

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 30 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 30 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-30apr15-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG
Jim Galvin - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Peter Green – NCUC
Wen Zhai - RySG
Wanawit Ahkuputra - GAC
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Pascal Haddad – Individual
Ubolthip Sethakaset - Individual

Apologies:

Justine Chew – Individual
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, (Chuck). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contacts PDP Working Group Call on the 30th of April 2015. On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Peter Green, Sara Bockey, Wanawit Ahkuputra, Wen Zhai, Petter Rindforth, and Ubolthip Sethakaset. I show apologies from Justine Chew.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund will be in the Adobe Connect site but she is unable to join us on the audio, Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri Agnew.

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

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, indeed. Now I've had an e-mail correspondence with (Rudi), who currently is in Turkey, so I have a feeling that that may be that effectively that's an apology. But anyway we'll find out later whether it is or it isn't.

And just a brief note before we head into the agenda just generally about what we are up to. And if you look at the agenda you can see really only one major thing on it and that is looking at this version of the review tool. It should be - it is version 8.5. I kicked the first draft of the final report off the agenda because I thought it was better to try and finish going through all the comments and then start with the - what will in fact be the second version of the final report on the 7th of May. So that is the reasoning behind that.

And I note in the chat room that Petter is mentioning that he can't read the colored responses. Neither can I. So the good thing about the colored responses is that we can see that something is there, that we need to go back to it. The bad thing is that actually nobody can read them at all, so all we know is that we have to return. Sorry about that. I'll use another highlight from this point on.

Now the other thing is, and I actually made this decision before I realized that was entirely legible, I actually wanted to start at number 27 anyway, so that's actually the point after which we stopped work last week and then basically try and get to the end of the document. If we do make it the end of the document, then we can come back and revisit perhaps some of the more difficult things we were talking about last week.

So if it is all right by everybody, I would like to pick up at number 27. So I'll do that. As I say, if we are - if we do have time at the end, we can certainly come back. Then we face the problem of actually decoding what those key bits are. Right.

And so anyway without further ado, if we look at number 27, which should be at the top of your screen, so and this is actually something that comes up for several responses, so it may be that if we can sort it out now, that that will actually save us time elsewhere. And so basically Amr is saying in his comment: "Agree with the key systems comment. A requirement of tagging data fields is out of scope of this PDP and should be referred to another one."

And I think probably what I want to suggest here is quite similar to all the things we were saying last week is that we'll actually do this both ways, and we - often with these things we will say that the thing is officially out of - well it is out of scope, but we may mention something about the desirability of doing it.

And I think whilst that was going on that another version of the - oh yes, Lars is actually typing in the chat room that the highlighting problem may now be fixed, which is most fortunate, because that really could have been awkward. I'm waiting for a couple of things to happen in the chat room.

But anyway, so what I'm intending to do with 27 and a couple of similar responses is actually, as I was saying to do it both ways and to say it's out of scope but perhaps make some sort of comment. And Amr is saying, "We

should collect the ideas we have on possible improvements that are out of scope and include them in one or more recommendations for another PDP." So that's a very good point. So it's basically make a list of anything out of scope.

Now if there's nothing more on 27 I'd like to pop straight down to 28. So there is some overlap here and this is the whole business about marking or tagging. And in fact I think a little bit further down that one of the other comments actually comes back the sort of rationale that we might have behind marking. I'm just wondering, it might be better to pick that up then.

And Amr is saying that he's not seeing the working group member responses in the document being shared. Oh yes, there is a - I don't know, that is really weird. The - so it may be that you're missing some of column four. Oh yes, yes, because in this version a lot of the comments that were in column four have been integrated into column 3. So I suspect that may be why some of them have gone.

And I think when that's happened, usually you've got things in the editing view saying, you know, we've done - basically we've moved it. I removed any sort - I hope I removed any formatting track changes because life is too short to be dealing with those. There are just so many.

Okay and so I think what comes out of 28 anyway, coming back to it, is whether we think that recommending marking is going too far. You know, this is very - is out of scope, but really if anybody were to do it or even conceivably we may even want to say whether or not there will ever be transformation, just to make a good database, it is necessary to know what language the data is in. So it's that - that's really the sort of - an issue.

