Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 30 October 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 30 October 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-20141030-en.mp3

Attendees:
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana-GAC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Jim Galvin - RySG
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Jennifer Chung – RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC

Apologies:
Emily Taylor – RrSG
Chris Dillon – NCSG

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recordings have been started. Please go ahead, thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group call on Thursday the 30 of October, 2014.

On the call today we have Petter Rindforth, Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Amr Elsadr, Rudi Vansnick, Jennifer Chung and Jim Galvin. I have an apology from Emily Taylor. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state their name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Rudi. And, Rudi, this is Terri. I see your mic is now muted. We are unable to hear you at this time.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, sorry. Thanks, Terri, for the roll call. And welcome to everybody. Chris could not make it today so I'm relaying and taking over the chair of today's call.

Initially there was supplement that Chris was - has been working on and, as said earlier, Terri - sorry Julie and Lars would have had a look into it. I've looked into the document and there is a lot of modifications and adaptions done.

But as Julie said also I think that one of the critical items we have to go through is the work plan. We know that we will not be able to stick to the timeline that we initially planned which was foreseen for having the final report end of this year in December.

And I don't know, Julie, if you can put up the - or Lars, the initial work plan. Yes, Lars, you have the floor.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Rudi. Yes, I just pulled up the work plan and released as well so everybody should be able to go through it but I'm going to just sync it. One moment to scroll down. So this is where we are right now.

So the idea was - I spoke with Chris - we had a little corridor chat on the last day in Los Angeles and was a little bit worried that, you know, we had to get done and needed - asked for an extension because we said additionally, you know, we'd be done by the end of the year.

And obviously there is no set timeline for us; this is - the work plan reflects what the group aspired to be doing but if discussions take longer and issues come up then obviously we can just go on for as long as we need to.

And so what I've done is - I am going up here a little bit. If you look today at today's meeting, 30 of October, the work plan then end of next week when Chris is back we can discuss the documents that will have all the changes in from Los Angeles and take it from there.

And then submit maybe the initial report for public comment at the end of November which then would tie in with the public comment reply period which is traditionally three weeks each, 21 days each, with the holiday period when probably the group won't be meeting as much anyway.

I've extended on this work plan the reply period by a week to take into consideration that it is the holiday period and so the community has enough time to respond.

And this would roughly then give us a submission of the final report at the end of March - the middle of March, I'm sorry. And also I'd like just to remind anybody that there is no need to submit a report during an ICANN meeting so we submit the report to the GNSO Council at any time.

Obviously during the ICANN 52, which is not here in the report, in the work plan, I'm sorry, we can again present to the Council as well as to the broader community our work (unintelligible) with the final report that is good but it by no means necessary.

So this is roughly where we stand. And I think the key would really be to have this open to public comment before the holiday period to have our initial report ready by then. And then based on how many comments we receive and how diverse they are that would also then determine the time afterwards. I think that's all clarification. I don't know if Julie has anything to add or anybody else. Otherwise back to you Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Lars, for the remarks and information on the work plan. Looking to the work plan I think it's acceptable that we would be able to produce the initial report at the end of November. That leaves us for four weeks in between.

And based on what I have seen in the document today I see a lot of good stuff in it. With regard the ICANN 52 as we note there is the question mark about the meeting going yes or no. I would presume that eventually we don't, you know, (tells) on the delivery of the final report during the ICANN 52 meeting but maybe if possible a week or two up front so that we have the possibility to have the face to face discussion on that one during the physical meeting.

I don't know if that's a good plan or somebody has any remarks to that view please let me know. I see an agreement from Petter. So knowing that ICANN 52 would normally be early February, it's the 5th of February - no, it's the 12th of February that's normally the date of the - the week that the ICANN 52 would take place. So it leaves us enough time I think to get the - starting the public comment period in total.

That would allow us to have the final one published for the week before or even two weeks before the physical ICANN meeting. I don't know if there were any comments or remarks after our meeting in LA that people want to bring up so that eventually we can give that to Chris in order to enable him to finalize the document he was working on. Are there any points that you want to add to the discussion?

I see people typing in the chat. Yes about the ICANN 52 meeting. I think that we will know this week where we are with the ICANN 52 meeting, at least for that recently.

Yes, Petter, you have the floor.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Petter Rindforth here. You may have seen but not read it yet, I've sent out just a couple minutes before this meeting some of the further inputs and questions I've collected when I turned around our working issue around basically IPC members but also other IP attorneys.

And although this may not be the time to discuss everything but if you saw there was some - a first question that I would like to see if I can maybe reply on and that's the advisory from last month from ICANN on the (Ray)'s agreement regarding uniform requirements for how to present (unintelligible) data namely to registries and registrars are encouraged to only use US ASCII encoding and character.

