

## **Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION**

**Wednesday 06 November at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Wednesday 06 November 2013 at 1300 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-20131106-en.mp3>

### Attendees:

Chris Dillon - NCSG

Rudi Vansnick - NPOC

Vinay Kumar Singh – individual

Amr Elsadr - NCUC

Volker Greimann – RrSG

Yoav Keren - RySG

Apologies: none

### ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund

Lars Hoffman

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: I just wanted to remind everyone the conference is being recorded. You may go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Julie). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. And welcome to the Contact call on the 6th of November, 2013.

On the call today we have Volker Greimann, Chris Dillon, Rudy Vansnick, Yoav Keren and Vinay Kumar Singh. I have received no apologies for today's call. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And this is Julie Hedlund. And I want to give a special thanks to Lars for pulling together this meeting so quickly and to all of you for being able to join so quickly.

And as you may know - I know some of you - oh I see that Amr has joined us in the Adobe Connect room. Amr, are you on the line? Okay. Okay I see - okay Amr is enabling the audio in the AC room. But just a little bit of background so at last week's GNSO Council meeting on the 31st of October there was a discussion of the motion to approve the charter.

During the discussion it was decided that the motion to approve the charter would be withdrawn in order to give the charter drafting team an opportunity to consider some changes.

And Lars Hoffman very helpfully went through the information sent by Yoav - the question sent by Yoav and Volker and made some suggested changes to the charter, which he sent around last week which I hope that you've all seen. And I know Chris Dillon had some comments that Lars has also tried to include. I have put this document into the Adobe Connect room.

And at this point I'll turn it over to our chairs, Chris and Rudy. But what I do have up on Adobe Connect is where the - is the section of the charter where the changes begin and as they're highlighted in redline.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, Julie. This is Chris speaking. Now, Rudy, what shall we do about the chairing of this meeting?

Rudy Vansnick: Rudy speaking. Well, Chris, I would suggest you did marvelous work in the past so I think you can do it again. Go ahead.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you very much for that, Rudy. This is Chris speaking. So all I'm going to do is - well actually first of all we need to have a look at today's agenda and make sure we just follow it. So we've done the roll call.

I need to officially ask people whether there are any changes in the Statement of Interest statements because, you know, there's been some time since we last met so there just about could have been. Okay just wait a few moments just in case.

Okay that being...

Rudy Vansnick: Amr raised his hand.

Chris Dillon: Oh, yeah, sorry. Just a minute, I was looking at the wrong screen. So let's - yes, Amr please speak.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah. Thanks, Chris. Thanks, Rudy. Yeah, just one change on my SOI is that I will be serving as the NCSG representative to the GNSO Council starting the end of the Buenos Aires meeting. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay. This is Chris speaking. Thank you very much for that, Amr. Okay so in that case we move into the main part of the agenda which is looking through the documents and just analyzing the various changes that have been suggested.

And Julie has displayed the document on Page 4 so the first question is whether there is any change that we are unaware of before then or are we just talking about those paragraphs at the top of Page 4?

Lars, would you like to say something about that?

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, Chris. This is Lars. Yeah, just to confirm that all the changes to the original charter that were submitted on tracked changes. So there's some on Page 4 and it goes also down to Page 5. And I'm just scrolling down. I presume you can see that on the screen. And that is it. Those are the only changes that were made since the charter was submitted.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you very much. This is Chris speaking. Okay so let's go to the top of Page 4 and then just work through systematically. I know for a fact there is one thing that we might as well just be really systematic and go through these changes.

So for the pink text starts and so we've got this thing what exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact data especially in light of the costs that may be connected. So that would seem to be fairly uncontroversial. So, you know, one guesses that people may be talking about security and things like that.

Then we have what was originally one question but which then got split into two. So we've got, "Should translation and transliteration of contact data be mandatory for all gTLDs?"

Now, in fact I've actually thought of another thing which is - may not be totally clear here and I'll just bring it up and that is, you see, I'm hoping that this is actually clear enough that you could have a situation where some parts of contact data were translated and other parts were transliterated.

