

**ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 13 February 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 13 February 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-20140213-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#feb>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG - chair
Patrick Lenihan- NCUC
Amr Elsadr - NCUC
Jim Galvin - SSAC
Justine Chew – At-Large
Patrick Lenihan - NCUC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Ahkuputra Wanawit – GAC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Pitinan Koarmornpatna - GAC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP
Peter Green - NCUC
Peter Dernbach – IPC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Sarmad Hussain - SSAC

Apologies:

Ephriam Percy Kenyanito
Rudi Vansnick - NPOC

ICANN staff:

Lars Hoffman
Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: The call is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Would you like me to do a roll call for you?

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, indeed.

Glen de Saint Géry: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is Translation and Transliteration Working Group call on the 13th of February. And on the call we have Chris Dillon, Jennifer Chung, Jim Galvin, Justine Chew, Patrick Lenihan, Peter Derenbach, Peter Green, Petter Rindforth, Pitinan Koarmornpatna, Ahkuputra Wanawit and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen.

And for staff we have Lars Hoffman and myself, Glen de Saint Géry. And we have apologies from Rudy Vansnick, and we have not had any news from Percy Kenyanito because he often asks for a dial out and he has not asked this time.

Now I think that's all. Over to you then Chris. Just to remind people to say their name before they speak for the transcription purposes. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, Glen. Okay well first of all we have Statements of Interest so I'd like to ask if - we need to ask this question each call whether anybody's Statement of Interest has changed since the last call.

Okay hearing no changes I'll move into the next part of the agenda which is the responses from supporting organization and advisory committees. And since last week we have had one reply which is from Linda Corugedo Steneberg from the European Commission. And so I would like to speak about that.

I emailed the mailing list earlier in the day and I have put a copy of the letter and also - oh yes, actually it is just a copy of the letter that we received. So I don't know whether it's in the wiki - I don't know whether it's possible to display that.

And I also circulated some comments about the letter so I'm intending to start to pick up those comments. Actually before I do perhaps I should ask whether anybody else would like to make comments about the letter because I think I'm the only one who did so far.

Okay seeing no comments I will just - I'll just get involved with the - with the letter and the comments I made on it. Okay. Oh yes, if you're looking for it in the wiki then actually it's underneath List of Stakeholder Contacted. And you get into it through the questions list.

Okay well looking at the, you know, looking at the letter it was extremely helpful and raised some quite interesting issues I think. And the first one that comes up is that, you know, there is a reference basically at one point in the letter it says, "Registrants should be given the opportunity to submit data to the registrar in his own language when registering a domain name."

From our experience there might be extra costs for some of the involved parties like the registry, the registrar and/or ICANN in the GNSO environment.

And really what comes out of that is a question about exactly what those costs are for. So I would say that that is really worth pursuing and that we should write a letter and actually ask for more detail about

that. That's really my first comment. I don't know whether anybody would like to pick that up at all?

I can see Peter's agreeing in the Chat room. Thank you. Okay. So then there are some rather interesting comments about what - about who should pay. And then - now let me just - basically it's a sort of a hierarchy so it's saying registries should bear the costs of translation and transliteration of registrar data and registrars should bear the cost of translation and transliteration of registrant data.

As indicated above this is the cost of making business (unintelligible). The additional costs should be budgeted in the interest of end users, the translation and transliteration should not have, in any case, an affect on the price registrants bear.

Now the thing that comes out of this is that, you know, that, you know, the translation and transliteration should not have an affect on the final price that the registrants bear. Now this effectively I think it's suggesting a sort of subsidy.

For me I think it is possible that, you know, there will be additional costs for the foreign language work. And the question then is really who picks them up. But unless somebody subsidizes them then there is a bit of a suspicion that it could affect the registrant price.

For me that is rather an interesting aspect to this. I wonder if - oh now I've got Jim Galvin just typing something in the Chat room. And then there is this - Jim is asking how we distinguish between registrar information and registrant information.

Yes, it is a very good question. At the moment I think we've often been speaking of this, they are the same thing but the - that's probably a question that's worth adding to the wiki in fact, you know, what are the differences. Yes, that certainly was. Thank you for that.

But certainly I think fundamentally it is possible that translation or transliteration could affect price and then the question is whether there is a subsidy or whether registrants end up paying it but it does highlight quite an interesting area.

Moving further down, unless there are any other questions about that, there is also quite a lot of talk about possible benefits. And I'm intending to add these possible benefits to the relevant part in the wiki after this call. So, you know, it's things like a homogenous IRD resource, actually the Whois resource, is quoted as a benefit of transliterating or translating presumably into English.

