Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 28 May 2015 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 28 May 2015 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-28may15-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan) – NCUC
Roger Carney – RrSG

Apologies:
Peter Dernbach – IPC
Justine Chew – Individual
Jim Galvin - RySG
Julie Hedlund - Staff

ICANN Staff
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you, (Jewell). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the deletion in transliteration PDP working group call on 28th of May, 2015.

On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Sara Bockey, Petter Rindforth, Ubolthip Sethakaset and Amr Elsadr. We have apologies from Peter Dernbach, Justine Che) and James Galvin, as well as Julie Hedlund.

From staff we have Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transmission purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, (Chris).

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. That means I think we can move into agenda point three which is the standing item on statements of interest. So if anybody has a changed statement of interest since this time last week, please mention that out.

Hearing nothing and see nothing in the chat, that means we go forward into agenda point four. Now there is a slight concern. Obviously we have three scheduled meetings before - well, three scheduled meetings, that's it.

This is like concerned that this may not be enough and so the idea would be to have a Doodle poll to set up additional meetings possibly on Tuesdays, which we could use of necessary. I wonder, Lars, which like to add anything to that?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Thank you, (Chris). I just realized I'm having trouble with the AC room so I might just walk out and come back again. I'll (stand the caller). Yes, I think it may be useful to - because I think there are three calls including this one today.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: So I'm wondering whether we should have another call scheduled for next Tuesday and then the Tuesday after, so the 2nd and the 9th respectively in addition to our regular meetings on the 4th and the 11th. I would suggest that we forsake the Doodle and interest of speed and set it at the same time, 15:00 hours. I'm sorry, it's my (unintelligible) - 13:00 UTC.

Chris Dillon: Yes, I'm just going to check what's happening. Okay, so the 2nd and the 9th, yes, certainly I - personally I have no trouble with that. (Amir) is asking in the chat room why Tuesdays?

Lars Hoffman: If I can respond to that. This is Lars. There is no reason. The reason has been that are meetings are on Thursday, so Tuesday sits nicely, and there's no preference. We can also extend next week to two hours. We can do it on Monday and - completely arbitrary.

Chris Dillon: My own personal preference is for more meetings rather than longer meetings if possible. I think one tends to get more done with more meetings rather than longer ones. But we may, you know, this may depend, to some extent on availability.

                 And (Amir) is asking every talking about additional meetings? Yes, we are. And these would be meetings that we would use if we, you know, basically we don't have enough time.

                 To some extent, it depends how today's meeting goes, for example, for next Tuesday's meeting. And (Petta) is asking about June, the 8th, rather than the 9th. And, yes, actually that looks, in my diary that is fine. That - anybody else? Lars, is that an old hand?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, I - yes, I'm actually - it's a very old hand because I don't think I'm actually in the AC room at the moment. And - but yes, I mean, if Monday is a better day, we can do not 8th and the 15th. I think - oh, sorry, the 8th and the 1st. I apologize. Can you hear me, (Chris)?

Chris Dillon: Yes, the 1st is a bit problematic for me. It would need ideally to be an hour earlier if it would be the 1st. Okay, well, let's see how much progress we can make today.

If we were to get to the end of the recommendations today that perhaps be not necessary. Would that be true? Or at least one would be one wouldn't be necessary early next week.

Okay, so what I would like to do briefly now is to have a look at - as you can see, we've got the latest version of the public comment review tool on the screen.

And I would just like to pick up a couple of things about that before we put it to bed for the last time. And now I'm wondering if I've got - I don't know whether it will move. I don't know whether you're seeing in moving.

If you are, I'm going to Page 4 anyway. And so the two things I would like to pick up here are really that I unified the comments so there were all sorts of things out of scope. And instead of having those comments, basically the meeting was, you know, this is out of scope, we've now unified that.

And the comments are all saying, this is recommended for consideration by another PDP. So a question - is everybody happy with that as a general wording? All right, just watching.

I know that (Justine) is all right with it. Anybody else - okay, so that was one thing. And then the other - oh, now we've got a technical problem here I think. We need really to go to Page 6 but it seems to have frozen.

Oh, no, it's moving. Okay, Page 6, now as I was saying - okay, and we've (de-synched) it now. As I was saying, so basically the whole thing - you know, the wording we're using is recommended for consideration by another PDP.

