

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 04 September 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 04 September 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-20140904-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual
Wanawit Ahkuputra – GAC
Peter Dernbach- IPC
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana-GAC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan)-NCUC

Apologies:

Justine Chew- Individual
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Lindsay Hamilton Reid – RrSG
Jennifer Chung - RySG

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Maryam Bakoshi
Nathalie Peregrine
Lars Hoffmann

Terri Agnew

Coordinator: This afternoon's conference call is now being recorded.

Terri Agnew: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 4th of September, 2014.

On the call today we have Wanawit Ahkuputra, Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Chris Dillon, Peter Green, Petter Rindforth, Peter Dernbach, Ubolthip Sethakaset, and Jim Galvin. Joining us a little later will be Jennifer Chung.

We have apologies from Justine Chew, Amr Elsadr and Lindsay Hamilton-Reed. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Nathalie Peregrine, Maryam Bakoshi, Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Now in fact I had one more apology, Rudi emailed us just a couple of hours ago so he can't make it - today, not too well at all.

And I should also just apologize for circulating the documents we'll be looking at today rather late. So the document you see on the screen now is the version 7 that I promised you during our last meeting but I only circulated it a couple of hours ago so I realize that it's not enough time either to go through it and certainly not to react to it.

But, you know, what we can do, at least, is present especially the newer parts of this I think and then, you know, we can (unintelligible) to think about and then come back to it next week.

Anyway, coming back to the agenda - I should just get rid of Point 3. I need to ask you whether there have been any changes in Statements of Interest since our last call? And hearing nothing and seeing nothing in the chat room I think we can move on into the strawman.

And as I was just saying a moment ago, I released actually two versions of this two hours ago. So one of them is the main version which we're looking at on the screen. And this is the one we'll be using during this - today's meeting because the other version has got the Word tracking changes and it's a bit of a bloodbath because I did make quite a lot of changes to it since we, you know, since our last meeting.

So it means that we can use the other version if we actually say well, you know, why did he make this change we can actually go and find out, you know, that what I've tried to do is when I made changes I used comments to say this is why I'm making this.

And typical reasons would be that it's duplicating something that's already there or it's irrelevant for one reason or another, the whole time I've said, you know, I've got rid of it because it's not relevant or I think it's better if we move it here.

And then the more interesting comments are when I've actually changed part of the text. And when I've done that that's usually been as a result of something that's been said during a recent call and I've put a comment and said, you know, the reason this is reading differently is because of that.

Anyway I think what I would like to do is to continue with the approach we've taken in recent meetings and that is just to start with larger things and then to move down to smaller things. I think that tends to be quite a good way of getting through the comments.

And so what I would really like to do is show you some of the completely new content. And this is at the end of the document so I think I have control so I'm going to try and whirl the whole way down to the bottom, I think you're coming with me I hope.

And we'll see here in Appendix chart of Recommendations. And what this is it was actually Mary's suggestion that I list these suggestions and then get some sort of chart over the level of agreement that we think we have at the moment, or rather I think we have at the moment.

Now when everybody - when we collected input from all the stakeholders and we have the review tool that some time ago now, I think by looking at that review tool it was quite clear, you know, in some areas, you know, whether we had agreement and also it was clear that there were very different opinions on other matters.

Now it's some time ago so things may have changed a little. So this was really an attempt that I made to - well it's really just the first stage of the working out how much agreement there is. And we can even have a discussion about whether this sort of a chart is actually the best way of doing it.

You know, certainly with the review tool we looked at it from the point of view of various stakeholders so I don't know whether perhaps we may have to do that again or whether something simple like this is adequate.

Now one way or the other I've only just sprung this document on you two hours ago so I'm, you know, it would be completely unreasonable to expect

you to say I think this is right or I think this isn't right. But what I can at least do is present it to you. And I will welcome comments as we go through it.

After that I'm going to deal with another piece of new content which is the - there's an example. So I've - I actually wrote an example of what the data would look like if the recommendations were implemented. It's a simplified example but, you know, that might be interesting to look at.

