Webinar: Interactive Presentation of the Initial Report of the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group 16th January 2015 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.

Nathalie Peregrine: (Lars) this is Nathalie. The call is now being recorded.

(Lars):   Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody. Welcome to this very informal Webinar on the initial reports of the PDP Working Group on translation and transliteration of contact information or TNT for short.

This Webinar is just an informal session. The two working group co-chairs Chris Dillon and Rudy Vansnick are going to give a brief overview of the Working Group's discussions and findings and the draft recommendations as their PME initial report.

The initial report is open for public comment at the moment. The public comment will close on the 1st of February.

There are links in the Adobe Connect room to the public comment room and so where you can find links to the initial report itself.

And the Webinar will then close with a question and answer session. And there will be a (unintelligible) proceeding longer than 30 minutes overall.

If my two co-chairs are on the call I'd be welcoming you. And I believe I'll pass it over first to Chris who will do the first section and then he will pass on to Rudy for the remainder. Chris over to you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much (Lars). I'll just change to the next slide. Now I can't, don't seem to be able to do that, lovely. Thank you very much.

I'll start off by just reading our two main questions. So first of all we've got whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script?

Now because this is quite a mouthful eventually we decided that we'd more or less summarize that by instead of saying translate or transliterate we always say transform.

And that and, you know, we then sometimes talk about, you know, whether it should be translated or transliterated. But just to introduce some of the terminology.

Then the second question is who should decide who should bear the burden of translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script?

There is quite a lot of background to this work other work going on at the moment. So there's a commercial feasibility study on translation and transliteration which is to inform this working group.

And there is also an Expert Working Group to determine the appropriate internationalized domain name registration data requirements.

And we've been keeping in regular contact with these other work strands. And let's go to the next slide.

Okay. This is just the timeline so started in December 2013. And basically we are hoping to present the final report in May. That's really the summary of that one.

We meet most Thursdays at 14 o'clock UTC and anybody is very welcome to attend those calls.

Next slide please. Here we have the key arguments. And I'll just go through these briefly.

The - in this version of the report there are two sets of arguments.

So one set is supporting mandatory transformation and the other is opposing mandatory transformation. But there isn't - there was a straw poll as a result of which the final report will only have one set of recommendations.

But anyway first of all let me go through them and then we'll make a couple of comments about them.

So if we start on the supporting side we've got this one about accessibility basically.

So mandatory transformation into a single script will allow for transparent accessible and arguably more easily searchable database.

Then we have transformation which to some extent facilitate communication among stakeholders not sharing the same language so, you know, whatever language would be used if a single language is used and that comes into play.

Then when Whois results are compared it may be easier to ascertain whether the same registrant is the domain holder for different names.

And that apparently is a key criterion for communities like the security community. So very often they are interested in basically is this the same organization? And that should become apparent if it's - or maybe it's easier to spot if it's in the same language.

Last but not least mandatory transformation would avoid possible flight by buy back to the least translatable languages.

And I think so far there's been relatively little evidence of that sort of thing. But, you know, certainly theoretically that is a possible - that is a possibility.

Then if we cross over to the other side we've got the arguments supposing mandatory transformation.

And so basically it would be near impossible to achieve consistent accuracy in transforming all scripts and languages.

So it's possible to translate in more than one way. It's also possible to transliterate in more than way and it all - it will all be correct.

So if we translate the Japanese word...

((Japanese Spoken 6:54))

Chris Dillon):   ...we can translate it is either right or correct. It doesn't matter.

And, you know, again if we use a Japanese example often there are more than one transliteration systems for a language.

And so weather, you know, one transliteration system uses SH and another one uses SY they're both right but, you know, there are different possibilities.

Other languages don't have a standard transliteration system at all so everybody just, you know, behaves, you know, depending on the context so that - so I think that's quite a strong argument.

Accurate translation needs to be done manually and is expensive. Well no doubt about that. Transliteration often is the same, depends on the language.

In my opinion the most weighty, the heaviest argument is this one. It's the financial burden could have negative impact on less developed regions.

Then we have establishing clear rules may be complicated.

So if we have a process going on ideally it would be an intelligent process whereby somebody - oh sorry, the intelligent process would be able to look at...

((Thai Spoken 8:21))

...which is actually that Thai word for Bangkok and say while this is a situation where we need to translate from...

((Thai Spoken 8:28))

...to Bangkok because otherwise, you know, nobody knows what it is internationally.

