

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting Transcription
Thursday 9 April 2015 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 9 April 2015 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-09apr15-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG
Jim Galvin - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Peter Green - NCUC
Pascal Haddad - Individual
Sara Bockey – RySG
Justine Chew – Individual – joined late

Apologies:

Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Emily Taylor – RrSG
Peter Dernbach- IPC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP
Wen Zhai – RySG

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Glen de Saint Géry
Yolande Jimenez

Glen DeSaintgery: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Translation and Transliteration Contact Data Call on the 9th of April. And on the call we have Chris Dillon, Jim Galvin, Pascal Haddad, Petter Rindforth, Pitinan Koarmornpatna, Sara Bockey. And for staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman, (Yolanda Jiminay) and myself, Glen DeSaintgery.

I just want to look on the call to see if I've missed anybody. I think everybody is on the call that is on the Adobe Connect. May I just remind you please to say your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

And may I also note the apologies that we have for today. The apologies are from (Russell Jeknobil), (Ven Zai) and Peter Dembach. Has anybody else have received apologies from other members?

I think Rudi has got a conflicting call so may not be on this call. So we might note him as an apology if he's not on this call. Thank you Chris and I think that it's now over to you.

Chris Dillon: thank you very much Glen and yes Rudi e-mailed earlier to say that he's got a class so yes that certainly counts as an apology.

All right, well before we head into the meatier parts of the agenda, let's just get rid of the statements of interest point. So I need to ask you if anybody has changed statements of interest since the last call if you could mention that now.

Okay, seeing nothing in the chat room and hearing nothing, that means we can move forward. And I'll just do a very brief introductory bit because we've - basically what we're doing today is having the last look at the public comment review tool which you've got on the screen. So that's the sort of main item.

And then the second one is to have a look at the new version of the work plan. And I think it's likely that we want to make some minor changes to that in fact. But it's just sketching out what we'll be doing over the next few weeks.

And we'll also at the same time - because it's such a major part of it -- just mention one or two things about what's happening with the final report. But we'll talk about those at greater length later.

All right well let us start with the review tool and we have - I am fairly sure we have looked at this in some detail as far as Number 70. And in fact we've also talked about it, but it's just that you haven't seen the typed up comments from Number 70 onward.

So it's really just a matter of - well perhaps, you know, we could just scroll down slowly in case anybody would like to raise anything before Number 70. But I think probably most of the things may be asked around that. So...

And actually I'm just noticing I don't have control of it. So if somebody who does have control just gets us down slowly to Number 70, that would be good. Yes, Amr is asking for the de-syncing as well so that we've...

Yes, right. This is being quite slow to respond today. I mean actually I've - I was involved in the drafting process of this document so I don't think I have very much to say about it at all. But, you know, as I was saying earlier it is our last opportunity.

Ooh, it is jumping round. Yes somebody is - I think somebody may have control of it. What would be really good would be just to scroll down slowly, and then we need to go even more slowly after number 70. That's the idea. Yes, that is perfect. So just scan read as - and just be on the lookout for anything that you haven't seen before or anything that perhaps has been left out.

But I think we need to be particularly careful towards the end. And in fact one of the things we'll do is as we - there has been some work going on, on the final draft already the last couple of days. And we will be adding edits from this and numbering them in the document, so that will just make it rather easy to know where the edits are coming from. So that's really part of the editing process.

And I've now got - I'm now able to scroll and I'm just really doing what I was suggesting and that is just heading down towards Number 70. So if anybody would like to pick anything out then please do so.

Yes and Amr is requesting that the edits to the final draft are redlined and yes they are. So originally there was a version which had a lot of formatting highlighted as well, but we've now got a version where we've got the substantial changes highlighted and the formatting not highlighted as there's no point in doing that.

Okay so I'm not sure whether you're able - whether you're seeing what I'm seeing. Now I'm round about 26. Thirty-three now.

Amr Elsadr: Hi Chris this is Amr.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: I just wanted to say that it would be helpful right now that if we just have a document in front of us be synced. Then we could all jump to Number 70 and do in or outs.

