ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 6 February 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 6 February 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-20140206-en.mp3

On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#feb

Steve Sheng's presentation may be viewed directly at:

http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/presentation-feasibility-study-06feb14-en.pdf

on page

http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/correspondence

Attendees:
Chris Dillon - NCSG
Patrick Lenihan- NCUC
Jim Galvin - SSAC
Marc Blanchet – No SOI
Justine Chew – At-Large
Pitinan Koarmornpatna - GAC
Patrick Lenihan - NCUC
Ching Chiao - RySg
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Ahkuputra Wanawit - GAC
Wolf Knoben - ISPCP
Simon Perreault - No SOI
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC

Apologies:
Ephriam Percy Kenyanito
Rudi Vansnick
Petter Rindforth
Amr Elsadr
Sarmad Hussain

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffman

Margie Milam
Steve Sheng
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Welcome everyone, thank you for standing by. This call is being recorded, so if you do have any objections, please disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much (Lisa). (Chris), would you like me to do a roll call for you?

Chris Dillon: Oh, thank you very much.

Glen DeSaintgery: on the call we have (Chris Dillon), (Jennifer Chung), (James Galvin), (Justine Chew),Ching Chiao, Mae Suchayapim Siriwat, Marc Blanchet (Patrick Lenihan), Ahkuputra Wanawit, Simon Perreault, Pitinan Koarmornpatna and on the line we also have -- for staff we have Julie Hedlund, Margie Milam, Lars Hoffman, and myself, Glen DeSaintgery.

Have I left off anyone that is on the call? Sorry, we Steve Sheng

Man: Hello, (unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: And we also have Wolf-Ulrich Knoben and Margie Milam. Thank you, Chris, I think that's all. May I just remind people to say their name before speaking for the transcription purposes? And it's now over to you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. We need to have a look at changes of statements of interest, technically, so if anybody

Okay, I'm hearing nothing. I'm presuming we can go on. And we've got two updates on today's call. And the first one is from Margie Milam,

who's going to give us an update on the expert working group on TLD directory services. So Margie, would you like to give the update?

Margie Milam: Yes, good morning, good afternoon everyone. This is Margie from ICANN staff. I'm the lead support person on staff side for the expert working group that the board convened -- it was about December 2012 -- to try to take a look at the whole Whois picture to see if there's a better way to provide the services. Essentially just take a clean start approach and try to identify whether there could be a replacement system to today's Whois system.

So that expert working group has been working for about a year. They published their initial report prior to -- now I can't remember which meeting it was -- two meetings ago. And that contains their recommendations for principles that could be used to design a new system. And then in the Buenos Aires meeting they provided an - a status update that went into much more detail on their thoughts on how to develop a new system to replace the current Whois system.

Since the Buenos Aires meeting, they've essentially taken a hiatus while we conduct a series of research projects to try to get better answers to similar questions that the group is exploring. So for example they're doing research on the costs of commercial validation systems. They're doing research on the costs of implementing some of the models that they've proposed. They're also looking deep into the privacy and proxy practice services to see whether there are some recommendations they can make with respect to those services. And they've reached out to various communities to try to get input.

So -- for example -- they've reached out to the CCTLD community to find out how the CCTLD community deals with validation with certain Whois issues. And they also are asking CCTLD's providers to identify what - how they deal with privacy issues. So as you can see, they're exploring a lot of different areas presented to the next generation -- what will be called the next generation registration directory service -- we call it the RDS, short for that.

But I think what's relevant to this group is that they really have not focused on the translation or the transliteration of contact data. Essentially, they're trying to keep the recommendations at a high level and they have a lot on their plate. They have easily 20 to 25 issues they're exploring and they just felt that they would prefer not to address those issues, other than maybe high level issues like the aggregated service that might be recommended should be able to handle multiple languages; something to that effect.

But they're not going deep into the issues that this PDP working group is exploring, particularly because they knew that this PDP working group was already - you know, was already convened and it already had a charter to take a look at these issues. And so they just felt that there wasn't anything extra that they could provide on this particular issue. So I think if you are worried about cross-over or overlap, I think you're probably not - you know, you don't need to be worried about that.

