

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 03 April at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 03 April 2014 at 1300 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-20140403-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Petter Rindforth – IPC
Ephraim Percy Kenyanito – NCUC
Jennifer Chung - RySG
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP
Amr Elsadar – NCUC
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Peter Dernbach - IPC
Ahkuptura Wanawit – GAC

Apologies:

Rudi Vansnick – NPOC

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group call on Thursday the 3rd of April, 2014.

On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Petter Rindforth, Amr Elsadar, Ephraim Kenyanito, Jennifer Chung and Wolf Knoblen. We have received no apology

for today's call. From staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. Rudi Vansnick was in contact earlier saying that he was traveling and I think there's a Lufthansa strike or something which is delaying him so he thought he probably couldn't make this call so I'll just mention that before we get going.

Then we have a formal part of the agenda where we just need to ask whether anybody's Statement of Interest has changed? Probably not but moving on. Thank you.

And then we move into the main part of the agenda and this is to talk through responses from SOs and ACs. And we have got two, to my knowledge. One is the NCSG response and one is the ALAC response.

We are also waiting for a couple - at least of other responses. To my knowledge those are Japan and I believe the Registrars are going to write something but, you know, there may be in fact be other responses but those are the ones that I - that come to mind.

Petter, would you like to ask a question?

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, well it's a note - maybe a question, IPC actually filed comments this Monday. Haven't seen them out there yet.

Chris Dillon: Oh, no neither have I. I'm not sure what's happening there. I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, I sent a couple of reminders actually to ICANN - to put them on the list but...

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: ...replies yet so.

Chris Dillon: Oh yes, it may just be that people are recovering from the Singapore trip. Email inboxes are very full at the moment. It may well be that we, in fact, are doing the two substantial responses today will fill today's call but let's just see what kind of progress we make with those two responses.

Now in the past I have tended to go through responses and just ask, you know, for comments from people. I don't know, Amr, what you would like to do with the NCSG. I think in some ways it's actually better that somebody involved in the drafting actually presents it because if somebody else presents it, you know, it's not always presented in the best way.

On the other hand I don't want to spring that on you so perhaps if you are willing to present it we could do the ALAC one first. I think we have nobody to present that so I'll need to do that. I don't know what you think about that.

Amr Elsadr: Oh thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I have no problem presenting the NCSG statement. If you would like to start with the ALAC statement that's also fine.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Well in the sense I think the principle has to be first in the first presented so if you're happy to do it then let us start with that. I have, you know, various, you know, I've been through it in some detail so, you know, it may be that - well I'll wait until you're finished presenting and then perhaps there'd be a couple of questions. But anyway by all means - oh yes, now what we do need to do is actually display it on the screen so I will just find it. And I'll just send this URL into the chat room so that we can see where it is.

Now so basically the NCSG response is right at the bottom of that page, Page 13. And the ALAC response is right at the top of the page. So if we start by going right to the bottom. Now just a moment - just before we get going with this I shall just mention recently I have been very busy in the wiki and I've changed quite a lot of navigation and cosmetic things just so that the URLs are easier and things like that.

But it does mean that you may find occasionally that older wiki links take you to a page saying oh I can't find this page. But the wiki is actually quite good at saying I can't - it usually says I can't find the page, I think it's moved in the particular - in the particular area so apologies for that. But I thought at some stage I would have a big administrative session with the wiki and I've done it for better or for worse.

Anyway, Amr, would you like to start the presentation of the response?

Amr Elsadr: Right, thanks Chris. This is Amr. I don't have control of the document. Oh there it is; Julie just released it. I suppose it's pertinent to start with the bottom of the first page because this is quite unique, I think, for this working group. We have so many Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group members participating in the working group so I made it a point to identify the members we have here. And it's quite a lengthy list as far as regular GNSO PDP working group.

So we've got David Cake, Chris, who's one of the co-chairs, and myself, Ephriam, Patrick Lenihan, Anthony - Rudi Vansnick, who's the other working group co-chair and (unintelligible) so we've got a number - folks from NCSG who are on this working group.

I guess we could scroll down to the questions. And each one of you would need to do that on your own screen. The first question on the second page, which is in bold, asking whether it is desirable to translate contact information

to the single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.