If I can have just a quick comment or information back if this is something that we should take in consideration before we send out our initial draft. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Petter. Yes, maybe Julie or Lars, do you have any input on this one?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I'm a little confused. Petter, did you send an email to the list or is this something that you would like us to - the staff to look into?

Petter Rindforth: Petter again. I made it - as I had shorter time so I just cc'd the email from - with your - when you point out that there was a meeting today. So it's for to Terri but cc our working group.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, I think that's...

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: I send out my local time...

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Petter Rindforth: ...it was like 8 minutes before the meeting.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, it's maybe either in queue or...

Petter Rindforth: Yes, maybe.

Julie Hedlund: I think that's actually a different list that Terri uses, it's this Notify list.

Petter Rindforth: Oh okay.

Julie Hedlund: And I'm not sure that you have permission to send to it. So you would need to send to the regular list.

Petter Rindforth: I'll do, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Petter Rindforth: But yes - I can resend it but you got my - you understood my question there?

Rudi Vansnick: I see Lars his hand up, maybe he has an answer to that question. Yes, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Rudi. I was actually just offline so I don't think I've heard the question but if you can repeat it but can I just say something just beforehand? It might be useful - the version that Julie just pulled up in the beginning was obviously a revised version that will we send out (unintelligible) correctly either on Friday or on Monday.

And so I was just wondering whether, A, you could repeat your question so I can hopefully answer it; and, B, you can hold back with the comments until the new version is out because otherwise we might be going back and forth between old things that might or might not be already be addressed.

Rudi Vansnick: Petter, are you going to state your question again for Lars?

Petter Rindforth: Hi, I can read the question and I'll try to resend it as well. But the full note that I got from the members is that note that ICANN issued an advisory last month clarifying technical aspects of provisions of the 2013 RAA and new gTLD Registry Agreements regarding uniform requirements for presenting Whois data.

Significantly it states that registries and registrars are encouraged to only use US ASCII encoding and character repertoire for Whois for the three outputs. And the question is is this is - this something that we should or have or must take into consideration before we put out our final report.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay thank you, Petter. I don't know, Lars, if you want to comment now but as you said I think it's good that we rather take in consideration the revised document that we have been working on in order to avoid having revise of triple times the discussions on the same issue.

I see also Amr's hand up. Amr, you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. Actually if I could have a couple of minutes I'll get back to you with my comment. Thanks. I'm only asking for a few minutes because I want to look something up before answering - giving a response to what Petter just asked. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes perfect, no problem. During the LA meeting I have also a quite long discussion with - chat with Chris on the next steps on how to try to get into a full consensus concept for our initial report.

And that's one of the reasons of the revised version where there is a block mentioning and supporting mandatory transformation and another one opposing mandatory transformation.

And I think that there are a few items that once we are going in one or the other direction that we need to have strong arguments if we go in - let's say direction mandatory that we have a strong definition also of why we did collect the mandatory transformation proposal and why the non-mandatory would not be acceptable and vice versa.

I think it's good to have enough arguments to avoid that during the debates. We will be unable to tackle them based on the fact that we have a period of almost 21 days that we can come back on comments and on visions we have. And just wondering if we have already today a vision on what kind of direction we want to go.

I know we are not that many on the call today but it's to have the temperature of the room to know if it's rather not mandatory or mandatory. We probably maybe just ask to flag with the agree button if you think it's going in the direction of non-mandatory. If you're for the non-mandatory please flag the agree so that I have an idea of what direction you think it would go.

I see Amr's going for the non-mandatory and others not. Others don't have the Adobe Connect on. I don't know, Amr, if you have - so meanwhile to think about your comment, maybe we can listen to your comments now?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. Well I had actually raised my hand initially just to - I'd raised my hand when we were still talking about the work plan. And I was going to recommend that since we still don't have a clear view on - or idea on when and where ICANN 52 will take place we should just continue with our work and with the schedule that we set irrespective of the next ICANN public meeting.

But to be honest, I also didn't really get the question Petter was asking. But the reason I asked for - to wait was just because I wanted to wait until his email came through that way I could read it. And oh I just see I just got it right now so if I could ask to defer again for just a minute. Thanks. Just until I read the email.

Rudi Vansnick: No problem, Amr. Yes, well regard the work plan I think that anyway I would not really use the ICANN 52 meeting as a specific milestone. It will happen during the work we have to accomplish and if we can agree that the 12th of March would be the date we are going to submit the final report to the GNSO Council in order to get it discussed and voted if possible maybe that - the deadline we have to try to fix now in order to inform the GNSO Council also about - of our plan.

