

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group
Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 11 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 11 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-20140911-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual
Peter Dernbach- IPC
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana-GAC
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan)-NCUC
Justine Chew- Individual
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Lindsay Hamilton Reid – RrSG
Jennifer Chung – RySG
Wen Zhai - NTAG

Apologies:

Petter Rindforth – IPC
Jim Galvin – SSAC
Emily Taylor - RrSG

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Amy Bivins
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much.

On the - good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group call on the 11th of September, 2014.

On the call today we have Jennifer Chung, Chris Dillon, (Unintelligible), Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Rudi Vansnick, Peter Dernbach, (Unintelligible), and Justin Chew.

We have apologies from Petter Rindforth and James Galvin.

From staff we have Julie Hedland, Lars Hoffman, Glen de Saint Gery, 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.

Now I have also an apology from Emily Taylor. Peter Dernbach - oh, Peter Dernbach said he'd be on the call late, but as I can see he's in the chat room, so I don't need to do that bit.

Okay, well as I said earlier on (unintelligible), I go by the agenda, though. So first of all I need to ask the official question whether there have been any changes in Statements of Interest since we last met?

Hearing nothing and...

Man: Sorry, Chris, I don't know if you - I just dropped back in. I was offline. I don't know if you called on me.

Chris Dillon: Oh, I - yes. I - basically, I thought what we could do is just have - well, have a short-ish call but just see how it goes and perhaps it will end up being as much as half an hour. But I think we are slight - we are more than slightly (pin on the ground) today, but I think there are one or two rather interesting things, so I erred on the side of running it.

Okay, so hearing nothing on the Statements of Interest front, that means we can go into Point 4 on the agenda, and what I would like to do is just to draw your attention to the end of the document, so - oh, no. Okay. Having trouble with my mouse. I'm trying to get - oh, yes. That's got it.

Okay, so right at the end of the document, there is a - lovely. Yes. Really clear. There is a new piece which is a reflection of some of the comments that were made in the last meeting, so I would really like to draw your attention to that.

And basically, this is an attempt to put the case for stakeholders who think transformation should be mandatory.

Now that said, I think at least the way I've expressed it here, it's not particularly well done, so I would be interested to - you know, either to hear now improvements for this, or later in the week to receive text which improves this. I mean, I'm quite - I am more than happy to build this up. But at the moment, this case is looking not particularly strong.

But anyway, just have a quick go through it. So you know as I was saying, this - you know, the other case - so this is not the main case that's put in the Strawman. This is the other side of the argument, and it's saying it's desirable to make transformation mandatory as the availability of contact information in a single common language or script. And we know from the Strawman what those are. So the single common language would be English, although ironically as you probably remember, in fact relatively few of the fields are actually English.

We're using the Roman alphabet, but we're not using the English language very much, with the exceptions of the country field and possibly the organizational name field.

Script obviously would be the Roman alphabet, and they're saying it makes it easier to contact registrars in the event of legal security and other issues. That's the - so that's the sort of - that's part of the case.

And then moving down, because obviously transformation is - you know, is potentially expensive, particularly if done on this kind of scale, we've got something about costs of transformation could be spread among the stakeholders, requiring it - probably needs to be rather more specific than that.

Costs could be reduced in the case of alphabetic scripts such as languages using the Cyrillic - there are hundreds of those by the way. There are hundreds of languages using Cyrillic.

There are not very many languages using the Greek alphabet.

By using automatic transliteration, because those scripts are so close to the Roman alphabet that you can do it reliably automatically.

However, in the case of the non-alphabetic script, such as Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese, automatic transliteration I think is impossible unless technology changes radically and very quickly.

And - but on the other hand, optional transformation by registrants when they register could reduce the costs.

Now I haven't forgotten what was being said in earlier calls about that, and so there are serious issues apparently with optional transformation, but at the

moment that's in there. And then I'm saying data consistency would be an issue.

But the main thing here is that in most cases, the data would enable registrars to be contacted, which you know obviously is the - it's really the - one of the main purposes of doing it.

And let me just pause for a moment and ask whether anybody would like to either pick up anything in this? Say they disagree perhaps, or add something to it?

All right. Well I think this is not particularly good drafting. You can say that when you've drafted it yourself. So I would be very keen to receive improvements. I have a feeling that we can do better here.

Anyway, let us - there is then - yes, I think it is right to do these now. There is then quite a long list of rather more minor points that need to be picked up, and I think we might as well get them out of the way. Rather foolishly, I have marked them up in a rather different version.

See, I may be struggling slightly to find the various passages, but I'll do my best.

So - let me get my glasses on for just a moment.

Okay, so the first one is probably around the bottom of the first page. Oh no, it's Number 3 here.

Oh, yes. Okay. So one quite major change compared to earlier versions is that we're saying the working group believes that they too will be most accurate if registrants can enter contact information in its - in there. It should be - oh, dear. And that language - script.

So for example, Thai contact information would be entered in the Thai script. That is an attempt at expressing what Jim was saying last week. Possibly not very well, but that was the idea behind the change.

