it should be there I think at this stage. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that (Omar), Petter. And I can see (Omar) is actually agreeing with you. Justine made the point - just made the point in the chat room that she felt sympathy from the mandatory position should articulate it. And that's basically what you've done so thank you very much. All right well let us gradually work our way down. I'll scroll purposefully rather slowly just to let anybody raise things as we pass. But I'm basically heading for a minor point on page 18. Oh and in fact that's lucky. In fact the - there's a slight version I see here. We've got the term domain name relay lay demon which we're using. So we're trying not to use DMLD because it's ambiguous but domain name relay demon is a real monster not to say a real demon. So, you know, I am still hoping that somewhere out - someone out there is going to find a better term than this because it's, you know, as I say it's really not very elegant English.

And right whilst I'm just letting you think about that there's something else going on in the chat room. Does the fifth bullet -- this is Justine saying -- under non-mandatory address the last two bullet points under mandatory? Wait a minute. I think to be honest I will pick that up afterwards but it's a bit difficult to do on the fly like this because I'm just not good enough at moving this document around. But I will answer the question. So it's just the fifth -- just a minute -- fifth non-mandatory address last two under mandatory address last two. Actually wait a minute. No we can do this because it's fresh in our minds. Let's have a go.

One, two, three, four, five. Mandatory transformation into one script could be problematic for or unfair to all those interested parties that do not speak, read, understand that one script. For example whereas transformation from Mandarin script to a Latin script might be useful to for example lower enforcement in countries that use Latin scripts it would be ineffectual to lower enforcement in other countries that do not read that Latin script. And I think the answer is that actually yes the - that that bullet does go some way but I think we probably need to just return to it and think it through and make sure it's really covered it. (Omar) would you like to raise something on that one?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks Chris. This is (Amr). Just in response to Justine's question. I don't think this bullet addresses those last two points supporting mandatory transformation. What this bullet really does is assume that if transformation is actually useful to certain stakeholders such as law enforcement that'll only be useful to a limited number of law enforcement agencies who use Latin script. So for example if a transformation occurs to English on language and script then it will be useful to law enforcement agencies for example in North America whereas it would not be useful to law enforcement from an Arabic speaking country for example. But it doesn't really address the issues of whether this - the arguments provided in those last two bullets supporting mandatory transformation are actually good arguments or not. And I would think that dedicated counter arguments need to be added anyway. So I just think they are two very separate issues. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you (Omar). Yes that's I think we have agreements about that basically. Anything not picked up on in the non-mandatory arguments on those last two mandatory points does need - that does need to be picked up, probably in two new points, but we can look at that in slower time.

                All right, so we will just continue to scroll down. And (unintelligible) got to 18. Ah, and I've got to be careful here because I think there are (unintelligible). Yep, there are some more things coming up and (unintelligible).

                I'll go there quite slowly because it just means that if you spot something that could be quite useful now in that current status discussion. That might be quite - yes, this is where things change a lot. So this we will need to stop at. And I'll just put my glasses on because I can't see what I'm reading.

                Okay, so I think there have been quite a few changes around here. So what I'm going to do is read the paragraph which is under current status discussion because the older versions are completely different. So just read a couple of paragraphs.

It helps to highlight the changes. "Although no consensus call has been taken for this initial report, it is declared to the co-chairs that at this stage a significant majority of working group members support not to recommend mandatory transformation of contact information.

Still a distinct minority takes the opposite view, and therefore it is hoped that the public comments received might allow for the broadest possible consensus supporting the recommendations of the final report." And then there's just one more sentence I think.

"Based on this, the working group proposes the following draft recommendations that are currently supported by a large majority of working group members. See previous paragraph."

Okay, so I guess the big question here is are we happy with - I think it's very nice drafting. I think it's really clear. The question is are we all happy with it?

Okay and (Omar) is agreeing with us in the chat as is Emily. And I'll just dwell on this because it's an important point and, you know, if people are not happy I think this is a really good moment to raise things. Emily is typing something. Let's just see how that goes.

Then - oh yeah, okay, so Emily is saying that it's fairly expressed. Now believe here whereas before we had two sets of recommendations, now we only have one. And that's the result of the straw poll. So the straw poll was that we will now only ever have one sort of recommendations.

Now at the moment they are the non-mandatory recommendations but who knows? You know if we get lots more arguments from this point on that could theoretically change. (Omar) is typing if we want to make it clearer that we are seeking the public comments (unintelligible) consensus call that could be outted. Yes, I think that's a nice improvement. Okay.