Using a common language facilitates registration when registrants do not share a common language. And consultation of data by law enforcement also requires a common language so these are all possible benefits.

What we are not saying is what, you know, what rights these various parties have. So we're actually not saying what rights, for example, law enforcement may have.

But certainly as a benefit, presuming that they do have some rights, then, you know, that, you know, the fact that one language is being used would, you know, would be a benefit and so therefore it goes into

the wiki under that heading. Any questions about the benefits part of the letter? Okay seeing none I shall continue.

(Unintelligible). Now the example that comes up in the letter is (unintelligible) which in many cases it wouldn't be necessary to be functioning in so many languages. Oh, sorry, Jim, I didn't see your hand go up. Would you like to say something about benefits?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Thank you, Chris. Jim Galvin here. The only question that occurs to me with respect to benefits is as we had this discussion some of the benefits - they're not necessarily in conflict with each other but there's certainly a relationship between them. And so one of the things I think that we should do as part of our analysis is to compare the benefits and see where the tradeoffs are in them. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, certainly I think there is a close relationship between benefits and tradeoffs. So, yes, I mean, it's a part of the wiki we haven't really developed yet so I think certainly what I might do is at least put Linda's benefits in there and, you know, we can then start to add and edit really. And, you know, certainly tradeoffs will be a part of that. Thank you for that.

Okay so coming back to - I was just mentioning the EU. And I was - I was saying that the EU could be rather an extreme case. So they are really having to deal with many languages. And so, you know, it may be that typically not - perhaps not so many will be involved.

But really the main thing, which came out of looking at the letter was that it would be very helpful to think through some scenarios. And I think that is work which I would like to suggest that we do. And the

scenarios would be something like probably start off with some quite simple scenarios.

So, you know, you have a French language registrant so he applies for a domain name in French so it's quite a simple example. And then we just talk it through and look at it from the point of view of contact information.

So actually that is something I would like to ask people on the call whether they feel that that sort of scenario based approach would be helpful. I don't know whether anybody wants to say anything to that or just, you know, just to put, you know, agree or disagree perhaps. Jim Galvin reckons the scenarios are a good idea. Thank you for that.

As I say, I feel that we would do well to start - and Petter is also agreeing with that. I feel that we would do well to start with very simple scenarios and then make them more and more complicated.

Jim, would you like to say something about that?

Jim Galvin: Yes please. Thank you. This is Jim Galvin. I wasn't agreeing with scenarios per se. I wanted to observe that the EWG has, in a sense, you know, have been starting from scenarios. They created their purposes for registration data and were using that as a basis for their work.

So I was thinking if we wanted to explore scenarios we should - going to suggest that we start with their example (unintelligible) at least a starting basis for our work.

Chris Dillon: Yes, that - I am more than happy to do that. You know, we should be linking to things that are already available. And have they actually published something on - oh sorry, purposes, yes, I think I have read something. So we just need to link to - it's not even the whole document, I think it's part of a document if my memory is right. Yes.

Jim Galvin: Yes, this is Jim again. They published a draft document twice now. And they have, you know, discussed their purposes for data in both of them.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: And I suspect that they were fairly consistent at least in the two versions of their document that will continue to be true going forward. I wouldn't expect, you know, any significant differences or movement away from those purposes in their final document. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you very much for that. We, you know, we should certainly revisit that document first. And, you know, it may also be the case that there is some aspect we want to add. I mean, there is also - I have a feeling that it's - there's almost a sort of a role not for duplicating but just it's rather like we were doing with just collecting examples of addresses.

So it's just becoming actively involved rather than just reading as a document - I think oddly enough if you actually try and do a little bit of work one often sees things which one, you know, doesn't otherwise see so that's - I hope it - I hope it will be possible to be quite active in that sort of area because as I was saying I think one does tend to see more by being active even if it's only doing a little amount.

Okay well let's move on from scenarios and just see if there's anything else in the letter. And, yes, sure enough there was one last point I wanted to pick up and that is the - we've got a question about validation. So this is obviously a very important area.

Also I have noticed that sometimes the word "validation" is used and sometimes the word "verification" is used. So I don't know whether anybody has a preference for one of those terms over the other. That's the question I would like to ask you.

Jim, would you like to say something about that?

Jim Galvin: So yes thank you. This is Jim Galvin. In one of SSAC's recent documents - and I'll have to get the exact reference and I'll post it in the Chat room here after I go look it up and forget which one it is. But we made a distinction between verification and validation.