I thought we would do the chart first rather than the example because it's conceivable that the chart will affect the example so that makes more sense. After that, I'm intending to hit the changes that I've made to the document as a result of comments during recent calls. I'm just really explaining the sort of methodology and I'm just about to you.

Okay, so feel free to ask questions with any points. I'm intending to set off and I'm going to deal with Recommendation 1 here. And this is the working group recommends that it is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory.

Now, we've certainly covered this. Anybody who's been on the call would agree with that. And I think in - since the recommendation was made in the strawman that it would not be mandatory. I think basically as I have perceived this I have felt that there has been agreement so that's why I'm putting why in the agree column there.

However, going back further and really now I'm talking about the review tool which, you know, admittedly was some time ago now, at that stage I think it's fair to say that there is some disagreement.

So also I've - I don't know whether this is a contradiction although what I am hoping this means is that although there's basic agreement or recently there's been agreement historically at least, and probably continuing there is some

disagreement and we are certainly still discussing it. So that's the logic behind - well also explaining actually how the system works.

Now, Petter, would you like to raise something about this?

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, thanks. Petter Rindforth here. Just to note that even if - when we - from IPC filed some initial comments, and we haven't fully discussed everything yet, but I'd say that we disagree with this. We think it's - it should be mandatory.

Chris Dillon: Right.

Petter Rindforth: So I guess we're one of the small point there.

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: ...some disagreement.

Chris Dillon: That's - that is, yeah, that is interesting. And in fact I think, yes, okay - yeah, so the - yes, the question is where the frontier between agreed with some agreement and actually not agreed is so that's something we need to think about. Thank you for that.

And, Peter, would you like to say something about that? Now we may have technical trouble. I can't hear...

Peter Green: Yes, Chris?

Chris Dillon: Oh sorry, yes I can hear you.

Peter Green: Can you hear me, Chris?

Chris Dillon: Yes, yes I can. Yes.

Peter Green: Yes, I was just saying that - I was just saying that I was actually surprised when I saw the draft strawman come out after London because in the discussion in person in London my impression was that there were some people who thought it was clearly desirable, some who thought it was clearly not desirable and I thought I heard you say that it was, at this point, we did not have a categorical yes or no. So I was surprised to see the strawman come out with a clear statement that it's not desirable.

And it seems that some of the reasons articulated for why it's not desirable relate to the practicality of it or the cost which I think are all relevant points. But I thought based on the community input that we had received before from some working group members and others in the community, it seems that the input we had received was quite mixed.

In my recollection, about half of the people suggested that it was desirable and about half of the people suggested it was not desirable. So I just think that on this it has definitely been discussed but I'm interested to hear more about your determination that it was agreed.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you for that. I think my perception has been certainly at the stage of the review tool your - you know, it was definitely mixed input and depending on the stakeholder. It was different, you know, there's really no doubt about that.

Since the strawman came out then, yes certainly my impression was that it had come closer to being agreed. But, I mean, obviously the fact that you're saying this now is indicating that, you know, actually that, you know, that may not be the case.

Okay so this is certainly something we probably need to revisit. What would be very helpful would be if - well actually on either side of the debate whether you think it should be mandatory or you don't and possibly particularly if you

don't, then it would be very useful to have text because then we can incorporate it in the - in future versions of the strawman.

Petter, would you like to add something?

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, I just want to add that I think that's - some of that (unintelligible) mandatory. Was it also the GAC representatives just more speaking from a local point of view, not from a global side.

Chris Dillon: I think one of the reasons the strawman suggested that it shouldn't be mandatory was really that it's possible to say okay, this should not be mandatory but we're not going to stop stakeholders from doing it. I think that was part of the reasoning. Does that answer the question?

May have technical difficulty there. I'm not hearing a response. Petter, would you like to say something?

