

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 04 December 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 04 December 2014 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-20141204-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan)-NCUC
Jim Galvin - RySG
Justine Chew – Individual
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Emily Taylor – RrSG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Wanawit Ahkuputra – GAC

Apologies:

Jennifer Chung – RySG

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Excuse me recordings have now started. Please proceed.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the translation and transliteration contact information PDP Working Group Call on the 4th of December 2014.

On the call today we have Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Chris Dillon, Petter Rindforth, Rudi Vansnick, Justine Chew ,Emily Taylor, Wanawit Ahkuputra, Peter Green and Jim Galvin. We have apologies from Jennifer Chung.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and back over to you (Chris).

(Chris): Thank you very much. Sorry I had an unexpected visitor. Okay so I need to ask you formally whether anybody has change in statement of interest since last time we met.

Jim Galvin: (Chris).

(Chris): Yes.

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. I have a statement of interest change per se but as I have been reading the documents here in detail I am reminded that I have failed to follow up and point out that I am not actually on this committee represent SSAC.

I am here from RISG not SSAC and that is something which has been carried in this document for quite some time.

(Chris): Okay that is certainly an edit we need to make. Thank you very much for pointing it out.

Jim Galvin: Thank you.

(Chris): Okay thank you. Seeing no hands and nothing else raised that means we can move forward into the results of the straw poll.

These are in the wiki. And basically what happened is that we had eight votes yes and four votes no. I should point out just for the sake of the recording that there was a certain amount of confusion with one Jive statement of interest. So that is now being sorted out.

And so that is the current situation as I understand it. I don't know that anybody wants to bring up anything about that.

Okay thank you very much for that. And then that means there have been quite a lot of emails with comments about the document on the list. But as far as I know we are actually up to date. So every issue which I am aware has now been raised on the list.

And - oh yes I actually know this. There is one small exception to that because in fact in the report I suggested a change and in fact some additional recommendation. But I will point that out as we go through the latest version.

Incidentally it should be Version 6A. I have seen quite a few versions recently but the latest one is 6A and you can see that on the screen.

Okay so I shall just - I think most of them are around about Page 11. So I will just try and scroll down now. This is interesting - actually I can't scroll down. This is a bit of a problem.

Woman: Hang on (Chris) I will take care of that for you.

(Chris): Ah yes. So it is now working. I am always horribly bad at scrolling. Ah yes so, again out with the voting because of a mess up with the statement of interest I allowed when Jive is named and at this point.

Before I go any further Jim would you like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: I just have an editorial question. Jim Galvin for the transcript for you (Chris). So in looking to the document and realizing that as part of the main text as opposed to just a note or something. We have, you know, references to our community wiki page and such.

Is that typical? You know I mean are we going to have those in the final document? And my concern here is just one of, you know, Web references like that, you know, always seem to come and go and ICANN has a way of changing its Web site as do most people. I guess I really should pick on ICANN.

But I worry about having any kind of, you know, substantive content that is referred to by inclusion and, you know, the only way to get at it is through a Web reference.

And, you know, that just suggests to me that the content wouldn't stand for too long like a printed document might. So just curious. Thanks.

(Chris): Thank you very much. There certainly are quite a few point at the wiki and at the Web. And I guess we will have to solidify those at some point. So I mean certainly it probably would not be a good idea to have so many references in the final version. But yes I think it is a very good point.

We have made very extensive use of the wiki and the joy of helping the references is there is obviously they refer to the very latest versions as it automatically updates.

But yes so I think certainly by the time of the final report we will actually have to take, you know, effectively solidify those parts of the wiki at that stage. So yes that is a very interesting issue. Thank you.

All right so just moving down. And then we start seeing quite a few changes here.

Now basically I have sent all of these edits - basically what is happening is that people in the document are using track changes to raise points. And then I am replying to those points and I am making some sort of change to the text.

