**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION Thursday 12 March 2015 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 12 March 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. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-12mar15- en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Jim Galvin - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC Petter Rindforth – IPC Justine Chew – Individual SaraBockey –
RrSG Peter Green – NCUC Wen Zhai - RySG Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
 Apologies:
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC

ICANN Staff
Lars Hoffmann
Howard Li
Nathalie Peregrine

Woman: Your recording has already been started. You may now proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening

                everybody and welcome to the translation and transliteration of contact

                information PDP working group on the 19th of March 2015.

                On the call today we have (Amile Sarday), Chris Dillon, (Howard Lee), Jim

                Galvin, (Peter Green), Petter Rindforth, (Betinam Korma) and (Unintelligible).

                We have, this evening, apologies from Rudi Vansnick.

And from staff we have (Rob Hoffman) and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. And as usual, I need to ask number three on the agenda, if anybody has a change statement of interest since our last call, then please let us know. Seeing nothing in the chat room and hearing nothing that means we can move further down the agenda.

And today we will be looking at the review tool especially from Row 87 onwards. The version of the document in front of us is slightly out of date but I think between Row 69 and 83, we need to rely on notes for this week, in fact.

But before we do the last four comments that require attention, I'll just ask whether anybody has anything to say about things we've already discussed. All right, in that case, I am about to start with Comment 87.

After finishing the four comments I am intending to start work, having a look at the draft final report from the expert working group on IRD. And, you know, that means that we've been cleared away all major documents as far as I know before we start working on the final - on our final report.

And so, yes - oh yes, the other thing is that I am intending to do the draft final report from the EWG in a slightly unusual order because I actually want to start on Page 11 because there is technical linguist stuff on Page 11, and then we can go back to the beginning and work through it pretty systematically but I think it would be good to start there.

Anyway, without further ado, let us scroll down to Comment 87 and pick up the story there. Whoops, I think I've gone - that looks really good, okay. So - right, so we've got the increasing - excuse me, I've caught a bit of a cold and I'm quite croaky today.

So the increasing internationalization of the Internet, besides creating new business opportunities, the domain name holders induces responsibilities for registrants, registries and registrars to maintain the liable and internationally readable Whois information and so what I would like to pick up and this comment is just that may be, you know, we can sort of say reliable and internationally readable.

Well, if internationally readable is another way of saying, you know, putting it in line that everybody understood if only there were such a thing, then there is actually a tension between that and reliable because that, we have set on numerous previous occasions, in this working group, reliable is surely the original data.

So I would like to say that there is just a little tension between those two things. I don't know whether anybody would like to add anything to that comment. Ah, yes, in fact, in the chat room Amr is typing internationally readable seems hard to design.

Yes. Yes, I mean, I'm guessing that it means, you know, perhaps (askey) which is, you know, at least the script which many people currently understand.

You know, that becomes quite possibly less the case as, you know, India, Africa, China, you know, become more dominance in our industry. But, yes, I think that's, you know, I think that's how I would read it. Petter, would you like to pick up something there?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here. Just thinking of what we have discussed previously the possibility to have the two versions readable when you make a (Whois search). So if we - to take this as two parts to it - the reliable - as I said, basically if we talk about it in a more legal way, would of course be the original but to combine that with an international readable Whois information.

And I think we have - I don't remember what our conclusions around that possibility, but we have at least discussed it before, if I (remember). Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, I mean, there is perhaps on top of this also a possibil- you know, there is also the question, you know, to what extent do we need to be able to read it?

It may be that we can do many functions without actually reading it. We can copy it and search for it and do things like that. Amr, would you like to pick this up?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. Just coming back to Petter's last comment, I do agree. We did discuss scenarios in which we might of recommended more than one field being present in the Whois, one with the original reliable information and one with perhaps a transformed version.

And this is irrespective of whether we decided is desirable to make this transformation mandatory or not. I don't mind recommending that a second field be made available for registrants or registrars that wish to transform data on a non-mandatory basis.

However, I don't think it's necessarily within the scope of this PDP to make that recommendation. So maybe what we could do is maybe recommend that, and another PDP, that this issue be looked at more closely, perhaps something like the (close) EWG PDP, but as long as we do stick to on non-mandatory basis for having to transform data. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. I'll just have a look in the chat room - in there, one or two comments. Oh, yes, so Jim is saying readable might just mean accessible. Right, yes. Okay - with which Amr is agreeing.

