Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 14 August 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 14 August 2014 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-20140814-en.mp3

Attendees:
Emily Taylor - RrSG
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP
Wanawit Ahkuputra – GAC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Patrick Lenihan - NCUC

Apologies:
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group Call on the 14th of August, 2014. On the call today we have Emily Taylor, Chris Dillon, Amr Elsadr, Rudi Vansnick, Jennifer Chung), Jim Galvin,

Ubolthip Sethakaset , Wolf-Ulrich Knoben And I think we have Mae Suchayapim Siriwat who just joined the AC room.). We have received apologies from Petter Rindforth and Iliya Bazlylyankov. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, (Chris).

(Chris Dillon): Thank you very much. Let us move into agenda point number three which is the statements of interest. So this is just if your statements of interest has changed since the last time we met I need to ask you now to state whether it has or it hasn't. I'm not seeing any hands in the chat room or hearing anything, so I think we can probably move into - ah, actually not true. (Jennifer), would you like to say something or...? May have been a slip, okay. All right. So anyway, let us move into the main part of today's agenda, which is the presentation of the recommendations or the straw man, which I circulated again earlier during the week.

And specifically at this stage we are especially interested in the reasoning in the straw man. So I picked out some themes in the e-mail, which you can see in front of you. And you're welcome to raise other things. I can't guarantee it will be possible to sort out everything on the call. A lot of these things require chasing up other things, but, you know, we can at least gather them together and then come back and address them at future calls if we can't do them today.

So I think perhaps the best thing to do is to start with the themes which we're already aware of but, you know, you're welcome to raise questions about them or -- once we've got through them -- to raise other themes. And so specifically let us - let's come and have a look at this swarm which - so this really addresses something that isn't in the existing document. But I thought afterwards might be a helpful thing to do and that is specifically we haven't made a recommendation that, you know - it may be good for there to be an

option for registrants voluntarily to put transformed contact information into the database.

So at the moment what we're saying is that registrants will - you know, would normally be putting IRD - so for example if they're a Chinese registrant, they would be putting in information in Chinese characters. And there is no - you know, there is no recommendation that, you know, that they would voluntarily put in information - transliterated information. In that particular case it would be in Pinyin. Oh, yes, so the question is whether it would be helpful for us to recommend that there would be an option to do that? Okay, Jim, would you like to raise something about that?

Jim Galvin: Yes. So thank you, this is Jim Galvin. The question of whether we should allow registrants to enter something in a different language or script - the concern that I have with that option is I think it then brings additional questions that we need to answer and additional issues that we have to resolve. I mean, the first and most obvious one -- of course -- is that now we have two forms of the data. So what does it mean to have two representations of the data?

And, you know, you have to carry forward the fact that the data was transformed. You have to carry forward and store who transformed the data and when it was transformed. And what happens when one or the other of those are changed? Or more generally, what's the synchronization question? I mean, speaking from a purely technical point of view, I would - I really would have, you know, very deep concerns -- grave concerns -- with allowing something like this.

I think it places additional burdens on the service providers all throughout the system if you let registrants just do this because, you know, they're just going to have to deal with these issues. And we're going to have to -- in our group here -- come up with recommendations on answers to those questions. Thank you.

(Chris Dillon):   Thank you. The stand point at the moment is, you know, there is some information about this issue, because if the - if inputting transformed data is not necessary -- is not mandatory -- then, you know - even if inputting transformed information isn't mandatory, there may still be players -- stakeholders -- who decide to transform the data. And so you then have to say, "Well, okay, if there are people who do that, then what sort of rules would apply then?"

And so within the paper -- which I'm just realizing -- it may in fact be better to display the recommendations rather than just the e-mail which is bringing up the - you know, the various themes that comes out of it. That's possible. Sorry, I was presuming that that document would be...

Woman: Excuse me. Which document - when you say recommendations are you talking about the straw man document?

(Chris Dillon):   That's right, yes.

Woman: Oh, okay. Sorry not to understand that. I heard the word recommendations and I wasn't sure if we were talking about something else. And I assume it's - we're still on straw man version six. I think that (unintelligible).

(Chris Dillon):   We are, yes. That's right.

Woman: Yes. And it's un-synched.

