ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 16 January 2014 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT call on the Thursday 16 January 2014 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-20140116-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan

Attendees:
Wanawit Ahkuputra – Individual
Peter Dernbach - IPC
Chris Dillon - NCSG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Sarmad Hussain – No SOI
Yoav Keren – RrSG
Pitinan Koarmornpatna – Individual
Patrick Lenihan - NCUC
Petter Rindforth - IPC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – No SOI
Jennifer Chung - No SOI
Peter Green - No SOI

Apologies:
Ephraim Kenyanito - NCUC

ICANN staff:
Lars Hoffman
Steve Sheng
Julia Charvolen

Chris Dillon: Thank you. I'll just repeat that the call is. Welcome to the Transliteration for Contact Information PDP Working Group meeting on Thursday the 16th of January, 2014.

Now I'll just read out the list of people who are in Adobe Connect and that's Amr Elsadr, Chris Dillon, that's me, Jennifer Chung, Jim Galvin, Peter Dernbach, Peter Green, Petter Rindforth, - sorry, for my bad pronunciation - and Pitinan Koarmornpatna, Rudi Vansnick and Wanawit Ahkuputra.

Now I don't know whether there's anybody actually on the call - on the telephone who isn't actually in Adobe Connect. If there is could you introduce yourself now? I think Steve Sheng is on the phone.

Steve Sheng: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Lenahan: Hello. I am Patrick Lenahan.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Okay you can see the agenda in Adobe Connect. So I need to first ask the group whether there have been updates to the Statements of Interest? Okay hearing none that means we can move on and look at the draft work plan which is being - oh, wait a moment - sorry, before I do that, Peter Dernbach has actually updated his - he's uploaded that. Okay, don't know (unintelligible). All right well it sounds as if there's at least one update - that they are in the wiki.

Okay so let's just move on then to the draft work plan which is being displayed in Adobe Connect. And this is an ambitious work plan so I think, you know, it really covers - I think it's about a year altogether. But I wonder whether anybody has any comments about the - any general comments about the work plan before we go through it?

Hello, Lars, would you like to say something?

Lars Hoffman: Chris, good morning all. This is Lars. Yeah, just to say I've drafted together with Julie and appreciate that it's ambitious time-wise as well but it's obviously something that is not set in stone, right. So, I mean, I'm just working on a different group and we've covered more problems along the way if you wanted to and then we'd change it accordingly.

So it's not something that, you know, you would sign up for for a delivery motion on the 1st of December this year; it's just that that might work but if we realize in April and June that we need to prolong - we need more time to discuss certain issues then we can change the work plan in general.

Chris Dillon: Indeed. Okay. Thank you for that. Shall we perhaps go to the top of it - somebody in the Adobe Connect Chat saying they want - we're actually - wait a minute, no I don't have control of it. Would it be possible to...

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: You should be able to scroll yourself on the right.

Chris Dillon: Oh, right, yes sorry. Now what's wrong - no, I - for some reason...

Rudi Vansnick: No we can't. No, Lars, we cannot - now we can. Yeah, thank you.

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you.

Lars Hoffman: Now you can? I'm sorry, I didn't realize...

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: Does it work?

Chris Dillon: Yes, it's indeed working. Okay just - I'll just ask for - oh, Rudi, would you like to say something general about it perhaps?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you, Chris. Rudi Vansnick speaking. I think it's important that we take the time to go through the list of this draft plan. My concern is that we should be able to finalize the work plan next week. But again, as we already discovered there are many other activities and working groups going on around the same (unintelligible) of what we have to do.

I think we have to try to find out the way to also close the list of important working groups and others that are going on before we really start going deeper into the discussions to avoid that we have to restart discussions. So I would like to have some reflections from other participants in this working group.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that, Rudi. Amr, would you like to address that?

Amr Elsadr: Yeah thanks, Chris. Thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. Yeah, I think Rudi is absolutely right that it's really important that we sort of have a - just be very aware of what output is coming from other groups that are working on this as well. But I would not recommend that we delay too much in our own discussions.

