

## **Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION**

**Thursday 24 July 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 24 July 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-20140724-en.mp3>

### Attendees:

Pitinan Kooarmornpatana - GAC

Petter Rindforth – IPC

Chris Dillon – NCSG

Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual

Peter Dernbach – IPC

Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC

Wanawit Ahkuputra – GAC

Justine Chew - Individual

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP

Thitikorn

### Apologies:

Jim Galvin – SSAC

### ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund

Amy Bivins

Mary Wong

Lars Hoffmann

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Thank you, and you may begin your conference.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group call.

On the call today we have Wanawit Ahkuputra, Mae Suchayapim, Petter Rindforth, (Unintelligible), Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, (Chris Dillon), (Unintelligible), and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen.

We have apologies from James Galvin, Lindsay Hamilton-Reid, and Peter Dernbach has (unintelligible) us he will join the call late today.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong, Lars Hoffman, 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, and we need to pick up Agenda Point 3, as usual, which is just to cover whether anybody has a change in their Statement of Interest since the last meeting.

I'm not seeing any hands or hearing anything, so I think we can safely move into Point 4, which is the main point of today's meeting.

So I'm hoping all of you will have received the document that's on the screen which was circulated I think about three and a half hours ago, something like that. So I'm sorry you didn't have longer to look at it.

And what it is, is it was a sort of a attempt that I started after the London ICANN meeting actually to draft some recommendations, and the recommendations are for various questions that come up within our charter - within the working group's charter, but also the expert working group asked us some questions and you know we ourself identified some areas that we thought it would be helpful if we had additional questions.

So the draft you see in front of you was originally just an attempt at answering all of these questions and then I shortened it because I found that quite a lot of it was duplicating itself so I took out all of that and said the result is the eight pages that we've got in front of us.

And as I mentioned in my email earlier on, the idea is that today I will present it to you. I'm not sure how long that's going to take. I'll have to do it quite slowly.

There will probably be time for clarifying questions, but I think the idea we've had is that they probably need to be clarifying questions at this stage, this week, and looking at the reasoning behind the recommendations perhaps rather than the recommendations themselves.

However next week the idea is to have a discussion, and I'm hoping that a lot of the discussion will be on the mailing list, so that means that some of you will look at this and you'll find things that are not right.

And so what I would like to encourage is that people send - you know, send comments in because that will make creating new drafts of the document easier. And you know obviously we can of course discuss during our calls.

And I think that basically the call next week we can use for - the discussion - the call on the 7th of August, I'm actually out of the country, and I don't think I'll be able to join that call. But, it may be possible if (Rudy) is free, for him to do somewhat that week. That's not ruled out.

But what I'm planning at the moment is to do the discussion on the - you know, on the 31st of July and on the 14th of August. And I mean we may well have other issues when we get into August because it does tend to be a month where it's very difficult to get people together. But - yes, I think that's basically what my battle plan is at the moment.

And just before I start presenting the document, I'll just ask quickly whether there's any question anybody would like to ask.

Okay. Well seeing none, let us start.

So - okay. I should say right at the beginning of this that although I've put my name on this document because I did draft the first version of it, actually several members of ICANN staff, including Lars, and Julie, and Marika Konings have provided a lot of input, and I should really say thank you to them for that.

But anyway, after that - so the idea of doing this is to - as I was saying earlier, to try and - to try draft responses to the various questions. Also specifically, to try and make some recommendations. And out of that, all sorts of discussion will come, and one thing that I have already noticed is, as I said in my earlier email, I had been thinking that we had read everything.

We have spent, as you know, many meetings reading documents together, commenting on them, working out whether there is something in them that we needed to pay attention to. This sort of thing. We've spent a lot of time on that, and I have been thinking that that phase was more or less at an end.

However, doing - actually doing the drafting, I have noticed that there are at least a couple more documents that we'll probably need to read. Not necessarily all of them, but you know at least again the relevant pieces.

So you know, that might be a good thing to be doing in the not too distant future.

Okay.

And that then bring - I might as well start using the mouse because we've really done the beginning of it now.

Okay, there's nothing very - oh, Petter, can I answer your question?

Petter Rindforth: Yes. Sorry. As I - this may be in the original document - original topic, but I just have a question about what you have stated on the working group deliberations the purpose of transformed data is to allow those not familiar with the original script to contact a registrant.

I was not sure that we - it was so straightforward.

(Chris Dillon): Okay.

Petter Rindforth: I would rather state that it's to...

(Chris Dillon): Okay. I think...