Petter Rindforth: No, just well I'm not 100% sure if it's - was a clear reply to my question. But I noticed your suggestion that we all - that we put together some further comments before it will be sent out.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes thank you. Okay well moving down - well let's just have a look at Number 2. So now Peter, would you like to say something or...

Peter Green: Yes, I just was saying that I think that the question that we have regarding the - or the recommendation language whether it's desirable to make it mandatory that was part of our follow on discussion but I think that the question in our charter was whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information into a single common script.

Chris Dillon: That's a good - that's a good - yes. So actually there perhaps we should be not only looking at recommendations but actually at questions, I think that's a

good point. Okay. Okay, I'll see if I can do something along those lines for the next meeting. Thank you.

All right, now if we move into the second recommendation, the - so here we have the working group recommends that any future gTLD, directory service, should be capable of storing non-Roman script data and the transformed version in Roman script to accommodate the possibility of a best practice transformation service.

Oh, goodness, quite a few possible issues here. So we've certainly talked about the various aspects here. And the impression I have is that we are not agreed about it.

So the reason here is that there is an, you know, I think there are some people who think that, you know, if I understand it correctly that the contact information should not be transformed because as soon as you do it you create this other version and you've got - you've then got all sorts of matching and validation and, you know, which one is the authoritative version and all kinds of issues like that arising. So I think there are voices on both sides, you know, really arguing both ways.

There's certainly some disagreement and we're certainly still talking about it. So that is the situation as I understand it. We also need to take up the whole thing about, you know, the necessity for a replacement of the Whois to have, you know, the possibility of displaying IRD. I think that may be dealt with later on.

Okay, now if there aren't any questions about that it means we can move further down. And that brings us to Number 3 which is the working group recommends as part of the PDP the need to - oh yeah, sorry, this is the thing about IRD capability to any gTLD directory service.

Okay so that's the bit I was just talking about. And I think a lot of our questions aren't really relevant unless that replacement system, or the system, has this functionality. And then we've got the thing about tag fields to indicate the languages used in the address and date fields.

We'll be having a more detailed look at this later if we've got time because of course the example has to show you what this actually looks like. Jim, would you like to say anything at this point?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you. Jim Galvin. I'm struck by the suggestion that a date might be in a different language. The first version of the IRD recommendations for data had dates in a standard well known format that was language - well language and script independent I suppose is what I want to say but I guess by all rights it represents, you know, Romanized numerals and a couple of appropriate characters in which to separate, you know, elements in the normal printed string.

Are we really suggesting that dates might appear in different languages?

Chris Dillon: Thank you. This is quite an interesting point because there are quite a few different calendar systems kicking around. The Japanese certainly have one. I - yes. I think we probably need to debate this. I mean, I guess to some extent we might be influenced by existing systems so if existing systems are using other calendar systems then we may have to those into account and especially if we're going to let legacy data into our system.

However, if there is already standardization then I'm going to do better just to knock this out because I certainly wouldn't want to add more complexity for no good reason. I don't...

Jim Galvin: Yeah.

Chris Dillon: ...I actually don't know what the situation is there whether, you know, what, you know, what is the, you know, what is the status quo. So are these other date systems being used.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim again. I guess I don't want to try to speak authoritatively about the state of the world in this space. I observe only that in prior discussions on this issue, again, what you have is within the registration data ecosystem, if you will, you have the legacy standard of essentially the Gregorian date system.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: And, you know, the UTC kind of format for time, if you will. And that's, you know, obviously what we've been using. Does that suggest that that's what we should continue to use going forward? I don't know. You know, I mean, I guess as you say maybe this is an interesting topic for debate.

Again, I'll just close by saying that we had previously, in the IRD Working Group and in fact the path that we're headed down in the current IRD Expert Working Group is to leave that alone and continue forward with what the legacy systems have been doing.

So that's just a data point for this group if we want to suggest something different, I don't see any conflict in that. But so thank you.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you very much for that. I notice in the chat room Petter is agreeing with you. My instinct is that we probably should just delete this, you know, really the last intention would be to add any complexity if it isn't necessary. Okay.

