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

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 12 March 2015 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-12mar15-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Jim Galvin - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Justine Chew – Individual
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Peter Green – NCUC
Wen Zhai - RySG
Roger Carney – RrSG
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC

Apologies:
Emily Taylor – RrSG
Peter Dernbach- IPC

ICANN staff:
Howard Li
Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This afternoon's conference call is now being recorded.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you so much, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the Translation and Transliteration Contact Information PDP, and we are on the 12th of March.

And on the call we have Jennifer Chung, Jim Galvin, Justine Chew, Peter Green, Petter Rindforth, Sara Bockey and Wen Zhai and Chris Dillon, the co-chair.

For staff we have Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund, Howard Li, and myself, Glen DeSaintgery.

May I remind you all please to state your name before speaking for the transcription. And thank you very much, Chris it is over to you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. And let us move into point three on the agenda and just get that out of the way. So I need to ask you officially whether there have been any changes in statement of interest since we last met. Hearing nothing and seeing nothing, I think that means that we can safely proceed into agenda item number four.

And no great surprise here. So last week we got around about number 70 in the spreadsheet and I'm just intending to continue from that point on. But before I do, we have now in the chat room - or sorry, in Adobe Connect, we have Version 6 of the review tool.

Now there were some relatively small amendments suggested by Petter I think. Lars, are those amendments included in this version?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, Chris. Could you repeat the question? I didn't quite hear.

Chris Dillon: Yes so okay, so this is Version 6, but I think Petter sent some edits by e-mail and I'm just wondering whether the edits are in this version, whether you...

Lars Hoffman: No I don't believe they are.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Well the main thing is just thing is just that we know they're not in there. But it is up to date apart from those.

Lars Hoffman: Can I just quickly ask because I can't see it in my inbox? Petter, did you send this to the list?

Petter Rindforth: Petter here. Yes I did. I sent them...

Lars Hoffman: Oh here they are.

Petter Rindforth: ...some time back, so. I can't actually read it here. It was more of a clarification correction.

Lars Hoffman: I've got it now, Petter. On point 68, is that what you're - that's the comment you made?

Petter Rindforth: Yes I think so.

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: Yes okay.

Lars Hoffman: I will upload the amendment in just one minute. If you want to want to proceed, Chris, and I'll upload the new document and it will be there.

Chris Dillon: Well, I mean it's a small amendment. I was just making, you know, I was just making sure that that amendment didn't get lost. I think it's probably okay just

to put in Version 7, which will come out after this call. I was just making sure...

Lars Hoffman: Okay no problem.

Chris Dillon: ...we knew whether it was there or whether it wasn't. My goodness linguists get very bogged out in the detailed things. Okay.

Anyway, so this document is very nearly completely up to date. And I'm intending basically to start at around about number 70, but just I'd like to ask whether anybody wanted to pick up anything from what we've already done before I do that.

All right. In fact I have noticed that quite a few of the things we'll be talking about today have already come up. So, you know, to some extent we will be referring back anyway. I also should say I apologize to the people who are having technical problems. It sounds as if Adobe Connect is not behaving very well today, but let's just hope it settles down a bit.

Now last week as we were saying, we got around to about number 70, and number 70 is very long and quite complicated. And so I said let's start with it rather than struggle through it at the end of the meeting. And in fact it's not quite as complex a comment as it first looks.

So there are really themes that come through these so, you know, really what the IPC is saying are, you know, that - so basically internationally readable Whois would benefit the following purposes. And then you've got a whole list of purposes, and it is a long list. But the interesting thing is, you know, there really are common things here.

A lot of these purposes could be addressed as long as the data were machine readable. So it's not the case that the only way of addressing these concerns is to transform the data, many of them would be addressed if the

data were machine readable. And I think we have fairly general agreement that, you know, we really do not want data in picture form or, you know, other non-machine readable formats.

And of course as soon as you're in a situation where you can highlight data, you can use it to search and for various other functions. So that actually addresses quite a few of these points but not - perhaps not all them. So I will just double check that that is the case more slowly. But I think that may save us a little bit of time.