(Chris Dillon):   Okay. Thank you very much for that. I mean, I will be referring back to that e-mail, in fact, but I think it probably is more useful to have that thing there. And what that document is saying is that the primary form of the data is the original script version. So if we go back to our Chinese case, the registrant would be inputting data in Chinese Characters. So that would be the primary form of the data. If there was - there were - there was a stakeholder who then

decided to transform the data -- and so it's not quite this simple -- but basically created the transliterated version of it, that transliterated version would be a secondary form of it.

And there is also some text saying that date fields would be necessary so that, you know, if somebody did transform them, the date would be clear. And so obviously if the data transformation is before the date of the original, then that means that the transliteration's probably not much use. So that's what this document is actually suggesting. Jim, does that answer the question?

Jim Galvin: Yeah, for now. Yes. Thank you. I'm fine with that for the moment. It brings up other questions (unintelligible)...

(Chris Dillon): It doesn't - sorry. Thank you for that. I mean, it doesn't really answer the question that I raised in my e-mail, because, you know, I think there was an idea in the e-mail that having optional transformation may be a positive thing, that it may be something useful. But actually if it's going to raise all sorts of problems, then that really needs to be rethought.

Jim Galvin: Yes. And I think that's my point, you know. Even optional just doesn't sit well with me from a purely implementation point of view. So - but for now that's a sufficient answer. We have other - I think some of these things will come up again as we get through some of the rest of these questions. So thank you.

(Chris Dillon): Yeah, not at all. Thank you, too. Emily, would you like to ask a question about that? Not hearing anything. Are you on mute? Nope, gremlins, I'm afraid. Emily, if you can hear me, then type in the chat room and - yes, I can see you're typing. In the meantime, Julie, would you like to say something?

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, forgot to put my hand down. You caught me.

(Chris Dillon): No problem. And Emily has written something, so let's get back to - I - oh, okay. That isn't any problem, so we can just wait a moment for Emily to ask

her question. Oh, yes, okay. And Emily is saying exactly the same thing as Jim did, which I find really interesting. I'm really going to have to have a think about that, because I was thinking that, you know, an optional input may be helpful, but yep, need to take that away and agonize about it.

And also - okay, on the costs and unintended consequences of two tracks of data not knowing which is authoritative and the legacy issue - okay. Well, no, there isn't actually an issue under this model about which one is authoritative because we're actually saying that the original data -- so in this case - in the Chinese case -- the original Chinese character data is primary. So that wouldn't actually be an issue under this model.

I see (Amar)'s question; I don't see IRD as being the optional bit. But a translation/transliterations being optional. Yes, the - under this model, the idea would be that IRD would be what people normally put into the system and then there is a question about whether they - you know, we might provide an option for them to put roman - well, a transliteration. It isn't actually transliteration but, you know, transformed data into the system. You know, that's really the debate that's going on here.

And I suppose it links to the issue of, you know - because this document is keen to assist stakeholders who may want to transform data. You know, we're not - this document is not trying to discourage those people. Okay.

And then coming back - I also got some feedback from our technical people who were also questioning the value of having transliteration and the difficulties, costs for registrars to have to validate such data. Yes, this - these difficulties are reflected in the document. To transliterate large volumes of data consistently is very, very difficult and very, very expensive. So that is reflected here. And we are very concerned about costs on registrars. And in fact, it really - you know, that concern is really one of the most important issues addressed by this document.

And then (Amar) is saying, "I believe those concerns are reflected." Yes, that is true. We worked hard to do that. (Amar), would you like to say something about that?

(Amar): Yes, thanks (Chris). This is (Amar). I'm sorry I haven't been on the call in such a long time. Congratulations everyone on the (unintelligible), I think they are quite solid. I was just wondering about Jim's earlier question. I wasn't sure I understood it correctly. Jim, is your concern about this working group including a recommendation that IRD -- international registration data -- should be provided as an option for registrants? I just wanted clarification whether or not that was your concern or not. Thanks.

Jim Galvin: No, that's not my concern. I actually believe that registrants should be able to enter their information in a language or script in which they're most skilled, with one caveat, but I'll get to that when we get to the question later on in our discussion here. So, you know, my concern is just about who -- if anyone -- transforms the data and what it means when that transformation exists. Thank you.

(Amar): This is (Amar) again. Thanks Jim. Appreciate the clarification. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Okay, thank you for that. That's also (unintelligible). So at the moment, the document is saying that transformation wouldn't be mandatory. What Jim is saying is that there could be problems with it being optional as well. So that is, you know, that is an extremely interesting contribution. And we then have a little discussion in the chat room going on, which I will - yes, just pick up.