But I guess as you do your work on this particular working group, I think the principles are going to be looked at and try to apply to this next generation as well. So that's the background on that. When they conclude their research phase, they will meet again in Singapore right

before the Singapore meeting. They have a two-day meeting scheduled because their goal is to try to finalize their report by the London meeting. And essentially their work will conclude right at the London meeting.

The next steps following the publication of their final report would be to send it up to the board -- directors of ICANN -- and then ICANN will decide -- or the board will decide -- whether it should be sent to the GNSO Council for a policy development process to see whether action should be taken on the model proposed by the expert working group. So that is the current expectation that the board would look at it and presumably would go to the GNSO Council. There's no plans to have this implemented without a policy development process.

So it would be some time before any of the work from the expert working group would actually become a real project to be implemented. And with that I think I'll pause and see whether you have any questions.

Chris Dillon   Thank you very much for that report, Margie. This is (Chris) speaking. Now, there's something going on in the chat room at the moment. Now, let's just have a look. Oh, yes, Ching Chiao is actually asking a question. He's asking, "Does the expert working group have the chance to cover the other three recommendations from the ILD working group report, especially access to Whois? And that means over the Web and via port 43 for IDM TLDs."

Margie Milam: Essentially what they're doing is they're trying to do this through - just as a high level model. So the model doesn't exclude IDMs, but they haven't done anything specific with relation to IDMs. And if there are

some things that this group would like them to look at that, you know, as you look at the model that was proposed in the initial report, you know, I can certainly take that back to them and ask them to take a look at it before they issue their final report. But the idea is that it would cover everything. It would cover any GTLD.

Chris Dillon   Okay, thank you very, very much. So that was (Chris) speaking. I think Ching is just about to follow - oh, yes, he's thanking you for answering that one.

Margie Milam   Great.

Chris Dillon   Are there any other questions about the report? I'm seeing nothing in Adobe Connect. I was myself going to ask about the timeline, but you actually - you responded on that one, so if there aren't other questions about that is there anything else you'd like to add to that, Margie, or should we move on to the next report?

Margie Milam: I think the only thing really that's - to highlight is that the model is open for essentially comments and the additional information that was published in the status update report prior to Buenos Aires is still open for comments through the end of the month. So to the extent that you have anything you'd like us to specifically focus on or have comments on the current model that they've proposed, we just encourage you all to submit comments on that report.

Chris Dillon   Thank you for that. I'm very - personally I'm very interested in validation. I mean, I don't know whether it's early days to ask questions about validation.

Margie Milam   The report actually has a lot of recommendations related to validation. They've spent a fair amount of time -- especially flushing out some of the issues with today's model -- and made recommendations for contact ID that you would validate and you could take with you. And so we - we're especially curious and interested in receiving recommendations related to that. And that validation that they're proposing is much more extensive than what currently exists today. So I am - I can certainly follow up with an e-mail that I could send to (Julie) or (Steve) highlighting what sections of the report address validation issues.

Chris Dillon   Thank you very much for that. (Peter Green) is just pointing out that there was an announcement from ICANN. I presume it's about that and I'll just have a quick look at it.

Margie Milam: If it's yesterday, it relates to the privacy and proxy questionnaire that we're sending out to all providers to try to get some feedback on what their practices are. I believe that's what that particular announcement relates to.

Chris Dillon   Okay, thank you. Thank you very much for that. All right. Any other questions for Margie or shall we move on to the next report? Seeing no hands up in Adobe Connect, let us do just that. Thank you very much for that.

Margie Milam: Thank you very much everyone.

Chris Dillon   And - you're very welcome.

Margie Milam: I'm going to drop off. Thank you.

Chris Dillon   Okay. Thank you. And the next report is from Steve Sheng. I'm just checking if he is on the call and that is about the study group to evaluate available solutions for the submission and display of internationalized contact data.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, (Chris). I am on the call. I have prepared a brief presentation to share with the working group to update you on the status of the study. Next slide, please. So just some general background. As part of the effort to implement the Whois review team recommendations, one of those recommendation is for staff - asking staff to commission a study to evaluate available solutions for internationalized registration data.

When the GNSO Council voted to approve the PDP, there was also a request from the GNSO Council to look into this issue. So this proposed study will fulfill both the requirements of the Whois review team and GNSO Council. Next slide, please.

