

**ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 23 January 2014 at 14:00 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 23 January 2014 at 14:00 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-20140123-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

Attendees:

Ching Chiao; RySG
Wanawit Ahkuputra – Individual
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Sarmad Hussain – SSAC
Yoav Keren – RrSG
Pitinan Koarmornpatna – Individual
Patrick Lenihan - NCUC
Petter Rindforth - IPC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – No SOI
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Peter Green - No SOI
Ephraim Kenyanito - NCUC
Justine Chew - unaffiliated
Peter Dernbach - IPC
Vinay Kumar Singh - Individual
Jaa Yoophoon – no SOI

Apologies:

Chris Dillon - NCSG

ICANN staff:

Lars Hoffman
Mary Wong
Julie Hedlund
Julia Charvolen
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: And this is the coordinator. I'd like to remind all parties that today's conference is now being recorded.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you, (Wendy). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone and welcome to the translation and transliteration of contact information PDP working group call on Thursday, the 23rd of January.

On the call today we have Ching Chiao, (Justin Chew, Jennifer Chung, Jim Galvin, Vinay Kumar Singh, Patrick Lenihan, Peter Rindforth, Rudy Vasnick, Peter Green and Mae Suchuyapim Siriwat

We have apologies from (Chris Dillon). And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Julia Charvolen. May I please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Woman: Thank you very much, Julia, and I'll just pass things along to Rudy and the agenda is up in the Adobe Connect room for your reference, Rudy.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you very much, Julia and Julia for helping us in kicking this call off. I think we have to check and go around to see if there are any changes in statements of interest. Is there anybody having changes to announce?

I don't see any for the moment so I presume we can go to the next point of the agenda - the review of the draft working plan. I suppose that everybody had the time to go through work that is actually showing the white board of the Adobe Connect room. Are there any questions, comments, things to add to that work (plan)? Okay, I see Amr. Yes, Amr, you have the call.

Amr Elasd: Hi Rudy. This is Amr. Just that we're finalizing the stakeholder group constituency templates. I see the deadline is today. Are we set on the draft? I didn't get a chance to go over the document that Lars sent yesterday.

And I do believe we still have to work on the one for the GAC so I don't - regarding the work plan, I don't know if we're going to be able to finalize that today or not, so - unless others have other thoughts. Thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you, Amr, for this information. We did and definitely received from Lars. It seems quite good to me. I mean, one of the groups we (used) to point a finger on the GAC - I hear some echo. I hear myself twice. If someone has - (unintelligible) please mute your mike.

Okay. If someone has an idea of how we can get the GAC a little bit more involved, I know that during the (NCAB) call and something is on the table for the GNSO call tomorrow, it's about - there's a workgroup or work activity going on in looking into how GAC and GNSO could work closer together. I see Julie. Julie, do you have any different information?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. I don't have information on that particular thing but I would mention concerning working with the GAC, the template that Lars has sent around has, you know, that can be used and modified also for an SOAC outreach, so that would not be confined to just sending out to stakeholder groups and constituencies.

But also we could send it as an official request for information to the GAC as well. And I think it would be quite appropriate for this group to reach out to the chair of the GAC and request their engagement.

I would say I don't know how easy it would be to get a meeting with the GAC, say, face-to-face in Singapore, but it's certainly something we can request. I know usually in - at the ICANN meetings, their schedules are quite tight so it can be quite difficult to get, you know, to get on their schedule. But at the very least, we can modify the letter-slash-input template and have that sent to (Heather) to get the ball rolling and engage that group.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you very much, Julie. I see Amr and Ching in the queue. Yes, Amr, you have the floor.

Amr Elasdr: Sorry, I was on mute. This is Amr. Thanks Rudy. So just to clarify the GAC GNSO consultative group is not something that were discussions on specific working groups and PDPs is going to take place, right now this group is only concerned with developing a framework of cooperation early engagements with the GAC and PDPs.

But it's not somewhere - it's not at the stage yet where we can start discussing specific PDPs at all. It's relatively in new - it's a relatively new initiative and it will hopefully set the framework that would be helpful in the future.

