ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 10 April 2014 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT call on the Thursday 10 April 2014 at 13:00 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-20140410-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr

Attendees:
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Wanawit Ahkuputra– GAC
Peter Green – NCUC
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Sarmad Hussain – SSAC
Amr Elsadar – NCUC
Peter Dernbach - IPC

Apologies:
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Ephraim Percy Kenyanito – NCUC

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Amy Bivins
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Thank you. The recordings are now started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, (Laura). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 10th of April, 2014.

On the call today we have Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Peter Green, Petter Rindforth, Jennifer Chung, Wanawit Akhuputra, Chris Dillon, Jim Galvin, Sarmad Hussein and a little bit Ephraim Percy Kenyanito will be joining. We have no apologies today.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman, Amy Bivins and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. This Chris Dillon. Rudi Vansnick emailed me that he would probably not be able to make this call. In fact he may have said he couldn't make this call a few weeks ago so let's count that as an apology.

And move into Number 3 on the agenda which is Statements of Interest. So if anybody on the call has changed their - has a change in their Statement of Interest since the last call we have to bring that up.

Seeing no hands raised I think we can move into Number 4 on the agenda which is the responses from SOs and ACs. And excellent, we've got the IPC response on the screen.

So now, Petter, I think you were saying you were able to present that, is that all right?

Petter Rindforth: Yes.

Chris Dillon: Okay. I'll just get my annotated copy ready. Please start.

Petter Rindforth: Okay. Thanks. Well as stated here this is initial comments. So it's our first expressions and replies to the questions. But thought it was important to get out to our comments at this stage.

And I'm not sure that I need to go into all of the detail but, as I say, more generally on the first question we think it's from an IP perspective as well as for the identification in general on - when it comes to this kind of international domain names and contact information that the Whois information we feel (unintelligible) at least should be registered in respect of each language script that is related to the home country and address of each holder.

But is also most desirable and necessary to translate contact information to what we say a single common language in order to keep the Whois information easily searchable and readable for all of global Internet users.

And before I pass on to the next one I discuss this issue with some other participants at the last ICANN. And I got some input from other representatives from other groups that when we talk about all the different kinds of translation and transliteration some members from the official committees actually stated that it could be fair enough to have maybe something that could be called an official ICANN translation so that if possible to keep to one single English translation even if, as we have seen, there are many kind of different local translations.

And on the benefits well we say it was finally formed in a more diplomatic way what I originally stated that without the proper translation or transliteration of contact information the Whois record will in fact lose its clarity. And it may cause difficulties for - both for the domain holders in confirming that they have updated and correct contact information which is also important when it comes to renewals and in aspects to see if it's the real holder.

But may also cause unnecessary legal actions or unnecessary alternative dispute resolutions actions where the holder of domain name cannot be properly identified and contacted. Meaning in many cases it's - the initial possibility to contact the holder to solve some difficulties may actually release the need for going forward with a dispute or a solution action.

So in fact the combination of contact information in both the holder's local language and one what we call worldwide acceptable translation and transliteration should provide an adequate legal basis for sufficient identification of contact information in national legal actions as well as in global domain name disputes.

And on the question of should it be mandatory for all gTLDs, yes, we think so. I mean, although the ambiguities in there by the need for clarifications are more obvious when it comes to contact information not using the current ASCII Whois. There are in fact difficulties to solve in all languages.

I mean, I'm from Sweden and we have our dots over the Os and As that can be without the dots and with the dots can be quite different

kind of words. And, I mean, we're talking about a (unintelligible) with just maybe three or four letters that have that kind of problem. I mean, it would solve a lot if translation and/or transliteration of contact information is mandatory and for all gTLDs.

And if I scroll down to who should bear the burden of translation contact information we actually - I don't know if we discussed this at the last meeting we had but we initially support the ALAC statement that decision on who should bear the burden of transforming contact information should be informed by the views of and impact of all affected parties which could include the provider of the information and those involved in collecting and maintaining the information.