Now practically speaking, to be honest with you, it's strained the grammar of the document a bit so you end up with these rather strange (clauses), is that the Whois replacement system would allow for the easy addition of (field) means an additional languages is recommended for consideration by another PDP, which is a very strange, you know, very strange way of speaking.

I mean, on the other hand, it does keep the - it keeps the form of wording and although the grammar is unusual, actually, I think it is clear what it saying. So we seem to have got a poll question on the screen.

So I think basically what we're asking - and I'm both of these counts, is whether we are happy to use fundamentally and all of these cases -- and there are many of them in the document -- is recommended for consideration by the PDP. Oh, (Amir), would you like to pick up something on this front?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, (Chris). (Amir). I think that is fine to use as long as we're actually recommending in the final report that these issues be picked up by another PDP. But I'm - to be honest, I'm not sure in the event that something is determined out of scope, but that this PDP working group not recommending that another PDP pick it up.

Then obviously this phrase can be used in that context. So I'm - just a heads up to - just want to make sure that we pay attention to that. We shouldn't put this response in the public, review tool unless we're actually making this recommendation in the final report. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: All right. Yes, so that - so basically and all of these cases we need to double check that the things have been picked up in the final (report). That's really the action coming out of that. I think that's fair enough.

All right, now I'll just double check that there's nothing else in the report. I don't think there is but let's just be totally (sure). Okay, as far as I know, that is it with regard to that, so now...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: I think we might have a technical problem. (Petta), we can't hear you or we could a moment ago. No, I think that is a technical problem. (Amir), would you like to pick up something?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks, (Chris). This is (Amir), so I guess until (Petta) manages to get back on the audio. I was just wondering about Row 24 of the public comment review tool, one of the comments that the business constituency submitted, at least Page - yes, on Page 4 of the document.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Oh, yes, just a minute - the BC support, a recommendation provided the transformation (to ask) is mandatory, we suggest the language of the registrar's term of service be used to determine the appropriate language. Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, I had submitted my own input on this comment a few weeks ago I think. And at the time I don't recall the working group response being what it is now. Now it says this is recommended for consideration by another PDP.

When this issue strikes me to be central to the scope of this one, so I'm just curious why the working group response is what it is now and sort of referring - punting this question to another PDP when basically the business constituency is saying that it recommends that all - recommends that the transformation (ask) is mandatory.

I recognize this is in response to the recommendation about the language that the registrar operates in and I pretty much - business constituency

response in context with this recommendation, I would say that this is within the scope of this PDP and we should respond to this differently. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes, so I think this comment has caused some a lot of confusion because it starts, you know, with this provision. And this it is that provision clauses in there, he gets very confusing because it really ties everything down into the very hypothetical situations.

And so it saying that the language of the registrar's term of service be used to determine the appropriate language. Well, oh, yes, okay, that is actually a fair point because it actually - yes, so really shouldn't be saying it is this.

And so perhaps we could replace it by saying that, you know, at this point will be addressed by the recommendation in a report. I mean, obviously that doesn't carry - it doesn't really cover this hypothetical situation in the beginning but, yes, I mean, certainly this group will make recommendations in this area. So, yes, I take your point. It shouldn't be that (answer). So...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, (Chris). This is (Amir) again. Perhaps we could - yes, perhaps we could, as you suggest, say that this issue will be addressed in the recommendations of the final report. We should probably also at that we note the business constituency's input on this just to make it clear that we did look at it and we know it.

Chris Dillon: Yes, okay. That's fine. Now I think we can come - I think (Petta) has typed his piece in the chatroom so (unintelligible) that. Just so that I understand you correctly, we will, at the end of our recommendation, list topics that we see do not fit into our working group and recommend, with no further comment that these are dealt with by another working group.

If so, okay. Now, that's not a - I think we don't have a neat list of those things at the moment. It would certainly seem to be one way of proceeding, so personally I have no objection to that.

And (Amir) is (also) typing something on that one. Perhaps we should wait a moment to see what that is. But, yes, it would seem to make sense to list - you know, to list them in there somewhere.

Right. Anything else on the review tool? Ah, now, just a moment. (Amir) is saying to (Petta), I would support that if there are a number of those issues identified. I would add a unique recommendation to each one of them as opposed to a single list.