Okay, one thing that may already be incorporated in your thinking is it's even to have an option to transliterate, translate will mean creation of new database fields? Yes, it will. We - you know, we are aware of that. And potentially lengthening and complicating the process of registration. It would be made complicated -- more complicated -- but only in the - in optional cases where stakeholders were actually deciding to transform. So generally

speaking, the stakeholders would not have to transform, but if some stakeholder were to decide to transform, then yes, it would be true to say that that process would - you know, would be more difficult because you're doing more than one set of fields. The answer to that.

All right. Well, I wonder whether it might be time to go back to the e-mail and just pick up another theme. And that would be - okay, we'll just be - yes, that's right. That's coming up. Lovely. Okay. So should we recommend that something be done with legacy transformed contact information? So this is contact information input using a different policy from what we are recommending.

Okay, so this - so, you know, let us imagine that everybody just follows what we are recommending. Now, that would mean that some older data -- before our recommendations -- would be in a different format. So that would be, you know - in some ways it would be better than what we were recommending possibly and in other ways it wouldn't be as good. That possibly needs expanding.

So it would be better in the sense that it would be in the original script, so that's sort of added benefit. It may be less good because within our recommendations, transliteration is quite important. So, you know, that means that if you follow what we are recommending here, what we are saying is that you need the Thai original and you transliterate Krung Thep, which means - it is the Thai word for Bangkok. So that means that if you've got legacy data which is saying Bangkok, that's actually better in some ways than what we are suggesting, because what you're getting through our transliteration process is Krung Thep, which is less helpful than Bangkok.

However, the reason we are suggesting what we are suggesting is because it is extremely difficult to tell a computer, you know, you need to transliterate this and you need to translate that. How is the computer going to know? Usually translating -- like saying Bangkok instead of Krung Thep -- you know,

that's actually an exceptional case. Usually with addresses you absolutely do not translate.

So for example, if you - you know, if you translate Beijing -- and I really wouldn't recommend this -- you end up with Northern Capital. Worse than useless. So okay. We have this sort of general issue with the legacy data. And I'll just come and have a look at what's going on in this chat room. Okay.

And isn't legacy transformed contact information presumably already validated? That's an interesting point. When I - writing the paper, I presumed it wasn't validated. That - well, actually maybe I shouldn't use the word validated. That it wasn't necessarily accurate. So, you know, certainly if you look at Who Is data, you find quite a few cases where, you know, it's obviously not accurate. It's - you find everything from data which is fine to data which is really very poor or even data where you have the impression that somebody's just put something to get it done and then moved on to something else.

Okay. So I guess what I'm working round to is this; is that I think we need some sort of status field which is saying, you know, that this - basically what this status field would be saying is that this is legacy data. That's really all it is. Whereas we may have other statuses which would indicate this data has been checked or validated in some way. And, you know, we'd need to have a discussion about exactly what those statuses would be. But I think, there's, you know - my instinct is to keep the legacy data but indicate that it is legacy data.

Emily, would you like to hopefully speak or (unintelligible)? No, still nothing, so please type. Okay, that's no problem. Don't worry, just type. Right, so my concern is that even setting flags to indicate that data is legacy or not will introduce costs for registrars potentially. No. No, no, because I would say that basically if we pull data into the system from another system, at that time you would actually automatically be able to set that flag. You know, as you import

the data, you import it and you set the flag to legacy as you do so. I hope, anyway.

Is this issue of legacy data - has it been discussed somewhere? I'm struggling to think whether there might be something in the expert working group's final report. If there is I'm afraid I don't remember it. Jim, would you like to say something about this?

Jim Galvin: Yes, thank you. This is Jim Galvin. So responding to Emily's comment about, you know, additional costs about marking legacy data, from an implementation point of view, what I would expect is if we're going to have a recommendation that says that, you know, transformations should be possible, then that does tell me that we're obviously going to be doubling up on -- or more -- on contact information fields because we're going to want to store both an original and a transformed.