So kind of split it up and also on the last question as we see it now the costs should be divided by - between registries and registrars but also having a mind that the final responsibility of correct contact information lies on each registrant.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that, Petter. I think there is a question in the chat room about the concept of official ICANN translation. Actually that was a question I had as well but I'm just wondering whether Pitinan has the same question I have.

Basically I thought that a lot of organizations - ah, actually something's come through, let's have a look at that. Just wondering if we actually should focus on the validation and verification, that's actually another issue.

Okay let's stick with the - with the ICANN official translation concept. Now a lot of organizations actually decide that they want particular forms of their organization or name in English or in another language so, you know, typically you might have a Chinese organization that has a form in Chinese characters which could be transliterated.

But typically they will have a translated form and it will be an officially translated form for the organization. And then there maybe an acronym and they may do that for more than one language so essentially a lot of this work may already have been done by organizations so it's quite interesting to see a proposal that perhaps ICANN should rubber stamp perhaps some of those translations. That was really the comment I was wanting to make about that concept.

I mean, I suppose there are also then straight away we get into its views of validation and verification because we have to say well are we going to be validating the original forms or are we going to be validating forms in other languages.

Now there are two questions about this. One from Jim, would you like to ask yours, Jim?

Jim Galvin: Yes, I have a couple of questions. Did you want me to focus in a particular area or I have a couple of questions about a couple different things.

Chris Dillon: I think probably if we go by area that might be the - that might be the quick way to proceed. So, please, address this one first and then well come back to other areas a little later.

Jim Galvin: So this is the - so the validation is what you're talking about here?

Chris Dillon: Well actually it started off with being an issue about official translations but validation comes into that pretty quickly.

Jim Galvin: Okay, if you want to talk about official translation then I'll hold my question.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you. Petter, would you like to come back with something on this?

Petter Rindforth: Just a comment. And now I'd be just from a personal point of view, I mean, if there are some parts but what you call the local official translation, I mean, it could still be used by ICANN as the accepted translation.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Petter Rindforth: So, I mean, it's - I don't see it contradictory to what we wrote of it. Correct me if I'm wrong there. But again as we have spoken about so many different possibilities to translate that globally of each country I figure it would be good if we could have at least one source that everyone could turn to and say this is the translation that is at least accepted by ICANN on these point of views even if it not maybe the single local official translation.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, this is Chris speaking. Yes, I mean, there is a situation where - well we know that there is a situation whereby for example quite a lot of Chinese organizations have no official English translation. So that, you know, that is, you know, that is certainly an

issue which needs to be solved one way or another. And I think earlier on in our call we were actually saying if there isn't an official translation we were actually saying probably transliterate it because, you know, even if there isn't an official translation you can always transliterate into English or into Romanization.

But the other possibility may be to say well if there isn't an official translation, you know, which is okay by the organization that somebody okays it. I think there may be some issue, for example, I can - there may be some issues with going that way because I feel that it's really important that the individual organizations are happy with those translations.

And there may be some administrative overhead here because if your chasing organizations for an official translation, you know, to get something okayed that's something that could end up taking quite a lot of time.

Now I think Lars has had his hand up for some time. Sorry I've taken some time to get back to you. Would you like to ask something about this?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. Yes, just two small things related to I suppose (unintelligible) verification. I read through the IPC's comments and also others that were submitted over the past few days. And I was just wondering especially - I suppose it goes back to Petter but also to other lawyers on this call so for people who would use the contact information essentially and who would benefit from being able to access the information in an ASCII script, whether they would, you know, I'm a law-adjacent person, let's say.