And, ah yes, Petter would you like to bring something up at this point? We may have technical troubles.

Petter Rindforth: Sorry I had it on silent mode.

Chris Dillon: Okay no problem.

Petter Rindforth: (Unintelligible) in half an hour for - the automatic. When it comes to when we wrote the working group proposes, I would like to have put in the majority of the working group.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes, I've no difficulty with that.

Petter Rindforth: And again, I mean if this is the initial, the first document we sent out, so I hope that could be okay. And then we - I'm open to reach at the end of our work that we can find something that we can accept as a full working group. As it stands right now, I would like to put in a majority of the working group. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, all right. I'm just - there's something going on in the chat room. But anyway, let's come down and...

Man: Chris could I just (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Oh yes?

Man: Thank you Chris. (Unintelligible) appreciate, had this comment and I think it may be useful to take the adjectives out. I'm just wondering whether we should do the same for the minority. I'm putting that out there, just thinking out loud.

Chris Dillon: Sorry, where is the minority in the text?

Man: Not off the top of my head, but it's over here (unintelligible) use of an adjective before majority I think is significant or large or (unintelligible). You know, being we have also for the minority when we talk about it there was a substantial or important minority, whether we should take that out too and just have it majority and minority and not...

Chris Dillon: Yes that makes sense. That makes it simpler. I mean there is also a side to me that feels that actually, you know, the fat that the group has the poll saying that it will be one set of recommendations which either way it goes, I think that's also quite important.

                    But yes, okay, so if we say the majority of the working group and then we perhaps lose some of the adjectives because, you know, at the end of the day, what we have is the result of that straw poll rather than anything else.

                    All right, now I'll just have a quick look in the chat room and then Jim's got his hand up. But I'll just have a quick look down here first. All right, it was just something about full consensus and middle ground. Right, okay, and it's just the fact that, you know, in order to develop in that sort of consensus direction, yeah, we'll certainly need to cooperate. Jim, would you like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin, thank you. I have two comments. I'm comfortable saying significant majority and distinct minority. I think the significant majority is appropriate because it is actually two thirds. It's a (unintelligible) and I think that does represent significance. You know, it's not that uncommon for that kind of a majority to represent a balance - a balance shift in any kind of democratic or voting process.

                    The second comment that I would make is I actually prefer the idea that we tried to be distinct - let me see, let me choose a different word there. That we actually tried to suggest that there is a clear bias in one direction or another

as opposed to offering any kind of hint that it's, you know, kind of even and wishy-washy and not definite and not a known answer.

And my reason for that is I think that it will tend to cause people to want to speak. If there are people who want to speak - especially folks who might be on the minority side of any kind of decision - it will motivate some comments and discussion out of that.

If you leave things in kind of a balanced state and suggest that, you know, okay here's where we are. We've got these two things on the side, and it doesn't look like you're going in any particular direction, my concern is that it looks like we're not going in any particular direction.

It feels to me like if we are definite about one side or the other or more definite about one side or the other, we're more likely to elicit comments and cause them to come into existence. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, so I'd like to reply to both of those but I'll do them the opposite way around. So I'll start with the second one and say I think the truth of this is that there has been direction. We have been heading gradually in the non-mandatory direction over the period of our meetings. But that really is - for me at least - what I see that's happened.

And it's not wrong to indicate that and conceivably things could happen and push it slightly back the other way or even rather more than slightly. So that's what I'd like to say to the second comment.

Now to the first one, to be absolutely correct - and his may be me splitting hairs and maybe somebody will criticize this - but to be absolutely correct I think that we, you know, what we have is a two thirds poll that we should have one set of recommendations.

Now it's actually not quite the same as, you know, what the level of consensus may be in the group because it could be that some people - and I actually think this is the case - I won't name people but I think it may be the case that some people who voted for, you know, there should be one recommendation, these were people who actually believed it should be a mandatory recommendation. So do you see, it's not totally the same thing?

And so that means that we - basically it just means that we don't have quite as much of a right to use adjectives before majority, I think, because there is this element of doubt almost. Yeah, Lars, would you like to take that up?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you Chris. This is Lars for the record. Yeah, I'd like to echo that. And I appreciate (unintelligible) Jim's point and understand that it's maybe kind of defeating that if the large proportion of members favor one over the other. But I think that we have decided not to have a consensus call for this report at this stage.

