

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP WG Meeting Transcription Tuesday 2 June 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 Tuesday 2 June 2015 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 on page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jun>

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

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan) – NCUC
Justine Chew – Individual
Jim Galvin - RySG

Apologies:

Petter Rindforth – IPC
Wen Zhai -

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
June 3, 2015
8:00 am CT

Nathalie Peregrine 6/3/2015 8:40 AM
Deleted: ICANN -

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Jane). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody and welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group call on the 2nd of June, 2015.

On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Jim Galvin, Rudi Vansnick, Sara Bockey, Justin Chew and (unintelligible). We have received an apology from Wen Tsai. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all too 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 indeed. And that means we can move into Agenda Point 3, Statements of Interest. And this is something we need to ask each time just in case somebody's Statement of Interest has changed since the last time we met quite recently on Thursday in fact last week. And hearing nothing and seeing nothing I'd just like thank everybody who has turned for this special meeting, it is very much appreciated to be able to do this at this stage.

And it is a simple agenda. We literally only have the final report on it. And today in fact there's very little else to talk about. But what we will really focus on is the recommendations that we covered most of the other things in fact last week. And I think the correct order is to do the more important things first and, you know, and then brush up any bits and pieces.

And so what I have done is I've scrolled us down in version 4 as far as Page 17, the whole way down. And I'm intending to go through the recommendations slowly - very, very carefully. And as we do it we are really looking for three categories of things.

And not necessarily in this order but, you know, the way my mind works I was tending to be looking for deletions so if there's anything here that doesn't need to be can it go. I mean, I don't mean necessarily a whole recommendation but, you know, additional words which aren't necessary or we'd like to get rid of those.

On the other hand, and, you know, those tend to be quite easy to spot. The things that are less easy to do are the omissions. So is there something we've been talking about and we really want to make a recommendation and we haven't.

The situation there is that there is actually a short list of suggestions which follows the recommendations. And, you know, that is something that we picked up last week and I had a first go at drafting that. But as they're status is less than the recommendations I think we should stick with our order.

And last but not least, or, you know, we may decide that we want to promote a suggestion into a recommendation conceivably, but let's, you know, let's just see how about that.

Last but not least we're talking about order because obviously with this like this I think people tend to presume that important recommendations come earlier than less important recommendations. So if, you know, if the order is majorly different from that then we may consider changing it. So it's those sorts of things that we'll be looking for. But as usual, feel free to stop me at any time.

And I am so glad we took the decision to run this meeting because I see Peter Green has just joined us as well. You are most welcome, Peter.

Okay so anyway I'm just at exactly the right time because I was literally a second about to start with the recommendations or introductions having been completed.

All right so as usual let us do the sort of thing that we have done a lot of during our calls over the last year and a bit. So Preliminary Recommendation 1, "The working group could recommend that it is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory. Any parties requiring

transformation are free to do it ad hoc outside the Whois replacement system as outlined above, consistency would be an issue."

Okay so any comments about that? Well, I have a lot of comments about that. And so I'll try and work through them as systematically as possible. So we don't get very far into it before I have a comment in fact. The working group could recommend that it is not desirable so straight away we've got this formulation of words.

You know, I'm presuming that we are happy to run with "could recommend that." This is especially a question for people who know more about policy - ICANN policymaking than I do so, you know, I just - I have an instinct that the wording here is quite important and so I am not expressing my concerns.

I mean, actually, you know, from a non-specialist like me then actually I'm relatively happy with it but it's just instinctively I feel it's a good thing to raise. Jim, would you like to pick that up?

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin for the transcript. Just so I understand, Chris, I guess I had interpreted the use of - phrase "could recommend that" to simply be you were putting it here for the purposes of our discussion. Are you suggesting that that this wording that's here now would be the final wording that appears in the final published document?

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Well, "could recommend that" could have several usages. I mean, in British English, as you possibly know, we never say anything straightforwardly. So, you know, we are always using subjunctives and conditionals and everything is very indirect.