I can - I don't think there's - at least I have not indication of how long it will take for other groups to complete their work or come out even with initial recommendations including the Expert Working Group which I believe is just starting its work, same as us.

We should keep an eye out and perhaps, if appropriate, when recommendations do start coming out of different groups perhaps amendments to this work plan can be made at that time. But I certainly don't think we should delay any discussions we're having over here. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Amr. Now that you've raised the Expert Working Group I think I would like to draw the group's attention - I mean, it's already been done in one of the previous emails. But the Expert Working Group has produced an update report. It's about 84 pages. But that is, you know, that is worth reading because it does do some work on defining data elements and also on legal issues. Just remind...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: I'm sorry, Chris. This is Amr again. I should have been more specific but I was referring to the Expert Working Group on internationalized registration data not...

Chris Dillon: Oh sorry, yes okay.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, so - I'm sorry, I should have been more specific on that. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. Okay I think, you know, we certainly need to address the question of, you know, who is involved in this area and, you know, who we need to wait for and use the wiki to flag up, you know, perhaps certain parts of the project that we are waiting for.

                  Jim, would you like to raise a point on this subject?

Jim Galvin: Yeah, so Jim Galvin speaking. As chair of the other working group that was just mentioned, the Internationalized Registration Data Requirements Working Group, I'll just comment that we've taken the approach of moving forward but paying close attention to other groups, this one in particular.

                  I do think that there is a close relationship between this group and the IRD Working Group and it will be important for us to pay attention to each other and be aware what's going on.

But I also don't think that we should wait for each other per se. I don't think that that's necessary at least not at this time. It might be at some point in the future as we begin to deal with issues. But, you know, let's not - let's not delay our work anymore than we may need to. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that, Jim. I think that's also my instinct. But, you know, perhaps we could leave it that everybody has another - has another week to look at the work plan in that light. Jim, is there something else you would like to say or is it just something in - okay, thank you.

Right, okay well let's just have a look at some specific aspects of the work plan. And it's really just defining a few terms in there. And it's things like - oh yes, for example, the input template and the input review tool. I think there's maybe one or two other - just a moment - one or two other terms that we may need to have a look at.

But - oh yes, okay let's - Lars, I wonder if you could just do a brief description of the input template?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. I can actually, if you wanted to, I did a quick draft based on something we've done before. And if you wanted to I can post it in the Adobe room. And basically what we do...

Chris Dillon: Oh.

Lars Hoffman: ...is we draft a quick letter saying there's a PDP going on on this issue. Here's a link to the wiki. Here's a link to the charter.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: We welcome your inputs by this date.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: And here's the list of the questions that we are dealing with and that you might want to provide answers to and also encourage them to add anything that - any thoughts that they might have these questions because the group might find that useful as well. I can do a quick copy and paste if you wanted to into the Adobe.

Chris Dillon: Yes, I mean, we - I mean, originally I was intending to come back to that a bit later in the agenda. But actually if it's handy that may be a good thing to do now. Oh yes and Rudi's also agreeing with that. Thank you.

Lars Hoffman: It would look something like this.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, yeah.

Lars Hoffman: Because I copy and paste into a note. You can't see the hyperlink so things like charter, background information, issue reports, the working group wiki, they're all - they would be all hyperlinks so that they can...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: ...access this very easily.

Chris Dillon: Okay. I mean, looking at that quickly it, you know, it looks really suitable. But if you could just send that around to the group after the meeting then we can have a slow look at it. Yes, and oh yes and on the same subject or a similar subject there is also mention of outreach.

And my instinct on this was to use some kind of version of what is Point 6 in the wiki. But admittedly Point 6 in the wiki is rather long. So I think you were suggesting something a lot shorter. And I don't know whether you've got any text on - for outreach but I wonder if something which just mentioned the

basic questions and was a sort of typical outreach email could be circulated after the meeting?

Okay...

Lars Hoffman: Yes, this is Lars, Chris. No problem, I will take care of that. Although it might have to happen tomorrow because right after this call I will take a flight back to Brussels - I'm in LA at the moment so...