Oh, now, I don't really understand what the difference is there because they aren't - those things are - you know, they aren't really - in my book, they are actually not recommendations. These are actually things saying these are things which are not in scope.

And so they - it's sort of a suggestion that another PDP might want to pick them up. Or I'm not particularly sure what the best way of dealing with this is but there's a slight difference in the sort of category of statement there, I think.

And (Petta) is coming back and thing that's what I had in mind. As you say, in case we will end up with a list of such topics. Okay, which is basically agreeing with that. (Amir), which like to add something to that?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks, (Chris). This is (Amir). Yes, if this working group determines that there are issues that we do not want to recommend ourselves - I'm just using this one as an example, not that I'm substantively arguing for or against it.

But, for example, if this working group decides that it will not give a recommendation on taking the different fields in (Askey) or provi- or recommending that the translation of the field names be done in as many

languages as possible but wishes to - which is that another PD- would like another PDP to pick this up for one reason or another, it really depends on how strong the working group feels about that.

I mean, if the working group really does feel that this is something that could be useful and - but feels that it happens, for example, explored the issue thoroughly enough and would like another PDP to pick it up, then a clear and determinative sort of recommendation saying that this PDP working group recommends that another PDP pick this up, if this recommendation is approved by the GNSO counsel, then the GNSO counsel can add this in the issue scoping phase of another PDP.

Or perhaps require - or ask policy staff to draft and issues report on it. And that would be something - but that would be a step that this PDP working group would take to make sure that this issue is addressed in a further policy discussion.

But if this working group doesn't make a recommendation very clearly then he could sort of be lost and then would be fairly unclear on whether this working group is actually asking for further steps be taken or just saying that would be nice.

So I'm just saying it's something - is a post saying this would be a good thing rather than saying that we're actually recommending this happen, so please do it. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. I actually think that we need to - more time to consider that there really are two possible ways to go around realizing - Lars has his hand up. Lars, would you like to add something on that?

Lars Hoffman: It's Lars. Thank you, (Chris). And, yes, (unintelligible) point. I'm sorry if I'm (unintelligible). Just one quick issue on the BC comments on the (process on) Page 6, I can really agree with what (Amir) said in terms of an (ultimate

strategy) and other PDP (punt) and in fact, I agree that we should put in this (unintelligible) report that we obviously noted.

And, in fact, it refers to a believe its (record) 22 because I think the wording we agreed on is (record) 22. I'm just going to (think of it) for second. It's the key systems comment that they would like to have supported by - and I think it's the same wording we would use, you know, in the context where the BC (called us out) for as many languages as possible.

So I think we, in fact, addressed the issue by using a more refined term that wasn't supported by the registrars. In another point for the list, future PDPs, I would - because we obviously had a discussion about the scope of this PDP.

And I'm wondering whether it might be possibly - there's always - we can obviously do the list (if there's an issue with that) and I just wanted to point another option which is we have (the ability to provide) for flexibility for future policy developments.

We - I think we should (consider) something that if there's policy issues that arise through the implementation from a recommendations, then that should lead to, you know, new PDP in these issues could include - and then we have a list and to leave some scope for the implementation team to be able to do this because some of them are very technical.

And before you jump in, also the expert working group on internationalize registration data, which is working in conjunction with our (effort) for basically the team that deals with many of the technical issues and creating the new Whois system, as it were, you know, the registration data access protocol, RDAP, which will come to (force) really soon.

And so the implementation around that would obviously also imply certain technical requirements. And I'm just a little bit (unintelligible) included definite

list that may impede the implementation of these technical issues that are developed and implemented by community experts.

So I'm wondering whether we can add the wording, maybe give it a little bit more of (invitation) and say we are aware of the expert working group working on the RDAP in implementing this.

We're aware that our team, our working group members of this working group would be part of an implementation review team for our recommendations.

And if is need for further policies with regard to implementation, we - you know, we thoroughly encourage the GNSO counsel to, you know, request and issues report, specifically the issues that might be a focus of that.

I'm just a little bit hesitant if we go straightforward and say that should have an (issue) report, there might be then a (unintelligible) overlap and - with the technical community. It's a shame that (Jim) isn't on the call but it's just a word of caution. Thank you. Sorry for rambling.