The study areas - next slide. Yeah, okay. The - there are three key study areas. The first area is to document the submission and display practices of internationalized registration data at registries and registrars. So the goal here is to get some ground zero data on how the practice is currently done today. I think, you know, within the community there is already a breath of experience dealing with internationalized registration data. And there's - and when we consider, you know, additional policies in this area, certainly it's to learn from what's been done is very important to avoid reinventing the wheel.

The second aspect of the study is to consider an assessed cost and functionality of commercial and open source solutions for transliterating and translating contact data. There has been mention in the past -- and certainly a key subject here -- about translation and transliteration. But exactly, you know, how much does it cost, you know, how good it is for these solutions. So it's good to have some, you know, concrete data in there that would facilitate the deliberations.

And the third -- and I think, probably, you know, the most important of all -- is to consider and assess the accuracy implications for transliteration and translations of the contact data. As we know that there are a variety of transliteration systems - even, you know, within a single language and script. You know, for the Chinese - for the hunt group and the Chinese language are native of and familiar with - I know there already systems in there.

And there will be obviously a fair amount of information lost for translations of the data. So just to, you know, kind of - to consider and assess in a more formal way the - those implications of those transformations. So those are the key study areas. Next slide, please.

Today I'm mainly going to talk about the first one. These are mission and display practices. We - I sent an e-mail to the working group I think a few days ago on this topic. So the goal here is to document the data collected from registrant or display purposes in local language scripts and as format specifications. We also seek to understand if the data is maintained in more than one language and script, how it's collection, you know, translation or transliteration is managed and the role of registrant in this process.

So for example we know some registries and registrars require a registrant to submit both a localized version of the contact data along with a rather Romanized version, right, to display. That seems to be a fairly common practice. So we want to know, you know, are there more practices similar to that or a different from that.

The third aspect is to explore - to understand tools, you know, that registries and registrar use for data collection transmission display and their enhancement use in practice. You know, for EBP and Whois services. We know there are some limitations on some of those and how does the registry or registrar deal with these issues? And finally, any additional tools employed for transformation of the data are collected in another language or script. So those are the goals. Next slide, please.

We - next slide. We've developed a survey -- it's actually two surveys -- a registry survey and a registrar survey. The survey is done. We are now in the pilot test phase where we conducted a pilot test with WAM registry already and we probably need to do more pilot tests. The administration of the survey is estimated to be around mid-February and it will probably take four to six weeks to get the data. Next slide.

One area -- as I was asked to provide an update to the PDP working group -- is to think about perhaps there's areas of collaboration with this group. There are three things I think about and probably, you know, would open for discussion here. Perhaps if the working group is interested, you know, we would really appreciate the feedback on the survey questions so that we make sure, you know, we are asking the right questions.

And second is as this PDP working team ahs, you know, a lot of experience in these areas so any additional insights you have on data points regarding submission and display practices to share with us would be especially relevant. Especially as some of you operate, you know, registries and registrars that are in different countries that are subject to different local laws, you know, regarding these practices. So those data points will be really helpful.

And the last is to perhaps you could consider to help us to spread the word for the survey or even to take the survey once it's public. So those are the three areas that we would like to have a dialogue with the PDP team to see how we can collaborate. So those are my main highlights of the update. I have one more slide on the other ones.

So we also started to look at the availability of translation and transliteration tools. We limit the scope to tools which covers a breadth of language and are not limited to only do transformation between single language pairs. This is to - you know, with the understanding that registries or registrars often operate in diverse linguistics context that that's not - if transformations are needed it's probably not limited - cannot be only one - between a single language pair.

We're looking at kind of four areas - the standards used for the transformations, accuracy for representative language pairs, license information -- whether it's open source or proprietary -- and the reversibility of such transformations. If one - if you could - if one could posture the - kind of the - what the end user experience for localized registration data directory service, probably think about, you know, people can view those information in their local language, regardless

where those - the domain names and registration data the original language is.

So, you know, to do that - and the very important goal is to make sure there is transformation and reversibility of such transformations. So that's another area we're looking into. This area we just started. Right now our focus is to get the survey out of the door and administer the survey so the study team has been focusing its attention. So that's all I have for the update. Any - happy to answer any questions, then - thus further. Thank you.

Chris Dillon   Thank you very much, Steve. Now, are there any - I can see there are questions. Ching, would you like to ask Steve a question?