Chris Dillon: No, I mean, any time - any time before next Thursday. Actually talking about next Thursday, unfortunately, I cannot attend that meeting. I'm giving a talk at a conference so I'll just mention that to the group now.

And then if we come back to the work plan and just checking through it to see whether there's anything which is worth picking up in the next few weeks if anybody would like to ask questions about any aspect of it then please do so.

Okay well perhaps let us leave this so that we have another week to have a look at it - and, sorry, Rudi's asking a question. Please speak.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Chris. Rudi speaking. Well I'm looking through the plan and I'm looking especially to the meeting - the physical meeting of ICANN in Singapore, 26th of March.

I think we will have more than one day we are going to be circling around in the meetings over there in order to do some outreach. And I think we will need to plan that very carefully because it's - most often there are a lot of meetings going on and we have to be able to be in the other meetings at a decent time sort of to get the required attention.

Perhaps next call, next week during the call we try with (unintelligible) to figure out what days we are going to be doing the outreach work in Singapore.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. Yes, that is absolutely necessary because, you know, we certainly are going to need to publicize what we're doing to - as many relevant groups as possible. So, yes, it would be really good to identify those times during next week's meeting. Thank you for that.

Amr, would you like to say something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I have a question to you and the group about the scheduling of the prep work involved in sending out stakeholder group constituency and SO AC outreach message.

I guess typically it's a good idea to send this out as early as possible during the course of the working group to get the feedback from the different stakeholder groups, constituencies, SOs and ACs as early as possible.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Amr Elsadr: And typically it's also common practice to include the charter questions and try and get feedback on that. But I was wondering if the group here would like to perhaps add a few more questions following some discussions? Because I see there have already been some discussions on the working group list. And we might actually come up with a few additional questions we might want to get input on from the different stakeholders in the community.

And if we do decide to maybe perhaps do this is the timeline realistic in terms of finalizing this template by the next meeting and sending it out the next day. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. It's - there are several things that need to be balanced here. So on the one hand you want to let people know really what you're doing in detail so that sort of indicates a long email which is quite difficult to write.

But on the other hand if one sends a longer email the success rate drops so actually that really - I think the weight then comes down on the other side that actually there is a huge advantage to sending quite a simple email perhaps only with the main questions but then with links to further information.

So that, you know, that's really what I was suggesting. And, you know, Lars, would you like to say something about that? Oh sorry I think it was just a hand up by accident in Adobe Connect.

Well perhaps this is something we can talk about on the mailing list. But I think if we aim to draft something this week and finalize it fairly soon then if we don't quite make it then, you know, at least it won't drift off too much into the future. We'll try and do it next week but if we can't then I don't know perhaps the week after.

Sorry, Lars, would you like to say something? And I think...

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. Yeah, I just did a little monologue into the mute button so that was fun for me. It's all right, it happens I suppose. Yeah, just want to add that on the point that Amr raised I understand that, you know, this sounds very quick to have this sent out or agree by next week. And there's no problem.

Chris Dillon: Oh yes. Thank you very much for that. I mean, my own original suggestion was in fact that we sent something pretty close to what is Point 6 in the wiki on background but, yes, you know, it is rather a difficult balancing act. So perhaps let's have a go at doing it next week and just see where we get with that.

Okay, well, any other comments people would like to make about the work plan either specific parts of it or generally? Okay seeing nothing in Adobe Connect I think that means we can safely move on down the agenda. And specifically that means, you know, continuing our discussion of the questions we were speaking about last week.

And so there is - in the wiki there is quite a long section on what is contact information and what taxonomies are available. So I went through that myself and I was actually struggling to find any contradictions in there. The definitions, as far as I could see, seem to be pretty compatible with each other.

I mean, I don't know whether anybody - because of course at some point ideally we would want to, you know, perhaps have something that's rather shorter than what's in that document.