And so sometimes it is just a matter of implementing the change. Sometimes it is saying we implemented - effectively we have covered this. And on some occasions there are actually, you know, explanations of why something perhaps looks confusing or you know actually explanations of why things are expressed like that.

And so I think I added quite a few footnotes as I went through. Those are literally defining what words like searchable means. There is a footnote about that.

And also now - wait a minute I think there is another one which is just slightly further down. Ah yes, there was some amount of difficulty actually with the word transformation because as people on the call probably realize. We always use the word transformation to be talking about the contents of fields.

So it is transforming data, contact information and it is sort of a shorthand because that could be transliteration and perhaps in some cases translation. So that is the meaning that we have always used the word transformation in.

But one of the interesting points that was raised was that actually there is this idea that transforming field names actually translating field names in the database is a very helpful thing to do.

That is sort of translation in another meaning effectively. So what I have done in the footnote is explain that generally transformation we are talking about data but there is also this other use.

But when we use it in the other use it will always be transformation of field names or it might even be clearer to say translation of field names.

And in fact that rather neatly connects with the additional point that I raise because sorry the additional recommendation that I made. And this was a very late edit and we can probably improve on it because this subject has come up I will just might as well just refer to that now.

I think it is this red one in the middle here. So - no it isn't. Just a moment. It is this red one on the next page.

Basically what that is saying is the working group could recommend that the field names of the new system effectively DNRD be translated into as many languages as possible.

I think it probably needs some work but the meaning of it is certainly that. Probably the English needs polishing a little. But I felt that was a change worth making.

Jim would you like to pick up something on that?

Jim Galvin: Not precisely there but going back a little bit. I apologize.

(Chris): No, no that is no problem.

Jim Galvin: One of the things I wanted to comment on was the use of the acronym DNRD. Although we do clearly define it in this document but our first use appears - see I was just there.

It is at the top of the page here in the mandatory to not transform where it is first viewed. So it is there at the top of Page 12 in the first bullet there.

I would like to recommend against not using that particular acronym because it is also popularly used now to refer to Domain Name Registration Data.

(Chris): Yes.

Jim Galvin: So, you know, we should come up with a different term there or perhaps just not use the acronym at all.

(Chris): Yes. The term this is overwhelmingly most easy to understand is just the replacement (unintelligible).

So yes we may even need to have to create something to do as - anyway point taken and we can think about, you know, how we replace this in (unintelligible) time after the call I think. We will try and cook up a word for it now.

Okay well in that case I will just back up a little bit and just give people a chance to have another look at these various points. I sent an email around the list earlier in the week which basically picked up all of my comments but I don't think anybody actually picked up anything in the email.

But, you know, now is also a good time to do that if anybody would like so to do. Okay Jim would like to say something or (unintelligible) perhaps.

Jim Galvin: Sorry (unintelligible).

(Chris): Okay no problem. Okay so in that case I am wondering if it would be helpful for me to go through that earlier email. I think my instinct is that that might be a good thing to do because it didn't - I think it didn't get picked up. And we have time so we might as well.

Okay so I think a lot of this stuff is actually unlikely to be controversial. It is just - certainly there are some points which I am aware need addressing at some point. So I will certainly raise a few of those.

(Peta) Would you like to pick up something there?

(Peta): Hi (Peta). Sorry I should have read it more carefully before I raised my hand. I was actually on the comment on the first point of each drafted recommendations alternatives.

And I just saw the comments on (unintelligible) 1 on the first point. I didn't see it on the first point of (unintelligible) but then I actually saw that it is already been changed there.

(Chris): Oh I think...

(Peta): Yes just wanted to be sure that we had the same text in so to speak. The same way of recommendation in the first points. But now when I read it more carefully I see it is already there (unintelligible).

(Chris): Okay I think I know what you are talking about. This is one of the changes between Version 6 and Version 6A. So I think when I did Version 6 I actually misunderstood one of my (unintelligible) comments.