But at this point, I would recommend, like (Julie) said, that we sort of modify the letter through the SOs and ACs to sort of invite GAC members to hopefully - even individual GAC members (in the) statements from the GAC as a whole but maybe just individual - statements from individual GAC members who have an interest in translation and transliteration of the contact information and get their take on it but - thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you Amr, for the clarification and additional information. And I think that our working group, our PDP working group, could be a good sample of a close relationship between GAC and GNSO in the future. I see also (unintelligible). Are you muted, Ching? We don't hear you. It looks like he has some audio problems.

Well, I will move on to - want to wait until Ching has to get out the issue of this area. Yes, (Unintelligible), you have the floor. It looks like we have some audio problems with some of the participants. You're on mute now. Why don't we try - you have to unmute. I hear some noise, yes. (Unintelligible) speak so that we can hear you.

It looks like we have some audio problems. Maybe we can have a check from (staff) if a dial out would be easier to (get them on). (I assume that's) in relation to the invitation letter and the (IP) letter that we (sent out) (in relation) to the GAC. Oh, I hear...

Ching Chiao: Hello. This is Ching. Can you hear me now?

Rudy Vasnick: Okay, Ching. Yes, go ahead.

Ching Chiao: Thanks Rudy. Hi everyone. I would just like to - actually to echo what Amr and Rudy just mentioned about this GNSO working group on getting the framework for the earlier engagement with the GAC.

And as you all know that every ICANN meeting, there's a chance for the GNSO council itself to meet with the GAC so I will assume that if we're able to get a timeslot with the GAC and provide the update, that will be the best way to channel the update of this working group.

If not, there's always a chance for the council - when the council meets with the GAC, we shall be able to let them know about what we have been working on. Then this is definitely one of the areas of focus.

One, on you know, thinking at this moment, is because this is related to the overall Whois review as well, and some of you here may recall that the Whois issues, in particular, the accuracy issue, has been something that the GAC really wants something to be done from the registrant side, so we would also need to be very, you know, careful (unintelligible) not to sort of backfire the - I mean, the issue to us, whether we talk to them, making sure that there's something that, you know, concrete and understand where GAC is actually looking for before we talk to them. Just my two cents. Thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you very much, Ching. Indeed, this is a quite an interesting approach. So as I see in the chat room also that it would probably be very good if we

could have our PDP on the agenda for the GAC GNSO meeting in Singapore so that we can invite the individual GAC members in our discussion, especially those that are, in our case, concerned stakeholders as they will be in the non-Latin (script) world.

I think that it is really important that we (get) these folks in our discussions at least giving us some advice on how they see things happening in their country. I don't know if (unintelligible) now or he has something to say. I see that there is (a need) to mention that there was a contact with (Heather) with the chair of the GAC, if I'm not wrong and that there was some interest in what we're doing.

Before going to finalize the letter itself, do we agree on the working plan, and especially the dates that are in the working plan? Do we stick to these dates or is there any question about eventually changing one of the proposed dates? Does someone have any comments to add to that? Yes, Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elasd: Yes, hi, Rudy. I would suggest that we postpone the letter to the stakeholder groups and consistencies for another week and perhaps within this week also try to come up with a letter to the GAC and hopefully approve them both together on next week's call and send them out for - after that. Thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you, Amr. Yes, I'm taking out of that request that would, in fact, extend the deadline also one week which is still before the Singapore meeting and I think that wouldn't be any problem that we extend it another week. Is there any objection to postpone with another week so that, in fact, the letter would be sent out on the 31st of January? I see Lars's hand. Yes, Lars, you have the floor.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Thanks Rudy. Just a quick question on the clarification. So I get this is correct for the GAC letter. I'm very happy to put together a draft and send that around. What do you see the key difference between that and the

(unintelligible) of the constituency? Do you want the letter to say - to ask for time (unintelligible) during Singapore?

Because the letter we send out normally goes to, as (Julie) said earlier, obviously to the SO and ACs, too, so they would always go to the GAC anyway. And so, in addition, the GAC letter would be sent out or modified to include a request for a face-to-face. Is that correct?