The document I was referring to before, the status update from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services, gives quite a lot of detail on the data elements. I don't know whether anybody would like to make any comments about - actually perhaps it would be helpful - would it be possible just to display the what is contact information part of the wiki? Well actually I'm not sure whether we can do that in here.

Rudi Vansnick: Well, Chris, I think Lars can do that by putting on - in the whiteboard...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: So it will probably come up soon.

Chris Dillon: Okay we might just wait a moment for that.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. I'm so sorry, I'm having some troubles with the line. Do you want me - because I'm in a hotel room - you want me to put the list of the questions from last week that were circulated as well?

Chris Dillon: If you - yes, if you can do that that would be useful - or actually just the URL because then we can display that particular page.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi here. I just dropped the list of questions in the Chat room so...

Chris Dillon: Oh yes...

Rudi Vansnick: ...it's not well really what (the form) but at least they are there now. But I think we got stuck at the - are we stopped at the Question Number 4, who gets access to what - what are the stakeholders. I think that's where we...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes. We got - yes, I'm actually just wondering did we do Question 3? I'm - because we definitely did what and why - oh, sorry, no we did do 3; 3 is who. Okay so that's the access rights and that's also hooked up to the - to legal issues as well. Okay.

I think actually because we are having technical troubles it may be easier to do new stuff rather than to look at stuff we've already done. So in that case perhaps if we have a look at Question Number 4 and that would really mean, you know, just having a brainstorm about stakeholders.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Chris. Rudi speaking. Yes, that's the question we need to work on who are the stakeholders, who is affected. I think that is a very big question where there's a lot of inputs to give and that would allow us to...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: ...to where we have to go and address people to be involved in it.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Wondering if perhaps there is a document that we can use to give us a head start on that. Oh, Amr, would you like to say something?

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks. This is Amr. I just wanted to ask where on the wiki space are these questions posted? I recall going over them before but now the Page 4 on the wiki, which is proposed questions and taxonomies, appears blank on my screen...

Chris Dillon: Oh yes, you need to have a look at the notes on the first meeting; they're within those notes. But you're absolutely right; in the long term, we really need to have links to all of those pages under Section 4.

Amr Elsadr: Okay. Thanks but the...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: ...meetings page also appears blank.

Chris Dillon: Oh now there is a link within the Chat room.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, I just dropped in, it's my link...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: ...you will have the page of the meeting of last week and it's at the bottom of the page that you will find all the questions we have been working on already.

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you. So, you know, coming back to the question about the stakeholders, I don't - I mean, I don't know whether anybody is aware of a

document that would make this - make this question - it's rather difficult to do it from first principles or any progress has been made here. Perhaps this is the sort of thing that's actually rather difficult to do on the phone.

Rudi, would you like to say something?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Chris. I think that we can, in fact, define two categories of stakeholders; those who are really the stakeholders who should be concerned about our task and will definitely be involved in contact details...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: ...in Whois data. And then you have the ones that have, let's say, a secondary interest and I'm talking about, for instance, law enforcement or those not really being registry or registrar or registrant. I'm rather looking at the outside world of ICANN and looking to how they see they are a stakeholder in our discussion.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. Yes, I think that's - I think that's a very good point. So you've got - you've got some stakeholders who are directly affected and then you've got other parties who have got some other kind of interest. Yes, that sounds like a useful way of continuing with that question.

Amr, would you like to say something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. And thanks, Rudi, for the link to the page. I got it. I was going to suggest another question and perhaps we could discuss this further on the email list.

But one thing that struck me as a potentially good question to ask is whether anyone thinks there are alternatives to an overarching policy that requires translation and transliteration of contact information? Are there other suggestions that could potentially provide access to this sort of service to

folks who need it whose local - whose native languages are not based on Latin Script while not recommending a policy to require it in all cases?

So I just thought leave a sort of open ended question and what possible alternatives there would be to this sort of policy. And I would also - I think just a point I've brought up on numerous occasions but the question about how much would a particular feature cost; it's a really difficult question to answer and it is in our charter and we should probably ask different stakeholders to - on their feedback on this question. But I don't see anyone providing anything really substantial as an answer. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. I would really say that whether there is a policy on a particular aspect of translation or transliteration or not, so, you know, there may be a policy not, you know, not to have a policy, or possibly to have a situation where, you know, the policy is to do one thing in a particular case and then another in another case.

