

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting Transcription Thursday 16 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 16 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-16apr15-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 Petter Rindforth – IPC Justine Chew – Individual Sara Bockey –

RrSG Peter Green – NCUC Wen Zhai - RySG

Rudi Vansnick – NPOC

Pascal Haddad - Individual

Ubolthip Sethakaset – GAC

Peter Dernbach - IPC

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund

Lars Hoffmann

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recordings have been started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Ellen). Good morning, good afternoon, good everyone, everybody and welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group Call on the 16th of April 2015.

On the call today we have Pascal Haddad, Petter Rindforth, Sara Bockey, Chris Dillon, Justine Chew, Wen Zhai, and Jim Galvin. We received no apologies for today's call. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much, and over to you, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, Nathalie. All right let's move into agenda point three, which is the statements of interest. So I need to ask you whether anybody has a change of statement of interest from when we last met. Hearing nothing and seeing nothing in the chat room, I think that means we can go forwards.

And now we can move into agenda point four and so basically first we'll be looking at the version 8.3 of the comment review tool, and then version 1.2 of the final report.

Lars Hoffman: Chris, this is Lars. Just very quickly, I'm having trouble uploading. I'm not sure what's going on. I'm working on it though. It should be there very shortly.

Chris Dillon: Okay. That's no problem at all. Now let's just have a look at I think not too many - well, yes maybe there are a couple of general things I should be saying right at the beginning because there's been a real flurry of documents recently. So version 8.3 of the review tool has basically Justine's - Justine wrote some rather substantial comments, so those comments are in there.

One of the comments was that we'd managed to lose some of our responses because had a call in which we had to remove which was saying yes we've already dealt with this. So what we've done is we've gone through the document, and in cases like that we've actually followed up where we dealt with it.

And we've usually been able to do that, but there were one or two play - or actually rather more. There were a few places where I needed just to change it slightly and just mention where something was covered, you know, either in the review tool itself or referring - in fact I referred to the final document, the early draft of that, rather than later drafts of the initial document. I thought that made more sense, because the final document is based on the initial document.

All right so what I'm intending to do, I wonder how much of this agenda we're going to get through. It took a long time to prepare today's meeting, and usually there is a link between the amount of time it takes to prepare and how long it takes us to get through. But let us just see how we go. What I would like to do is just to scroll down as usual and stop in places where I think we need to address a few, which may lead to comments.

And one place I am actually going to be able to -- at least one place -- I'm actually going to pick Sara Bockey's comment as well, but we can deal with that when we get there. My standpoint is usually the same as Justine's. Originally I thought we'd be needing to compare three versions simultaneously, but I then realized I could actually remember my own opinion, so it wasn't necessary to do that complicated comparison.

So usual approach. I'm going to scroll down slowly and then stop at various places, but as usual, you are very welcome to raise something else. Oh yes, so I think possibly the best approach is that if I could have control of this then we know that we're all in the same place. I think at the moment it's set up so that everybody can scroll. Oh I imagine this is an issue, isn't it, what's the best thing to do.

If I scroll, then at least we're in the same place, but then on the other hand, it may be easier for people to read. Oh Nathalie is saying I've got control. I think that's probably the best, and I'll just scroll slowly. Thank you.

All right so I've actually nothing at all on this first page. I don't know whether anybody else has. Okay I'm going to just gradually go down towards number six. That's where I start, I think. Whoops. Okay so we'll just leave it like that so that you've got it on your screen for as long as possible.

And okay, Justine has put up quite a long response in here so we might just have a quick look at that. So she's saying she agrees, doesn't see a direct correlation between transformation and necessary to the continued development of the secure and trusted Internet. Transformation is limited to registration data submitted by registrants, so verifying accuracy of registration data is paramount, not transformation of the same. I believe that is not controversial and I think perhaps we can keep on going, unless somebody would like to stop me.

