

ICANN
Transcription
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT
Thursday 27 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 27 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-20140227-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Jim Galvin - SSAC
Ahkuputra Wanawit – GAC
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Peter Green - NCUC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Rudi Vansnick – NPCO
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Supachok Jantarapatin - SOI

Apologies:

Justine Chew – At-Large
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP
Ephriam Percy Kenyanito – NCUC
Amr Elsadat - NCUC
Ching Chiao - RySG

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffman

Nathalie Peregrine
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded. Please go ahead, thank you.

Terri Agnew: Good morning - thank you (Anna). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is the meeting of the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 27th of February 2014.

On the call today, we have Peter Green, Rudi Vansnick, Ahkuputra Wanawit, Chris Dillon, Mae Suchayapim Siriwat, Peter Rindforth, Pitinan Koormornpatana, Jim Galvin. We have apologies from Justine Chew, Jennifer Chung, Amr Elsadr, Wolf-Ulrich-Knoben, Ephraim Kenyanito and Ching Chiao.

From Staff we have Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund, Nathalie Peregrine and myself Terri Agnew.

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

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. This is Chris Dillon speaking.

Let's just move to item three on the agenda which is whether there have been any changes to the Statements of Interest since the last call. Just put your hand up in Adobe Chat if that's happened.

Okay, seeing their hands up, we can move into agenda item four which is responses, if any, from SOs and ACs. And we've had one response, it's a tie response, very, very interesting. So we'll cover that in a minute.

But during today's earlier call with the GNSO Council, it was suggested that we actually increase the deadline. So the deadline for responses to the letters that we sent out is actually tomorrow which is obviously very soon and we've not had many responses. So there is a suggestion that we, you know, make the deadline sometime in the future.

Now the question would be exactly when that might be appropriate. And I think the suggestion may have been to, you know, just to make it another week which would put it at the 7th of March or something like that.

Lars, would you like to add something about that?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, thank you Chris. This is Lars for the record. I apologize.

I think we just probably find maybe two weeks might work too. I was just wondering on the format whether it would be okay for - it might be useful for the chat - other working groups have done this - for the chat to send out reminders to the leaders of different SOs, ACs and stakeholder groups and contingencies. So it comes from you this time around as a reminder from the secretariat, who sent it out the first time, and there's precedence for this and I think it might add to the urgency.

Chris Dillon: I'm very happy to do that. If you have an email list that you used last time, could you send - I mean sensitive list with the names and the emails, then I'll do that.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, no problem. I will get in touch with Glen and particularly with Julie, I will forward that all to you.

Chris Dillon: That would be very helpful. I mean leaves us with the decision about whether it should be one week or two.

But before we get into that, I'll just ask - I think Rudi would like to say something.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Chris. Rudi speaking for the transcript.

I've had the chat with Olivier overnight discussing about the comments about the At Large. And it seems that they need some more time to handle this question (unintelligible). There's a lot on the tables that the different SOs and ACs. There are so many working groups at the same time going on and a lot of input is requested from all of them, and I think that's the reason why we need to get that much response.

They will look into it and they promise me that we can have a face-to-face discussion in Singapore to eventually highlight a few of the questions we have.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. That sounds as if it's a vote for the deadline to be at least two weeks, so that would be the 14th of March. But that really is just before Singapore and I'm really wondering what the best thing to do with this is because obviously, you know, we don't want to add unnecessary delay, but on the other hand we haven't had very much input.

Julie, would you like to say something about that.

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

I would suggest that the working group is having a public meeting on the Monday in Singapore that the deadline should be extended through Singapore because we would have the opportunity at that public meeting to remind - to go over the questions, to ask again for input because we'll in the Asian region we might be able to generate some interest from members of the community in Asia.

And I think that probably the most important goal for this group is to get as much information as possible. While we do have deadlines, it's fairly clear in

the charter that the working group is supposed to consult as much as possible and I think the consultation on these questions is very key.

So I would ask the working group to consider extending the deadline through Singapore. And if there is an opportunity for face-to-face meeting with the ALAC in Singapore, of course we could gather input from them as well.

Although I would suggest Rudi, that if that meeting is to take place, it needs to be scheduled ASAP because I do know that for many groups, their schedules in Singapore are booked or nearly booked, and I imagine that's probably the case with the ALAC as well.

So I would put that out there then for the working group's consideration.
Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that Julie, very helpful.

