

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION

Thursday 26 February 2015 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 26 February 2015 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-transliteration-contact-26feb15-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#feb>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG
Jim Galvin - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Jennifer Chung – RySG
Roger Carney – RrSG
Peter Green – NCUC
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Wanawit Ahkuputra - GAC
Wen Zhai - RySG

Apologies:

Emily Taylor – RrSG
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Peter Dernbach- IPC
Julie Hedlund - Staff

ICANN staff:

Howard Li
Lars Hoffmann
Glen de Saint Géry
Gisella Gruber

Coordinator: Recording are started. You may proceed.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you very much. Would you like me to do a roll call for you (Chris)?

(Chris): Yes please yes.

Glen Desaintgery: Good morning, good afternoon good evening everyone. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on the 26 of February 2015.

On the call on the Adobe Connect actually we have Amr Elsadr, Howard Li, Jennifer Chen, Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Excuse me for the pronunciation. Roger Carney, Rudy Vansnick, Sarah Bockey, Ubolthip Sethakaset, and Wanawit Ahkuputra

And for staff we have Lars Hoffman, Gisella Gruber and myself Glen Desaintgery. Have I left anyone off perhaps who has joined on the phone only?

If not may I just remind you please to say your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And it is over to you. Thank you very much (Chris).

(Chris): Thank you very much. Now I had two apologies, one some time ago from Emily Taylor and then I think yesterday one from Peter Dernbach.

Okay so I'm very relieved that we can run this call today because we - we're able to get through almost half of the review tool in Singapore.

But there, you know, there is still a lot of - there's still lots of things that we need to pay attention to.

And I would guess that we may not be able to finish this in one hour. There really is quite a lot of stuff but let's just see how it goes.

So as I was saying, we're going to pick up in Line 42 of the spreadsheet. So I'll just I'll drive down there in a moment. But before I do so I've just realized I forgot to do the obligatory agenda point which is the statements of interest.

So I need to ask you whether your statement of interests have changed since you - since the last call?

Okay so hearing nothing and see nothing I think that's a green light to proceed. And as I say I'll just go - oh yes, before I go down to Number 42 I would like to just ask anybody because obviously we're going to spend I think the majority of the time between Number 42 and the end of the spreadsheet.

But if there is stuff that people would like to go back to because the Singapore meeting happens very early in the morning and (unintelligible). So, you know, it's not always the best thing - it's not always the best time to be dealing with quite complicated arguments.

And so if somebody wants to go back to something that is absolutely fine so I won't be at all surprised. So anyway I shall head off and I'm just going to wind down to Number 42 but before I do so I'll just ask Amr would you like to ask something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks (Chris). This is Amr. I would just like to ask that the review tool will be updated to reflect the discussions we've already had. I think that would help us move forward.

Unless I missed it you didn't receive an updated review tool over email. And right now I can't scroll through the - what we're seeing on the AC or on the other connect room the chat window but...

(Chris): Okay.

Amr Elsadr: ...it just seems that we have one comment in the first row so I think updating it would be helpful. Thanks.

(Chris): Thank you. Amr I'm fairly, you know, I'm pretty sure there has been an update. And it may be that it's in the wiki. Hopefully (unintelligible) fix that. But

actually I'm wondering did we forget to circular it? We may just have done so which apologies.

So I mean as I was saying earlier I do think it's unlikely that we're going to get through this today. So all it means is that on next week's call, you know, we can, you know, pay particular attention to any differences between the two versions.

All right, so and certainly what we're looking at is I believe it's the updated version. I'll know when I get that because if I told the truth I'm actually still using a slightly old version. So I'll be able to tell because I got all my notes on that so I should be able to tell whether it's updated.

So let's see, yes this is certainly - yes I think this is a version. This is oh yes. This is actually Version 4.1. That's slightly different from the one I put in the wiki. The one in the wiki is Version 4.

I don't know Lars would - do you remember what is that - are there major differences between those two versions?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Thank you (Chris). It's - I believe this is Version 4. I just renamed it for the purpose of the (unintelligible) room and there was an overlap with my computer. But it's the same version that's in the wiki.

(Chris): Okay all right. Well anyway as I was saying we can pick up all the differences next week perhaps I think we'll be doing very well to finish this today.

Right in which case and if there are no urgent things about any of the lines before Line 42 I am intending to start there at Number 42.