And in fact, we don't get very far this time because I think we also need to talk about number seven. So again I'll do the same thing and leave you the data on the screen as long as I can. And here she's got - oh yes, one thing I'll just explain quickly - oh yes, so number eight, which we haven't seen yet, is actually talking about saying registrants should have the option of entering both forms, so both the original and the transformed form, so it's in that sort of a context.

So somewhat agree. When read with response number eight, I think is that optional transformation must be subject to a common standard established by the stakeholders and not merely not registrants in order to avoid discrepancies. All right.

How far do we get this time? Oh I think we get some distance, so in that case I should drive quite slowly I think. I think we get right down the next page. There were one or two occasions in this where I found it was very helpful to put brackets in the documents, so this is number 14. And if you put the first sentence in square brackets, it's lot easier because then it's easy to respond to the question, and there are a few cases of that.

That all must be worth picking up. Okay and then here we get to number 18, but I'll continue going down there rather slowly. Okay, right let's stop with 18 like that. So here there's just a reference back to working group response number seven, and this is basically the one that says this data are submitted into forms there could be discrepancies, and we just need to make clear what that reference is.

And then in fact probably return to our scrolling, unless something controversial comes up. I think it's only a matter of time before it does, by the way, but so far so good. I've got to make sure I know where I'm going. I think it's number 23, yes. Ah, yes. So we'll leave it like that. Agree. So I'll do the working group response, which is (unintelligible) so we've got agree with the suggestion that transformation, if any, should happen only at the submitted data, not in Latin characters.

And I think that's not very controversial. Justine is writing "agreed." Additional edits suggested to remove notion of mandatory being in play. Okay yes, this was the sort of square brackets I was just telling you about. So this IPC support for this transformation I mandatory would be really good in square brackets. Because what we're really talking about is this next bit, which is the otherwise transformation should happen if the submitted data are not in Latin characters or other UN language. And I think that is a lot easier if you work like that.

All right, and I think this time we don't get very far. I think we just end up going down to 25. So we'll just stop there for a moment now. Oh yes, and it's actually a very easy answer to the question raised. So perhaps addressing the final report. There is a substantial dedicated section towards the end of the report.

The second possibly needs some more work, but it does exist and, you know, we have every intention of building it up. And that is actually the response to

a couple of questions but certainly to that one. Right. Now let's see how far we get this time.

Right. As we pass number 28, there was a mention of - okay and the working group response was something about the data needed to be tagged or marked. That's actually an aspect which we may need to stress more, especially in the draft of the final report. Anyway that's just a side issue, really.

And I think we might get as far as number 34. Ah, but somebody stopped the bus. So we actually need to have a bit of a look at number 25, Amr. Amr is saying, "Number 25 can be addressed if this working group makes recommendations on what should be in scope of other PDPs." Okay.

Yes and in fact that takes us onto something that we will be dealing with I hope if we get into the final - the first draft of the final document, because that - there is a dedicated section there. So we actually need to be looking out for anything like this.

I'm just making sure this is going into my system. Okay thank you very much for that. Amr, would you like to say something about that?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I just wanted to clarify what I mean by my comment in the chat. It's - I believe (Bachevika) was one of the registries that submitted the comment saying that some of the recommendations we came up with may involve a wider scope than what we should be addressing, and more work may be needed.

So I think to be consistent with Justine's comments, how we clarify this may be in adding a recommendation, which I believe I suggested before, on sort of including some issues we had identified to view it in the scope, especially of the post PDP - the post EWG PDP. So that may help in answering

(Bachevika)'s concern on how this PDP fits together with other Whois issues and other Whois policies. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Okay those are some very useful points. Thank you very much. All right, now I'll just see whether we can have a look at number 34 perhaps, like that. Okay so this again support mandatory transformation but otherwise that's, you know, it would be good to have that sort of bracketed out really

And then we've got the suggested edit: is the working group response referring to its response number 33 or IPC's comment? Yes, it isn't clear. We clarified that by saying it is the - it's response number 33, it's not the comment. And okay, we don't get very far this time. I think we get to number 36. Ah, oh no, just a moment. I thought for a moment that things were moving in the chat room but perhaps not.