And to me it would make more sense if other, be given it a Chinese or a script that it didn't understand, that was clearly marked as where I can see this is the name, this is the email, but I wouldn't understand what it means or what the address is. I would assume that the lawyers and even law enforcement would undertake their own translation in any case because they would assume that the original type (in) data is the more (unintelligible) to this one. We can discuss whether that's true enough but it just (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. I think a lot of people might think that certainly the original form, so if we use Chinese as an example, so in the Chinese case we might say that the original Chinese form in Chinese characters may end up being the most important form.

And then, you know, if that particular organization has an English form, an English translated form which it's happy to use then it's fairly clear what happens then, you know, that's going to be easier for people to use.

Now if the organization doesn't have an official form, you know, it's possible for anybody to do a literal translation. The problem is that people will - different people will translate in different ways. So you then run the risk of getting several possible translations to the same organization and, you know, you then may decide that you want to get back to the original organization say, look, are you happy for this to be used as your name. And that could be time consuming.

The alternative would be - well, you know, there are other possible alternatives. One is just to use the original. Now the problem with that

is that I think if it is a language that you're not familiar with I would wonder how happy people would be to do that, you know, particularly, you know, if it's completely unrelated script. Yes, it's an interesting issue.

Lars, would you like to come back on that?

Lars Hoffman: Yeah, it's just an add-on to my thought. Because if you then think that - if you, you know, validation needs to take place at some point of some form or other. The registrant that's allowing people to register in a language different than ASCII would probably be able to verify whatever mechanism would be put in place at some point (unintelligible) (EWT) be able to do that in that script that the registrar offers the registrant.

Chris Dillon: Yeah. Yeah.

Lars Hoffman: So validation would be possible in that matter. And then for somebody who doesn't speak that language - and I know it's (unintelligible) ASCII, obviously, you know, there's (unintelligible), you know, the Russian authorities would like to know somebody who has registered a Korean Website and so ASCII (unintelligible) helps anybody.

But (unintelligible) the issue is that - in my view, and maybe I'm wrong, but I thought the important thing is that I understand from the Whois quest what is the email, what is the street address and what is the name? And then whether that is in Chinese script or in Korean script or in Latin script essentially doesn't matter because I can copy and paste that, I can have it translated myself.

And I can contact that person and if I don't speak Korean well then I have to find a way to (unintelligible) anyway so I send them an English letter (unintelligible) won't be able to understand that in any case.

So I'm just wondering whether the key to translate and transliterate clearly the format of to make sure everybody understands what of those information is the street, what information is the organizational name and what of those is the email address rather than trying to translate it which would lead to lower accuracy and probably much more difficult to validate especially at the registrar level for those registrars are unfamiliar with ASCII because obviously those are around too. So that's just my two cents. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. So are you suggesting that we just use the original script or are you suggesting the other possible route which is transliterating the original script?

Lars Hoffman: I'm not suggesting anything at all. I just thought about this and I'm just wondering what the most effective way is to do this for the end user. And I'm wondering if I was an IP lawyer, if I was, you know, the German federal police I wanted to make sure that the information first of all is correct. That's the key thing for me that the information in there is as best validated as possible.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Lars Hoffman: And the translation of that or transliteration of that is secondary because if the information is correct I will find a way to contact that person.

Chris Dillon: Okay yes. Right okay thank you. Thank you very much, that's clear. Pitinan, would you like to say something about this?

Pitinan Kooarmornpatana: Hi, it's Pitinan here. I would second - I would agree with Lars that the translation and transliteration will be useful if the original data is correct. So that's why I'm asking if you want to focus on the validation. And also I agree with Petter earlier that he said about official local translation and transliteration body which is - I think it make more sense especially when Thai translate to English there are many exceptional cases.

So I don't really see if this can have the single translation system. It probably have to be distributed to each country and probably ICANN can accredit each of that translated body. And maybe if it's not the translation - if it not stop there so ICANN may be should accredit the verification and validation body for each local country or administrative area. So that will be - that will make more sense for me. That's my thoughts.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Now, Peter, would you like to make a comment about that?

Peter Green: Yes, can you hear me?

