

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP)  
Work Team (WT)  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 25 March 2010 at 14:30 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT) meeting on Thursday 25 March 2010 at 14:30 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-ppsc-20100325.mp3>

On page:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb>  
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

Jeff Neuman - Registry Stakeholder Group - Work Team Chair  
James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Paul Diaz - Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Avri Doria - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group  
Alex Gakuru - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group  
Wolf Knoblen – ISCP  
David Maher – Registry Stakeholder Group  
Alan Greenberg - ALAC

**ICANN Staff:**

Gisella Gruber-White  
Marika Konings

**Absent apologies:**

Tatiana Khramtsova – Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Gabriel Pineiro - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group

Coordinator: The call is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Gisella, do you want to take the roll?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's PPSC PDP call on Thursday the 25th of March. We have Jeff Neuman, James Bladel, Paul Diaz, David Maher, Wolf-Ulrich-Knoblen. From staff we have

Marika Konings and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Alex Gakuru will be joining us in about 15 minutes and we have apologies from Tatiana Khramtsova.

If I could also please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you Gisella. Welcome to the March 25th meeting of the PDP Work Team. Well it seems like from the roll call we have good attendance from the contracted parties and we have Wolf from the non-contracted parties. Thank you Wolf for making it.

So we really are kind of short on people. What I'll do is we were planning kind of a shorter meeting anyway is we'll try to walk through some of, you know, where we are, get caught back up. And then, I think a lot of this is going to probably have to be restated in an email to the list just because of the attendance.

Alan has just joined Adobe. Alan are you on the call yet? Alan and Avri. So let me actually give a couple seconds for them to join.

Gisella Gruber-White: Avri's on the call - commute.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Hi Avri. So where we are right now after the Nairobi meeting, or actually where we were before the Nairobi meeting, is right now we have draft reports for each of the five stages up on SharePoint now. And Marika has sent the link around on those draft reports.

It is crucial that everyone read those. I know it sounds kind of like a broken record, but now we're getting to a point where we're getting close to actually coming up with some sort of reports that's pretty cohesive and has, you know, from beginning to end.

So really please read those. We have, you know, James thank you for all the comments you submitted on drafts one through three. I believe those are in there. Avri has submitted comments on drafts at least one and - at least one, maybe one and two. I can't recall if it's both of those, and those have been incorporated.

But now we have all five that are up. So if you could read that, that would be extremely helpful, and provide comments. We're going to get back to all of those in some shape or form for the open issues. And what Marika has done now for a Stage 6 if you will, although we don't call it Stage 6. It's kind of the overarching issues that have run throughout each of the stages of the PDP process.

Those include, and the document's actually up on Adobe right now. That includes things like timing. You know, at each step of the way we've sometimes addressed timing issues when things have to come up for a vote. On others we have not.

There's translation issues and then there's things like development of definitions, you know, standard set of definitions, voting thresholds, decision making methodologies and I think finally the - oh and transition which I think is the last overarching issue which my recommendation and I'm willing to hear from others, transition deals with okay now that we've come up with this new PDP process, what do we do with existing PDPs that are already in the works?

And so I think for that one, my inclination is to recommend that we wait for that to be the very last thing to do which is after the, you know, after the full process is defined. I think there - it may introduce some unnecessary complexities that, you know, it's a little too early to address.

And then finally what's in this trend - what's in this overarching issues document are kind of a side by side look at original text in the by - currently in

the bylaws versus what we will propose if anything to put us to the next set of bylaws which I'll have to go through a narrow set of processes.

So there - are there any questions on that? Hearing none, I think the ultimate goal is to produce some sort of report that is out for comment by the time we get to the Brussels meeting. And then also to have a workshop at the Brussels meeting where we can all present the report, taking comments, answer any questions on the report and so that we can then use those comments and that workshop to include in a final report.

That sound like a plan? Anyone have issues with that, (churns), comments?

James Bladel: Jeff this is James in the queue.

Jeff Neuman: Okay James, yes please.

James Bladel: Yes. Just a note of caution regarding a workshop. There's a lot of material here and a lot of the workshops at least in the past have ranged from, you know, one and a half to two hours. And I think it's laudable to try and, you know, broaden the community and put on this effort.

I just - I'm concerned that there's just so much to digest here that if someone is showing up at the workshop thinking that they can kind of digest all of this in an hour, we might be asking too much of that format, so just wanted to put that on the table for discussion.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think that's a good point and I think one that we could discuss more as we get closer to it. You know, it may be that we - and Avri has put down a, you know, maybe it's a tutorial. You know, maybe it's a different type of workshop. Maybe it's just highlighting or, you know, giving an overview of the highlights. Marika you have a comment on this?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think partly the idea, or at least the idea I had on this would be that basically that workshop would be as well the start of a public comment period. So it would be a way to explain to people what is actually in the report and maybe point to those parts where the group is looking for specific input or comment because there might be areas where the group might not reach an agreement on what, you know, the recommendation should be and, you know, what, for example happens while the registration abuse that are too competing recommendations where we want to tell the community to look - these are the areas where we all have agreement and this is what we're proposing.

But here are some other parts where we really would like your input. And this is what it means and, you know, do you have any questions you want to ask and just, you know, note here is a public comment period and we would encourage you like public comment period (unintelligible) maybe after the Brussels meeting so people have plenty of time to review and submit their comments and maybe work - use it in that way.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James.