Okay 36. Okay so really the key part of this is the responsibility for deciding who should bear the burden of transformation is beyond - there's a bit of grammatical trouble here. So we need to delete some stuff. It does not lie with this working group. That's what we want to say. And the suggested response is address the - oh yes, address the misunderstanding contained in that, which I think we do by saying, you know, really this beyond our remit.

And Justine is commenting in the chat room. "The same goes for line 27. It should be response rather"- oh there's an interesting one on that. The short answer is I don't know but let's go up there and have a look. Right. So this should be strictly optional as neither registrars nor registrants can be expected to know the tag to every given data sent. Yes actually, yes. So yes. I think that should be "see next response," not "see next comment." It's so easy to miss something like that. Okay.

And then perhaps back down to what we were doing, or in fact rather beyond that as we get to perhaps 36. Oh yes, okay. Amr is saying, "I believe this is also out of the PDP's scope." Yes so I think this is absolutely the case, and

this whole tagging thing, you know, as we said last week in fact, whether this should be marking or tagging is also a big question. But yes, so that's a found - like another possibility for that section that we haven't started on in the final report.

Okay now if we - okay and I think we might have done 36, so that means that we get to go a bit further down, although I think it's not very far this time. Thirty-seven. Ah, Jim, would you like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you, Chris. Jim Galvin, for the transcript. I guess I've been thinking more about this, you know, what's within our remit and what's not. And although I certainly do appreciate the strict, you know, letter of what's written and what's allowed, well what should be responded to, I am concerned that we're going to miss an opportunity to say things about related things.

I mean sometimes you don't always know everything that might come up when you're first chartering a group, and so additional questions come up. And I'd like to think that, although we might not want to make a definitive statement and recognize that it wasn't strictly asked of us to respond to particular questions, you know, like in, you know, 36, comment 36.

It just feels to me like well yes we're supposed to talk about translating or transliterating contact information but is it really that far a stretch to even make a suggestion or comment about the issue of the labels and the fact that, you know, standardized labels are a useful thing and, you know, this might be something that someone should undertake, and this is the advice that we would give had we been asked that question.

Anyway I'm concerned about missed opportunity and opportunity cost here about things which seem to me to be clearly related. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. That is an excellent point. I think, to some extent, we can actually go both ways at the same time quite legitimately. So, you know, we can say

something about issues that are on the edge of what we've been doing, and, you know, have done that. We can - but we can also say, you know, we can put it like this, we can say, "As far as we can see, it looks as if this sort of approach may be useful but further work needs to be done." So, you know, perhaps that could be a way around that.

Amr, would like you to raise something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. I think you pretty much said what I was going to say. And what - the only thing I would add is that isn't necessarily about the strictness of what we're chartered to address and what we're not chartered to address, it's more about the farness with which we've addressed it.

And as Chris has just said, yes we could very much - very well identify this as something the working group thinks would be useful, and in thinking so and due to the fact that we haven't really taken as thorough a look at it as we should, you know, we would recommend that another PDP picks this up within the remit of their work and give it a really good and hard look and try to figure out a way to do it. Because this PDP determined that it may be something - may be a useful opportunity to really try to figure out how to get it done. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you very much. I'm - perhaps I'm overoptimistic. I'm really hoping we may, to some extent, be able to do both of those simultaneously. Now all right. So ah yes, now we're going to have some fun. Number 37.

So here we've got the as many languages as possible issue that we all know about. However, as I was doing my proofreading and general slow reading of the first draft of the final report immediately before the meeting, I actually found something in a footnote, which I shall to read you. I thought it was rather practical.

