**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 9 January 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 9 January 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-20140109-en.mp3

On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jan

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO

Master Calendar page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG – co-chair
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC –co-chair
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Yoav Keren – RrSG
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Peter Dernbach – IPC
Pitinan Koarmornpatna – GAC
Sarmad Hussain – SSAC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Peter Green – NCSG
Ahkuputra Wanawit – GAC
Vinay Kumar Singh – Individual
Anthony Oni - NCUC

Apologies:
Patrick Lenihan
Justine Chew

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffman

Mary Wong
Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: Begin.

Glen DeSaintgery   Thank you very much. Good morning good afternoon good evening
everyone. This is the translation and transliteration of content
information PDP Working Group on the 9 January 2014.

And in the Adobe Connect room we have Amr Elsadr, Chris Dillon,
Sarmard Hussian, Jim Galvin, Mary Wong from staff, Pitinan
Koarmornpatna Peter Green, Petter Rindforth, Peter Dernbach,
Jennifer Chung, Rudy Vansnick, and Wanawit Ahkuputra.

From staff we are Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman, Mary Wong as I
mentioned in myself Glen DeSaintgery. And in the meeting on the line
we have Jim Galvin, Chris Dillon, and Amr.

If it is easier for you to talk perhaps you should connect to the
telephone now. May I please also just remind you to say your name
before speaking for the transcription purposes? Thank you very much
and over to you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Glen and happy New Year to everyone. And
welcome to our first meeting of the Translation and Transliteration of
Contact Information PDP Working Group on January 9, 2014.

I'm glad to have you all with us. And this is Julie Hedlund again for the
transcript. And let me just start out by reminding everyone that all
according to the working group guidelines all working group
participants need to have a statement of interest.

When you joined the working group you should have either created a statement of interest and Glen DeSaintery would have sent you the link to do that or you would have provided updates to your statement of interest if necessary.

If you have already a statement of interest that you've provided and it doesn't need updating then there's nothing that you need to do.

But one of the - but what we do want to do is make sure that on our list of members in the membership for the working group that there is a statement of interest listed and linked for every member so just a reminder to go ahead and do your statement of interest if you haven't already done so.

And the other item of business that we always start out with on every working group call is we ask if there are any updates to anyone's statement of interest.

So I will ask that now. Does anyone have an update to their statement of interest that they would like to mention on this call?

I am not seeing anyone raise their hand in the Adobe Connect room. And I see that Lars is list is sending in the link to the chat room showing where we are missing SOIs. So please do follow that link and check to see if your SOI is in place.

And the next item of business on the agenda is that at our last meeting Chris Dillon and Rudy Vansnick had volunteered as cochairs of this PDP Working Group.

We did ask on the list if there were any other volunteers. I have seen none. And so at this point the PDP Working Group should affirm whether or not they want to have Chris and Rudy as cochairs of this group.

And to do that I might ask if you wanted to use the status symbol you see where there's a little symbol at the top of the little hand a person with a hand raised.

If you wanted to if you agree that with Chris and Rudy as cochairs you can click on the Agree symbol.

And I do see that someone has raised his hand. It is Yoav Keren. So oh I see Yoav has now changed his symbol to the checkmark the green checkmark.

But of course if you have any questions if you have any statements please raise your hand and we'll (unintelligible) from you.

I see there are a few people in the room that we haven't heard from Peter Green, (Pitanan), (Sarmad) and Wanawit do have an opinion as to whether or not you support Chris and Rudy as chair cochairs?

I see some more checkmarks. Thank you very much (Sarmad) I see in this chat room that (Sarmad) supports. And I and Wanawit in the chat room say's he also supports.

Peter Dernbach do you have an opinion you would like to GNSO express I think we have - you are the only one we have not heard from

who is not staff. And staff don't vote needless to say. I think we can at this point say that we have the majority in support of Chris and Rudy as cochairs.

I do see the Yoav has raised his hand, Yoav do you have a statement you'd like to make? Perhaps not.

I think that then this appears that we have affirmed Chris and Rudy as cochairs of this working group. I want to thank you all. And at this point I would like to turn over the meeting to Chris and Rudy.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much Julie. This is Chris Dillon speaking. Now actually Rudy and I didn't decide who would chair this meeting in case we were made cochairs. So Rudy if it's all right for me to do today because there's a lot of wiki stuff that's the main reason.