Chris Dillon: Right, yes. I think we may have strange things happening today. I'm able to move up and down but I'm not sure whether you're seeing the numbers I'm seeing. Or if you don't have control then this is quite difficult. Unless you have paper copies.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars, if I can just butt in. Chris, I made you a presenter in the Adobe room so in theory what you should - what you see everybody else sees, so it's (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Oh yes. That's what - that's exactly - thank you Petter. Yes that's true. That's great. So we're on the same page quite literally. Yes, okay. So I'm just

continuing this scan reading effectively. And I will go especially slowly when we get to Number 70.

There is an icon which - there is an icon top right which allows you to go full screen but the problem then is that you can't see the chat room. So I think this may be the best approach. And we are down to Number 50 or so now. Okay.

All of the stuff I believe you've seen before, but we made edits on the 12th and the 19th of March. I think on the 12th of March we started with Number 17.

All right we're getting very close to the magic number now. (Unintelligible) that many others down here anyway. Right, okay. So as far as I know from Number 70, you know, this is stuff that I've seen and I have edited but we haven't had any (Chrises) and (Roberts) so just be very, very sure that you're happy with what you're seeing from this point on. No doubt about Number 72.

Just hoping that this is reflecting the discussions we had on those various calls. Down to about Number 77 now. Sorry about that. Right, I actually reckon we are at the end, so we might be - well what we could do is - yes okay, so Lars is saying, "I'm happy to unsync but then we won't see what Chris says." Okay.

Actually at this point I think we probably can desync because we've now scrolled right down through it. And there haven't been any comments. So I think at this point perhaps if we do desync, people can have - just have a couple of minutes looking through it and just check that there's nothing that they would like to pick up.

I mean I'm slightly laboring this, but I think it is important that we sign it off officially like this. And, you know, the other thing is I realize it's quite difficult to do this sort of work on a call. But if people miss something then perhaps if

there's any final comments could be made by 2400 hours UTC this evening that would be really good. And then we can just move on. Jim, would you like to raise something? Sorry I didn't see your hand.

Jim Galvin: Thanks Chris. Jim Galvin for the transcript. Just a process question. How is this going to be included in the final report? Are we just going to, you know, put this chart in just like this?

Will there be any additional, you know, rewrites or summary paragraphs or something that are done? Just curious as to what the next step is once we decide that this chart more or less represents what we want it to. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay well that's a neat transition into the next part of the agenda really. That was really the next thing I was going to say. The answer is both. So yes, at the end of the final report, the complete comment review tool will be appended. So it will be there as is.

But it will also, you know, the various comments from the review tool will be added to the report. And when those additions are made the numbers they refer to will be used.

Now sometimes the same thing comes up in more than one place, so that sort of slightly confuses it. But that's basically the idea. And some work has been done along those lines already. So I'm speaking about something I've seen.

And that approach seems to have worked rather nicely because, you know, the new text in the final draft, which is based on the initial draft, you can trace it back to the tool quite easily. Petter, would you like to raise something at this point?

Petter Rindforth: Petter here. Yes I just have a question when it comes to Points 74 and 75 whether it's just a reference to Number 22. And going back to -- so yes, now I can scroll it myself - going back to Number 22...

Chris Dillon: Yes okay.

Petter Rindforth: Would that be - that is accepted if it is - if it's a recommendation or how do you propose that we should understand that reference to Number 22?

Chris Dillon: Okay I think the main thing here is that I think the likelihood is that the language used will be supported by - so it's the language supported by the - I think it's usually the registrar. So I think all three of these are pointing at that. So that's the most likely outcome of this.

Petter Rindforth: Petter again. I don't really got it. Is it - do we read that what the possible solutions in 74 and 75, that is something that could be included in recommendations?

Chris Dillon: There is actually a bigger point here because at the moment we have included the recommendations in the first draft of the final report. But there was a bit of a debate about whether that was the best way of doing it. So it would also - because it is just - we are aware that that part of it needs a lot of work.

So another way of working may be to have the recommendations separate but at the moment the version that exists does have the recommendations included. So there is that aspect.

Petter Rindforth: Yes so maybe if it - maybe just for me, but I think it would be clearer to add just a short sentence that explains the working group's response a little bit more clearer than just a reference to Number 22.

Chris Dillon: Yes I think certainly I'm realizing on the call that it is a bit cryptic so we're certainly happy to update that part of the tool. Lars, would you like to pick up something there?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you Chris. This is Lars. Yes just to pick up very quickly that Petter just raised. To clarify, I believe (revisable) yes, it's a little bit cryptic and we should be more clear about what is meant here.