It was, frankly, you know, my assessment it was arbitrary in the sense that we just made a choice. We found ourselves that the terms are used - they seem to be used interchangeably. And so...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: ...we sort of created the definition of verification versus validation. And we chose to use one term versus the other. And roughly speaking verification we chose to interpret it more as the process; the act of validating. And validation speaks to the state of the data.

Chris Dillon: I see.

Jim Galvin: So that was just our choice. I'll get the reference and I'll post the words into the Chat room so that we have that for consideration.

Chris Dillon: Okay.

Jim Galvin: My specific advice to the group would be to make a choice on what we want to do, define it and then stick with it.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: I'm not aware of a clear distinction in any kind of standard way as to which is which. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. Now I notice in the Chat room Sarmad is writing quite a lot. And he says, "Validation is are we building the right product? And verification is are we building the product right?" That's a interesting possibility there.

Now whichever one it is - sorry, Jim, would you like to say something about that?

Jim Galvin: No just typing in the Chat room that...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: ...Wikipedia distinction is essentially what SSAC did in its document too. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Oh okay. Yes. Right, okay that's good. Thank you for that. Well either way I think that we may do well to add a question to our questions which actually deals with this area. It's obviously a key area. You know, we can decide exactly where that goes later but, you know, I think it is another area where we need to - it's worth having a dedicated question for it so thank you for that.

Sorry, Jim, is there something you'd like to add?

Jim Galvin: No, sorry.

Chris Dillon: That's all right, don't worry. Easily done. Okay so that means we, you know, we're probably almost ready to move on to the next point in the agenda. But I'll just ask are there any other issues anybody would like to raise about that letter before we move on? Okay thank you very much for that.

And so the next part of the agenda is refinements to the proposed questions. Well, we've already had one possible refinement and that is that we, you know, we feel that we need to add something on verification and validation.

And so I'll just come back to the questions which are under Part 4 in the wiki for anybody looking at that. And so - might as well work through it fairly very logically from the beginning.

I am quite seriously considering leaving out the second definition so under Number 1 on the taxonomies there is a definition from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services which I think includes things which are actually not contact information as I understand it.

And moreover there are shoulds in the wording which are things that we don't necessarily want to pick up so I am considering moving that - that definition into a sub document. But Wolf, would you like to say something about that?

Wk: Thanks, Chris. It's Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. Well not just directed to that point just we're on, you know, but I had some comments to the Number 4 questions, stakeholders. Is that okay?

Chris Dillon: Yes, okay yes. We can certainly pop down there. What would you like to ask?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well it's just - it came to my mind, you know, this question in the context also with the letter just...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...before that and the question - very last question with regards to cost burden and so on. So it seems to me that - with regards to the cost burdens especially related to the question who of the stakeholders should bear the cost? So it might be understood in that way. So and what I see you already put a list together with some stakeholders.

And it came to my mind that we should also ask, well, who are the end - the stakeholders are the, from my point of view, the so called involved parties I would say in that way. But the question for me is also don't we have also interested parties? That means parties who are interested to receive those data not only to - just to produce or to provide those

data, just to receive those data and who are they, all of them. Are they covered in the question of who are the stakeholders and that's to be seen then in the relation of the question of the cost burden so that's my point.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Wolf. That is a very - that is a very good point. I have been using the word "stakeholders" in a very, very wide loose sense so it really covers all of what you were just saying. But, you know, we, you know, it may be necessary to actually use it in a narrower way.

But I think actually if we do end up doing something with scenarios this is the sort of area that will be covered by it because as we work through - or we use materials created elsewhere which has dealt with this area, I think these issues will become clearer. But yes, okay.

Now there is some chat going on in the Chat room about what I was saying a moment ago about leaving out the second definition. Is not - oh yes okay because Amr is actually saying that that work is not policy. So yes, I mean, I - so he's saying it's not policy but we can decide to use them or not.

So we could also look - we could look at that second definition and perhaps use some of it and not other parts. But the reason I was suggesting that we might want to put it out of that document, which I think may end up being part of reports later on, is that, you know, the definition of contact information is rather different from what we've been using and so, you know, and also the bits that are left when you remove the stuff are actually very similar to what's in the other definitions.

So my suggestion is we do remove it but I am happy to, you know, if somebody wants to rescue it for a particular reason then I'm happy to - also to talk about that.