Rudy Vansnick: And Rudy speaking yes Chris you have been initiating the list of questions also. So I will follow up and chat on the Adobe if hands are raised or if there are additional information to (unintelligible). So go ahead.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you very much for that. Well coming back to the agenda the next thing we need to look at is a review of the charter.

And that's just really for people who especially for people who are new to this that, you know, we just really go through the charter and highlight the importance parts of it.

So Julie were you perhaps intending to do that part of the agenda or are you happy for me to do that?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. And Chris I'm happy to go through it if you would like me to or I am happy to defer to whichever you prefer?

Chris Dillon: Actually I'd be grateful if you would go through it. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Chris. It's my pleasure. This is Julie Hedlund. And what I have done is I have pulled up the charter in the Adobe Connect room.

And really the main and most important part of the charter is Section 2 the mission purpose and deliverables.

And I had thought and suggested to Chris and Rudy that we should spend a little bit of time going through the charter since we do have quite a number of people in this I think in this working group who may not have been that familiar with the charter as it was being developed.

We do have some people in this working group who were part of the development of the charter. And so I apologize to those people because this will be a little bit duplicative.

But I hope that this will help everyone to understand the background but also the mission and scope of this particular working group.

So the background and I think we discussed this some this some last meeting as well is that the GNSO Council requested an issue report on three issues.

And that is whether it's desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information into a single common script? And then who shed decide who should bear the burden to take on this task.

I'm not going to read through the full text here. You can do that yourself. And then the third question was whether or not to start a PDP to address these questions.

The final issue report was sent to the council in March 2013. And on 13 June 2013 the council approved the initiation of the PDP.

So the PDP itself then addresses the first two questions whether it's desirable to translate contact information or transliterate it and who should decide who should bear the burden.

And one thing I should point out and this and this is a question that was raised previously when we were developing the charter is why is the phrasing who should decide who should bear the burden?

Why is the workgroup for example not saying, you know, just this group or this group should bear the burden?

This has to do with the fact that this is a policy development process. And so the council may not the council may wish to say that for instance that ICANN, or, you know, the ICANN CEO, or the ICANN staff should decide based on the information presented in the PDP who should bear the burden or, you know, or someone else, or perhaps, you know, the GNSO Council but it itself decides who should bear the burden.

But it's - it sort of takes that question to a, you know, a slightly higher level because it is a really a key policy question.

There is no doubt going to be that there will be a burden to do this work if it is decided that it is desirable to translate or transliterate.

But the most important part of the charter here as I'm moving along and I think I've unsynched this you can move the document yourself is the mission in scope.

And a lot of this information follows a template. The template is part of the GNSO Council operating procedures. And it is part of the - and within that it is part of working group guidelines.

And then the working group guidelines there is a template for how a charter is structured. And a charter always includes a mission and scope.

And in this case this PDP Working Group is tasked by the GNSO Council with a policy recommendation - regarding the translation and transliteration of contact information.

And there is actually another working group an expert working group which we discussed and described at our last in our first meeting of this working group and that working group is tasked with determining the appropriate internationalized domain name registration data requirements and data model for registry directory services.

And Jim Galvin is leading the group that is devising a data model. And so the work of this group will fold into the work of that expert working group.

And so as part of the mission and scope we go back to the fact that these two issues whether it's desirable to translate and transliterate and who should bear the burden are the two issues that are in scope of the work of this working group.

And that's actually a very important consideration because the scoping of a PDP is something that happens when the issue report is developed.

And is also something that ICANN legal staff is involved with to make sure that the work is within scope of a PDP. And then the charter needs to stick to the key questions that were enumerated in the issue report.

However of course the charter can delve quite deeply into the issues that were identified in the issue report and can, you know, develop other questions that may relate to those issues.

So the charter contains also some background, you know, why is this an issue? It is because the Whois protocol does not specify US ASCII as the exclusive character set for tax requests and tax content encoding. And no standards exist for all Whois protocol implementations to signal support of character sets other than US ASCII.

Then there is some background of what is contact information? And that relates to the registration accreditation agreement.

These are data elements that must be provided by registrars in response to a query. But the RAA does not require that these elements must be translated or transliterated.

And these elements are the name, organization, postal address of the registered name holder, technical contact and the admin contact.