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you, Lars. Yes, I think that is the proposal that we, in fact, (join in kind of invitation) to have a face-to-face meeting in Singapore in order to enable us to explain the reasoning while your (supposed to) explain the difficulties that we've been encountering doing our job. Yes, Amr, you have raised your hand.

Amr Elasd: Yes, thanks Rudy. And yes, Lars and Rudy I do believe what you said is something that should be included in the letter. But I would also - and this is just me - I would also sort of seek the request for input.

Regarding the GAC personally, I'm not necessarily looking for a statement by the GAC. I'm looking for individual responses from GAC members, especially those coming from countries that don't use a lot (and very script) in their language.

So I'm actually thinking maybe we could get more than one response from GAC members representing their own perspectives on what they think and what they're views are on translation, transliteration of contact information.

And, sure, within the - I mean, we're still going to be presenting the charter questions. But I still think it would be helpful to sort of get those responses at this point. Thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you, Amr. It is quite important that we are not waiting until the GAC has a final decision on this because I consider that that would be after the (summer hoe days) somewhere.

I prefer also to have a sooner participation by those individuals that are really helpful in the languages that we don't manage ourselves and where we know that due to certain legislation and jurisdiction, translations maybe an issue itself so I consider that personal engagement from GAC members - I'm really looking forward to. Lars, I see your hand up. Are you still asking for the floor? Okay, probably not.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: Just a quick comment or a response. I think that's a great idea. I think the - to reach out to individual GAC members, from what I gathered, I've spoken to (unintelligible) of the Brussels office and who deals with the GAC from the staff side, in (a sort of) staff side and - or a quality team staff side rather, and he said it's - the response he expects this group (will have) for a face-to-face meeting - and it is obviously, you know, just what the thought. So we never know.

But what he expects is that probably they'll say that this should be slotted into the GNSO council meeting with the GAC, which obviously would make this more difficult to present something of a longer sort.

And so when Amr talked about contacting individual GAC members, I was wondering whether the group can maybe, on the list, identify countries or individual GAC members that they think might be helpful in this matter.

And we write a letter to the chair and also indicate in the letter that we will also be contacting individual members on their personal views because that - or their country's views or the administration they represent rather than the GAC as a whole because as Rudy said, to get an answer from the GAC, it's

always very difficult, to put it carefully. But say, if the group can come up with a list of countries they would like to contact, I think there might be a (resource) to some of that. Thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you, Lars, for this information and this proposal. I'm really liking that idea, too. I see also (Petta) having his hand up. Yes, you have the floor.

(Petta): Yes, it's a practical question. If we can extend the (decision so you can) send out a week, that's good, but where there will also be some minor corrections, additions, so when can we see the final packages sent out? Is it possible to have it at least on Friday?

Rudy Vasnick: Well, we have the letter actually on the white board so I don't know if you all have - looking at that document that was prepared and send by Lars. Are there any comments or additional remarks to that (unintelligible) so that we can at least finalize with the approach of the document and the content of the document itself rather than deciding on the date?

Lars Hoffman: Rudy, if I can just add - this is Lars. (Petta), it also should be in your inbox. I sent around, as Amr said earlier, yesterday so you should've received a copy of this as well on your computer.

Man: Yes, sorry. I have it. I thought there may be from the discussion today some minor changes. Otherwise, it's (okay).

((Crosstalk))

Man: We can - whatever the group decides, I don't think - if you (could Julie here, too), you know, there's no problem to send this back tomorrow. I don't think so. That should be (good).

Rudy Vasnick: Okay, thank you, Lars. So I would like to note, is there anybody having some extra comments on the content of the letter? If not, then we could at least

consider that document being okay for the larger group (as well IC) so that, in fact, you don't have to come back on that one.

And that we're only looking to the letter specifically for the GAC. Is that okay for everyone? I see (agree) from (Petta). If I don't see any hands up, other arguments in the chat, I will consider that we agree on the existing document.

If we got the SLs and ATs, and we don't have a check tomorrow on letter that would be proposed to send to the GAC. Yes, I have a lot of people (unintelligible) and that's not wise. Hearing myself once is more than enough. So I think we have then clarified the work plan (itself) and the timing with the exception that just one week delayed for the letter and all other plans stay as they are.