Now there's parts of me wondering whether we should actually make that clear or whether this is good enough, whether looking at this we can presume that the working group could have a situation where certain parts of the contact data were translated and other parts were transliterated. So it's not a binary choice; it could be sort of the elements of one and/or elements of the other.

You know, there is a question whether we should actually be explicit about that. I don't know whether anybody feels that the document is all right as it is or whether we should actually be explicit. That's really the question.

My own instinct is that we should possibly add text and just, you know, really just encode or so I've just said that we would want the working group to have the option of doing both of these. And they may decide not to. But I feel, personally, that it would be good to give them the option.

Okay...

Yoav Keren: It's Yoav here. I'm going to...

((Crosstalk))

Yoav Keren: ...I think it's a good idea that...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Right, yeah, so...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: I will draft something which will just make clear that it isn't a binary decision; that it could be one or the other but it could also be a mixture. Okay thank you for that, that was - just adding that.

And then moving forward we've then got - so should translation transliteration of contact data be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries. I have no comment about this at all. I think we're just fine leaving it there.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Rudy would like to say something so please fire away.

Rudy Vansnick: Yes, thank you Chris. Rudy speaking. Well, I think that it should not be restricted to certain countries. Translation or transliteration is not specific for countries; it has to do with information that could not be available for (unintelligible) and that typical language that is used in the contact data. That's my personal opinion.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you, Rudy. This is Chris speaking. To an extent I agree with you completely. I was quite surprised to see this question. However, I have no objection to it. And I think effectively what I would like to say is that, you know, that is something that the working group can decide. And, you know, I have feelings about that as well but I don't really want to guess what working group wants to do with that.

And then there are two other people with their hands up. And I think Volker got in before Amr. I'm sorry if it was the other way around. Volker, would you like to say something?

Volker Greimann: Yes thank you. Just to this point I will also think that countries may not be the best diversifier. Maybe using certain languages would be better here or using certain scripts, i.e. would a registrant using Roman script be used to transliterate or translate? Probably not. Would the same registrant, if he entered a Chinese script and be for transliteration and translation? That would be another issue to consider.

So rather than looking at where the registrant is actually based we should look at what he's actually entering into the Whois or what he should be - what he can enter. That may be a consideration...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Okay.

Yoav Keren: I'm sorry, I'm not on the Adobe Connect at this point. I'd get in line. It's Yoav.

Chris Dillon: Sorry?

Yoav Keren: Yeah, it's Yoav. I just want to - I can't raise my hand, I'm not in the Adobe Connect...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Oh yeah, okay. Would you like to say something about that?

Yoav Keren: Yeah, but was there anyone else before me in the queue?

Chris Dillon: Yeah, there's Amr and I think wants to say something...

Yoav Keren: Oh.

Chris Dillon: ...so let's just let Amr go first.

Amr Elsadr: Sure. This is Amr, Chris. I actually have a question. And I would defer that to Yoav first, he might actually explain what it is I want to ask.

Chris Dillon: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Yoav Keren: Okay so I want to explain what was my motivation for this point when I raised it. It's coming from the fact that there are official scripts in different countries. Addresses - it mainly refers to addresses. Addresses in different countries are written in specific script that is official in that country.

So for example if you go to China probably addresses are written in Chinese script; in Israel it's written in Hebrew script; in Lebanon, in Arabic script.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Yoav Keren: When you want to - when we're talking about contact data so maybe - maybe you want to decide that only in countries that are using certain scripts and therefore those are specific countries this is where we want to do the transliteration.

It's mainly because I was referring - and, Volker, this is where - by the way, an issue that we've discussed also between us in the Registrars and with the Board also and it goes to the next point of Whois validation - is how can you actually validate these addresses?

And, by the way, my opinion is also no. But I just want to raise that and make sure that that doesn't happen, okay, because it's actually going to make things very, very complicated. But it's very important to understand that there is a difference. And I totally agree there are different scripts but when we are talking about addresses - official addresses in countries are written in an official local script. And this is why I think it's important to discuss this.

Chris Dillon: Yes, okay thank you for that. Amr, does that make things any easier for you - now you've put your hand down...

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, yeah it does actually.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Yoav.