Ching Chiao: Yes, thank you (Chris) and Steve for the update. This is Ching - Ching Chiao from (unintelligible) Asia. So once again, thanks for the update. I think it's really useful to know from the Whois review team the status of the work.

So I guess I have a couple points and question or comments to make. I will just go through some of my notes here. So - actually first is perhaps Steve you can, you know, help us to recap the - kind of the mission for the Whois review team and also for this working group. It seems that there is a very obvious on the overlapping works here. So - and it seems that the Whois review - I mean, this PDP goes even further than our - this working group. So just maybe you can help us to recap how these two groups should work together or actually to, you know, allocate works among each other. So maybe I will just stop here and let you respond.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Ching. Very good question. With respect to the mission of the Whois review team, I thought one of the goals to review the effectiveness of the Whois policies that ICANN is developed or has developed. I don't remember the exact language here.

In terms of the effort, there are three efforts in this area. So the first effort is obviously the - this PDP working group which tackles really the central question of internationalized registration data. That is the translation and transliteration of the contact information. There is the - kind of an expert group -- not expert group -- a volunteer group to - formed to look at the requirement - the overall requirements for internationalized registration data. That is also in this area. Sorry.

The approach of that expert working group is maybe looking - is by categorizing the data - the Whois data into different categories and look at standards of internationalization for each of those categories. So besides the contact data, there's a breadth of information that has been output by Whois. For example, there are status, there are dates, there are e-mails, there are domain names, there are name server names, DNS set information, and a variety of other informations that could be considered internationalized. So that working group is tackling that piece of the problem and make recommendations.

The third effort here is to study the - to look at - to study the available solutions, which I envision primarily would benefit, you know, this PDP team as well as the other working group on the standards. So I - so there are three efforts and that's how I see they are related.

And I think it's, you know, helpful and important to not do the work in silence but to let the left hand know what the right hand is doing. So

with that spirit, we are very happy to collaborate and share as much as we could to avoid duplication, really and to make sure there is synergy in all these efforts.

Ching Chiao: Right. There's - actually I - first of all, thanks for the clarification. My only worries are not on the outcome, I know there's expert -- you know, trustworthy experts -- working on the experience on those issues. My only worry on this right now is that we are seeing an expert working group on the IRD and we have two kind of channels for them.

One is the Whois review team and also -- as well -- at this IRD working group. It's likely that the EWG - that expert working group will create a sets of recommendation. And the two separately working groups working on the same topic may have, you know, different, you know, the recommendation to the board eventually on the policy.

So, you kwon, this is - I mean, point this out - this may not be happening if we, you know, collaborate well. But I'm just, you know, pointing it out that we have two kind of on the table, you know, parallel PDP process made by two different working group. And potentially I'm seeing a risk of different sets of recommendation being made to us to the same, you know, issues or questions. I'm not actually seeking for an answer now, but just pointing out potential kind of issues that we all - and your - I mean, the Whois review team need to deal with.

That's one. I have couples but I just in - for the sake of time I only like to point out one more item here is that both of us and many others in this call. We've been through very lengthy IDN, you know, projects, the variant project, the IP ones. So I guess one thing that we have already learned is that there seems - there's no cross the border standard for

different languages. It seems that the only commonality is there's no standard. Each language, each different local market may have different rules for IDN - I mean, usage.

I'm seeing similar scenarios here. We're coming up with sets of recommendations but maybe if it comes to the stage to implementation into different language group or different markets we'll be seeing that, you know, you know, different language may have different implementation approach.

So I'm just trying to help us to get, you know, some learning from the past especially on the IDN VIP project which, Steve, you're taking the lead and also I'm seeing Jim Galvin here taking the lead on that.

I think that's a lesson well learned. I'm suggesting that we really look into that type of structure and not - when we work on this translation and transliteration project maybe we should really to look into not to really to get a standardized or a common standard solution for all languages but to see how we can incorporate different solutions for different needs. That's my two cents. I don't want to take too much of your time and other's time. Thanks .

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Ching. Point well taken. I think with the deployment of IDNs it's to, you know, I think the local operators really have a breadth of variants and that, you know, we need to learn from that. So I think your point is very well taken.

We probably - if I could make a request, we probably will come back to you to learn more about your localized practice at dotAsia, which serves a variety of audience throughout Asia. So thank you.