I - now I wonder what the people feel about that. I mean effectively that is more or less saying that the deadline should be moved until the end of March, that's how I understand that. What do people think about that suggestion?

I can see that Rudi is agreeing - yes, okay now. Peter, would you like to say something about that?

Peter: Yes, I'll just (unintelligible), okay. I think it's a good idea if it's practically possible.

I just wanted to add - do we have the possibility to also have a meeting with the group of interests - as I understand it?

Chris Dillon: I think effectively, we are to have a meeting I think either early on Monday or Tuesday morning which we can use for that. So that is my understanding. We

don't know whether it's Monday or Tuesday but I think that's what that is about.

Peter: You know, because as said, the general schedule is quite full already. So if there are any opportunities for us to meet formal or more informal to get face-to-face input from the groups, it would be excellent. (Unintelligible) it would take all those opportunities that came up to us.

Chris Dillon: Yes absolutely, I agree completely.

Now in the Chat, Julie's typing that there is a tentative time for that meeting which is 7:30 till 8:30 on the Monday. So you know, we really need to make the most of that meeting and advertise it, publicize it.

But also, I think it's very important that all of us, you know, use networking opportunities to mention, you know, what we're doing and that we do need feedback and other help.

The facility that we know we won't have is a home room, so you know, there is no way that we are going to have a room where we could actually invite people back, that will not work. So it's either going to be a matter of using that meeting on Monday or going to other meetings, or what we can do personally just lobbying people. That seems to be the situation we are in.

Oh yes, Julie is pointing out that the (walls) are requesting a meeting with the GAC which is turned down which we should just add just to make sure things are complete. But that schedule is just way to full.

Okay, well, if we tentatively agree that the deadline is moved till the end of March, we can now perhaps have a look at the tie correspondence that came in, unless there's anybody wants to pick up before we head into that.

There's also various typing going on in the room here. Oh yes, so I think we may have the - if that's a tie. Yes, it's a tie. (Vlativa) in the chat room, that's really useful.

Okay, so...

Rudi Vansnick: Chris, if I may?

Chris Dillon: Oh yes, yes. Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes Chris, Rudi speaking here. I just got reaction back from Olivier with regard to a meeting with ALAC. And it looks like they still have a couple of slots available. So you know, going to check with (Ivy) also and we will try to find a space in their agenda to fit in to it.

On the other side, I will try on the (Unintelligible) side to see if we can have an hour space in our schedule to allow people to come and have a face-to-face chat with us too at that moment.

With regard to the question of Peter, I would say let's try to individually push GAC members in order to get return back from GAC. I know that that will require a lot of work and energy, but I think we need input from them too.

Chris Dillon: Yes, absolutely. Thank you very much for that input.

Julie Hedlund: Chris and Rudi, maybe I could - this is Julie Hedlund. Perhaps I could just add.

I'll go ahead and get in touch with Heidi for the ALAC meeting because I will actually have to try to see if we can avoid conflicts. And I have a draft schedule so I know when various meetings are scheduled, and of course Heidi knows the ALAC schedule. So I'll work with her to see if we can find a

time that does not conflict with something that we know that community members will need to attend.

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

All right, well, in that case let us move into the next point in the agenda which is looking at the response that we've had. And it is this tie response you can see on the screen.

And making some very interesting points about English as the first language or an official second language, though, you know, English is no such thing in Thailand. But you know, for practical reasons, English is - yes, reading it through, there is a clause that says that English is the de facto second language of Thailand.

And then further down, I think there's recognition. It says, "It is quite clear," - this is on Page 2 near the top. "It is quite clear that it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate it to a single common script." And effectively that means English.

So nothing too con- I mean interesting but nothing too controversial coming out of that.

Moving further down, there is mentioned that English contact information may be inconsistent. Well you know, this is a very, very common issue. And in fact, there was another Thai document that was sent to the list which has absolutely beautiful examples of actually - I think they are Bangkok place names, and it's just an absolute education to see what the issues are. I mean there's just nothing like looking up the data.

And if we're lucky today, we may have time to have a look at that correspondence because, you know, it does raise a lot of things that we've already talked about but one or two meetings as well.

Moving down what have we got? Oh yes. Now there is talk about Romanization so we're heading towards the bottom of Page 2. And the Thai case is by the Royal Institute.