And so actually British English, you know, this would be possible. However, in international context, I'm, yeah, it may be that we need to be rather more direct and just come out with the indicative tense, perhaps we say this working group recommends that.

And I can see in the chat room Lars is saying no more conditional. The "could" should go. So the suggestion is - and the thing about this is it would be a global edit. So if we get rid of one "could recommend" it means that they all become "recommends."

Jim Galvin: Right, so...

Chris Dillon: And - oh and, yes, by all means do continue, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Right so thank you, Chris. So I kind of phrased it as a question but I'll answer my own question and express, you know, an explicit opinion. I do believe that in this situation particularly it is important as well as helpful for the working group to be quite direct about what it thinks its response is.

And my preference, my personal preference would be that we state explicitly, "The working group recommends that," and then whatever the recommendation is without putting any kind of qualifier in the front that could in any way suggest any ambiguity about the direction in which we should go. So thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, I think - I can see Sara is agreeing with this. Yes, no more beating about the bush. And Lars in fact, in the chat room is saying "preliminary" should go. And even as British English "preliminary" really no - we would have to get rid of that. Now what's Rudi saying? "I would also prefer to move could but I'm not an English."

Yes, you know, there are usages of the conditional tense where, you know, it's just sort of a polite way of doing it. But here, yeah, I think we need to be direct. I'm personally happy with that.

Yeah, there is a - this is actually interesting because we should perhaps also have a bit of a glance at the paragraphs before these recommendations

because actually there could be things there which are not ideal. So, yes, let's just have a quick look at Page 16. Perhaps it's easiest if I read it quickly.

"Reliable automated transliteration is not available for non-alphabetic scripts and is unlikely to be available for a considerable time," recognize the drafting it's me. "See Study 2 all of this for further information. Many alphabetic scripts and syllabaries do not indicate all vowels or word boundaries and so cannot be (unintelligible) transliterated. In all of these cases manual transliteration will be required."

"Transliteration of alphabetic scripts would not indicate, for example, streets, roads, buildings, etc. which would ideally be translated. Sophisticated transformation tools which know when to transliterate and when to translate do not exist and are unlikely to exist soon."

Oh dear, I probably shouldn't use a negative there and just say, "they don't exist." I think that is too direct. There could be some exceptions, some minor exceptions somewhere so I might put some sort of additional wording there.

"Manual transformation could solve some of the problems outlined above but it is slow and expensive and should be conducted centrally to avoid consistency problems arising from transformation implemented in different ways by many actors. As regards accessibility data in their own form as long as they are machine readable are easier and more consistently searchable."

All right, I think I've only found one thing in that - oh yes, but Rudi helpfully is picking something up. "Unlikely to exist soon. Do not forget the timing of this report being approved is approximately a few months from now." Yes, unlikely to exist soon, that was my way of saying will be, you know, will be years or conceivably - well I was thinking more decades than years although it would rapid progress of IT, you know, one always hesitates to predict time periods because, you know, time seems to move more quickly in IT.

Jim, would you like to pick up something?

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Chris. Jim Galvin for the transcript. Rather than saying, "unlikely to exist soon" might, you know, lean towards a phrase like, you know, there are - I had a phrase in my mind and now it just - it fell out. We don't know of any that are coming at this time. None are known to be coming at this time. Rather than trying to predict a point in the future, make a statement about the here and now is what I'm suggesting.

Chris Dillon: Yes, that's - yes, it makes life easier for us. Thank you very much, let's do that. All right I think that means that we're safe to go back to further quibbles of mine about the first recommendation.

Now, what else? What else rang bells there? "The working group could recommend," or rather, "The working group recommends that it is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory. Any parties requiring transformation are free to do it ad hoc outside the Whois replacement system."

Lars, would you like to pick up something there?

Lars Hoffman: Yeah, I'm just wondering you can obviously have as many or as few recommendations as we would like. And I was wondering whether we should here add something about the - "any parties requiring transformation are free to do so," whether we should add to that also, "and they're expected to carry the costs." Because that's something that came out through the public comment and I think the group agreed on.