I believe what is meant is that the first bullet point that was raised by the IPC in 74 and also raised slightly different in 75, mainly that "whose information should be in the language of the registrar" and 75 as it says, you know, is to be used for the registration data to add data of the (TDLC) itself (unintelligible) use ASCII.

And I think the note, the reference to 22 is that we initially recommended in the initial report that (unintelligible) information should be supplied and (unintelligible) in the language supported, I think operated. In other words the registrar operate and we clarify it - through focus comments was clarified that should we say "supported by."

So I think what we're saying here is see note 22 is that if the recommendation would be changed to in the language that was supported by the registrar, that would address some of the concerns raised in 74 and 75.

So I think it also addressed Petter's note in the chat and just for Amr, just very quickly Amr you said - because it did provide a link to the initial report with the common review tool for some cross-check. Do you mean - do you mind if I put you on the phone - do you mean link directly here in the tool itself or just references to say see Page 22 of - I'm making up a number obviously but see Page 22 of the initial report.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks for the question Lars. This is Amr. Yes I'm just thinking because the language in the final report will have changed significantly. So if the people

reading it and reading the appended public comment review tool won't necessarily be able to cross-check comments submitted and the working group responses with anything that is actually in the final report.

So if a link to a copy of the initial report could also be provided along with this so that people could also check that and cross-reference what's in the review tool along with what's in the initial report, it may be easier for people to sort of see how the working group responded to their comments in the initial report or even if it's just a third party who didn't submit comments but was interested to learn more. Does that answer your question?

Lars Hoffman: Yes thank you Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. I don't think there's any problem whatsoever with doing it because certainly it is interesting to watch how these changes happen. And so a link to the initial report would work there.

Okay now I'm just wondering have we actually dealt with all of these comments in the chat room? Yes. Yes. So the conflict between Number 74 and 22 I think were picked up in 75 and 22 also (unintelligible) to make it 75. Right, okay.

And still - and Amr is pointing out that recommendations are still subject to post-expert working group PDP. Hm.

All right now so I wonder whether there are any other things that people would like to pick up in the tool or whether we can move into just talking about the work plan. Okay. So Amr would you like to raise something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr. It's more of a generic sort of comment on what the working group recommendations may or may not be. I have to say I'm a bit

disappointed with the sort of binary approach we're taking to answering our charter questions.

I would have liked for us to at least to explore options that were responses by the working group. And the review tool would not consistently show up as most working group members agree. It shows to me that we haven't really explored any sort of middle ground that everyone may find to be appealing.

I'm not necessarily sure how this could be done but we have always approached things in terms of having to get a yes or no answer and advantages of yes versus disadvantages of no and vice versa.

And since what we're really -- we're pretty much wrapping up the review of public comments -- I was wondering if there is any intent to attempt to do so or if there are any ideas on how to go about that at all? That would be helpful. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. Strangely enough there was a preparatory call today with ICANN staff, and this was one of the main issues that came up. And to cut a long story short, you know, we are aware of this. And we are very much thinking of ways to get round this.

And, you know, also whether there are ways to approach perhaps people who historically or still do tend towards the mandatory transformation point of view. So yes we haven't made a final decision on how that will happen.

I mean, possibly it may happen on the mailing list. And so we may have a debate and just actually ask people, you know, how do you stand about this? For example, is it likely that a minority report may be necessary? But we've only really just started talking about this, so that's not necessarily the best way forward.

But by coincidence there was a discussion about this earlier. Amr, would you like to pick up something there?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr again. Certainly it is the right of any member of the working group to request that a minority report be submitted along with the final report. I was just hoping that maybe we could try to avoid that somehow by incorporating something that may mitigate the need for a minority report.

And to be honest I don't exactly recall the specific contents of for example the public comments submitted by ALAC, but I do distinctly remember that ALAC sort of budged from their initial position of requiring mandatory transformation in the input they provided early on when this working group had sought input from the community when we were first starting our work.

Unfortunately we don't have ALAC participants or any at large participants in this working group. But I would think it might be a good idea to try just explore some options. And I recognize with the majority of the working group do not support mandatory transformation but there must be something we can try to do to also sort of address some of the concerns presented for example by the IPC to sort of, to try to reach some form of full consensus on recommendations that we provide. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Amr yes. Thank you very much. I think all of that is really desirable. Petter would you like to raise something?

