**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 21 August at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 21 August 2014 at 1300 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-20140821-en.mp3

Coordinator: The recording has been started. Please go ahead.

Terry Agnew: Thank you.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday, the 21st of August, 2014.

On the call today we have Wanawit Ahkuputra, Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Chris Dillon, Howard Li, Jennifer Chung, Jim Galvin, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Mae Suchayapim Siriwat, Peter Dernbach, and Rudi Vansnick.

We have apologies from Petter Rindforth and Emily Taylor.

From staff we have Julie Headland, Mary Wong, and myself, Terry Agnew.

I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much, and back over to you, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, Terry.

Okay, well without further ado, let's proceed into Agenda Point 3, this is just the usual point whether anybody has a change in Statement of interest since the last call?

Okay, hearing and seeing nothing in the chat room, I think that means we can proceed.

And we are really continuing with what we were doing last week, so we were looking at various themes which have been raised, and there was some amount of discussion about them, and all of this is about a document which I circulated earlier today, and I thought we were still working on the same version of it last week, which is the Translation and Transliteration Draft Recommendations Version 6.

And so what I'm intending to do is just to continue to work through what seem to be larger themes, and you can see those on the screen in front of you now. So these are the larger screens - themes that we're aware of.

There are also quite a few smaller things, some of them very small indeed, and so we can also start to work on those if we have enough time today, but let's just see how things go.

So there'll be quite a lot of switching I think between the two documents. It's a list of the themes, and then it's the Version 6. Really, very much like last week.

Now at any point you're welcome to bring up other things, so if you'd like - if there's just a burning theme that you'd like to have added to our list, then please mention that now. It just gets us a bit more time to think about it.

Okay.

And so the other thing is that when we get as far as actually going through the document, picking up even quite small things, we're then hoping that may happen is that as we're doing that, people may just spot other things and that's - you know, that's absolutely fine as well. Because - awesome.

Something that you think is quite a small issue, you know, just some issue over a definition or something like that, actually turns out to be larger. So you know, we're really expecting that to happen.

Anyway, without further ado, and it's good to see that the numbers are getting healthier and healthier looking at the chat room. Without further ado, let's actually start with our list.

And as I was saying, these are the things that we think are larger themes, and some of them we raised last week. And yes, I think most of them in some way or another we raised last week. It's really continuing with that list.

Okay, so one thing that came up is - well, it's what - it's a sort of general issue over purpose of data and accuracy of data. So there are many conceivable purposes of data really in some of the related work. There is the expert working group's final report, for example, has a very long list of purposes. And so really what comes out of that is that you know for some purposes, you need accurate data. For other purposes, possibly you don't really need accurate data.

Just one thing I would like to flag up is we seem to be finding it difficult actually to specify which purposes don't require accurate data. I find that rather interesting. That seems to be where we are with that at the moment.

So - but really - so I think the thing here is that in some ways, there is an issue over you know whether we should be talking about purpose at all, but I feel, as I've written here, that there is a link with accuracy. So at that point, we may need to take it on.

Jim, would you like to raise something about this area?

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Chris. This is Jim Galvin.

I have a question. It would be helpful to me and hopefully others if we could just take a moment to recap how we got into this particular discussion. I mean, I've been thinking about this a little bit more, and I've realized that accuracy is important to transformation in general. But I guess I'm not remembering how it is that we got to talking about the purpose of the data from the accuracy or from transformation.

Could you help to fill in that gap a bit for me?

Chris Dillon: Yes.

I think that - the key to it should be the - I think it's connected with - if my memory's right, it's C3 and O2. I could've got that wrong.

Okay. So C3 is the question about what exactly the benefits the community are of translating or transforming in relation to the cost. So I think part of its coming out of that question.

And then later on, we've got - it's the O3 or even O2, but who are the stakeholders? So who is affected and what do they want? So straight away, as soon as you start listing the stakeholders, you know, you've got different purposes. The - I think those are two of the places where that is coming from.

It may be coming from somewhere else as well, but at least those two.

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you.

So if I understand then, I guess - yes. So what we're saying is as we consider the question of when and where to make a transformation, it's important to understand the purpose of the transformation, which of course is closely related to the purpose of the registration data. Would that be fair?

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes. I think so, yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you. That helps.

Chris Dillon: Okay.