Our response was that there is no justifiable reason to create a policy requiring translation and/or transliteration of contact information within the Whois gTLD registration directory services in a common language and/or script.

The IRD Working Group, in its final report, published some very substantive findings those included that it is both suitable to internationalize the data elements of domain name registration data with the exception of the sponsoring registrar.

I think that was the only data element the IRD Working Group had identified as not appropriate to internationalize. And that is suitable to introduce display specifications to address internationalized registration domain name and registration data.

These two functions would enable potential registrants whose native languages are not based on Latin scripts to register domain names and internationalize domain names using their native languages and script for registration data purposes.

This option should be made available to registrants and should not affect developing (unintelligible) requirements of registrars (unintelligible) 2013 RAA.

There is, however, no basis for any assumption that those registrants will benefit whatsoever from translation of their contact information to a single language or transliteration of their contact information to a single script.

The parties that are most likely to benefit from translation and transliteration of contact information, which was also pointed out in the IRD Working

Group's final report, are (unintelligible) proxy rights holders and law enforcement agencies.

So I think the point that we were trying to make in answering this question is really that in the future we are assuming - and the IRD Working Group also assumed this in their work - that there would be a great number of registrants from countries that don't use Latin script for their languages and that they would be registering a great number of domain names.

And it seems rather disproportionate to require that all of the domain names - all the registration data affiliated with these domain names be translation and/or transliteration for the purpose of a few domain names that might be necessary for certain stakeholders.

I think that's the main point we're trying to make as well as the fact that display specifications of registration data in different languages and different scripts could be made possible. And well this was also pointed out by the IRD Working Group. And I would personally think that this is a more appealing approach to registering domain names and providing registration data as opposed to having to translate and transliterate all of it. It would certainly cut down a lot of unnecessary costs for (unintelligible) valid reason.

Would you like me to take questions on each one of these responses or wait until the very end? Chris?

Chris Dillon: Actually I think it may be easier if we - it will be slightly slower but I think it will be a better discussion if we take questions at the end of each section because then people, you know, don't have to go right back to the beginning. So I think, you know, at the end of each section would be good.

Amr Elsadr: Okay great. If anyone has any questions at this point I'd be happy to respond to them.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Okay, seeing none...

Chris Dillon: ...Adobe Connect.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, I don't see any raised hands in Adobe Connect either so I guess I'll move on to the next question.

Chris Dillon: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: Of what exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact information especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation and/or transliteration.

The NCSG's view was that we believe that the benefits of translating and/or transliterating contact information (unintelligible) would be limited to end users seeking the contact information of domain name registrants. And by that - because I was listening to the recording of the face to face meeting and Jim Galvin used end users for two groups; one who are actual registrants and one who are end users of Whois lookup services so here I am referring - the reference is specifically addressing end users of Whois lookup services.

As mentioned in the IRD Working Group's final report those are most likely to be involved with property rights holders and law enforcement agencies, specifically IPR holders and (unintelligible) using English language and Latin-based scripts.

So they are IPR holders and OEAs who come from countries using the English language and Latin-based scripts. Since they are the beneficiaries of the service the burden should fall on them to translate and/or transliterate the contact information, not domain name registrants, registrars or gTLD registries.

So effectively in answering this question I think what we're trying to say is that a policy requiring translation and transliteration of contact information is undesirable and should be left up to the end user of Whois lookup services to do this themselves since they are the main beneficiaries of this feature.

I'll take questions on this at this point.

Okay I see no raised hands. We'll move on to the next one. The next question is, "Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all gTLDs?" And our answer for this is, "For the reason stated above we believe that translation and/or transliteration should not be mandatory for any gTLDs."

The next question was, "Should translation/or and transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?"

And again the answer here is, "For the reason stated above we believe that translation and transliteration/or should not be mandatory for any registrants in any country." Excuse me.

The next question would be, "What impact will translation/transliteration of contact information have on the Whois validation as set out under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreements?"

And our response was, "In the event that mistakes are made we foresee that translation and/or transliteration of contact information could possibly lead to problems in Whois validation - validating contact information in the Whois database would likely be more successful and less burdensome if it was carried out in the original language - script provided by domain name registrants."