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Yes anything - what I just wanted to throw out and see what you think about this. If it could be good and clear for us all to just send out these 95 points again to the full group and add the line where we can just easily note yes or no or if you don't have any specific decisions yet to see clear what are the topics we're 100% agreed about and also more clearly see where we are, where we're disagreeing and how the majority and the minority looks on each topic.

I haven't seen it before but it seems that it could be - if we do it and give us all like until next week to do it, it could be a more clear document where we see where we stand and from that also have hopefully just a handful of questions where we need to probably need to have a majority and minority document. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Petter. Yes that would seem to be - that would seem to be one way of doing the sort of thing that was being discussed earlier. So then I'm very interested in that. Jim would you like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: Thank you Chris. Jim Galvin for the transcript. I guess I want to just state - try to state - maybe somewhat clearly here, you know, my view about this in response to, you know - apologize now. I think it's Amr who was talking about trying to respond more directly to the question of, you know, mandatory transformation or not. You know, my view is people talk about the cost and we put that out there. But I think that what we have in our documents and maybe there's an opportunity to restructure our words in some way to reflect this more directly the reasons why you don't do mandatory transformation just seem more compelling to me than the reasons why one would want to.

You don't do it, you know, beginning with the idea that the registrant, you know, may not be able to provide it.

If you look for automated systems you don't do it because you just don't have the accuracy that you need. And that is a compelling requirement these days for registration data.

But I do think that we could perhaps as a response to the need for transformation maybe more directly redirect the question or the desire for mandatory transformation in the direction of taking the data so the transformation has at least the opportunity to be more accurate when those tools and those kinds of services become better at what they do.

We do actually say that in a couple of places. It is not really within our remit to make that a recommendation but maybe at least in my view I think that's a critical point that maybe we can find a way to highlight a bit more.

And I think that response really quite directly to this desire, the strong desire to have mandatory transformation, you know, reflecting on lack of accuracy in the tools and instead suggesting that we need to move in the direction to support those tools.

And, you know, the tagging is the key part that moves us in that direction. So and I hope that helps, just some thoughts thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. I mean there is some concern that tagging effectively well, you know, maybe my understanding here is wrong. But, the way I understand tagging is a tagging is a way of telling people which language this data is in and it probably has to be done by field.

But in some ways I think tagging is actually a tool and there may be problems with tagging out a tool so there is a possibility that we may do better rather than specify this determination of the language must be done by tagging.

We - it may be better to withdraw and say the outcome that we want is, you know, we want to know what language the data is in or, you know, it's also the purpose that we want.

But tagging may or may not be the best way of getting there. I think that was another thing strangely which came up in the preparatory call but Amr would you like to raise something at this point?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thank you Chris. This is Amr. I just want to say that I agree with Jim, very much agree with Jim on his last comments.

And I want to add to that and also to what you just said on potential problems involved with tagging the fields regarding what language the data is then.

One thing we could do because we haven't had the opportunity to explore that in depth although we did consider it and it was included in our initial reports to a certain extent.

But since we haven't had the opportunity to explore in a way that would allow us to make recommendations and in addition to that it was clearly outside of the scope of this PDP to recommend something like that I think what we could do is specifically because of those two reasons what we could do is perhaps recommend, include a recommendation in our final report that the topic of tagging the fields be included within the scope of the post EWG PDP so that they would take this issue into consideration based on what we've come up with on our work and in our final report.

And so that way a more appropriate platform for discussing this issue could be provided therein it could be something that they could consider. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes I mean certainly, you know, there is no doubt that this determination of what language is in that field needs to be picked up.

Yes. And it may be that tagging is the best way of doing that. Whilst we're on the subject just to mention that Unicode itself will get us as far as the script but unfortunately it does not get us as far as the language. So that's also a relevant part of the background of that.

Jim would you like to continue with this discussion?

Jim Galvin: Yes. Thank you Chris, Jim for the transcript. I want to just respond a little bit to your comments about tagging as a tool and I want to say two things.

One when I say tagging I'm actually referring to being knowledgeable about the language and the script.