I'm sure that we will have some changes in the future once we are going more in depth and the other aspects of our work (to do). So I would like to come to point six of our agenda. It's a discussion we launched last (unintelligible) is the question that (Chris) (unintelligible) at the beginning and would help us in clarifying the targets and objectives.

If I'm not wrong, we are back to the question of who gets access (unintelligible) (a primer) (unintelligible). So I see from Julia that they cannot hear me, correct?

Julia Charvolen: Rudy, this is Julia speaking. We can hear you but I can hear a very, very, big echo. Oh, even when I'm speaking now, (I see).

Rudy Vasnick: Exactly. So...

Julia Charvolen: If someone can maybe mute their speakers or their mikes on the Adobe Connect if they're on the phone line at this time, please.

Rudy Vasnick: So I will try to see if the echo is gone.

Julie Hedlund: I'm not - this is Julie. I'm not sure if people understand but if you are on Adobe Connect and you are on the teleconference, you must mute your computer's microphone. That is what's causing the echo. Everyone take a moment. We can't...

Man: Well, Julie, you said (unintelligible) that option.

Julia Charvolen: This is Julia speaking. (Patrick), is your Adobe Connect speaker on and you're on the phone bridge as well?

Rudy Vasnick: Julia, can you (eventually) mute (Patrick) in that case?

Julia Charvolen: Apparently - yes, this is Julia. Apparently the echo is coming from (Patrick)'s line.

Rudy Vasnick: It's not easy to work if you hear yourself (unintelligible).

Julia Charvolen: This is Julia. I will try to - with the operator, what can be done. Thank you.

Rudy Vasnick: Okay. Okay, thank you, Julia. So I'm going back to the question, the list of questions that we have been starting to work on and I'm back to the question who gets access to what. I think there is a definition of responsibilities and (out) of the discussion about Whois the translation or transliteration of the contact (input).

So I'm looking into the room if there is anyone willing to pick up that question and have some comments or remarks with regard to that question. Actually, when we say having access, normally we all have access to (unintelligible) private otherwise we have content data being visible in the Whois data.

And the question is when you have access to that data, what is, in this case, considered having or getting access to. That's one of the questions I have

myself, in fact, as the (unintelligible). So I would like to know if someone has some thoughts on that. I see no one putting their hand (on). Then I think we have to look into - yes, I see Jim. Jim, you raised your hand. You have the floor.

Jim Galvin: Yes, thank you, Rudy. This is Jim Galvin. I guess, in terms of completeness, I'll just offer that the expert working group, the next generation directory of services expert working group is, in fact, speaking to precisely this question.

So if this is, you know, important to us, I think that we should consider, you know, how we're going to align with the work product that's going to come from that group. Thank you.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you, very much, (Jim), for that information and indeed, it's something that we already highlighted in the previous calls, in the previous meetings. We will need a strong liaison with the other working groups and especially the expert working group that would enable us to understand that there is - if we have to consider that question in our domain or we leave it in the expert working group so that's another approach.

And I think we have to try to tune the work we have to do with the work that is happening in other working groups in order to not get (answers) to all our questions when it's too late, when we are (unintelligible). So that's one of the dangers I personally see in our mission.

That is that we need to track down what we need as information at the right time in order to avoid restarting the whole discussion on - (since the) beginning which would be the worst case. So is there somebody on the - on this call who is active in that expert working group? I see, yes, Amr, you have your hand raised. Go ahead.

Amr Elasdri: Hi everybody. This is Amr. I don't believe we have any of the members of the expert working group on this PDP working group. But I'm sure we should

make a study of the status update reports as it is right now and just try to see what it is they're proposing and the differences in access to Whois data as opposed to the current (model).

It is very different and it won't really - I mean, according to the expert working group recommendations, access to Whois, is - will be very different (I suppose) but it is important to bear in mind that we need to also come up with our own recommendations because there will - my understanding is there will be a PDP following the expert working group's conclusion and final reports.