And I thought it just referred to one recommendation but then I reread it and realized it referred to all of them. So that was actually one of the reasons why we have got 6A rather than just 6.

(Peta): Yes that's okay. Sorry.

(Chris): Yes okay thank you. So now I think one of the general things which I really would like to raise is that a lot of the time we are referring to law enforcement for example.

But a lot of these statements may be wider. So I think for example, in Comment 15 ends at 16. There is talk about - actually slightly - I have to put my glasses on to see this. I am really struggling.

A lot of the time was saying law enforcement but in fact there is an idea that some of these things may be wider. So if you read this and you see law enforcement and you can think of other organizations which would be similarly affected it would be a really good change to mention them.

Jim would you like to pick up something?

Jim Galvin: Excuse me. Sorry that moment I had to cough. So Jim Galvin.

Yes one of the things I wanted to ask about which is different than what you were talking about with law enforcement there. Would it make sense - is it possible to reorder some of these bullets? I know that there are bullets which is intended expressly to not imply any kind of ordering.

We all appreciate that you know bullets even so people tend to take them - the first thing, you know, first is more important than the rest. And I had a specific suggestion in the case of this particular section here. The section on opposing arguments.

(Chris): Yes.

Jim Galvin: I would like to see the last four bullets pulled up just the way they are ordered in the last four and have them made the first four.

(Chris): Okay. So...

Jim Galvin: So the fourth to last bullet is accurate transformation is very expensive. And starting with that one I would like to make that one listed first and all the other three under it be 1, 2, 3, 4 and then everything else we have.

(Chris): Yes okay. Right. I think certainly I very much like the idea. That argument on expense is very, very powerful. So yes I have no problem with moving that. Just have a quick look in the chat room and see what is going on here.

And (Amar) is saying he is going to send some comments which is absolutely fine. And then yes, ah yes okay. I am just referring to versions. It should be 6A.

So yes (Emily) is then saying that in the chat room that it would be good to do that move. Yes I think that sounds like an improvement. Because as you say, at present I don't think there is an ordering but you are absolutely right.

People will tend to see the first ones as being more important. So yes that is sounds good. Let's move the last four (unintelligible) okay.

Okay so that then brings us back to other things which have come up. And we are more or less in the right place to deal with this one. So we have got an example, you know, I am aware that we probably need more examples by the way. But I think all we can do is just gradually build them up.

And here we have a large example because we have actually got this ccTLD example. And there was a comment at one point that I heard that could be some problems in guessing this approach to work with gTLDs.

I don't know whether anybody knows more about that but I would be quite interested to have the information about that.

Waiting for a moment because I hear some typing going on. So basically the example is talking about ccTLDs. And the bullet point is suggesting that the gTLDs take a similar approach.

Somebody in the past I am sure of it said that there was some reason why the ccTLD approach wouldn't work and I don't know why.

So if somebody happens to know why that would be an improvement - obviously that would be an improvement because it may be that we no longer want to use this an example for example. It could be that sort of situation.

There is a lot of typing going on at the moment. I will just wait for the result of that. (Rudy) is saying, ccTLDs have other relations to the data and (unintelligible) yes that is certainly true.

So this is the point in the middle of Page and I think it is Page 11. I am struggling to see. But it is the one with the large example with all of this data in the middle of the screen which is ccTLD data. It is that one.

Okay Jim would you like to pick up that or something else?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you (Chris). On this point here I am not sure I am understanding the question. I mean I guess I was kind of leaving the bullet points as is. My understanding of the bullet point - no let me do it differently.

So the question I would have based on the fact that you have opened this discussion on this bullet point is I think that there are options here in this if we want to dig in a little bit right?

Are we talking about, you know, the information could be in whatever the local script and language is but the labels might be left in a Latin script, you know, obviously. Probably US (unintelligible) English.

This would allow, you know, for identification of the data elements even if the data elements themselves are in a different language and script.