It can also go - one of the later recommendations it could be subsequent one obviously because we are supposed to deal with the costs. But it could be something that features in this recommendation already off the bat. I'm just putting it out. Thanks, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Yes, that's - thank you, Lars, that's a most interesting suggestion. I also you see that, I mean, I'll be absolutely honest, I mean, as we've been doing this work my stance has actually changed a bit as we have become aware of more and more information on the subject than you start off in one place and you develop.

And certainly I'm looking at, you know, "are free to do it ad hoc outside the Whois replacement system," well yes they are. But I just feel it's a little - it feels a little bit too liberal in a sense. I mean, its saying, yes, people are free to do this but it's sort of - it's almost hinting that it's something that's easy to do and actually it isn't.

Rudi in fact in the chat room is saying, "at their own expense." Yes, so maybe that addresses both the criticisms that if we put something expense in there, you know, they're free to do it but, you know, it may be expensive. And there's also a sort of feeling earlier on we got criticized, you know, for being too concerned about money.

And almost within me, I mean, yes I actually I am very concerned about money, I'm a quite a tight person if the truth be known. I don't like spending money unnecessarily. And, you know, I feel the same with public money. Not necessarily that this would be public money, you know, in all cases but, you know, depending who gets involved.

So, yes, so, you know, we might want to mention money. Or maybe we mention - we could also mention perhaps burden or something like that because that then, you know, just indicates the sort of difficulty of it which in some ways is actually more of a concern than the financial burden. It's just the sheer difficulty of doing it.

And I don't know whether, you know, should we perhaps be using burden rather than just expense. Is that getting us to a better place?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars, Chris, if I may? I think that's a very good suggestion, the burden of translation should rest with the party requesting the information.

Chris Dillon: That sounds lovely. I'm just waiting to see what happens in the chat room. But I do like it. Yes. Okay and people agreeing, Rudi and Jim agreeing, okay lovely. I think we might just run with that. Now Sara is saying, "Consistency would be an issue truly necessary. If we are recommending it it is not desirable and at the requestor's expense and not public is the last sentence necessary? The last sentence desperately needs to go somewhere."

Now, in the sense I quite like having it there because you see the thing here is that we are not saying what we are saying just because there's some sort of political reason or something like that. We are talking about the difficulty of doing something.

And so if we are able to keep a reminder there that this is, you know, this is really the reasoning for it because unless you spend substantial resources, you know, you set up good standards, you make sure people adhere to those standards, it's a pain in the neck, it's just such a hard thing if those things aren't done.

And there's a secondary matter, they're expensive things. But, you know, that's not so much what's motivating us. Then, you end up with a poor quality of data and hence the sentence. Sara - oh okay there's a little bit of movement going on in the chat room. But let us wait a moment for that.

Okay, I think that is actually the last - those were the last points I was going to raise about that first recommendation. I wonder if we can try the second one and see where we get? I think in the interest of saving time I shall move on but we can always go back and pick up other bits if necessary. And I can see a couple of people are typing.

All right, so Preliminary Recommendation Number 2, "The working group could recommend that any Whois replacement system contemplated by ICANN should be capable of receiving input in the form of non-Latin script contact information. However, all data fields of such a new database should be tagged in ASCII to allow easy identification of what the different data entries represent and what language script has been used by the registered name holder."

Okay, Lars, would you like to raise something there?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. This is Lars for the transcript. Yes, I think my piece in this recommendation is to, A, refer to the Expert Working Group on International Registration Data that obviously has been working on this. And also refer to the new RDS.

And so, you know, in line with the outcome of, you know, in line with the technical capabilities of the RDS the working group recommends. And then it might be useful also in line what we discussed during the previous meetings to take the tagging out obviously and say that any data fields filled in in non-ASCII characters should be - what's the - on the top of my head.