And as a result, there will be a number of additional tagging fields -- if you will -- that are necessary. We've already talked about wanting to keep a date, wanting to keep a source of the transformation. I can imagine adding a status field. And in fact, one of the status fields could be legacy, if that's the case. You know, I mean, if we're going to - if we go down this path, then you have to convert your existing data to something that works. And so that gets covered. So in general my response to Emily is yeah, there's a cost, but it's not a cost that's different from any other cost we're talking about here. There's no separate or additional cost as a result of having legacy data. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you very much for that. I would just like to chip in briefly and say that the fundamental recommendation is that, you know, that transformation is not mandatory. What we're doing is trying to be helpful for any stakeholders who do actually want to transform data for one reason or another. And there is - it seems that the recommendations that we may suggest may not be very binding in those cases.

So I was thinking originally that if we - you know, if we answered and said this should not be mandatory -- which is what we're doing in this document -- but then we made some recommendations or cases when transformation, you know, was carried out by certain stakeholders, I was - I was thinking that those might have some binding force. But if my understanding is correct, they may really have more of a status of good practice rather than actually be binding. But, you know, that's an element that I would be quite interested to hear about if somebody knows more about that than I do.

All right. I'll just come back to the chat room and check we haven't missed anything down there. And Emily is just saying she's back from holiday and would like to share with other members of the RRSG who manage large databases. Good. Yes, we would really like to encourage that. And (Amar) is saying with my limited knowledge - he agrees with Emily. I'm also not exactly sure what purpose it would serve. I'm not exactly sure what the it is in that. Is it transformation, perhaps?

(Amar):   Yeah, this is (Amar).

(Chris Dillon):   (Unintelligible).

(Amar):   Yeah, it was just to Emily's comment regarding the requirement to flag whether this is legacy information that was transformed or not.

(Chris Dillon):   Well, that I would say to you that we have to be very careful about the way in which data is transformed. So if it's done using our rules, that's one thing; you know, we know what it is and we know what they are. They're actually quite simple rules. But if they're done using other rules, then you could get - I mean, basically it's just a data cleaning problem, because you end up with data in the same database where, you know, the new data is saying Krung Thep, the old data is saying Bangkok. It's that sort of thing. But it is a data cleaning issue.

Okay. And then (Rudy) is coming in with it looks like it's important to have a clear view on the data model requests and the need for further investigation on this topic. Yes. Absolutely. And, you know, obviously -- as usual -- very much encourage people to look at the document, you know, look at the ramifications of some of the things that we've been discussing today, get back to the lest and, "Have you thought of this? And what should we do in a certain situation?" That's all - it's all good.

I'm hoping that we are going to be able to continue with a nice short document. I don't know how much longer we'll be able to do that. But that would also be desirable because, you know, I think it's just a lot easier if you're dealing with eight pages rather than something quite long.

Okay. Right. If nothing else on that topic, let us come back - oh, yes, we are in fact back with the e-mail and let's see if there are things in there which we haven't yet spoken about.

It seems likely that our recommendations for those cases when transformation occurs and - bother, my screen has gone blank - try again. It seems likely as our recommendation for those cases when transformation occurs will not be binding. That would mean for example that C5 on when the policy comes into effect would need to be redrafted - right.

This may be one that we have to kick around on the list because I think the likelihood is that the recommendations would not be binding because we're just talking about situations where some stakeholder decides to transform. We think that isn't going to be binding. And that basically will knock out a paragraph which is Paragraph C5 on Page 4 of the document.

And so that paragraph at the moment is saying this policy should come into effect as soon as possible, and at the latest with the introduction of the new internationalized RDF. To impose policy on stakeholders before then, they force them to increase the number of temporary solutions and any transferal of data between systems may have to take place twice instead of once.

So that was what I wrote when I was rather thinking that the recommendations would be more binding. And it's looking as if they are going to be. But, you know, if they are not binding - if they are just good practice - then that really needs some redrafting.

And it would be along the lines of, you know, those stakeholders who do carry out transformation. For those stakeholders who carried this out, the policy could come into effect immediately because it's, you know, they who are driving it.

Yes, I think it would be something like that. But it's interesting. (Emily) is writing agree in there. I think it's referring to us now. (Amar) is typing something.

Okay. So that bit, you know, could change. But I'm hoping that we may have input on that during the week. You know it really does depend on what kind of status these recommendations have in that. You know the transformation is not mandatory.

Wait for a few moments to see that typing finish in the Chat Room.

(Amar):   Oh (Chris), if you want I could just say what I...

(Chris Dillon):   Oh yes, thank you.

(Amar):   I was just wondering - I mean in this situation if the non-transformed contact information is the authoritative data...