But it is also possible that for local usage, you know, you might want those labels to be in also be in a local language or a script along with the data because otherwise local usage is hindered since they might be able to understand the label.

Do we have any - I don't think we have actually talked about this particular point here but if I were to dig into this particular bullet point and question what we are really trying to get at that is what I would ask.

Do we have a preference on that particular issue and what is the point we are trying to make? Thank you.

(Chris): Thank you. Just to clarify something in the chat room before we go on. It is Page 13. I couldn't see what the number was. It looked like 11 which it is probably 15.

Okay so this is really the thing I was trying to bring up in the recommendations that by having the field names in as many languages as possible then those things are - whatever the language is in then at least we know what refers to what.

So (unintelligible) is one of those - is only one possibly for representing the field names. So yes the field names would definitely be an (unintelligible) as one possibility. But the more languages we could provide field names in the better. That is really the idea behind it.

So yes as (Amar) is typing in the chat room it is the address labels not the data. And this also goes back to what I was saying about the definition of

transformation that in this particular case we are talking about translation of field labels. We are not talking about transformation of data.

Jim Galvin: So I think then just to respond to that. Jim Galvin again. I think I would probably I would like to and I am going to think about it for a moment. But I think maybe a slightly different wording of this would be appropriate or maybe that we should first ask the following question of the group.

Are we suggesting that - I am sorry just trying to collect my thoughts here for a minute. I am concerned about this tension between whether the labels should match the language or script of the data or not and the circumstances under which it should be one or the other. So it feels like we are not being clear there.

On the one hand if you are suggesting that we suggesting that we support labels being in different languages and scripts is that something that should just happen in real time on the part of somebody?

I guess in this case probably the registry since they are going to be the ones ultimately who are providing the directory service.

Or are we suggesting that there will be a standard translation of these things available from, I don't know just say a table that ICANN maintains and registries would simply be using that table to display the data appropriately.

You know I mean we are sort of - we are skirting that whole issue of how the label transformations are done with our focus on the data transformations. And I think that, you know, in this bullet we probably should begin on that detail and speak to that more specifically. Thank you.

(Chris): Thank you. Yes so I think translating the labels in to a number of languages is a relatively small job and the - I mean certainly in comparison with the transformation of the data.

So there would be a benefit in it being done centrally and then adopted in various different areas. So it is good to be put on the spot.

I mean I suppose that possibly there was an idea that if ICANN was designing the replacement database that this would be part of the replacement. I think that would certainly be one way to go.

What you wouldn't want would be lots of small organizations all doing the same translating the field labels.

Jim Galvin: Right just quickly, you know, as a response I agree with you. I think as I think about this now in the context of this call I think there is an issue here that we probably should spend a little more time thinking about or discussing.

You know I don't have any problem with transforming the labels. I actually do think that if the data is in a different language or script that the label should match the language or script of the data.

Although I also see a case which suggests that maybe it should appear in both. Anyway I will be quiet now. You have got another hand up there. Thank you.

(Chris): Okay thank you. Just to add a couple of comments to that. There are possibly several ways to go here. I mean one possibility was sort of the central route whereby one organization would do the entire translation of the field labels, perhaps ICANN.

The other one would be that perhaps it would be possible in some way for registrars to translate but only for their - to create another set of labels locally. I mean that would be another possibility.

But oddly enough for me I think the - I quite like the idea of just having different interfaces that different registrars could use depending on the language of the people using the system. I think that was the original idea anyway.

Emily would you like to come on this - comment on this one?

Emily Taylor: Yes thank you (Chris). It is a really and timely discussion. Like Jim I think that we could easily spend some more time on this and this is an area where I think that the, you know, the data fields are known and limited in number. They are quite standardized.

And so there is a lot more - it seems a lot more ready to, you know, say for example if there were language packs or as you said (Chris). I can think of for example some of the idea new gTLDs like Dutch Tobacco, some of the Chinese names.