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks Marika. That's an interesting idea. This is James speaking. In fact I was thinking the opposite in that we should try to, you know, have the workshop conditional on that the comment period was open for as long as possible prior to the workshop so that we could at least present some of the summaries and see what kind of issues and areas of focus would be uncovered during the comment period.

And then those could be addressed in the workshop. And just, you know, and I hate to sound overly cynical here but I just - I don't see any issues where there's multiple points of view getting clarified by a workshop. I think that, you know, what happens is that, you know, opinions and consensus tends to fracture and dig in in those types of things. And I don't know. It's just my opinion.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes thanks Jeff. It's Paul Diaz. I share James' concerns about doing - opening - essentially opening up a can of worms with a workshop in Brussels. Just a question for this particular working group, I know we've totally kind of lost our timeline, but, you know, what sort of commitments have we made most importantly to Council about, you know, where we stand, when we're going to get the, you know, recommendations to them etcetera.

I'm just concerned that if we, you know, kind of open this - open the floor with a workshop in Brussels like James says, everybody's going to start, you know, throwing whatever their pet projects out, what not, and then we'll wind up very likely pushing this much further back into the summer.

You know, I was kind of hoping that we'd be closer to presenting our recommendations at Brussels rather than another full round. That may be too aggressive but I see the calendar. It's up there. And basically we're supposed to, you know, get this thing wrapped up before the meeting. Correct?

Jeff Neuman: Marika do you want to...

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. The idea indeed would be that we actually finalize the report before Brussels and indeed, you know, as I - I probably didn't explain myself well but I basically - in Brussels it would be the presentation of the final report.

And basically - I think it's similar what we did with registration abuse where we basically had the report out before the meeting, used the meeting in Nairobi to present the report, have people asking questions so the group can clarify what was meant or what was discussed or how the group came to those recommendations are basically mainly as a way of encouraging people to the public comment period which then would be launched, you know,

probably just after already immediately with the publication of the report and extend beyond the Brussels meeting so that people have the information they need to actually formulate a comment.

I didn't envision it as a way of opening the made and have the group based on that, rewrite the report and then updating it more as a way of getting people excited about it, informed about it and really guide them to the public comment period so the group can gather that after the public comment period and then look at all the comments received and, you know, incorporate that in an updated version that then will be submitted to the PPSC.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Marika. That makes a lot more sense.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. Yes. I actually think that that's a great idea. The only thing that I wanted to still comment on is the sort of concern about opening it to any and all comments. I think that it has to be, I mean we're talking about the PDP here after all.

I think it has to be opened up to any and all comments that people would want to make before, you know, the Council has, you know, deals with the next steps on this one. I mean yes we should be finished, but yes people will have comments.

And hopefully with the amount of work that's been done in this group already, most of those comments will be things that have already been discussed and people will be able to report back to places in the report where these kinds of issues were discussed and what got into the recommendations got into the recommendations because.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And I think there's also one step that's not on this chart but it's after all this. Technically this report's going to go to the PPSC, the Steering

Committee even before it gets to the Council. And what the Steering Committee does with the report, you know, the hope is that the Steering Committee, you know, doesn't - there are a lot of people on the Steering Committee that some of which were on this PDP Work Team that haven't shown up.

And one of my fears is that the Steering Committee members try to open everything up. So I'm planning on convening the PPSC short in the next few weeks to have a discussion with them to make sure that they're not going to use this Steering Committee role to open everything up, that it's really for legitimate concerns of the process even before it gets referred to the Council.

And, you know, we have to deal right now with the Working Group recommendations at the Steering Committee level. You know, I can only imagine with some of the people on the Steering Committee some of which again are on this work team but haven't shown up, you know, my fear is that they try to use that as an opportunity to open up a bunch of issues that we've discussed in exhaustion.

But, you know, we have to deal with that. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes thanks Jeff. You just nailed an issue that I was going to - the issue I wanted to raise. And, you know, you're our Chair. But if you would like to back you the group, I would be happy to sign a letter that basically expresses support for what you've just said.

The PPSC, it's another layer. But a lot of those people are on the Council anyway. I think we know who some of the people are you're hinting at. And I think it's very important that this doesn't become the 11th hour, let's open up every pet project and every pet peeve that we have for discussion which would result in more unnecessary delay. If you feel that, you know, backing of the group by a letter, please draft something, shoot it out, but very supportive in backing you up on that.



Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let me - sorry for the cough here. Let me have the - a meeting with the PPSC as a whole and just, you know, make those points pretty clearly in that meeting before we kind of resort to a letter.

I'm not saying that it's guaranteed that the members of the PPSC will do that but - so I don't want to overreact with a letter at this point, but I want to make it clear to those members of the PPSC that this is not, you know, the role of the PPSC as a Steering Committee is to make sure that the work that's done by the work team was in accordance with the charter of the work team, make sure that they've operated within its procedures to make sure that they haven't ignored a substantial amount of input.

You know, basically to make sure that the process worked the way it was supposed to work as opposed to commenting on the substance. And so I will let this group know how those discussions turn out. I am the Chair currently of the PPSC. Now that may be something that the - it's also a question I'm going to ask the PPSC given that I'm the Chair of the PDP Work Team whether they want that to still continue or whether they want to appoint a different Chair or basically - or have J. Scott and I because actually J. Scott's Vice-Chair.