Petter, would you like to ask a question about this?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here. No just to clarify, what we wanted to show was a number of situations where it was important to get a quick and easy way to search for the contact information without having the need to go to any local attorneys or local transcripts to get that. So it's more of a number of examples on that.

And of course I mean if you can find - we'll be glad if we can find any possible way to do that, but we want to show the need for an easier way to do it and also point out from different kinds of Internet users. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Indeed. Thank you very much for that clarification. I'll just whip through the list and just double check that what we've just been saying covers all of these different points.

So enable due diligences searches. Yes, I think so. Enable one to determine all domain names registered by a specific entity. Yes. Domain names registered to recently merged company or an internal search. Yes, I think so. Enable brand owners to contact registrant. Yes, I think so.

Infringement, oh yes okay, it's about infringement. Facilitate identification of and then respond to fraudulent use of legitimate data by reverse query. Hmm,

I think so. Yes, I think that's all right. Enable IP owners to conduct historical research. Again I'm fairly sure that's all right.

Now the one which doesn't quite fall under this - oh, sorry Amr, we're at number 70. Now the one that perhaps doesn't fall under what we've been saying is the last one. So I'll just perhaps read that more slowly. Enable individual Internet users, including consumers, to confirm that any given website connected to a specific domain name is held by a real company and not a fictitious one that masks its identity by using a unique script or language.

Okay, so I think that is sort of a slight issue. It is something we have already spoken about. And, you know, certainly the comments I've already made when this issue has come up before is that at the moment, you know, this doesn't really - I think this isn't really an issue. It hasn't really happened, but, you know, certainly conceivably it could happen.

So, you know, I don't know what the likelihood of this happening is but perhaps we need to flag it up in the comment as a logical possibility. But I am fairly sure that we have already dealt with this. But just in case we haven't, that would be the line that we would want to take.

All right, Amr, would you to pick up anything?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I had a question about that last bullet, and I'd appreciate your help on it. I'm not sure I see how transformation or actually the Whois in general, I'm not sure it enables an individual Internet user from confirming the authenticity of a website's owner or who is behind it.

If someone who is misrepresenting himself, herself or an organization is misrepresenting itself in the Whois, how could an individual identify this? An individual would probably come up against a name and contact information of

Whois which may be - which correspond to the contact information available on the website itself.

So I'm just a little unclear on how transformation of this data would help with the Internet user's confidence in the authenticity of the data or the representation of the owner of the website. So if Petter could help me out with this, I'd appreciate it. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Yes I think that's a - I think that's certainly a very good question. Perhaps if, Petter, would you like to address that?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here. I'll just give you a quick practical example that we got questions from (unintelligible). Often you're sitting there in your office during summertime where everybody is away and you're dealing in a company that say a restaurant company and you got an e-mail connected to your website stating that oh you need to do this and this, otherwise you will not have any possibility to use your bank account or your trademark is going to fail and you need to pay this and that.

And there's a link to a website, and it looks very significant and real. But you can also if you do a quick search and see if this seems to be the real holder of the real legal website communicator, and then you can see that easily that the domain name is obviously registered by someone that you can identify has nothing to do with that company.

So that's just one very common example when let's say a normal customer needs to have the possibility to identify the holder in the easy way without having to - well I have nothing against getting legal work from that, but I mean it happens often, so. Also the normal customer needs to have an easier way to identify. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Yes I think effectively what this is saying is the sort of at the moment the language which is most likely to be sort of (unintelligible) is

English, so of, you know, I guess it more likely at present that English would be useful in that case. I mean increasingly as the Internet expands, that may become less so. But yes, thank you. I think that certainly adds some elements to that.

Now there are things going on in the chat room. Oh, yes. Okay so I'll pick those up and then I can see Amr's got his hand up. So how would the user be able to determine that the register's name holder has anything to do with the company? Yes, okay that's actually the point that Petter was just raising, and (Justine). It concerns that it's an issue, it's a question of how the registrar handles registration application process. Yes.