But, you know, should be - the language used in the field should be easily identifiable and leave that. And then we can maybe put a footnote in there that's either due to the implementation team and if this, you know, typically done then new policy work comes from this and it should be put back to the GNSO (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Okay. Yes, thank you - thank you very much for that. So, yes, no problem at all with referring to the working group. Now, as regards the RDS, I mean, I was thinking basically Whois replacement system was our way of referring to that. I don't know whether we need to revisit that one. Then...

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: If I can just very quickly...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: I think the reason why it might be good to put that exact name is so that we don't mix ourselves up with the Expert Working Group that works on the replacement of Whois and the data (unintelligible) and so forth what we talked about last week that it's helpful to be...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Okay, yes, that would seem to work. And then I was really hoping that the word "tagged" wouldn't go without somebody catching it. Yes, so we need to certainly to pick that up and, yes, and add comments about, you know, the language must be easily identifiable and refer it to the implementation team.

I have a feeling I might have missed a couple of your points there for which - sorry. But, you know, by all means when I do redrafting later on, you know, pick me up on it.

Now we've got - or now if you would like to - thank you, okay. Then in the chat room we've got Justine saying, "Any parties requiring such transformation are free to do it ad hoc outside the Whois replacement system at their own expense while ensuring that exercise meets their exact transformation requirements."

Yes, when I'm drafting I'll have a look at that at the same time and try and - and cover that one as well. And then Amr is saying, "If our recommendations are meant to be implemented immediately there's no need to really describe

it as the Whois replacement." Oh yes, okay so definitely not Whois replacement. That may affect to her parts of our document.

Sorry for keeping you waiting, Jim, would you like to bring something up?

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Chris. As I look at this now and think about these recommendations I'm struck at this point by the specific recommendation - implementation recommendation that data be tagged in ASCII. I'm wondering if we should be quite so specific. I'm wondering if you can remember some of the discussions that we might have had about this point.

I mean, certainly I'm all for tagging the data but to be so prescriptive in what that tag should be as opposed to, you know, there obviously should be a standardized table and set of identifiers. But do we need to be prescriptive and say that they should be ASCII? Just - I'm not necessarily advocating for a change; trying to recover some of the discussion we may have had on this point. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Jim. My instinct is to put something like, you know, to put some sort of explanation of why marking of some kind is necessary. You know, tagging is, you know, is - may be one use of technology. And I guess that it probably is in ASCII but no, you know, certainly we wouldn't need to prescribe that is has to be. So, yes, I'm pretty sure I can draft something that covers those bases.

And Jim is actually typing - so, you know, it could be numbers. Yes, that's a very good point because it may be much more elegant, you know, just to, you know, for example number languages and, you know, instead of having great long language tags you just have 44 for British English or something like that, I don't know. All right, I'm fairly confident I can cover most of that I think.

Now just before we leave it though just a final look at it. Okay no, I can't spot anything else so should we have a bit of a go at Number 3? "The working

group recommends that registered name holders enter their contact information data in the script - language or script supported by the language that the registrar operates in."

This is well out of date because we agreed that we would be using languages supported by the registrar, I think. May not even be the only change there. Slightly puzzled that some of this text has survived as long as it has. But the problem with proofreading is that one gets very tired of it and then one starts to miss things.

Oh yeah, sorry, as it is there. Oh, I don't know, supported by the language that the registrar operates in, that's the main thing. Registered name holders into their contact data (unintelligible). Okay. Perhaps we've got through Number 3 with relatively little then.

Jim, would you like to pick up something?

Jim Galvin: Yes, it's Jim for the transcript. Thanks, Chris. I know we've come a long way around on discussions on getting to this particular recommendation and the wording here so I feel a little bit bad sort of putting this out there at this point.

But I guess I'm just - I'm becoming less enamored with this the more I think about it with this particular recommendation. I mean, at the same time we talked about users being able to enter the data, you know, in their language or script that they have. I'm concerned that I think what we're trying to do is try to find a way to speak to the relationship between a registrant and a registrar.

At least this is what I think so please, you know, correct me if you think I've got the wrong picture here. And what I mean by that is, you know, the registrant should only have to use whatever the registrant, you know, can use and they're skilled at. Not all registrars are going to support all registrants is kind of the question.