So what this means essentially is that if I for example wish to go into the Whois and I wished to find out information about a domain name holder in say China.

And the, you know, and I was Chinese. And the information that was returned to me was an ASCII and not in a, you know, a Chinese script I probably would not be able to recognize or read that information and so essentially that information would be useless to me.

And that is the basis of this next paragraph where the -- and this came out of the work of the Internationalize Registration Data Working Group -- that to balance the needs and capabilities of the local registrar with the need of the potential global user of this data is one of the questions is whether or not domain name registration data directory services should support multiple representations of the same registration data in different languages or scripts. So that's essentially what I was trying to just describe.

And then there is the description of what is translation and what is transliteration. And some issues that the IRD Working Group raised

concerning how translation and transliteration could vary across languages and scripts, how people how people may translate or translate differently, and how would a registrar determine different spellings? So there are several key issues that we call out here.

And then some of the some of the differences in the scripts and I see that I have pulled up an earlier version of the - I had pulled up an earlier version of the charter and I do apologize for that.

This actually had some redlines that we made earlier. How interesting I thought we had the latest version in here.

At any rate this is actually still the same in the current charter it just happens to be highlighted in red line.

But one of the things that the charter developed the working group that was developing the charter the charter drafting team did was ask that there should be some specific questions included in the charter.

And these are called out here that talk about, you know, they get into some of the, you know, the deeper issues involving, you know, involving these two issues.

For instance what are the benefits of doing this? Should these - should this be mandatory and for whom? And what impact might this have on the RAA?

And later in this in the agenda we have some other questions that really are an outgrowth of the charter that Chris and Rudy have suggested that we look at.

And then the charter goes on to provide some more information out of the - that came out of the IRD Working Group.

And but one of the important items here to call out is that this PDP Working Group will not be limited to considering the alternative possible approaches suggested by the IRD Working Group that is, you know, the various ways that this translation or transliteration could happen.

But it's encouraged to consider all possible alternatives to consult with legal staff when considering alternatives and also to look at the though work of other PDPs and working groups related to IDNs and Whois.

And the charter drafting team felt that this was quite important. And there are a number of groups that have done work in this area.

And staff will help in collecting information on anything that is related to this, you know, anything that other groups have done that are related to the work of this working group so that we're not duplicating efforts and that we're gathering any information - we're gathering every any - all relevant information let me put it that way.

And then the charter drafting team suggested that the working group may want to consider who should bear the cost and, you know, within the limits of the scoping of this issue.

And that the working group will review and check relevant recommendations that may arise from the expert working group that is

looking at the purpose of gTLD directory services. And staff of course will help and gather that information.

The rest of the charter deals with that there is going to be at minimum an initial report and a final report coming out of the deliverable from this working group. The working group is expected to develop timelines and its deliverables or a timeline for its deliverables.

And then the rest of the charter is sort of boilerplate information. It's open to, you know, membership is open to all interested parties.

But we have encouraged people to join who have particular experience in translation and transliteration of languages and scripts.

And there's information about the formation dependencies and dissolution of the group, information about the roles of staff, rules of engagement and how the working group makes its decisions. And this is taken directly from the working group guidelines.

And I am not going to go through all this now but I do highly recommend that you spend some time reading it.

And so this is I'm just passing through the decision making section and what happens if there are disagreements and how those problems or issues are escalated.

And then closure and the working group self-assessment. All working groups are expected to complete a self-assessment when they have completed their work.

So I know I just went through a lot of information here. And what I'd like to do is to turn things over to Chris and Rudy as - and we can look - we can answer any questions that arise.

And I'm looking at the chat. Rudy has said do we need to indicate who is the liaison to the GNSO within this working group?

And yes we do need to have a liaison to the GNSO. And what we would ask is for someone who is a GNSO Council member in this group to volunteer to be a liaison.

And then we would submit that request to the GNSO probably as part of their consent agenda so we can formally ask that on the list and during this meeting as well.

And Amr has pointed out something that I was going to mention later but I think it's very important to note now.

The policy development process specifically says that a PDP Working Group has to request input and in fact statements from SOs from the statements from the stakeholder groups and constituencies but also input from the supporting organization and advisory committees.

And in fact let me just mention the actual language here. And essentially in the PDP it says that the PDP team and that is the PDP Working Group should formally solicit statements from each stakeholder group and constituency in the early stages of the PDP.