And okay, I think maybe - perhaps if we just leave that for the time being, we might come back to it later.

But anyway, certainly, I think this - you know, this is one where the next version may need to have text or - you know, I think just more time may need to be spent on this.

Moving on - oh, well. Unless - now, are there any other comments about that, or shall we move into the next one? That's what I should say.

Okay. Well, let's have a look at Number 2.

So this was a case where - this sort of thing, it's always rather difficult because you sort of think of typical cases. So you know for example, a Chinese registrant applies for a Chinese name in China, and it's all quite easy and you had to sort of follow what's going on there.

But last week, we were talking a bit about, you know, what about more difficult cases? So I think there might've been an example on the lines of a

Russian applying for a Russian domain, but from a Chinese registrar in China. That sort of a situation.

And we were wondering, well you know, what special issues could this sort of thing raise? So in Number 2, I've really referred to it as language is not typically supported, so you know sort of out of the - you know, sort of less likely ones I suppose.

And here, the suggestion is that it's really - you know, it's really a matter of the business analysis that registrars would make a decision which languages they were going to support. So, we're thinking about, you know, would a - would the particular Chinese or just a registrar want to support Russian (unintelligible)?

And the only thing that comes out of the data is that if the guidelines that we have suggested here are followed, then the Russian person would probably be inputting data in Russian (unintelligible).

Rudi, would you like to flag up something about that?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Chris. Rudi for the transcript.

Well, I'm just wondering why would a Russian registrant use a Chinese platform to register a domain name? I think that if the Russian registrant is able to understand Chinese, I'd consider that in the registration of the domain language be done in the Chinese platform in the Chinese language.

I think that there is also an issue of - related to the legal aspects. If a Chinese registrar allows registration of domain names by registrants that are not Chinese, I would consider that already in the Chinese rules would be a difficult point.

So, I'm wondering if we allow to have translation done in a country where the legislation is very strict, are we not squishing it in a position where it's too far from the reality in itself?

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that.

I think the temptation for this was to do something like say, "Okay, so what if you've got Chinese applications happening in the United States?" I mean, I suppose that case is more likely to happen than this sort of thing.

But I guess the point of this is really that - you know, we've got to find out some sort of general rules for this. So actually, we have to think of - you know, not just very typical cases, but you know are there other cases that could happen? And, try and try and work out if there are sort of general principles.

I mean, certainly I think the point you make about there may be quite a likelihood that this particular Russian would need to be dealing with a Chinese interface. And you know similarly in the American case, you might have a Chinese registrant having to deal with English. So that we don't worry about at all.

But I think in some ways by thinking of other similar cases it's - I think in some ways it's helpful in just working out what can reasonably be expected? That's really - you know, that's really what it comes to.

And so decisions - you know obviously there are legal aspects, as you say. There are also you know just business reasons, so the Chinese registrar may or may not provide a Russian interface. The US registrar may or may not provide a Chinese interface. That's really what it comes to.

And that's separate from the language of the data that's being input. So the Russian is inputting data in Russian, and the Chinese is - that person is inputting data in Chinese characters.

I'm wondering if that makes it any clearer?

Okay. Now there are a few comments going on in the chat room, so let's just spend a bit of time to have a look at those.

So we - first of all we've got Jim saying, "Language is not typically supported in a country." Don't we mean language is not typically supported by the country of the registrar?

Sorry. Yes, we do.

Yes. That's just a more accurate way of saying it.

Okay. Then again, Jim is saying, "It's really about the registrar, not the country."

Hmm. Not totally sure about that because - yes, I mean it's quite - because of the legal aspects, I could imagine situations where a registrar could even be bound by different law depending where he or she was operating. So, that means the country could be relevant.

Jim, would you like to pick that up?

Jim Galvin: Yes. So, thank you Chris. This is Jim Galvin.

Okay, then I think I'm - I really am confused. I'm not quite understanding the point here that we're capturing with Item 2.

When I was involved in this discussion last week, because this isn't quite the point that I was trying to bring up then. You know, I was simply focused on the idea that an address information - you know, that I was focused on what the language or script choice would be for the postal contact information that was going to be entered, and asking what our consideration was of that.

And so, I had - well, I had used an example of English in Japan, but that was morphed in the discussion to you know Russian in Japan, which is probably a better sort of example here - or Russian to Chinese.