Anything else about that one or shall we move onto the fourth one? Okay so Number 4 - oh, just a moment, we have something quite long in the chat room. Desirable and undesirable to transform. I think the point is we should

focus on the extent to which people will access or need access to the Whois data that is not recorded in their own language community, for example, how many English-speakers will need access to Chinese, Japanese or Thai.

That's an interesting point and it's not one that is very reflective in the strawman at the moment. Okay, so Number 4. The working group recommends that registrants provide contact information in the language script of the contact information. The group believes that this will provide data that's as accurate as possible and notes that the recommendation does not present registrars/registries from providing best practice transformation.

Okay, I'll just explain what the record is and then I'll just answer Jim's question just in a moment. So this is certainly something we've covered. Now I was thinking that we were pretty agree - oh yeah, actually I was thinking that we were pretty agreed on this that we - that we're basically feeling that the original language is the primary form and, you know, that really should be in the system.

I wasn't aware of disagreement there. And from the discussion no, you know, obviously, you know, we are still talking about it. Jim, would you like to add something to this?

Jim Galvin: Yes, this is Jim. I confess I'm not entirely sure what that first sentence means that contact information in the language and script of the contact information? You know, that's not the phrase that the Internationalized Registration Data Requirements Expert Working Group is going to use to describe the situation.

Chris Dillon: What it's trying to say is so - and I admit it - this is a clumsy way of putting it. But the idea is that if you've got a Korean address that your fundamental record is in the Korean hangul script. That's the idea. But I admit that the - it may be possible to improve the wording.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, I mean, because I'm thinking that we're in agreement on this point and so I'm nervous about the words here. So let me try a different phrase on you and see if we're still in agreement.

What the IRD Expert Working Group is going to say - at the moment the path that we're headed down, I have to be careful here because even we are still in deliberations but I would suggest that this is the consensus as I understand it today that contact information we need to separate out the name.

A name in the contact information will be freeform text so that someone could certainly put their name in whatever language or script is appropriate for their name. When it comes to the postal contact information, so the address and, you know, the city, country, that kind of postal information, that information should appear in a language or script appropriate for the region in which that address is located, and it should be structured in a way that's appropriate for the region in which that is located.

That's - roughly speaking, that's the phrase we're going to use. We're still actually working on exactly how we're going to say that, but that's what's on the table at the moment.

Now does that match what you're suggesting this means or not?

Chris Dillon: Yes it does, because it also covers the rather, more difficult situations. For example, Singapore, where you may conceivably have several different languages which could be used to represent a particular address. In the Singaporean case, it's full of languages that could come up. So that sort of wording would handle those rather more difficult situations. So yes, as far as I can see, that would work.

Jim Galvin: Okay. So as long as those align, then I'm fine with this, and just reserving the observation that we may talk a little more about this once we see some actual text in a document, because I do think it's important to get this right.

And it would be especially helpful if these two groups could align, even though your group is - this group actually is a PDP group, and the other one is just an expert working group. Given that we have the opportunity to align here, let's try to do that. Or if there's a difference of opinion, I certainly want to resolve that too before either of us publish.

Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much.

And as far as - you know, as far as I can see, that would seem to make a lot of sense.

Okay now, Peter, would you like to say something about that?

Petter Rindforth: Thanks.

First of all, Jim, you know, just summarized somebody's going to state - or I think it's important whatever the topic is, that if you are two different groups that works with the same things, that we use the same kind of words so it's generally understandable.

And talking about understandable, sorry, Jim, I didn't really - got the idea or the completion of what you say about two different kind of addresses. One - if I understand it correctly, one was the free address that the domain holder could put out and the other one was the official postal address. Sorry if I misunderstood you completely, but could you just clear that?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I'm not - I confess I'm not sure I understand the question. I wasn't tracking the bit about two postal addresses.

Petter Rindforth: Yes. The way I heard you, you first said that the domain holder was free to use the language or describe the address as they wanted to do, but then you also talked about it's important to use the local official postal address.