So certainly my own feeling is that, you know, we should continue with the approach that we have been suggesting and say it is out of scope but put some form of wording which indicates that marking of - that marking is desirable,

and also perhaps rather more content about how me might want to mark. So that is really what I would tentatively like to suggest for 28. I think this is something that comes up further down. There may in fact be some rather better comments further down.

Okay in that case if there's nothing else on 28, there are similar things for 32, but I think we can probably leave those and go onto perhaps 33. I must now remember that you can't read the document I've got in paper form. I'll actually move it to the current place. Okay. And so and here we've got basically - oh yes there was a - in Amr's version there is disagree with the working group response.

And the working group response is that there should be two sets of fields for any transformation. So - well yes, and also as regards to CC number 13. So I think again, you know, there is this question, although in this particular case it would be, you know, it doesn't - these things don't have any effect on whether there is mandatory transformation or not, whoever does the recommendation. But the idea of in some ways suggesting two sets of fields makes it easier for any party who may at some point want to transform data. So that's really the issue here.

So yes it's out of scope, but it's quite similar to the other one but just the idea if anybody ever does it, two sets of fields would be necessary. The only other possibility would be to say something like if you ever have to transform then somehow you have to link the Whois replacement to some other system.

By the time you recommend something like that, things are starting to get very complicated, and that's why I feel it is better to put some sort of recommendation about two sets of fields. And that is - Amr got a bit lost. We're in 33. You know, the issue here is two sets of fields.

Okay, any - I wonder any other comments on 33? If not I'm intending to pop down to 37. I'll go quite slowly just in case people stop things, because this is

a part of the document. That much time with. And again Amr is typing, "Disagrees with the working group response. All responses of the working group pertaining to additional fields and associated tags should be addressed as possible solutions that require further consideration of the scoping phase of the post CWG PDP."

And so we could - I think it might be possible to put that's it out scope, more or less replace these two responses in fact. And just before I - I can see Petter's got his hand up, but just before I ask him to pick things up, I'll just mention that the key issue here is that data should be identifiable by non-experts and, you know, exactly how that would be done would be a responsibility of the post-CWG PDP.

Petter, would you like to bring something up here?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here. Sorry, I missed it. Back to point 36. Just noted that there seems to be a small error at the end of - the meeting started with in other words the responsibility for deciding who should bear the burden of transformation is beyond and then comes (unintelligible) with this.

Chris Dillon: Oh yes.

Petter Rindforth: So I presume that in fact we have two versions of the last words here. The burden on transformation does not lie with this working group or the burden of transformation is beyond this working group. Maybe I mixed the - do you see what I mean?

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes it looks as if two possible versions have both ended up in there. The responsibility for deciding who should bear the burden of transformation is beyond this working group. I think that's probably the easiest way of fixing it a little bit.

Petter Rindforth: I'm fine with just one of them. Just wanted to note...

Chris Dillon: We really don't...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Thanks for that. Okay. Now as regards to 37 are we wanting to pick up anything there or shall we just continue to our next stop? Okay. Well now there are several ways we could do this, but I think - yes let's try going to 42, but I think we'll need to come back a little bit to sort this out. We'll pop it and put it something like that. And so Amr had a response which was saying basically agreeing that the validity of the question in the response, that's column three, but would respond similarly to questions 40 and 41.

And so the working group response for number 42 is would these costs be proportional to operational profits, and he's basically - Amr is suggesting that we use a similar approach with 40 and 41. And then there's also another sentence. This PDP should determine who decides who should carry that burden that decides to place its own contracted parties collecting and maintaining the information or any other stakeholder.

I think that there might be grammatical trouble here as well. To me it makes more sense to say something like this PDP should determine who decides who should carry the burden but not decide to place it contracted parties collecting and maintaining the information or any other stakeholder.

And I just noticed that Amr's hand had turned into an okay sign. So that - yes, that - I think we just found another - we seem to have a plague of grammatical errors this week, for which, apologies. All right. So I think we may be ready to move on from this to 40, 41, 42.