(Chris Dillon):   Oh yes. Yes it is.

(Amar):   Does it - to what extent does it matter how accurate the transformed data is? And is it something that we need to really hunger upon too much? I'm just wondering. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon):   Well that's a very difficult question because if you look at the expert working group's final report, it breaks down into many sub customs. So you're actually looking at the expert working group's report, and they've got lots and lots of purposes for data.

And so you really have to answer that question for each purpose that they have outlined. Now that's a bit of a nightmare because there are lots of purposes. And at the moment I am thinking that rather than answering the question that way around, it's actually better to say well what are the situations where data which are not particularly clean would fill be useful?

So this is data which - I don't know. I mean it might have been generated automatically for example. Or it might have come from a legacy database where there was a lot of rather dirty data in there, although it's this sort of situation.

So effectively what I'm saying is okay, well, you know, what are - among all of those purposes, what are the purposes for which that sort of inaccurate data would be acceptable? Maybe that question is easier to answer than going through that great long list.

Oh, sorry - I'm missing various hands. (Amar), would you like to come back to that?

(Amar):   Oh yes - thanks (Chris). This is (Amar). Yes, I suppose what you're saying does make sense. But in the event that it isn't authoritative, and if this is a

question that the expert working group has posed in its final reports, then would it make sense for us to sort of just defer the answer to that question to the post expert working group PDP as opposed to trying to answer it ourselves right now?

I'm also just wondering what folks here think about that. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Now that's an interesting idea. I'm just wondering whether that falls within our remit - whether we actually have to - it strikes me that it's on the edge of what we're doing. A lot of what - there are quite a lot of issues where it's really on the edge of our work.

(Amar): (Chris), this is (Amar) again. I do agree. I can see how it is on the edge of our work. I guess I would like to point out though that the expert working groups reported not actually policy though until the committee has had the opportunity to discuss it in a PDP of its own, which is why I'm wondering would folks just like to tackle this now based on the export working group report? Or would they like - do they think it's more practical perhaps to defer it to that PDP?

And again I'm only wondering about this because we are so far recommending that transformation is not mandatory. So basically the non-transformed contact information is that which is authoritative. So that's just why I'm wondering what I'm wondering. Thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Okay. I'll be absolutely honest with you.

Emily Taylor: (Chris)?

(Chris Dillon): I'm not sure whether we should attempt to answer that question. It's certainly a difficult question to answer. What I'm going to do is put that on my little list of things which need to be returned to. I think that's the best thing to do with

this sort of question and what I said at the beginning of the call. It's like I'm stuck.

Emily Taylor: (Chris), it's Emily.

(Chris Dillon): Emily, yes. Hello Emily.

Emily Taylor: I decided to give up on the (unintelligible) including audio and just dial in. It was very nice to be able to be heard.

(Chris Dillon): You're very welcome.

Emily Taylor: This is a very interesting discussion. And I'm probably more aligned with where (Amar) is coming from on this having spent a wonderful two years of my life doing the who is review team.

Issues such as who gets access to data and what data they get access to are complex and they do raise numerous issues. And I quite like the current drafting of 02 where we're saying well this isn't really within our remit.

As someone, you know, having been involved in, you know, the other end trying to get who is data when doing say run protection type of work or doing other investigations, you know? And I'm sure you know yourself that any data to some extent is useful if you can get it. I think that's part of the world we're living in at the moment.

But I think that I would really caution us against straying into that territory because we're looking at the representation of that who is data rather than other issues such as access which do - they just get very involved. That would be my feel on that. I think that you've dealt with it very well in the draft as it is.

(Chris Dillon):   Thank you for that, yes. I means as regards access, yes really - it is being discussed elsewhere. You know I know that. And it is on the edge of what we do, yes. But that bit feels relatively firm.

As regards some data are better than no data, yes. I mean I think looking at who is, there is some really horribly dirty data out there. And I think, you know, rather than have data which yes, there is something there but it's just really misleading, I think the maybe situations where actually they'll think it's better than that.

But yes, I think certainly access control - who sees what, how exactly gated access works. This is - these are discussions being held elsewhere. And I don't - I'm not expecting to have to go there.

But as regards, you know, whether we actually have to answer questions about the requirements of accuracy for different purposes, this is just - that's something I would really - I just think we need to consider in slow time, yes. I mean just waiting for that one to become a little clearer really.