And then there is talk of exceptional reserved words and that there is a Geographical Name Committee. So this means, you know, the Geographical Name Committee may be establishing four more versions of Thai place names.

Now the reference to the list of reserved words, I'm not sure about that. That might be something we need to follow-up.

Fascinatingly, at the end of that paragraph, there is the however the standards are not widely known. Oh dear, I mean this is exactly the sorts of issues we were seeing when we were looking at suggestions before now.

Standards are not widely known and it is not mandatory to adopt them. So that means that even government entities could be using different methods of translation or transliteration. You know, these are issues we have seen with the addresses we've looked at.

I'm just trying to think which language they are, certainly Chinese, Japanese, yes. It's a really big thing.

Okay, some talk about validation. I posted a definition of validation to our list of definitions which is on the Point 1 in our questions.

It's also taken up in - validation is actually also taken up in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. Again, it would be very, very good at how validation is used. It's in a section called Whois Accuracy Program Specification. And you know, admittedly, it's only for registrars, but that's very interesting and we may just have time to have a look at that I hope.

Okay, now any other interesting things? I think the answers to some of these other questions are more or less what we've seen before. So you know, contact information needs validation, and then should translation and/or transliteration be mandatory? And you know, basically it should be mandatory.

And there's also some statistics about how gTLDs breakdown in Thailand. So how many are gTLDs and how many are ccTLDs.

And then - now we're well on to Page 3. So we're looking at should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all registrants and that? Yes, again, we're guessing the answer mandatory for those.

Oh actually, based in - yes, but based in non-ASCII script country so that's the sort of answers I suppose we would expect.

Moving further down - oh yes. Oh brilliant. They're actually talking, I'd forgotten. They're actually talking about the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, wonderful, we can cover it.

And so validate that all (post address) fields are consistent across fields. So for example, the street exists in the city and this sort of thing.

It brings up some very interesting issues about just how addresses are represented in databases. And if we get as far at looking at the other Thai document, there is an interest situation where somebody actually missed out part of the address, and I think it was the district name in the Thai address.

And you know, the question there was that might have been because whoever was filling in the form didn't realize that the district information

needed to go in a particular field. So that's actually starting to raise some issues that we haven't thought about very much.

Okay, is technically commercially feasible.

And then there's, you know, the pointing out that validation of postal addresses could be, you know, very costly. And there could be difficulty with that, you know, getting various territories to comply with that.

Perhaps I should just pause momentarily. I wonder would anybody else like to pick up any points in here. I'm just replying through all the points that I noticed but it's quite likely other people have thought of other things. So I'll just stop for a moment and see if anybody would like to pick up any points.

Problem? Yes Pitinan, would you like to say something?

Pitinan Koarmornpatna: Yes, Pitinan speaking here. Thank you very much Chris. This is very good reading of the documentation.

I just want to update a little bit about the attempt at GAC during the Singapore meeting. We actually tried to approach the GAC individually, and during the (Apricot) presentation, we met in Singapore and Malaysian GAC and we talked to them a little.

So it likely that we will have a small group if they are individual GAC. But it's not confirmed yet and I will keep the group updated for that one thing. (Unintelligible) update now.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. I realize that there have been efforts going on. But we are really grateful for that and all of the work that you have been doing with your colleagues. It's much appreciated.

Rudi, would you like to make a point?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Chris. Rudi speaking.

I had a chat a few days ago with Kathy Kleinman in another working group session. And she pointed out that a lot of registrars are looking into the discussions about the RDS and figuring out what the new model would be. And eventually if in the model there is a definition and there is space for (unintelligible) to allow having (ASCII Script) field an unknown (ASCII Script) field more contact information and translation (unintelligible).

But that has a lot of impact that the services that the registrars have to develop for their customers. And I felt a lot of push back from the registrars' work that they see it as a non-beneficiary service that they would have to deliver anyway or they would be excluded from some markets.

So it is an issue that I think we need to have a deeper discussion with the registrars for in order to better understand their pushback at the first level. But also at the same time, try to convince them that there is an advantage having this also.

Chris Dillon: Yes, those are very, very important points. Thank you very much. So we really need to target them as an audience.

Okay, now coming back to the Thai document/letters - let's just continue with other - see what other issues they have raised.

So there is something about the Whois accuracy program specifications. Manual verification could be costly for registrars when it is cross border. So yes, that's really very much building up what you're just saying. I mean that's obviously one of the concerns.