And actually quite a few of these comments in this part of the spreadsheet are fairly similar. But there are one or two people who are newish to the working group today.

So that it might be quite useful to, you know, spend perhaps a little more time than we would normally do because of that.

So anyway Number 42 so we've got the BC supports, business constituency supports, manager translation and does that or not consider this in mute.

We believe the cost should be treated as part of the regular cost of doing business for the parties collecting and maintaining the information. So this is registries, registrars and resellers.

Okay so that as such is not particularly new as an opinion. But I think when we weren't sure whether something was new or not we tended to give it the, you know, presume that it might be new.

And I think the general background to this is that those supporting mandatory transformation do tend to regard the costs effectively as being part of the - of doing business. And so they tend to fall on, you know, registrars and on others.

But those who believe the transformation should not happen they, you know, for them they believe that the charges should be picked up by the community and then, you know, and only done if necessary.

And later on today in discussing quite a few of the comments we haven't really spoken about yet, I think one thing that's going to come up is the difference between transforming absolutely everything in the database and just transforming ad hoc so when needed. And that's actually something that we haven't spent much time talking about but it comes up, you know, as we go through several of the comments today I think.

Okay. So unless there's anything else about Number 42 I suggest we go down and we get quite a few lines down after that.

Down to roundabout 46 right, so yes, now there are one or two comments that I'm possibly taking them slightly out of context.

But contact ability of registrants is always guaranteed by the presence of the email address data.

No, I really don't think it is because, you know, we don't know that the data - well, depending on what sort of validation has happened we don't know whether the address works for a start.

But the other really big issue is, you know, are the people who are emailing, are they actually able to share some language so if they can't then, you know, then that really blows this one out of the water.

Now I didn't see whose hand that went up first. It might have been Amr. Would you like to pick this up?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks (Chris). This is Amr. Yes I would just like to point out that what I believe key systems is trying to say here is the registrants are contactable by their email addresses.

And this is guaranteed because there's sort of a check system. While registrants are registering domain names they have to confirm their contact ability.

So what - when someone - when a registrant creates an account on a registrar's Web site and asks to register a specific domain name they're required to provide an email address.

The registrar will then verify that this email address is working by sending a message asking the registrant to respond to this message to verify that this is

a working email address that he or she or it can be contacted at. And so this is what guarantees contact ability.

But this does not guarantee that the registrants will respond to every email that he, she or it receives from someone trying to contact them through their contact data in the Whois.

But it just does - what it does guarantee that they are contactable but there is no guarantee that they will respond. So that is just my 2 cents on this.

(Chris): Thank you very much for that. Lars would you to like to add something to that?

Lars Hoffman: This is (Chris) - this is Lars thank you (Chris). Yes I think Amr is absolutely correct. I'd just like to add I think what they also had in mind I believe is that regardless of the script that is used because of the S sign and people can usually detect what the email address is.

And then if we have machine readable data it would then be fairly easy to copy and paste emails address into an email in fact and contact them this way without having to know what, you know, the name or the street address necessarily is.

(Chris): Thank you very much for that. Yes I mean the copy and paste argument comes up a few times later as well. And this has in fact already come up.

But as long as the data are machine readable even if you can't understand what they're saying, you know, you can still copy it and use it for searching and various purposes.

I'm just checking, Jim Galvin is typing a few things in the chat room, okay which is just backing up what we're saying so good, good.

Unless anything else about that I think we get to go down to Number 49. Now Number 49 is quite a complicated comment. So we'll just try and unpick it as we do it.

So report would benefit from addressing the question of cost benefit evaluation of transforming contact data such as - okay.

Well first of all actually there was a feasibility study that started to address those issues. And, you know, we are aware of what they were saying. So yes but actually probably it means we need to refer more to the feasibility study.

So that's okay. And then what to come in - oh, various aspects here. Mandatory transformation would require additional data fields that would need to be added to each registry database and supported by every accredited registrar especially problematic and underserved regions.

So yes, I mean any, you know, if transformation is going to take part in this database then the fields for the data would be needed and also tag fields would be needed.

So I think it's, you know, it's an earlier stage. I always said oh, you know, tag fields probably all you have to do is say this - these data are Japanese and that's the end of the story.

Thinking of about it at greater length, you know, we - and this is something we spoke about in Singapore very quickly from a logical, you know, just from the point of view of logic one realizes that actually isn't true, that we're not talking about saying these contact data are Japanese.