Whether there is an obvious target audience and target language? And it may well be that the registry or registrars who are selling those names would be presenting the field names in say Arabic or Chinese or whatever was suited.

And that some sort of, you know, it could be like a language pack or some sort of central case system where you could say, well I know that that - I might not be able to read the squiggles there but I know that that's something that is a registrant name and I know that that is the street name.

(Chris): Yes.

Emily Taylor: And I think in a way that that could in some measure start to meet the concerns that (Peta) and others have been highlighting where are looking at completely alien set of data and you don't know what is what.

So I can really see the utility of that. And rather than trying to transform the entire universe of possible labels that could be put into those fields. Then the field names themselves might well be a good thing for us to start on.

I made the suggestion of the language part but I don't think that we're yet ready to propose a solution. I think that it would be quite handy, quite useful at this stage to discuss a little bit more whether people agree that some sort of key to understanding what the labels mean in different languages would be useful, thank you.

(Chris): Thank you, thank you very much indeed. However, whatever the solution is that is used to translate the field labels, whether it's done centrally or locally I think it really is a case where a small amount of work, you know, just a very limited - there are very limited lists could provide a huge benefit.

You know, just doing that simple task just makes things so much clearer. So yet - yes I think we probably need to spend longer, you know, thinking about, you know, very, you know, the possibilities of doing it.

But yes I mean it certainly does seem to be a situation where really a very small amount of work will cover a huge area. Now (Amar) is asking in the chat room and actually refers straight back to what I've been saying.

Are we saying that we're translating the data labels rather than transliterating them? So I think usually we probably would be translating them, there may be some situations there language is actually used transliterated versions of English for this sort of thing.

I think Japanese would be very likely to use transliterated field labels I think, they (unintelligible) they very often transliterate. But I think usually we are - we would be talking about translation because, you know, it's much more useful to, you know, to translate something like a street address in the

language rather than just having address or something like that, which is much more difficult.

(Petina) would you like to pick up something?

(Patina): I - (Petina) here for the transcript. I just want to say I agree with the benefit of the label transforming. But I was wondering I maybe...

(Chris): (Petina) we have some sort of technical problem, you may need to type in the chat room I'm not hearing what you're saying. Okay no we've still got some sort of technical problem there.

Yes, no there's still trouble, yes but now typing is coming through thank you very much (Patina). Okay, yes basically she's just agreeing with that idea, yes it's a very practical way of moving forward and yes and it does a lot of work.

So and we might want to refer to the list of languages here, yes well in the - yes okay well we'll certainly have a look at that. ISO 639-1, well okay we can certainly look at the parameters of what we might be doing there.

You know, it is at least quite a discrete job that it's quite limited so that's a very practical suggestion. Okay, I assumed (Rudy) has these given the Wiki (P) dealing, okay.

Something - I might want someone to help to explain more on how it will display. Yes okay so the display of the data would be just really be original data but it would be broken down into the fields.

I mean obviously there would need to be more work on making sure it's displayed well like on the interface of the registrar. I think so yes, (Rudy) is sending through all sorts of stuff on the codings now.

Codings for the representation of names of languages, okay. Two letter codes for languages yes, yes see an only slight issue I can think may come up here is that there are an awful lot of languages in the world and we are going to have to make - we are going to have to limit the ones.

It probably isn't going to be possible to do all of them but if we can find a way of doing that then this may be a really good way forward. Can that be done in a way that is easily searchable (Petter) is asking for anyone looking for the content information a quick search.

I certainly hope so yes, I mean presuming we have monies to get the labels into the language that person is using I would say. IETF language tags, yes. Yes so it's a set of languages, which is really the biggest view here.

Emily is writing I suggest we try to think of an on the fly type of translation of labels both for people entering data and for people searching data. Yes, otherwise it could be cumbersome and expensive.