See, I don't really see - because of the point that you're making here about it's really a business issue, right, I mean the registrar is going to have to make its own business decision, and the business decision will of course be weighted by whatever legal constraints are present about what they are or aren't going to support in terms of language and script, right?

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: So the real issue here is taking it a step further into accuracy and then into validation. What really matters is whether you're going to let a Russian registrant come to a Chinese registrar? And if they're going to be entering a Chinese address or the domain name that they're buying, whatever the IDN of the domain name is - the language and script of the domain name is, is that Russian going to enter that Chinese address in Russian or enter it in Chinese?

That was my question.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Right. Okay. That case is that - so if he's buying - oh, that's the point. So it's if the - so since the TLD is a Chinese TLD, it's whether he has to input in Chinese or whether Russian is fine?

Jim Galvin: Not quite. Not quite. I'm not even tying it that way.

That is a way to tie things, okay, so let me say that, but that actually is not the example that I'm getting at, okay. You're right. It could be the case that there are restrictions that given a particular language or a script of a TLD, so the TLD itself is in simplified Chinese and it wants you know all names to be in simplified Chinese, if you will...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: That's one way to look at it.

I'm focused on the fact that I'm a registrant and I have to provide contact information for myself. I'm Russian, but I happen to live in China, so I'm going to enter a Chinese address because that's my address.

I could be buying any TLD - any TLD name, whether it's a Chinese one or a Russian, or something else entirely. But again, I live in China so the question is do I enter my Chinese address in Chinese because after all I'm in China, or should I be required or optionally have the ability to enter my Chinese address in some other language or script?

Chris Dillon: So in that case, it would probably be Russian.

Yes. That's an interesting issue. I mean instinctively one really wants to answer that the data should be input in Chinese because that - you know, those data are going to (describe) that address in the best way. So the best language for a Chinese address is actually Chinese.

But in a case like this, that is - you know, that is adding quite a complication because the - you know, it may be quite unlikely that the Russian would be able to do that, so there is an issue there.

Jim Galvin: No, that's an interesting question. I actually don't think that that would be difficult for the Chinese person - for a Russian person to do that. And I base that on the following.

I agree with you first that - when you said it seems fairly obvious - intuitively obvious -- maybe that's the right way to say it -- that if it's a Chinese address, you know I should enter it in Chinese. I mean, why would I do anything else?

And in fact, if you think about it in terms of accuracy and validation, that makes the most sense.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Certainly, you could not operationally validate a Chinese address if it was entered in Russian because you could not expect the Chinese postal system to deliver that address - to deliver any postal object with that address on it.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: And then you asked, "Well, could a registrant enter a Chinese address if they're not Chinese?" I would say that they could, based on the fact that at the very least, you know, they must have some printed copy of their address somewhere and they could always copy and paste it, you know.

I mean if I'm going to live in China, then presumably I know what my Chinese address is and I must know what it is in Chinese; otherwise, I'm never going to get any mail, right?

Chris Dillon: Yes. So yes, so I think all of that works fairly happily. And you know certainly if the Russian is copying out of the kinds of database we're talking about, that would be beautifully labeled, so you know, he would - you know, he would know exactly what he was copying. So we're not worrying about some sort of crazy mistake happening. You know, because obviously when you're copying

data which you don't understand, there is always a - you know, there is always a possibility that you're copying something which actually means wrong way up, or something really crazy.

But if it's coming from a database where it's properly tagged and you know what that data - what those data are, then yes, that's - yes, that should work.

But that's - I think it's a very nice point. Thank you very much.

Let me return to the chat room at this point because I think - oh, well before we do that, Amr is just wanting to ask something. Amr, would you like to pick up something on that?

Amr Elsdar: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr.

Yes, I just wanted to ask whether folks really think this is a puzzle that is within the scope of this PDP? I agree that it could be an issue at some point.

I may not be very different than any other person in China who wants to register a domain name in another script that is non-Latin based like Cyrillic for example. As Jim said, there probably are practical ways - someone who is not a Chinese who is living in China to fill in his address. I'm guessing this person will have to do that for other purposes as well, not just for the sake of registering a domain name.