So can we agree that the 12th of March would be our deadline for the submission of the final report? Okay I see many agreements. Yes, Lars, you have the floor.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, just to clarify just to say, I mean, let's not call it a deadline just say, you know, the aspired date that we're aiming at. That's all I'm saying. You know, if we can do it earlier that would be great too, there's nothing from stopping us.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Lars. Yes, there is - we could use this work plan as our work plan
                    for the next call and if eventually we see we cannot reach the goal of having
                    our initial report submitted end of November then we have probably to
                    reschedule anyway. But it okay that we stick with this one.

                    I don't know if, Amr, you have some comments on the mail from Petter or an
                    answer to the comments of Petter?

Amr Elsadr: Hi, this is Amr. Yes, on the Port 43 output and what is required for that, I think
                    uniformity of Whois output is of course desirable. And I think that includes
                    other aspects not just the language and characters. And his email points out
                    that they encourage the use of US ASCII for that purpose. And to my
                    knowledge that is the only form of Whois output is currently being used.

                    And is - so there is no other language or character set that is used for that
                    purpose to date. But if I'm not mistaken what we're discussing here is what
                    we would like to see in terms of when internationalized domain name
                    registration data is an option for registrants to use what - that's the context
                    we're discussing this PDP in.

                    And that doesn't - I don't feel that really applies to what is being suggested in
                    that email. And so I really don't know what to make of it at this point. I think
                    we need to look beyond that and we need to look at - and we need to make
                    suggestions based on a - sort of the next generation of gTLD registration
                    services which will be discussed following the - during the expert working
                    group PDP.

                    So I wouldn't want to be bogged down too much in uniformity of language
                    and script of Whois output at this point because of that recommendation. And
                    as they say they're encouraged to do so, registrars and registries are
                    encouraged to do so but it's not actually a requirement.

And, well, if we're going - so but we will be hopefully be allowing registrants who don't use US ASCII in their native language the opportunity to register domain names and put in the contact information with different languages and scripts. So thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr. Well indeed I think it's not part of our big discussion in the sense of what is mentioned in the existing documents and agreements will most probably change once we have done our work and if we are recommending to have a mandatory transformation. That would anyway have an impact on a lot of documents and agreements that exist today.

So it's good we keep it in mind that it is mentioned and that in the context of our report it's most probably good to address the fact that some of the agreements or documents should be modified depending on the decision we take.

I think we cannot work around it. It's really a question of - and as we know that there is also the - this working group that has been working on and - a eventual other data model for the next version of Whois. I think that a lot could change in between the period of now and the moment we have our final report being accepted.

I don't know if there are - yes, Amr, you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks. This is Amr again. I just wanted to remind folks that the reason this PDP exists is because the IRD working group had recommended that the option for registration data in multiple languages and scripts be done. And that's why this PDP is - that's why this PDP has been called for, it's why it exists.

So, yes, so I don't really see those two as conflicting in any way. I mean, there's an encouragement to use US ASCII now I guess. But we're looking

beyond this model and we're discussing this PDP issue and the binary question that we have so far based on that.

But I would - I think it would be a good idea to move forward because I think we're really just bogged down in this question of yes, mandatory, or, no, not mandatory and I think we need to settle this issue as quickly as possible. And obviously there are folks who favor one set of recommendations over the other and we need to resolve this soon. So I'm wondering are we going to get into that today on this call or not? Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr, for these additional comments and remarks. Well as we said earlier, Chris has been working on this modified version of the document. And he is still willing to go into some modifications and add comments and remarks that we will bring up. So he proposed that we would discuss the document when he is back on the call next week. And so that he will be able to catch our comments and our remarks in a way that the is also able to discuss it.

I think that - I would like to respect that request from Chris in order to avoid that we have to re-discuss it next week. The initial goal was to have this work plan revised. And the reason why we have this call today is because we didn't have the call last week and, yes, unfortunately Chris could not make it so he requested to have the discussion on the document when he is available to have account of the discussion rather than listening into the recordings of this call.

I don't know if there are other items we need to talk about now as the document itself is not on the table for discussion. Don't see any questions, remarks. So I think we - so I don't know, Julie, did you send the document on the list already?

Julie Hedlund: No, I didn't. This is Julie Hedlund. I didn't because I frankly misunderstood and when I first suggested sending it it - I had thought that it was something we were discussing today.

But given that it is still in draft form and Chris was anticipating have staff and also himself, you know, having some time to look through it again before next week's meeting I now gather that he meant for it to be undergo yet another revision before it's released to the list and discussed at next week's meeting. So after consulting with Lars I gathered that it would be premature to release it at this point.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Thank you, Julie. So then I would say that we have done what we could do today on this call and we will have the final version probably sent out and should be sent out before the next call so that Chris still has the time to go through it and produce the revised version and publish it on the list.

If we don't have any other points to discuss and I would thank you all for being at this call and look forward for our next call next week. Thank you all.

Terri Agnew: Once again, that does adjourn today's meeting. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. (Ana), if you can please stop the recordings. Have a great rest of your day.

((Crosstalk))

END