And that the stakeholder groups and constituencies should at a minimum have 35 days to complete such a statement once it's formally requested.

And the PDP team is encouraged to formally seek the opinion of other ICANN advisory committees and supporting organizations as appropriate for those that may have expertise experience in this issue considered under the PDP Working Group.

And then also the PDP team should seek input from other SOs and ACs. And the SOs and ACs should receive as response from the PDP team on this input.

So this is a - this is meant to be an early step in the process. And thank you very much Amr for mentioning that.

And also thank you very much Peter and Amr and for reminding me that Ching Chiao did volunteer to be the GNSO liaison for this working group. I want to also make sure that this has been formally recognized.

I will look back at the minutes of the last council meeting because I think that -- and I'm sorry not to have checked this before this meeting -- but I think that that happened that step happened at the same time that the charter was approved. But I'll follow up on that and make sure that it has been formally recognized.

I think that I've tried to cover everything. And I'll turn things back to Chris and happy to help answer any questions.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that Julie. It's a very good summary of a complicated document and some other issues as well.

So may I ask if there are any questions about any aspect of that before we move into the next item on the agenda?

All right seeing nothing in Adobe Connect we'll move on to the proposed questions and they've just come up on the screen.

And actually just before we start going through this list there are one or two things I'd like to explain. And that is that the idea is that this is a sort of a brainstorm session.

So it's - and it's a way of looking at, you know, what could the parameters of the project be by answering these questions at this early stage we're hoping to get an idea of the areas we will need eventually to cover.

And really the main idea is to save time. You know, by doing this at an early stage we are starting to think about all sorts of things we're going to need to do in the different areas of the project.

And I am suggesting that we do this in the wiki. So part of the wiki will be actually looking at these questions. And the answers will break down into pages under the various questions.

And in fact, you know, obviously the major questions in the charter that, you know, the two big questions that Julie was talking about, you know, whether it is desirable to translate contact information, you know, that one and who should decide?

Obviously that will be covered. And also, you know, the smaller question what exactly the benefits to the community are and all of those questions will be covered in the wiki.

And the reason for choosing the wiki to do that is that is that it should be possible to have a sort of a summary of what we're doing at a sort of a high level of the wiki so people can look at the wiki and see fairly quickly what's going on.

And then those people who are interested in getting detail about the various aspects can then drill down through the wiki.

So that is - that's really the thinking behind these questions. So may I ask if there are any question oh sorry any questions about the approach questions about the questions?

Okay seeing no questions in Adobe Connect I'll - we might as well move forwards. And I mean the order of these questions may be important.

So we may start our brainstorm and actually then discover this really would have been better if the questions had been in a slightly different order. But, you know, eventually we have to start somewhere.

So I think perhaps if we do, you know, let's have a go at looking at What is Contact Information, which is the first one, and in fact, some amount of work has been done on the (unintelligible) that were circulated the - before the meeting. So if you haven't looked at those

documents that were circulated, there is already this, "What is Contact Information?"

So I just wonder whether anybody would like to expand on what was circulated or, you know, perhaps make some comment about it.

Rudy Vansnick: (Unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Rudy, would you like to address that?

Rudy Vansnick: Yes, I would like to address the SAP. In fact, a document in which we found a very good description of contact information is the SAP 054 Economics Reports in which it is a data model description that is a very clear view what is considered, you know, contact information and I would eventually point to Jim Galvin, who has been a leader in this work, who eventually added some information which we have for additional input to deliver.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that.

I would like to propose that provisionally, we answer the question within the Wiki with that answer as given in SAP 054 but I wonder if Jim might like to say something about that definition.

Jim Galvin: Yes, thank you. This is Jim Galvin.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

Jim Galvin: It's - I think it would probably be better to say that it was not the purpose of SAP 54 to state, "What is Contact Information" but rather to

provide a way to represent registration data and what that might look like. What we chose to do was to take a look at what might be said, might be described as commonly regarded as contact information and, you know, took a survey of what was out there and what was available and we simply collated that and pulled it together.

I think a number of these exercises have been done before. ICANN staff has done a similar exercise for different things. There's an ITF Working Group, which has done this exercise also to collect data. EPP, the protocol, has its own definition of What's Contact Information and even the EWG, the Expert Working Group on New Directory Services, has taken look at, "What is Contact Information?"