So nothing that comes out of the expert working group at this point is really set in stone but we should really keep an eye and make sure that we know what's going on with their recommendations. Thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you, Amr. Yes, well, thinking (unintelligible) now by knowing that the new rule structure will be different from the one we have in front of us now and knowing that the impact and - of our recommendations would not go only to - actually would probably go to the new structure and just wondering, is that something that we need to highlight as a kind of alert and something that gets to GNSO in the sense that we are asking eventually if there is a consideration you have to take into the work we do.

In order to avoid that at the end of our work, we have to start again until there is something new on the table. Or is that out of the scope of our mission? Maybe some advice from staff in specific context?

Omar, yes go ahead Omar.

Omar Kaminski: Hi Rudy, this is Omar.

It's certainly not out of scope, not at all. Our charter does specify that we should be taking a look at other work that is being done on Whois and the Expert Working Group is certainly one of the groups we need to be looking at.

And sure, our recommendations of the working group regarding those, I mean I don't see any reason why we wouldn't also provide those in a context of maybe the existing Whois and also in the context of any possible changes.

We should really - I mean we'll be - we're still starting our work now and we should keep an eye on the Expert Working Group and we already have their status update reports. And we should take into consideration all work being done on Whois and we're chartered to do so, so it's certainly not out of scope.

Rudy Vasnick: Okay, thank you Omar for clarification.

I was just hesitating that I had it also in mind that we cannot put all Whois related stuff outside of us (unintelligible), it's too important. But it's just personal timing.

And if we consider giving a final report, as is scheduled at the end of this year and we know that there would be eventually a PDP popping up that would influence our work, then we maybe have to consider in a month or two a review of our working plan in order to adapt and give the correct information in the outreach also.

I see (Tatyana) up. Yes, (Tatyana), you have the floor.

(Tatyana): Yes, I was just saying that we will have next, you know, the Council Meeting later on today. So maybe if we not have the time to prepare any formal questions, but at least to save time we can take it up briefly on that meeting to save some time.

Rudy Vasnick: Yes, well thank you very much T for the clarification and that proposal.

I see Julie's hands up also. Yes Julie, you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, this is Julie Hedlund. I just wanted to point out that the agenda for the Council Meeting this afternoon is quite full. Unless there is extra time at the end of the meeting for any other business, I don't anticipate that this item would be able to be raised.

Usually what happens is that agenda items for Council Meetings need to be circulated in advance and approved by the Council before the meeting. We would have plenty of time, for example, to be able to get an item on the agenda if we wished for the Council Meeting on the 27th of February which is the next Council Meeting, which if we adjusted our, you know, deadlines slightly and our work plan, we could coincide with, you know, urging the Council which would have received our letter, then follow-up.

And of course we have Ching Chiao is our liaison to the GNSO Council and he could raise this as an agenda item, and in fact also he can bring any information to the Council outside of a Council meeting. So Ching could provide a report or, you know, provide a request, you know, provide to the Council Meeting as well.

So just wanted to point that out that unfortunately it's really doubtful that we would be able to get something on today's meeting. But it might be useful for the next meeting.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you Julie for this clarification and this information on the meeting on the call today.

I know that in the agenda, in the consent agenda, is the presentation of the Co-chair of this PDP Working Group. So eventually the GNSO would not accept the new proposal of the Co-chair. We have to turn back to them for anyway, but I don't think so.

Maybe during that moment seeing (unintelligible) it can eventually just highlight and we'll have probably some extra thought about the mission and agenda time of the next GNSO call.

I don't know if Ching, if you would like to go that way?

Ching Chiao: Sure. As I mentioned in the Adobe Chat, definitely; happy to help.

Rudy Vasnick: Okay, thank you for much.

So back to the question list, the next question on the list was who are the stakeholders, who is affected and what do they want leading back to what? That's a complex question, I think it's also the finding Whois and who we need to address and who we don't need to address our specific questions, at least that's my understanding.

Does someone have some thoughts on who the stakeholders are in our context? And one willing to - yes Ching, go ahead. You have the floor.

Ching Chiao: Sure. Rudy, I will just try to take the shot first.

So hear in China, I believe and others on the call can also share their experiences with the registrar. And I understand that this topic could be covered before, but I know my - if it's okay I'd like to share again.