Chris Dillon: This is Chris speaking. I would like to suggest that we change this and we say those based in certain countries or those based in certain countries or in certain scripts so we're just adding the text "or" in certain scripts.

I mean, the complicating situation here is the situation like Singapore where, you know, you could have sort of Roman script; you could have traditional Chinese simplified - oh no sorry, they used simplified Chinese these days - or you could have Tamil. So, you know, some countries do have several scripts and so, you know, you might get into that kind of mine field.

But I think if we put something like only those based in certain countries or only those - or only those in certain scripts, I think that may get around that problem but I shall remain quiet for a moment and just...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: ...wonder whether anybody can improve on that.

Yoav Keren: I think it's okay. I think it's straightforward.

Chris Dillon: Okay. There are some interesting things going on in the Chat room here and just reading my way through those. Volker, would you like to say something?

Volker Greimann: Yeah, thanks Chris. First of all thank you for the comment with the languages with the countries with different scripts; that's exactly what I was getting at. And Amr also raised a point in the Chat; immigrants who don't speak the language of the host country.

I mean, depending on or not if registrations can happen in a certain country or a country that uses a certain script in that script they can also still happen in Roman numbers and therefore make transliteration or translation unnecessary still.

Maybe the word "mandatory" in these two questions should also be looked at. Mandatory for any certain country might not be applicable if the registrant does what he's used to with the current registration and he just uses Roman scripts.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that, Volker. This is raising, you know, really quite a, you know, quite a difficult issue. And it is. You know, for example perhaps we have a - we have a registrant who has been used to doing everything just in the Roman script.

And there is then the issue, you know, what happens if he has to, if he is forced to, if it's mandatory that he then starts processing other scripts which, you know, he does, you know, these are scripts and languages that he doesn't have access to.

So it's actually a big - what I'm trying to say is I think this is a bigger problem than just, you know, immigrant people; it could be any registrant being forced to deal - to do work in languages that they don't command. I mean, this is stuff that the working group definitely needs to talk about. And that's how I have understood the word "mandatory." For me the word "mandatory" is talking about that situation.

But, Volker, would you like to add something to that?

Volker Greimann: Yes, from my experience having lived a couple of years in Japan and looking at Japanese domain name registrations regularly I can see that there is a wild infrastructure or wild variety of ways that the registrants in Japan put their addresses.

Because they're using currently ASCII scripts to place their addresses there and they're doing the transliteration and translation themselves...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Volker Greimann: ...with wildly different results. And that is something that will probably also continue even though you allow non-ASCII scripts in the future. And I'm assuming that those will not have to be translated and transliterated again even if you end up with transliteration and translation at all.

And therefore mandatory - like I said, the word "mandatory" in these two questions might not be the right word to use. But also be considered, I don't know what better word to put there. I just wanted to throw that as a thought.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you very much for that. This is Chris speaking. Yes, I mean, I agree completely. I'm not convinced that it's the best word but I - you know, I have understood it to mean that kind of situation. And incidentally, you know, Japan is the case where there are at least two Romanizations in fairly common usage. And what you actually see when you look at Japanese contact data is often a mixture of both Romanizations.

So, you know, this ends up being very, very tricky. And there are situations where, you know, there are even countries - smaller countries particularly where, you know, there are, you know, there's either no standard Romanization or there are many and they're all competing with each other. And, you know, Romanization just ends up being a terrible headache.

Rudy, you've got your hand up; would you like to add something to this?

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you, Chris. Rudy speaking. Well as I just written also in the Chat I'm wondering if at the end the working group should elaborate a kind of matrix that will help in decide if we are talking about mandatory use of translation and transliteration.

It probably would be good if we can have a matrix with countries and the scripts or languages that could be mandatory in order to avoid that - there will be a misunderstanding of where is the mandatory taking place; the country,

the language, the script. That's, I think, a difficult thing that this has to go through.

Chris Dillon: Okay yes. Thank you for that. That is another possibility here. You might need to send some possible text on that to the list after this conversation I think. This is Chris speaking, by the way. Thank you for that.