If I'm not mistaken we did have some discussions early on - in earlier meetings of this working group and I believe we have so far - although we might need to discuss this further but we have identified certain problematic areas regarding validation of translated and/or transliterated contact information. Stop me if you disagree. But I think that the NCSG agrees with this point so far.

Chris Dillon: Okay, may I - yeah, may I just jump in at this point and say one of the conversations I had in Singapore was actually with a particular - it was actually Hebrew - well it was a registrar who would probably be dealing with Hebrew registrations.

And he made the interesting point that actually validating in the original script can be more difficult because if, for example, you are used to dealing with the Hebrew script and then suddenly you have to validate Chinese you don't have the ability to do it. I thought that was an interesting - I thought that was an interesting comment.

Amr Elsadr: Okay. Thanks, Chris. I had a similar conversation - I'm assuming yours was with Yoav?

Chris Dillon: Yes, that's right.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, yeah, I could - Yoav is a member of this working group and I wish he was on the call now. But, yeah, I did have the same discussion with him. And well I suppose it would require - one way of trying to get over this would probably also what I personally believe to be a good approach to this is to let market forces lead the way on this.

And if a registrar, for example, in Israel has a large enough client base in China might want to invest in staff who could form Whois or registration data validation in the local language and script.

But I don't want to get too immersed in this discussion right now but I would be happy to discuss this further when we do have a call dedicated to this point later on. But at this point if anyone else would also like to chime in with some input I'd be happy to hear it and respond.

Chris Dillon: I think - again this is Chris speaking - I think there are two other little questions that come out of it and that is that (unintelligible) more than one language. There is a question about what is the primary (unintelligible) and so, you know, for example, you know, in some context - in a library context, for example, if you were cataloguing, you know, for example, a foreign language book in the library the original language forms would always be the primary forms.

But I think we may make decisions about (unintelligible) at some point because that may be linked to validation so you may say that you validate the primary form, whichever that one is. So I think it's just worth bringing these issues up, you know, without necessarily having solutions for them at this stage.

Amr Elsadr: Okay. Thanks, Chris. Shall I continue?

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, Chris, I would like to note that I'm having a bit of a hard time hearing you speak. Your voice is a little - I'm on a dial-out today which is not my regular connection and I hope you can all hear me fine but it seems the volume on...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: ...my end is a bit low.

Chris Dillon: I can hear you absolutely fine. So I will speak louder. I hope that...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Thanks.

Chris Dillon: ...problems elsewhere on the call.

Amr Elsadr: Appreciate that.

Chris Dillon: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: Okay the next question is, "When should a new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?" "NCSG feels we believe that there should be no policy requiring translation and/or transliteration of contact information. However, if this PDP working group should determine that it is desirable the policy should not come into effect until the conclusion of the two post expert working group PDPs have been concluded." Those are the gTLD Registration Data Services Expert Working Group and the Internationalized Registration Data Services Expert Working Group and the recommendations are taken into consideration.

Moving on to the next question, "Who should decide who should bear the burden of translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script?"

This question relates to the concern expressed by the IRD Working Group in its report that there are costs associated with providing translation and transliteration of contact information. For example, if a policy development process determined that the registrar must translate or transliterate contact information this policy would place a cost burden on the registrar.

The NCSG view is that domain name registrants should be the only stakeholder making this decision. The registrant should decide if he, she, it, in

case of an organization, will bear the cost of translating and/or transliterating the contact information associated with the registered domain name or if this should - if this cost should be borne by the end user of Whois lookup services.

So in other words, if the registrant opts not to translate and/or transliterate then it is up to the end user of Whois lookup and no one in between so not the registrar, not the registry. There should be no policy requiring a specific stakeholder to bear the costs whether this be a registrant, registrar or registry.

In the absence of such a policy, as is the opinion being expressed here, it would be the registrant's choice to submit contact information during domain name registration in the language and script of his, her, its choice. In the event that the contact information is submitted in a language and script requiring translation or transliteration it is up to the end user of Whois lookup services to bear the associated costs.

Any questions or comments on this right now?