So I think we have a number of sources to draw from in order to decide what we want to use. Anyway, I guess my main point is I don't think that ASAC wants to take authorship of What is Contact Information. Our goal was simply to take advantage of the various sources and describe the commonality and I think there's, you know, consensus in a de facto way -- if not a stated material or official way -- and we should draw on that. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you for that Jim.

Now, I mean certainly two of the other places we need to look at so therefore, the IETF and the EWG. Now I'm sorry. I didn't hear the third one. Could you repeat that please? It was a protocol that had a definition of it.

Jim Galvin: Yes, EPP, the Extensible Provisioning Protocol. That's the protocol that at least all the ccTLDs use between registries and registrars and many ccTLDs, though not all.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you very much for that.

                  Okay, so I think provisionally we should run with that 054 definition but with an action item to, you know, for the various members of the Working Group to have a critical look at it. Perhaps that's the best way to leave that one.

                  Looking at the chat room, Rudy is also suggesting EPP so that's the fourth one. Okay...

Rudy Vansnick: (Unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: ...oh yes...

Rudy Vansnick: (Unintelligible) by the EPP is the process that is used, the electronic protocol that is used for a registrar to reduce that (unintelligible) so it's probably part of that protocol also.

Chris Dillon: ...okay, thank you very much.

                  Well for the time being, unless anybody else would like to say something about that first question, I propose we move on to the next one.

Okay, seeing nothing in the ADOBE CONNECT, so okay, we're now looking at "Why" so, you know, this definitely needs to be a very early question. Why are we doing this project?

So - and here, I think to a great extent, we're actually on a roll and so I think really winkling out, discovering the reasons for this, you know, that's going to be quite a major part of this Working Group and, you know, also, on a micro level, you know, there will be certain things that will be necessary to support variations of this.

So depending how it develops, you know, certain things may become necessary and so the "How's" been (unintelligible) in the past of a sort of matrix, whereby there may be particular features to translation and transliteration and some of them, for example, may be, you know, just free to get and others may cost a small amount of money and yet others may be expensive and so you end up with a sort of matrix coming out of this.

I wonder if anybody has anything they would like to say about this particular question. Well the - nothing in the - I think I can see someone that's typing something. I might just wait for that but I think, you know, certainly questions with no answer are possibly the ones that were made to come back to the most.

I'll just wait a few moments. I think there are comments coming so I'll just perhaps see what those are.

So (Falmouth) is suggesting that we look at the users of Whois. Yes, so that's part of it, isn't it? So...

Rudy Vansnick: Chris, maybe just an additional comment to that question. Rudy speaking.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Rudy Vansnick: I would rather (unintelligible) the question as, "Why should we not do this work?" Makes it maybe easier to just clarify that user reason - is there is no reason to not do it. It's the invert of, "Why should we do it," just aloud thinking on things.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Rudy.

I think that -- this is Chris speaking -- I think that makes huge sense. We can really use both of those approaches so, you know, I suspect there will be things that we absolutely should not do and that's going to save time on occasions.

Now I can see Europe has put his hand out. Europe, would you like to speak about this?

Man: Yes, that's actually a good point -- why we should not do it -- and I can think about a few reasons why we shouldn't do it. One would be, you know, we want to keep it on one standard, one script in this scape.

This is not IDNs. IDNs were -- and as one of the people that been promoting IDNs in the past 13, almost 14 years -- no one can blame me as not doing things in favor of the communities but I could say that we do want to do IDNs. We don't want to create a mess and a reason why not to have the translation and transliteration of content

information would be to keep everything in one stand and one script that it is at the end, clear and make sure there's no confusion.

This - now there is - I can think of different reasons why we should do it and, for example, and I'm not providing my opinion at this time. I'm just saying - just raising the issues and why we should do this, in general, is to allow people from different communities to actually better understand who is behind specific Web sites in their own - by reading this information in their own language.

The question is -- and this is what we've raised before -- how important is this and what - how different it is from the actual current state of using Latin or English language? So who is and whether, you know, and again, and measuring and weighting the costs to the community for the benefit - in front of the benefits so just generally raising this thing - hopefully -- to another level.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that.