But this PDP, if I'm not mistaken, is specifically required to address translating and transliterating contact information from non-Latin based script to Latin-based script, so we're not talking about Chinese to Cyrillic, are we? And although this is something we could spend time trying to work out, I'm not sure if it's necessarily the wisest way for us to spend our time.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Perhaps we should have - perhaps we should've stayed after all with and English and Chinese example. Maybe that would've been better. But I have a - I do think that it could be adding - it could be worth adding some aspect of this to the document that - you know, I will think it through and make a decision before the next version anyway.

So one way or the other, it will turn up in Version 7.

Okay, I would like to just go back and check that we've not missed anything in the chat room. It's been rather busy.

I think it's probably just picking up very fast bits of this. And Amr wrote something about allowing flexibility for the business models of registrars to decide what language they would like to support.

Absolutely.

And then agreeing with Jim saying, "I believe it's about the registrar, not the country."

Okay.

And then another piece. "I'm guessing the registrars are well equipped to understand how to operate and maintain ability to serve their desired consumers, while maintaining contractual compliance. If they fail to meet market requirements, then that gap may be filled by other or new registrars." Yes. I mean, this is just the sort of business model thing.

Rudi is saying it's helpful anyway.

What would stop a Russian registrar from hiring or outsourcing tasks to Chinese-speakers or contactors? It's a matter of demand and supply before

registrars and registrants - it's the cost of outsourcing issue, so outsourcing work from one language to another or one country to another.

Okay. Yes, so - I mean again, yes - I mean, I guess that aspect is really very much supply and demand, as Amr is writing there.

Okay. And Rudi is then saying, "To make it a bit more complex, same case except the registrant does not live in China but in Russia." Oh, gosh. Yes. I think perhaps I'm going to invoke Amr here and say we possibly need to think more just about the sort of English and other ones, not so much between all possible languages.

I mean that also goes back to the document where there is something about the (UM) mentioning the desirability of English as being a sort of pivot language or that sort of idea.

So I think we can legitimately also hold ourselves back to English and other scripts rather than looking at all possible possibilities.

Okay. I think one general principle that comes through all of this, you know, as we were saying before, is that - you know, if you've got an address in Japan, the best language to represent that address is Japanese. That's what we're really saying.

In the case of the Japanese post office, actually they are very, very used to using English, but still you know even in that case, really, Japanese is better. You know, often - you know, if you've got a transliterated Japanese address, you know you actually can't get that into Japanese because you don't know what characters are used to write the various sounds. It's that sort of thing.

Okay. Anything else about Number 2 or shall we move down the list?

The same discussion.

Okay, Number 3 it is anyway.

Jim Galvin: Sorry...

Chris Dillon: Yes? Sorry, Jim, would you like to say something?

Jim Galvin: Yes. So I guess I'll come back to my original question that kind of started this. I guess you know perhaps it's just me, and if so we can move on for now and I'll try and catch up as we go here. But I'm not - I'm really not quite understanding the point that we're trying to make here with 2. It's - I'm sorry, but I'm not following why this is an important theme that requires attention, because it does look to me like it's just a - you know, a business issue.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

I think probably this is - this is probably just going to become a note saying - I mean, I feel something does need to be there that - because you know it is likely that those reading the document will be interested in - you know, in the support of languages. And I think we probably do need to say that fundamentally, we'll probably make those two points.

So one of them is that it is a business thing, so it's actually not something we are going to get particularly involved with beyond saying that it's a business thing.

But then make the other point that, you know, when we have this - or actually, two other points. So one is that addresses are best in the local language, and - no wait a minute.

There is another point which has now skipped my memory.

So the addresses are best in the local language.

Oh, yes. And the interface of the system as well, so that's - you know, if the decision about what interface the registrar is going to provide. Again that is - that really is up to their business model.

It's worth just mentioning these things, because otherwise, you know they're just things that are very, very likely to be questioned. So you know, if we - I think we can make things clearer by - just by settling - it's been quite - just to argue it through, I mean particularly because we were trying to argue not just English, non-Roman script, but everything.

But I feel what's come out of it is - you know, is worth putting in there, even if it is just as a note.

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you. That's helpful for now.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

I think that may - I hope I can make that clearer in Version 7.

Okay, so that means we can pop down into Number 3. And this is something I actually raised last week, but I have a feeling that because fundamentally we are not making transformation mandatory, that seems to affect how binding our recommendations about transformation are.