So it was saying, it's footnote number seven in the first draft of the final report and it's saying, "Transformation on its own is used to mean" -- oh it's sort of a grammatical error here -- "it's used to refer to" -- how on Earth did I miss that? -- "to contact information, not fields in this report. A future system could provide field names in the six UN languages and the consistent central depository field names in additional languages for those registrars that require them for display for various markets."

So a consistent central depository of field names. Well that really is another way of saying this. I wonder, you know, I wonder whether that is actually better than saying "as many languages as possible." That's really what I'm trying to say to you.

And a few things going on in the chat room at this point, so we've got Amr saying, "Had we discovered this early enough, we could have requested that the chartering organization, the GNSO Council, add this within the scope of this PDP."

"Yes I agree that we should comment wherever possible but in relation to line 36 there is a misconception that this working group is supposed to determine who should bear the burden of transformation. That's not the case. The remit of this working group to identify who should decide who should bear the burden."

Yes it's a difference between what could have happened and what actually happened there. And Jim is then saying, "It's quite an interesting process discussion." Yes indeed. Okay, well I wonder - okay. Amr is saying, "Yes there is some confusion on this."

It is a - I think that thing, you know, who should decide who should bear, it is quite difficult to - it is a bit confusing and a bit difficult to process. I think is absolutely true. As regards to as many languages as possible, unless anybody says something to the contrary, I think it might be a good idea to try

and - to draft something using something closer to that footnote. Yes maybe move forward on that one.

All right. And again we don't get very far. We get as far as number 38, which is one of the (Dot Shabakar) comments. So yes, the - so the response to number 25 is that there will be a dedicated section in the final report and they're saying we recommend further community discussion to understand better how the PDP - oh yes, so how it all fits together, yes.

It really is. It's very, very similar to number 25. So basically what I'm saying is that Justine's recommendation should work for us, I think. Yes, yes they're incredibly close, if not - are they actually identical? That would be - yes it's actually identical. No wonder (unintelligible) okay. Perhaps it applies under both (unintelligible).

In cases like this, it's also actually easier just to leave a duplicate thing in and actually sort it out. Okay there could be a reason for it being there.

Now if it's all right for us to move on to number - to Line 39 this is the case where (Sarah Baci)'s comment is rather interesting because (Sarah) was saying no to this.

So I think in most respects her responses were very close to (Justine)'s and mine. But this was actually an area of difference and actually we are - yes Amr is asking where we are?

We're on comment 39. So a moment ago we were just remarking that comment 38 is actually the same as comment 25. And I was basically saying possibly best to leave sleeping dogs lie. But I have moved on to 39.

And this was a case where (Sarah)'s answer was different from mine and (Justine)'s. And I can see (Sarah) typing something in the chat room. So I'm really hoping that we get to the bottom of this one.

In a moment be heading off to Number 42 in a minute. So I'll just get that on the screen for you as well so that we're ready. Okay. Okay and (Sarah) is saying this goes to the as many languages as possible. So that is why it's no. Okay. Oh sorry yes, yes, yes okay.

I think it may be possible to make that more precise. So that means that I guess this is probably not as - again not all that major of thing if we are able to redraft it.

And (Justine) is saying I believe we are still grappling with as many languages as possible. Yes and, you know, I was just rather interested oh yes so this recommendation Amr is saying this recommendation is specific to field names not the data in them.

Oh yes. Yes absolutely. But you see what we want to say is that the field names should be available in as many languages as possible. However legally it is seriously bad to recommend something like that.

So I am hoping that something more explanatory having this consistent central depository of field names yes having this sort of central depository to which we could add new languages that might make - that might be a better approach.

There's a lot going on in the chat room over this one. And there - so Amr is saying this recommendation is specific to the field names and the data yes right (unintelligible) a minute ago. And then makes transformation much more straightforward.

Yes it's an important issue. And (Sarah) is saying yes once defined it would be (unintelligible) to agree? Yes and (Justine) is agreeing with that. Lars would you like to come in here?