I think we've kind of had this discussion a little bit in this group, you know, but it is important to always know both things about any particular, you know, string of...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: ...characters if you will.

But more directly to your comment I take your point Chris. You're right, you know, I mean as a technologist I tend to focus on tagging because that's a solution which is readily at hand.

But you're right in terms of how we phrase it if we wanted to go down this path in this document we should take a step back and indicate more directly that knowledge of the language and script of any data is really the requirement that you want or not that - let me say that differently.

Knowledge of the language and script is what we believe is a direction in which to head if you're looking for, you know, transformation services.

You need that information anyway to do it. We have our reasons for not making transformation mandatory but we recognize that for transformation to work at all you need this kind of thing.

And so we don't have to say the word tagging, you know, but reference the requirements in a more abstract sense.

And then as Amr was saying, you know, sort of redirect the efforts for mandatory transformation to, you know, find a way to get that out there so

that you have that available for doing transformation at all and, you know, find a way to suggest that that is a work item that needs further study.

But there are a lot of issues with tagging from a technical perspective, you know, beginning with whether or not even registrars have that information available to put it with the data and how they might get it.

Once it's in the system, you know, everybody can carry it. But getting it is its own set of issues. You know, the new Whois replacement the old weirds protocol will certainly make it available if it's there.

So anyway sorry, the point here is just I take your point Chris that we should abstract back from saying tagging and refer to knowledge of language and scripts. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Many thanks for that Jim. That was an absolutely beautiful summary of the situation I think we're in -- very, very elegant.

Now one or two things going on in the chat room, I'll just check. Amr is saying he's agreeing with Jim just wondering if we can also somehow just that's some time ago adjust the IPC's concerns.

We could have a clear recommendation (unintelligible) that we - that this should be included. Okay I think this is slightly old - these are slightly old comments, all right.

Okay...

Amr Elsadr: So Chris this is Amr.

Chris Dillon: Amr, yes.

Amr Elsadr: If I could just jump in here...

Chris Dillon: Yes by all means.

Amr Elsadr: Yes my last comment was pertaining to this specific point of tagging.

Chris Dillon: Oh yes okay.

Amr Elsadr: I think we could have a recommendation in the final report expressing I mean at least portraying that or explaining that this working group did look into tagging as a possible solution for the desire to transform data at some point in the future but it was - but there are too many issues to consider in that regard.

And so we would like or we recommend that this issue be taken up by the post EWG PDP and included in its issues report. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. And that's sounds very practical and I can see Jim is agreeing in the chat room. So post EWG, right.

Okay so yes. So now we should really I think that I think now is probably the time to switch documents and display the work plan.

In fact it's only the last page of the work plan. If we've got technical problems it wouldn't be the end of the world if we can't display it in fact.

But at the moment we're on the last page of the existing plan. What I might do is just put a (unintelligible) because that might be quicker than people.

Put the link in the chat room, a horribly long link there.

So on the last page it's just sketching out the various stages from now on.

So what we have is the initial report. Gradually comments will be added to it both from the public comment review tool also some things from today's conversation so those will be added.

And then the idea is to circulate the report early next week that may be optimistic but we will try to do that. And then it's a matter of moving into discussions of that on the 16th, the 23rd and the 30th of April and in fact on the 7th of May.

And the reason for those five meetings just - sorry it's not five meetings but it's four meetings discussing the document is that one possible deadline is the 11th of May.

That's the deadline for submission as a consideration of the May GNSO Council meeting so one possibility is that we take that approach.

Now the other possibility is for some reason we're unable to make that - ah ha, yes. Now we can actually see all of this in front of us but it is actually just that last page.

So I've got to be 11th May which is the middle of the last page. So one possibility is that we do four meetings discussing the document and we try and submit on the 11th May.

If that doesn't work - and I think we probably still are in schedule. My instincts is it might work. But if it doesn't for some reason if it's more difficult than we expect then the other possibility is to run those other five meetings in May and early June because there is another deadline on the 14th of June.

So that - so that's a sort of a two possible ways of doing it, you know, either the 11th of May route or the 14th of June route.

I am expecting to travel in early May so that may mean that I can't run either the 7th of May or the 14th of May but this is probably fairly small (there). I think the other ones I can make.