They basically J. Scott to Chair the sessions dealing with the PDP Work Team and I would Chair the sessions dealing with the Working Group Work Team since we, you know, I'm not on the Working Group Work Team and he's not really on this one.

So, you know, those are some ideas that I'm going to float by the PPSC to make sure that there's no issues there.

So with that said, any other questions on the process we're envisioning? And Marika we owe an update to Glen on this for the next Council meeting. So could we send this timetable out?

Marika Konings: Yes. I can post the timetable on the wiki so the group can review it as well and they can then provide it to Glen as a sort of conflict and look there for an update on the timeline.

Jeff Neuman: Okay great. The - just for those on the call that aren't on the Council, the Council has instituted a process. They're wanting a status report published where the Councilors to review on every single work team, work group, PDP that's ongoing.

It's interesting because the Council meets every three weeks now. And so it does amount to a lot of status reports, some of which where there's really not much of an update. But I think it's actually a good process for the Council to be engaging in as much of a pain it is.

With that said, I'd like to actually, because I think this is going to be a little bit shorter call, like an hour as opposed to an hour and a half given that it's later for some people, given the whole time conversion issue.

Just a reminder, next week for those in the United States, it's actually going to be - it's the same time UTC but that amounts to an hour earlier which is our normal meeting time. So next week for those on the East Coast, it'll be 9:30 am Eastern US Time and on the, excuse me, on the West Coast that'll be 6:30 am Western Coast Time.

Is that right? Did I do my time conversion right?

Marika Konings: So just to confirm, we go back to the normal hour no? Not the UTC time but the normal hour that we had.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Correct. Sorry about that.

Marika Konings: Am I right?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, yes. Yes, the normal hour, that's right.

James Bladel: UTC doesn't change, correct?

Gisella Gruber-White: No. The UTC will become 13:30 UTC which will then be 06:30 PD PSC and 9:30 ESC.

Jeff Neuman: Got you.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: That whole time conversion thing, that's a little too complicated for me. Anyway, so the - let's - Marika can you get that last document back up on the screen, on Adobe, the marching issues?

Marika Konings: Yes give me one second.

Jeff Neuman: So I actually thought that what we would start with today, and I know this'll sound kind of interesting, weird, but I think one of the easier topics or, that we can start a discussion on is probably with B, the translation issues. And I don't mean easy in the sense that it's an easy issue, but I mean it's pretty straightforward. And so I'd like to actually start with that as opposed to starting with timing.

So the issue that we've run across that we've talked about on a number of occasions is, you know, most of the work done in working groups right now are in English. And so that has proven to be an issue with a number of parties that are trying to participate where English is not a first language or even a second language.

And so therefore a question came up about, you know, what translations should be provided at each stage of the policy development process and how will translation impact timing in relation to public comment periods, how to assess the success of and/or need for translation.

And so what we've done in this document is publish what ICANN's guidelines are and then also I've asked Marika and I'm not sure - sorry Marika I haven't checked. Did we publish the other document that we were talking about?

Marika Konings: No. I haven't published that because it's actually an internal document and not really an official policy. But I can...

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...talk about it if you want.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So, to fill everyone in, the ICANN Policy Team has an internal guideline I guess document which as Marika said is not official policy. But it's guidelines that the policy staff has created on which documents to - which documents and when to do translations.

So I thought so let's discuss what ICANN currently has in their guidelines. Let's discuss what the policy staff has come up with as their own guidelines and then just start with that as a base to move forward. Do we agree? Do we think things should be, sorry, added? But I thought it would be a good base line to start with.

So with that, in looking at what's on the screen, ICANN has a policy that they've published that basically says that they will provide timely and accurate translations. It's four - it's a four layer system. The bottom layer contains those specific documents and publications that address the organization over all, strategic thinking, and those will be translated into an agreed block of languages.

The next layer is a class of documents that ICANN undertakes to provide different languages to allow interaction with ICANN processes by non-English speakers.

Third layer is our documents that suggested by staff as being helpful or necessary in ongoing processes or documents that are requested and documents requested by the Internet community for whatever reason.

They go through a translation approval system and finally a top layer of documents where the community is encouraged to use online collaborative tools versus official translated versions.

So then they go on to state that English shall remain the operating language of ICANN for all business consultation and legal purposes. Every effort will be made to ensure an equity between comments made in languages in other than English.

If it's not possible to arrange a release of particular documents in the agreed languages at the same time, then each language will be provided with some time period in which to make comments and ICANN will adopt the International Organization for Standardization 639-2 naming system for identifying and labeling particular languages.

Man: Yes. That was same time period not some in the previous meeting.

Jeff Neuman: Yes that is. I need to increase the size of this font. Sorry about that. That's a good place.

Man: Often it has been some instead of same however.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. So that currently - James do you have a comment on this?

James Bladel: Just a question.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

James Bladel: And maybe I can wait until Marika presents the non-official policy on that - on translations.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So why don't we do that. Marika can you just give an overall summary of that and - to help on this conversation?

Marika Konings: Yes. No problem. So this is Marika. So we have in the Policy Department then a translation policy which is sort of an aspirational document which outlines partly like, you know, what we should do in the short term but what should be the goal, you know, in the long term. And this is I think a document that was developed initially by (Nick). I think partly as well inspired by the language needs and desires that exist especially in the ALAC community.