Yes because I suppose the thing is that if even if you do a small job, if you do it 1000 times it certainly becomes a big job yes. And if we stick to the IETF then we respect Internet standards.

I wonder how many languages, yes. Well let's us all - let's us by all means be practical about that one, yes. I mean certainly before when I know that alarm bells to some extent have rung when we've been talking about limiting them as languages.

But if we can, if we can find a useful list then that could be really good or yes okay, Emily is also saying minimalist approach six UN languages. Well, it would be possible to do that incredibly quickly but yes I suppose the small number is possibly controversial or at least the languages - yes okay.

At least the languages that have ccTLD use. Okay, UN ccTLDs well it sounds as if we can have a bit of fun on the list discussing what list could be used but yes I think it might be possible to be quite generous with it because as far as we can see it's certainly in comparison with transforming data.

This is a small amount of - yes okay, I understand that over 90% of the world's population speak about (70) yes and yes okay but the thing is there is a tremendous advantage to taking the list that is uncontroversial as possible here I think because otherwise there will always be cases on the edge as well.

There are debates right, yes and we certainly don't want to be doing 6000, no. (Rudy) is raising the point should we - is it actually our responsibility, yes it would be very nice if it wasn't.

UN languages may be unsatisfactory as I'm afraid that is my instinct but there is a certain consistency in the - and if it works in the UN environments and people are used to it, okay.

Well I think if we can make a practical suggestion I think we should do it but let's maybe take this one out of the meeting and do it on the list. But yes I mean we could always say that it shouldn't be us doing it but on the other hand if there is a handy list that would certainly not be a bad thing to do.

Just waiting for the chat room to settle down a bit. Okay we are talking about gTLD is the term, the address, specific regions. Yes that could well bring the number down.

To be clear, and then to be clear are we suggesting that the data labels are available in local languages but only translated to six UN languages? Yes this is worth picking up because here I thought that this meant that what we were saying was that basically there were six - well six or whatever the number is.

So let's just presume from that we're talking the UN languages then effectively what you've got is six interfaces. So with one interface the labels will appear in English, in another interface, you know, that might be in French, it's that sort of approach.

That's - yes okay so yes it is a sort of an interface thing and this is why I was saying earlier that my instinct is that whoever designs the replacement gets this job and okay let's just come away from our various discussions about languages and, you know, in fact there is one last thing that I definitely want to come back to.

There were three things that I wanted to bring up and I've done two, there's one last one but before I do that I would just like to mention something about the timetable.

So the idea now is that what I'm hoping is going to happen is that we work hard on getting in edits for a new version. So we'll be doing version 7 and the deadline for that is the - is I kind of want to say GMT, sorry UTC 2400 hours on Monday.

So the idea is we get - please be very practical so if you're, you know, comments are welcome on the list. If you can send texts that may speed things up a bit.

So the idea is that we do another version by the end of Monday and then in next weeks call originally we weren't going to run the call next week but the feeling now is that we should do it.

We prepare the initial report for submission. So I just wonder if anybody would like to pick up anything there. (Patina) would you like to do that?

(Patina): I - can you hear me now?

(Chris): Yes, yes it's working yes.

(Patina): Okay speaking of the transcript I was wondering or I'm sorry but I just need to bring it about verification because I just really think if we relate it to each other if initially if it's early we'll be fine then I think it is very (less) important to translate it but if you need the translation before you're doing the verification then the translation becomes quite important.

So I'm not sure if are we taking that into account no? I just wonder about it.

(Chris): Yes, yes so the validation and verification are I think are separate from this because transformation of data could effect - so if for example there was a situation where data was transformed then - and then there was also a decision that validation was happening with transformed data.

I think there are relatively few people who would recommend that but if that would happen then obviously, you know, transforming or not transforming becomes very important.

However here we are only talking about labels so it's actually quite interesting to know how that validation would be happening. But I don't think the labels would cause any trouble with validation or verification as far as I know.