Amr, would you like to develop that?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks, Chris. In response to Petter, I do appreciate that these sorts of problems are fairly common in cyberspace and the issue of fraudulent representation of the companies or services as well. It's certainly significant. I'm not debating that at all.

I'm just wondering how someone who is trying to answer this question, some who - for example, someone who gets an e-mail like the one Petter just described and there's a lookup in the Whois to find out who the domain name holder of this - of any of the domain name user was directed to, and the person finds a name and an address, contact numbers and so forth, how would the user actually determine whether this domain name holder is associated with the company or the service or not?

And I guess that would also apply to whether transforming the data would be helpful or not, as well. I'm just trying to figure it out and I'm not seeing it. So any help would be appreciated. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you very much. I think Jim is typing something into the chat room which may be relevant. And in the coming new TLDs it might also depend on

the requirements of the registry registration policies. And actually that is a slightly separate issue.

Okay. So I mean the way I read it, the way I understood that was that just if the data were in a language - I mean it's not so much in English, it's more if the data are in a language that one understands, one can often see who, you know, what's going on, whether there's likely to be a connection. If the data are impenetrable, if they're in a language we do not understand, then we really have no way of knowing what's going on.

You know, that's why I was saying what I was just a moment ago. All right. Now in the chat room there are other things going on. So we've got (Justine) saying, "What about privacy services by registrars? Sometimes Whois won't even tell you who owns a domain."

Ah, yes. And there do seem to be - it does seem to be stipulations that would indicate that if anything that may be more of an issue going into the future, if I understood that correctly.

Okay and then Amr is picking up the point, "Aren't we discussing identity validation which is actually not done in the current Whois set up?" Yes, I mean I think that's a fair criticism. We are wandering off into that area, but it does, you know, it does affect us to some extent because, you know, we are dealing whether transformation should happen or not. So it's really why we're considering it.

And then Jim is saying, "Even if Whois won't tell you precisely who owns it, it should in principle give you a point of contact." Okay.

Now before going on into more of the - or perhaps I'll do the comments and I'll (unintelligible). That's probably the best approach. You know your pure bank ID and if you see that the domain name is registered by a physical

person in another country, you can avoid problems by the identification. Yes that's an interesting example.

And (Justine) is then saying, "Correct. So if the registration data are invalid then how does transformation correct that?" Yes, I mean the data, you know, if the data are false, they're false. It may just be more obvious that they're false if they're in a language that you understand.

Amr, would you like to add to this?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks, Chris. This is Amr again. And I just did want to point out that identity validation is not the current practice in terms of where registration and domain names. And if you look at the findings of the privacy and proxy abuse study that was done last year, there was also - part of the study also did involve looking at people who registered domain names who don't use privacy proxy services and just to check see how whether or not the domain name holder is actually who he, she or it says they are.

But I think the study did show that are a number of people registered in the Whois who aren't actually who they say they are. So we have a lot of bad actors who do use privacy and proxy services to mask their identities, but you also have a large number of bad actors who don't use - but just misrepresent who they are in the Whois.

And this may support Petter's argument here, because then you would say well if they're misrepresenting who they are in the Whois then you could discover this by looking it up. But my question really is how would you make that determination?

When you do a Whois lookup and you find some random person's name being listed as the domain name holder and random contact information, if this is indeed a bad actor pretending to be let's say for example the technical contact for HSBC in the Whois database, then how would you be able to

determine if you call this person or e-mail this person the person would simply respond saying, "Yes I am with HSBC" even though he or she isn't.

So that's really what I'm trying to wrap my head around. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you. Yes I guess when I was speaking earlier I was presuming that, you know, if you're, you know, if you're looking for somebody in HSBC, on is presuming that there'll be an address or something that will link it, but I guess there probably are situations where, you know, where is there no sort of clue like that. So hmm, that puts us in a bit of a tight corner.

There are a few things going on in the chat room so I'm just going to pick those up. Okay. (Rudy)'s had horrible difficulty dialing in. Petter is saying, "Correct. As a customer you only use the safe and correct information."