So, you know, for the GNSO, what is, I mean it talks well about other things like, you know, the policy update and things like that. But in relation to, you know, the PDP, the recommendation there is in the short and medium term to at least have executive summaries of issues reports, initial reports and final reports translated.

And I think this is something we have done as well in practice. Some reports for example I recall the post expiration issues report. We actually translated completely yet this was specifically requested by the ALAC and we thought it's, you know, to have a very broad community from many different groups for - we translated actually the whole report for that purpose.

On the - in the long term, I think the idea is as well to have, and this is again this is aspirational, you know, for example the public consultations we have done from experiments but the objectives should be in the long term to have consultations translated in the five UN languages, have as well the

announcement text translated that the main object document should be translated referenced to other documents that refer to any announcements should be translated.

And the actual entry on the Web site should also be available and translated, of course being able to submit languages and/or comments in other languages. There are other documents that relate to working groups such as charters, issues reports, advisory statements, other working group documents, and again basically the list goes on basically.

I think coming down - and of course in an ideal world we would like to see everything translated so everyone can participate in different languages but of course it's, you know, it relate to as well time, budget, impact on the over all process. So this is the - our internal approach.

And it's that - the practice that we've been handling so far is translate executive summaries of the main documents that come out of a PDP Working Group, so the issues report, initial report and the final report.

And we have done a few experiments of having public comment periods run in different languages. I think we did that for the IRTP Working Group where we actually did not receive any comments in other languages. And I think might be for a variety of reasons so. And that's it.

Jeff Neuman: Anyone have like - okay James, sorry. I didn't - I should have just looked up. James?

James Bladel: Yes thanks Marika and Jeff. This is James speaking. And my question was for Marika relative to the personnel and facilities that ICANN uses for translation. Is this a service? Are these ICANN employees or is it an opportunity to leverage some of the multi-lingual volunteers and perhaps even have a standing translation committee for folks to do this so that we're not spending ICANN's dime to engage in a lot of these translation efforts?

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. I think that's an excellent suggestion. As it currently works, we do have a person within ICANN that coordinates translations and to who we submit the documents we would like to have translated. But I think she just works through, you know, approaching different vendors and they provide a budget and then she, you know, I guess picks the cheapest one on there.

I have been informed that there is a kindly a corporate policy that is currently on the development to deal with translations that I presume once available will go through, you know, the normal motions of putting them out for community comment. I don't know even if this is something the PPC is involved in.

So there are some things as well in the works that might provide some further guidance. But I think your suggestion's a very valid one and I'm not sure, hoping Alan might provide some insight on how it's being done in the ALAC because I know they translate a lot of documents and they actually have as well I think called meetings with - from obtain this interpretation, so.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Okay. A couple of things, first I'll address the issues that James raised. We had volunteered to have volunteers do translation for nigh on three years now. And in general ICANN said no we're not interested.

More recently we have in fact had volunteers do initial translations and then the professional translators cleaned them up which is - which seems to be viable when we can in fact do that in a timely manner. It's certainly better than machine translations because they take longer for the professional translator to clean up than just doing it from scratch. So volunteers may well come into it.



It's a real hard issue though getting people to do that on a timely manner where the - when there's hard deadlines. So but that has been tried a little bit. It's not quite as easy as James implied having a cardric, quadra - sort of a quandary of volunteers ready.

I'll just note one difference between what Marika said and what's in the document. You'll notice when Marika was talking but she was talking about UN languages. And in the actual published document, it says a - agreed block of languages.

There's been a lot of discussion recently about whether we should be using only the language of - which were relevant post World War II or we should be looking at what languages are in fact relevant for the communities we're looking at right now.

You know, for instance within that large Portuguese seems to be coming a much - a more important language than some of the other UN languages. And so that may well be evolving. And the ICANN formal policy seems to address that. That's it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So let's - I want to take kind of the stuff that Marika had mentioned, you know, take it apart a little bit and see if we can, you know, (unintelligible), I apologize. Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes hi. I actually want to first of all argue for - this seems to me one of the reasonable things that ICANN should be paying for in terms of getting professional translations. I think it makes sense to have a set of volunteer editors who basically people who understand the language and can edit it.

In terms of which, and let's review it since it is technical material, it is policy material. You can't necessarily expect a translator to get all the nuance and such correct.

In terms of which languages, I would argue strongly for sticking with the UN because as soon as you start to decide which are the relevant, then you basically get up to 21 plus languages like the European Commission is forced to deal with because who were we to say your language is not a relevant language.

And so, it's the same sort of tactic that we use of saying who's a country, who's not, who's whatever, using something like the UN languages which are, you know, a fairly good cross section. They're not just post World War II relevant, seems to me a preferable way to go.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you Avri. James and then Alex.

James Bladel: Hi Jeff thanks. And Avri I think we about 50% agree and 50% disagree in the just the overall philosophy of how we should support different translations. And I think where I'm going with this is you mentioned that the UN is now supporting 21 languages.

I think I read somewhere where the Orange County California Board of Supervisors is now publishing their leading notes in over 90 languages for the exact problem that you mentioned is that you get into these situations where you have to make the decision on who's language is relevant, who's language is useful, which languages are important enough for official sponsoring of translation efforts and which languages aren't.