Chris Dillon: No, not at all. I think that articulated the situation very well. And I think it's fairly close to what I feel, that - I mean, actually I think I'm actually in the middle here so I don't think these things have the status of recommendations.

I - on the one hand, the difference between these and the other ones, because we haven't spent the amount of time necessary to from them up, and we haven't got it now, on the other hand I think it would be handy to have a list of them.

I think without a list, they just get completely lost. So my instinct is to have a list so that they wouldn't have the status of recommendations. (Amir), would you like to pick up something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is (Amir) again. Yes, I would say that in principle I agree with everything Lars has just said. It is important to take into account the work of the implementation teams.

And by that, I mean, staff teams, and then any role, if there is - if there actually is an implementation review team which is community members working with staff to sort of make sure that the implementation of a certain policy is done in accordance with the intention that the policy was created in.

But I'm a bit just - I'm a little unsure, and maybe Lars can help me understand this - of why we would actually require an implementation at this point right now of the recommendations this working group is going to get in, as they are right now.

It seems to me that we're - there are six effective recommendations. One thing that transformation is not mandatory, and then a series of other recommendations that may require some technical implementation but my understanding is that this is all going to be done once there is a new registration directory service, the future sort of version of the Whois and that implementation of these recommendations would somehow happen then.

Did I misunderstand this are the recommendations that we are providing now isn't the intent to have those recommendations implement immediately? Or is this something that might happen in the future? And noting that we do we for the future, it might actually take quite a few years before implementation - anyone gets around to implement in them? Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, (Amir). Now my understanding has been that they are not for immediate implementation. I noticed Lars has his hand up. Would you like to add something?

Lars Hoffman: Yes, going up - Lars for the record. Thank you, (Chris). Thank you, (Amir). And yes, I hope I can shine a little late on this murky maze of Whois efforts. Let's call it that.

So principle to our recommendations, we have - so I think part of what we recommend is that we don't want - we don't require (mandatory) transformation. However, registrants should be allowed to submit the data in non-(Askey) form whatever technically possible, as (unintelligible) at the moment that's not possible.

And now the expert working group on internationalized registration data, which is different from the expert working group they came up with a new model of Whois, so these are technical experts led by, you know, Steve Shank from staff and Jim Galvin has been part of that effort, too.

And they have been working based on a new protocol that's coming into practice regardless of what we do here and that we'll be able to receive and display computer readable non-(Askey) scripts for registration data.

So our recommendation would be that registrants should be able to submit the data in the language that their registrars support. And I suspect for that, they will need to be some (change) in policy that flows from our recommendations.

And there will tentative requirements and some implementation requirements as to how this is done for example in terms of verification, because the registrars still have to verify that the data is correct. You know, if they accept the script, they support the script, they need to be able to verify this the same way if it was in English ASCII.

And so there are issues that are related to that. The expert working group that came up with the Whois system (unintelligible) several presumably rather large PDPs in the next month and will probably run for a few years will then

be based on what we decided. So they will not change the technical protocol that comes into the RDAS that comes into force, neither they will deal with the issue that we've been dealing with, whether or not the data should be translated or not. I think they are mainly content with access and data protection.

I'm simplifying this hugely, but I hope I made the difference that there's a technical aspect to the Whois that is independent from the expert working group on the new Whois system as such. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Okay. I would like to pick up -- thank you for that -- I'd like to pick up a few things which are going on in the chat room at the moment. So Amr is pointing out that IRTs aren't actually standard. Roger Carney is asking, Lars, you're speaking of (unintelligible) work, and Amr is saying, "Yes I understand all this. My question is are our recommendations meant to be implemented immediately or as part of the implementation of the broader Whois reforms?"

Lars Hoffman: If I can just add to that. Lars again for the record. Amr, I'm - it is with a pinch of salt. My understanding is that our recommendation if they are implementable at the moment and if the RDAP, the registration data access protocol, is in place I think our recommendations will be implemented regardless of the other efforts. That is my understanding, though that might not be how it will it play out in the end and I would have to verify that. But that's what I've been operated - I've been operating on. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: And Amr is then coming back and saying, "Okay that would actually be pretty fine by me." Okay. I have to admit that my own understand - I'm actually struggling with this because I thought that nothing was going to happen until the new system and so yes at some point I'd be grateful for a bit of a briefing about what the exceptions to that are. I'm not quite understanding this.