Chris Dillon: Not in...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Okay, again, I would like to just make a comment here.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: On this - it's really - I think that the context of how this would be useful is really something we should take into consideration. Hypothetically speaking let's say we have 10 million domain names registered by registrants who do not use Latin script in their native languages.

If a large number of these registrants - if it was necessary to identify them or contact them for reasons such as law enforcement from countries where Latin script is being used and it's problematic to try to translate this information then perhaps it might be worthwhile to translate and transliterate the information as it goes into the Whois database.

But the indications that we've seen so far seem to suggest that this is not really necessary and that there's only a small number of registrants who actually need to be contacted for these purposes. So I think it's just important to take this context into consideration when answering these questions, I mean, we've tried to do so in the NCSG.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

Amr Elsadr: The next question, "Who does your stakeholder group/constituency believe should bear the cost bearing in mind, however, the limits and scope set in the initial report on this issue?"

So I believe this question is phrased that way because this is not actually in the scope of our working group to determine who should bear the cost but it's a good question.

And our answer was, "As stated above since the end user of Whois lookup services is the beneficiary of the service the end user of Whois lookup services should bear this cost. This would become the de facto rule if no policy requiring translation and/or transliteration of contact information be made in any other scenario. The only purpose this policy will serve is to shift transaction costs of translation and transliteration from one stakeholder to another and ultimately serve the end user and place a burden on registrants/registrars and gTLD registries."

So this is another point but equally as important is that financially speaking there is a cost in translating and transliterating contact information especially

if it has to be done for all contact information in the Whois database. So one way to look at this policy if it goes through is that the only purpose it will really serve is to shift these transaction costs from the beneficiary of the service to someone else and I think also is something we should consider.

Any questions or should I go on?

Chris Dillon: Nothing in the chat room.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, okay. Last question was, "Is there any other information we think should be considered by the working group as part of its deliberations? Please feel free to include that here."

We finally have - the response is, "We finally have the promise if IDNs, internationalized domain names, coming to fruition and hopefully many new registrars coming online in Africa and other regions which need them. To burden these new registrars with additional costs such as translation or transliteration seems not only burdensome and potentially quite destructive but would also be anti-competitive to burden registrars working with IDNs with higher operating costs than English-oriented registrars."

This was a comment submitted by Kathy Kleiman and I think it's spot-on actually because with the expected increased use of IDNs and probably submission of contact information in languages other than English scripts, other than Latin, it will - providing services that allow for these folks from countries not using English is going to be a business advantage to new registrars that are emerging out of these countries and regions.

And it will be problematic for these new registrars who have to basically break into the market to have an extra cost of translating and/or transliterating this contact information when other registrars that are well established and have been operating for years might not even cater to these registrants and so will be unaffected by the policy being developed.

So I think this was the point that Kathy was trying to make here in this being an anti-competitive policy and it is also an aspect that we should probably look at.

And that takes me to the end of the NCSG statement - or response for the working group questions. Again if there are any questions or comments I'd be happy to address them now.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that presentation. I think you've certainly covered it very thoroughly. Perhaps it would be good just to allow a few moments for people to have a look through for things which may have been missed.

Amr Elsadr: Sure, Chris. And also after the call and during the course of our work I'd be happy to answer any questions on our email list as well.

Chris Dillon: And just double checking my own notes to see whether there's anything I would like to pick up. I mean, I was - I have to admit that I was quite surprised that registrants didn't have much of a need for looking at who else was registering or at least they'd be aware that other names were being registered but may not be able to understand. So I was expecting for there to be some requirement but it's very interesting that that - that is not here but, you know, that was something that surprised me.

Amr Elsadr: Well, Chris, this is Amr. I wouldn't say that there is no need for registrants to look up the contact information for other registrants.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Amr Elsadr: However, I guess what I am - what we are trying to put forward here is the point of view of non-commercial registrants. When I say law enforcement and intellectual property rights holder, IPR holders are probably registrants themselves except they're probably commercial registrants not non-

commercial registrants. And they certainly have good reasons for wanting to look up who has registered certain domain names.

The question is - and they are registrants within their own rights of course. The question is how many registrants would they actually need to look up? And is it worth setting a policy for all domain name registrations that are not in English or Latin-based script and are not so.