We might be saying, you know, we've got a Russian guy who lives in Tokyo at a Japanese address. And so theoretically you could have, you know, different languages within the contact information.

And so that means that more than one tag is going to be necessary and obviously that could have some effect on the complexity of the database.

Okay so that's that bit of it. And yes I mean one is concerned about anything that is adding cost to registrars and, you know, basically registries, registrars in underserved regions. I mean that's not something that we've spoken about on several occasions in the past.

But before I go on Amr would you like to pick up something there?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks (Chris). This is Amr again. Just on the tagging of the data fields yes, just to repeat something I think I believe I said in Singapore is that maybe when addressing these issues because we did discuss them and we did sort of come to some conclusions that there may be benefits, potential benefits in following those. And that's why we included them as potential recommendations in the initial reports.

But following some of the advice that we received on this in the public comment periods which I think is quite good advice actually maybe we should defer these questions to other PDP working groups that are chartered to look into them into more detail and ask them.

So maybe we might want to modify our recommendations as such. And we could do this. We could for example ask that the issue reports for the post CWG PDP is required to address these issues or just include them in the issues to be scoped and their discussions. And that way they could be chartered to deal with them appropriately and have sort of a time and focus to do this more than we did.

And that way maybe we could also limit our concrete recommendations on the charter questions that we were chartered to answer.

So that's just my thought on this and a few of the other recommendations we've made as well. Thanks.

(Chris): Thank you. Thank you very much. I think that that may well be very, very good advice.

It's so difficult to - it is actually very difficult to separate policy and actually how we would do it. Because sometimes where, yes, I think it can happen the people talk about policy without realizing that what we're talking about is extremely difficult or impossible to implement.

So yes, it's quite a major issue. But yes, I think that, you know, I'm certainly very happy with that sort of approach.

So, you know, what we need to do is to say that, you know, we, you know, we believe that the data should be tagged but exactly how that is done we leave to the people actually implementing things.

Okay. Now what we have proportionate domain name subject to a law enforcement query or grant protection intervention is extremely low, approximately .1%, UDRP interventions even lower.

So this is one of the comments that brings up the issue of, you know, to what extent are we, you know, should we be talking problems which already exist? And to what extent should we be talking about problems that could exist theoretically?

And so what this comment is saying is that actually at the moment these things are really rare. You know, and we just, you know, we just don't know to what extent of these things could become more common. So, you know, that's certainly one side of this.

Okay then it - so yes, and then the last point, transformation would not be proportionate to the expected benefit.

This is actually something we've have heard many times before we know about that. So I think there's not too much point in saying much about that.

All right before we go further down any more questions about that or shall we perhaps move to the next one?

Okay Number 50 will there be rules or standards governing translation of - or basically transformation so that it can be done programmatically and in business?

Will a common system be used or are we all just relying on free services like Google Translate? Okay, oh wow where to begin?

So you see Google Translate will work really well. Well it'll work accept, actually the more I think about it the less will it work. Google Translate works better with some languages than others.

So some languages Google Translate is really horrible and it's actually pretty useless. And, you know, certainly if you're learning Yiddish which I am they actually say, you know, people actually say do not use Google Translate. It's terrible.

Other languages the quality is far better and it really depends just which language it is, how big the database is, how long it's been going -- all of those things.

So rules or standards governing the translation, translation anyways we would imagine would be a marginal activity.

So I mean again this is a different policy than actually doing it. But we think that probably most of the time translation will be the important thing and there may not be very much - transliteration will be important activity and we're not expecting a lot of translation.

So as regards transliteration that is very much stuff that that has to be done with standards. And the smaller the number of actives doing it is the smaller the number of those people doing transliteration the better because the more people you have doing it the more possibilities, you know, you have for it to be done in different ways.

Yes with some languages it's also possible to get pretty good automatic transliteration. With others it's very difficult.

I'll just give an example and say I have transliterated a lot of Mandarin Chinese recently. It's really hard. So if you want to know how hard transliterating Mandarin is, you know, I can speak to you about this for a long time. I've had a rough time doing that.

Anyway quite a lot going on in the chat room so I'll just pause for a moment and just check that there's nothing I should be thinking of.

Right, so yes so apparently other people trying to shift the cost to some easy to use automated solution.