Is that the registrar actually collect both Chinese and also the transliterated contact information from the registrant. So without the consideration, if the domain name object itself is an IDN or not, the registrar in China, most of them if not all have already started to do so.

So let's say a domain name XYZ.com, the registrar would prepare the registration form, I mean the Web registration form, to allow the registrant to

input both Chinese as well as the transliterated contact information in English. Then - and the registrar will collect those information.

Some of the information - I mean store it in local for verification and, you know, legal purposes which means that the Chinese part. So those transliterated part, there would be posted to the registry to make sure that the registry receive the contact info is complying with whatever is required.

So that being said, this is something that has been done by the registrar in China. The model is, once again, to put it in a simple way, they collect both Chinese and also the transliterated version of the contact information.

Some they're - I mean they only say that locally, some they post to the registry to associate with that particular domain object. Let me stop here, but thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you Ching for that very interesting information and it already raises a question to me.

Who is responsible for the transliteration that has been done? The registrar or is it the registrant? Is there any additional acceptance to be done by the registrant at the moment they're filling in the form? Is there a check-off by the registrant - by the transliteration or translation of the data? Do you have any information on that?

Ching Chiao: I can probably answer a little bit but since I'm not from the registrars - I can definitely get, you know, the proper answer from some of the Chinese registrars that I constantly work with.

So far what they have done, and I'm just sharing, you know, some of my limited knowledge. So first of all the Chinese part, they would need to verify that for sure because there are legal requirements by the government that registrant must provide the most accurate identity and also the registration

information of the domain name. So the Chinese part is actually being verified by the registrar.

So the transliterated part submitted to the registry, that could be an interesting part which I don't know. But from time to time as requested, you know, by ICANN, at the registrar contract is that they have to send the notification or the alert email to the registrant to make sure that the registrant fulfills the Whois accuracy responsibility.

So I guess from that standpoint or from that approach, the registrar, although they did not do anything on the transliterated part, they put the responsibility on the registrant itself to, you know, make sure that they themselves, he or she, provide the accurate contact information.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you very much Ching. That clarifies a bit, yes.

I see (Peter) and (Suma) up in the queue, so (Peter) you have the floor.

(Peter): Just wanted to recall a bit what we discussed in the last meeting, and I have sent out some specific questions to three organizations organizing Trademark (Unintelligible) and Trademark holders around the world, to get input on how they think it works when it comes to trademarks compared to domain names. And also up from our questions what they would like to see in these aspects.

I've got some replies, but I plan to hopefully send out a quick summary for our next meeting because I want to have some more input on it. But so far I can say it's interesting to see, especially companies coming from countries like China and Japan and Russia and other companies where you normally have national translation both of domain names and trademarks, so this is a well-known topic even if there is not 100% solutions of it right now. Thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you very much Peter. I have (Suma) in the queue and also have (Picinown). I know that (Picinown) as sent out a document which we can probably talk about also.

So (Suma), you have the floor.

(Suma): Thank you, this is a question for Ching in response to the information he shared.

First, if you know is there (unintelligible) transliteration from China? And then is this - do you know if this is done by the registrant or is (unintelligible)? And if it is the registrant, how (unintelligible) of this transliteration?

Rudy Vasnick: Excuse me (Suma), but your sound was broken up several times so we're not ready to - what I captured was that you're wanting to know if the government has any obligations on the table. Is that correct?

Oh, he's going to type it in the Chat Room. "Is some queues from transliteration," that's the first question.

Meanwhile, we can go to (Picinown). Yes, you have the floor.

(Picinown): Hello.

Rudy Vasnick: You have to unmute.

(Picinown): Hi. Okay, thank you.

As you guys already know that the (unintelligible) document, sorry for the very immediate short notice for the document. Maybe (unintelligible) might not have time to review. Basically is the draft of the proposal of how we as a GAC team, also as a Thai speaker, see that we should head about this.

So basically, if we really need to convert it to the common language, right, the question is whether is - who has to pay the cost but it's also how. So we propose some of the how which is based on some of (unintelligible) which is actually already somehow not in (unintelligible) but we already have it there. So maybe it's practical that each country has the mechanism to extend that (unintelligible), how they convert.