Ching Chiao: Sure, I mean, I'm so happy to help not only this - I'm seeing this couple of issues that you're working on. I think that's a good progress. But if we all take a step back, even let's say, for example, for the accuracy issue even for the current English Whois, the ASCII Whois, it would be really tough for any operator to ensure, you know, 100% even 90% of the accuracy of the Whois information.

I mean, personally I shouldn't speak for the registrar. I'm not seeing any registrar during this call for this call but even taking the accuracy part for - info for the ASCII Whois reads - it's really a challenge for any registrar or registry to accomplish that. So I'm just, you know, there are a couple of issues but I mean, hoping to, you know, to listen to further update and provide my comments but thanks.

Steve Sheng: Thank you.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you, Ching. Now are there any other questions for Steve about his report? I see none in Adobe Connect. The other thing that we could bring up at this point is actually anything that came out of the surveys which Steve circulated a few days ago whether anybody would like to make any suggestions about these surveys?

Okay, now I had a look at the surveys and actually found very little. But one thing we have talked about on this call in this group has been the fact that it could - there could be a possible policy. I mean, I'm not saying this will be how it will go but it might be possible that there could be a policy whereby certain fields were translated and other fields were transliterated.

So when I was reading the survey I was trying to make sure the whole time that if policy went in that direction that actually the survey, you know, there would still be useful data in the two surveys, you know, if the policy did go in that kind of direction.

Now the good news is that I think most, and possibly all of the surveys, were actually leaving that possibility there. But I would just like to flag it up because I thought that was quite an important thing because often people think oh, you know, the decision may be all translation or all transliteration but actually it could, you know, it could be based on the various fields concerns so that was really my comment - or one of my comments on the survey.

I don't...

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Chris. I hear that very loud and clear. In some of our preliminary work, in other areas, I think that's, you know, an area we are, you know, seeing things happening too. For example, we look at - sometimes it just doesn't make sense to, you know, translate names and organizations, right because...

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: ...because of the accuracy really for those and even for address. Maybe some part of the address ought to be transliterated and some part can be translated, a mix of those. So, you know, we are seeing some of that too not only in the registration data itself but also in other provider's practices.

So we hope the survey could, you know, it will come up - these things could come up and get documented in the survey. Thank you.

Chris Chaplow: Yes. Thank you very much for that. Now looking at the Chat window Justine Chew is asking - actually a question I was about to ask as well, it's quite a coincidence, and it is about the main - the timeline of the whole thing. And actually you've replied that you think it will be round about the time of the London meeting. Okay so that's important additional aspect.

Okay so now the other thing, which this group on this mailing list we have spoken about on occasions which, again, may be interesting, is actually the use of the word translation. And I think we actually haven't put - I was intending to put something about the word translation in the definition section in the wiki but I haven't done it; I will do it after this call.

But we - I think we are in agreement that the word translation can actually have several meanings. So transliteration could be, what I would - I would almost like to suggest would be a Romanization so it's Romanizing a particular language using an ISO standard or it might be some government decree, you know, this language will be Romanized in a particular way. So that is a sort of very, very sort of technical use of the word "transliteration."

But then you get other systems which - well maybe that's the problem. You get what you might call on the street transliteration. So this would be - I don't know if you, you know, you use, you know, the underground

system, the subway in Tokyo, you may notice that the companies have transliterated Japanese in a particular way.

And that, you know, there may be quite a lot of distanced between the way they've done it and what the official standards are. And then you have another situation where a private individual transliterates something. And the example I would like to give that - it's a very simple example but it would be a Chinese person who transliterated the name Lee as - using L-E-E.

=   Now if you follow the Pinyin transliteration that should be L-I. In fact even more strictly it should be L-I and a tone mark on it. But actually people very often use sort of very individual translations. So what I'm trying to say is that we need to be very careful with the word transliteration because it has many meanings and that's something that we've talked about on the call.

Okay. And now there's some - and Julie's actually picking up some points in the Chat window which I'll just have a look at. Okay there is an official - certainly there is an official transliteration, a definition of the word transliteration but I think we have to be quite careful that we - that when we use that word we know what sense we're using it in.