Chris Dillon: Okay yes, that - yes that clarifies that. Now before perhaps we move on to the ALAC response may I just ask one last time whether anybody would like to raise any other issue coming out of the NCSG response? Okay, seeing no hands I think we can safely thank Amr for the very detailed presentation and head off into the ALAC response which is at the top of Page - yes at the top - there it is, yes.

And I think oddly enough the way I've done it if we scroll down past the summary, because we'll deal with everything in the summary in the main body of the document so strangely I think it may be quicker just to come down a little bit beneath - oh just - oh I'm in control. Okay so I'm just scrolling down beyond summary of answers to questions asked. And then now I think it's Page 2 of it.

And I'll just canter my way through this. And there are one or two rather interesting concepts that come out of this which actually address some of the issues that Amr was just mentioning, you know, some things that are going some way to address those issues.

Okay so there's - they start off by using this word, "transformation" which is rather a useful shorthand for translation and/or transliteration which is very, very long if you are using it frequently as we are.

And then if we come down into number one there's this rather interesting point made about using a particular language, a single language, actually

privileges the users of that language so, you know, there's no arguing with that, it's absolutely true. It just, you know, anybody who happens to use that language is in a better situation.

Then as regards transliteration, you know, they're also saying that the use of a particular script, again, privileges the users of that script. I mean, as a linguist I would make the point that there is a particularly good selection of transliterations available for the Roman alphabet. You know, other scripts, you know, may not have the same kind of range.

And certain scripts do not, you know, are very difficult to use for transliteration. And the example I would give there is the scripts based on Chinese characters. It's really, really difficult to use those scripts for transliterating other languages particularly Chinese because you see every syllable of Chinese usually has a meaning.

And so that means that, you know, when you transliterate every single syllable has some kind of meaning. And if you do it badly it can go very, very badly wrong. So, yes, but anyway that's just a linguist's footnote. Let us move on down.

And then very interesting, ideally registrations contact information should be available in languages and scripts that reflect the global diversity of Internet users. Again, we can't argue with this, it's absolutely true. But the issue here is the cost because, you know, this isn't even talking UN languages, this is, you know, making a case and it's not unreasonable for very, very wide translation - not necessarily, let's say transformation, that gets us around it.

One thing that comes up is that you could imagine a system whereby you had the original language then you had a translation and transliteration into the Latin alphabet and into English possibly. And then you had another translation and transliteration into a local language such as Russian or Arabic

or something like that. So you could imagine that sort of threefold system conceivably.

If anybody's got any comments about this or I'm missing something because I'm not reading every sentence here, I'm just reading the bits which I thought were worth picking up.

Okay so then - yeah, if anybody's got questions about any of it then just stop me at any time is what I'm trying to say. As we go down there is a strong statement about the necessity - it's verifiable and verified contact information must be accessible to those with the right and need to access it by the Whois database. So there's a sort of plea for it there.

And, you know, it needs to be accurate and the accuracy and usability promotes consumer trust in the domain name system which is, you know, is obviously a very major benefit, you know, being able to, you know, being able to know roughly what's going on in an application whose script one doesn't understand, you know, it does sort of build trust. That's what that's saying.

And then talking about a fully nationalized Whois which could be achieved in various ways. And so one option is to transform contact information into a single language or a specific set of languages conceivably however expensive that may be using scripts that are representable within the constraints of the current Whois, yes.

And then another option would be ASCII based Whois record pointing to a non-ASCII based record in another system basically. You know, I would like to make the comment there that, you know, if you had a Whois which was full of links to another system I think one ends up creating rather the sort of strange system that has a habit of becoming a long term solution. This is an option that I find personally rather scary.

Moving further down, there's mention of the - so it not being a matter of either translation or transliteration but it could be a combination of both. This is stuff that we have spoken about at length in earlier meetings. I won't repeat all of that stuff but this basically agrees completely with what we were saying in earlier meetings saying that, you know, depending on the field you may want to do different things and there are examples of that given where, you know, unique names of people, places, events and things should absolutely not be - well the names shouldn't - events and things are getting more dubious I think.

But these are areas where we may not want to translate but, you know, this is stuff that we have spoken about at some length at an earlier stage. So as I say I won't revisit it.