Right. And then there is a comment on - now sorry I'm missing my - there are papers in a mess here. Number 46, so we've got a comment, "Copying and pasting of would require machine readable text." But technically it is out of

scope of this PDP but I feel very strongly that we should say something about copying and pasting because the thought that something else, images or data or something like that, could be used, is really quite frightening and that really is a seriously bad idea.

Lars, would you like to raise something?

Lars Hoffman: Yes just a quick note on the question of scope. I think - I looked a little bit at precedent about the PDP and had a quick chat with other staff as well. I think this can be considered a wider scope of the working group to recommend this and similarly the tagging issue that was mentioned before. Just because we've asked whether it should be translated or transliterated and the group may say yes or no, and then say based on that outcome, here's some recommendations that would guide if you want implementation, right?

So if you would say it should not be mandatory but we do think that people who are interested or needing to translate or transliterate data it should be as easy as possible for them. And therefore we recommend that machine readability and some form of easy recognizing descriptor language through tagging or other means is something that the group strongly suggests.

I don't think that would pose a problem in terms of scope, considering how the charter's written and how this has been done in other working groups. I just wanted to add that for the record. Thanks, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. I think that's - I think that it is a very important point and one that, you know, one with which I personally am happy but I can see Amr's typing. It seems out of scope. Yes. I think part of the issue is that the charter is very narrow.

We've spent a lot - we have spent a lot of time on this, and I feel it may be possible to get suggestions in. I mean an awful lot of this could be language, and so this is a challenge for drafting so that we can do it in such a way that

it's helpful but not in a way that we are really straying majorly from what we should be doing. Perhaps that the situation.

All right. Amr - I'm sorry Lars is saying, "It's of course up to the group to decide. It's just I and other staff would see it." Okay. And Amr is saying, "Recommending a policy of machine readability involves technical structure of the database and display capabilities of Whois search services." Right.

So I - yes I mean, it's starting to get really quite technical there. I suspect I some ways that actually being able to put images of data into a database may be more difficult than putting plain text, but, you know, I'm not totally sure so I probably shouldn't talk about this too much.

I'm just waiting for one or two things to happen in the chat room. We're heading towards number 50 now incidentally. This is (Jim) saying, "Machine readability is about the structure of the data in transit and using XML." Yes. And Amr is saying he's not saying it's a bad idea, just that it warrants more discussion before being a PDP working group recommendation.

So yes, but then I think it's possible to - for us to put things in our report which are actually not in the recommendation section. There's that side of it as well. Amr, would you like to say something?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks, Chris. This is Amr. Yes the problem with - I mean the way I see it, the problem with trying to wriggle out of the very extremely narrow scope of this PDP at this point is that it was clear from the beginning that if the scope was broader, we might have had more interested parties who might have wanted to be involved and become part of the conversation that we're having.

Right now the fact that we have more questions that answers on all these fantastic ideas that we're coming up with, is a clear indication that it does warrant more discussion. But I disagree with your last statement, Chris, that

we don't actually have to these within the recommendations. They could be within sort of the body of the report.

I think the ideas a lot of them are really good ideas, and we should, as a PDP working group, mandate other efforts to look into those, and that's why I think we should really make a list of all these great ideas on things that will make transformation possibly easier to both do and display.

We should really collect those and include them in either one or more recommendations from this PDP working group to say okay we recommend that the GNSO Council charters another PDP with this and the issues reports of that PDP. So that it becomes clear from the beginning of a new process that these are issues that came up during this PDP and have gone unanswered and would be beneficial to the registry directory services in the future. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Amr. Yes I - yes I've been slightly slow to pick up onto the idea of collecting things and perhaps having a recommendation which would - yes now I understand yes you've been suggesting that. And yes it would seem to be a good way of making progress. So yes I really have no objection to that. Now - and in fact I'm grateful for the ideas.

Now there are other things going on in the chat room so let me just pick those up. We've got (Jim) saying, "Display can them do want they want and third party applications can do what they want" which is the point of the (unintelligible) work, the replacement for Whois, yes. Third party app include transformation. And then Amr is coming back saying, "They need to be within the recommendations, just mandated to another PDP."

Okay yes. So, you know, what we can't do is recommend them directly but what we can do is recommend that another PDP picks them up. Yes okay. I've been really slow to (unintelligible) but anyway I think, you know, it sounds like a very good way of dealing with this slightly difficult situation.