Okay. So let us come back to my little list again and see what else we have got. What should happen to transformed contact information created by other stakeholders? Okay.

So this is imagining a situation whereby, you know, there is no mandatory transformation as we know. However stakeholder A for some reason goes to the trouble of transforming.

And, you know, then we have to say well okay, if somebody's gone through the trouble of transforming it and it's in the database - I guess that doesn't necessarily follow. They may go to the trouble of transforming it. And we would never know.

Let's presume for a moment that it is in the database. You know what about - do we actually need to think who gets access to that transformed data? And there I think there was a cautious recommendation that we should be liberal and say that if somebody's gone through the trouble of transforming it, we hope that they've done a good job and that therefore we hope that by default that transformed data would become available to other stakeholders.

I'm possibly in the middle of contradicting myself everyone. I've just told you all that we don't need to worry about access restrictions. And now I'm saying that if somebody goes to the trouble of transforming it that - unless there's a good reason - I think that's how drafting runs - but that data should be available to other stakeholders.

Emily, would you like to express an opinion on that one?

Emily Taylor: Yes. Actually I just thought that's what we had been discussing, so I may not have made a whole lot of sense in the last thing. I guess our two issues, whether it's accessible on display of who is data and if it's not going to be mandatory, then it would depend on I guess each provider to decide whether or not they include those fields. If the fields are there then it's accessible to everybody.

If the idea is that there would be data that isn't displayed on the public who is but is accessible to those with a sort of legitimate need to get it, then I think that would be wrapped up in questions of access. And, you know, there may be loads of other information like billing information and all sorts of information - log in and so on - that law enforcement may want from a provider that would be wrapped up in a request.

So I'm not really sure that this has that much of a special status. It would be about - I think that the two issues would be what is displayed on the public who is to everybody. And if we're getting beyond that, then it's going to be to be determined alongside, you know, questions of who gets access to data

and what requirements and what verification is done to make sure that they're who they say they are in their good faith and so on.

So in other words just to summarize, I think in a way if it's on the public who is, it doesn't particularly matter where the data originated - who did it. It's just there or it isn't there. And it, you know, it's there for people to see. And it may, you know, as you've highlighted yourself, some data is horrendously inaccurate and not very, very good. It's just what you have.

If it's hidden and to be revealed in response to a proper request, then I think it probably just gets wrapped up. I think that the most useful thing that we can do in our work is perhaps to flag that that is something that may or may not, you know, that people should be aware of as a new thing that will exist or may exist. And then they can request or dealing with requests.

But because we don't want to have sort of different elements of policy popping up in different working groups that people have to kind of - or, you know, to say this is about access. Oh, but you need to look over here at what the transliteration guys have been doing to get the full picture. I think that we should just be quite streamlined on it.

(Chris Dillon):   Okay. Thank you for that. I guess what's coming out of this is that this transformation was mandatory, and it was being done, you know, perhaps by one organization always or, you know, something very homogenous like that.

Then you'd have one set of access rights if you - but as there are, you know, conceivably many stakeholders that may conceivably transform, then that does end up being quite statistical, you know, quite - a noticeably more complicated picture. I guess that's where - really where this one ends up. Thank you for that.

And that actually brings us to the end of the short list. And I'm just wondering whether we may - there was some other stuff in an earlier email. Oh no - in

fact I've picked that up because we have been talking about purposes which is very much what the earlier email was addressing.

Okay. Now I'm wondering if - we've got about ten minutes left. We've dealt with some rather large issues. What we could do is actually get -if we - perhaps you make the use of the remaining time and just go back to the recommendations document.

And we can then actually go through and pick up some other themes which are in there. They're typically not quite so high level, but we might as well make use of our time and give it some sense to display that document again.

Woman: I'm sorry. Which document is this?

(Chris Dillon): Oh sorry, that's the straw man.

Woman: Oh, we're back to the straw man. I'm sorry.

(Chris Dillon): We are, yes.

Okay. I'll just whip through this and I'll and do the larger things first - that makes sense. I'm sure that there isn't anything large that we haven't looked at. The answer is no, so that means that we can - oh yes, well there's one thing under E7 which is rather confusing.

So I might just point that out. It's a bit further down - all right. Under E7 - in response to an individual question which is about company and individual names, I've made some suggestions.