So, you know, maybe the answer here is that we take a subset of languages that ICANN will support for translations and then anything beyond that would be a, you know, best leveraged by volunteer efforts if it's a much smaller or spoken by a very narrow (plice) of the (public) community.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And let me just Alan, for those of you just on the chat or not on Adobe, Alan has said that he forgot to talk about the simultaneous interpretation of meetings. I'm assuming this is with the ALAC. I could speak to it if you wish in

summary. It works well for in person meetings if facilities support it. It does not work for teleconferencing.

Let me go to Alex and then Alan if you want to add to that but let me go to Alex first.

Alex Gakuru: Thank you very much Jeff and sorry everybody for being late. Daylight savings, we don't have any daylight savings around this part of the world (unintelligible). I'm glad we are going back to the regular time next week.

I'm just proposing that in addition to whatever language is a set of languages that we are going to recommend to be translated and in conjunction with the policy staff recommendation that it might be a good idea to also leave the door open for other languages that may want to have a translation that we may not think of right now.

And this is to open participation for other people who may feel that whatever languages are decided, I'm not just talking about English. But they may feel that there's still time to participate as fully.

So if we can create or (unintelligible) other people who may want to come in and have their summaries translated for them, I make a (unintelligible) of making sure that the translations can also be incorporated.

Of course I'm thinking for example about Swahili which is about 120 million people. It's one of the likely - they know they (have) us in different parts of the world as in the emerging future. And I was just thinking in addition to the set that will recommend whether UN or whichever post World War II that we may also additionally consider an avenue where others can also come into play.  
Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you Alex. You know, when I think about the which languages, I think that's a - I think we may get there. But that may be an issue for ICANN

in general as opposed to this working group taking on that really difficult issue.

In other words, we can make recommendations in this group that certain things must be translated, certain things may be translated, certain other things should be translated. But perhaps, and this is just - I - because this is an extremely political issue. And you can bet that no matter what we come up with, even if we could come up with something that the GAC and other entities are going to have comments on that.

So is it possible in the interest of time and expertise in this group to just - and please feel free to comment - to kind of punt on that issue of which languages but rather just make recommendations as to which element of the PDP, you know, must be translated, should or may.

Let me go to Alex and then Alan and anybody else who wants to comment on that question.

Alex Gakuru: Oh sorry. I need to put my hand down. I'm sorry. I don't have a comment on it.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay. Thank you Alex. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. That's why I said that the wording in the ICANN current policy I think is fine. It says we'd be translating into an agreed block of languages. It puts on someone else's shoulders the decision and allows flexibility if indeed the world is in a stage where it needs it. And you're right. I don't think we want to be in the position of suggesting which they are.

In terms of the simultaneous translation, I did add in parentheses if the facilities support it. For instance in Nairobi, they did not. They physically had booths, but they just didn't work very well for a bunch of reasons. You know, the output could not be fed onto remote participation.

So as we saw in various meetings when someone spoke in a different language, the scribes in this case couldn't hear it. So it's a difficult issue. In terms of teleconferences, it - we're - if the interpreters are good enough it works okay for people to have a record after the fact to listen to.

To actually interact and participate in multiple languages in teleconferences does not work very well at all with the technology that we're using at the moment.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James?

James Bladel: Yes thanks Jeff. This is James speaking. And, you know, to your earlier point about determining or making recommendations on which sections must be translated, I'm having some difficulty understanding the difference between may and should.

Can we just identify those areas that - for those inputs and outputs to a PDP that must be translated and then just assume that everything else is optionally available for translation if, you know, if there's sufficient need within the community? And does that - I mean am I oversimplifying that by saying that these areas are required and everything else is optional?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So, yes, I use words interchangeably as I'm sure many people do. I think my intent was to basically say we have elements that we believe must be translated. We have areas that it may be a good practice to do. And then we have areas that are just completely optional.

But, you know, whatever this group wants to do, I was just kind of pointing that out as an example. I'm, you know, this is our group. We could make whatever recommendations we want. So...

James Bladel: And I'm just thinking that, you know, collapsing that into a binary decision where you identify these, you know, for example the charter of a working group must be translated. The executive summaries of this output must be translated into that block of languages. And, you know, comments must be open to be received in that block of language. But everything else is kind of drawn, you know, draw this box around it as, you know, optional, available for translation but not required.

I don't know. Maybe I'm oversimplifying it. I'm just trying to collapse things into binary decisions.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Something else that the group might want to discuss or to enter comment in this discussion is like how - I'll make any recommendation how this impacts like the publication or duration of public comment periods.

And it would be helpful I think as well if it could make some recommendations on what is expected like, you know, if it's recommended that executive summaries are translated, so do we then wait until all translations are in and then a document gets published so everyone has it at the same time or do they - should they be published, you know, as they are being done and what impact should it have on public comment period if you, you know, should you have an extension if translations are there later or ten people in different languages then submit a comment later.

Some of those things might be helpful as well if the group can provide guidance on that.

Jeff Neuman: So Marika you are five steps ahead of me. I think we'll get there.

Marika Konings: Okay. I thought we were...

Jeff Neuman: I agree with you...

Marika Konings: ...(wrapping, so on this issue, you know - just on this issue).