And Petter now is just agreeing with Amr over that. (Jim) is saying, "Yes push forward to another PDP. The point is not to let the issues get lost or forgotten." Exactly yes. We spent such a long time speaking about these things, it would be a real shame if these things got lost. And the question is just how - effectively how to protect our work, I would say.

All right. Let us continue and I reckon that 50 may be the next stop but if somebody feels strongly we should stop before, that may also be possible. And so will there be rules or standards governing translation of non-ASCII characters. And so Amr was saying he agreed with the first paragraph of the response but not with the second, which was actually - which is actually recommending a particular system.

So you might read that comment because it's not in this version. Agree with first comment, disagree with the second. But issue of liability as part of the burden as opposed to any of the cost is meaningful to me in the context. Any standard that is mandated by a policy may create liability on the registrant who unknowingly does not adhere to it.

Furthermore in many cases it may be appropriate to disregard the standard particularly when transformation of proper nouns is the issue. So yes we've really got to make a decision whether we keep this second paragraph or we kick it out. So I think it might be possible to redraft this so that we say something like these tools may be useful but we don't, you know, we're not - we're certainly insisting. And again we need to make the point that anything done here actually doesn't affect the decision to transform mandatorily or not.

So that's worth raising. Okay. Now returning to the chat room, we've got (Pascal) agreeing with (Jim)'s comment about pushing towards another PDP and we've got Petter saying in fact very helpful for all new working groups to have some kind of summary and recommendations from previous working groups, even if those are not formal.

Yes thank you. Yes exactly. Yes. That's another reason for doing it. Okay and Amr is saying, "Yes the historical context is always helpful as is the guide to drafting to this issue report and working group charters as well."

All right. If there's nothing else about 50 then we get to move on and I think the next stop is 55. And actually I seem to recall we've already spent quite a lot of time here so I think - and the agreement was something like these are outside - so we want to try and have it both ways and say, you know, these things are outside the scope but, you know, we want to make a comment and these are possible candidates for future work.

And specifically in number 56 again there's a slight problem with versioning here because I think I remembered that there was a suggestion that primary be replaced by authoritative, and I actually picked that up but without okaying it with the group, which is not normally what I do. But let's just check that we are happy with the word authoritative there rather than primary.

Personally I have no objection to either of them. I'm not exactly sure why one may be better than the other but because I have no personal preference, you know, if somebody does then I tend to just go with that. All right. That's actually a comment about 56 rather than 55 in fact.

Now also on 55 there's also the issue that in the foreseeable future there won't be an approved transliteration because, you know, that would really indicate the existence of technology, which we really don't have yet, you know, for certainly for some languages. Amr, would you like to pick up something around here?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. Yes just my reasons for suggesting authoritative instead of primary is only because authoritative have been used in other policy discussions and in other PDP working group recommendations as a term to sort of indicate what sort of data sets is sort of - well the primary or

authoritative set. The thick Whois PDP is one that comes to mind. And we're sort of trying to determine whether Whois data obtained from registrars or registries is the authoritative set of data.

And so I just thought - my suggestion to use it is here is to have consistent words or descriptions for what is - what were meant across different PDPs. I think that may be helpful. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you very much. That is - that's certainly a very solid reason. If a word has been used in a similar sense elsewhere, then that really is a reason to prefer it, yes.

Okay. Now if there's nothing else in these 50s which we did spend some amount of time on last week I seem to remember, then we get to go as far as about 62 if I am right. I've got a flight of bad actors. Oh, before we - I'll just pop back briefly to 55 because I think (Patina) has found a problem in the text. Thank you.

And she's asking if the question means change of address, not just corrective typo. Oh, let's have a look. No, I'm afraid I'm slightly lost with this one. Can anybody see what's gone wrong? I'm afraid I'm struggling. (Patina) on this is saying she's not sure of the intention of the question. So this is 55. What is the registrant? What was the change in the approved transliteration?

So is the change an approved means? So there are an awful lot of these questions, and change the transliteration because it doesn't transform correctly. So I think a lot of this really means it really depends on how any transformation would be done. If transformation is done using really strict guidelines, then the if you are relatively small. If the transformation is done in a very liberal way by lots of different people in lots of different ways, then you're just really magnifying any differences.