So you know if it had been mandatory, then we could've made binding recommendations. Because we are saying it should not be mandatory, then that seems perhaps to effect the level to which our recommendations can be binding.

I think - you know, this is something I raised last week, and it's - you know, it effects the drafting, that's really why I'm raising it. So you know when I wrote

the document, I was under the impression that even though we said it wasn't mandatory, that actually our recommendations would be quite binding.

If that isn't the case, then there may be a few other places in the document that I need to adjust to reflect that.

But I'd be obviously quite interested if somebody could help out with it.

Jim, would you like to say something?

Jim Galvin: Yes, thank you Chris. This is Jim Galvin.

This Question 3 that you have here to me - you know, I interpret this as asking about those stakeholders who optionally are deciding for themselves whether or not they're going to transform data.

But I want to distinguish that and I guess ask the question is it your intention to distinguish that from - my understanding of the question in our charter, which is you know, who should bear the burden of transformation if we decide that transformation you know should be required?

Because I would expect that if we answer that question, those recommendations would be fully binding. There'd be no question about the binding of those recommendations.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: And so I just want to make sure that you're asking - you are asking a distinct question from our charter question with the one that you have here, correct?

Chris Dillon: Yes.

I mean, I think - the reason I'm raising this - in some ways, it would be much easier if I didn't, but the reason that I'm raising it is that - I mean we are - unless there's a major - you know, and this is a fairly major change to this document. We are saying that transformation should not be mandatory.

Now obviously - and we're also saying quite overtly that we don't want to discourage stakeholders that do want to do it. So you know, there may be stakeholders who do that locally or using some other criteria. That's really up to them, and we don't want to discourage that.

Now the reason I'm holding on to this and saying you know if there's going to - if people are going to be doing transformation, then there is a benefit to doing it in the same way. At that point, you know I think - and also because we've spent a lot of time you know talking this through, then I - you know, I feel quite keen that if - you know, if we can at least encourage people to do it in the same way, that's really why I am keen not to - not just to let it drop.

That if possible, those who transform should use the same similar approach.

Jim, are you wanting to take up something in that?

Jim Galvin: Yes. I was just leaving my hand up for a follow-up, but I have to be honest, I'm now not sure what to ask.

I'm not sure I tracked fully what you said, to be honest with you. And I - yes, I guess I really didn't track what you said. So let me not hold things up at the moment. We can move on if no one else has a question, and I'll just keep that in mind.

Chris Dillon: No, I think for that - I think it might - I mean, the more I think about this, the more I think it's going to be quite difficult to have - to make our - you know, the sorts of things that are suggesting to make that in any way binding.

However, I have a desire that the work that we've put - we have all of us put into suggesting, you know, this - you know, this is what we - you know, this is - we think this is the best way of transforming. We've spent a lot of time doing that.

Now it's not going to be - you know, that transformation will not happen - it won't be mandatory for that to happen, but there will be people doing it. I mean, I'm just hoping that we can - I mean, I guess to some extent, I'm just hoping we can save the work that we've done. It is just - you know, the thought of everybody transforming in totally different ways is quite a difficult thought.

I mean it's really just trying to encourage a sort of standardization. That's really the - that's the reasoning behind it. But the more I think about this, the more I think this is going to be difficult.

Amr, would you like to take up something about that?

Amr Elsdar: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr.

My personal answer to Question 3 would be that no, we shouldn't make it mandatory. Sure, it wouldn't be a bad idea to encourage it and say this is what - this is the standard we think we should be used, and we'd encourage whatever stakeholder decides to transform contact information (in) the standard.

But I've got to think the point I made last week that if the recommendation of this PDP working group is that transformation is not mandatory, then the original contact information provided in whichever language and scripts will be the authoritative contact information that should adhere to standards and contractual compliance in general, and validation, and such.

But I'm not sure we could encourage a certain standard use for transformation if a stakeholder decides, but we - I would say that it would not necessarily be helpful that we make it mandatory for any reason.

Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you.

That's - I think that's actually very helpful. The local language is certainly authoritative and you know that should be rigorously defined. And to try and do something with transformed data is quite an uphill battle.

And yes, that is you know actually another reason for why we're not suggesting that it would be mandatory because it is just so difficult to get it standard. I mean, it is a - you know, it really is a reason against doing it all together, which you know is there in the document.