And Jim is saying or replying to (Justine), "Precisely. Transformation should be about display, nothing more, nothing less. That's what makes dealing with some of the issues put forth by IPC and others difficult to address in this working group." Okay thank you.

And (Justine) is agreeing with Jim, as is Amr.

All right. I think we are about to be able to go a bit further down the spreadsheet but before we do, I'll just check Amr's comments. "Apologies for moving us into this direction. Probably unnecessary for the purpose of this PDP. It's associated with the IPC comment."

Yes that's true, and as I was saying earlier, you know, I think there are quite a few things that we have to be aware of on the edges of what we're doing. Because as I was saying last week, there is a concern that we could recommend impossible solutions, which would be a seriously bad thing to do.

All right. Let us move to number 72. Now yes where to begin with this. So IPC appreciates that concerns about mandatory transformation are related to costs. Well no they really aren't, because it's not just the costs. You know, there is this whole feasibility, the fact that we don't have standards, that it's very important to do it accurately. That could be very - well okay sorry, that is cost.

But it is sort of - it is the whole sort of feasibility, you know, the lack of standards, so. And I really would stress, it isn't just cost. You know, there is a link because generally if you try and do something really hard or impossible even, then, you know, the prices due to tend rise. So it's not that prices aren't relevant but there are other, you know, there are other serious concerns there. But they believe that there are ways to provide solutions without increasing of registrants and/or end users.

Okay these ideas are that -- now let me think -- either it's done automatically, at which point then, you know, it may end up for some languages being transliteration but, you know, there are situations where that doesn't work very well. Or it's done by volunteers and we know that if this kind of work is done by volunteers, the quality is going to drop hugely.

So I find this comment quite exasperating, to tell the truth. Would anybody else like to pick this up?

Okay, right. So oh yes, Amr in the chat room is also mentioning the fact that burden isn't just cost, it's liability. So I was talking about feasibility, but liability is also a crucial part of this matrix. So yes that is a good addition to be made there.

But what I am very keen to do is to dispel the idea that there are free tools and that we get a quality or there would be a quality product if volunteers in all sorts of different places did it, so the automatic tools don't work and if you

do it by volunteers, your quality will be so poor that it may not be useful for anything very much. That's really the summary of my rant.

Okay, and I'm not aware - and then Amr is saying, "I'm not aware of any solutions that exist." Well to be fair to them, I think they may be referring to the (unintelligible) solutions I just mentioned. So this is the automatic solutions, which, you know, the feasibility study said more or less what I just said to you. And, you know, this idea that somehow we can get volunteers doing it all over the place and somehow keep them consistent, I think it's just - it's real nonstarter.

Before going to Jim I'll just finish because the chat room's quite busy. Amr is saying, "I'm not saying that they aren't out there. Yes there are some, okay, but recent studies indicate what Chris is saying that the solutions there in the market that meets the accuracy transformation - that meet the accuracy and transformation." I think there's something -yes. I mean the other thing is...

Amr Elsadr: Chris, this is Amr. Yes I meant to state don't meet the needs of.

Chris Dillon: Oh don't. Yes, yes. I thought there was a -- thank you very much, Amr -- I thought there was a missing negative. Yes that brings it together.

I mean very long term. Conceivably, you know, this could change but no time soon. I think that would be the best way I could articulate that.

Jim, would you like to come in on something?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Excuse me. Jim Galvin. Just to comment directly on item 73 here about the gaps coordinating standardized conversions. I don't recall that we've talked a great deal about this, so it might actually be something that's a little bit out of scope for us.

But as - it would be interesting and I'm wondering if it's, you know, really within scope for us to suggest something like this for future work, but long term, you know, there are really significant benefits to having standardized translation mechanisms to and from a language which is something that, you know, GAC representatives could coordinate for their respective countries and such.