Ah yes, so change the name of the street because he moved the house. The way I understood this was no, we're not talking about a situation where the building - where's somebody's actually changed address. This is just different ways of representing the same data. For me that's what this is referring to. Yes, all right. Okay.

So let us pop further down to 62 - that's up. So the response is this is the current situation. Theoretically it could change. So by current situation, what was really intended here was that there are few bad actors, and there are actually some statistics about the number of bad actors there are at present. That could change, but there are some statistics which we could put in the report about this.

So I hope that's enough to clarify this thing because, you know, I use the shorthand of the current situation, and it is actually referring to a situation where the statistics are saying that currently there are few bad actors. That's really the nature of that one.

If that is - if people are happy with that, we get to go a few further down, just to 64. So you can leave 62 still on the screen for a moment. And here we've got - Amr was saying, you know, Bangkok is not the only exception. You've got Cairo as actually another. We can't be sure how many there are.

Yes, so yes. Beyond Bangkok, Cairo, I think there are going to be a lot of these things. These are really just symbols. They're examples of a phenomenon. Actually even beyond Bangkok and Cairo, you know, there are also situations like - and for me this is actually more serious - that you've got addresses where, you know, like in Chinese for example, you would have a street name which would end in (jie) meaning street.

Now if you just transliterate, you're going to get J-I-E, which is not very helpful for non-Chinese speakers because they don't know that that means street. So this is quite a common phenomenon. So in the various languages you

typically get these words for street and road. And it may - to get the kind of nice transformation, you know, there was Japanese example of a nice transformation - a really nice transformation of data which we were discussing a few weeks ago.

To get that kind of quality record, you may be transliterating some parts and translating others, where it's transforming but it's actually using both techniques within the same data. And so this is a street and road thing, but it's also quite a big issue. Okay. There are things going on, but in the interest of making progress, let us go a little further down to 67, and we can easily come back if necessary.

So here there is this suggestion that verified should be used rather than validated here. Now I'm wondering whether this actually makes sense in this version of the document. So here we've got - yes. So I think basically what we're asking is whether people are happy to reply - to replace validated with verified here.

Now whilst you're considering the - Amr is going to mention something. And I can see there's also stuff in the Chat Room. But Amr, would you like to pick this up?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thanks Chris. This is Amr. In the registrar accreditation agreement, validation and verification have two different meanings. And I think what we're looking for here is verification, not validation.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Verification is sort of us assuring that data is correct, and by using this contact data a registrant is indeed contactable. Validation is more about making sure this contact data actually exists out there in the real world somewhere. So they have two different meanings.

For example validation would be to validate that this city exists within this country, and this street exists within this city, and this street number exists within this street. That's kind of what validation is as far as I understand it. So I just thought that what we're looking for here is more a verification rather than validation. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. These are especially difficult definitions, and I'm grateful for that. Now we need to go back in fact to 64 just briefly because there a few things in the Chat Room. So first of all we've got Amr picking up the Cairo example (unintelligible). And goodness, on this it says conqueror. That's very funny. I think that beats the translation.

Amr Elsadr: In the female form Chris, not just the conqueror, but specifically in the female - a female omnipotent conqueror.

Chris Dillon: Oh yes, that is definitely a substantially more amusing slit than the accidental translation of Beijing is northern capital. I mean that's just confusing, but omnipotent female conqueror, oh my goodness. Right. So then (Patina) picks up, you know, the fact that because if a quality transformation were to take place, you probably are talking about transformation which is actually a mixture - mostly it's going to be transliteration.

But, you know, things like Cairo and Bangkok and street names may be translated. And personal names I would say - well I suppose it's closer to translation than anything else. But as we've discussed before, personal names tend to depend on people.

So, you know, as I've said on several previous occasions, I am Chris Dillon. But, you know, the only way that you can know that is really by asking me because theoretically I could be (Christopher Dillon) or (Chris J. Dillon) or half a dozen other possibilities. The only one way of finding out is quite close to translation there actually.