And I wonder whether that may mean that we can get on to the last page of this now and head down to 92. So, scroll down there, perhaps, and I'm aware

there are things going on in the chat room but I shall come to those in a moment.

So mandatory transformation would see a shift in costs away from those requiring transformation to those who do not, so registrars, registrants with potential negative impact on them to served regions.

Yes, I mean, this would certainly seem to be likely and on the other hand, I - this is an argument with which we are fairly familiar, I think. I don't think it's a very new argument.

All right, now, looking at the chat room - oh yes, again, this is actually going back to the last comment. Amr is saying adding internationally to readable does not necessarily imply universally readable but I suspect that (unintelligible) intend on something to that end. Okay.

And being cognizant that universally readable is also impossible to achieve, so we've certainly had discussions about not wanting to recommend anything that's impossible.

All right. Okay, so whether we want to pick up anything else with 87 or 92. I think there are things happening in the chat room but let us make a bit of progress and go to 94 and we can always come back if necessary.

So registrars are potentially unable to validate information data. I do wonder whether we need to the find exactly what sort of validation we're meeting here - syntactical operation or identity.

It seems a little vague, my initial impression of that. Now there are things referring back to previous comments going on. Oh yes, I realize this way of working is slightly confusing. So that's - first of all, we're talking about internationally the difference in internationally in universally. That's been pointed out by Petter.

And we're now on 94 which is registrars are potentially unable to validate information data. And I'm raising the point that, you know, validate is a horrendously vague term and, you know, I think it might help to point out whether it's syntactical, operational, identity or some combination there. Amr, which like to say something about that? Sorry, I didn't see her hand.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. Yes, I would need to refer back to the NCSG comments to understand the sentence within the full context. But in terms of validation, this is on- I mean as far as NCSG concerned, think we use that pretty uniformly to mean sort of just making sure that, for example, in - for example, as in a physical address that the city does indeed exist and the street does indeed exist in the city. In this street number indeed does exist on the street in this city.

So that's probably what is meant by validation here. It's not necessarily verifying that this information - this physical address belongs to this registrant but just validating that this information is actually in existence.

And validating contact information is extremely problematic because it's very impractical for registrars to attempt to validate all contact information and with increasing internationalization of domain name registration and we foresee that happening, especially with new IDNs. Validating contact information in different countries will just increase the likelihood of that being practical or even possible. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. I think those are very good points. All right, unless there's anything else about 94, that means we're on the last row, 95. And that is searching in the original script will be far more reliable than searching in transformed data since consistency will almost be impossible to achieve.

Okay, so let's just look at this in two parts. So searching in the original script will be far more reliable than searching in transformed data so, you know, the

idea here is that the original script is, in many ways, primary. You've more of a chance of matching things within the original version often.

And then pointing out the fact that if there is a transformation, particularly if it is done by - or particularly of transformations are dumb by many parties, consistency will be almost impossible to achieve.

So these are both things which we have spoken about before and I believe that's more or less where we are with them. Amr, would you like to pick up something in there?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, Chris. I believe in the statement -- this is Amr for the transcript -- in the statement here I think it's especially relevant when you're - when a search for a registrant is being done using cross referencing the registrant name or physical address across the different - with different registrations especially if they're coming from different registrars.

There may be variations in how the contact information is transformed so it'll actually make cross-referencing far more difficult. So if this - if searching and cross-referencing is done in the original language and script, it probably would yield more accurate results or at least more complete results. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that because, you know, one can certainly think of situations where in the original script, cross-referencing would be straightforward.

However, if it's transliterated using more than one transliteration, for example, then you can end up with entries which are so different that cross-referencing is highly likely to fail. All right, anything else about Number 95? Well, that means that we're at the end of the document. Now, Amr, is that an old hand or?

Amr Elsadr: Chris, no this is Amr. No, this is a new hand. I wanted to just take a minute to go back to Number 92 which we didn't talk about, if that's all right.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes, absolutely. A shift, of course...