Jeff Neuman: I agree. All of those are issues we need to tackle. But I want to kind of micro like piece it together. So I want to start with, you know, James actually started down a list. I think Marika has sort of a list in the guidelines.

I would like to hear from the group before we talk about how the mechanics of it, I'd like to hear from the group what elements they believe must be translated. James had started with the charter, the executive summary of any output documents and comments must be able to be received in that same - that block of languages.

Avri has said on the chat that she believes recommendations themselves should be translated. Should means most of the must but the - there may be occasion when that's not necessary.

Avri can - I know you have Skype but is there a way you can explain those comments? All right, it may...

Avri Doria: Hi.

Jeff Neuman: Hi Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. And basically what I'm thinking is it's not only the executive summary of when there's actually a recommend something that those policies should - the main part of a document. And that's what you need to start looking into, certainly not the annexes. They would certainly be in a may.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Avri Doria: But the recommendations themselves and the explanations of why that document is going to translate things, that seems critical.

In terms of what I meant by the word should, I was trying to sort of apply because you said you used the words between must and should interchangeably. And I was just sort of giving them an IETF view of when you should as opposed to must.

And that means that in most cases, it is a must. But it's possible that there would be an exception and that's why it's only you should. And that's all I was trying to convey in that as what is the degree of difference between a must and a should.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you Avri. And before I go to James, is - so I thought we had a discussion about this but, you know, we've been having many discussions. But didn't we at one point say that the executive summary should at least contain a list of the recommendations?

And if that's the case, then would that Avri solve your issue of the recommendations being translated? You can answer on the list or...

Avri Doria: It takes time to do the mute off. Sorry. Depends to what degree, I mean if the executive summary is putting in the full level of the recommendations then perhaps not. But then it ceases to be an executive summary, so I'd have to go back and reread what we said when it's the executive summary.

But I also think that we need to consider not only what the recommendation is but some of the reasoning that went into it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.



Avri Doria: That's why I called it a should. If, in other words, that's 150 page document, then perhaps it only being a should means this is one occasion when you might decide not to and only do something else.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James and then Alan.

James Bladel: Thanks Jeff. James speaking. And just real quickly I was thinking of policy recommendations. That's a good catch and we probably should do that. However I would point out that the actual policy, if any, is going to be drafted will be in the governing language of English so I just want to make sure that we're doing that as a courtesy and not saying that we're going to have multi-lingual policies. That's all.

Jeff Neuman: So you're saying kind of like what the legal agreements say which is that English would control in the event of any inconsistency between the English and multi-(lingual) versions - multi-lingual versions.

James Bladel: Right. Right. If it's going to go into a contract, if it's a recommendation that language be included in the contract, we can translate that as a courtesy but, you know, we need to emphasize somewhere in the translation that all, you know, I just said that above here that English is the governing language for ICANN contracts, or the operating language for ICANN business and legal purposes.

So just want to reemphasize that whatever policy recommendations will come out of this will have to be in English if they're going to be inserted into a contract.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let me - Marika is this related to that or is it a new thing.

Marika Konings: No. It's related to what James is saying. This is Marika. Just to mention indeed on the translations that we currently do, we have a disclaimer on the front page of the document basically saying that, you know, this is translation.

The original is English. So, and that's the, you know, governing version. So that's currently being done but, you know, it might make sense to make it more extensive.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think that should go into our recommendations. I think it looks like, you know, a few - bunch of people agreed with that. And, I don't view that as being controversial. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. What James is talking about is really post the PDP process because things only get translated into verbiage which will go into agreements once the Board has approved. At our level, we're simply putting out a recommendation to the Board and that's going to go out for public comment so I don't think we need to worry about that at our stage. It's a level past the PDP.

Jeff Neuman: Well I think at this point because working groups generally run their proceedings in English, I think we may need that because most of the working groups will not be able to check to see whether the translations are actually accurate.

Alan Greenberg: No. No. I'm not arguing with that. I'm simply saying that we don't need to worry about the disclaimer that this is - these words are going to go into a contract because that happens post Board approval, not at the level of the PDP report that we're talking about.

Jeff Neuman: Got you.

James Bladel: Jeff if I could respond to Alan real quickly.

Jeff Neuman: Yes sure.

James Bladel: So, you know, I guess I was envisioning down the road a working group that was solely and exclusively conducted in a language other than English than

being non-English recommend - policy recommendations to the Council and to the Board. Well I guess it wouldn't get past the Council.

But, you know, the idea of being that any translation being at that point runs the risk of, you know, modifying the intent of the policy recommendations. So I was just trying to get that - nip that problem as early as possible and that...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: We are so far from that.

Man: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Well, you know, yes...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Maybe I'm over optimistic I guess.

Jeff Neuman: So let me ask Marika a question and then this - is there anything in the working group guidelines that states that all proceedings - I mean ICANN says that all of its proceedings will be done in English. But is there anything in the working group guidelines that has that similar type of statement?

Marika Konings: I think it does. I think it does point out that English is the working language of a working group.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Marika Konings: I'll quickly check on it. If it's different I'll come back.

Jeff Neuman: I was just reading James' comment. Yes, so if you could check that out and verify because that was my assumption and that's the way ICANN generally

operates. You know, that the general language that ICANN conducts its proceedings in is English.

And so if that's the case James, we may not need to worry about...