All right. Let us continue, and we'd more or less done 67. And let's see how far we get this time. Right. I think perhaps 70s are our next stop. And so there was quite a - there was - Amr suggested quite a lot of text here, so it runs - I would also point out that the lack of mandatory transformation does not disable as opposed to enable (contactability). It only tasks the Whois look up user with the burden of transformation.

Yes, but I don't know whether we have strong feelings about that answer. I think I'm thoroughly happy to have it. Oh, Amr, would you like to pick up something there?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr. Yes, I just thought to point that out because the IPC comment here made it a point on several of the bullets and the comment that transformation is sort of an enabling tool. So I just wanted to point out that the lack of transformation isn't necessarily disabling. It just shifts the transaction cost onto another actor, that's all. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you. Okay. So if we let that go, I think we get as far as 72 - so not all outside of that. And again it's a similar situation where Amr suggested noteworthy to mention that increasing costs on contracted parties is also an issue, not only registrants and end users. This will likely also be reflected on the cost burdens on registrants and create other problems on startup registrars and developing nations mentioned elsewhere in the initial report.

I'm certainly very happy to add that. But I don't know if anybody has any feelings about that. Okay. We are very near the end now I think. We might even get time to look at some of those pink bits if we can read them. Then next stop is I think 76. Oh yes, in fact these are really brief stops because there will be a dedicated part of the - well there is already in fact a dedicated part to the final report that will deal with other - oh, no, sorry. I got totally confused.

So this is picking up whether we know about these previous rulings on ASCII. And the answer is yes, we do know about them. I actually thought that we had picked them up in the report. But what we can do is make sure that these are, you know, possibly we change the wording slightly.

But yes, I mean certainly we are aware, you know, both of these IPC comments. We are aware of the existing ASCII rules. But we need to make sure that we indicate possibly more clearly that we were aware of them. Perhaps that is the issue.

Okay. And then we have what may be the - no, Amr is just picking up a few things about this, so let's just go there first. This comment was raised by the IPC as far back as the webinar, but withheld on the initial report. But we haven't addressed it yet. So this is the ASCII issue. Yes.

Perhaps if we spend longer, another option based on (unintelligible) to require the script use of registration data to either be that of the TLD or else US ASCII. This approach would reduce though not eliminate the need for translation or transliteration, as all pertinent data would already be in US ASCII except that of IDNC TLDs.

I think it - I actually think this might be an example of - it's a comment that we are aware of. But it's, you know, how -no obvious way of doing this without mandatory transformation I think. IPC points out that the initial report makes no reference to the fact that current ICANN stands for registries and registrars, and is encouraged to use only US ASCII code in character repertoire for Whois 43 app.

Okay, that's what I was saying before, so that we cancel any pickup. And Amr is writing I think we need to do some homework on this one. Okay. I can certainly put some highlights on Number 76. It won't be pink - some sort of highlighting. And that leads me to what as far as I know may be the last thing I want to pick up. And that is Number 78. And again this is - it's actually

similar to one that we had a moment ago using the word verification rather than validation. So I think unless somebody has an opposing opinion, I think we should just do that and just change validation to verification again.

All right. So the question now is whether there are any other comments in the document that we would like to pick up now. I'll just ask you that question. Are there any nagging doubts about any of the comments? If there aren't, what we can do is go back and readdress some of the ones which we flagged up last week.

(Unintelligible) is that we have - oh, yes. Actually thinking, I don't know whether (Alas) is still on the call. But it might be easier to load the other version because actually the pink, although we couldn't read what it was saying - oh sorry, yes. Yes we can. It's become green. That's what's happened. Right.

So we need - we can just look at - so Number 1 is this business with accession. Though no, at last let's leave this version. I just hadn't realized that you'd the pink into green. So no, this is great. So it's whether we have an improvement for accession in Number 1 - the burden of accession and understanding contact information. And apologies from Amr.

So if we could - if that could be one that went to the list, that would be really good. And that means I think we get to go to a little bit further down which is Number 4. And here we've got the IPC opposes this recommendation and strongly supports mandatory translation and/or transliteration of contact information and/or generic top level domains. Having registration data in an unlimited number of scripts is troublesome.