I am wondering whether we should now move on to the last of these four points which is the - what impact will translation and transliteration of contact data have on the Whois validation as set out under the 2013 RAA?

And that was actually replacing a piece of text which I had suggested which was saying, when should the working group's recommendations come into (unintelligible) because I added that piece of text originally because I was concerned that you could have two pieces of ICANN policy saying opposite things at the same time.

So to me the, you know, the question of when does this, you know, when does this policy come into effect? You know, for me that's quite an important question. I am wondering whether we actually need to bring this back so whether it would actually be necessary to reinstate that thing and actually have it, you know, when should the working group's recommendations come into effect.

Because, you know, if the recommendations are contradicting something in the RAA then, you know, you've got an issue there. But that also raises the - raises the more general question of whether the working group should be allowed to contradict the RAA. That's a far bigger question.

So what I'm saying is I would like to replace the question about, you know, get that back in. I would like to add, "When should the working group's recommendations come into effect?"

((Crosstalk))

Yoav Keren: Can I be in the queue? It's Yoav.

Chris Dillon: ...to hear any contributions on that.

Yoav Keren: Can I be in the queue? It's Yoav.

Chris Dillon: Yes, please speak, Yoav.

Yoav Keren: Okay so I'm okay with you adding this question. I just think that your original wording that was talking about the Whois validation is important. It's unrelated because, again, that's one of the issues that we need to see, we need to - when the working group gets together and talks about this whether this is actually feasible.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Yoav Keren: So the fact that you're going to have a new policy can be actually - once you have that policy of translation and transliteration - can that be actually used once, you know, for example for validation? Can we - will we be able as registrars to validate those addresses, that contact data as we are required? So that's what I am saying.

And when it will come into effect is another question. You can just add it as the next question. But I still think that considering the other policies that are - have been accepted by ICANN is very, very important in the discussion for translation and transliteration.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Yoav. That's going back to the correspondence that we had on the list where, you know, this was - you know, this is a point that came up on the list. And certainly, you know, this is actually going back to what Volker

was saying about the Japanese case whereby you could get several different Japanese Romanizations all of which are valid.

So, you know, the idea of, you know, the emails were very interesting because in the email the expression "the correct form" was used. And in fact you actually suspect that in a rather difficult situation where there are several Romanizations or there's not even a particularly stable Romanization that you're no longer talking about the correct form; you're talking about a correct form, one of several.

So, I mean, I think it's absolutely right, you know, to flag this up. I mean, if validation of something that, you know, is very strict and, you know, doesn't allow this kind of bandwidth, you know, the sort of movement from one side to another, you know, it doesn't allow several possibilities then, you know, there could be problems there. It needs to be a - you know, it's a validation which would be - will accept, you know, a certain range of things.

And then Julie is suggesting something in the Chat room. And when should the new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect? Yes, that's really what we're - that's what we're saying for that additional bullets.

And there was also an earlier piece about the matrix which I'll just read that out because I think that's helpful. It's to help to answer those - these questions and determine whether translation or transliteration should be mandatory the working group should develop a matrix elaborating a ruling in each possible case for countries in non-ASCII scripts.

Yes, that's a very, very interesting suggestion. To be honest I feel - personally I need to think about that because I'm just worried that that feels like quite a heavy commitment, quite a heavy responsibility. So we could - perhaps we should add that that's part of the document that we really need to

think about very hard because, you know, it looks like quite a difficult responsibility.

Okay and...

((Crosstalk))

Rudy Vansnick: Chris, Rudy speaking. Yes, if I may add some comments to this sentence. It's just a proposal to create such a matrix. And it's the working group at the end who should decide if it's going to use a matrix here...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Rudy Vansnick: ...but it could help to make it easier for the new gTLDs how to understand where their commitment will go to.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you for that. This is Chris speaking again. I think probably perhaps the wording needs to be changed that the working group may wish to consider a matrix along these lines. And, you know, so that way we could say to look, if a matrix is helpful to you, if that's a good way of approaching this then good. But we wouldn't actually be tying them to it, do you see?