Then also in the Chat room - right, yes. Oh right okay so there's also some points being made about validation in the Chat room. Okay and that's the difference between the validation and verification. Apologies to Amr. I realize he - well he'll hear this when he listens to the tape, he can't hear what we're saying. That must be very difficult.

Okay so that's the only - oh yes, okay, he can hear, he just can't speak. That's better. Okay that was the only change I was going to suggest to the definitions part of the document. However, there is - there is a note that I sent around about translation and transliteration.

And I have added that in the wiki so that when you go into the definitions you will find also various comments. So at the moment the comments are just what I have been saying about translation and transliteration but I'm also going to add, you know, any other comment to do with those definitions, you know, for example whether we want to do something with the second definition. That will also go in that comment document.

But anyway let me just pick up some of the points of - that come up in that note that I wrote about translation and transliteration. I mean, one of them is, you know, I was talking about translation and it was - I got - I actually got stuck because anybody who speaks another language knows that there can be different sorts of translation so that would mean that sometimes you have a translation that's really close to the

foreign language, that's one thought. It's just a loyal translation I suppose.

And then you could have another translation that's not very loyal to the original language, it's not a literal translation. But actually it's better English. And I couldn't actually think of a specific example of that. I'm convinced anybody who's ever translated anything is aware of that phenomenon but I really wasn't able to think of a good example.

So basically what I'm, you know, what I'm asking is if, you know, if anybody can find a good example of that phenomenon where, you know, you've got a literal translation and then you're got good English and they're actually quite different then that would really rather help that paragraph I was writing about translation. I mean, it doesn't have to be this moment but if somebody just has a good idea on that I would be really grateful.

Oh yes, and there is in fact another aspect which is - which I didn't put in the note at all but I will add after this. And that is that apparently this is quite a common phenomenon in mainland China. But it's quite common for organizations to have no English version.

So, you know, that would be that a particular organization is - I don't know, maybe if we just cook up an example you could have - you could have an example that would be something like Beijing (fun dian), which, you know, if we were to do a literal translation it would come out as being the Beijing Hotel.

But actually that particular hotel is - it's a small hotel and it doesn't actually have a formal English translation. So it would actually be

incorrect to call it the Beijing Hotel because they don't use that form. And so I feel that I would like to add something about that phenomenon into these comments because, you know, there are certain situations where if you translate you are being profoundly unhelpful because that is actually a translation which nobody is using.

To give another example I suppose, you know, this came because I was starting to think about scenarios. And so I was imagining a hotel in Paris and thinking, you know, you could imagine a hotel called Hotel Champs-Elysees, it's literally Hotel Champs-Elysees in the middle of Paris.

And then it could have an English form which would be the Champs-Elysees Hotel which would be a sort of English version of that. But it ends up being quite difficult because although, you know, perhaps we can find Hotel Champs-Elysees and the Champs-Elysees Hotel on the hotels notes paper it may be that they really only use the French form although the English form exists.

So when you actually think of concrete examples even quite simple ones like that French one, you can sometime find some rather interesting phenomena. So, you know, it is not only that there are different forms of translation but there is a problem of usage.

So, you know, is this translated form actually used or do they use the transliteration or do they just use the original language? It's all of those possibilities. So that's something I will add to those notes about translation and transliteration.

Okay and also I - oh no that's a point I made last week. I said last week that translation, because there tends to be different sorts of it, is often not a reversible process. Because, you know, often there is more than one good way of doing a translation that is often not reversible. But there could be an exception where you actually had some kind of a controlled vocabulary.

So the example I give in the notes is the Japanese word (bidu). Now originally that word comes from (biduingu) meaning "building." So what you could do is say right, with Japanese addresses every time you see (bidu) translated as building and so that is effectively a controlled vocabulary. And so at that point actually building and (bidu) become completely reversible because there is a, you know, if actually there is a controlled vocabulary which links them.

I then made a - sorry, before I continue I just need to - I don't know who put their hands up first but Petter, would you perhaps like to add something about that?

Petter Rindforth: Yeah just - thanks, Petter Rindforth here. Just a short note that I agree that there are many different options here. But I feel that in order to not extend our work too much so it will be impossible to find a solution we need to keep to - and the way it's possible the more official translation versions. And in the examples you gave for when it comes to company names, for instance, in most countries there is an official - an alternative translated but still official version.

And then it's completely different what maybe the public - the common public called that company. But if it keep to the official translations as far as possible.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. That is tremendously helpful. I think there are many occasions where the word official is very useful to us. So, you know, also with transliteration we may want to use the word official which would actually mean an ISO standard or a government regulation. So I very much like the idea of official.