Okay. Okay and there's also a possibility of using the word transformation, Marc Blanchet is just suggesting that. To be honest with you, Marc, and I'm almost, myself, going to the opposite extreme and trying to use very, very precise words so that we're not running the risk of using a, you know, using the same word with several meanings which, you know, is often the start of trouble.

Okay. Okay thank you for that. Yes, Marc's just agreeing with that last point. Okay so...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Chaplow: ...any questions about - so it's any aspect of Steve's report or it's anything to do with those two surveys that he circulated, anything anybody else would like to bring up?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: Is that Wolf Knoben?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Yes I am.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, please speak.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Chris. Well I was just wanted to refer to the same what to report up to the definition of - with regards to the translation and transliteration which his here in the text, I think, from the IRD Working Group. And so I'm - with that definition so that is, for me, for my understanding not really that I could understand what is behind really.

So I really agree to what you were saying that we should be very, very exact and try, well, to find a definition which is - it is then understandable to everybody at first.

With regards to the - that definition of translation in that context I would like to say there is a short definition. It's that translation is the process

of conveying the meaning of some (unintelligible) of text in one language. That it can be expressed equivalently in another language.

So here's the word meaning in it. And that makes me (unintelligible), well, for questioning what was behind of that. Does this refer, in this context, to what we exchange on the list over the last week, you know, with regarding to meaning of contact information and to be translated and transliterated and the question then problems that may arise in that context or what does it mean?

So I have some questions with regard to that - those definitions. And I fully agree that we should further discuss those. Thank you.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you very much. Yes, it sounds as if we need to have a slow think about both of those words to make sure that we use them in an agreed way, you know, perhaps in that formal way that's in the wiki.

And, you know, it also means that somehow that has to - I think in practice it could be quite easy in Steve's surveys to use a word like transliteration and people will look at that and they will say, oh, you know, that means one of the looser meanings that I was just talking about. Well actually we're using it a very narrow way. So it might be quite important to stress that.

And the other interesting thing here is that we, you know, we may find that actually it's quite rare to find places where transliteration is being used very, very strictly. I mean, you know, we can't second guess what the surveys will find but my, you know, that part of them I shall certainly personally be watching with great interest.

Okay now a couple of people are making points in the chat room so I'll just make sure that we're up to speed with those. Yes, we - yes there's a mention of a definition of translation in the final issue report, yes, conveying the meaning. Yes.

And of course as soon as we see that, you know, we may be getting problems with reversibility because we can find a word in a language that means this word but when we go back again into the original language then we may find that we choose another word. And so, you know, there's a link with reversibility there.

Okay. I'm just checking that there's nothing I need to be telling you about in the chat. I think we're up to date. All right, well, perhaps let me just - let me just ask if there are any other points on Steve's - either on Steve's report or on Steve's survey that anybody would like to raise?

Okay, in which case we can move on into Point 6 on the agenda and this I really just me - first of all I would like officially to thank Klaus for sending out the - for sending out the various letters and to ask whether we had any replies? I suspect we haven't because I think we'd have seen them on the list. But I'll just ask quickly.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. We did get them out and I want to thank Lars Hoffman in particular for helping out as I was out of the office for the last few days. But they did go out to all of the supporting organization and advisory committees.

We don't have any responses yet. But it's early days so we certainly will bring any responses before the PDP working group as soon as we

receive them although I would be a bit surprised if we received them before the deadline that we placed, which is the end of this month.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. Thank you very much for that. Yes and Lars is just also thanking Glen for her work on that. Good. Good. Okay and as I had hoped we do have a little bit of time to revisit our proposed questions.

Let us do that and they are on the screen at the moment. As I was saying before, you know, we will certainly revisit the translation and transliteration. I think, you know, those, you know, those two words really do need quite a lot of thought.

And, I mean, I sent some comments around the list over the last week or so. And I think I can find no contradictions within the definition - sorry, the definition parts so that's what is contact information. I couldn't find any contradictions.

There's some amount of duplication which is actually a good thing because it just means that some of the definitions are quoting each other so, you know, that would need to be tidied up before a report was written. So there's some duplication.

What the other thing I did circulate is I pointed out that there is a sentence in the definitions which reads, "To meet basic domain control needs it should be mandatory for registries and registrars to collect and registrants to provide the following data elements."