Okay. Amr was under the same impression. Okay yes. So, Lars, sorry I've really not got it. Could you actually explain that again because I was really

thinking that nothing would happen until the reforms and I'm just wondering what those - what can happen before them.

Lars Hoffman: Sure. So I will get back to the group later today or tomorrow to verify this but my understanding has been that the expert working group on international rights and registration data, nothing to do with the new Whois system, and we, our group, work in conjunction to allow for non-ASCII submission of registrant data and to be able to question whether that data should or should not be translated or transliterated. And the work of this is divided between the two, because part of that essentially and it's a technical issue of how this actually can be done.

And so our - so this is the technical, you know, it's a technical issue with policy overlap. We are dealing with the policy overlap. So this will be dealt with. The current Whois system will remain the protocol, the underlying protocol will be changed, become more efficient, but I believe the completely new system with different access, different protection mechanisms, that is a whole different policy process that was kicked up by the board under a different heading.

So the new Whois system will not look at what we are doing. That will not be part of their scope. And so what we're doing can be implemented as soon as the new protocol, the RDAP, is in place. And then the EWG follow up PDP from the GNSO will look at the issues that have been brought forward by the EWG that to my knowledge does not overlap with what we're doing here.

Chris Dillon: All right. So the key thing here is actually RDAP, it's not the new Whois system. That's the misunderstanding, isn't it?

Lars Hoffman: Could you just repeat that, Chris? For the Whois system?

Chris Dillon: So the key - so what we're waiting for is the implementation of the RDAP system. So it's not the implementation of the new Whois system.

Lars Hoffman: That is correct.

Chris Dillon: Yes okay. Right. Okay that is an interesting distinction. Right. Okay I'm just double checking that - yes okay. So Amr is then saying, "What Lars is saying actually makes a lot of sense. If our recommendations are now technically feasible then there's no reason why implementation should be delayed." Yes well that's - that is the case. So yes, all right.

I wonder is there anything else we would like to pick up in the document or whether we can start having a look at the final report. Amr, would you like to pick up something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. I just took a quick look at the - at this working group's charter, because I had recalled there being something about when the policy should sort of come into effect in the charter. And looking at it, under the bullets of what this PDP working group should consider there is this. It says, "When should any new policy relating to transformation and transliteration of contact information comes into effect?"

Now it seems that we may not be actually be making a recommendation on mandatory transformation but we are making a few other recommendations. So in - to be consistent with sort of what this PDP's being asked to do, maybe it would be worthwhile to add the - a section just to making clear that any recommendations this PDP working group is making should be done as soon - implementation should commence as soon as it is technically feasible. So just to address it.

But to be honest, I hadn't really considered it much before. For some reason I was under the impression that this was all going to happen at a much later date. But I'm happy to learn otherwise. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Yes well I think we're both in the same boat on that. You know, I thought these things would not be possible before the new system as well. But yes, I mean, you know, certainly if they are then, you know, I think it would be an advantage to saying, you know, implementation should occur as soon as technically possible, yes. Just a way of making more progress. In this sense its good news that it may be possible to make progress without the whole new system.

Okay any last thoughts on this document? Well in that case if we could display version three of the draft final report that would be good, and we can actually start looking actually mostly about - mostly at recommendations but there are one or two small things which also need picking up just for completion.

Lars Hoffman: Chris, this is Lars. You can see me in the Adobe room but I'm actually (unintelligible). I do apologize and I will upload it. I have to log out and log back in.

Chris Dillon: Ah yes. Okay.

Lars Hoffman: And it's preloaded so it should be clean.

Chris Dillon: In that case I shall - now let's see I think I can find a link for people so we can at least fire up the document individually. I'm just going to paste that in the chat room. That should work but I shall leave - just leave you to do that for a moment and take a look.

The idea is to go to the - Page 12 of this and there are actually a couple of things there. So first of all I want to point out that I have sent an e-mail to the IPC to try and clarify the penultimate bullet point on this page but I haven't heard a response. So I'm aware that this requires attention. So this is the thing about reverse query, so we're waiting for a response there. It's still on my list, but we know that is incomplete.

And in fact above that also on Page 12 there is another point I would like to pick up. And so basically there is a bullet point which I might as well just read out. And this says, "The main burden, financial or otherwise, to provide data in ASCII should lie on" and it makes various suggestions now. That's actually outside our charter.