Okay, (Peter Green) has brought up a few things in the chat room so I'll just read those briefly and just see if there's anything we need to take up. Maybe the point I want to make is not going to - is another issue okay.

The main purpose of transformed data is to allow those not familiar with the original script. Yes okay I remember that but I think there is a logical issue here, which we may have missed, yes good.

My point is starting from the need of content, how is it possible likely for those unfamiliar with the original to contact the registrant. Yes that is a point that

has been taken up because one of the points in the report is saying and it's a point against transforming.

It's saying that even if you transform you may not, you know, it may be of no use to you because the original person won't understand English. So I think that point is taken up.

Now let's have a look, how is it possible for an English speaker to contact the registrant to register the domain name in Arabic, how is it likely for a Chinese person to contact the registrant to register the domain name in Russian.

Okay so the Arabic one I've just spoken about and the short answer is that, you know, it probably, you know, even if you transform that's probably not going to work.

There is no intention for transformation to be done into any other language except ASKi, well ASKi English. Most of it is transliterated ASKi, there may be a little bit of translated English.

Then I think we should do some discussion on the possibility rather than accuracy mentioned above of, you know, whether it's actually possible to do it. Yes, I think actually we - there has been some discussion on the ins and outs of doing that.

And then the whole relationship of accuracy because it's controversial whether original or transformed data, you know, the relationship between that and accuracy that is something that's come up.

I think we should do some - I mean it matters in regard to whether transformation is mandatory. Now that's a point I'm not totally understanding. It's whether it can actually be transformed.

Well yes I mean it's whether it can be transformed in the sense that there may not be transliteration systems in some cases. So in that case the two big

problems here would be either there is no system to transform the data, that's the case in some languages or in the case of some other languages there are several systems weren't not sure which one to use.

So that sort of thing does affect possibility. (Amar) sorry I kept you waiting a long time.

(Amar): That's okay (Chris), this is (Amar). I just wanted to make a couple of points on this topic before we move on or end of the call, thing - just things to take into consideration.

For one thing, I really believe that any registrar should have flexibility to provide services in any language they see fit according to the market they're trying to address, the market of registrants.

So if a registrar wants to sell domain names under gTLDs to any country using any language or script they should have the flexibility to label the data while selling, I mean in their interface while selling their services.

To a local population they should have the flexibility to do so but I'm also mindful of another policy the (thick) Whois policy where response consistency was an issue where a registry could dictate a consistent form in which data labels are collected by registrars and sent over to the registries.

So I just think these are two things we need to take into consideration and moving forward addressing this and maybe we could discuss this further on the list.

The (thick) Whois PDP is recommended and this was picked up by the board afterwards I guess where data labeling should be consistent, which makes it easier to parse from one entity to another like a registrar to a registry.

And this also includes uniformity in the scripts and uniformity in the data collection and displays standards. So these are things we probably do need to consider as well while thinking about this, thanks.

(Chris): Thank you very much (Amar), I very much liked your point, you know, making it as easy as possible for registrars to sell to any market they like. I mean that's - that makes huge sense and it pulls us in the direction of the labeling being changeable locally in some way.

Unfortunately consistency pulls us in the opposite direction, that means that it needs to be done centrally. So I think we may have two contradictory forces here and I agree with you completely this is certainly an area that we need to spend more time on the list and try and work whether there is some way that we can actually do both.

And you're typing that's the conundrum yes okay, yes okay and Emily is also agreeing with this thing about selling, yes absolutely. Now, whilst Emily is typing and using the few second we have left I'll just go back to (Patina)'s comment.

Just to be clear, how can we narrow down the scope to transforming labels only. Not necessarily we are very keen to transform labels although we're not totally sure how best that should be done.

But the main question, you know, whether it should be mandatory to transform data or not, that is still (unintelligible). So this is just something - this is very likely to be in our recommendations.