I will give - just quickly I will give an interesting example here. There is a Japanese company which is called Matsushita in Japanese. And that very often is Panasonic in English. So there can be situations where the original language is completely different from the translation. And using a concept like official is really, really useful. Thank you for that.

Wolf, would you like to make a comment about this?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from the ISPCP speaking. Well I wonder whether my question is related to that what Petter was just pointing out. It's the question well to the translation rather than a transliteration. And it's referring to - how to say that is specific names, you know, to the contact information, call it in German (Eigenhammer) as the, for example, a - the name what to say (unintelligible) also in English it would be New Town or whatever.

But you never - you never would translate it because it's a German city, it's called that way and it would be called in other languages as well as (Noristatua), the pronunciation might be in different way.

So for me the question how we deal with these things, you know, are we going also to think about what kind of words in this - in this contact information are so these kinds which really should be translated or are

we going to try to translate all the words or are we going to exclude from translation those words which are specific - the specific names in any language which might be pronounced a different way.

But this is a different thing, well, to pronounce Paris in French, Paris and in German Paris and so that's very different. So how we deal with that way so is the question from my side. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. I mean, again when one actually looks at addresses one sees certain tendencies. In some ways I'm - there's part of me not wanting to say too much because I think we may need to look at more languages, more addresses in other languages before we really come off the fence.

But what seems to happen at this early stage is that you can - if you look at addresses - or sorry, if you look at - yeah, sorry it is addresses. If you look at addresses then there seem to be two parts. There is the organizational name part of the address and then there is the rest of the address.

Looking at it at this point it seems often that the best thing to do with the main part of the address is to transliterate it. Now at that point we might want to use the word "official" so you transliterate it using an official transliteration.

You may then have to do something else so you may find that your official transliteration has got lots of detail that you don't actually need, tone marks, that would come to mind. So, you know, we might want to transliterate Beijing, you know, B-E-I-J-I-N-G. We may not want to

transliterate it, you know, B-E-I- with the third tone mark - and then J-I-N-G with the first tone mark. That's just going too far.

But, you see if you follow the official Chinese transliteration that's what you have to use. So anyway for the main body of the address it's very early days but it does look as if transliteration may be really useful.

Okay at that point examples like Japanese (bidu), you know, do we actually want to change (bidu) into building? Maybe, you know, that might conceivably be an exception. But that seems to be what some of this early data is sort of indicating.

Now as regards organizational names it's the opposite. So there what we're looking at is official translations if they exist. So going back to the example I was giving earlier our little hotel in Beijing doesn't have an official translation so that's just going to be Beijing (Sun Diun). It means Beijing Hotel but we are not going to use that; we are not going to translate it because there is no official translation.

However in many other cases where there is an official translation, I mean, for example the hotel which had the ICANN meeting a few months ago or a year ago now, that was the Beijing International Hotel so that would be an official translation. And we wouldn't be using the original Chinese.

So that seems to be a sort of (unintelligible). Perhaps I've said rather more than I should about that. Would you like to make any comments?

Petter Rindforth: Just it seem that we need to limit it a bit. And as I said there are some hotel names that we don't really need to translate. We have the - in the

original more difficult question I think that everything should be readable even if it you don't understand what it is.

But to have the two versions, one the Cyrillic version and the other one the English version, for example, and the Chinese different - two, three different versions, to be readable in English.

Chris Dillon: Oh well, I was really talking only of two versions so I was saying we should have - I mean, I was using a Chinese example. I was saying we should have the original Chinese characters. Then for the address that's the transliterated address in probably some version of pinyin. And then the organization is going to be a translated name if there is one in existence - if there is an official translation. But that would in fact be - otherwise that would be transliteration as well.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, so just we get - we had the German example, for instance, I mean, that's...

Chris Dillon: Neustadt.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, it's readable for us. We have up in the North Sweden our dots on As and Os that make it (unintelligible). And if we take them away it will be just Os and As, that can be everything. But as I said simple example what you do.

But once you can read it you, I mean, it's - so we don't get into a discussion on if it's possible to understand once we have translated the Chinese sign into English do we have to really make it readable word that we understand that means something or can it be so to speak just translated so that we can read it.

We know that, okay, the hotel name is whatever it is and it may mean something else in Chinese. But at least it's readable.

Chris Dillon: Yes, I mean, at all stages we would have something readable. I mean, the addresses frequently have a different format so, you know, it is often the case that in English numbers come at the beginning of the addresses and in other language often the number is the very last thing.