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. It actually says and I'm reading now from the guidelines. English will remain the operating language of ICANN for business consultation and legal purposes. But this is actually as well because the working group guidelines have incorporated ICANN's translation principles which include that sentence. So it takes the translating principles, incorporate those so I'd act as the - it takes that over as well.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So let me - sorry James, you had an additional comment?

James Bladel: No. No. I'm just going to go ahead and withdraw. Thanks Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So let me go down this list before we finish. And I just want to make sure that we're all in agreement that these are the elements that we believe must be translated and then we could - so we actually have the beginnings of a recommendation.

So does everyone on this call agree with the notion of translating the charter, the ultimate charter that's agreed upon by the Council in whatever block of languages that ICANN generally translates things into?

Yes, of course, does anyone dis - yes okay great. If you could do checkmarks that's fantastic.

Alan Greenberg: If it's a small enough group of documents that aren't too large, then it doesn't seem unreasonable.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. How about the executive summary of the output documents which I believe James refers to the initial report, final report or any other reports that

are formally issued out for comment by the working group, is that your intention?

James Bladel: Oh was that a question for me Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I just want to make sure that that's your intention. I mean it seems like people agree with it, but maybe...

James Bladel: It was - it was my intention but I hadn't considered the time delay that Marika's point raised and whether or not that would, you know, unnecessarily lengthen comment periods and, you know, I hadn't considered that, so.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Well we will need to consider that. That is very important. So if yours is now a checkmark pending the outcome of those discussions, that's fine too.

James Bladel: Well can we make a recommendation that ICANN, you know, at least with respect to that block of languages be able to turn those requests fairly quickly and, you know, so that it doesn't impact the comment - the length of the comment period? I think that's a reasonable request.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That of course all depends on the length of the document because I think translations can be turned around quite quickly but if you have, you know, an executive summary that's 50 pages and you need to do five languages, of course it takes longer than...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...pages.

Man: Yes.

James Bladel: Well and I point would be it ceases to be an executive summary of it's getting that long.

Jeff Neuman: Well and to be fair also there - it could be an issue of technical - how technical the issue is.

James Bladel: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: So, let's capture that point but let's come back to that because I think we're going to start there on the next call as far as timing. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just a quick point. As a matter of practicality, we tend to get very few comments in the multiple languages. And the practices being that the summary of comments tends to start being processed before the close date of the foreign language ones and then they get incorporated in sort of at the last moment of the process.

And to date, because we've gotten so few foreign language comments, it hasn't been a problem. That could change if people start getting more active.

Jeff Neuman: Well I'll tell you Sebastian will file all his comments in French. For those of you who know what I'm talking about, I - it's just a joke. For those who listen to the recording, I love Sebastian. I think he's a great guy. Anyway, Alex?

Alex Gakuru: Yes. I was wondering after they have all been translated into the various blocks of languages whether we may also recommend a sort of consolidated area where each language can send - find all the translations for French in one corner, for Portuguese in one corner, for another one.

We (defiling) to different policies just so that the people that read - that speak and read that language can also find more sort of a reservoir where they can get material that's relevant to a language other than one that is scattered all over the place and it becomes hard for to follow if they only knew or can read

or write in that one language. It's just another recommendation suggestion for you to consider. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks Alex. So that's like a segregation of comments so that once they're received the people can read them in the different languages. You know, they know to go - actually go there. Marika you have a comment on that?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. It was actually more in relation to finding information on the same page and I just wanted to mention as well I think as part of the redesign, for example the GNSO Web site, there was the idea to make it as lot easier for people to find translated documents. So as well put, you know, different on each side. You can see the translations also have a section like your all French documents. So make it easier as well for people to find information that is translated. So this - it's just a side note.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So before we close, I want to go to the last two elements, make sure we have agreement which is that comments must be able to be received in that block of languages, whatever that block of languages is. So, you know, that ICANN must have the ability to receive comments in those languages. Is there agreement on that principle?

Marika Konings: This is Marika because just in a comment because of course if you're going to receive comments in the language, there's no purpose in being able to receive comments in the language if you don't translate the announcement and the related documents that you're expecting comments on or there's the expectation that people can read English but just not comment in English.

So, you know, I know you have to start somewhere, but it's one of the things where, you know, if people can just submit an English comment period with all the information in English, indeed how likely is it going to be that people are going to submit in other languages.

Jeff Neuman: Well so I think we're starting under the premise at this point that the charter, the executive summaries or the outputs documents, the comments, and then the last one which we're asking a question on is, as Avri has said, policy recommendations should be or yes, her words, "should be translated as well as those languages." And the should is a must in most circumstances unless there's some compelling reason that the working group indicates why it shouldn't be.

We have Alan and Avri have checkmarks. How about others on that comment? Does anyone disagree with that notion?

Okay not seeing disagreements, so just to summarize, the charter, executive summary of outputs are musts. The policy recommendations are a should. And the - and then comments, ICANN must be able to receive comments in the block of languages which also means they must be able to translate those into English so that it could be reviewed by the working group or whoever's reviewing it.

Alan Greenberg: In general, ICANN has translated those back into English for their own convenience. I don't think they've generally published the translation and nor are we saying they should at this point.

Jeff Neuman: Well I mean if the working group is going to consider it, then you would think that that, you know, at least a summary of that must be translated into English.

Alan Greenberg: I would guess. I don't think we've had many occurrences of that happening, so it's hard to look at current experience.