So yes, perhaps we are a little closer to answering that one, and perhaps we have to accept that all though we've spent a lot of time thinking about this, it is very, very hard, and eventually perhaps to some extent we need to let this go.

Okay, unless there's anything else about Number 3, shall we head down the list into Number 4?

Okay, and I think we might have picked this one up. So the draft was written - presuming this line (unintelligible) - oh, sorry. No. This is a different issue, and it was one that just came up slightly in what Jim was saying earlier.

So the draft was written presuming that allowing registrants optionally to transform data could be an easy way of building up transformed data into the database. However, such optional transformation raises data quality matching and versioning problems.

Of course, what comes out of this is do we want to - do we actually want actively to discourage transformation, or is that going too far?

I wonder what people think about that.

Instinctively, I think it is going to far personally, but it's quite difficult to - you know, it's actually quite difficult to argue why it is going too far. So I think possibly we need to have a few more arguments about you know whether - when a registrant fills in the contact data, whether you're having the Chinese registrant just filling it out in characters, or whether you're encouraging him to put some (unintelligible) into the database as well.

And it might almost be worth going back to last week's meeting, because Emily Taylor said some very interesting things about this last week.

So yes, I think that might be a provisional answer for Number 4. I'll look at last week's minutes, because certainly Emily was picking this up in quite an interesting way.

So I think at the moment, probably Version 7 is going to be saying something like that we - that there will be an option for putting in transformed data. That perhaps saying something that - you know in many ways, it's not very useful because there could be data - clean data problems and various other things. I feel that isn't all of what Emily was saying last week.

Jim, would you like to pick up anything there?

Jim Galvin: Yes. So - this is Jim Galvin. Thank you, Chris.

I guess I will just express my bias here on this point for the moment, you know quite directly, and then I am very interested in continue discussion to

see what other you know points of view would exist and what other people think about this.

But in general, you know, I would certainly prefer that we not allow registrants to enter two forms of data because there is this issue - I mean, I think that if we're going to go down that path, then it is important for us to speak to the issue of matching and versioning, and to have some requirements and such that go with that too.

And I am concerned that that adds additional complexities that at least for the moment it's not obvious to me what problem we would be solving by having that exist.

But I certainly do allow myself to be educated here by a continued discussion on this point.

So thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Jim. I really appreciate that. I mean, I think you're - I can really understand your logic. I feel instinctively that there is a demand out there for - you know, for data in ASCII or English, but it is really just that. And I think this is almost a challenge to the group.

In some ways, it could be quite - you know, it could be a cleaner thing. It could be easier just to say if you - you know, if you are a Chinese registrant, you put in data in Chinese, that's it. You don't need to be fiddling around with English or transliteration, or whatever it's going to be.

But I think there needs to be - you know as you were saying, I think there needs to be more debate about this. I am very sympathetic to what you're saying. It's very logical. It's very clean. But, I feel instinctively more than anything that there are probably other opinions out there. They just need to be articulated more. I think that's all it is.

Jim Galvin: Thank you.

And one additional follow-up.

I'd welcome additional discussion and debate, because I agree with
everything that you're saying. So like I said, I currently have a bias, but I do
want to hear (unintelligible).

The other thing I wanted to clarify though is - add a caveat to one additional
thing that you said was - which is if I'm you know a Chinese registrant, as a
concrete example, you know, I should be allowed to enter data you know in
Chinese, because that's what I am.

And my clarification and caveat that I want to keep putting on the table to
make sure that we don't forget it, and include this in our detailed
considerations, and I want to explicitly make a choice here as to which way
we go. And so I'll express my bias at the moment, again leaving the door
open for more discussion.

It's not that a Chinese registrant should enter their data in Chinese. I think
that the Chinese registrant should be able to use the Chinese as their primary
language of choice.

But for example, contact information in the form of the postal address, the
language for that needs to be relevant to the address that's be entered. So if
I'm Chinese and I'm living in Russia, or Russian living in China, I need to
enter that address in a language appropriate for the region where the
language exists. That's where my bias is at the moment.

So, thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, that's going back to the earlier discussion.

There is also an element here whereby you see - I think it may also be possible, and I'll change country - give me just two - maybe it makes things clear.