Now other things that we should consider is that one thing I started doing is actually anything - I've only used it once so far but anything which I don't know the answer to so it's something which we, you know, just for some reason I don't know what to do I'm turning magenta. So if you see magenta in the document that means watch out, this is broken. It needs fixing.

Oh yes. So one of the things the example I can think of is actually the oh no, let me try and to remember this. This is the - oh, and I had it a second ago. And the harder I try and remember it the more it goes. Lars help. Do you know the thing I am talking about?

The - oh it's the language in the (unintelligible). Okay so there is some language in the initial report which basically says we want to be able to display the fields of the database in as many languages as possible.

Now we know for a fact that as many languages as possible is really bad from a legal point of view. What we don't know is how to fix that.

So that's just an example they're going to be more of these things. So if you see magenta it just basically means we know it's broken. We just don't know what the solution is.

I think I'm also going to use magenta on, you know, just the heading of the recommendations because it's not completely clear that the best thing to do is to put them in.

But anyway if we term the title the recommendations magenta what that means is watch out. This is broken. It needs attention.

So that's one little trick that or one device that I - that we'll be putting in there. And another thing you will notice is that there is a brand-new section on rationale.

So basically, you know, well we haven't actually decided what our recommendations are going to be but when we do there will need to be that new section. And I have drafted a few comments for that which are brand new.

So I'm just trying to think of other things I should be in fact perhaps I have a very quick look at what we did. But I think in fact those are the major, major things.

You know, there are obviously there are huge numbers of small things and I think there will be more small things because, you know, as we do proofreading and things like that we'll get quite a few of them.

But yes actually I've now I have skimmed through. That is basically the situation as I am aware. But basically if anybody would like to raise anything about either the work plan that you see in front of you or the sort of approach we're taking with the final report then basically please do that now.

All right. I think one thing which is relevant here is this perhaps we should return to it just briefly because I think, you know, Petter mentioned this possibility of circulating the comment, the comment review tool and just getting people to yes and no each of the 95 points because that would, you know, that would really make opinions very clear.

I guess those could possibly go into an Excel spreadsheet as well.

I think that is something that might work. I mean this sort of thing is not my strong point. But as far as I can see those are the systems that really might

do us rather well. And, you know, we were certainly saying early on in the preparatory call that something like that would be desirable.

So I think that is certainly something which, you know, would at least identify areas where there is disagreement.

And at that point we might become, you know, is Amr was saying interested in non-binary. So, you know, what are things that could be done to make this work perhaps, you know, that sort of approach.

But yes, I think that might work rather well. And in order to do that we need to set a deadline. So just before I can see (Pascal) has got his hand up.

But we actually need to think when the deadline. Perhaps we just say the deadline is because we need some time for compiling this into a spreadsheet.

The best thing to do would be or maybe we do 2400 Hours on Tuesday the 14th would be my suggestion because that gives us enough time to compile that.

Okay (Pascal) is this something you'd like to raise?

I can't hear you speaking. I think we've got technical problems. No we can't hear you. It doesn't matter. Type in the chat room. I'll read it out.

Okay so (Pascal) is typing is very happy to be meeting with us and saying that he's new and has a quick question. Fire away.

Amr is giving technical suggestions. Yes actually we did at an earlier stage of the meeting we did collect. I mean you'll still find small samples of data in the report. In the initial report there is some sample data.

But also if you have a look at the groups wiki the wiki at one point I was collecting data in several languages. And I'll just read this. At (unintelligible) count we just have a sample of the data with all languages and data cleaning part of the transliteration.

That's actually a rather interesting question because a lot of people say, you know, that one solution would be to get volunteers to do transliteration.

But the problem there is that nobody is actually cleaning the data and that is very, very important if the data is a clean. It may not be good enough for a lot of the purposes we're discussing.

So from fundamentally if transliteration happens it should happen by as few people as possible. It really needs to be done centrally.

That's in fact suddenly enough that is, in the rationale section that is something I was writing earlier.

So the sort of data cleaning part of it tends to be - well you can do it either way around. You can either have people following rules so basically when you transliterate Japanese you need to follow this set of rules or you can do it afterwards and say well this piece of transliterated Japanese needs cleaning because they've used SY instead of SH -- something like that.

And thank you very much Amr. He's gone digging into our wiki and found the examples.