Petter Rindforth: To reach the contact information or to read a contact information.

(Chris Dillon): Yes.

There's some - this is actually a very good - it's a very good question, and this is actually something that I'm aware of that that sentence does need a lot of - that - it's amazing actually, because I think in the whole document, that sentence is probably the one that is most difficult.

I think that we - it's going to - that's going to generate a lot of discussion and we actually probably need to go back into the expert working group's final report which talks about purpose in much greater detail.

However, at the moment I think all I can really do is present this to you - and it's really funny because I think you've probably identified possibly the most important question already, thus - but as I say, it does require quite a lot of work, and probably revisiting that document I think.

Petter Rindforth: Yes.

But we can assist together to see what we can find in the original one.

(Chris Dillon): Yes. I think it's probably - you know, I would expect to be doing that next week.

It actually comes back to haunt us further down in the document because the word purpose is used later on as well.

Okay. So yes - okay, I think that's probably all I will say about that, because the other thing there is that the word accuracy also needs to be expanded because depending on the purpose, the accuracy could be different.

Okay.

And then - oh, yes. Now the next thing is consistency, and this is really saying that - you know, if you're talking about very large amounts of data, lots of transformations going on, consistency becomes an absolutely huge issue. I mean even if you're using very, very strict guidelines - I mean if we talk transliteration for example. If we're using a particular transliteration, it's actually very difficult to get - you know, to get really good consistency right across the languages in very large data sets.

The - then we go on and we say that - so the first point here is that basically it's more likely that if registrants put data in their own language, that that data will be accurate. So if I put data into a database in English, it's more likely that it's going to be accurate than if I do it another language just because it's my other language and I spot errors more quickly. That's the idea behind that.

Okay. So then we're looking at contacting registrants, and this is really the issue of even if we have a situation where contact information were provided - you know for example if I - you know, if we have the contact information that was in Chinese, the data would be much more usable if we knew that, "Oh, well this part of the contact information is the person's name, this is the organizational name, and this is the address." So it's really stressing the necessity - well really, the necessity to have some sort of splitting up of the fields and labeling.

And actually, it might be quite easy to at least provide those labels in other languages. That's much easier than transforming data.

And then we end with basically the costs of transformation would be much higher than can be justified in view of its potential usability. So you know again, this is going back to what we were saying before, that you know we're talking about a lot of languages. Huge amounts of data.

Then accuracy raises its head. So you know to be able to be accurate enough for some of the purposes. And purposes of course takes us right back to Petter's point, because I think it is true that that does need to be defined better than it is at the moment.

Moving a little further down, even if a transformed version of the data were available, actually, it doesn't mean that the person who has - well, the organization who has provided it can actually correspond with somebody. I mean, let's just use English for an example.

So you know, if data has been provided for an organization in English, it doesn't necessarily mean that we can communicate. I mean, to be able to provide data in English and actually to be able to communicate by telephone, or email, or some method, you know that doesn't - it doesn't necessarily follow.

This said, it is absolutely not the intention of this group to discourage best practice transformation, so it may well be that some stakeholders will want to transform data and contact information, and we don't want to discourage them from doing that.

One interesting thing is that because we've fundamentally felt that - or at least we're just about to say that it's basically not desirable to transform data, that may mean that we don't have a very - you know, that we can't make very binding recommendations for what people do when - you know, what people who want to transform actually have to do. That is likely to be an issue.

Okay.

So - yes. Now one issue is that really in order for transformation ever to be necessary, really you have to have a replacement to Whois and new ideas which have non-Roman script functionality. I mean, if the replacement system doesn't have that, then you know I think that's really - that's - you know, that is really the key part of it.

So basically, registrants can enter you know when there is a situation when the data is - when the data are to be transformed, but they (count into ILD). And at the moment, you know, that is an issue. It seems that the - it seems as if we are some distance from having an RDS with that kind of functionality.

Then - and again, this covers the situation where transformation does take place. You know, somebody has a business case to transform. The United Nations made a recommendation that basically the Roman script should be

used and Romanization should be used for transliteration, so that is worth quoting.

And the reason they say that is that it is a - effectively a practical solution to the - you know, effectively to the challenge of finding places reliably.

Further down, there will be other - there will be some other notes on stakeholder groups who want to transform contact information, but we'll come back to that a little later.

And I slightly anticipated this next bit earlier, but anyway, probably one of the most important sentences here is this next one, which is the working group recommends that it is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory.

Yes, that is a pretty big sentence.