Then - oh there was a sentence here I found very difficult to understand. So this is in Section 2 if we just scroll down into Section 2 at the top of that third page I think it is.

So we've got, "In the absence of transformation of contact information non-ASCII represented scripts cannot be placed in the Whois record which contravenes the registrar accreditation agreement."

I think it's something about the use of "that which" that I'm finding very difficult to understand. If somebody can explain the sentence I would be very grateful. I am just sitting staring at it. Yes, okay. Well in the absence of transformation if contact information is not translated or transliterated non-ASCII represented scripts cannot be placed in the existing Whois record. And then that contravenes the registrar accreditation agreement.

I didn't think it did. No, I'm really - I'm really struggling with this. You know, as I say if somebody - if somebody understands this either during the call or afterwards I would be most grateful.

Okay moving down - oh sorry, Amr, I'm hoping you've put your hand up to rescue me.

Amr Elsadr: Well I put my hand up to try but I'm not sure I'm going to do a very good job at it.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: I think I would have to go back and check the 2013 RAA again. But this statement might have something to do with the display specifications of Whois as far as the contractual requirements of registrars go. But I think what you said - you added a word to the sentence which is you put "exact" - "existing" before Whois record...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: ...so perhaps - because isn't there a document that says in the Whois record that non-ASCII represented scripts cannot be placed in the Whois record. I'm not sure that's accurate, I think it's - I think that's inaccurate but perhaps in the existing Whois record that might be correct.

But I guess that I'm pushing at is that perhaps a revision of the display specifications in the RAA might be something we might want to recommend if we, as a working group, decide that this is not a desirable policy. So I would have to go back and check the RAA just to make sure but I think the existing Whois record is what they might have meant to say we would have to back to someone from ALAC and ask them. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. I mean, I think one of the things that comes out - well there are a couple of things which come out of this. One is that, you know, there's nothing that can be done to the existing RAA. I mean, that is a piece of legal, you know, that has legal validity and, you know, we can't possibly fiddle with that.

So the issue is certainly which versions of, you know, are we talking about the current Whois or future replacements of it? Are we talking about the current Registrar Accreditation Agreement or future replacements of it? I think that's why I'm getting confused. But anyway thank you. We have at least highlighted the possible sources of confusion in there.

Okay continuing down we've got contact information used by a range of users for various purposes. This is basically another way of talking about the matrix of the, you know, the various stakeholders using Whois in various ways. And there being various amounts of agreement, you know, whether that's something we may want to recommend in some - at a later stage. So this is really very much the sort of matrix that we have been talking about.

And then highlighting - a lovely long list but things like malicious Internet activities or harmful Internet activities, for example, where, you know, those things you're tending to require, you know, it's more likely that those communities may need something - some transformation done.

Going down into 3, not much to say there. I think it's quite clear. Into 4, okay yes in principle registrants should not be expected or required to transform their own contact information. Yes, okay that's one of the key areas of that.

And it will become more and more of an issue as you've got more and more registrants which are registering in other scripts. Then okay then we've got transformation of content information automated. Well, you know, we know from our previous calls that automation works better with some script than others so there need a little bit of amplification there.

And then the mention of transformation being voluntary at the time of entering the contact information. So that's another conceivable option perhaps.

No comments on 5 or 6. Then moving down to 7, we've got, you know, who should decide the burden and the decision on that. Oh, yes, this is rather interesting. "The decision on who should bear the burden of transforming contact information should be informed by the views of and impact on all affected parties."

That's what we're doing, that's what the matrix is or will be, "Which include the provider of the information registrants, those involves in collecting registrar reseller registry and the range of users that include end users and regulatory authorities and LEAs."

Okay. Yes. So just a (unintelligible) so, you know, what this is saying is that the decision has to be affected by all of these players. But there's part of me saying, yes, but actually what's the bottom line going to be? I don't know. Perhaps in some way the matrix can be - a matrix could be used. We will have to see at a later stage.

Number 8, if we can write down, and this is what I was referring to earlier because this is a very interesting suggestion. And so who does your SG believe should bear the cost bearing in mind the limits in the initial report?