Oddly enough all of this stuff actually comes under the area of policy. I'd really better explain that; that didn't sound at all - that really wasn't at all clear. What I was actually thinking about was something like - I mean, and this is completely an example.

But you might have a policy that if an organization puts it contact information into a system that it would provide a translated name in English. It's only an example. So, you know, for example Tokyo Daigaku may apply and then the policy would be that if there was a translation, in this case the University of Tokyo, that that translation would be given.

Now of course the problem is that you may get an organization somewhere which actually does not have an English translation of its name. So you then end up with a policy that maybe goes something like: If there is an English translation then you provide that; but if there is no English translation then

you provide the transliteration. It might run something like, you know, you end up with a sort of an "if" in the middle of the policy there I suppose.

And what has been coming out of the discussion - because we've been talking about various specific examples of addresses on the mailing list, and what has been coming out of that is that the word "translation" - sorry, the word "transliteration" does actually seem to cover several concepts.

So, you know, there might be, you know, there might be transliteration following an ISO standard or transliteration following a governmental decree. But there might also be a transliteration that was just something that was used in a particular area or even worse, there may be a transliteration that just a private individual uses for his name or something like that. So it is, you know, we possibly need to bear this sort of aspects in mind.

Now I'll just stop for a moment and go back to the Chat because I think there have been one or two things mentioned in the Chat as we've been speaking talking about cost of transliteration or translation.

Okay. Accuracy, which depends on the RAA specs. And then we have the whole issue of validation. And, you know, as you may guess from what I've just been saying and from the examples we've been looking at it's, you know, it could be quite - it could be very difficult to validate particularly - well actually both translations and transliterations.

Translations because frequently one word can be translated in many ways. Transliteration because actually the - you know, there is an issue with the concept of transliteration, in my opinion. You know, it can mean several things.

And so, you know, if you presume that an ISO standard is being followed then you might be able to validate against the standard. But what happens,

you know, if either no standard is being used or people are really transliterating on the fly then validation really becomes horribly difficult.

Okay. And then Sarmad is saying something about original language data validation, okay, yes. Okay and the - we've got the question pages loaded as well. Thank you for that.

Okay, Amr, would you like to say something?

Amr Elsadr: Yeah thanks, Chris. It's Amr again. I think you made a lot of great points. And, you know, we have - there have been discussions going on about quite a bit of these things which is why I just think it might be worthwhile to add a question like the one I suggested on whether there are any suggested alternatives to a recommendation of a policy requiring.

Eventually someone is going to have to do the actual translation and/or transliteration; someone's going to have to pay for them whether it's registrants, registrars, registries or perhaps a new form being suggested by the Expert Working Group on registration data.

So if there is some sort of - someone with an idea of an alternative to a recommendation for a policy one way or the other or about not having a policy I just think it's a worthwhile question to be added when someone else questions the different SOs and ACs. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: My own feeling here is that actually whether, you know, even not having a policy is still having a policy so I think, you know, for me I don't really - I - personally I don't think not having a question about not having a policy - I think for me it just - yeah, I have to admit I'm not very keen on it because for me not having a policy actually comes, you know, it is actually a sort of policy.

Rudi, would you like to say something?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you, Chris. Rudi speaking. Well I'm just wondering could we eventually address the GAC and ask GAC if they could bring up some ideas or samples that maybe governments are using in the same context if they have policy with regards to translation and transliteration that we could try to base ourselves on and have a look into may be a way of getting something that is, let's say, globally accepted or recognized.

Chris Dillon: That - thank you very much, Rudi. I think that's really worth trying. Perhaps that could be another action. Lars, would you like to say something?

Lars Hoffman: Great. Just very quickly on the issue of the GAC. The letters will obviously go out to the GAC as well; they're going to all the ACs and the SOs - the request for input. As a matter of experience the GAC very rarely replies. They find it very difficult to come up with a common statement on this where everybody can agree.