So what we have a charter to do is to decide who should be deciding, but we should not be deciding who that is. Now unfortunately this bullet point makes the decision which is outside our charter. So my suggestion to you is that we delete the bullet point because we've strayed outside what we should be doing.

Now okay we've now got it in the chat room, and let us just go down as far as Page 12. I've gone too far. Okay. So we've dealt with the second yellow area. We're waiting for the response on that, but I'm now dealing with this previous one, which is also yellow, and I recommend we're outside our remit there. Amr, would you like to pick it up?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. I certainly agree that this sort of addresses something that is not exactly what this PDP was chartered, not the question this PDP was chartered to answer. However, having this within - I mean having this bullet point here in this part of the report, which is the part that summarizes the arguments in favor of mandatory transformation, I would look at this bullet point not necessarily as language for a recommendation but sort of just a rationale for why some believe that mandatory transformation should take place.

So I'm not sure it's necessarily helpful to remove it. Although this PDP can't make a recommendation exactly the same as what this bullet suggests but just placing the rationale on why we - why someone may believe that mandatory transformation is desirable is - I think is fine as having it as part of

the final report, especially as this view has been expressed both by working group members and by others in the public comment period. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Amr. Yes okay. I guess effectively we really have to imagine that it's got inverted commas around it. Yes. Okay let's give it the benefit of the doubt, and I can see in the chat room that (Petter) is agreeing with that.

All right. Well we get to a go a little bit further. Right. And again...

Amr Elsadr: I'm sorry, Chris, this is Amr again. May I follow up on that very quickly?

Chris Dillon: By all means, yes.

Amr Elsadr: Perhaps instead of - because the way I see this bullet is sort of copy and pasted as is from the public comment review tool, maybe as part of the final report we can it could be edited to sort of serve the purpose of addressing this as a rationale but not making it so clear that this should be a recommendation of the working group.

So maybe the language can be edited to suggest that, you know, those who believe that mandatory transformation should be recommended believe that and then what the rest of it says, that the burden - the main burden of financial (unintelligible) ASCII should like and then so and so forth instead of just having sort of like a flat statement that does say the main burden should, et cetera. Does that make sense at all?

Chris Dillon: Yes. No, it made total sense. Yes that gets around the problem because, you know, certainly one does rather trip over it at the moment, and yes I think that would fix it. So I'm happy with that. (Petter), would you like to raise something?

(Petter): Yes (Petter) here. Can you hear me now?

Chris Dillon: Oh yes, yes we can.

(Petter):   Yes good. Just note that when we make this point for or against mandatory, I presume that initially we collect arguments and if we are going to rephrase it as suggested, as Amr suggested, I suppose that we will rephrase it when it comes to non-mandatory. And then the working group can make a conclusion so that - I mean we don't list these topics and say well some had added this, we have to refer to it, but it's of non-importance. And just so that we note our comments in a similar way.

Chris Dillon: Yes thank you for that. Yes I think we certainly need, you know, a consistent approach on both sides. Amr, would you like to pick up something there?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr again. Yes, (Petter), I take your point and I assure you it was not my intent at all to belittle the value of the comment or the commenter. My only intention was sort of just to eliminate the - any possible confusion someone reading the final report that may think that this PDP working group is actually supposed to decide who bears the burden as opposed to the actual charter question of this PDP deciding who should decide should bear the burden.

                   So yes it wasn't the intention why I'm recommending that we perhaps alter the language of this specific bullet point and not any of the others is just to make that issue sort of clear within the context of what this PDP is actually being asked to address. I hope that helps. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: In fact I believe that on Page 13 we actually have a case where we have an argument on the other side which actually has the same problem. So, you know, we've got -- or a similar problem -- so we've got this argument mandatory transformation would require validation of both the original and transformed contact information. Well, you know, I've picked this up because I actually I don't think that is true.

So effectively what this is a sort of quote, so it almost a sort of a balance to the other one. So yes it's difficult to know if one is unwilling to leave things in there which are misleading, so perhaps these things do need some amount of attention.