This is - you see this is - it's really very the only word to use is naïve because the as I say these problems get worse the more solutions. You know, if you have one solution to one of these problems then, you know, maybe that's, you know, that could be pretty good.

If you have everybody doing it on a volunteer basis in thousands - millions of different ways this is a sort of nightmare.

And as a linguist I - this is where I really have to ring the alarm bell and say please do not do that because you will end up with data which is of a very poor quality, it will not be accurate, it will not be consistent it will be pretty useless actually.

So, you know, this is as you can probably tell this is something and I don't feel strongly about very many things but this really okay and more just back to the chat room for a moment.

Okay yes, okay and Rudy is picking up the quality aspect of this. Yes there are free tools but without any guarantee yes.

And Amr is saying he thinks it's out of scope. Right and yes this is a good point. So actually, you know, we are we should really be talking about whether it's desirable and not how - not so much how to do it.

But I think if actually there is a connection here because if we are if we, you know, if we are recommending people to do something and the knowledge that it will cause chaos unless it's practically impossible then that does affect our decision about whether we want to recommend that are not. It really does.

Okay and now (Pitinam) is agreeing, (Jim) and (Pitinam) are agreeing with Amr. Yes okay I think it is a - yes - it's very easy to remember that we are here to say is it desirable or not?

And then (Pitinam) is making an interesting distinction between the various meetings of the English word burden so burden could be cost. But it's also liability. So that's something that's quite easy to forget.

Yes, both of those. Yes. And Rudy is agreeing with that and Jim then is saying so he's saying that the registrars and registries are talking about the feasibility of doing it which is mostly out of scope for us by, yes okay.

And then Amr has come back to me and says that limiting our answer to why. Okay, so yes, that's right. So when we give the answer we really need to say desirable or not and probably not all that much more and we shouldn't get too much into the nastier parts of it.

Okay I'll just double check that there's nothing else in here that we need to consider before moving on. Will there be - yes we can do programmatically will it - yes I think that's, I've said it all really.

And fundamentally if this is to work properly it probably can't be done automatically. I think that's one side of it.

And, you know, if it is going to be manual then it needs to be done by a smaller a small group of people as possible. And then okay Jim comes up with a characteristic of desirable is whether or not it's feasible.

Yes so there's no escaping this is there? Good. And Amr is agreeing and Jim is then saying that's the level at which we get to speak to the question of how?

Yes well I really hope that - well, you know, that whatever happens after this PDP that, you know, we are involved in the - in future work both with the policy and actually with doing it because I think it's impossible to do this work without getting really interested in it and actually quite, you know, quite passionate about it as well.

So okay, and so I've rather labored that point. But I think yes, this is just it's really important stuff.

We then perhaps go down further to Number 51. And then we've - so if translation cannot be automated and human judgment is required who is responsible for doing it? Okay. I mean, this is - I think to some extent this has

come up before but I think the idea would be registrant, but then theoretically the registrar would have to be able to check it and later on that comes up as another question. You know, what happens if they can't check it?

So, some of these questions are really, really hard to answer. There's at least one of them that I really haven't been able to answer at all. So, okay. I think I (unintelligible) but first, Amr, would you like to pick something up?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, (Chris). This is Amr. Yes, just one on this question number 51. Who is responsible for doing it? I believe the IPC also hinted towards or asked us to sort of answer this question as well, when in fact what this PDP is charted to answer is who should decide who should be responsible for doing it.

So if we focus on that instead of actually saying who is responsible? For example, you could say the registrar is responsible to decide whether they're going to do it or they'll ask the registrants to do it or whether they're going to leave it up to the registrees to do it later. Or we could say or the registrant is responsible for deciding who will do it by opting to do it himself or herself or just deciding not to do it and leaving it up to the registrars or registrees at a later point.

That's of course in the event that we do recommend that it is desirable to transform contact data or not. So if we're responding to this question specifically both here for the registrars and registrees as well as the IPC, then we would say well, we're not going to answer this question of who's responsible for doing it. We're only going to answer the question on who we think should make that decision.

(Chris): Thank you very much. Yes. Yes, that makes huge sense. Yes. And then the idea that perhaps the registrar would make the decision and, you know, you would imagine in a lot of cases that they may decide that the registrant has the responsibility. But anyway, Rudy, would you like to pick up something here?