And I think then to - so it's really up to the co-chairs to kind of gauge where the majority lies for this, where the support lies for this. And I think taking out the adjectives - I appreciate that it might rally the sides, but I believe that putting this way -- you know, there's a majority/minority -- will not keep people from commenting that these people who have considered an important issue will comment either way.

And so I think by leaving it out maybe we take some of the contention out and make it easier for everybody to agree and to record. And having said that, for the final report obviously there will be a call to consensus call in there. Definitions for that, and so whatever adjectives we use now it's kind of, you know, borrowed words. You know, it's very difficult to express where the numbers are because we don't know what the number are. So it might be easier this way forward.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that Lars. Yes, I - and (Justine) in the chat room is saying drop the adjectives. I think it is right to use the word majority there. There is a majority. We know that. You know, to go back to my nitpicking, the honest truth is that what we have is the straw poll. But that was about the number of recommendations, which is actually rather a separate - it's a slightly separate thing.

So yes, I think we are okay using words like majority, but yes, probably better I think to drop adjectives. I feel that's the, I feel that's the way to go.

All right, now in fact, round about this time, I'm just doing a little bit of time management now. We may be able to come back to the report in fact, but I would like to do now is actually to go into any other business briefly. And the any other business is really all about finalizing the initial report.

And what I would like to do is to set a deadline for the close of business. And last time I forgot to specify the time zone, so I'll be generous and say PST - Pacific Standard Time -- tomorrow, Friday, for substantive changes. So, you know, obviously there may be quite a few typos and things like that, but I don't know whether people would be happy with setting that deadline, basically for (unintelligible) final, substantive changes.

I can see (Omar) agreeing with that and Emily, thank you very much. Okay, right. Well, close of business everywhere else, okay. (Omar) would you like to pick up something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is (Omar). I would, but that is if we're going back to the initial reports and we're done with any other business.

Chris Dillon: Yes, oh yeah. Well, what I'm intending to do is if we're happy with that timeline then we can indeed come back to the report, so just wait for a moment and if there's something else on (unintelligible).

Amr Elsadr: All right, great.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, okay. Let's come to the report. That's fine. If there is - you know, if there is something else about the timeline then just please type it in the chat room. That's the best way forward and that way we can multi-task and talk about the report. So what would you like to pick up?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is (Amr) again. It just occurs to me that one of the charter questions we haven't addressed in the recommendations at all, and although it's sort of a given considering the recommendations that we are putting forward, but we didn't address the charter question of who we think should decide - who does the working group believe should decide who bears the burden of transformation.

And since we're recommending in the initial reports, we're putting forward this recommendation of not making transformation mandatory, so it sort of implies that there is no one who the working group is specifically recommending should be the decision maker.

But I was just wondering if we want to address this in any way, because it doesn't seem to be included in the recommendations at all. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, thank you very much for that. That is, that is very meaty. I mean, I feel that one idea that was articulated was that basically if there is an actor or actors who want to transform then basically the burden of doing it is on them. That's how I understand this at the moment, but I think you're right. In this version, that is not, that may not be particularly clear. I don't know (unintelligible).

Amr Elsadr: Yes Chris this is (Amr) again. I agree completely. And that would be my assessment as well in interpreting the recommendation that we're making here that whoever does - yeah, I just think maybe perhaps we should just

include it, include the language that makes this clear since it is one of the charter questions we were asked to address. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay that's my instinct. Jim, would you like to pick that up?

Jim Galvin: Galvin, thank you. There's actually two questions that we probably should have language in, one of which is (meaty) that we haven't addressed. The one that we've said is if there isn't mandatory transformation then the answer to the question who should transform is whoever wants to transform.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: However, if there's going to be mandatory transformations we have not actually addressed the question of where we would put that burden. That's a substantive question that really we probably need. And I thank (Omar) for remembering that and bringing that up, because it reminds me that we probably should have that even in this initial report.

I mean, we have a significant, we may have a significant, you know, (written) position here about having mandatory transformation. So it seems to me that we should include as part of the arguments where we think that's going to go. Either that or we need to put an explicit question in there asking the community for a response to that question if we want to get more input if we're not prepared to make a recommendation ourselves.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Thank you very much. This is just such an interesting issue because I think in some ways, you know, as soon as you have mandatory transformation, you then have a situation where, you know, often what's happening is that people are just trying not to pay for it.

So, you know, it may be - and I'm just taking this as a total example - so say there was a situation where registrars had to pay for mandatory transformation. I'm not recommending that, but if that were to happen then

what actually could happen in practice is that they pass it on somewhere else or any actor that ends up with the charges. There is always the possibility that they will simply pass it elsewhere.