And I'm wondering if that would be something that we could mention as future work or something to, you know, keep aware of for the future. I'll defer to our chairs as to whether or not - I mean how far we would go down such a path in suggesting such things. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Jim. Yes that is, you know, as with everything in this PDP nothing is black or white. And that is a very, very solid suggestion.

So really, you know, as I was saying before the key thing here is that that transformation is of high quality. One way of doing that is to get it done by as few actors as possible.

So if the GAC were able to coordinate that and they were to say in the case of Thailand then transformation should be transliteration and it should be done along these lines that sort of approach would work.

Now it may be expensive but that is in the realms of possibility whereas, you know, the woollier suggestions that have been around earlier are really quite frightening.

So yes I mean actually I, you know, if actors were to want to transform then that sort of approach would be most likely to produce the sort of quality product.

So yes, I think that's effectively that's the other side of it. So if it were to happen what would be the best approach? And it would be pretty close to that.

And then, you know, straightaway out of this way, we, you know, we come are we transforming all of the data or are we just doing it ad hoc? I mean obviously if we just - if we do it ad hoc that gets easier.

Now before going to Amr I'll just pick up a few things which (Petania) is saying in the chat room. And she's saying that I can't quite agree with this approach.

Yes I think that was a very good paper which brought up things like this some time ago. So tie address system transforming meaning mix of transliteration and translation.

So yes, so I mean in some ways it's easier to specify a pure system. You know, you used to say it's basically transliteration and perhaps you might have a few exceptions.

Okay I'm dealing with a small (thing) but, sorry I'm just having slight technical problems.

Okay so back to (Petania)'s thing. The - so yes, okay. It's easier if you have a pure system so, you know, basically you're transliterating. You could have a few exceptions.

Now one thing that's interesting because obviously the Expert Working Group on internationalized registration data have just published their draft final report.

And one of the things in there that you might find interesting is that on Pages 11 and 43 they have examples where they've actually used a sort of a mixed

model of transformation. And it's neither transliteration or transformation. And they haven't really explained that.

So when we come in the near future to look at that document then, you know, this is something that we will need to spend longer thinking about.

Coming back to the chat room just before we go to Amr, Petter is saying hopefully we'll get we will, there will be a way to get official national accepted translations.

And I think that's more just it go - I think it may more be transliteration and may also cut the cost or for the users yes.

That point was made in the Thai paper as well that if it's done centrally it will for, you know, if that, - you know, if the costs are actually all brought together which of course if they're scattered they may not be. You know, they may just be lost effectively.

So, you know, you could get a system which is apparently cheap but actually far more expensive just because people are not declaring costs.

Okay and then we're back in the chat room. (Justine) saying mandatory but encouraged through changes in policy and processes and policies.

Well yes. I mean this is leading us onto other things, bigger things really about whether the whole thing should be mandatory or non-mandatory.

I think in some ways the arguments, I think it's true to say the arguments I'm talking about now really occur in the case of transformation whether it's mandatory or not.

You know, even if you think that it really shouldn't be mandatory you still have to be able to say well okay if it were necessary what, you know, what would you do? So that's the way I am thinking of these arguments.

Amr sorry for keeping you waiting.

Amr Elsadr: No not at all Chris. Thanks. This is Amr. Yes I just wanted to go back to what Jim was saying and what you said Chris and (Justine) also mention this in the chat I see.

I certainly have no objection to having standardized translation mechanisms. I'm sure this would be helpful but it's not necessarily helpful to address this with the GAC in mind when trying to answer this - the questions for this PDP.

If like (Justine) says yes I think it would be helpful but I don't think it should be a reason why we would say that it is desirable that this policy be mandatory.

If a GAC member wishes to assist in developing linguistic standards for translation and transliteration, that would be great.

And maybe Whois look up users could use those or could be directed to them somehow when attempting to transform contact information.

But I still don't see that as grounds for mandatory transformation in any way. And I certainly don't think that we should suggest that this policy be mandatory and just sort of drop the burden on the GAC's shoulders and say okay every one of you GAC members is now required to somehow do this.