So it might be also useful come the Singapore meeting - and we found that in other groups if the group were to do - if you want corridor (unintelligible) because this obviously on the issue of policy this is an issue of experience, right, where you might want to learn from something that a specific country has done.

To also reach out to the NSOs and to reach out to individual GAC members and ask them whether they could provide you with some ideas and input. But I fear that the GAC, as a whole, is probably unlikely to respond.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you very much for that, Lars. I would be grateful for any specific recommendations. I can understand that, you know, to get a large body to make a, you know, to make a collective recommendation is unreasonable. But if there were ways in, you know, ways of talking to individuals about this, you know, it could be a good approach. Thank you.

Okay so coming back to the - no, Amr is - oh yes, Amr is suggesting in the Chat that we write a customized letter asking for individual responses. Yes, that sounds very good.

Or, yes, then again actually - if that - yes, this is a very good point. So if that were added - if the idea of doing customized letters to individual GAC members - if the was in the general thing then we'd kill two birds with one stone. Yes, that sounds like a very good way of getting around that.

Rudi, would you like to say something?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you, Chris. Rudi speaking. Well indeed I think Singapore is not that far away and we should try to have a slot with the GAC - a meeting with the GAC, half an hour maybe, in order to highlight the importance of the work we have to do and capture in the corridors those who are really interested who have responded during the meeting we have with the GAC and have shown interest; try to get them - from them input after the Singapore meeting.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that suggestion. I think if that's possible that would be a really good way forward and also thank you, Wanawit, for, you know, agreeing to help in the liaison with individual GAC members.

Okay, perhaps - just wait for this - and Rudi is saying, "What about other stakeholders?" Yeah, I think we really need to make a list of other stakeholders for various approaches during Singapore.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Chris, Rudi speaking. I think that Singapore is the ideal moment to catch all those who are (unintelligible) interest and show interest in dealing with us ways to solve the issue and in order to allow us between Singapore and London to build some first ideas so that in London we could re-discuss what we have been working on. And in order to have a good follow up.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you for that, Rudi. And, Lars, is Pitanan - is again volunteering help with (Tigard) members, I think. And Lars is saying that the GNSO could also reach out to NSO and GAC staff. So I think all of them - I think all of these approaches are good. And, again, this feels like another part of the wiki to me so at least we need to keep track of who we've spoken to about this sort of thing.

Okay I'm just waiting for a couple of things in the Chat room. Got about 10 minutes left. Okay.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Chris, maybe in between the - we see there in the Chat the message popping up. I think we need to have a look into the work outside ICANN also; how are we going to address those stakeholders that are not actually permanently dealing with ICANN but are concerned or would be concerned about what we propose.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Well absolutely. I mean, this is actually part of a - quite a general collection of issues because, you know, sometimes there are stakeholders and you just know that they would be interested in this stuff that they actually represented.

And I have experience in the variant issues project and, you know, obviously ideally that project would have covered all the scripts of the world. But, you know, certain scripts, you know, were not, you know, were not represented during that. So, yes, I think that's certainly one we need to be thinking about.

And there are some interesting things in the Chat at the moment. There are ongoing attempts between the GNSO Council and the GAC to increase early participation. Okay in the GNSO's policy development processes. And the Policy and Implementation Working Group has tried to do something similar. So oh yes that sounds useful.

Thank you, Petter, for the - for your suggestion of reaching out to the - it's the FICP, which is the international IP attorney organization. Working group and FICP. Okay. Oh yes, now Rudi is saying in the Chat that there is general GNSO meeting - there's a call - a telephone conference next week so that could also - that could also be a possibility, yes, another action. Yes.

And the - and then Wanawit is suggesting the Universal Postal Unit - Union and the United Nations group of experts on geographical names. Thank you very much. This is a really good brainstorm. Okay.

There's something about the working group liaison to the Council. Okay. Amr's just typing about that. Okay well there are quite a few avenues that need to be followed up after the meeting.