And here we have two very interesting concepts articulated. So we've got the concept of general use and specialized use. Okay and we really need to think about this and magnify it. So if the transformation is required for general use the cost should be borne by the process entities that collect the information. So, you know, straight away - oh yes, okay, well before we move on to the definition of specialized let's just think about general use for a moment.

An example of general use is contact information that serves a public purpose and is made available to the general public without charging a fee so that would be Whois. Specialized use is a paid service where the data requested can choose the language of required data.

That would be one example of it wouldn't it? But it might also be that law enforcement and that sort of area would be specialized use. Going back up again, "If the transformation is required for specialized use the parties requiring the specialized service should bear the cost of contact information." Okay. That's an interesting suggestion.

But I think really what I'm trying to stress is that if this sort of approach were taken up we would have to be very, very sure that we had very tight definitions on general and specialized because, you know, specialized might be law enforcement, for example, but I'm not convinced that general is just sort of general Whois use because that is very, very wide. So I think we'd have to, you know, we'd really have to spend some time thinking about that.

Okay. Groups that may require specialized use of contact information may include law enforcement, yes, fair enough, intellectual property, network security so it is basically that sort of security-related community. And the cost of specialized use can be negotiated between the data provider and the data accessing entity and the level of accuracy required of - and that would have a bearing on the cost. Heavens, yes, because of course accurate data is, you know, that's data that's being checked, it's more expensive.

Okay any questions about the ALAC response? Okay thank you very much for that. Well we've dealt with two substantial responses today. Now we've got a little bit of correspondence in here and unfortunately a couple of people have had problems with the time change and that's - happens very easily. And mercifully the calls are recorded.

Amr is saying, "Categorizing registrant types is problematic." The Expert Working Group made suggestions to that effect for other purposes. Oh my goodness, because you see far we've been talking about a matrix, you know, where we're fairly sure, you know, we're talking about particular groups. If we're going to have trouble actually saying whose in these groups that really is another level of complexity.

Not what we want to hear. Okay, and we are fairly close to the - ah, Amr, would you like to pick up some aspect of that?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I just wanted to ask if we will be further down on our discussions when we pick up each one of these items or each one of these questions separately and start having more in depth discussions on them, will we be going back to the different points of view being made by the different stakeholder group, constituencies, ACs, and taking them into account? I think that may be a good idea just to make sure we address all the points of view that are being provided.

So I'm just saying I hope we come back to all of these responses and I'm assuming we might still get a few more. I'm hoping the Registrars will at least provide some answers to the questions. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Amr. The intention is absolutely to do that. Now in practice it, you know, it may not be all that straightforward. You know, there have been quite a few responses making several points. We've also then often during the calls elaborated on certain things. It's quite complicated and it's therefore possible that bits and pieces may get missed. But the intention certainly is to be quite rigorous about that. Okay thank you.

Now as we come to the end of the meeting just - we've got a few minutes for any other business, in fact. And oh wait a minute what - we were originally - in fact the agenda is slightly different from the one I had. Originally we were going to be looking at the work plan but we really don't have enough time to do that this week so it'll have to be next - next week.

And so just before we end I will - you've probably noticed it but on the front page of the wiki I added a few points just as you come into it. And it is saying that we are doing all we possibly can to put all of the relevant documents in

the wiki in a systematic way and actually saying, look, if there is something that you think should be in there and isn't then just contact us.

We are stressing that we are running the group using the multi-stakeholder model. You know, there is nothing hidden, there is nobody deciding what's happening here, you know, no one person, you know, just making those decisions.

What else have we done? Then reports will be based on written input. And then also there's some information about what to do if you're not currently in the group but would like to be so that's all stuff that I've added to the front page because I just thought that it was quite good to have some slight little (unintelligible) things there to show, you know, just to show people who visit it, you know, what approach we're taking.

And, you know, if you read that and you think actually we would do well to add some other things to that then please just make suggestions and we can - and we can change that page very easily.

All right well in that case we're at the top of the hour so it's good to have got through the two responses. And I think one of them narrowly missed the last meeting for which apologies but anyway it's good to be up to date. And many thanks for your contributions to the call. And obviously we'll be back next week at the same time. And at the moment we've certainly got the work plan on the agenda.

So many thanks and see you again next week.

END