Amr Elsadr: Yes, I think this is something that I've raised (before) and I think it was also, if I recall correctly, in the original NCSG submission during the early stages of this PDP.

                We recognize that there is obviously a transaction costs in transforming contact information when that is necessary. The question here is, does this transaction costs fall on - who bears the burden of this cost?

                So the NCSG's view, the Whois for other reasons, for historic reasons beyond the scope of this PDP obviously needs to be accurate and up to date and available.

                However, a transaction cost which already - which may already exist, which will exist in the future and its existence may increase in the need to transform contact data, this transaction cost is, I think, more to the benefit and the limited benefit of those who are performing the Whois lookups.

                And a decision by this PDP to make transformation mandatory on the registrants or contracted parties would shift this cost away from those who are benefiting from the service to others who are not. And I think this is a crucial issue in the lack of justification of recommending mandatory transformation. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for expanding that. And the other comments on 92 or any other row in the spreadsheet? All right, we will now work to update the spreadsheet and circulated probably within the next few working days. I'm doing some amount of traveling in the future, but even so.

In that case, I think it may be time to move over to the draft final report from the EWG on IRD. I'm hoping that we've got that handy to be loaded in the chat room window.

Man: Chris, this is (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: We had a bit of technical difficulty there. Is that going to help if I paste a URL in so that we can have a look at the document perhaps? Now, let's have a look. Okay, there is a URL there in the chat room.

And what I'm intending to do, I don't like starting in the middle but I think on this occasion I would like to start on Page 11 of that document. Aha, it's coming in the middle. Super.

Just in case Page 11 takes a lot of time - all right. So, as you can see, we have a - so it's the example of Whois out localized for an English-speaking audience. Oh, that is a lovely size.

Okay. So what I wanted to raise was that the data that we see here is very, very clean. I mean it's - you know, this is a really, really nice English record for the Japanese address that we can see on - I'll to show you that very briefly.

The original is on Page 10 up here. There it is. And then this address, on Page 11, is then the transformed address. And the data is lovely. I mean, this is just - if you were writing a letter to that company, then this is really the kind of address that you would want to use.

And the reason I, as a linguist, wanted to raise this, right at the start of looking at this document was just to make clear that the likelihood is that the record is being done manually, I would say, because actually there are elements of both translation and transliteration in here for a start.

So, for example, if we look at the postal address we've got the (T or the) first building and - ah, yes, this is very useful. Jim is saying in the chat room it was done manually.

I'm very, very happy to hear that because one would not want to give the impression that there was some machine out there somewhere that could produce a record as beautiful as this one automatically.

I just don't think there is and if I just take one or two or if, in fact - Jim is typing a lot in the chat room. So rather than me guessing, it's better to - yes, okay. So they've got some automation but we cleaned it up for the document. Yes. All right.

So I mean, for example, this word, I would guess, in this is me guessing but I think the word first - will actually building as well, but first probably was tight. It was cleaned up because usually or the most frequent translation of first in Japanese buildings is actually the word (dietchee), so you know First Insurance, (dietchee Samay), something like that.

Now here, in fact, it's interesting because it's coming from an English word. It's (fast orbida) is - has been transformed as first building. And, you see, the interesting thing here is it's a lovely example because the word (fastom) in Japanese could be first as it is here but it can also be fast.

So, for example, in Japan there is a chain of fast food restaurants called First Kitchen and there's always been a bit of a suspicion that there was a problem with the transformation and actually it was Fast Kitchen.

But if you look at the English form, it's First Kitchen because in Japanese, (fastom) could be first or could be fast. We don't know. It's - if we - now that's an unusual thing to see in the chat room. Amr has got the smiley face.

So this is a lovely example of where you can have different possible ways of transforming. This is really the point that I making with this. But I was very happy to see this example because I think it makes the point rather nicely.

Now, that then enables us to address one or two points which are made, so under the table, we've got - so it is essential to understand that the original data could have been in either form - Japanese or English.

Well, hmm. Yes, Amr is saying the fast food examples I'm using, it's sort of - it's really most fortunate that this word first was in this record because it just allows us to indicate the most interesting things in a way that's quite easy to remember as well as very pleased to see it.