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Peter Green: Yes, I agree that the contact information being correct is oddly the most important element because if you are transliterating or translating incorrect information it is equally not very helpful.

But I think that the question is assuming that we have some kind of verification of the contact information is it desirable that that then be translated or transliterated into any uniform script?

And for the - just following on what Pitinan said, because of the complexity of these issues, both with translation and transliteration, and with local usage, the fact I think that the decentralized system of having the registrar - I'm sorry, the registrant and the registrar in each of their localities they would be more apt to come up with a globally readable to the global Internet user rather than having each individual Internet user wherever they are in the world come up with their own translation or transliteration in an attempt to contact the registrant.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. And I mean, specifically how would - what would that look like?

Peter Green: What would what look like, Chris?

Chris Dillon: So a solution like that that was centralized so you would have, therefore, some sort of central display of the contact information. But, I mean, are you specifically suggesting that it should be in ASCII or does it not matter how that is represented?

Peter Green: I think that the - this is me speaking from my personal perspective. But the entry in the local language or local script is for the convenience of the registrant and the registrar. If the global Internet users - I thought what Lars was saying, and perhaps I misunderstood, was that the important thing is that original information is verified so that that's the correct information.

Because if that's the correct information then the global Internet users, regardless of where you are and regardless of what language or script you're familiar with using you can find a way to contact that registrant. And I was just suggesting that based on the point that Pitinan just made that the translation and transliteration there are a number of variations that are possible.

But there are already certain conventions in different countries for how certain elements of contact information whether we're talking about company names, company forms, streets, districts, city names, are represented either in ASCII or other systems.

So I'm not saying that it needs to be all in the ASCII script but I think that the - I'm agreeing with Lars that the most important thing is that the original information is validated. But that doesn't preclude the desirability of having that validated contact information translated or transliterated into a common language or script.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you very much. That is clear. Okay so I think perhaps now we should move on to other issues that came up during that. I know Jim Galvin has some perhaps - perhaps, Jim, would you like to bring up the other questions that you have now?

Jim Galvin: Yeah, I've been listening to all of this dialogue and trying to relate my questions back to what's here. I guess in my specific questions in going to what the IPC said, and I was thinking a little bit about their statements and I wondered if we could get some additional discussion on what was meant by a couple of points here.

So in the question about what exactly the benefits of the community are of translating there's this comment that it would cause difficulties for domain holders in confirming that they've updated correct contact information, you know, if it's not translated and transliterated.

And I guess I was wondering if we could say a little more about that. I'd like to understand that. From the point of view of a registrant that only speaks one language and would know, you know, very little if anything on average about the translation or transliteration that might appear in the Whois record I wonder if they could say a little more about what the difficulties are that they would have in verifying information if it's not translated properly.

It feels like I'm trying to speak a double negative but I hope my question makes sense or...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes, it certainly makes sense, yeah. So, you know, this is very much difficulties that arise when updating records and that that language is not one that is available to the registrants - sorry, registrars.

Jim Galvin: So that was one question that I put out there. I don't know if they can say more about that. Do you want me to ask my other question too which is - it's kind of a similar question.

Chris Dillon: Yes, yes please. Please do that.

Jim Galvin: So let's see - let me just find it here in the text. I'm sorry. So there's a comment in here about validation and it's a similar kind of comment.

Chris Dillon: Whois validation will not be possible in many cases thus causing severe problems that will threaten the system itself, that's on Page 2 in the middle.

Jim Galvin: Right. And what occurs to me there and I think this has come out in the discussion that we've already had here is from a technical point of view it seems to me that if validation is going to occur it has to occur in the original natural language. You wouldn't want to try to validate the translated or transliterated version; you'd want to validate or verify the original version.

And so I'm wondering if, you know, we could get more information about their discussion about why it would be severe problems to validate if you couldn't translate or transliterate. That, at least from my experience, doesn't follow and so I wondered, you know, what they had been discussing when they had come up with that statement. So those are my two questions.