That's how we see, that's one of the steps that need to be done and that's in the paper in the summary. So maybe if you guys have time to review, we can discuss about it next time as well. Thank you.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you very much (Picinown).

I have been quickly looking into the document and it's very clear the way the process is going on. And I will note that we take this up in our next call and we go around the information that was in the document. I think it's quite similar to the approach of what's going on in China.

So I see the responses to the question of somewhat in the Chat Room. I'm not going to read them except if someone - are there people just on the phone and not on the Adobe Connect, otherwise we need to go and have a reading of it.

I see Julie's hand up. Yes, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Rudy, this is Julie Hedlund.

I was just pointed everyone to something that I put into the Chat Room and just remind folks that it was also sent to the list as a separate endeavor but very much related to the work of this PDP Working Group.

ICANN has commissioned a study to evaluate the available solutions for the submission display of internationalized contact data. This is the study that

Steve Sheng had mentioned in one of our earlier calls. And the study areas seem to overlap with some of the questions that we have been discussing here today and that relate to how registries and registrars handle the display of contact data.

In fact, two of the study areas are to document the submission practices of internationalized registration data at a representative set of gTLD and ccTLD registries and registrars. And to do the same with documenting the display practices.

And then there are several questions involved as well that have to do with translation and transliteration. And I won't list them all, but the link is in the Chat Room and it is also linked to our Wiki under Studies and Background Documents.

So that you know, this information arising from this study will feed directly into the work of this PDP Working Group. So we will have access to a great deal of information relating to whether or not there are standards and how these practices are conducted in various ccTLD and gTLDs.

I'm not saying that it's not useful to get the specific examples that we are getting now from Thailand and China and others; I think those are very, very helpful to our discussion. But I just would note that there is a much larger study being conducted along the same lines.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you very much Julie for this additional information and it is quite interesting.

So for those clicking on the link, you have to eliminate the point that is behind the last word data. Otherwise you get a page not found (unintelligible).

But what I'm wondering a bit, in what way - the Board has been requesting this study if I'm not wrong. In what way does the Board know the importance

of the PDP Working Group we are trying to fulfill here? As having another study going on, does that mean that we wait to see the results of the study or we give input to the study in the terms that we have already done some work?

It's a bit unclear to me in what sense this goes together with the work that we are doing.

I see Julie's hand up. You may probably clarify it.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Rudy.

So just a little bit of a brief background. The Board is very much aware of this particular PDP Working Group, and in fact it was a Board mandate that created this PDP Working Group along with the Expert Working Group on gTLD directory services and also the Expert Working Group that Jim Galvin is leading on the model - the data model.

And the study is meant to coincide with the work of this PDP Working Group, and it is meant to be completed in time for this PDP Working Group to be able to take those data into consideration.

So these are very coordinated efforts. It's just a little confusing because the Board, I believe it was on November 8th of last year - no, the year before - pardon me - basically made a mandate initiating all of these efforts. But not all are PDPs; some are expert working groups that could result in PDPs. Ours is the only PDP Working Group and yet we are trying as staff to do our best to make sure that all of these efforts are coordinated.

And to that end, I would like to ask whether or not this working group would be interested to hear from Margie Milam. She is the staff support for the Expert Working Group that is looking into TLD Directory Services in which you know is related and is considering some of the questions we have here. I

could see if she would be able to give us an update perhaps at our next meeting if this working group is interested.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you Julie, a very good proposal. And I would say yes. Personally I would be really up to having some input from that expert working group, from Margie, on our next call.

And maybe another request is in what way could we eventually have a meeting with the study group in Singapore, the study that we were just talking about? I don't know if that's a possibility but I'm just wondering.

Yes Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: So I can go ahead - I'll lower my hand, I forgot to do that. But I will ask Steve Sheng what is the availability of the study group and whether or not they will be in Singapore.

And in fact, perhaps it might be useful for us to meet via teleconference sooner than that depending on where they are with their work.

Rudy Vasnick: Yes exactly, thank you very much Julie.

We are already one hour on the call. I think that we covered already a lot today also and we have some action items on our list. We have already four action items.