Rudy Vansnick: Yes, thank you (Chris). Rudy for the transcript. I think it's quite important to keep in mind -- and especially in Europe as the debate is going on here on the data privacy again -- that the contact information, the owner of the information is the registrant in the end. So I'm wondering if we can allow that the third part would verify change the value of the data that the registrant has been entering.

I think that with regard to the European data privacy law that that would be a strong objection to it, so I think we need to keep in mind that the only owner of the contact information is the registrant. So I'm wondering how we could say who is responsible other than the registrant.

(Chris): Thank you. Thank you very much for that. This is really - yes it just adds another element of complexity to the whole thing. I mean certainly there are links questions. I mean as soon as you - as soon as transformation becomes mandatory, it just seems to be extremely difficult questions like this, and you know, in certain conversations, you know, the law will stop them and some possible solutions.

Now I'll just have a look - I'm just typing something. Oh, yes. This is the one about validity. Yes, translation will need people, at least for many years. Yes, that's basically one of the things that I was trying to say this earlier.

Transformed address needs to be agreed by the data owner registrant. Yes, well that's basically what Rudy was saying. Yes, and so it's agreeing with Rudy and so (unintelligible) and then the focus on who should decide. Yes. Okay.

And Rudy then has a comment saying yes, this is something we need to put back towards the beginning of the report.

Now, some of these other questions are pretty close to what we've been talking about, so I think I'll - there is a little bit of stuff going on in the chat

room, but I think I'm going to just keep on going and - in hopes of making as much progress as we can.

So if we then go to 52. I think 52 is actually the question I really got very stuck at - I don't know. Okay, so if the registrant is responsible for providing translated data, what if they don't know what it should be? Yes. Okay. I just - I mean the most likely apt to know what the data should be if, you know, it is the registrant that, you know, basically what we're saying is, you know, do you know, you know, do you know your address in your own language.

You know, the overwhelming likelihood is yes, but I guess if we, you know, there certainly could be situations with people living in countries and having to provide contact data in languages they're not familiar with. You know, this does come up.

Okay, so I'll just look here just for a moment hoping that somebody may shine a bit of light on this one. I think this was the - to me this was the darkest part of the document. I just - most of the time you can remember something from a previous call that may help but, you know, this one I - yes. It's really pretty tough.

Okay, so anyway, let's just keep on edging down and just see how much progress we can make. Oh, yes. And then we get to 53 which actually again is related. What if the third party disputes the accuracy of the transliteration? Okay, well you see, again if we - it's very, very difficult to separate policy and practice here. I mean, if you've got - if you've got a system where you've got a standard transliteration which is carried out by not too many bodies. I mean it's pretty standard.

Well, actually these disputes effectively most of the time the people running the standard are going to say, "Yes that meets the standard" or "No, that doesn't." So, you know, that is the joy of having the standard. So, you know, I mean it's just really - it connects with what I was saying earlier. You know -

and there are concrete suggestions for doing that further down, so perhaps I'll hold file until we actually look at the concrete suggestions.

In fact, okay (unintelligible) is just saying something. She's saying, "I start to think it's really no point transforming because if we needed some officially then it could be easily transformed by a free tool without guarantee." Well, yes, in a lot of cases true. Yes. And if we need it officially, then we need the validated one. Yes, absolutely, in whatever language. And you see, this is what - when I was talking about do we do - you know, would the whole database be transformed? You know, this might (unintelligible) a huge amount of work, or could it be done ad hoc?

And something's just fallen off my desk. That's what the crash was. So here, this is really backing up this sort of idea that, you know, what you might want is to have a - an organization that would do ad hoc transformations or that you, you know, and if that was the case you'd then be able to keep the consistency. But for some purposes, just using free things might work. So, you know, it really depends how important is it to get it right?

Then Amr is saying - oh he got disconnected but wanted to support what Rudy was saying about I think about putting something about who should decide at the beginning of the report, which is a really good point. The policy recommendation we may require contacted parties to send registrant contact data to third parties. Conflicts with some local privacy laws. This might prove problematic. Another good reason why transformation may be undesirable. Oh my goodness. Yes. Okay.

Well, though, I think the definition of send is quite interesting there because you would image that oh no, it's so much sending. It's more for just having some - giving some organization the rights to view data. So yes, I mean what we're saying is that if it were a situation where the quality of the data were important, then you might have to let some third party have a look at them to make sure that they're transformed according to the standards, and that

could have data privacy connections. So that's - that is a wonderful point which I don't think has come up before now.