Chris Dillon: Okay yes. Thank you. Petter, are you - do you have any further information about either of those?

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, well I'll try to just comment shortly. As I said initially there's this - these comments is (unintelligible) more from a pure legal contractual point of view. And of course I realize that from a more technical point of view it's not that difficult. But it's - as I say it's important to have a clear and easy way to check out that - in a global matter - that all Whois information is correct and thereby easily solve a lot of initial problems before it goes further to any legal actions.

And so that's - we may have - we may could rephrase it in some way but that was actually what was meant here that it's also in a way a secure way from the holder of such that the contact information is easily understandable and readable also in a global way.

Chris Dillon: Okay yes. Thank you for that. Jim, does that make things - does that make things any clearer?

Jim Galvin: So Jim Galvin again for the transcript. Probably should have been saying that all along. The question that comes to my mind is when I think about postal addresses and, you know, knowing whether that contact information is usable or not one of the things that we observe in the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group is in looking at the UPU standards, you know, individual countries, you know, states, get to decide what they want to their postal addresses to look like.

And so I guess I understand the legal perspective of wanting to see it in essentially a more global universal language, I mean, English is often regarded in that way, so the desire to want to have it translated or transliterated that wouldn't be the way I would expect verification and validation to be effective because a nation state will decide for itself what it wants its postal addresses to look like.

And those are going to be in the local language; they're not going to be in English. If I want to send a postal letter to China I need to indicate that address in Chinese, not in English. The postal service, you know, wouldn't deliver it otherwise. And one would expect validation, you know, for it to be in Chinese in order to properly validate it too.

So I think that, you know, the comment that it has to be - that coming from a legal perspective I guess this makes sense. And I think that's the point that I just want to highlight that this is a legal point of view that it should be in English to make it more universally acceptable if I can use that phrase. But at the moment it's not clear to me that that is a benefit to the system as a whole; it's a benefit to the particular, you know, constituency that's commenting.

So that's an observation at the moment, you know, interested in any additional discussion that might shift my observation. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Thank you very much for that. There has been quite a lot of conversation in the chat room. I'll just have a quick look at that and check whether there is stuff that we need to pick up. Okay. So verification and validation needs to be done once. Then the translation you will find the way to do it and contact the registrant. Yes.

And something about wouldn't transformed - sorry, transformed contact information and verify defeat the purpose of the transformation. Let me - so and then - oh yes, the priority should be the accuracy of the contact information in the native language script. However transformation will become necessary. If transformation is necessary transformed contact data are useless if they're not validated. Yes, okay.

So this is just an added cost and raises additional challenges. Yes. I mean, I suppose what's driving that is just the needs of people who cannot read that original form so they cannot process it, they can't do anything with it. So that seems to be what's driving the need for transformation.

I agree. And this is my point as a lawyer or law enforcement officer would always translate the most reliable, i.e. the original information. Yes. Okay. And then Pitinan saying, "What needs to be done needs to be done anyway so if the validation or verification of the original information (unintelligible) must do then we still have to do it and find a way to do it at minimum cost."

Okay that's certainly an interesting opinion. And then at minimum cost so it should be some mechanism of ICANN accreditation. Yes okay so that's an interesting possibility.

Amr, I think we're up to date; would you like to bring something up on this?

Amr Elsadr: I actually have a question on a topic so if you want to continue on this one before I ask...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Okay well let us first ask whether there are any other questions on this or, you know, otherwise we can certainly move into other areas. Lars is saying in the chat room that validation and verification of the contact information is not within the remit of this group.

Okay, I'm not seeing any other questions about this so perhaps, Amr, you'd like to bring up the other issues?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. And this is Amr. I would delay the question on Lars's last comment about validation and verification not being in the remit of

this working group because I do recall that it was mentioned in this working group's charter. But that's not my question.