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Petter Rindforth: Or did I misunderstand you?

Jim Galvin: Okay, so let me try and say this back - I think that you did understand me, and I'll try to say this again and hopefully see if we're coming to closure here.

The postal address should be in a form that the principle here that's in play is that the postal address should be in a form that ensures delivery in the last mile of delivery. And it is my understanding about postal regulations is two things.

One is that a country, of course, gets to decide what its postal addresses look like. This business of you know address, city, state, postal code kind of thing, that's a Western way of describing addresses which works in a good portion of the world, but it's not the way it's required to be for some parts too.

That's just an observation for the moment. So it needs to be in a structure and a form that fits that.

But the implementation there is that the postal information needs to be in a language and script that that final postal person understands. That's really technically what you're trying to get to by using the phrase that I had suggested.

So if Singapore, you know, allows English as well as other languages, and as long as all the postal people can - you know, can read and understand it, then that becomes valid.

So one of the (unintelligible) that you had for this then - the consequence if you will of this is that in some way there needs to be a mechanism that needs to come into place that ensures that when you take in an address and you see what country that address represents, you have to somehow know what languages and scripts are valid in that country and confirm that that's what you're getting in from the registrant.

That'll be an observation from this expert working group. You know, it's just an observation that that's something that will have to exist in order for the rest of this to work.

But let me pause there for a moment.

Chris Dillon: Okay. That - thank you. Thank you very much for that. I mean you know eventually this is really - I - you know, I agree strongly with this. You know, if the postman is using something in the form where substantial numbers of things are going missing, then this is totally self-defeating. So I'm sure this is the right way to go.

Okay, moving on to other recommendations, we have - - I believe we finished that one.

And actually before I go - I'm just keeping an eye on the chat room here.

Okay, so let's look at Number 5. So that one is saying the working group recommends that there is no need to determine who does the costs as no mandatory transformation is recommended.

I'll just read - I'll just go through the implications of this. So if Number 1 means that the transformation is not mandatory, then we've covered it. And in fact, this is probably wrong because this is very much depending on the - on Number 1. So if there is a question about it being mandatory, then I think this

question is very much depending on Number 1. That's really what it comes to, so this will almost certainly need to be redone.

I mean certainly, the fact that you know if we decide it isn't mandatory, then you know it's just a slight advantage that it gets us out of answering some questions. I suppose that is a slight advantage.

Okay.

So we're almost certainly going to have to come back to that one. That's really what I mean.

Then Number 6, unless there are any comments about that, the working group recommends that IRD becomes a basic - oh, yes. Sorry. We've already covered this, so I think we can leave that one.

I'll just ask whether anybody would like to say anything about it before we move on.

And then last but not least, the working group recommends that there should be no requirement for registrars or registry operators to support English.

Okay. So again, as far as I know, we've certainly covered it. I think we are agreed. I don't think there's disagreement and we're not particularly talking about it. That's what we're saying at least.

Jim, would you like to say something about that?

Jim Galvin: Yes, thank you. This is Jim.

Just a question. Do we mean to say English here or do we mean to say a single language and script?

Chris Dillon: In the Strawman it's saying - well effectively, there is this United Nations recommendation for - you know, if there is going to be a single language it should be English. If there is going to be a single script, it should be the Roman alphabet. It's sort of based on that.

Now in our case, the interesting thing is that what we are recommending, we end up with English in a maximum of two fields, and one of them is the country name, so the suggestion is that the country name you know would be English, but that's such a relatively short list that could be translated into other languages very easily.

And then the other field where you might get English is in the organizational name field because we are saying if there is an English official translation, then use it.

But you know, you could almost argue that really there's only English in one field. That's the organizational name, and then only when it exists. So you know, fundamentally, most of the record is transliterated. But, we can see more of this in a moment when we look at the example.

Does that (unintelligible)?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Thank you.