Whereas as (unintelligible) was saying earlier, if the quality of this data doesn't matter too much, then you might in certain cases some languages be able to get a free tool to do some of it. So - data privacy. That's really interesting.

And Amr is coming in with a couple of things here. Sorry, the wrong thing here. Sending could also mean cross border transfer of data from jurisdictions with high data privacy laws to answer it. Oh, gosh. Okay. Well, yes. This is really something where we really need expert help. I think very often it may be actually point taken. So what's going to happen is that you're not going to need to give people electronic access. What you're going to be doing is just showing them something and just saying, you know, "Is this correctly transliterated?"

But there are certainly huge data privacy aspects to that. And Amr is pointing out well (unintelligible) agreement, and Amr is pointing out that it's an ongoing issue with the implementation of the (unintelligible) policy. Okay. Yes.

So I think you've got this sort of nightmare situation here where, you know, there may be certain situations where you're legally allowed to do that and other situations where you cannot legally do it. And then this horrendous matrix of when you can and when you can't. That's how I understand that. Amr is pointing out that there's an ongoing legal review being performed.

So all of this, you know, there is a slight risk that we could be recommending stuff that isn't actually legally possible in some parts of the world if we're not careful. So that's something we really need to bear in mind. All right. And a very interesting point which I don't think we've spoken about very much before today. Just slightly got lost when (unintelligible) is out.

Oh yes, here we go. 54. So a lot of these things are quite closely related. Is the registrant's consent required before a transliteration is published in the Whois? Yes. I would say so. I would imagine so.

And can they withhold consent? I would say no because - I mean I'm presuming that's consent to the transliteration. And the reason I say no is that, you know, this transliteration should be happening according to a standard. So, you know, the standard is not going to produce bizarre things. You know, fundamentally the standard should work. I'm not totally sure that's what withhold consent means, but presuming it is then that would be what I would suggest.

Okay, no. Amr is actually picking that up and saying that the withholding consent could be publication of the transformed data. Okay. I don't know the answer to that. This is - I just regard this as a technical legal thing. So I could - I would imagine that it might be possible because certainly in the UK, we're quite used to having situations where we don't have to give our addresses or our names or permission to photograph us, so it wouldn't surprise me at all if there were jurisdictions where it would be fine to refuse to do some of these things. And it does add a layer of complexity.

And Amr is saying this is another policy question that needs to be answered, but not by this PDP. Yes, I couldn't agree more. We - I'm really just guessing when it comes to the... Okay, so that's 54. 55, what if the registrant wants to change an approved transliteration? All right. Okay. Well, we're really hoping that that transliteration has been produced by a standard.

Now obviously there would be the other - you know, there might be other situations where transliterations are just very ad hoc and it doesn't matter too much and, you know, this doesn't really apply then. But actually normally because, you know, if it is a situation where a standard would be - were being used, then the short answer is that it wouldn't be possible to change it

because, you know, the standard is just going to do it, right? Yes. I think that would be a suggestion.

Amr, would you like to pick this up?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, (Chris). This is Amr. I just want to throw in a snarky remark here and say that I think the registrars and registrees are just throwing these questions at us to try to point out the vast complexities involved in a policy requiring transformation to make it seem as unappealing as possible, and I couldn't agree more with them. So just wanted to say that. Thanks.

(Chris): Thank you Amr. Yes. I mean certainly when I first started looking at this document, I actually wrote in the margin non-mandatory (unintelligible). I mean, they really are. And they're pretty powerful because trying to answer these questions is murderous. Really quite difficult stuff. Now, Rudy is just mentioning refers back to the previous points. I know today there is a change. There are also updates done. I've not quite got that. My brain stopped working. Refers back to the previous. So he thinks 55 refers back to previous points. And today that who is this change or also updates done? Sorry, I can't understand it, Rudy. Could you - oh yes, okay. Thank you.

Rudy Vansnick: Yes, Rudy for the transcript. Well, all the elements that are put in the comments from registree and registrar contacts are pointing to what I would call irresponsibility of registrees and the registrars. And we cannot add to that actually is in the agreements signed as being their responsibility. It's almost impossible to go above that responsibility.

So where - they are putting the questions about -- for instance -- the list verification of - but today there was an update out there that the domain name in the list. There is automatically a verification that takes place anyway in order to be able to assure that things are consistent. That's nothing new.