Yes, I'll just pause for a minute before I move on to the next one, and I think we managed to escape an entire page before I picked something up again.

Go down.

All right. Then the next one is Number 4. Here - and this again has changed - oh, yes. So this is actually rather closer to what Jim was saying, so it's saying the working group recommends that registrants provide their contact information in a language or script appropriate for the region in which that address is located.

The working group believes - I think the rest of this is actually pretty similar. Yes, it is.

Okay, so that's - again, it's another change, but designed to reflect what Jim was saying.

And this could actually change again depending on what the expert working group decides. But you know, the idea is very much to reflect what they're doing because the ideas are the same; it's the way it's expressed.

Okay, pick me up if you'd like to add anything. But I think we might get down as C5 before another change.

All right, here we go. C5. I think this might be the same thing - oh yes. When should any new policy come into effect? So yes, the thing here is that this is presuming that transformation is not mandatory, so this is a section that would need to change if it's possible to build up the arguments I was

mentioning earlier, then this is no - a section which may change depending on that.

And then where do we end up?

All right, we go right the way to 04. This is point. I think - okay. So if registrants are allowed to submit, what language or scripts are supported?

So must at least support the input of contact data in one of the languages of the contact information. This is really another attempt at expressing what Jim was saying. At some point, it may be better to unify these, because they're perhaps saying the same thing but in slightly different ways and causing confusion as the result.

Okay, and then where do we go? I think we - oh, yes. Down to Number 4 on Page 8 I think.

Yes. Okay. Now this basically again is as a result of discussion last week, so originally we were saying for personal names, the Romanized forms preferred by the organization should be used. That was the original position. And we were saying that with organizational names, that it should either be the official English form or it should be transliteration.

This has changed as a result of last week's discussion, so now we are saying organizational and personal names both are the forms preferred by the organization and the individual, or transliteration. So that is - you know as I say, that is another change as a result of last week.

I should flag up that it's - you know, there is still no mention of the universal postal union's recommendations. The reason for that is that the recommendations are very complicated. And in fact, I would really say that they're not a single set of recommendations. They're actually recommendations for many countries.

And at the moment, I am sticking to my guns and saying we should keep with our simple rules rather than using the very complicated UPU rules. But you know like everything else in here, if somebody makes a strong argument, you know that could be something that changes at a later stage.

Okay, and then we have E3, which is just a bit further down.

Whoops. I've managed to miss it.

Oh, I know why I've missed it. Actually it was deleted. And this was a question about basically if registrants are required to submit a single common script version of the IRD, and the user is unfamiliar with or unable to submit such a transformation, are registrars or registry operators expected to provide assistance?

Now at the moment, because we're saying that transformation is not mandatory, we don't have to address that question. But if we decide that it should be mandatory, then we need to bring back the question. That's a - just - okay, it is deleted in this particular version, but it is not forgotten.

Try to have a memory like an elephant on these occasions. There. That's on my list of things which are deleted but may need to come back. Heavens. Quite important we don't forget that.

Okay, and then - oh, no. That's the end. That's the end of - oh, yes. There's only one last major change of which I am aware, and that is down in what has become Appendix A. Last week it was just the Appendix, but there are two now so it's Appendix A. And the agreed column here has gone from a Y to an N because you know there are two groups. One saying transformation should be mandatory and one saying that it shouldn't, so that's why that has changed.

Now at this point, what I should ask you is there were quite a few more minor changes, you know, just the old word here and there, and usually the idea being to make the document easier to read.

However, if I have missed something or you've spotted a change you really don't like, then now would be a good time just to mention that because really what I've just done is a summary of many changes, and these are the ones I think are the big ones, but that may not necessarily be the case.

Okay, hearing nothing on that one, I think we can move away from editing the document - well perhaps, I'll just give you a few more moments to see if anybody would like to raise anything about the document. But otherwise, that means we can go into - yes, it's not very easy to use a version which hasn't got the changes flagged up at this point, but...

Okay, I think probably from an efficiency point-of-view, what we want to say is anything on the document, any suggested edits are very welcome after the call, and you know we are intending to meet on two further occasions. The 18th of September and the 25th of September. I think the 25th will very much be a preparatory call for the LA meeting. Please note that there is no meeting on the 2nd of October. I can't remember where I am, but - well, I certainly wouldn't be able to attend it.

Okay, so that leaves us with any other business, and there's rather a large piece of any other business this week, and that is what I put in my email to you earlier today about two hours ago. I sent around an email. And basically, what that was suggesting was that we would move forwards with this document and create a draft initial report. So you know, that would involve adding certain sections on background and this sort of methodology and that sort of are.

And I think probably the key thing to flag up with a draft initial report, or actually an initial report at all, is that we don't have to resolve any issues over

agreement. So - you know obviously, we may want to say that there are more than - you know, there are several views on a particular issue, but we don't actually have to resolve them. All we have to do is to express the different opinions as well as we possibly can. I think that's the main part of that.

And so that would then be presented at the LA meeting. I mean officially, we should - I think according to the timeline, we should actually just be doing the draft report that at least we would - sorry, we should be doing the initial report at the LA meeting.