So for example, if we have a Japanese address, it might be - this is not a very good example, but we'll try and run with it.

There is a large road in Tokyo which is called Meiji Dori. Now I think usually it's not called Meiji Road, but let's just pretend for a moment that it is called Meiji Road. You see, whether that - if we've got a - imagine we've got an address and we've got a - you know, the address is on Meiji Dori somewhere.

Now you see, you could say that as long as we're saying Meiji Dori, whether it's written in characters or whether it's written in transliterated Japanese that is Japanese even though it's transliterated.

But if there's something major whereby you know some major element of the address has been - you would probably translate it actually, so it might be the sort of like (unintelligible) in Bangkok example, or here we've got Dori becoming Road. Then, actually at that point, it becomes English.

So I think some people may argue - you know, could even argue like that, that you know whether - in some ways, whether it's the original characters or whether it's a transliterated version? It's actually still Japanese, but it only becomes English if there is something that - which - you know, which has been translated.

Jim, would you like to pick up anything?

Jim Galvin: Yes. So to add to that, you know as a principle that I see that covers the example that you're offering there, that's why I use the phrase - that I

carefully use the phrase that the contact information should be entered in a language or script appropriate for the region in which its located.

You know, it's - you're using a very good example there. I mean, it's easy to say that we're talking about Tokyo, so it seems natural that it should be in Japanese.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: But you're right. In that particular example, there probably are locations that are commonly known in their English form, so why wouldn't that be allowed?

So the place that you get to is, okay, how do I do validation now? I think that it's validation that drives a part of what becomes valid for the region. What becomes appropriate for the region? Because as long as the address is deliverable, as long as the postal system in that region will deliver it, then however its entered is appropriate.

Of course, now you get into the second order issues of implementation, which is okay, now I'm a registrar taking this in. Well, how the heck am I supposed to know if English is okay or if it has to be Japanese, or it has to be in something else? And you know, so it gets more complicated as you dig in a bit here.

But keeping it back out at a level for this group, I think the issue is if it's supposed to be appropriate for the region, then whatever that is is fine. That might be English. It might be Japanese. It might be something else entirely. And, all of that should be okay.

Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

I'm sympathetic to that generally, but I think that possibly - it just ends up being quite complicated and - you see for example in the Japanese case, actually Japanese - the Japanese post office is very used to dealing with addresses in both characters and in English, in fact. And in other countries also.

You know, we have a situation where really there are several languages which could be used. But I think probably we're talking about exceptions here. The general rule remains that you're much safer using the local language, so if - you know, so if it's Japan, then let's use Japanese, and all the rest of them.

The - okay, there are situations where there may be alternatives, but you know for me those feel rather like exceptions. So you know, there's part of me that wants a sort of general rule saying just really generally speaking, use local data.

And, I don't know whether we need to get as far as making exceptions because the problem is that I just worry slightly that we'll end up with a list of places where the major - you know, this general rule doesn't apply, and that feels quite complicated. And there's part of me just wanting to avoid that.

So, that's why I'm not - I'm very sympathetic, but I'm not completely agreeing. That's what it comes to.

Okay, on that - unless there's anything else about Number 4, that actually brings us to the end of the sort of more major issues. And I think because we are nearly at the top of the hour, I won't start by going through the document - you know, bringing up other things - smaller things. I think it's probably just good to finish with this.

So we do have a couple of minutes before we round up, so if anybody'd like to make any comments, now is a good time; otherwise, I think - just look forward to dealing with the smaller issues next week.

And we'll do that quite slowly, because as I was saying at the beginning of the meeting, I think you know as you deal with some smaller issues, sometimes you suddenly discover that something small is actually hiding something larger. So you know, we're just prepared for that.

And also, I'd rather skip - you know, there was - you know, there is something we were talking about, legacy data last week. I think we've more or less finished it.

But anyway, do have another look at the document in the light of what we've said this week if you - and you know, we can still bring up other larger issues, but what I'm intending to do next week is to just go through issues which are not quite as big as the ones we've been discussing this week.

Okay. Well in that case, many, many thanks for another good call and we'll meet again at the same time next week. Thank you very much, and goodbye.

Man: Thank you. Goodbye.

Coordinator: Thank you. That concludes today's conference call. Thank you all for participating. You may now disconnect.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Terry.

END