So it's essential to understand that the original data could have been in either form - Japanese or English. Well, yes, but you see we've got these sort of multiple things which are not quite matching and then we've got, since each form can be derived from the other through translation and transliteration, not really because you see, if you go from first, you may end up - you'll probably end up with (dietchee), in fact.

And then you might get fast, although that is not a very likely possibility. And then in Japanese you have fast or you may get first but you may also get fast. And then you see the whole thing becomes a real mess.

So I think we can use the - this particular example just to draw attention to various possible weaknesses actually in the arguing here. I think that's what it comes to. We then go on to the effect of this observation, is that no single internationalized form must exist.

I'm just reading that. It's rather difficult to, you know, this concept of internationalized form. I mean, you can sort of think of the Japanese original form as being primary and then conceivably the Romanized transformed form

is then the internationalized form, but it's not necessarily the case that it's particularly easy to get between the two forms.

Okay. Now, I'll just come back into the chat room and we'll pick up one or two things in here. So Jim says he can't speak to the specifics of the transformation and he says he's amused in a good way that Chris is picking apart the example.

Well, it's - it is most fort- it is, as I said earlier, it's a most fortunate example because it is a wonderful example of just effectively how languages are rather like little bushes, so often people think that in languages, oh, you know, each leaf on the one bush will correspond to a leaf on the other bush.

That's just not how it works. So you have all of these different leaves and they don't necessarily correspond. And so this whole process of transformation is really very, very complicated and particularly when we're translating we, you know, we can end up in some very funny places.

If we decided to transliterate then that's a different matter. You know, we could get this address into transliteration pretty consistently actually. But it would not look anything like as clean as it does on Page 11.

All right now back into the chat room. (Justine) is saying right so there's still automation - there's still an automation solution which knows when to translate and when's to - no there isn't such a thing.

So here we have a person that did it. And we are probably a long way before we will have an automated solution there.

And then Jim is saying the only thing I can think of to say is that we're trying to make a point. Perhaps there are better examples but as I'm sure you can appreciate it's all very difficult. Yes absolutely.

And then (Justine) is saying I mean so there is still no automation which knows when to - yes okay that's it, so went to translate or when to transliterate?

So yes the truth is basically that there is no automatic solution and one is a very long way away.

And then Jim is saying hopefully you're not going to suggest we explain all of this in our final document where this is what you're saying?

No. The thought crossed my mind that may want to make a public comment on this. And I - but anyway we can think about that in slow time.

Then Jim is saying also know we're trying to show an idyllic final solution, right.

Yes that's interesting. I have to admit I have been more interested in showing solutions which are not idyllic but are not ideal but maybe closer to what we can achieve in the near future. And the transliteration approach may be somewhat closer.

And in fact would it be helpful for me to give you an idea of what a transliterated approach would look like and then you can compare them? That will only take seconds. I'll do it, just a moment.

Jim Galvin: This is Jim, Chris if I may while you're doing that?

Chris Dillon: Okay. So there it is in the chat room. As you can see that would be - the order may be wrong but, you know, there may be ways around that, you know, just by indicating what the various fields are doing in the database.

And that - this is a, you know, this is a solution which is not using diacritics. If you had diacritics then that would look like a different. Jim would you like to say something?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you, so Jim Galvin for the transcript. Just quickly I want to kind of wrap-up maybe talk a little bit about the perspective from which we were coming from and remind people we do say this earlier in the document.

But, you know, because we are or this group was a Expert Working group and not a PDP group we although we considered, you know, carefully some practical issues and as a result that we do have a section here where we talk about technical issues about achieving the final solution we really took the approach that we should look at what would one like to achieve and where do we want to be to sort of put a goal out there and then recognize that there will be follow-on work from here as an appropriate group of people, you know, discuss in more practical terms what's achievable and what's not and what a transition plan might be.

So, you know, this example, it's interesting. I enjoy listening to, you know, talk about the I'll call them flaws for the moment here in this example.

But, you know, I mean it highlights this problem in general which we're all quite familiar with. And there's certainly no intention, we did not intentionally want to demonstrate the things that you're talking about Chris.

And I'm not sure if I want to add to the document and try to explain all of that. If you were to do that it might be better to put it to find a way to include it in the technical issues discussion. So that actually might be useful Chris.