What I feel is that they are bringing a lot of arguments that indicate us that in fact based on what they have as responsibility today, well we cannot add on top of that many of their responsibilities that are in fact not there. I think that's the argumentation that I feel here. And eventually if somebody from registrars is present, it could be good to bring up what's the concern from their side especially with regards to the points, I would say 53 through 61, 62 even.

(Chris): Yes. I mean, certainly. There are a lot of very interesting arguments here. And - I mean I would agree with you. It would be really nice to make sure that we are actually understanding them correctly. I think that's a good point.

All right. So moving down again just to make progress, but I'll just take out Amr's comment before I do so. Technically we could add to those responsibilities that they obviously don't want to see. That's understandable. I don't want us to either in the absence of good reasons why we should. Absolutely. 56 - he says (unintelligible). Is a - who is verification required. Every time one of these transliterated fields are updated. Yes. I think that's a simple answer. I can't imagine the answer to that would be no. Oh, yes. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Hi, (Chris). This is Amr again. I would actually disagree with you on this point.

(Chris): Ooh. Okay.

Amr Elsadr: Say that verification is not required with transformation, whether it's translation or transliteration because if the authority to form of the contact data is the data provided in the local script, then it's that data that needs to be verified, not the transformed data. So verification would not be required either initially or upon updates of transformed data. Thanks.

(Chris): Ah. Thank you Amr. Yes, and so basically it depends I suppose on the model that they're using and one hopes that that is the model that they would use with the original data being the sort of the master version. But I don't know. I mean, I guess I was vaguely thinking in my head that there may be some

fuzzier model than that, in which case it gets, you know, it does get - you know, if they are wanting to verify both sides, then that does - that would get extremely messy.

Okay. Okay. And Jim is saying that the change needs to be logged and tracked. Yes. Okay. Yes, and Jim is making the point that validating the transformation is reasonable. Yes, but that's a different thing than what's being referred to here. Yes. Okay. Yes. Okay. I mean, I think certainly, you know, it would seem to be extremely undesirable to be having to verify every time some minor change were made. I mean, I guess if the address changes completely, that's a different matter. I mean, that's another issue that, you know, as addresses change it's going to be necessary - it would be necessary if mandatory transformation were to come in to keep the original data and the transformed data connected.

You know, obviously the same address not just the old address in the transformed form. Okay. Amr, would you like to pick something up?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, (Chris). Thanks. This is Amr again. I just wanted to point out that the purpose of verifying contact data is to make sure that registrants are contactable in the event that contact becomes necessary. So if registrants are contactable in the original contact data they provide and this is verified, then it becomes unnecessary to verify whether they are contactable using the transformed data or not.

I also - I raised my hand before Jim put his last note in the chat, but I'd also like to add something to that in saying that validation of contact data -- which I believe is just sort of just making sure that this data is real data, for example - - it's making sure that the physical address provided, that this street number exists on this street which it does actually in fact exist in this city. I believe there are several complexities surrounding doing this -- even in Latin scripts - - because there's simply no practical way to validate all contact data around the world.

And this might even be more complex if we're going to recommend or suggest that validation of transformed contact data should be mandatory as well. This might prove to be an impossible task to perform under any circumstances. We should probably consider that as well. Thanks.

(Chris): Thank you. I am aware incidentally that we are - we've really timed out. But I'll just pick up a few things in the chat room before we finish. And there is - there are also other ICANN calls this afternoon that people may be wanting to attend.

Okay, so Jim is saying validation of transformation is reasonable. Yes, so we've done that one. (Unintelligible) saying only if there is some standard way of transforming, yes. That needs certainly to be the case. A reasonable topic for discussion. Not what meant was reasonable to do. Okay.

Very briefly, any final comments before we end? I'll just ask for any other business very briefly as well. All right. Well, thank you very much for today's call, and as expected we didn't get to the end of the spreadsheet, but we can pick up where we - basically where we left off next week and on the mailing list before then on site, so thanks. And see you at the same time next week. Goodbye.

Man: Thanks, (Chris). Bye.

(Chris): Goodbye.

Coordinator: And that concludes today's conference. Thank you for participating. You may now disconnect.

END

ICANN

Moderator: Glen Desaintgery-GNSO

2-26-15/8:00 am CT

Confirmation # 1618103

Page 25