Okay. Whether there's anything we want to pick up that about, oh yes. Okay, so there was some talk about need rather than desirability. I think we - there was some possibility that we were going to pick this up on the list. We're on

Number 4 now, so we're awaiting discussion on the desirability. It's words like need and desirability in Number 4.

I sense there hasn't been much movement on this. So if there hasn't, that means we get to look at the next - this is highlighting. These are areas we know that we are stuck on to some extent. There's not much more highlighting in this document.

Amr is saying technically it isn't unlimited. It is limited by the number of scripts languages that exist. Okay. The number of languages is pretty close to unlimited, isn't it? There we go. And I'm just now looking for anything else that we highlighted. It's even conceivable that I don't think that's the end of the highlighting. But I'll just double check. Oh actually, yes.

So actually the other thing is Number 24 which at last point we brought up last week. So this is a combination between making transformation mandatory and changing the term of service. So in term of service would cover both burden with costs - would cover both cost and liability. So I think the, you know, there was certainly an idea that we should have a bit more of I think about Number 24.

That really is the last thing of which we - at least I personally am aware. And I try to be very thorough on these occasions as you know. Well, all right. Rather than prolonging the agony, we're very near the end. We're really very near the end of the meeting now anyway.

So Amr, would you like to say something briefly before we finish?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr - just a comment on the business consistencies comment in Number 24. The way I read this is - well it's a combination of the business consistencies position that is contrary to what the working group has so far determined was a majority recommendation. So they are recommending mandatory transformation to ASCII.

And the second portion of their comment here suggesting that the language of their registrar - that the language be determined in the registrar's term of service would suggest that a decision has already been made on who determines who should bear the burden of transformation. So this is kind of also beyond the scope of this PDP because we're not supposed to make that determination here. We're only supposed to suggest who we think should make that decision, not who should actually do it.

But here they seem to be suggesting that the register is responsible for - that that's where the transformation should occur.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you for that. Yes, that makes it quite a bit clearer. So actually the - perhaps what would be best here is just to explain that actually making the decision really is outside our scope. That is something that we don't, you know, just the way it's worded. You know we cannot do that. So perhaps that could solve that one.

All right. That means that as far as we know - as far as I'm aware, we have covered every comment. What I would like to do would be to have a discussion about some of the ones which have caused more trouble - so perhaps 1 and 4 and a few others that came up this week.

I will add the changes as I understood them from today's meeting. I'll probably do that sometime tomorrow. And then you should have another version of the document. And you are very welcome to pick up either the ones which have caused a few issues today or other numbers. And that then means that next week, you know, we can discuss comments on the list.

But by next week, or specifically actually by the end of Tuesday of next week, the idea would be to have a second version of the final - a second draft version of the final report. And so if we can manage to get that out to the group by the end of Tuesday, by which I mean UTF 24, then that means we

can really have a good discussion of the second draft of the final report on Friday the - sorry - Thursday the 7th which is a discussion I shall lead.

Rudy has agreed to lead the discussion on the 14th. And I think that there is quite a benefit there before there's possibly been too much input from me in recent meetings. And so we can really welcome a slightly different approach from Rudy on the 14th.

And - oh yes, Amr, just before I finish, Amr is mentioning a first version of the final report. Yes, if you go back into the minutes of last week you'll find that version. It's attached to the Wiki page. I was optimistic. I thought that we would not take so long going through the comments. So I posted that some time ago. But there may be a case just to wait until the end of Tuesday and running with Version 2 because I think there will be quite a few edits to Version 1.

Amr, would you like to pick something up?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thank Chris. This is Amr. I was going to actually ask if it would be possible to have Version 2 of the final report be - sort of have redline changes to the initial report. That way we can easily track where changes have been made.

Chris Dillon: I think that that is what happened. So I'm - certainly the first version of the final report was based on the initial report. And I think track changes were used. But yes, I take your point. Yes, that would be a handy suggestion.

All right. Well thank you very much everybody. I just didn't know whether we'd be able to get through all of this work today. I am extremely pleased that we've been able to do it. We do have a little bit of homework for the mailing list. But apart from that, I'm really looking forward to discussing the report next Thursday.

So again, many thanks for today. Goodbye then.

Terri Agnew: Chuck, if you can please stop recording. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. And have a wonderful rest of your day.

END