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Chris. Just very briefly and just (Justine) on the right there I was just wondering whether something is the purpose that we can identify the language of appeal essentially. So we could also imagine that we recommend (unintelligible) the field should be (unintelligible)...

Chris Dillon: Lars you're breaking up.

Lars Hoffman: I'll type into the chat.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Sorry. I think that is the best approach because you were breaking up quite badly. Okay so we'll just wait a moment for that to come through. Oh yes (Rudy) in the meantime is saying difference to be made field names database field names and registration application.

Yes I'm not totally sure we'd be making that distinction as well as we should have been. Lars is saying just wondering whether we could recommend too number the fields. And then have a fixed order of field names and each number corresponding to one field the language would then not matter?

I like that very much. Yes and then Amr is saying that he thinks that the distinction (Rudy) made between the field names and the registration application in the database is an important distinction.

Okay. And (Justine) fears that numbering the fields could be complicated. Okay and (Jim) is saying that it's an implementation choice. (Rudy) is saying in general I think it's important to make clear field names who are not the ones in the application form online registrar services.

Yes. Yes that sounds right. And (Justine) and (Peter) are agreeing with (Jim) saying that it is a matter of how it's implemented. But yes I mean oddly enough, you know, something like, you know, in some ways an English field name could actually be used very similar to very similarly to a number.

So, you know, if you see this then actually what that means is if, you know, if you see name of country then what you really want is (unintelligible) or if you're a Japanese viewer anyway. Lars would you like to come in on this?

Lars Hoffman: Chris no sorry it's an old hand. I'm - my...

Chris Dillon: Oh that's all right.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Incidentally you're sounding a bit better than you were a moment ago. It's lucky isn't it? All right and then Amr is saying in principle I would leave the service provided by registrars in their own interfaces. Their own decisions may need to get into that. In any case this is also related to tagging or identifying the fields. It should be part of the scope of another PDP. Yes.

So back to now - okay so that I think we were dealing with T9 for that. And the idea is to go to 42. And over two pages unfortunately. And so this is very much about cost.

Okay. And basically this one was reworded as an opinion rather than a question and included emphasis on oh yes overall burden which could be cost or liability. I think that was additional thing in Number 42.

Again the first sentence of Number 42 could be bracketed out. It makes things easier. There's also an important thing here this sort of proportionality here. That's a very important, you know, that, you know, are these costs actually proportional to profits?

And then if we go down to 44 I'll just clarify what this working group response is. So the 42 we've, you know, we've just done so we know what that answer is about.

Number 40 is the point about burden including liability. All right now I think we get to go a little bit further down to about 48 I reckon. And so yes there was some confusion about whether this comment had got lost. And the good news is that it hasn't. It's on Page 13.

And in the first draft of the final report and so this is a text that runs - it would be near impossible to achieve high levels of accuracy in transforming a very large number of scripts and languages mostly of proper nouns. So yes so basically that is all right.

Okay unless there's something else about that we can go down quite some distance this time 55 I reckon. But I'll go slowly. Oh yes. So okay so there is a question here, you know, why are these responses not the same as the response to 54? So 54 we said this is outside the scope of this PDP.

The answer I would say in the case of - they're actually different answers to the two of them. So the answer in the case of 55 is that the working group's response is more precise.

So saying if transliteration standards are consistently implemented any such changes should be minimal.

So this is my way of reminding anybody who goes down this road that as long as you stick to rigid standards and you have high quality control then actually these things, you know, approved transliteration if it's done according to the manual, you know, in a particular case then actually, you know, admittedly these are very big if's but if that's so then actually the changes are minimum.

We could also say it's outside the scope. And we could do that as an additional comment there. But I can see Amr has got his hand up. Would you like to raise something on this one?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr. In question 55 if I'm not mistaken I believe it is - when it says approved transliteration I think what it is referring to is that this is a transliteration that was performed by someone other than the registrant.