And I don't think we actually have - I don't think the GNSO or ICANN has this authority at all. ICANN has the authority to enforce or compliance standards in its practical agreements with the contracted parties to registries and registrars but certainly not the GAC. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Yes, I don't think we'd be very popular if we were to suggest such a thing. However, you know, generally speaking, you know, the idea, you know, if it were to be mandatory the idea that, you know, the sort of centrally coordinated approach whoever those people are would be more likely to be cheaper and, you know, to produce a higher quality product. I think that is true.

Okay, and Amr is saying popular. Probably not but we can't do that way even if we wanted to. Okay.

Then Lars is saying the working group could recommend that the GAC look into this and suggest the Whois would benefit from GAC action but the working group GNSO would certainly not compel the GAC.

Yes. I think my impression is that they might - the GAC might get a bit of a surprise if we were to suggest it. But probably need to ask some more advice before launching that one. Jim would you like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you, Jim Galvin. We probably don't want to spend too much more time on this. But I wanted to just kind of reshape the comment that I was making before and build a little bit here.

I think we're all generally in agreement. And I guess if we're going to add some words in a final report about this we'll spend a little bit of time wordsmithing this a bit so that we are certain we're all in agreement.

I think that it would be fair to observe that mandatory translation, you know, would benefit from standardized translation and transliteration mechanisms.

Separate from that, you know, we could also observe that if there were standardized translation and/or transliteration mechanisms then automatic mechanisms for translation and transliteration would have higher probability of success and quality and in fact would probably, you know, move this

requirement for translation and transliteration occurring in real-time. It could be something that could happen later.

I think it's useful to make those observations and to point out that appropriate authorities, perhaps governments are the most likely place because I do agree that, you know, maybe we don't want to identify who would do this or who wouldn't.

So maybe we simply suggest it's something for the ICANN community to consider and look at and look around.

But it is a worthwhile long term strategy especially in response to the study that's been done about translation and transliteration tools, you know, to further corroborate their advice and recognize in the context of what we're doing that yes, you know, there's some value here.

It would help to mitigate many of the concerns that we have that are causing us to have to answer the questions we're answering in this working group.

So I was a little bit long-winded I'm sorry. But I am thinking that we're generally in agreement. Let's see if we can find a way to say something about this in our final report just to sort of put this in context and put out there this suggestion that this might be a considered work item of the community at large perhaps. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Indeed yes, that sounds like a good way to go.

I'm aware that I am possibly more skeptical about the tools than a lot of people. But, you know, it is really just based on the experience I have - I have had of looking at various tools for various languages.

All right quite a lot going on in the chat room. And okay so (Justine) was saying not mandatory but encouraged.

I'm almost more wanting to say that I'm talking about transformation and the policy thing is really something else.

You know, what I'm looking at is how would you get transformation to work well as well as possible at a low price?

Okay and then Amr is saying to Lars we could recommend this but I would urge the recommendation that that would be irresponsible.

We haven't looked into the GAC's ability to do this accurately. A dedicated PDP charter to look into this with the GAC may be needed to make that recommendation way beyond the scope of this PDP anyway.

Yes so one is aware that there is a link between where we are and what the GAC could possibly do. And then Amr says I do not encourage this being included. Okay.

Jim would you like to add something to this? I think your...

Jim Galvin: I just typed in the chat room. Sorry.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Oh you have indeed. Yes sorry.

I'm not hot for this but on the other hand I believe there is value in group technology in the work of others and the value it might have had for them. This is important for raising awareness and priorities indeed yes.

And (Petania) comes in. Sorry the mic isn't working well today so okay yes.

And Amr's, another piece about the GAC versus mandatory, agree with Jim saying that it's not the ground to make it mandatory. I think these are two

separate things. The standardization would be a benefit yes, but that's not the reason for making it mandatory.

Yes that's exactly how I see it. Thank you very much.

And then she comes in again with I just want to be clear about the standardization at least from Thai drafts we can't make the standardization for translational standardization for transliteration but we need the standardization of transformation which is mapping, directly mapping.