So most of the things you - we have tried to be really consistent with our use of the wiki so a lot of things like that will live in there.

And certainly other documents that are relevant to us or documents that we have read they are all in there. Yes no Arabic. Yes that's a shame isn't it?

Yes. And Arabic falls into the category of languages where not all of the vowels are represented so that means that manual - that automatic transliteration won't work.

Because the problem with most Arabic, some Arabic it's different and sometimes they do write the short vowels but often they don't.

And so that means that you tend to just end it with jumbles of confidence and you don't know which vowel to put in there so as transliteration it doesn't work.

And yes Amr is saying multiple languages use the Arabic script. I think certainly for Persian and Urdu what I was just saying applies.

The Hebrew script is similar to Arabic because often they don't write the short vowels. But interestingly Yiddish, so Yiddish is another language that uses the Hebrew script but interestingly they always write the short vowels.

So Hebrew although it's using the same script, you know, when it's used to write Hebrew you've got problems with short vowels. When it's used to write Yiddish it's totally clear. All of these things are written.

And then Amr's winding me up. He's saying there are no vowels in Arabic. Well in Buenos Aires we'll have a slow conversation about that.

Okay. I think it maybe short vowels. I think the long - oh yes wait a minute, yes. I - that may be one of the - oh, I'm not totally sure because certainly for short vowels there are sometimes sort of dashes that are used in Arabic above and below for I and for A.

But actually Arabic isn't my - it isn't my main thing. A few years ago I learned bit of Urdu but I think Arabic is rather different. Okay.

And (Pascal) is following-up his question. It's mostly about standardizing names and areas, and cities. Oh yes, okay yes.

So it's actually quite interesting because it's surprising how few large lists there are of geographical places. This is - there is an ISO standard. But, you know, it does tend to miss out places.

I think Amr's and Patagonia may fall into that sort of problem. And (Pascal) is picking up the problem with, you know, the same name can be written in many different ways or transliterated perhaps in many different ways.

It's not even totally transliteration because, you know, there is sort of - I think one approach with names is just fundamentally to say that the name is whatever the person says it is.

So like in my case I see my name is Chris Dillon. I was born Christopher James Dillon but I only ever use Chris Dillon. And the only way you'd find that out is by talking to me so that's another approach.

So certainly with personal names but I think that works with personal names. It probably doesn't work with geographical names.

And, you know, it is quite surprising. I was involved with geographical work a few years ago for ICANN. And it was very interesting to discover that, you know, often one presumes that these lists exist and they don't necessarily exist.

And the geographical names is a problem, even lists of languages is a problem. You know, there doesn't seem to be an authoritative list of languages. It's, you know, it's also something which affects us. It would be wonderful if there were such a thing.

Okay and, you know, for example Lebanon is a country - (Andrew) says okay yes.

There are also political issues so geographical places that are recognized by some countries and not by others yes. And, you know, this is sometimes picked up in the relevant ISO.

So if I was on the ball I would be able to give you the number of the ISO but it's 31599-2. I could be wrong but it's somewhere around that.

Then Amr is picking something up, yes we explored such issues. What could also be confusing is it's the same person transliterates his name differently when registering domain names in different registrars one of the many reasons for using the original script. And if that gets rid of that sort of problem yes, yes that's certainly the sort of conversation that we had.

And exists as areas in the US, yes? The US is quite famous for certainly European place names tend to occur in the US.

And then that represents problems over, you know, who has sort of claim on that name. But and I'm talking more about other work I was doing (unintelligible), yes.

Right, okay. We're at the top of the hour and we haven't looked at it any other business. I should just raise that briefly.

But let me just recap and say that we are hoping to circulate the first draft of the final report early next week.

We're also going to send around the review tool with a column so that you can just say oh are you happy with this and that sort of approach. That will be compiled.

And so the deadline for that is 2400 Hours on Tuesday the 14th. I'll send a reminder around which covers is the work plan part of this call. I'll send a summary because it's also useful for people who couldn't attend the call so I will do that soon in the near future.

Okay. If there is no other - any other business then I think we can wind down. And it looks as if we have some very busy days ahead of us but that will be a good challenge.

Thank you very much for attending today.

Man: Thanks Chris.

Man: Bye-bye everybody.

Chris Dillon: Goodbye everybody.

Man: Bye everyone.

END