However, you know as we were saying before, we are saying that replacements to it should have the capability for storing it for those stakeholders who do have a business case to do it.

But it goes rather further than that in fact because we are also wanting to say because of the reasons further up that even if money were no object, it would still be undesirable to transform. And the reason for that is the poor consistency and accuracy.

Now again, point taken, Petter was absolutely right to raise it. We need to magnify this. You know, say now there may be some (port) purposes for which mediocre contact information are fine. That is possible.

But what we are saying is that a lot of the time for many purposes, it's just not good enough.

Moving further on - okay, so this is really what we were saying earlier, so it is just a recommendation that's only future gTLD directory service. Should be able to store by LD. And also, accommodate a transformation service for those stakeholders who want to provide one.

Okay. Then we're down to Number 3.

So again, this is a recommendation that IRD capability be outed to any new directory service, and it includes also tag fields. And I think I - I think there's more information about those tag fields further down. But basically, you know, even if you've got a Romanized - sorry. We're not talking about Romanized. Whether it's Romanized or - whether the data are Romanized or whether they are internationalized data, we do need to know what language those data are on both sides.

And yes, I think I'll leave the more precise things to later on rather than repeat them now.

Yes. And we're saying tags for the address and - oh yes. So certainly for the address fields, and then separately -- there should've been a comma here really -- they need date fields because it's quite important to know when data has been input because you know if you've transformed data but you've transformed an old version of the data, then it may be useless. So the date field is crucial.

Okay, moving further down. Recommendation Number 4. So it's a recommendation that registrants provide their contact information in the language or script that their registrar operates in. And again, that is likely to assist accuracy and reliability.

But, that's - you know, but that - but again, some stakeholders may want to transform the data, as we've said earlier.

Then we come to another question, so this is the other - the big question about the burden of the translation or transformation in fact.

And the sum information about where that question comes from, and just I think we can skip that little bit.

And then the - basically because we have said that it is not desirable to transform - you know, to make - to have mandatory transformation, there is actually no need to make a general decision on the distribution of the financial burden.

So in this model, what is happening is that stakeholders who have a business case to do it will do it, and those who don't won't. So, that's really how that works.

Now then we get another recommendation, which is basically just summarizing that.

We then move on to what exactly the benefits for the community are of translating or transforming effectively? And so what I've done here is I've presented some benefits and I've then moved on to disadvantages on the next page.

So you know transformation certainly to some extent facilitates communication, although you know there are some caveats there, as we mentioned earlier.

And there is the general thing about good communication inspiring confidence in the Internet and making bad practices more difficult.

Then we've got the current situation which I think we can summarize by saying English is the de facto international language effectively. And the interesting thing here is that along with these recommendations, although it's

not quite clear until we get further down into the document, but actually there are only two fields in the transformed data that are English. One of them is the organizational field.

And in fact, there are some cases where even that is not English. I'll explain that later on. And the other one is the country. The country is basically a drop-down, so the idea is that people select an English name for the country under these recommendations.

And so the fact that the data are in the Roman script actually makes them pretty accessible to speakers of other major lingual (unintelligible), and the ones that came to mind were French and Spanish. But you know, you could almost have added Dutch and Portuguese perhaps, you know, sharing the same script.

And the last benefit is the benefit to searching because basically if you're searching for data, you really have to do it language by language. So if you're searching a database, it's going to be quicker if stuff in the database is all in the same language.

That's the last benefit so far. Obviously, we may decide to add more.

And then we have the word however, and this is again quite an important sentence. So we've got however, these benefits are outweighed by these financial burdens that would be imposed on stakeholders. And it is likely that the burdens would be large enough to make the expansion of the Internet considerably more difficult in the developing world.

And I think this is one of the main reasons for several of the recommendations in this draft. This is - yes. Increasingly, as the Internet expands, it will be expanding out largely into populations where English is not the first language. People don't know English. So it is no longer as convenient as it has been until now. That's really the way of thinking.

So - yes. and then we have registrants should be able to submit contact information, you know, in his or her own language, or as we were saying above, at the very least, in the language of the registrar.

And in fact, that is the basic requirement really. You know, that - you know, that should be fundamental. Something transformed is then something secondary effectively.

And then we return to the accuracy things. They were saying that you know if we are transforming huge amounts of data with these large number of scripts and languages, and a lot of its proper nouns, you know this is actually a very, very large burden, especially if it's going to be half way consistent.

(Unintelligible) as you would expect comes this Recommendation Number 6, that (ILD) is the basic requirement for directories. Then we move into another question and this is on the impact on the registrar accreditation agreement.