But under this suggestion, what we're actually doing is working for a draft initial report to be presented at the meeting, so that's about the tentative suggestion that I am bringing to you. So that's the other major update, and I don't know whether there are any reactions to that? Whether people are happy to - for us to do that.

Yes. I'm not seeing anything one way or the other in the chat room.

So yes, I would suggest that it would be good to start that work, unless somebody feels strongly against it. And you know, that really you know would be quite a substantial piece of work to be done in the run up to the meeting.

And then with the aim of - oh, yes, we've got a little bit of reaction, thank you (Justine) in the chat room. And so she's saying she's happy to do that.

And o the idea would then be to open up the draft report to public comment sometime after the LA meeting when people are no longer traveling. I think that's the general idea.

All right, and - in my estimation of how long this would take has been - has possibly been almost exactly correct, so I think we are almost exactly half an hour into this. My instinct is actually to end here and just leave you with the idea.

Perhaps I'll send around an email, and I'm not exactly sure how I worded the email earlier, but just make sure that people are happy with doing that. But that - you know, that is certainly a suggestion I would like to make.

And Rudi is just typing in the chat room are there any suggestions to add to the present - yes, absolutely. Yes. This is the - this is a very good question.

Waiting for - now - oh, yes. Okay. So there's an editing question here. Check that.

Okay, let's just see what - where that's gone wrong.

So in Appendix B, we've got - yes. Yes. It's a typo. Thank you Peter. This is actually a bit of a problem with the English language here because we've got registrars, registrants, and registries, and it's rather - yes, it's - oh, yes.

It sounds as if I've actually made the same mistake more than once, so at least I am consistent.

Oh, there - no. Actually, at the end of Paragraph 2, I think I did mean registrants. So no, the first one is a mistake, but the second one was intentional.

Yes. Okay. Lucky I left that on the screen.

Rudi, would you - oh, yes. Okay. Please say something.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Thank you, Chris. Rudi for the transcript.

I think that in both conditions can be considered. It could be that you have to contact the registrar for some information. If the registrar information - contact

information is in a language you cannot read, you have already that issue to handle and to tackle.

And secondly, it could be that you have to contact the registrant also. So I think even in Point 1, both conditions could happen.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes. Okay, yes.

Rudi Vansnick: Or as we discussed up until today, we have been talking about contact information. As I am - I have been checking into some situations, am just wondering when we talk about contact information, it can be contact information of the registrar. It can be contact information of the registrant. Maybe we have to make it very clear which ones we consider?

Chris Dillon: Yes.

We may need to go back to the official definition of contact information. And anyway, the official definition actually breaks down into three parts.

Oh, so one of them is technical, but I know that the contact information anyway is composed of three contact addresses. So yes, we may...

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. You have the registrant contact information. You have the on-site contact information that can be at the registrant's office. And, you have the technical contact that could eventually also be at the registrant's office, but can also be at the registrant's office.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: So you see it's something we need to maybe tackle in the second stage - phase maybe for the next call. We need to clarify if we want to address that other aspect of contact information, being the three different elements of domain name contact information.

Chris Dillon: Yes. I think it may well be worth revisiting that and just checking, because it reminds me slightly of validation. You know, sometime these concepts do split into several sub-concepts, and you have to be careful that what you're saying is actually true for all of them.

Yes. At least you have to be quite precise about them. I think that's fair - I think that's a fair comment.

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

Peter Dernbach: Yes. This is Peter Dernbach for the transcript.

And I was just thinking in the context of our charter, which was talking about the issues in which this arose and the international registration data working group and the group looking at the registration data director services. And our charter says in the context of these issues, "contact information is a subset of domain name registration data."

So in that context, I was thinking that here we were talking about the registrants in connection with their domain name registration data, an a subset of that was the contact information that we were talking about.

The registrar of course also has contact information, but I thought that was different. So I agree with Rudi's point, which is if we're going to be addressing different things at different times, we should identify it. But I'm not sure to the extent that the registrar information is within the scope of our working group.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you for that, because that is actually how I have understood it as well. So you know, despite the typo in Number 1, you know, that was how I was perceiving it.

Yes.

There's something going on in the chat. But you know, we may can see that we need to revisit it.

I'm just waiting for the chat room to update.

Okay. (Justine) is saying since we are making recommendations, perhaps mention it and qualify it if it is not within the scope.

Yes. That would be a good way around that. It sounds like a footnote or something, and say it's not in scope. Yes. Okay.

Yes. I had the feeling when I drafted that it would need polishing, and so it did. All right.

Okay, well I think unless anybody would like to add anything more to the Appendix B that is - or some other - or would like to discuss some other aspect, I think the best thing to do is to continue the discussion on the mailing list and start to work on the draft initial report. That's what I would like to suggest.

So I would suggest we should end here and meet again at the same time next week, so as they say, speak now or forever hold your peace.

Okay, thank you very much for today's call in that case. I'll just wait for a couple of things in the chat room.

Okay, thank you very much indeed. Goodbye now.

Man: Thanks, Chris.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Andre), and now stop the recording. Have a good day.

END