My question is regarding the last - the last response IPC provided in its comments which is the costs should be divided between the registries and registrars however also having a mind that the final responsibility of correct contact information lies on each registrant.

From my understanding the RAA makes validation and verification thus ensuring the accuracy of contact information a contractual requirement for the registrar not the registrant. In this model that the IPC is proposing I wonder how that would be contractually enforceable?

Are we saying here that the registrar will not be required to make sure that the contact information is accurate and that this responsibility will be on the registrant if that is the case? Then how would that be enforceable? Would there presumably be some requirement to have a contract from each registrant and ICANN?

And I'm just - I'm not clear on what the IPC is trying to say here and I was hoping Petter could clarify.

Chris Dillon: Yes, that certainly, I'd be really interested to hear more about that.

Petter Rindforth: Just quickly reply to that. I don't think it's - so it's not so difficult that it might seem - what we had in mind was just to note that each domain holder in fact that's in all contracts reliable for having an updated and clean contact information so that the holder can be with the right address and everything. So that's what...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Okay. Okay thank you for that.

Petter Rindforth: And, sorry, I have to leave within a couple of minutes because we have next GNSO Council meeting.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Well now so I think any other questions about any aspect of this - Amr, you are - just taking your hand down. I know Jim does have other issues with this. I wonder if there might just be time to ask a couple of quick questions about them?

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr if I could - I'm sorry, if I could just follow upon Petter's last comment?

Chris Dillon: Yes, by all means.

Amr Elsadr: So just to be clear that would mean that contractually the final responsibility of correct contact information would actually lie on the registrar not the registrant. Of course there would be a responsibility between - in the contract between the registrant and the registrar that the registrant would provide an update his, her or its contact information appropriately. But the final responsibility from a contractual perspective between ICANN and the registrar would indeed lie with the registrar not the registrant, is that correct?

Petter Rindforth: Was that question for me, Petter?

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes, yes.

Petter Rindforth: Well it's - as I said it's just a note on the current status that all
                  registrants have to update with correct contact information. So no
                  changes there as we see it.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Any other quick term questions for Petter before he goes to
                  the other meeting? Now there's been some stuff going on in the chat
                  window so I'll just have a quick look and check whether there's
                  anything that we need to bring up here.

                  Okay so talk about validation and verification in remits. And then
                  charter does not speak to the validation of the original contact
                  information; it's mentioned with regard to potential transformation of
                  contact information. Okay. Okay thank you.

                  Now I'm just going to double check other - oh yes, Petter, I don't now
                  how much longer you can be with us but I was going to ask you
                  actually to use Singapore as an example because early on there is this
                  talk about local Whois information. So if we take Singapore as an
                  example you've got four local languages.

                  So does this actually mean that - would local Whois information mean
                  in the case of a country with several local languages it - does it actually
                  mean that information in all of the local languages? I was slightly
                  surprised by that.

Petter Rindforth: I don't have a clear reply on that. As said in general it - oh yes, you mean that a translation into English (unintelligible) on each - for local. Is that what you mean?

Chris Dillon: Yes because see what it's saying is as the local Whois information should be registered in respect of each language script related to the home country so if we're talking about Singapore it's actually four different languages. So I'm just sort of confirming that this is suggesting that that be put in a new Whois system or whether it's central Whois or some kind of local Whois. I was really quite puzzled about this.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, what's actually - well what we mean there is that in the official language that is actually the contact information is registered within.

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: And I presume that is not registered in...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yeah, yeah, okay. Yes so it is actually only...

Petter Rindforth: Yeah.

Chris Dillon: It is only the registration language. Yeah, okay that clears that one. The information is registered - okay. I think that is the end of my questions and I'm not sure whether you've got time for anymore. Are there any more out there?

Okay now beyond that a few more things going on in the chat room. I'll just have a quick look at those. Right, the cost of translation and transliteration when one registrant holds more than one domain name, okay. Oh I see, so even if he uses the same contact information it will need to be transformed more than once. That's a lovely point, yeah.