And so because transformation is done by individual stakeholder groups there is a thought that it is unlikely that the RAA will be affected because they are making a decision whether to do it or not.

Now then of course trying to deal with the situation where perhaps we've missed something, perhaps there is some kind of effect and there there is quote from the RAA, which is saying registrar shall implement international IRD publication guidelines according to the specification published by ICANN following the work on the ICANN ILD working group and its subsequent efforts no later than 135 days after it is approved by the ICANN board.

So that is actually there in the agreement. And then yes okay and then we're saying that future RAA's should be (unintelligible) in the life of the policy of this ETP working group final report.

And there we're saying that specifically recommendation number six about ILD being the basic requirement I think there is a concern that that could possibly affect future RAA's.

Then we have the when question so when would the new policy come into effect? And yes this was - this is - this answer is really presuming that we have some amount of - the recommendations we make will have some binding force on stakeholder groups who decide to just transform data.

We'll have to read this at this part of the document if the, you know, if our recommendations are not binding it probably needs re-writing. But at the moment we are saying that the policy should come into effect as soon possible and that the latest with the introduction internationalized RDS.

And certainly there is a concern that imposing policy before the introduction of a new RDS might create temporary solutions, which are very expensive and moreover instead of moving data from Whois into one RDS you would be moving data from Whois into an RDS and then into another later on.

The second RDS then being the one with the internationalized functionality so basically the idea in this drafting is to try and save money by really helping one move not two, I think that's part of it and also to discourage the creation of temporary solutions, there could just be so many of them.

Okay, then we come over onto page 5 and we have an easy question, goodness there had to be one. So this says we'll first contact information we'll take from (unintelligible) are available and we're just running with this definition, which I think everybody on the call is very familiar with by now.

And there is also a link just to other similar definitions back in our Wiki, right. Who gets access to what information question 02? Fundamentally according to this drafting beyond the remiss of the PDP so - and the thought is in the

draft in here is saying but whether the dates are original language or transformed should not affect stakeholder access rights to them.

The question is picked up at greater length in the expert working groups final report there but the drafting here is really presuming that only those with the right may access data and that data protection and freedom of information principles have been correctly implemented.

I think these things are quite a long way away from the remit of our group. However this does raise the question of access to transformed data added by other stakeholders. And so, you know, if the sort of model that is being suggested in this document were to be adopted what would happen is that, you know, there would be some stakeholders who may be transforming data.

And what this is saying is if that does happen that basically unless there's a good reason that data should be available to other stakeholders. If somebody is going to the trouble of transforming the data then unless there's a good reason that should be made as widely available as possible.

Okay moving onto 03, who are the stakeholders, who is affected and what do they want. Okay, this actually goes right back to what (Patty) was talking about at the beginning of the call so it's really a matter of spending perhaps more time on purposes and, you know, who wants what and what degree of accuracy I suppose.

The existing work is as I have outlined there. The expert working group final report has a lot more detail. Then 04 so it's weighing costs some benefits and here it's just again this is a bit of a summary of other work that's being done but it's just saying that reliable transformation is expensive, existing systems are inadequate and then again the purpose has been raised is it said that to some purposes accuracy is a serious problem and anyway less than 100 languages are covered.

The point has been made to actually covering about 75 languages maybe enough in many situations for our purposes. However my own suspicion is that, you know, okay less than 100 languages are covered and the ones that are covered really well I think they are a very, very small number.

Yes I mean more work required both in those transformation tools have made huge progress I mean just watching Google translate, develop over the last few years has been amazing but it works very well with European languages even Chinese is fairly good.

If you put the addition to it as I think I've told you before really you've got total nonsense. So depending on the language it's, you know, and the tool - yes huge issues here.

Now developing systems for languages not covered by existing transformation tools is slow and expensive especially with the translation ones. And I guess with the easiest version of Google translate the problem there is not many people use it and so it takes a bit of time to learn and get better.

So and then there's another comment here for purposes for which I could see as important transformation work often needs to be done manually at least to some extent or perhaps you run a translation tool and then you check it manually and there's just point off to further information in the study of that point.

Okay now we get questions from the expert working group, I'm sorry (Jim) is not here to hear this next bit but we have been good and we have how to go - advance to the next (unintelligible) all of the questions and maybe there was one duplicate but I think most of them - there is something here.

And to some extent there is a little bit of duplication so we're saying that registrars and registry operated systems much at least support the input of contact data in one of the official languages of the countries and then saying

effectively because these transformations depend on the particular stakeholder group, you know, it really does depend on the business model.