You know, so I mean I suppose it could be a Thai registrar which is possibly having to register, I don't know, Chinese addresses conceivably. You just - you have to wonder what sort of cases that could be.

Now, so we've got to the bottom of Page 3 now. And then if we go over to Page 4, we're now talking about what should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration - or sorry - when should it come into effect.

And then there is talk about phishing in Thailand - sorry, PH, no offense to fishing.

And so - and actually, this is answering the issue that Rudi just brought up. So you know, this is a reason for doing this, you know, providing this information, you know, could come under phishing mitigation. And so, you know, those actually an argument for doing it soon.

Then if we just scroll down a few more paragraphs, there are suggestions at the end of the letter, really just one sentence, but it says, "The cost of conversion from local language into common language should belong to registrants and the costs of validation should belong to registrars." That definitely needs to be recorded about costs.

Now that is just my version, yes, that is just my sort of criticism, my summary of that letter. It's, you know, very, very interesting. Before we move further on, I'd just like to give other people a chance to add any other input about that letter.

There is typing going on in the Adobe Chat so I'll just wait for that - Rudi, would you like to say something about that?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Chris. Rudi speaking.

This is a good sample. The Thai letter is a really, really good sample that there are specific needs for translation and transliteration. And I think this could be used as a kind of sample too. And I'm just wondering if we would be allowed to go public with the responses of Thailand to trigger others to step up and come forward with their feelings and their perceptions and their comments. Sometimes this could be an advertiser for others.

Chris Dillon: Oh, that is - thank you very much. This is Chris speaking. That is a very interesting suggestion.

Now basically, as these things are coming in, I am making them public so they are - I think this correspondence is all in the Wiki somewhere so it's really just a matter of putting links to it.

Now what we could do is when I send out the letters, you know, to (chase) at responses, I could add a line just saying, "You know, this is what other people have said because, you know, certainly, it's a lot easier to look at what other people have done and see what sort of issues there could be for other languages because they may well effect your language." So that is what I would like to suggest.

I don't know how people - okay, thank you Rudi. Rudi's saying he agrees with that.

Okay, so when the letters go out, I will add a line to the Wiki correspondence so that people can see what's already happened and that should make things easier. Thank you very much Pitinan.

And now just looking again at the Chat, Peter Green is expressing interest in the infrastructure concept and asking a very good question. Okay, you know, who is building these databases?

Rudi, I wondering if you're answering that question.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Chris. Rudi speaking.

I think it's important that we catch up with the expert working group that works on also the RDS and the data model. It would be good if it could trigger them in order to see if they plan in the model, space for having two languages for one field. If that's a fact, then indeed we have to look into the infrastructure concept of the work that is to be done.

But again, I would like to know, and maybe we have to address that working group with a specific message, asking them if they are thinking about having such a solution in the RDS. Otherwise, it will make it difficult to get our recommendation being implemented by another group.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. You know, that is absolutely the case. Does anybody on the call happen to know whether that is the way the database is being - I have to admit I have presumed that there are two fields the whole time. You know, one ASCII, one non-ASCII.

And in fact, the issue doesn't stop there because, you know, there's going to be the problem about whether the ASCII is transliteration or translation. But that is a very, very important question that we need to be sure about.

So specifically, one of the issues is that, you know, presuming there are two fields, let's just imagine the organization field. So you would have - now again, we're going to use the Chinese organization as an example. So we've got the Chinese organization and it's written the organizational name in Chinese in the non-ASCII field in characters.

And then because it's well known organization, the University of Peaking for example, it's a well-known organization. So it's them in the other field and in the ASCII field it's put University of Peaking in the other field.

But you know, the question is so if you had a rare organization which actually didn't have an English form - so now I'm just really struggling with something ending in company - you know, whether we're happy to have transliteration or translation all in that ASCII field. I mean these are the sort of questions that come up.

Okay, well, the main thing is that we have highlighted this issue. And you know, we will need to be in contact about both sides, you know, how many fields there are for what, and you know, we can actually have two rather different sorts of (papers) sitting in one field.

Okay. And so moving on, you know, I think unless anybody has got anything else to say about that, we can now move into refinements to proposed questions. And there was quite a lot of work done on question 527 last week which I have tried to summarize in the Wiki.

So basically, it may not be a very good summary of what the various people said. It's always rather difficult to summarize, you know, other people's pieces in meetings. But you know, have a look at the summaries, and just at the moment, giving you a URL so you can have a look at the questions.