So, oh yes, okay so Julie is actually typing some text as I'm speaking. So she's writing, "The working group may wish to consider developing a matrix." Now that, yes, that feels like really - that feels like really good text of the document. But again it's just tying them down really, it's keeping them free to solve it in whatever creative way they want to.

Okay now does anybody else want to raise any points on this text on Page 4? Amr, would you like to add something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I have a question - I'm sorry, I missed the queue to ask questions on the first bullet, what exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact data especially in light of the costs that may be connected. Translation/transliteration...

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Amr Elsadr: I'm just wondering how - I wonder will it be easy for the working group to answer this question? Will they need to determine what the cost of translation and transliteration is before answering this question? And if so, will they be able to do this considering...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: They will not be able to even determine what items in the contact information...

Chris Dillon: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: ...will be translated or transliterated because that's going to be happening in another PDP, correct?

Chris Dillon: Right. Okay, thank you very much for that, Amr. This is Chris speaking. I wonder whether actually we need to edit this text. "What exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact data?" And then lose the rest of it altogether because that is - that could be an onerous responsibility for the working group.

Yoav Keren: Sorry, it's Yoav here. Volker, I think it was your point raised on this. Do you want to (unintelligible) on that or you want me to talk about it?

Volker Greimann: You take the point. I think...

Yoav Keren: Okay. So I think the reason we've raised it as Registrars - and, again, so there has to be something attached in the matter of cost. I understand what you're saying that it was going to be hard to evaluate exactly what's going to be the cost from that perspective.

But if there - if the recommendation is going to be, hey, we need to have this but the cost is there because there is a (unintelligible) benefit. But that benefit is when you look at some estimates of the costs to the community in general is going to be, you know, doesn't worth it at some level then, you know, maybe their recommendation should be okay, you know, what's (unintelligible) cost. I'll exaggerate now. It's going to cost \$1 billion to have that happen and the benefit is not so high so maybe we shouldn't do it.

And that's where this came from that was brought by Volker but I solely support that. So this is why we think that cost to the community in general, it doesn't matter who's paying at the end, whether it's the registrants, the registrars, the registries, ICANN or whoever, should be considered in this discussion at least at some level, even if it's not per site but some level of evaluation.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you for that, Yoav. I think that probably means that we do need to, you know, to leave it there. But, you know, obviously I am trying to - I am trying to give the working group as much freedom as they can here. But I think you may be right, that may be something they need to answer.

Now there are two questions, and I've missed who got there first, I think Volker may have done.

Volker Greimann: Well last time Amr got the second (throw) so I'm letting him go ahead.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Volker. This is Amr. Yeah, just in response to Yoav I think it's a good question that's being asked. And it is valid question and it should be answered. I'm just questioning whether this working group will be able to answer the question. And I'm just concerned about posing the questions and they will find that they lack the capacity or the ability to answer.

And this takes us to a point that we discussed earlier during the drafting of this charter of the fact that there is another PDP which will determine what items in the contact information will be translated or transliterated. And so my question is really will this working group be able to even give a rough estimate of what the costs might be or will they have to sort of hypothesize and guess and then weigh that benefit - weigh the benefit of translation and transliteration against this cost?

I'm just wondering, and I would like to hear other people's thoughts on how - just how fair it would be to ask the working group to make this determination. I'm guessing it might be a serious point of contention during the work of the working group but I'd rather spare them if we feel that this is something that they will find difficult to be performing. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. I think there are strong arguments on both sides of this. Volker, would you like to pick that up?

Volker Greimann: Yes, just as an attachment to that I agree that the working group will probably have a very hard job attaching a dollar figure to this work because there is just so many unknowns in there. There is not just the cost of maybe having a provider that does it but also implementation costs and adaptation costs for current systems. And there are all kinds of background costs that will have to be borne at some point that are not external costs that can be taken over by some party.

There will be costs that the registrar or registries, which will display the data and verify it, will have to bear that will not be on the front edge. But on the

other hand I think the benefits can be more or less determined. It can be - it can be defined by the working group that something is nice to have or something is - needs to be.

Does transliteration and translation provide - which benefits does translation and transliteration actually provide to which stakeholders and how will these stakeholders value that? What they're getting from potential transliteration and translation.