Maybe that's something you and I could talk about anyway independent of whether this group decides to make a public comment about this.

You know, we should talk a little bit about the difference, all the things that you just said, find a way to summarize that and observe it as an issue.

Anyway my point really is, you know, idyllic example this is where we want to get to and, you know, all of these issues that you're talking about were intended to be exposed by this process. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much Jim. Let's follow this up in detail after today's call.

My concern in bringing it up was that I felt that the example might give the impression that it was very easy to produce clean data.

And, you know, just the reality is that at the moment, you know, admittedly it is very clean but at the moment it has to be done by a human being.

But anyway thank you very much for the input. We'll talk about this off-line afterwards. And I think that this is really the only sort of very (linguisticy) bit of this document in fact.

And so we can now go back to the beginning and just work our way steadily through it.

And how I'm aware that Amr is typing something but I think oh yes, oh yes okay. So yes there's an amusing go with transforming some (unintelligible). Yes, I can just imagine what happens when one takes a language which tends not to write the short vowel, yes.

Okay right. So let us go back to Page 4. That's really where we get going in this document apart from that clusters interest on Page 11.

And so basically one of the things is these three principles which are suggested and I thought it was worth having a quick look at these especially the first two.

So we've got the user capability principle, so the capability of the data permitting users should be the constraining factor.

And we need to think of that in, you know, this is, you know, basically can this person input data in this language is actually that's made clearer further down. So we'll actually come back to this but, you know, I feel this is rather relevant to us.

Then we've got simplicity and reusability, so where possible existing standards should be applied. Where simpler standards exist they should be preferred.

So, you know, I think we are certainly I mean it affects us in some ways because, you know, you've got that UPU standards. And in the past we have said well actually, you know, UPU are existing standards but effectively it's the standard for each country so it's not as straightforward as it seems whereas transliteration may be, you know, just transliterate this according to a national standard, that may be simpler.

Extensibility so where possible the data model should be able to be easily extended to tailor to the evolution of data elements.

So I think this is really on the edge of that. You know, that, you know, that might be - refer to a situation where for example sorts of contact information which aren't currently in the Whois needs to be outed to it. That sort of situation conceivably but it's very much on the edge of what and what we do.

Okay. I'm still on Page 4. This is going to be easier if I use my hard copy I think.

Oh yes. Now at the bottom it's just spelled out a bit more. Registrants should only be required to input registration data in the language or script that they are skilled that.

Oh, and then all data elements should be tagged with the languages and scripts in use. And this information should always be available with the data element.

Now one of the shocks which I had when I read this document so it was a very interesting document to read, but it was actually this thing about tagged with the languages and scripts in use because as we go a little bit further into it we realize that it may be quite difficult to have a list of languages and scripts.

And we have presumed that we would just be able to put our hands on some list of languages and scripts.

And there seems to be a real possibility that that may not be straightforward that that was a bit of a shock and just then that's spelled out a little bit more further down the document.

Okay. So I'm just going to have a quick look at some things on Page 5.

The only thing I would like to draw your attention to is that whereas registrar name and postal address have got things about languages and scripts personal names and organizational names don't have that restriction.

And I'm actually not completely aware of what sort of ramifications that may have. But I just - what I noticed is that, you know, there are restrictions on number two and number three registered name and postal address but not on number one personal names and organizational names. Perhaps wages need to bear that in mind.

All right, if there are any points anybody would like to raise about any of this of course as usual you are more than welcome to do. But otherwise let us continue as far as I think it's Page 9 our next stop.

I mean his usual I, you know, I am stopping at places I believe personally to be of greatest interest to us.

It's only a personal opinion. If somebody finds some other parts of the document important and I have a very - I have bad feeling I am missing things. You are more than welcome to raise things I'm skipping over.

But I thought that it would be worth just highlighting the difference between localization and localization and internationalization. It's a key concept. So with the localization referring to the adaptation of a product, the applicational document to meet the language culture and other requirements of the specific target market locale or purpose whereas internationalization is the design and development of a product application or document content that enables easy localization to target audiences.

This I wanted to stress that and that distinction because it - as I think it has, before in our meetings but it's just one in particular to have a different of one's mind.