I think it's quite important at this early stage that we - all of us feel that we're not necessarily giving our opinions about this. I mean, you know, if any one person knew the answers of this, we wouldn't have formed the group so, you know, this is very much a matter of talking things through and coming to opinions.

If we don't need to do this or -- sorry -- if we should not do this, then this Working Group may be a lot shorter than we were expecting it to be so I very much appreciate your rather provocative suggestion on that front but yes, I mean we can certainly start to collect reasons why people in different communities may want a new version of Whois,

which, you know, is more accessible in their own language so thank you very much for that.

Now, ah yes, and actually in the ADOBE CONNECT, (Peter Rinsforth) is saying - is giving more reasons from legal and marketing perspectives so that's an interesting addition and I see now there are two hands up - sorry -- one hand up. Peter Dernbach, would you like to say something about this?

Peter Dernbach: Yes, hello, hi. Can anybody hear me well?

Chris Dillon: Yes, I can.

Peter Dernbach: Hello? Yes, okay, so I'm Peter Dernbach, Thailand.

I would support that why we are doing this is the matter of the legal as well as I'm from Thailand, which we don't use the Latin script for our legal writing things and for a phone call, we can write two different trial works and the trial installation into the same English word.

So I think doing this will probably - a high enough position internally as well. How do we represent into the command script and from there then we can buy the English (unintelligible) into our local jurisdiction so that will be my suggestion why we should be doing this. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much.

I think it is very frequently the case that words do not correspond, even very closely-related languages like French and English. You know, words tend not to correspond so, you know, a very simple example

would be the French word ((French spoken 0:15:51.4)), which can have two totally different meanings in English so one would be history but the other one would be story.

In English, they are completely different but in French, it's the same word and that is a phenomenon that you find across languages, that you get complicated relationships and so, you know, for example, if we were thinking of setting up a translation system -- which would be easily verifiable -- you know, even with a simple example like that, very often it just is not possible to go, you know, to go directly to - in languages, even when they are very closely-related so it's a huge issue. So thank you very much for that.

Now there are a couple of things going in ADOBE CONNECT and so Europe is asking about local script, will often be - whether a local script will often be clearer from a legal point of view. I mean, I guess within individual jurisdictions, I suppose often the local language will have priority over a translation. I'm not a lawyer but that's what I would guess.

And then -- so yes, sorry, (Peter) enforces -- (Peter) enforces giving an answer to that, yes, if both versions are available and then how that is done fairly, in a clear way.

Okay and then - now various hands are - Jim, would you like to add something to this?

Jim Galvin: Yes, thank you. This is Jim Galvin.

On the question of, "Why we're doing this work," is it okay to address that question still?

Chris Dillon: Yes, absolutely.

Jim Galvin: So going back to the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group of two years ago that created the questions that are on the issue report that brought us here and into existence, from my point of view as a participant in that group -- and I say that because I was also Co-Chair of that Working Group -- but as a participant to that group, this question comes up because the starting premise is that we need Internationalized Registration information.

So you start from the premise that a registrant should have -- and we struggled with this word at the time -- I'm going to use it now because frankly, I forget exactly what we did and the phrase that we used at the time because I remember quite extended discussions about it.

But an individual registrant should have the right to use their own local language and their own local script in order to enter their contact information. If you start with that as a premise, that immediately gives you the question of translation and transliteration.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: There's no way to get around that. The existing Whois system is US-ASCII based. People do a variety of things in order to -- I'll say abuse that -- to get other things out there so you also have to accept as an inference that that protocol is going to change and that's the work of the IETF WEIRDS Group.

But given that all that's going to happen and if a registrant should be able to use what they know in order to represent themselves in order to get a domain name, you have to ask the question of translation and transliteration and whether or not it will be present.

You know, if you're going to take it in in a form that's different than what is currently permitted by the system that's deployed, you're going to take it in in a language or script that can't be output because that output has to be in US-ASCII or Latin-based.

How are you going to get there? That's why this question exists. It's a practical question and it just logically follows. I don't think there's any way to escape answering this question. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you very much for that.

So it sounds as after all, the Working Group will be rather a longer existence.

Yoav, would you like to raise something at this point?

Yoav Keren: Yes, I would actually want to - let's talk about what (Peter) brought up, which is the legal issue, and I think, as I see it, this is the main reason that we - why we are here. I know I said something before that. As you said, oh provocative and I said, "I'm not pointing out my personal view."