There is a recommendation that this shouldn't be an automatic requirement for registrars or registries to support English. As we were saying the next billions of Internet users many of them will have little or no knowledge of the language though it's really that recommendation is bearing them in mind.

Sorry was somebody asking a question then or was it just a (unintelligible) some strange noise on the line? Perhaps nothing so let's just continue. Okay and then so if registrants are required to submit a single common script version are you expected to submit - yes okay so it's translated or transliterated.

Okay so here basically, you know, as we've already said generally transformation is not necessary but here there are some guidelines and, you know, don't really know what kind of stages these guidelines could have but this is basically saying now if you're a stakeholder who does need to transform then these are things that you might be interested in, bearing in mind.

And so this is saying things like in cases when transformed are input the official English translation that might be the one on the headed paper in an email or on the Web site, should be used where one exists but often they don't. If they don't take this then transliteration would be used.

So there's - apparently this is quite common for example in China, there's a lot of organizations actually don't have English translated names. So in that case, you know, you'd have some sort of (pinion) version. (Pinion) is the Chinese transliteration.

And so that would mean that in that case if you had a Chinese organization with no English name, organizational name then the only field that would be English would be the country.

Moving on, addresses should be transliterated except for country names, which should be selected from a dropdown list of English names and that's something we've mentioned before. As regard to translation the official one should be used, which I think we've actually already mentioned so it's a headed paper or somewhat like that.

Transliteration so of addresses for example should follow the rules in a national standard of the language where there is one. If there isn't one then you could follow the standard of a related language using the same script.

So, you know, if there weren't a standard for Urdu you might try and use the (unintelligible) one. Now obviously they have some problems with that.

Addresses are transliterated except for the country name, which is given in English, which we know that. There may be issues where letters do not exist in the related language.

So for example Urdu has particular letters, which do not exist in Arabic. So if you're using an Arabic transliteration for Urdu you will be in trouble with some letters or with letters that are translated differently depending on the language.

So again Arabic and Urdu actually pronounce certain letters completely differently. So I think what may be a rather strange sounding D in Arabic is a (zed) in Urdu so there can be quite major differences.

Okay, yes it may be possible reliably to pivot so this is automatically transliterated between alphabetic script. So for example between Roman, the Roman script and Cyrillic in Greek.

This would not work with Arabic because Arabic often doesn't write short vowels and with Neo--Brahmi, which again sometimes doesn't write short vowels especially in the Hindi case they're at the end of words in fact.

But generally speaking there is still an issue with short vowels although it's not as big an issue in Neo--Brahmi as it would be in Arabic. Okay, now the note we've already covered English only goes in two fields, possibly only in one.

Moreover the list of countries is quite short, that could be quite easy to translate into other languages. Then we've got the thing about transliteration being easier to automate than translation. Yes that's true it's quicker.

And so there are quite a lot of reliable transliteration systems and it's quicker to develop them for transliteration than for translations. Now I just need to pause for a moment because I've realized that we only have eight more minutes.

That means that we can't really deal - we can't really do much clarifying or - so what I might ask is is there anything urgent, is there an urgent clarifying question perhaps or any urgent aspect of the business that somebody would like to raise?

Okay, hearing nothing and seeing nothing in the chat room I'm intending to use our remaining minutes. Well perhaps I shall be slightly naughty and try and get to the end of the document even if we do go very slightly over.

I'll try and do it and just see if I get in trouble. Okay, so let's go back to what we were doing up near the top of the page. Yes, now admittedly some parts of addresses would ideally be translated.

So for example Bangkok is a lot more useful, Bangkok is a translation it's much more useful internationally than (Krumtayp), you know, a lot of people don't know where (Krumtayp) is.

However usually it's the other way around. So if you start translating addresses you get into very bad trouble very quickly, you translate Beijing of Northern Capital and Tokyo of Eastern Capital and nobody knows what you're talking about.

Now the thing here is that it's not easy for automated systems to know when to translate or when not to and it's not just the city fields this could be an issue throughout the address.

Yes, the sort of contact information recommended in these - in this draft would be usable for postal purposes. I mean there would be a (sue) so at the bottom of the letter it would be saying (Krumtayp), Thailand it would be nice just to say Bangkok, Thailand but, you know, this is just the situation we're in. Okay E3 so what - so basically what support registrar and registry operators are expected to provide. Within this model again because it's not mandatory transformation, stakeholders are doing it because they have a business case to do it. So therefore they shouldn't be a burden on registrars or registry operators.