Yes. I mean to be fair to the examples given on Page 11 and 43 of the draft report they are pretty nice. They're nice transformations. But really the amount of work necessary to create them is quite large. You know, they certainly do map to each other.

You know, there are then issues about, you know, whether you could get from one to the other and back again and not do anything else by accident so all of those issues are very interesting. I thoroughly recommend that report by the way. You will find it interesting.

Amr would you like to pick up something at this point?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks Chris. Just to clarify my objection to all of this.

I think that well GAC representation is very limited in terms of what an entire government actually does in any given country.

GAC representatives are normally limited to specific branches within the executive branches of their governments with very limited scope.

For example there are several GAC representatives who are from the telecom regulators of their given countries.

And if you ask them for expert insight on issues for example like healthcare or agriculture they wouldn't necessarily be very helpful in those - in answering those questions.

I'd say it's - it would be the same for linguistics. So my objection to this is that before a recommendation like this is made I think a great deal of coordination and dialogue need to take place between the GNSO and the GAC before we even touch upon this.

I mean if - I mean a recommendation like this could be done after extensive dialogue takes place. And that would only help determine what the scope of a policy process may be in the future.

But to recommend this now having done no work in this area at all I think would be extremely irresponsible and possibly lead us into a direction we have not - I mean where we would have no idea where we're actually going. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Thank you Amr. I think, you know, I think it's too early to recommend it as a course. It's an interesting idea but yes I mean I think you're right. I think it's way too early.

You know, the interesting side of it is that for example if a recommendation were - sorry if, you know, if the recommendation would be that mandatory transformation happened then we would, you know, very very soon it would be necessary to look at ways whereby that could happen. And at that point it would then kick off all of that. But yes, I mean it does feel like a huge amount of work.

All right and Petter is saying, you know, can we at least agree that it would be interesting to hear the GAC's view?

Yes I mean, I think we'd have to be quite careful, you know, basically because of the sorts of things Amr was just saying. But we, you know, at this stage it probably best done informally I think.

All right we've spent rather a long time on that. And I would - I think we should move a bit further down. We are very close to the end now.

Now one last comment though Petter the GAC view on any topic the GAC's views are always welcome. My objection is in phrasing this. Yes, yes okay.

Amr, all right so Number 74, I actually reckon we've dealt with this before because it's Whois information to be in the language of the registrar. We've really spoken about this possibly supported by the registrar.

Mandatory transformation if it is not in Latin characters or one of the six UN languages. And we've, you know, we have already spoken about this.

So I would like to suggest that we go on to Number 75 but there's, a little bit of stuff happening in the chat right now so pick another first (unintelligible).

So Amr is saying discussions should be taking place elsewhere, not here. Yes and Petter is saying maybe there is a group within the GAC that can give us informal comments. That would be really interesting and that could be some interesting work to do in Buenos Aires perhaps.

And Amr is reminding us that we should stick to desirability rather than these more peripheral things. And (Petania) is offering to coordinate which I'm sure will be gratefully received.

Okay wanting to make as much progress as we can, so another - so going into 75 oh, I keep forgetting to scroll which is very bad, just a moment.

Going into 75 other options based on the Expert Working Group is to require the script used for and registration data to be either that of the TLD or else US ASCII.

This approach would reduce and not eliminate the need for translation or transformation which is again I would like to say that we've dealt with very similar items to this. I think this is not very new.

Okay and then into number 76 the...

Jim Galvin: (Unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: IPC - sorry I'm - oh yes Jim would you like to add something about one of those points?

Jim Galvin: Yes sorry, Jim Galvin. So Item 75. I do want to point out that the IRD, Internationalized Registration Data initial draft of its final report does speak to this issue and would encourage us to take a look there.

And, you know, just to the argument that we made there I mean we actually don't recommend these particular choices.

And there's some discussion and argument about the choice that we do make which is that the registrant, you know, should use whatever it is that they are most skilled at. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Oh yes. Thank you.

Yes. There are various principles in that report. And this - and one of the principles back (unintelligible) and I can't even remember which one it is. But as we read the report that will be very obvious.