Okay. Then oh, then we catch up with ourselves. Now we are at the bit that we started with Page 11. And for the first time in a while we are making better progress than I expected we would so that is wonderful news.

Gradually scroll through the next few pages. We can stop if necessary. And the chat room Amr is saying to Jim haven't gone through this yet but very eager to. Okay. Yes well as you know it is a most interesting read.

All right now, no I think we go quite a long way this time. Yes I think it's Page 15. That's where our next stop. I'll just double check yes, as far as I know. Let me start it. Okay.

And so and the interesting bit here is that it's in middle. So the current XML schema the DNRD does not support representation of two forms.

So to specify that the two forms represent the same record there should be some indication of the relationship between a preferred form for example and then specify the transformation information whether it's translated or transliterated and the date and time of the transformation yes.

Okay. I think I just wanted to flag those things.

I mean, also looking at that Japanese example, you know, here we've got translated or transliterated, you almost need to put all some combination of the two because, you know, certainly it's manual transformation is involved a nice clean version may well be that.

Oh yes. And obviously in the first bullet point there is this reference to preferred form. And obviously we are wanting to say that preferred form would normally be the original data.

Now, ah, yes then we just go a little further to Page 16. Oh yes, and this is the thing I was flagging up before. The - oh no, where has it gone? Additionally it's that paragraph standard list of languages and scripts.

Now the UPU had got a standard that it's quite small used by 40 countries. Okay so, you know, as I said earlier this was a bit of a shock. I think this is something that we had presumed.

And certainly looking at I actually had to look at Wikipedia after this. So I started looking up languages and I looked at the Korean language.

And, you know, I has I think yes, that's right, I had two different words in the original script for the Korean language one which is used in South Korea one which is used in North Korea.

What was even more interesting was that the South Koreans used one Romanization, one transliteration for Korean and the North Koreans used a slightly older transliteration scheme but different anyway.

And, you know, there are other - there are some pretty long lists of languages. So, you know, maybe, - you know, this, you know, there may be some way of making progress here at least having a list of languages and scripts.

All right, now if we go down to Page 17 here we have rather an alarming thing. And it's a bit - I should've read this and (had all). I hope this isn't true because it's going to cause trouble.

So this suggests that the Western convention is requiring an address to be in the form of a name address line 1, address line 2 city, state or province postal code and country may be inappropriate in an internationalized contact.

So gosh, yes. This is a - this is really quite alarming because, you know, at least until now we have been presuming that that kind of a format might get us a really long way.

If I take a linguistic approach to this it's like saying we believe there's an irregular verb. And then the linguists said yes that sounds interesting. Now which verb do you mean?

So what I would like to see is I'd like to see the exceptions that are causing the author to write that. It is yes, it is rather alarming.

I mean perhaps the modifications required are minor but, you know, that is quite an alarming thing, all right.

Jim Galvin: Chris, this is Jim.

Chris Dillon: Yes sir, please bring me anything you would like.

Jim Galvin: I'm sorry I'm not in the Adobe Connect room at this point anymore. Just quickly, yes I agree that's a pretty dramatic statement.

It really comes from recognizing the idea that, you know, postal rules really belong to the local regional authority and the actual rules on what's allowed and what's not.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: And so it seems odd that even if the UPU won't enforce a uniform format or addresses it seems odd that ICANN would put it there.

Now perhaps we can add some additional clarifying text I guess as I'm listening to you talk. But the intent was not to suggest that anything has to change because personally I agree with you. What we have will certainly take us a long way.

But I do think that in the overall context of internationalization and again thinking forward to sort of this idyllic kind of solution that we'd want to have we need to recognize the fact that, you know, perhaps there's a more general solution to what an address looks like.

And if we're going to change things we should be thinking about that as we, you know, consider what changes we might make.

So and this kind of point has not been documented anywhere else in the ICANN context that I could find.

And so I, you know, again speaking personally thought it was really kind of helpful if not important to at least mention it in this document.