So by enumerating the benefits and talking about what the costs may be without making an actual determination the working group can make a determination if certain factors of translation or transliteration are actually worth it, needs to be or are nice to have and could be in a recommendation or best practices packages for example.

So that's just something that shouldn't be the basis for their final decision but should be an influence in their deliberations. Just keep that in mind what - to determine what the costs - what the benefits are and what the costs may be so if these are somehow in the scale that they even out to just value the - to make the recommendations bear that in mind. That's the main point - my raising that originally.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you very much for that, Volker. I think the - I think the consensus is that we need to leave that clause in but it also strikes me that, you know, it may be good slightly to change the wording so I don't know whether anybody wants to have a go at doing that now or whether it's best done after the meeting.

Amr Elsadr: Can you scroll down to this sentence just have a look what's currently there?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. I've just released the document so you can all scroll - scroll all by yourself.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

Coordinator: This is the Operator. All the lines are still connected.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you. I think probably that needs a little more thinking about. You know, the text at the bottom of Page 4 is interesting. Volker, would you like to say something?

Volker Greimann: Just for the - top of Page 5 the thing is I don't really like the issue of - that who should decide who should bear the cost. I think that misses the point. But I think we should rather focus on making an evaluation of costs versus - of potential costs versus expected benefits in the recommendations, i.e. deliberating what the - what the recommendations are actually supposed to achieve and if that is still reasonable with the expected costs. That's, I think, the better question you need to ask.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. So to some extent that matrix may be replacing this bit. This is Chris speaking. Okay, Rudy, would you like to say something about that?

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you, Chris. Rudy speaking. Yeah, well I think that the matrix can help in a certain way. But again, first of all I'm wondering if it's possible to calculate the real costs first of all of translation and transliteration. It all depends on a lot of things.

At the other side who is querying the translation and transliteration that aspect needs to be discussed. And I think that if we could put that in the matrix it can help the working group in having a final decision on which way to go that the end.

Chris Dillon: Yes, okay thank you for that. So I think probably we are talking about both. Volker, would you like to say something at this point?

Volker Greimann: Sorry, just forgot to take...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yeah, no problem. So I think the consensus there is - and this is still Chris speaking - that we will leave that text there and possibly have more of a think about it after the conversation. And I think that means we are down to the last additional sentence, which is the - finally the working group is expected to review and check relevant recommendations that may arise from the Expert Working Group on gTLD directory service when those become available.

Yeah, okay so I wouldn't think that's going to be too controversial unless somebody would like to raise something about that last addition? But if not Julie has been adding something about the matrix which is, "To help to answer these questions and determine whether translation or transliteration should be mandatory and to help consider the costs the working group may wish to consider developing a matrix elaborating the ruling and potential costs in each possible case for countries in non-ASCII scripts."

Yes, that sounds lovely. Thank you very much for that. Okay so I now get to ask the question, is there anything else anybody would like to bring up? Yes, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: I had a question. I think it's - I think it was Volker noted, you know, we have added the text at the top of Page 5 that says, "As part of its deliberation on who should decide who should bear the costs," and the text that follows, are we keeping that text in or is the text that we have concerning the matrix replacing that text. I'm a little unclear based on the...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: This is Chris speaking. My understanding is that we're keeping both but if Volker or anybody else would like to make a case for something else that's also good.

Volker Greimann: Volker speaking. I am always in favor of making the charter more broad so including more options, having both options in there, the matrix and this language, I think is helpful.

Chris Dillon: All right. Just something going on in the Chat room but, yeah, I think this - so what - oh yes, and Julie, would you like to...

Julie Hedlund: Just one other question. Chris, in - when we were talking about Page 4, there was some text I thought that you mentioned adding. And I don't - I didn't capture - I was not able to capture...

Chris Dillon: It's in the comments. So the comment - you see originally Bullet Point 4 - I actually replaced it and I said, "When should the working group's recommendations come into effect?" And then somebody came back - it might have been Volker - came back and said, no, actually what was intended was what impact will - and then as it reads.