I don't know if there are additional comments on the question list up to the point we were commenting today. I think that even the other questions on the list are somewhere covered also where we were discussing.

I would propose that the next call we jump in the specific information that we meanwhile received from (Unintelligible) and the information received from

Ching today in the call, that we try to gather this information together in order to define some targets that we have to keep in mind.

And that we for the next call try to invite Margie to give us some input from the Expert Working Group.

I don't know if there are others that we have to consider, otherwise we could organize our next call in that way in terms that we have input from outside coming in to our discussions allowing us to have a broader talk on (unintelligible).

With that, we are coming to Number 7 on the agenda. Other than business, is there anything else we need to talk about? Is there anybody having some extra questions/remarks/comments?

I don't see any hands. Well I see (Justin Shiu). "I would like to request a work plan timeline for this working group."

Yes, we have to wait until we get some input from Margie I think in order to be able to know this status of deadlines.

"Next call if will generally it will be Chinese New Year's Eve."

Well as the meetings were scheduled upfront - are there any other participants on the call that could not join us on the next week call? Because that's too important - in some regions that's really - very important in our discussion.

If there are some difficulties, I'm just wondering, Julie, should we keep that in mind and eventually reschedule the meeting? It's a question to - where's Julie. I don't know if there's technically something we do about that.

And the other point, if there are too many not being able to join, maybe it doesn't make sense to have that call.

Yes Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, so as you can imagine it's quite difficult to find a time that works for everyone for these calls. So usually what happens is if there are conflicts for a particular call where many people cannot join, then we would just skip that call and proceed to the next week.

I think we do have some things that we need to get done; particularly we need to finalize the letter for the SOs and ACs, and particular for the GAC. But if we can do that via the list, and I can send that out as an action item today, then conceivably we could indeed skip next week's meeting and then just move on to the following meeting which would be Thursday, February 6th, if the work group agrees.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you Julie.

Maybe we can just drop it on the mailing list and ask for those who cannot be there so that at the end we have a decision - we can take a decision before the weekend and consider having the call yes or no. Because it indeed influences are activity for the letter that has to go out.

And I will also be out of the country. I will be in L.A., Los Angeles next week. (Unintelligible)...(unintelligible). So it is possible that I could not join also.

Can we consider it that way, that we ask on the list who cannot join and that we close the decision on Friday evening in order to enable us to have the call yes or no?

Julie, you still have your hand - you still want to speak?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, just to respond to that. Actually it might be easier because sometimes people don't respond when we ask for RSVP's, to simply have people indicate whether they object to having a meeting canceled next week. And if we receive no objections, then we'll proceed to cancel the meeting.

Rudy Vasnick: Okay perfect, thank you very much Julie.

So if we have no other questions or points to put on the discussion today, I would like to thank you all for the participation - oh sorry. I see Omar - yes Omar, you have the floor.

Omar Kaminski: Thanks Rudy.

I was just going to say that if we're not going to have a call next week, I would also think it might be a good idea to work on the questions via the list. And I was hoping we could - if we all - I mean I'm assuming that we're all in agreement that these are the questions we would like to answer as a working group. If maybe we could start breaking them down to do this instead of just having discussions on them.

I think these questions can be sort of refined into maybe sub topics I can work on that a little bit over this next week. I'm just thinking in terms of two weeks without a call, we should really try to get something a part from the letters done in this period. Thanks.

Rudy Vasnick: Thank you Omar, very good proposal. We could indeed start working, and in fact we already have got some first reactions, for instance, by (Unintelligible) - giving us some input from her country.

(Unintelligible) talk to Chris maybe later today otherwise tomorrow and try to plan something and put it on the mailing list in order to have activities in between if we're skipping the next call. All right, I think it's too important and there's too much things going on.

So by having had these last comments, I would like to thank you all for your participation and I'm looking forward to the responses to the list first of all, and also to any additional input that you can give. The weekly space is there for us; it's not there because of ICANN but it's also a space where we can work. And so I'm looking forward to seeing your responses popping up in the weekly space.

So thanks again, until next call. So we can...

Woman: Thank you very much Rudy and I'll end the recording.

END