But if I do want to point out my personal view, the main reason to actually have this would be the legal clarity or the legal issue to allow -- as we've heard in different places -- the local script is allowing a better

legal action in problematic cases and that, for sure, is something that is, I would say, a good reason to do this. Just - I'm just thinking out - I know it's a little too early but just bringing - and ID that I just thought about and I want to share maybe we'll, you know, talk about it further.

If you go down this road and decide that this is important and maybe it's even reasonable from the cost perspective, we are talking on this - the main benefit of the legal - for the legal community or for legal actions. Definitely, the local scripts that would be chosen for a specific Whois or for a specific domain name should be - I would kind of do it like in that we'll have like a default or maybe a main or leading script for specific Whois, which means - so when a registrant will decide they want to have their Whois in Thai, so they will put in their details in Thai and those details will be translated or transliterated to Latin, stuff like that, while not the opposite, okay, not the opposite around.

That's - so the formal Whois of the - that domain name or the legal Whois of that domain name will be the local script. I'm just thinking that this is the right way to go. I know it's too early to talk about that but just to have this shared with others. That's it.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that Yoav.

I'm afraid we are starting to run out of time on this call so I'm - apologies, especially to Omar. I know you want to add something but I think we need to use the last five minutes just to round the meeting up so, you know, just to confirm that we've got the actions about the first question, which is looking at the definitions of contact information in various locations and also to, you know, to revisit this Why and really,

you know, there needs to be a Wiki (unintelligible) which summarizes that discussion on Why, I think.

And then basically, what, you know, we are intending to have weekly calls in the Working Group until we get to a stage where, you know, perhaps we're not filling the calls. At which point, we can revisit that but until things, you know, until things start to slow down, I think we should meet once a week and in fact, I'll just ask whether anybody would like to add anything to what we've just been saying and - with the few remaining minutes.

Yes, and that makes sense. Omar, if you would like to put your question in the last couple of minutes, that would make me feel a lot better. Thank you.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr.

I was - I won't get into the question now. We can do it at a different call but I was going to respond to your last request of, "If there's anything else we'd like to add."

I think it might also be worthwhile to - when listing the questions that we're asking here is because we're saying, "Why are we doing this?" And this is the question we were discussing right now and then later on, then the question of, "How much would a particular feature cost?"

I think one of the important questions we need to answer is the weighing the benefits versus the costs. This might be listed separately because when - especially when considering who the potential stakeholders who might be paying for this that were translating and

transliterating contact information are, then it might be just worthwhile to make this very clear that we need to weigh the benefits versus the costs and make due consideration for whoever's going to be paying. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you very much for that.

I think the idea behind the matrix that I mentioned before is pretty similar to that so yes, thank you for reminding us of that.

Okay, and I think that bring us more or less to the end of it and I'll just, you know, just remains to me to say thank you very much, all of you, for contributing today and, you know, we've obviously covered two of the questions. We didn't get all the way through.

We can use the Wiki to link these very easily so that's another reason for using the Wiki so, you know, please wait for the actions to come round in an email after the meeting and, you know, we continue to discuss on the mailing list and also suggest things for the Wiki and thank you very much, (Peter), for what you're writing in the chat room.

Rudy Vansnick: Chris, Rudy, maybe just one question to the group for the - regards the next call.

Is this time slot for everybody or is there a lot of concern about the time slot?

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much.

I think I am - as far as I can see, nobody wants to bring that up so I think provisionally, we should run with the same time slot but, you know, obviously that's another thing we can discuss on the list or, you know, we can even do a Doodle poll if that becomes necessary.

Okay and the discussion in the chat room is very much along that line so my instinct is if at all possible to stick to it, if the (unintelligible) fix it.

Okay, well we're at the top of the hour so I would like to thank you very much for this first meeting. I think it's promising and I look forward to correspondence later in the week on the emailing list.

Rudy Vansnick: And thank you, Chris, for doing the good chairing work as you get used to doing the - dropping things through so up through the next call and we have a look at the Wiki in order to allow us to put the information on the questions we have on the list for the next time.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much Rudy.

Rudy Vansnick: Bye-bye.

Chris Dillon: Goodbye then.

Man: Thanks everybody, goodbye.

END