So, I mean, ideally there might be some soft of system where, you know, if there was a particular address that, you know, that somehow that would be flagged up, you know, if it had already been transformed in some way that, some additional requirement for any system.

Okay we are quite close to the end of the meeting. And there is another response that we've had from the International Federation of Intellectual Property Attorneys. I actually think - oh yes, that's displayed on the screen.

Make a quick decision whether we try and do something in the few minutes remaining. Okay. I think we should start it and make - and just see how far we get with it. I - as far as I know there is - thank you very much, Petter, for answering all of those questions, it was most interesting.

I think probably I should try and present this FICPI thing or at least start - just start the process. And...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Chris, this is Amr.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: I have a question on this please.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Fire away.

Amr Elsadr: From a process perspective I'm just a little puzzled about the comments we're receiving both from SLIGP and from Mark Monitor. At this point we're - I was under the impression that we just sent out requests for input to the different SOs and ACs and we haven't opened up the working group's work to public comments yet.

And I would assume that at that point when this working group has an initial report that's when we would start getting this input. I'm just wondering...

Chris Dillon: Ah yes...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: ...why we're getting input from these organizations.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Amr. Yes, I'm not - yes that thought had crossed my mind as well. So, yes, in a sense it is - I am actually not sure how they heard of what we were doing. I don't know whether anybody on the call knows how that happened. I don't.

I mean, as far as I am concerned, I mean, basically I'm interested in ideas on this subject really wherever they're coming from. So, you know, I'm quite happy to, you know, to look at it. But, yes, I take what you're saying into account.

The Mark Monitor thing we haven't received as far as I know so this is the only one at the moment that falls into that. But I did hear that they were intending to send something. Amr, would you like to continue with that?

Amr Elsadr: Just also because I'm a bit of a stickler for process so I apologize about that. But if we're going to start receiving comments from non-working group participants at this stage wouldn't it also be advisable to perhaps send out wider invitations, for example, from individual registrars and registries, from different civil societies, different private sector companies who are commercial registrants?

But my problem with all that is that we're going to get way too bogged down right now in these individual responses we would be getting if we do want not just any input but balanced input from different stakeholders with different interests.

And that is why I feel it might be more appropriate to consider these things after the initial report of the working group is out and we send it out for public comment. So that's just why I have a bit of a problem with this right now.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Thank you for that. Yes, although the input is interesting I take your point because it does open flood gates. So we can't really be seen to treat a particular organization in a special way. So, yes, I think - and especially because we're rapidly running out of time in this meeting, I think probably there needs to be a decision taken possibly at a future meeting. There's something going on in the chat room here, I'll just read that.

Perhaps better because the wiki and other information is publicly available that may be triggering. Oh yes, yes. So I suppose effectively, you know, the fact that we are being so open about what we're doing and we are putting so much of it online so that anybody can read it, yes, that is a likely explanation for how they've heard of what we're doing. Yes, and it is a - I suppose in a sense almost a downside of making everything open like that.

So yes it leaves us with a policy decision which I won't try and rush in a few minutes now. But we do need to actually think, you know, when do we want to deal with this and whether, you know, whether we should deal with this in a telephone call in the near future.

So Amr is certainly suggesting that it's put off until public comment starts which, yes. I think perhaps we need an action for the next meeting, you know, about a final decision on that. But that sounds as if it might be a good thing to do.

Okay that means that we've more or less timed out. So I'd just ask quickly we don't really have time to do the work plan whether there's any other business. Okay well in that case just thank you very much for a really interesting call. And the - oh yes, I should also explain now that I probably won't be able to attend meetings either next week or the one after but Rudi is available to chair them. Anyway thank you all very much for today.

Peter Green: Thanks, Chris. Bye-bye.

Chris Dillon: Not at all. Good-bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. (Laura), if you could please stop the recordings at this time?

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

                                   END