I guess I'm not certain about this recommendation. I mean the way that I'm expecting this to be characterized in the IRD expert working group is not that country name is in English per se, but that the script will be Latin and this is derived from you know a postal regulation that simply requires that the country name has to be in a standard form.

It's not really a language per se because you can create a flat list of these things, and it's an identifier more than it's a language recommendation. So

I'm kind of taking that out of this category of supporting English because you're supporting an identifier.

Chris Dillon: Okay.

And that's also - that's also an interesting approach, because is that basically using the UPU guidelines at that point?

Jim Galvin: Yes.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Okay. Yes.

Jim Galvin: And then when you talk about names, the requirement that we have in the - again in the IRD discussions in our draft document is that the name that's used should be - wait a minute. Now we're talking about two different things here.

This is the general organization name that might appear in any registrant's contact information.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Well, the path I was going down was when talking about the registrar, and I was confusing it with this other thing. I mean obviously with a registrar, you can have a requirement that says that you use whatever name you've used in your RAA, so whatever is valid there goes there.

That rule doesn't apply here. We are - the path that we're going down is the same as name in general, and that the name can be free-form text because an organization name, like a person's name in this particular technical context - I mean, it is whatever it is and you shouldn't obligate it have to be anything in particular because that may not be appropriate.

Chris Dillon: Okay.

Jim Galvin: So again, I mean this thing about whether English is the right thing to say here, I'm wondering if part of I thought our charter question was whether or not there should be a single language, I realize that as part of our discussions we've - the obvious choice for if there was going to be a single language would be English.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: I mean for legacy reasons if nothing else.

But that's why I'm questioning whether English is the right thing to say here, or if you want to more generally speak to the issue of, you know, single language or script.

Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes.

Yes. So does - again, it sounds here as if there may be more than one way to go, because actually as regard to personal names, that is what we're doing, so you know the personal name we are just saying, "Well, you need to tell us what your name is," and you know we're really not stipulating, you know, just because you've - it appears in a particular place, it doesn't necessarily mean that it's your name.

And you know, I think last time I was giving myself as an example because you know my name comes up in all sorts of different forms. But eventually - I'm certainly in a library context, you know, that would be the approach taken. But eventually in a library, if somebody does write five books of five different names, then actually you do have to write (unintelligible) of a person. That's the official correct thing to do.

So yes, that's - it does seem as if there may be more than one way to go there. And I will draft some text surrounding some of these areas where, you know, perhaps it is more complicated than this makes it appear. Obviously, I'm always very grateful for other people's text.

Yes. Okay.

Because I think often, you know, other people understand particular areas better thankfully, so that sort of thing is appreciated.

Okay, well we've got through the recommendations, and certainly enough material there for another version of them. And what I would now like to do, I think we're going to have time for it, is just to come back and have a look at the example.

So you might notice that when I give examples, they tend to be Japanese, and the reason for that is that I used to work in an information service, and we - one of the main things we did was give people Japanese addresses, so I have the experience of dealing with probably thousands of Japanese addresses. And so, I like to use Japanese examples because I guess I'm just really familiar with them.

I mean, the slight danger is that there could be addresses in other languages which have issues that the Japanese addresses don't have. But - yes, anyway, I guess it may not be a surprise to see this thing in Japanese here.

And so we're at - really at the bottom of Page 6, and so we've got - so if we're looking at our primary record, we've got a status which is (unintelligible), which is Japanese of validated. I'm not totally sure that they'd use it in this context, to be honest, but for the - you know, let's presume that whatever is the use of validated, that that's what we'd see there.

We then have a language tag, JA, that's another thing that comes out of the library.

And then in the next field, here we have a Gregorian date. Now it is in the Gregorian calendar, but as you can see, there are Chinese characters in there for the name, the month, and the day, and also the order is rather strange because you've got the year coming first.

So generally, large things come before small things in Japanese.

And then we have the name holder, and this is (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) is the surname and (unintelligible) is his first name. And as you can see, there is no space. It's just all there together like a normal Japanese name.

We've got another flag saying it's Japanese.