Jeff Neuman: So would our recommendation - do we want to recommend that those comments - a summary of those comments at least...

((Crosstalk))



Alan Greenberg: Well if they're going back to the working group who was - has an obligation these days under transparency to take into account comments, they will have to be translated back into the working language of that committee or working group.

Jeff Neuman: Well is it that the whole comment has to be or is it that the summary of it because you can get a comment that's, you know, it's very 20 pages long.

Alan Greenberg: You could.

Jeff Neuman: James?

James Bladel: Yes Jeff. I mean that's a good question. I'm sorry, this is James speaking. And I think that - I think that if we're going to draw a box around this small subset of approved blocked languages, and we're going to accept comments in them, then we have to translate the entire thing for working group analysis and comments.

I just don't think there's any, you know, wiggle room out of that obligation unfortunately. I wish I could think of one that would but.

Marika Konings: Well this is Marika because you can't really expect the translator I guess to make a meaningful summary on an issue that they're not familiar with. And I don't think in the policy staff we know enough Chinese to be able to make a summary of a Chinese comment, not yet at least.

Jeff Neuman: So how does ICANN deal with that? When you get a comment that's in another language, that's to be considerate...

Marika Konings: It needs to be translated fully for us unless it's in a language that, you know, one of us speaks or understands. But otherwise I guess it's the - but as said, I

mean at least from the policy side, you know, we did a few test runs and we didn't receive any comment.

So I can only actually speculate on what they do in other parts where they have had comments in other languages. But my presumption is that those get translated completely and then integrated into the summary I presume.

Jeff Neuman: Interesting question. I think that one - that - all right. Let me go to Alex and then James and then let's wrap it up for today. Alex, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Alex Gakuru: Yes. I think for the purpose of the work - for the purpose of the working group to consider the full message on the comment, I think the whole message, the whole comment should be translated. That's all I wanted to say. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James?

James Bladel: Yes. And Jeff respectfully I think what Marika was mentioning is really more of a challenge of determining what those five languages or six languages or three languages will have to be, you know, what's included. I think once you've identified that block, you need to, you know, comfortably and without, you know, without discretion until you get through the contract phase, just operate, you know, interchangeably as much as possible.

So maybe that's an argument for keeping that block as small as possible, you know. That's another way to look at this. But I think once you've identified that block, you've got to play well within it.

Jeff Neuman: So should we say something like where feasible those comments must be translated back into English? Does anybody - would anybody object to that? And the reason I say feasible is I could seriously imagine a large comment, and James just said no.

I guess my question is - yes. I mean I take the point that it's hard for someone to know a summary. But I could just imagine the great extent if you get a 50 page, 20 page comment, but I guess there is an obligation to consider it. So Alan and then James.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think we need to put in that they have to be translated. Excuse me. If staff or someone else comes back with the rationale why something else is acceptable, then fine. But I don't know what else is acceptable and I don't feel comfortable putting in that I'm going to take a 20 page document and summarize it in four sentences in another language.

I don't know if you've ever worked in countries where someone's doing simultaneous translation for you and they speak for 20 minutes and the translator gives you a two sentence summary. You know there's other things going on that they didn't tell you, so.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James?

James Bladel: Yes. I think Alan raises a good point there and I agree with him. And, you know, I think overall that those - when you say where feasible or, you know, whether or not it should be undertaken or there should be rationale for not undertaking it, I mean those are questions that need to be addressed on whether a language should or should not be included in that block.

If it's not feasible, it shouldn't be in the block. If we've identified a short list of languages, then it should always be feasible to operate within those languages. And even if it's a 20 page comment, it should be translated in its entirety if it's something that, you know, staff is saying it's greatly expensive to do translation or even after that they're not comfortable with the outcome, then it shouldn't be in that block of languages.

So again, I think that this problem lies a little bit further down the road than the question we're trying to address is, you know, which is essentially do we accept and translate entire comments within that block of identified languages. And I think the answer to that is yes. And what goes into that block is a totally different animal.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I think that's fair enough. So let me try one last summary and then we can adjourn for the day. We have the charter must be translated into that block of languages. The executive summary of any output document needs to be - must be translated into those languages.

Comments must be able to be received in those languages. Comments that come in must be translated into - back into English. And policy recommendations that are - policy recommendations should be translated into English.

And for all of those, there must be a disclaimer that states that the English language of each of those controls.

Man: I see.

James Bladel: Thanks. That's good Jeff. I just would say that, you know, policy recommendations should be translated into English should be changed to must because then ultimately they're going to be in English when they get into the contract, but that's just - if I'm alone on that I'll defer.

Jeff Neuman: Avri's comment on that was that should means must unless there's good rationale for not doing so.

James Bladel: Okay. I know we're not signing anything unless it's in English, so.

Jeff Neuman: Well I - I said we're...

Alan Greenberg: This week James.

Jeff Neuman: Well remember, English is the controlling language so you don't have to worry about that unless you guys suddenly don't speak English anymore.

All right guys. Thank you very much everyone for this call. I think we made some good progress.

I think we will start up on next call next week on the issue of timing and how these translations will actually work, so the mechanics of it. Okay? Thank you everyone and talk to you next week.

James Bladel: Thank you Jeff.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible)...

Alan Greenberg: Thanks Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

END