So I think our agreement was that it would actually be helpful to reinstate my comment as a separate bullet point so we end it with 5.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Thank you for that clarification because I don't - I hadn't captured that correctly in the document. And just so that you all know all the things that I've been putting into the Chat room I've incorporated into the - I've incorporated into the document as redline on top of, you know, the redline that Lars had put in. So that was what I was planning on sending around to this group.

Which leads me to another question and that is, do we need another meeting to discuss the revised version that I've tried to capture here?

Chris Dillon: Hello, Julie. My own impression is that we do not require another meeting. We have officially 30 minutes to, you know, to talk about any of the edits we've made or even make new edits. Obviously, you know, once you've updated the document it is possible that there will be some discussion on the list. But I feel now that that is unlikely to need another meeting.

Lars, would you like to say something?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. Just to - just to point out that if there is - if the Council were to consider this in Buenos Aires meeting it has to be submitted on Monday. So if we agree not to have a meeting and send it out via the list and then people would like to come back we would have to agree to either do this - if they want to submit for the Monday to do this via the list or have a very ad hoc meeting on Friday, which might not be the easiest thing to organize.

Chris Dillon: Indeed. So the conclusion there is that this - because of that Monday deadline this has to be treated as very urgent at this point. So if there is somebody who does, you know, who reads the document and thinks oh, you know, this really has missed something then that really has to be treated as a very urgent so that we meet the deadline. Okay and, Rudy, what would you like to say about this?

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you, Chris. Rudy speaking. Well I think that with the modifications that we brought up in the document now we are in fact responding to the questions that the GNSO Council had about the charter and the working group definition. So I really don't see any need to go in further discussions.

If we can agree on what we decided now it can be sent within the time limit requested so that it can be handled in the Buenos Aires meeting and the decision can be taken so that the working group can be launched. Further delay would not be good as we know that certain new gTLDs will be launched

within the next few months. So I would propose that we try to keep it in the timing and that it can pass on the Buenos Aires meeting.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you very much indeed for that, Rudy. I completely agree with you. I think we've, you know, we've had a good discussion about the various additions. It, you know, we have addressed them. We've taken the trouble to clarify some of them. And, you know, the drafting looks very good to me.

I think, you know, we should allow people just to, you know, to read the updated document but that anything that would come out of it would be small enough to be - so that we can settle it on the list rather than requiring a dedicated additional meeting this week.

Yoav Keren: Sorry, guys, I need to leave in a minute, it's Yoav. Can I just say something?

Chris Dillon: By all means.

Yoav Keren: So first - thank you all for, you know, the very fast process here. I'm happy that we were able to do this this way. I think we're, you know, okay. I think it's enough that everyone will be able just to read the corrections, then we can submit it on time for Buenos Aires.

And I will be happy to be the one proposing it to the Council - to submit it to the Council. I'm sure Volker will second it. And we can quickly have this charter passed.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that, Yoav. That is really good to hear. Okay...

Amr Elsadr: Yes, Amr speaking. We have no intention of keeping this any longer than it has to be. I mean, we saw a few deficiencies in the charter that we thought that were limiting to the work of the actual working group in the Council. And we want this on the way as soon as possible. So if you can get it ready for

Buenos Aires I am certain that at least from the Contracted Party's House there will be no objection to passing this.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. Okay, any other business at this point? We have a bit more than five minutes left now. Oh yes, Julie is actually saying in the Chat room that we should actually set a deadline and say that anything on the mailing list needs to be put there by the close of business on Friday which I would certainly agree with and Rudy's typing so does he. And Amr is agreeing as well.

Okay I think we are probably done. That just leaves me to say thank you very much to everybody for turning this around. And, you know, that we've, you know, we've had a really good conversation today and we've managed to get through it and we've avoided, you know, we have also avoided having to do another meeting, which may not, you know, may have struggled to be quora at later in the week.

And there's some nice things in the Chat room. Okay, thank you very much. And...

Amr Elsadr: Thank you.

Chris Dillon: ...probably be running into people in Buenos Aires. Look forward to that.

Amr Elsadr: See you there.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Yes.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, everybody. See you in Argentina.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, indeed, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, (Julie), you may now stop the recording.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: ...today's conference. Please disconnect at this time.

END