So actually funnily enough very often the database will solve that sort of problem because, you know, there will be something, you know, there might be different fields. So, you know, I mean, that's actually another question that really comes out of it, you know, do we lump the whole address into one field or do we split it up/

If we split it up then, you know, there may be a separate field for the number at the beginning and then it does some amount of analysis which part is, you know, which part of this foreign language address means what. So that means that order doesn't matter so much because the database is actually performing that role.

Okay Petter was wanting to ask a question for a long time. Would you like to ask your question, Petter? I'm sorry we took a long time to go into that.

Petter Rindforth: You're talking to - I don't think I have a question left.

Chris Dillon: Okay sorry about that. Amr has been typing quite a lot in the Chat room so I'm just going to pick that up. There's something about Arabic.

Oh yeah, and okay so here we've got situations where the same word in one dialect or one language means something totally different in another. Again, I think if we're dealing with official translation of organizational names and transliteration of addresses I don't think it's - it's not a really big issue.

Now there is also a point that Amr is making about the Norwegian (Er) sound but I'm afraid I don't - oh yes, (Er) in Norwegian that's the O with the dash through the middle of it. When - if you do not have a Norwegian keyboard you have to write only O; you don't do O-E or anything like that.

And so you may end up with several Norwegian words coming together and meaning the same thing because one has the dash through it and one doesn't. Yes, and you've got (Oh) and (Eh) as well from Norwegian. I think it's very similar in Swedish.

But again because if we do end up and it's very early days but if we do end up using the official translations for the organizational names and transliteration for the addresses then that really decides these things because, you know, if those letters come up, well, they would only come up in the translated form if it was actually part of the official translation. And they would need to be able to be displayed in the transliteration.

Okay well that was an interesting discussion. And, I mean, I would like to - I would like to emphasize that the opinions I gave then are based on not enough data. You know, I need to see more addresses in more languages whether we collect that data or whether we borrow it from one of the other working groups.

But at the moment time and time again whether it's the Chinese example we had or the Japanese one, you know, tried this on various European languages. There was a Thai example where we had very similar phenomenon happening at the moment a lot of the data is nudging - is sort of pushing us in one direction. And we will just have to see over time whether that continues to happen.

Okay so then I'll just come back to - we're getting quite close to the - in fact I'm thinking maybe it's better if we - I'm just wondering do we do a little bit more on transliteration or do we wind down? Well we've got a few more minutes, let's do it.

So lastly I may - I really made a point which I think this call has actually emphasized that the key word with transliteration is actually process but, you know, there has to be a systematic aspect to it, it's not sort of somebody just transliterating something in a particular way. There has to be some system.

So that anybody doing it can produce the same result. And so typically there will be government legislation or an ISO standard. But then you may want to make - but you may want to make certain exceptions, you know, knock off some sort of detail from the transliteration, from the standard.

Then there was also a thing about reversibility. And basically some of the simpler alphabetic and Syllabic alphabet - sorry, alphabetic writing systems or (Syllabre) so these are the systems which use syllables rather than letters, some of those are reversible but many writing systems aren't.

So in my notes I just - I pointed out that Japanese is not reversible because, you know, frequently you can write the same words using different characters and there's a Japanese name, Ito which can be written in two common ways in Japanese and in fact it's a problem with transliteration as well because there are several transliterations so that, as we've already discussed on previous calls.

And so Japanese is certainly not reversible so if you transliterate Japanese into Romanization you will - you may not be able to get the original back if you go the other way. You know, you really are guessing particularly with names.

And then - and then Thai in fact that is a similar situation because Thai is an alphabetic writing system but very frequently there is more than one way of writing the same sound and so sometimes a particular way of writing the sound does create a particular tone and sometimes it's hooked up with tone but sometimes it isn't. There are just alternative ways of doing things.

And so that means that Thai would be very difficult to reverse I would think because things which may be written several - sounds which may be written several ways in the Thai script end up looking the same in English. They use, again, as with the Japanese you can't get back reliably.

Okay so I think that brings us to the end of the translation and transliteration notes, you know, that part of the wiki. I did have a few more comments about other parts of the questions but we've really

timed out so I think I shall save those either for the list or for a later call.

Does anybody have anything to say about translation or transliteration? And is there any other business is the other thing I should be asking. I think a couple of people are having to leave. Well in that case many, many thanks for today's meeting. And I look forward to kicking around some of the things that have come out of it on the mailing list. Okay thank you very much indeed. Good bye then.

END