Just waiting for things to happen in the chat room, I thought I might just use the thing to - yes, yes in fact subtly enough the point that I was mentioning earlier is very, very close to this.

And it is exactly about, you know, who, you know, who stipulates which languages those should be. Yes so this ties up really well, so it's really funny the last point I was wanting to raise is really connected to this.

Okay and Emily is saying (Amar)'s earlier point was useful, my understanding is that UN language parallel and can speak in their own language and it will be translated into those six languages.

So in the Whois context if UTF 8 is supported data labels and then can be in local languages. Yes, well at the moment we're talking more about labels but yes UTF 8 is definitely the way to go there.

And then maybe we could explore what if the data labels were available in a limited number of languages? Yes although the only issue there is that could affect marketing, which is not to desirable.

And then (Amar) is saying that's the direction I was trying to head us into. Now I think yes I might slightly be missing something in this discussion but we have more or less, we have more or less finished.

So let's wait for a few more things to happen in the chat room and then we should probably gradually wind down. As we were saying earlier be very practical send text to the list and, you know, it would be really, really good if we could find some kind of solution to this.

On the marketing point leading up to the channel and provide tools after the fact for others to understand what the labels mean. Yes okay, yes (Amar) would you like to make a comment?

(Amar): Yes thanks (Chris) this is (Amar). Yes I agree with Emily that the choice of language display should be left up to the channel as she puts it, the marketing channel. And this would help them sell to a local market.

However on sending this information through a registry, which is required certain centralizing the database under a (thick) Whois policy and possibly even further centralization under, you know, post expert working group PDP.

This could be done using six UN languages and the way I see it this isn't really a minimalist approach but actually a broader approach than we've been asked to address in terms of contact data because we're talking about transforming contact data from all languages into one common language or script.

But now we're presenting an option of doing that with data labels to possibly up to six different languages. And so I don't really see that as a problem and I think this could - this is probably doable if - and still allowing registrars to display data while selling domain names through registrants in whatever language or scripts they deem appropriate, thanks.

(Chris): Yes I think, you know, the registrars should certainly have the choice of effectively which interfaces they present, you know, actually which languages they're marketing in.
But, you know, the question is how many interface can we let them have, you know, what is the best way of developing those I suppose?

(Amar): This is (Amar) again if I may, I think my point is that we shouldn't put a limit, not a lower limit or an upper limit, we should let them decide what interfaces they choose to use.

And then they would be required to translate the labels into whatever languages we specify later. But their use should be while selling domain names should be totally up to them I think.

(Chris): Yes, I mean the only issue here is how we ensure consist, you know, if we need to ensure consistency as well then there has to be sort of some central repository for those translations.

So that in the case of an individual language the same translations are always used.

(Amar): Yes, that is correct.

(Chris): Right, well that might be a way of getting the best of both worlds. I wonder I'm still centrally, okay well I think that may be rather a nice place to end the meeting.

We've got a glimmer of a solution there but obviously you are very welcome to hammer things out and as I say the aim will be to produce a document by the end of Monday, Monday the 8th that is.

And I'll just leave you with one final thought and I might speak very quickly two final thoughts. We've got (Patina) talking about the word Thai in Thai script for serving Thai customers and this is another ISO, which I think we need to check and so we can do that after the meeting.

And then Emily on the consistency point, it seems doable to have consistent data set in a number of language - in a limited number of languages. I think we are starting to see possibilities for doing that. It may require some cooperation between registrars and a central body, possibly ICANN or possibly somebody else.

And yes lovely stuff, (Amar) is saying far easier to do that with the labels than with the data. Yes absolutely, yes I mean it's a very small job in comparison with that.

Okay, well I think we should round off and continue this on the list in fact, but thank you for a very good call and I look forward to next week's meeting, goodbye all.

Coordinator: Once again the meeting has been adjourned, thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines, have a great rest of your day.

END