We've then got the organization which is the Japanese name of the sort of institute. Again, no spaces. So - and again flagged as Japanese.

Then we have the postal address, which has the country at the beginning. It's then got a thing which you probably wouldn't bother to transliterate because all it means is what's coming next is the post code.

And then, you've got the address. Well then you've got post code then you've got the address.

((Foreign Language Spoken))

Again, we're going from big - the Tokyo Metropolis literally, then down to (unintelligible), which is one of the wards in Tokyo. And then we've got a part of Tokyo, (unintelligible), and then we've got the number right at the end. And the number actually breaks down into various blocks and buildings.

And then, we've got another flag saying this is all in Japanese.

We've then got an internationalized email address. I thought you'd like that. (Unintelligible). And again this is in Japanese.

That's then, all of it, gets transformed by anybody who wants to - you know, any stakeholders who want to transform, then the suggestion is that this is how it be transformed.

And so here we've got validated, obviously English. We've got the date. Then we've got the guy's name.

Now I threw a little bit of entertainment in here for us because I thought - you know obviously, he may be wondering around calling himself (unintelligible), but you know life being life, the more likely is that he decides that nobody even knows what to do with (unintelligible), so instead he's going to use the (head).

So this is the sort of three-form text idea basically. You know, people do just suddenly decide to do something like that, and you only know that they've done it when you ask them.

Now this particular organization, we're lucky because it does have an official English translation. It's the National Institute of - sorry. The National Institute for Informatics. Also, it's a real organization. The guy isn't a real guy. Don't worry. It's a real organization. It's very frequently called the NII, but we've said in a note that we don't like acronyms. So actually for things like this, it has to be the National Institute for Informatics.

Now in the event that it didn't have an English name, you would've ended up, and I put in one of the notes that you would've ended up with (unintelligible), and I have been - it's Note 7. I've been slightly naughty here because I

realized looking at this that in fact there would be no way for something transliterating that address to know where the spaces are.

Because as you can see, in the original there are no spaces. So actually really, that should all be together unless - (unintelligible) actually, I can't think of a way around it, so that might be an issue.

So then we have the physical address, which is basically more or less the Japanese address but backwards to the fundamental rule that's going on here.

I - now you may notice that suddenly we've got spaces, which are obviously very helpful because we can see you know which bits of the address are doing what with the spaces. So actually, this bit has been simplified. The postal address would probably be in several fields. And what I'm really saying here is that we believe it would be possible to display that data in a way that it will make sense.

You know, it may be that we need to go into more detail, but I think by sticking the data in different fields, you could legitimately produce those spaces correctly.

That may be something we want to pick up.

And we then end up with the internationalized email address, which of course is still in Japanese.

Oh, before we go to the email address, just make one comment about the postal address and say that there is a bit of an argument about whether that address is English or Japanese. Although it's in Romanization, I think some people would say actually although it's in the Roman alphabet, it's really Japanese language.

So I wasn't totally sure that it was right to write the (N) there.

Okay. Now looking at that, any comments I wonder?

All right, well I really didn't give you very much time to look at this, and I would really welcome other comments on the list either about the recommendations or about the example.

Before the next meeting, I will produce another - I will at least do - in fact, I think it will need to be another version, because I think the recommendations are rather more complicated. But don't let that stop you from commenting.

And if there are things that you're spotting and that we didn't have time to cover because we - you know, we haven't covered all of the document today, then do send that stuff to the list because it just makes things easier.

Okay, any other business I think? Because we really haven't time to go through the other changes I made I think.

Okay, hearing none, I will get a new version to you by the next meeting, which is a week from today. I hope I'll be able to get it to you giving you a bit more time to look at it. But as I say, I'm just grateful for comments on any of the issues we've spoken about today or others, and you know either on this version or the next one.

Okay, well in that case, thank you very much for a good meeting and we'll meet again one week from today.

Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Thank you.

Once again, this meeting - please disconnect all remaining lines at this time.

Have a

END