Now we - I think we're starting to time out so probably if we just return to the - to the agenda rather than going on with more questions. And so let me just talk about action items and next steps. And I'll mention the ones which I've noted down but I think there may be a few I've missed.

So, you know, we're very much looking at identifying opportunities for outreach at various meetings in Singapore and with individuals, you know, perhaps members of the GAC and other organizations so that's one of the action items.

Another one is that in the wiki we need direct links to the questions under Number 4 and the meetings under a number I don't have at hand but there is a dedicated menu point in the wiki for meetings just for, you know, just for ease of use.

And then we are looking for policies on translation and transliteration generally. And then there is the GNSO call next week which either Rudi or I will do a piece on this during that call.

Now I realize I may have missed some important actions there but just, you know, just as a quick summary, okay. And then that really brings us to Point 7 on the agenda which is any other business. Okay. Well hearing none we can actually use the remaining few minutes of the meeting - probably not worth looking at questions at this point. Oh yes, Rudi, would you like to say something?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Thank you, Chris. Rudi speaking. Just before we close and we forget as I don't see Eric being on this call today. Eric has been bringing in a lot of information already in the past week. Thank you for that, Eric. It's great to have things going on outside our calls.

And I would invite other participants also if they think of something just drop it in the mailing list so that we can take it up for further discussion in our next calls.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. Also obviously very grateful for people who have given - actually specific examples of addresses over the last week because it is actually surprising how many issues - well they're not exactly answered but when you actually see the addresses you can see the issues very, very clearly. So I think I really want to have a good collection of addresses and the kinds of issues that they raise.

The other thing is that I have largely skipped over the issue of names so, you know, depending on the country there are all sorts of strange things that happen with names. So, you know, it may be that you've got something before the name, Mr. Christopher Dillon, use a Mister.

You may have something coming after the name. The order of the name may be different, you know, some countries go Christopher Dillon; others go Dillon Christopher. And then you may have situations where some languages only use one word for the name.

There are quite a few issues in this sort of area so it may become necessary to collect issues that are actually coming out of names as well as out of addresses it strikes me although a lot of work has been done in this issue - in this area by other organizations.

But I realized, you know, as soon as we started talking about addresses and organizational names that actually we may be missing some things on personal names. So that's another thing that we can be doing on the list.

And I can see Amr just mentioning things about Arabic names. And the fact that there is a link between people's names and geographic names. You know, for example a lot of Arabic names (unintelligible) names. A lot of Japanese surnames are actually originally place names so there are some, you know, there are all sorts of interesting connections with names. And I think Peter is typing something, I guess about Chinese names.

I think we do need - I have a feeling we will need to collect examples in this area. With Spanish names you got - in the old days, I don't know whether it's still true but you used to have male names behaved in one way and female names behaved in another so you would have Senor Roja but then you would say La Senora de Roja and there would be actually an additional bit in there but that may have changed.

Okay and then Peter is saying something about names of streets named after people. Yeah, I think that's probably quite a common phenomenon. And Rudi is mentioning current practice so how are registrars dealing with all of these issues at the moment.

Incredibly important, there's no point in us reinventing the wheel. You know, if these issues are being dealt with adequately we just copy. Okay well they are just about - we are just about to time out so I think probably it's a good time to round off the meeting.

But it looks as if we could have quite a busy week ahead of us answering some of these things that have come up today. I would very much like to thank all of you for today's call. Waiting for things to come up in the Chat room.

Yes, there is, you know, there's no problem about, you know, exactly when the action items are typed up and that's all fine as long as it's done before the next week.

As I said I probably can't - I almost certainly can't attend next week because I have a direct clash but obviously I will listen to both recordings, both this week and next week and continue to be active.

And, yes, thank you all very much indeed. And looking forward to hearing you next week and to speaking with you the week after but probably lots of contact on the mailing list well before then. Thank you very much indeed.

Rudi Vansnick: All right, thank you Chris.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Good-bye.

Rudi Vansnick: You may stop the...

                              END