And that's one of the reasons why mandatory transformation is so difficult. I don't know perhaps whether we want a paragraph saying something like that and perhaps ending saying, you know, if somebody else in the community have an idea on this, then, you know, ideas welcome, something along those lines.

A couple of hands have gone up, and I'm being told also that I'm breaking up, so I'll try and slow down, although we're running out of time. Emily would you like to pick this up?

Emily Taylor: Yes just to join in the conversation. Looking at our top two bullet points under arguments opposing mandatory transformation, we do discuss costs. And the assumption seems to be that they would - that the costs would fall to registrars, registrants or other parties. So okay it doesn't nail it down with precision but it's hitting in the general direction of it's going to be borne by registrars and probably passed on to registrants or somebody else.

So I think that where - you know, just also thinking practically - we're thinking about final comments by - this is quite a well-developed document. We have in those two bullet points indicated where we think there will be a financial burden, where we think it would generally fall.

And while the consensus or while the position - I'm choosing my words as carefully as possible - is that we are currently recommending non-mandatory transformation -- or not recommending mandatory transformation rather - that that's probably enough.

If as the document and the working group develops and in taking into account public comments we reach a different conclusion, then I think it will be

appropriate at that stage to try to work that more fully. But I think it's probably covered enough for our purposes in writing.

Chris Dillon: Okay I would be interested to hear (Omar)'s response to that. I think you're right. To some extent, you know, we've certainly thought along those lines. Perhaps just existing text needs to be strengthened a little. And in fact (Justine) is saying that she recalls some discussions on some of these issues already occurring, yes. But there's always slight risk that things drop out of certain versions.

Lars, sorry, you've had your hand up for a long time. Would you like to add something?

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Chris. This is Lars for the record. So I think Jim is making a very good point and Emily picked it up too. So I believe that for this version, just it has a recommendation in that we don't have - we don't recommend that mandatory transformation come to (unintelligible).

It probably would be good to put an (unintelligible) sentence into the paragraph that Emily just mentioned (unintelligible) the thinking of the group lies, if it were to happen, and then explicitly actually call out the two steps after that, specifically call out in this report and for anybody who submits a comment to also address that issue even if the comment is we support not to recommend any (unintelligible).

You know, if we were to swing the other way, it would be good to hear these people's thoughts and who they think should bear the cost and who they think should decide who bears the cost. And rather than discussing this now within the group, you know, we have almost seven weeks until the public comments on (unintelligible).

So when we gather again either before the holidays or after, this may be an issue we want to look at for one or two calls as well to address this in case

the recommendations at the end are not what (intelligible). That's all for me, thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Now there is a - Jim is asking whether we're intending to run a meeting next week. There is one on the schedule. It may be useful to have it next week to discuss any public comments that there have been. So I'm free and I'm happy to run a meeting as scheduled. I don't think there's a problem with that.

Going back to what Lars was just saying, yes, so I think that's all, you know, that's all content that I'm certainly happy to support. And there's quite a lot going on in the chat room at the moment. Okay.

Yes, and so (Tata) is saying we should meet next week, so I'm really happy to do that. Okay, by then we will almost certainly be dealing with public comments, so that will be an interesting change in our activities.

Lars, is there something you'd like to add or shall be gradually close down?

Lars Hoffman: I'm sorry.

Chris Dillon: It's no problem at all. Okay, well, it looks as if we'll have quite a flurry of activity tomorrow drafting that final initial document, so to speak. And so I'll look forward to our meeting next week, and, you know, feel very free tomorrow to send e-mails and, you know, we will incorporate as many substantial changes as possible, but with the idea of actually submitting the documents on Monday. That's something I should have specified.

And (Justine) is talking about formatting requests, changing references to working group and group to working group. Yes, that sounds good to me, yes. Yes, because it's good to be as consistent as possible. No problem at all. And, you know, any typos you spot or any inconsistencies like that, really gratefully received.

All right, well thank you very much indeed for a good meeting. And I'll look forward to tomorrow's discussions and next week's meeting. Right, I'll wait for them to - there's still a couple of things going on in the chat room. Then I'll close down.

Ah, yes. (Omar) in fact we're just more or less rounding up now. I'm sorry if you missed a few things towards the end. Okay, thank you very much indeed. Good-bye then.

Coordinator: This concludes the staff recording.

END