If you have a look at the questions, and you know, you think that your bit's too short, then just email me or if you've got direct access to the Wiki, just fix it, and it's one of the really good things about Wiki.

So anyway, lots of stuff on questions 5, 6 and 7. I then added, you know, we were going to have new question about validation. And I think eventually I just called I think it was verification and validation.

And so I started that off by using the other Thai document because there is the - now let me see if I can find that. I'm struggling to get that question. Okay, we've actually got some sort of technical problem because I did

actually create a page but for some reason it seems to have vanished from the Wiki. So I don't know - oh, wait a moment.

Oh yes, - Julie just pasted the - yes, okay, that is the correct URL which Julie has just pasted and it's called Validation as Addressed Information, and this is the other Thai document which is the presentation. So I think it would be very good to have a look at this because, you know, there's just so much in it. So I'm hoping that everybody is able to see it.

And in turning to Page 2, and that's a slide called Current Whois Contact Information. And there we have the problems I was just telling you about before that for some reason one of the parts of the address is messed off, it's actually the district. But you see, that can be a probably because different countries call districts and subdivision different things.

You know, in Japan, you have words like chore and (choremay) and these all refer to various sorts of districts. And so there can be problems because it may not be clear, you know, where people put the information. And if it isn't clear, you've got a problem like the one here that I already mentioned a little bit earlier.

Then if we go on to Page 3, and that's called Current Whois Contact Information. So we have the - it looks like Google Maps. Yes, now things are a bit easier and we're not having to use two tops in my browser.

So here, we have the transliteration (Tunnel with Diu), and this is - we had such tentative ideas about how addresses would work. And our tentative idea was that transliteration would be used, so basically we are talking (Tunnel with Diu) like the first possibility. And that's what's on the street sign.

But on what looks like Google Maps, you've got (Wireless Road), and of course, the question I really want to ask the Thai members of our group is how common is this? So is it that normally, you know, you find (Tunnel with

Diu), and it's quite rare to find these things actually translated? Or is it something that just happens the whole time.

So Pitinan, I'm hoping you're going to be able to help us.

Pitinan Koarmornpatna: Hi, it's Pitinan here. (Unintelligible) their number two is actually happen not every cases. But for this case, actually the (Wireless Road) is the road that is the location of U.S. Embassy and British Embassy and also quite a number of the financial institutions. So it's coming to the spotlight.

The (Witty You) means radio and the radio is the wireless, so somehow the first one who put the English name on it has called it (Wireless North). So in this case, we actually go the (Wireless). And so maybe I'll just go over the next slide or so.

So the next slide is (unintelligible) - sorry, I can't hear myself. Okay. Okay - I just (unintelligible). Okay, this one is called (unintelligible) on this road. As you can see when you search for the Google, the result first (unintelligible). But on the map on the right, actually Google couldn't figure whether it's use of translation and transliteration. So after the number ABC, you will see the Thai word often on the U. And the rest is called (unintelligible).

And if you look at the Whois registry (unintelligible) the (Wireless Road) because it depends on the (unintelligible) to key in. And on this road the common name is the (Wireless Road).

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

Pitinan Koarmornpatna: Actually (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: I think it might be something with your computer Pitinan. If you can click off your computer Pitinan, I think that might help.

This is a very difficult case, just quite (unintelligible), you know, this is something we really need to think of because we have a road in Thailand which is common name. What else do we do?

I almost expect (Wireless Road), but we may want to have a rule which is they use transliteration which is (unintelligible). But anyway, I won't go too much into the ins-and-outs of this because there is more of this stuff just a bit later which I think will help.

Rudi, would you like to say something?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Chris, Rudi speaking.

Yes, I have in fact a question for Pitinan and maybe - oh, she left. She's no longer on the line.

But I'm just wondering, with the sample you were giving being the translation being (Wireless Road) is (Wireless Road) being recognized as a leading address in Thailand or not? Because that impacts a lot the validation and the value of a translation is that it's giving no legal address. It makes it really difficult for (unintelligible) to act in the correct way. So if you can eventually get some information about that.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Rudi, I couldn't agree more. This is, you know, certainly one aspect of it. But you see, I think the fear is that however much you say to people, you know, use the standard, use the legal form, this sort of case it's very difficult. It's a very truly wonderful example.