So in one situation we definitely want a translation but then the second situation the northern capital that is actually Beijing in Chinese. So Bei is northern and jing is capital but we really do not want translation there.

So how do we make them machine intelligent enough to be able to tell the difference between those two situations?

Last but not least usability of transformed data is questionable because registered nameholders unfamiliar with Latin script, you know, really not be able to communicate, you know, even if it were used.

All right I've gone through that rather quickly. The reason is that I wanted to leave time for Rudy to do the next two slides on recommendations so let me hand over to Rudy at this point.

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you Chris. And first of all I would like to thank Chris the many, many hours he has been spending exploring all the aspects that were needed to come up with a good report (unintelligible) all the language issues as he is at that point a real specialist.

So if we come to the next slide I can - myself, yes okay thank you. Come to the first or key recommendation that are still preliminary as we will see what we will get from the public period.

The first one is that as an answer to the two questions on essentially the first question first the working group recommends that it is not desirable to make transformation so translation and transliteration of contact information mandatory.

It's clear that those that are willing to do so we are not going to stop them as we know that in some countries the language that registrars and registries are using for registering a domain name allow already some kind of translation.

The next recommendation number two, we know that based on what that Expert Working Group has been doing and based on the knowledge of the

new registration directory services database design today already does not really specify fields for registration of non-Latin scripts contact information.

So we are recommending that there is enough consideration that in the future there would be enough data fields foreseen to capture non-Latin scripts contact information.

Picking up what I see in the chat room yes (Peter) indeed the majority of the Working Group and again it thanks to do all the participants in the Working Group after many, many hours of debate and a lot of interaction that we came to this proposal. And this is indeed not yet a document that is final.

We will produce that after we got all the comments in. And we will see if that is going to push us in another direction which I don't think so but at least my personal opinion.

Number three in the recommendation list it is in fact known that registration of a domain name is always going through a registrar.

And as such our Working Group is recommending that the registered nameholders are entering their contact information in the language or script in the language that the registrar operates in.

And I think it is important to be consistent with information that is going to the database that it is consistent with the platform where the registrant is unable to enter or if contact his or her contact information.

And number four it is clear that somehow it's responsibility of the registrar to verify that all the data is consistent.

And as such the Working Group is also recommending that the registrar and of course the registry that is behind it is assuring that the data fields are consistent and that we entered contact information are verified in accordance

with the RA, the regulatory agreements and that the fields are correctly tagged to facilitate transformation if such would be needed or required.

I think that's a point that relates to the services that most often are asked by the law enforcement people that are willing to know if the data and contact information that is available in the Whois is reflecting the real current physical data also.

And as such we know what's - with what's going on in Europe it is important to know who is behind the domain name.

I'm moving to next slide where we have recommendation Number 5. It is clear that we are not objecting and then you could say we will promote the fact that voluntary transformation could be done or would be done.

And the working group recommends also that if registrars which to perform transformation contact information that this data should be presented as additional fields.

Of course actually no clear definition of extending data fields in the list so which allow to have the correct reflection of all the data and to allow a maximum accuracy.

We all know that transformation just looking into Google translation is quite dangerous to use automatic translation mechanisms.

So it's better that the data would be entered as such in corresponding extra data fields that we as a working group are recommending to establish as such would be possible.

Number six, translation of data fields, that's indeed also important. And we know that today all the data in the Whois is in ASCII and most of the times all in English.

It is indeed important and the Working Group is recommending that the field names of the domain names relay domain (unintelligible) inventory be translated into as many languages as possible.

And again that will reflect again the process of the RDS in the future. And the last key recommendation is non-recommendation for Charter Question 2.

As we have this important second question of the charter looking for who will be at the burden of the translation or transliteration it is clear if we are giving the recommendation that it is not mandatory this question in fact can be easily - were it asked, okay there is no reason of creating any burden any cost as it is not a mandatory fact.

So I being through the seven key recommendations and I think it's important that those having ideas or suggestions that there is still the possibility to engage and bring up information and eventually comments by going to the public comment platform.

We will - and the public comment period the 1st of February. And we will take up all that information and come back to the public in Singapore during the Singapore meeting. And you'll see also that on this slide you'll find the addresses to access the platform to eventually require access to the mailing list or to this Working Group.

Everybody is - we would enjoy having many more participants for the next last stage we have to do. And if you want to join you can just send the mail to gnso-icann.org and you will be followed up quite rapidly.