Okay and (Peter Green) it is applauding (Petania)'s suggestion. And Amr is saying that the PDP can's even recommend who performs the transformation.

Yes it is - it's a long way from our essential work and actual solutions is a step further. Okay another huge discussion we haven't had.

All right so coming back to Number 76 so the IPC points out that the - this is very similar to 77.

IPC points out that the initial report makes no reference to the fact that current ICANN stance that registries and registrars encouraged to use any US ASCII encoding character repertoire for Whois 43.

And also ICANN issued an advisory stating that Whois must be an ASCII in 2014. We are aware of these things.

Again we are talking more about, you know, the system to come than what exists at the moment.

So, you know, we are very aware of this but our discussions are really about the replacement system. And I think that that is something that we've already that I feel it's come up before but just in case it hasn't.

And coming back to the chat room yes (Peter) is saying he partially agrees with Amr. And Amr then came back and said yes needed as a case of effort and discussion. The decision shouldn't be based on us indeed. Yes okay.

Then on to Number 77, ICANN has issued an advisory statement Whois must be an SO - sorry, we've already done that.

And in fact we get down to a very long way this time because the next one we need to pick up his Number 83.

And this is .sharebacker saying aims to bring to end - oh yes they aim to bring an end to end Arabic experienced to the domain name space. Thus it would be very disappointing if Whois remains the only component of the domain name registration process that continues to requiring a knowledge of English.

I wrote one letter in response to that. I wrote why, yes.

All right now I realize that we are very, very near the end of today's meeting but there are just a couple of things I would like to mention. And that is that we will definitely finish this document. It's taken a lot longer than I expected it would. But we'll definitely finish next week.

And then we will move into having a look at the draft final report from the Expert Working Group on Internationalized Registration Data.

Now as regards to meetings we have a scheduled meeting next week. I have no trouble with that but unfortunately the following which is the 26th I am traveling. So we'll need to think about whether or how we, you know, whether we can run that meeting.

Now just I can see (Rudi) is typing in the chat room so just wait a moment. And (Rudi) is saying that he's available. So it sounds as though we may be able to - yes okay.

Well it would be very good if that were possible because, you know, as I mentioned earlier it has taken us longer to address these comments than I thought it would so, you know, it would be very good if that were possible.

It's also conceivable that I may - I might be able to attend the meeting but I think it's very unlikely I'd be able to give it.

Now I am and the other thing here is Amr have you something you'd like to bring up?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thanks Chris. This is Amr. On regarding Number 83 are we discussing this now or next meeting?

Chris Dillon: No. Sorry, yes I brought it up. So, yes if you'd like to bring up something about that let us do that. That sounds really good.

Amr Elsadr: Yes I just wanted to say that I certainly sympathize with .shutter because on the point here I think - I don't think that this is something that is unique to that registry per se.

I recall just a few days ago at the Middle East GNSO Forum the chief administrator of the Kuwaiti ccTLD mentioned that they got - they received several requests to that effect from their local registrants.

And this is concerning a country code top-level domain, not a generic top level domain. But on I can certainly see how would also apply for internationalized domain names that are of a generic sort, not country code sort.

However having said that having an end-to-end service in a local language script may not necessarily conflict with a policy recommendation of mandatory transformation because then this burden could be shifted from a technical or linguistic perspective to the registrar or registry.

But cost implications will certainly affect the registrants. And I don't think that is necessarily fair to that to those registrants.

So I just want to say that I do sympathize with (Jenaca)'s statement here and also support an end-to-end solution for any provider in any script or language they choose to provide. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed for that Amr. That's a really nice place to, you know, to end in a sense because, you know to, we -you know, it's very, very good to be aware of opinions like that that are likely to be existing and not just in - not just there but in many places.

All right well in that case I would like to thank you all for another very good meeting. Let us as I said earlier let us get to the end of this at last next week and move into draft final report so very much looking forward to that. And as I say thank you again. Goodbye then.

END