Now, let us continue because there are more good things in this presentation so let's just see the next slide.

Here - now this is - well, we've got the Romanization problem. Now this is a problem that we've already spoken about that it is possible to transliterate the

same word in several ways. So we've got H-U-A-Y, we've got H-U-Y, and brilliant - we've got H-U-A-Y-hyphen. And these are basic classic transliteration problems.

The good news is that, you know, following the standard would be really helpful here. I suspect there is probably a standard which will say, "You have to do this," and we're not just talking about how the words are written, you know, whether it's H-U-Y or with the A or not. We're also talking about the use of hyphens.

So I think the Romanization thing is not so much - I think that's fixable. A completely new issue that we haven't seen before, is just really simple, but it is whether it's road R-O-A-D or just R-D, you know. That sort of thing is also another set of issues. And assuming - you've also got the issue we already know about, you know, using road and street and things like that in, you know, Thai and other addresses.

So yes, okay. And before we leave this slide, I think there are also problems with no building name and no street name, but maybe we could ignore those. That looks just like data input problem possibly. So perhaps move on to the next one.

This slide we - Slide 6 - sorry, I got lost. Oh yes, so this is just the breakdown between the ccTLDs and gTLDs. So perhaps what this is telling us is that, you know, we really need to be looking at both groups. And you know, we do really need to reach out the ccNSO. I think that's something that's on my conscience at the moment.

Then the following slide on Number 7, we already know about. This is just our stuff so we can keep going through it.

Then we have a very interesting slide which is the Compliance slide. And here we've got some suggestions. We've got suggestions for geographical names, geographical nouns and contact information format.

And so what is very interesting here is that, you know, you've got the list of the local rules and regulations, and you've also got international standards, the United Nations Group of Experts and geographical names for geographical names.

And also the UPU, the Universal Postal Union for both geographical nouns and contact information format. This is very, very interesting because really until now, we have just been saying, "We'll transliterate it," and that's the end of the story. And perhaps transliterated is part of what these standards are saying.

Basic question, is anybody on the call familiar with these international standards? I am slightly familiar with the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names because I did some geographical work some time ago, they were involved with that.

But I'm just wondering, does anybody have familiarity with those standards? Here I am hoping to see hands going up (unintelligible). Okay, well what that means is that I will have a bit of a look at what the ramifications of what the UPU and the United Nations Group standards could be.

I mean it's the whole issue of okay, there are these standards, but are they actually going to help us? You know, by saying right, you must use this standard when you do this, is that going to make it easier for people, you know, providing transliteration or translation or is it actually making it more different?

And perhaps the approach that we've taken so far which is basically, you know, if it's an organizational name, then you translate it if it's a translation

but otherwise transliterate it. If it's a geographical address, you transliterate it, that's very simple.

Is that a better approach than this? Is there anybody that's got any feelings about that? Now Wanawit is talking about the United Nations geographical database which is an extremely useful tool which just has huge numbers of place names in it.

And Rudi is making a very similar point here. "What if the standard deviates too much from the real translated word or frankly what if the standard deviates too much from what people actually use and practice?" This is an extremely interesting area.

Okay, anything about that slide before we move into what if anything can be more interesting slide?

Okay, this is a really solid proposal. This is what should be done. So you know, there is this possibility of formalizing data using this sort of a scheme. So you've got information about the registrant on a card which then goes, you know, which then there's an application to registrar. And you've actually got a role for the GAC in checking information before that registration information goes into the RDS.

I don't know whether anybody would like to say some more about because I am probably not the person to talk about this suggestion, whether Pitinan, you would like - oh no, is Pitinan still on? If Pitinan would like to say something about this slide.

Pitinan Koarmornpatna: Okay, Pitinan here. I think the main idea of this slide is we actually see that it would be best if you try to make the input be as much right as possible. So just fix at like the very beginning of the (Unintelligible).

So it might be different from country to country, which standard you want to follow and which mechanics you want to use. But for Thai, because (unintelligible) input is from the local (carise), so if you follow this for Thai (unintelligible) probably will start to deviate too much from the real translated word. That's where (unintelligible) also. So the main idea is to make it correct since the beginning, and that's the thing.

Also, it's not really the tools, it's like the mechanics. So if you want to set the standard up for the country, it's actually takes on (Thai) right. So we are kind of working our way with the post and also the (ETDMA) agencies, we try to make it - get the stakeholder involved and set the standard for the input to be correct since the beginning. So that's the core idea.