I think with that I've come to the end of this first presentation. And I think it's good if we can open up now the Q&A and try to help giving the required answers as we go on.

So I will hand over again to (Lars) who is going to moderate this part of the session.

(Lars):   Thank you Rudy. Yes no admiration needed I think. I think a few questions in the chat that has been addressed already.

If there's anybody else got any questions you want to raise your hand in the Adobe Connect room? I don't see any at the moment.

Just to let you know that the Working Group will be meeting face to face in Singapore as well if anybody was not part of the group would like to join special (unintelligible) members and maybe also then get an idea and overlook of the public comments that has been submitted.

Because by that time the phone will be closed and it will be the Working Group discussions - discussing that the comments received.

And otherwise Rudy has raised his hand up, pass it back to him and otherwise then I will speak to you soon. Rudy?

Rudy Vansnick: Yes thank you (Lars), Rudy speaking. I think it's important also and I would like to thank (unintelligible) for addressing the GAC and ask the GAC members to try to participate in these sessions and admit it's a good idea to have and to reach out to the other SOs and ACs in Singapore if there is any possibility of finding some timeslots which allows us to do so to eventually have the chance to having a good interaction of eventual extra arguments so that the recommendations could be - could have a really good founding ground for passing through later on for voting.

So that's what I wanted to add to what I've said before.

(Lars):   Thank you Rudy. And Chris any last words from you? Do you want to close it off?

Chris Dillon: Well in fact I was just about to pick up something that's been discussed in the chat room. And it was in fact there's Steve Metalitz picked it up. But it was a comment I wanted to make anyway so I thought I would pick it up.

And it' just that recommendation Number 6 runs something like if there are actors wanting to transform then they should be free to do so.

But in the chat room of course it was picked up that, you know, how would that work? Because actually if, you know, we already know that transformation is difficult whether you go the translation root or you go the transliteration route.

Now transformation being done by lots of different actors in lots of different ways, you know, that really sounds like, you know, quite a few quite difficult issues.

So I really just wanted to flag up that there is a sort of slight tension between saying people should be free to transform unless there is some way of control, you know, some way of standardizing the transformation.

And, you know, standardizing it is really not very easy so that's really just a point I wanted to pick up.

(Lars):   Thank you Chris. I think that Amr has raised his hand as well. Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks (Lars), thanks Chris. This is Amr. Yes. I think Chris is absolutely correct in what he has said.

However we did also discuss and sort of pretty much come to the conclusion that given that the complications in transforming contact information the same complications may not be true in transforming the labels for the data fields in the RDS, this might be a considerably simpler job to achieve consistency in.

And so we may have a different recommendation on that as opposed to transforming the actual contact information. So I just wanted to make that very clear and hope Steve and others can provide some input on this during the public comment period. Thanks.

(Lars): Thanks Amr. Rudy has his arm up as well.

Rudy Vansnick: Yes thanks (Lars), Rudy for the transcript. Indeed I think that technically the translation of the labels of the fields it's a one-off run.

So it's something that can I think easily be decided. And then maybe it's good if you could indeed try to enforce a little bit that aspect as a strong recommendation enabling the possibility for the registrants to understand what is meant by some fields.

As we know not everybody is native English speaking and sometimes it is not so easy to understand what as required as information when you have to fill in forms on a Web space.

And especially when it's going to the more responsive device ways where you have rather small screens I think it would indeed be good to highlight the fact that for the RDS in the future the labels of the fields should be in as many languages as possible and certainly at least in the six UN ones.

(Lars): Okay. Thank you very much Rudy and everyone else who's contributed to the discussion. Thank you Chris and Rudy for the presentation.

If there's no further questions, I'll close the Webinar. As been pointed out before this will be posted on the GNSO master calendar with a link where you can review this and look at the Adobe Connect room recording where you'll see the slides (unintelligible) and obviously that you can pass on to your respective groups in the community.

And that I can only encourage you to join us in Singapore or you can better join the Working Group. We're meeting at (unintelligible) at 14 UTC. And if you want to become a member just drop a line to the GNSO secretariat email.

Thank you very much and see you all in Singapore if not before. Bye-bye for me.

Chris Dillon: Goodbye from Chris too.

Man: Thank you guys.

Man: And too want to (unintelligible) thanks to (Lars) and (Julie) for the tremendous work they have been doing to assisting us as co-chairs in doing our job. Thanks again.

Man: Absolutely.

END