So but if you have some advice on, you know, how we might temper that statement so that, you know, you're concerned about what the consequences might be a bit I would welcome, you know, that input to the work party so that we can think about that. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. I mean in some ways it's going back to an earlier point in the report where there is, you know, there is the point made that a flexible data format has a huge advantage because if we become aware of situations where this sort of traditional approach does not work then if we have some flexibility we may be able to, you know, either to arrange existing fields and data in slightly different ways on occasions depending on, you know, which is the language of the interface viewing the data or to possibly split field, you know, split existing fields into more than one field so that it's clearer what, you know, exactly what the data are representing.

I mean the reason I was quite concerned about this is I just looked at it and thought oh my goodness, If we can even, you know, if we can take this, you know, if we can't rely on this then it sort of represents possibly quite a delay.

So fundamentally what I'm saying is I mean it's great to be it's - if there's bad news it's good to hear it early. That's really what I feel. And that we, you know, certainly, you know, there is an interest in looking for things which break this traditional model would really be my summary of it.

All right, now I'm conscious that we are near the end of today's call. And unlike recent calls in which we have not made as much progress as I had

hoped we have made more progress than I expected with today's call so that is a very good feeling.

And I will pass my note on the document on to Rudi who is running next week's call.

I am traveling and in fact I shall be in Korea. And that means that the - it means this call is very late in the evening and so rather difficult to deal with. So I probably won't be able to attend it.

I mean it may also be that, you know, fairly soon. You know, we've actually covered most of the points I was going to cover any way very soon - well not all of them looking at my notes.

But it may also be that at some point we'll have a rest and there will be work done on drafting the final report over the next few weeks.

But obviously I will keep you all up to date with what is happening via the mailing list as usual. Any questions about any of that?

And also yes oh yes, I'm also aware that we need to update the work plan. At the moment there is only quite an out of date work plan in the wiki. And it would be really good to have one with more likely dates in there.

So as I was saying I wonder if there's anything you would like to bring up about what we'll be doing in the next few weeks?

All right well oh Amr yes, would you like to raise something?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Hi Chris this is Amr. Just a question on reviewing the IRD EWG's report - and this is just the initial report. It's still in a - there's still an open public comment period on this report and it may change.

But on reviewing it here is - it - I'm unclear on the intent. Will it somehow change the content of this PDP's report in any way?

And from a process perspective I'm not very certain that this is appropriate at this point. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. The reason I was keen to look to read this document in the group and read it critically as well I think reading it critically is a positive thing to do.

You know, you understand things better if you give them this sort of critical attention. The reason for doing it is that soon we will be drafting our final report.

And before we do that I want to have read as many relevant documents as we possibly can together. Because if from this point on we, you know, other documents become - we become aware of other documents which are relevant to us it means adding content during our drafting process. So that is, you know, that makes the drafting far more difficult.

So my idea has been simply to read everything we possibly could to understand our tasks as well as we possibly could. And so that's really been the idea.

So yes I mean anything we read could affect our report. Yes because it may shine light on some area that we have missed out.

So that's the sort of philosophy behind it. And Amr is kindly saying in the chat room that that makes sense. All right and I'll be absolutely honest with you to some extent I am hoping that nothing relevant comes up during the drafting period.

If it does that will add a little bit of time to what we're doing. And obviously we will address it but I was keen to do as much as possible before we started drafting.

Amr would you like to raise something there?

Amr Elsadr   Yes. I would just like to clarify my concern with this from the process perspective is that following the public comment period now open on this report the IRD EWG itself may elect to make changes to its report.

But from the context that you described yes, that certainly does make sense if there are - if there's information here that was whether it is amended or not is certainly something we should be looking at. So thank you very much.

Chris Dillon: Thank you too. I should also say to the group if anybody is aware of something important that we haven't read then I am not.

You know, as far as I know we have read everything but if somebody is aware of something relevant than okay, you know, that is something we need to pick up.

And in a way better to do it before we start drafting. We don't want to draft a document and then have to change it. That's really the idea.

All right well we're a little over the time and so we are I think likely to well there will be a meeting probably next week with Rudi and then with me on 2nd of April once I'm back.

And obviously we will keep up to date on the mailing list as usual. So thank you very much for a call in which we have covered a huge distance today.

All right goodbye then and many thanks.

Man:		Thanks Chris. Bye-bye.

Man:		Bye.

Man:		Bye.

Woman:		Thank you Jim. We now stop the recordings.

END