After it get in correctly, then the validation would be like much easier-- hopefully.

Chris Dillon: Well thank you very much for your explanation. And in fact, thank you for the entire thing. I mean we are really grateful for your work and I think this is going to be helpful to many, many people.

Now Rudi, we're running out of time. Would you like to say something?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Chris. With relation to the actual slide and the explanation Pitinan has been giving which is really great, there's something popping up in mind that we maybe have to trigger into our further discussions.

It's about - as we see here the action of the registration and having the translation or transliteration done at the moment of the registration, we perhaps have to think about a later action allowing translation or transliteration after the registration has been done in order not to block a registration and have a complexity of first-in/first-out or last-in/first-out.

And so I think it's something we have to put on our list to discover if we would allow having the translation being done in a later stage than the registration.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much Rudi. Yes, extremely important.

You know, if there's a possibility of discerning the translation or transliteration, that could mean in some cases that the translation and transliteration will never be provided. If we end up in a situation where we do allow it to occur later, that could cause some problems. It's certainly something that we need to consider very carefully indeed. But thank you for that.

Okay, I wonder that there is just so much that could be said about that presentation, but if there's nothing immediate - and Rudi is actually just pointing out that going the other way is also dangerous as one may go before the other - the registration phase. Okay, so that is certainly something we need to flag up in the Wiki and elsewhere.

Okay, so now there is - we've gone just slightly over the hour but we'll just continue a few moments just perhaps.

Working methodology, this is a very general thing. I mean we have been working so far just using these questions and using the Wiki a lot. I should have made it clear earlier on there's so much that really opens just, you know, to all sorts of methodology. You know, really anything that gets us closer to where we want to be.

So this is, you know, if anybody would either like to say something briefly now about maybe improving the way we work or whether, you know, I'll just raise the issue. And you know, if somebody would like to say something now then by all means. But then otherwise, please just contribute to the mailing list at some point during the week. So that's why that working methodology point is there.

You know, it really is only one possible way of working. And at the moment what seems to be happening is that we seem to be sort of outing sub-questions every one and then. But you know, if somebody looks at the questions and says, "Well you know, this is totally irrelevant, we shouldn't be doing it." Then you know, we may want to get rid of stuff, or we may, you know, I think today we've possibly discovered a couple of new issues and therefore a couple of new questions.

But anyway, what I would really like to say is that, you know, I'm really open to changing methodology. And you know, that's an ongoing thing so I say it now. But I'll try and remember to say something similar at regular intervals.

Rudi is saying, "Perhaps we need to prioritize the questions and sub-questions?"

Yes, I think that we - that certainly I realize that if we covered the questions about cost earlier on, we might have wanted to add something to the surveys about costs so I think that's a very good point. But you know, with that said, we're fairly near at the end of the questions now. But yes, I mean we might want to change the order.

And Rudi is saying, you know, whether we want perhaps a table format with indications of priority - that sounds very useful to me. And who addresses it? Yes.

And talking about the survey just briefly, I don't know what the status of that is, whether they - I believe that they are still interested in input. And I think the only major input this survey that is being done by the study group - I should have made that clear - yes. So Julie is saying it's gone out but they are interested in comments.

And I made a comment last time that I thought it was very important that transliteration and translation could apply differently to different fields in the

database. But they've made that point in the first survey and perhaps not in the second one.

Now the other perhaps more important issue is the whole thing about costs. And that may well be too late for that survey (unintelligible) because I think it's too big an area. That may even be a follow-up survey conceivably because I think this area of costs is very, very important.

And yes, apparently there will be - I'm just reading what's going on in the Chat room. Apparently there will be a presentation in Singapore during the working group meeting. Okay, that sounds very useful.

All right, any other business? Well, thank you very much for today's call. And you know, obviously we're scheduling calls at the same time this week and the week after. So we can continue the various discussions we've had there and also on the mailing list. So I'd really like to thank you for today.

Man: Okay, thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Chris for chairing this meeting or helping us through difficult phases, thank you.

Chris Dillon: It's really interesting. Okay, thank you Rudi. Good-bye then.

Rudi Vansnick: Bye-bye.

Terri Agnew: (Anna), we can stop the recording.

Coordinator: Thanks very much for participating in today's call. You may now disconnect, thank you.

END