E4, if registrants are required to submit a single common script version and - yes so is there a requirement that they match each other these two versions of the data. So matching is required for some purposes for legal purposes for example and for validation or some sorts of validation.

So here with translation its really very difficult to match because you can legitimately translate things in different ways just so, you know, there are just so many examples of that it's difficult to know where to begin.

But with translation there are always many possibilities and, you know, even if you say well give me a literal translation actually it doesn't help very much. It's just really, you know, it's really hard, literal translations just tend to be less natural and so, you know, that's the absence of a natural aspect to them, you know, something rather constructed.

On the other hand it would be possible to say is this the official translation of that organization. I think it does, you know, so Beijing International Hotel is that the official translation of that Chinese hotel you could say yes or no.

It might be a little bit of fuzziness spelling, things like that but it should basically work. Then as long as the same transliteration is being strictly used for language it should be possible to match two transformations of the same data.

So if you used the same transliteration on the same data it should come out the same theoretically. Yes I think maybe that word strictly should be involved because yes you really do have to follow the rules for, you know, this is two words not one word. There's a hyphen here, there's a space here it should be written together there are actually lots of very small things that could make a difference.

Okay onto E5, if there are two versions, which is the primary one, the original language. Yes I mean this - the original language may well have features that the translation doesn't, you know, a (transliterator) a Japanese name.

For example you know he's missed a call but you only know how you write his name because call could be written in many different ways in Japanese. You only know if you can see the original data, which uses a particular character. Okay, yes we've done that that's good.

Onto E6, if transformed versions of the data are required how will data be maintained simultaneously? So here we're talking in more detail about

language tags, which are needed to end the (unintelligible) language of addresses.

These are supported in all of that but not in EP pay apparently. Each language version needs to indicate the validation date of the data. That's not possible with either of them EPP and RDAP.

So has this been checked or not and yes we're going to need to work on this because, you know, there are different sorts of validation we'll need to come back.

Addresses need to have a date field to indicate when the data were input. Yes we've already talked about that. The functionality is supported in the EPP but not in all that.

It is possible that three or even more languages could be required in the director. So you would have the original language of English and, you know, conceivably somewhere like Singapore with four official languages it's conceivable that people may want to provide more than one of them although English is one of them in fact.

Okay E7 (unintelligible) so company and individual names should translation or transliteration be required and we've actually done that. So for organizational names official translations should be used otherwise transliterations.

A tag should indicate the language of the organizational name. Yes and possibly still put this next bit in early, for individual names the form preferred by the individual should be used when not available otherwise transliteration.

So yes people are, you know, you can write the same name in many different ways. My uncle who publishes a lot of books is never very consistent and so

it must, you know, it would be very, very difficult to know what his name is because every book that he publishes has a different name on it.

Well it's the same name but he represents it differently. So eventually the answer to it is when there is a doubt about a person's name you actually have to ask the person.

Yes I was born (Christopher Dillon) but I haven't used (Christopher Dillon) since 1983. I am (Chris Dillon) and you don't know that unless you, you know, say should I do in what I'm writing or you ask me.

Okay and then finally when data are not transformed it's just a few other things that actually didn't come up in the questions. When data are not transformed the provision of translated field names in the future RDS would at least indicate the relevant parts of foreign language content data.

I think I did mention it actually very briefly about the data needs to be typed for the language so it is clear, which transformation should be used if it is required.

And then issues that we are left with right at the end if Whois is replaced by a system without ILD functionality there will be pressure from the (unintelligible) script world for that system to be replaced. And so you then end up having to set up two RDS' in quick successions, very expensive and to be avoided at all costs.

And last but not least work is now required to support stakeholders who transform content information so that a future RDS will have the necessary functionality that they require.

And we're barely over the hour I am sorry that the presentation took much longer than I was expecting it to but I felt strongly that I needed to go through it slowly.

And I hope all of you have been writing down questions and please feel free to email me questions about any aspect of what I have said. And so the questions will be used to create a new version of the document and that version will be circulated shortly before next weeks meeting.

And then we can have an open discussion. Okay well I think we are done for today but, you know, if anybody has anything very urgent then please feel to raise it otherwise I am looking forward to emails about the document and, you know, as I say the aim is to have majorly improved version in time for next weeks call.

Okay, well thank you all very much for attending today and as I say I look forward to your contributions.

Man: Thank you for your presentation.

(Chris Dillon): Not at all, bye now.

Man: Bye.

END