It's profoundly unhelpful for me to have made the suggestions there and not under E2 because it looks as if, you know, there's some drift between E2 an E7. So what I'm suggesting is that the second paragraph on individual names be copied to E2 because it is saying the same thing.

But looking at this, it really looks as if it's something different. So, you know, just to highlight that for a moment. With individual names what we're saying is that somebody's name - they should be allowed to decide what it is.

So in my case, my name is (Chris Dillon). Now, you know, there are people out there who will call me (Christopher Dillon), (Christopher James Dillon), (Christopher J. Dillon) - the numbers of possibilities are huge. But actually the correct answer is (Chris Dillon). And I am the one who decides that.

So that's almost - that particular field almost ends of being free text - that that individual decides what their name is. And that practice is actually something I have borrowed from the library world.

So in the case of the library, you know, there is actually a book I published, and the publisher incorrectly called me (Christopher Dillon). So, you know, normally in the library world the library would actually contact the individual in the case of a doubt and say what is your name? And the reply in that case would be (Chris Dillon). Sounds rather strange, but that's really what's going on there.

(Jim), have you got a point either about E7 or about something else?

(Jim Galvin): Thank you. This is (Jim Galvin). My comment is around this E1, E2 and the number 7 that's in there going back up a little higher. So I don't know if you're doing this in order or if you jumped to something that your concern was.

So if it's okay to jump back, then I'd like to make a comment. If not, it can wait.

(Chris Dillon): Oh yes. You know that's fine. I mean I was just working through the other comments on the document, trying to do the larger ones first. I think - if that makes sense.

If you've got another point you'd like to make, you're really welcome to do that.

(Jim Galvin): Okay. So I'll put a question out there for the group to consider. These are questions that actually the expert working group on internationalized registration data requirements for submission and display is actually looking at.

So I paused a bit when I was reading phrases like, you know, data should be in the format that's supported by the registry or registrar. And, you know, phrases along those lines. And then also suggesting that the contact information should be entered only in whatever language the registrant supports directly.

The questions that come up in this space are, if I am a Russian registrant and I've living in, you know, China and buying a Chinese name - a Chinese domain name, you know, the question is would I enter data in Russian, in Chinese, in some Romanized version of one or the other?

Or if for some reason we decide, you know, I mean I guess we're not going down this path right now. But for the purposes of the other group, you know, what if a single mandatory language is chosen? Are you obligating someone to enter it in that form?

You know all of these things affect what a registry or a - well a registrar more directly is required to support. And, you know, it's a question of phrasing. It's a question perspective in which direction you're looking at it.

The way I saw some of these things phrased, it was if the registrar is driving things whereas it should be the case that the registrar is choosing - what I would ask is shouldn't it be the case that the registrar chooses to support languages based on the community of registrants they want to support?

So I've kind of opened up a big thing here as we head to the top of the hour. I'm not sure how much you want to get into this now or save it for next time. But, you know, these are challenging questions. Thank you.

(Chris Dillon): Well before we end the call, thank you very much for that. Before we end the call let me say that the idea that the languages the registrar supports - those are linked to their business model.

That is an idea that is in the report. But I think, you know, this idea of, you know, what happens when Chinese names are being applied for with a registrar who's based in the US or the example you gave. It feels as if those cases may throw up some unusual situations.

So I think it's a lovely place to end because we can really think okay, you know, what are the principles here? Is it the language of the domain name? Is it where they're based or where are we going here?

There do seem to be some quite (fiddlish) issues - so quite a nice place to - it's quite nice to end on something that requires us to think of it I think.

Man: Okay. I'll just say thank you and I look forward to starting with this conversation next week.

(Chris Dillon): Yes. That sounds good. And we can certainly pick up other similar issues that have come up during this, you know, this call. And, you know, also other things that come up during the week. And, you know, as usual I'd really like to encourage people to send them in because it just gives us all more thinking time.

But yes, thank you very much for that. And Emily is just saying to borrow from the dispute resolution world, it could also be language of the registrar agreement. Okay, right.

Well thank you very much for what has been a very helpful call I think. It's been really great to sort of - to discuss these things. And I really look forward to next week where we can take things further, and indeed before then if you - might myself (unintelligible) this week.

Okay. Thank you for all the nice things and the comments.

So anyway, see you same time next week, and we'll just take these various discussions forward.

Okay, thank you very much indeed.

Emily Taylor: Goodbye.

(Chris Dillon):   Goodbye Emily.

END