So for example if the registrar performs the transliteration then approves it a registrant may want to go back and challenge this and say, you know, this is not how I transliterate my name.

So I think that changes the context slightly to what is being addressed in question 54 and why it may of required a different answer. I don't know if that helps at all.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Now we're going to need to pick up a few we're going to need to pick up a few threads in there because the - I mean one of the thing is that if we're talking about, you know, if we're talking about a personal name then - now I'm just trying to think how we're going to do this.

Yes. So if we're talking about a personal, you know, personal name then in practice in the real world transliteration the official transliterations are very often ignored.

So, you know, I'm just thinking of a - there's a fairly common Korean name called O. And, you know, the official Roman yes the official transliteration for O is O.

However if you actually watch what people do you will see them writing O-H and things like that. So this really comes back to what we has said on previous calls that really with people's names some of them do follow the official transliteration but many don't.

I mean names really are a rule unto themselves. And, you know, especially because I have a library background my line on names tends to be the only sure way to ask the person.

So yes but if we are using the word transliteration in quite a technical sense you see in a sense you could almost say that, you know, if you're going to translate the Korean name O as O-H or something like that, you know, that isn't a standard transliteration.

I mean you almost don't want to, you know, it's a representation of it but it's a sort of - it's such an idiosyncratic transliteration that I'm not totally sure it's right to use the word.

I mean I suppose it is very loosely. But by the time we get down to (advanced). And they can build Hoffman transliterations and everybody has a separate one it's just rather an odd use of the word and do you see what I mean?

Anyway Pascal would you like to say something about that? I fear we have problems with the audio. Oh and in fact you are saying you'll write it. So in that case whilst that's oh right that's okay that's great. Had problems with the sound which is what we thought.

Yes I should have remembered this. So we can - I mean certainly the (Eurostat) database today sounds extraordinarily useful. And you see I would suspect that individuals, you know, our famous Mr. O has probably gone into that database and said I spell my name O-H.

You see as long as it's done in a consistent way it's fine. So yes I think to some extent we can have it both ways. You know, if we could, you know, we could use what we could refer to as the name authority. So it's basically a system which says this is what the name is.

So in the case of Mr. O you write it with H just like that in the same with company names. Okay and I think that would be a really nice link to follow up. I think I shall click it now so that I can have a look at it.

Pascal Haddad: Hello.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Pascal Haddad: Hello can you hear me?

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes we can.

Pascal Haddad: Hello. Yes this is Pascoe. Hello everybody. Yes well I strongly believe that the experience done over the years with (Eurostat) can help us a lot.

And I think it has like some sample data. I can work on a draft like do a sample transliteration over the languages we have to see the result we can advance across all the databases we have. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes I mean I think the idea of getting around these problems by using name authorities is a very good one and, you know, personally I certainly support it.

Okay (Justine) is saying I'm not objecting to us providing learned comment. I was inquiring about our approach to closely related comments that we - then we should be consistently giving a proper response and not just saying outside of scope to one comment but not to another.

Yes. Yes so okay. I think certainly, you know, generally the more precise one can make a response the better really.

So perhaps we need to revisit Number 54 in that case. If the registries - oh yes is the registrant's consent required before a transliteration is published in the Whois? And can they withhold consent?

I mean it's quite a complicated answer if we - and if we really go into it because I think different things are actually applying particularly for personal names and company names.

Not for addresses. That's easy. The address it's just a matter of following these number transliterations. There's no doubt about that. But that would be the sort of more complicated answer to that one.

You know, those, you know, I think 54, 55 and 56 are, you know, are very detailed. And, you know, they put - they I think they are outside our scope. But this is what, you know, we're going back to what (Jim) was talking about earlier. It's beyond our scope. But we may be able to say some useful things. Sorry Amr I've kept you waiting.