And you see, you've got this word should being used and I pointed out on the list that we - because we are a policy group it's conceivable the we might want, you know, it's not necessarily the case that we're going

to follow that. You know, we may conclude that we want to but we can't take it for granted that that will be followed.

And that's actually in the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services wrote that - wrote that part of it. And there are also some parts of that document - and I think we might want to have a look at that and just make sure that it is contact information because there were certainly things like DNS servers being mentioned which are - I think don't fall under that. So perhaps we - perhaps we need to revisit that as well.

I think that was all I wanted to say about that first one. So - and we've already spoken about this quite a lot on this call. But is there - is there anything anybody else would like to add about that? Okay. Thank you for that.

And then as the second question, "Why are we doing this? Is this particular feature necessary?" I think it would be good to think especially about legal aspects and that sort of thing but I - as far as I know there actually isn't an update on that aspect unless - I don't know whether Vinay or Petter - I don't know whether either of them are on the call. I'll just double check. No, they're not on the call so we can ask them about that.

And now the other questions we actually haven't - we haven't approached. And so we're dealing with who gets access to what which I think is one of the questions which is overlapping. It might - with the work of other groups. So I don't know what people feel about that whether we should be - yes, Wolf, would you like to pick that up?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Chris. It's Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. I'm just referring to the last question, Number 2, again which is - well which is under Petter's and Vinay's work. But my question this context is - you are just focusing here - or more or less focusing on the legal aspects of what I understood. So...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...a question also with regard to the - well it's a why the reason - what is a need to do so and is there a sense to do so. What are the advantages we are supposed, well, to expect from doing so? So this is, to my understanding, a little bit in addition to the legal aspects. There's some question about that. Are those questions also handled here in this group?

Chris Chaplow: I think it certainly - it's something that we need to consider. It may just be that, you know, some of these questions are getting quite close to the work of other groups. There's no doubt about that. But in cases like that it might just be that, you know, perhaps we link to what they're doing and we just use it.

But, yes, I mean, certainly what you're saying is it isn't just, you know, it isn't just the legal thing, you know, things like advantages would come under that. So, yes, you know, we certainly need to develop the questions in that sort of direction even if we aren't answering all of them ourselves, you know, maybe other people are answering questions.

Whilst we're speaking about this I circulated some addresses, I think Chinese, Japanese, I think it may just have been Chinese and

Japanese addresses. And in the sense that may well be - that may well be duplicating things that have been done elsewhere.

But I do feel that rather than just passively listening to other groups that sometimes it's actually quite good to do a little thing yourself actively. And by doing that you suddenly become much more aware of what the issues are. So I think sometimes we may - we may do things like that just so that, you know, we have an active rather than a passive knowledge.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Chris Chaplow: Okay so if we move into who gets access to what, I mean, on one level, that's the third question, on one level it is just a brain - it is a brainstorm of all the stakeholders so it's, you know, it's everybody involved so let me think, registrants, registries, let me think, ordinary people, the public, security people, ICANN, you know, it's this sort of a thing.

And you're then starting to get a matrix of, you know, what the features are, who the players are and who gets what. And, yeah, you know, almost certainly overlapping but also things that, you know, we should probably be - we should probably be aware of so it might be good to start work on that third question which is in fact overlapping with the fourth one.

It's quite conceivable that - because we've got who are the stakeholders and, you see, the - who are the stakeholders actually plugs straight into who gets access to what is almost come before it.

So we may also need to add some questions here, to develop it and possibly change the order. So, yes, that might be another thing that we consider over the next week.

Perhaps that's a good place to start. It's always quite difficult doing this sort of question work on the call. I think in some ways it's easier to do it on the list and we're quite near the end of the hour. So let me ask any - well any other business basically? More or less done. Oh, wait a moment. Oh yes, I'm just noticing that, you know, there are actions coming out of this.

So it's basically refinements on the list. And it might be adding questions on - yes, and looking at 3 and 4 whether there are other questions and then linking to existing information would be the other one and especially within the first question thinking of transliteration and to a lesser extent, translation, that sort of area.

Okay. Well if there is no - any other business then let us kick these things round on the mailing list during the week and then come back to this on next week's call. And so I'd like to thank you for attending the call. Thank you very much indeed.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, thanks.

Steve Sheng: Thanks, Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone. We'll talk to you next week.

((Crosstalk))

END