All right. And Amr is saying, "Agreed. This is not accurate and shouldn't be in the report." Yes I tend to agree. I think that - yes I think that the Page 13 one, you know, just deleting and transform - wait a moment - both the original - would require validation of both the original and transformed. Hmm. Yes I think actually we're in trouble here because we agreed at an earlier stage that we weren't going to remove argument and now we have the sort of nightmare where we've got this argument which is actually wrong and - hmm. Yes, we've got also got a commitment not to remove arguments.

So again I think we have to imagine that it's got inverted commas. What we can do is correct it in the arguments on the other side. Amr, would you like to pick up something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I will note that I was opposed to the commitment that you just referred to of not removing all the arguments. I was not very much in favor of adding the language provided during public comment verbatim into the body of the final report. I thought that's why - I mean I thought adding the public comment review tool as an annex to the final report serves that purpose nicely.

If you and others find it agreeable, I would say that we should take all of this out of the final report and maybe sort of draft our own interpretation of what these arguments are presenting and then maybe more concisely place them in the section. If someone wants to actually read these word for word they could do that in the public comment review tool where they will all be available and listed and part of the final report.

But as you may know, when we add this here in the body of the report, then this is basically - this will be interpreted as what the working group is presenting, not what the community has presented in public comments. But the working group is supposed to review the public comments, take the comments into consideration and come up with its own determination. It isn't supposed to reflect the public comments directly into the body of the final reports. So, yes I would be in favor of actually taking all of this out and reworking this section. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Actually I think there may be a solution here because the commitment that was given was that we wouldn't lose the argument, you know, we would remove the arguments. However, there isn't a commitment to keep the exact same wording. So I think we can redraft wording because, you know, that doesn't mean we're removing comments. I think there's a certain amount of freedom with that.

And the other technique we might want to use is footnotes, you know, then you can say well this is what they said and we need to keep it because we gave the commitment to keep arguments. But in fact there is some sort of issue.

All right. So I think now we're quite near the end of the call and what has become clear is that we are going to do well to run meetings and so we need to go - to run extra meetings, because we were hoping we might get to the end of the recommendations, but we've not made as good progress as hoped. So that means that we need to make a decision about next week, and so we have - oh yes okay.

I think we have the option of either an hour earlier on Monday the 1st or at the same time on Tuesday the 2nd, so perhaps the quickest way is just to have - is just to show agreement in the chat room. So I'll say - so yes. So if we go for Monday the 1st an hour earlier than now, so that's going to be, what, 12:00 UTC, who can make that? Lars can make it. Oh sorry I need to

do something. Obviously I can make it. Okay that is not brilliant because we're not core. So obviously I can advertise it on the list.

The other possibility is the same time...

Lars Hoffman: Chris, can I just interfere? Sometimes people have trouble with the ticks. I'm just wondering whether those who can't do it can actually put a disagree up so we know they're actually (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Ah yes. Okay that makes sense. And for people using the system, it's this raised hand icon at the top of the screen and there's a dropdown box and you get various issues like raise hand but also other things. Agree is one of them. So yes let us do that. So anyway, let's run that again. So we'll say 12:00 UTC on Monday the 1st, and please indicate yes or no in the system.

Okay. So that is altogether five people can do that and okay. Then if we then go for the same time as normal but on Tuesday the 2nd, if we do any better with that. That's one, two, three, four, five. So we're up at the same. Okay.

Amr Elsadr: I'm sorry. Chris, are we talking about Tuesday at 12:00 UTC?

Chris Dillon: No we're talking about Tuesday at 13:00 UTC, same time as normal.

Amr Elsadr: Oh okay. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: One, two, three, four, five. Well that's actually - one, two, three, four, five, six. That's slightly better. So let us schedule the meeting then. That's Tuesday, and I will put something on the list because it may well be that people who are unable to make our Thursday meetings are able to come to a Tuesday meeting. So I will do that in the hope that we may get some people that we don't normally get as well.

All right. And yes, and Amr is saying yes we should share it on the list. Yes absolutely we should. Okay. So that means that we've got two meetings next week, one on Tuesday and one on Thursday and they're both at 13 o'clock UTC. And obviously the hope is that we might get to the end of the recommendations on Tuesday.

Well in that case thank you for a good meeting. It was a good discussion, one or two slightly unexpected things but good to have them now rather than at a later stage. So thank you very much for today and see you at the same time on Tuesday. Goodbye then.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. Goodbye.

END