Amr Elsadr: Not at all Chris. Thank you. This is Amr. I just wanted to say in response to Pascal -- and I probably should have done this on list -- is that I have some concerns about basing the response of this PDP on the availability of a standard like that of (Eurostat).

I'm not terribly familiar with the standard but that's not the issue really. The issue for me would be that if we base our response on whether mandatory transformation is desirable or not on the availability of a standard then in effect we may be defining a policy that says that registrants have to transform their names according to a standard and not according to how they personally choose to transform the names.

We are talking about proper nouns here as Michele has pointed out. And so for example if I transform my name from Arabic to English or any other language in a certain way but the standard tells me that I need to do it this way and this standard is the one that is used in accordance with ICANN policies then that may create a liability for me as a registrant if I am not aware of the standard or if I choose to transform my name differently.

So the mere availability of a standard should not in my humble opinion have an impact on the determination of whether a mandatory transformation is desirable or not. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. In some ways that file it's a standard in one sense but actually within it the transliteration may have been done in many, many different ways.

And it's really just an alternative way of going, you know, rather than, you know, saying well, you know, with a personal name individual has to, you know, just tell us what, you know, what form they want and then use that consistently.

And it would be no bad thing if that for - went into some sort of central database. But it's just the sheer convenience of having a large resource which had and you see this is what I don't know the answer.

I mean if the resource has been in contact with individuals and companies, and they have it is actually registered the forms that those individuals and companies want to use, and it sounds very, very useful and it could be a shortcut.

However if there is, you know, if there's a split between, you know, if they - I mean for example if the database has just done all of the transliterations for a particular language according to a standard which actually annoys people because, you know, in our famous case of Mr. O, you know, probably he would come out as O.

But that's not really what he wants his name to be. So there's an issue there. Okay a few things going on in the chat room. So I shall just I'll just come back to it. Well (Rudy) usefully very usefully at this point is saying it seems to me that I would not allow someone to translate my name without my consent.

Wow yes so, you know, we don't want to be using a database which has done that sort of thing. That's, you know, it's actually that's a poor database rather than a name authority file. Also saying he agrees with Amr. And Pascal is saying he thinks this should be a recommended transliteration which can be edited.

Well so, you know, ways to go there would be either use the form in a particular name authority or follow the rules for the recommended transliteration for that language. So it might be (Pen Ying) in the case of Chinese which can be edited yes.

Yes you see if you're going to make the decision you're going to follow the external database then you may not be able to edit it.

And likewise if you're following the rules for a particular language there's actually very little leeway because, you know, a good transliteration will say, you know, this is how you do it.

Incidentally there are less good transliterations where, you know, I have transliterated myself large volumes of languages where the transliteration has been vague.

And that has been extremely difficult because it hasn't been clear whether a particular thing is a word, or should there be a hyphen there or should there be a space in there. And you go mad doing that. Believe me I've done it a lot.

Amr is saying want to use indicates willingness not a mandatory policy. Oh I lost the reference there. Yes so I think because this is actually outside our parameters I think, you know, all we're doing here is trying to be helpful. Sorry Pascal I didn't notice your hand. Would you like to say something? I'm afraid we have audio problems. Worse I have completely lost...

Pascal Haddad: Yes hello.

Chris Dillon: ...completely lost track of the time. Pascal I can hear you. But I am terribly sorry. I have lost track of the time. I have to finish the call absolutely now and go to my meeting. I am very sorry about this. I should have watched the clock.

Anyway obviously we will pick up the call here next week. And I also apologize for not doing any of the business. But I think I really cannot keep these people waiting. So please accept my apologies. And we will pick this up at Number 54 next week. Thank you very much. Very interesting call anyway. And again apologies for cutting it short. Goodbye then.

Man: Thanks everybody. Thanks Chris.

Man: Goodbye.

Woman: Thank you very much (Ally). You may now stop the recordings. Have a good day.

END