And it feels like we're trying to find some interesting way to say that. And I don't know, the more I look at this and think about this recommendation the less comfortable I am with it and I'm actually almost more comfortable with just not having this recommendation at all. It's not clear to me exactly what it adds outside of the context of trying to find a way to talk about the relationship of a - between a registrant and a registrar.

So I hate to ask for that at this point but if there's a little more discussion we can have on that that might help me understand better I'd appreciate it. If I'm in a minority I'm happy to just move on and deal with it. But that's my comment. Thanks.

Chris Dillon:

Thank you, Jim. Yes, I take your point that it isn't adding all that much but on the other hand, the last time I did a piece to the GNSO Council, you know, there was some amount of nervousness there because I think people were worried that suddenly all languages would be usable, you know, anybody could use any language and the registrars, you know, just wouldn't be able to cope.

So the possibly the reason for having it there may just be to remove that kind of fear. So I think I'm sort of slightly tending towards having it, I think, but I agree it doesn't add all that much.

I'll just visit a couple of things in the chat room. I can see Amr's got his hand up but I'll just cover these things and then we'll listen to that. So Amr is suggesting that we pluralize "language." I think the best way of doing it is actually having the plural in brackets because, you know, you might have a registrar that only operates in one language but generally perhaps there may be more than one.

Then Rudi is saying, "At the end it is the registrar who offers a platform for registration based (unintelligible) of languages." Absolutely and Amr is

agreeing with that. Sara is saying, "Yes, it seems to go against universal acceptance a bit."

Well, yes. I mean, I think it's actually quite an interesting one. I mean, we very much want to get the, you know, for example IDNs, you know, just working quite normally in all sorts of different contexts. But I - yes and I'm happier with this sort of more gradual process of reform rather than obligating everybody to handle things they're not happy to deal with and probably the British disliking of revolutions coming out there.

And then okay - and I think we're getting some agreement with this. And a couple of hands up. Amr, sorry, you've hand up for a long time.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. Yes, just for the record I agreed with you but not on the bit of British dislike of revolutions. I'm kind of in favor of those. Yeah, I just wanted to address Jim's last comment.

And, Jim, yeah, I think you're spot on. I think the purpose of this recommendation is to really address the relationship between the registrar and the registrant. And the reason why I think it should be there and why I believe we put it there in the first place was to make sure that it is - that it is a decision of this working group, and I may be speaking out of place to be speaking on behalf of the working group, but this is my understanding is that registrants should have the liberty to provide services as they see fit.

And when I say "they see fit" I assume that this would be based on how they understand the needs of their clients or the registrants. So as opposed to providing a recommendation that requires registrars to behave in a strict sort of fashion providing regulated form of services, this recommendation sort of allows them the flexibility to address the needs of the registrants in any way they can.

And so when we say that the language or languages and script or scripts is supported by the registrars this in effect would leave the choice and the decision up to the registrar. So for example, if you have a registrar in the Arab world somewhere and they - and it's desire to service its local community, decides to support Arabic language or script it is up to them and they can do so because they feel that this is what the registrants need.

So I don't see this recommendation as being one that is limiting a service or the flexibility required for registrants but sort of more of an enabling recommendation. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, thank you, Amr. A couple of things going on in the chat room. And Jim is saying he understands the desire to protect registrars from the requirement of supporting all languages and scripts. There was certainly some nervousness at the Council meeting. And not less because the way I expressed things wasn't very helpful during that meeting but never mind.

Anyway and then Jim is saying, "I think that might be part of what hidden in the recommendation. I'm wondering if we could say it differently, although I don't have a suggestion." Okay.

So we can certainly do a bit of, you know, again perhaps we need to be more straightforward with it and make it clearer why it's there. Maybe that's the solution. Jim, would you like to add something?

Jim Galvin: Yes, thanks. So you read my two comments from the chat room. Thank you for that, Chris. And I'm also thinking back, we've had similar discussion in the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group actually. And in our report, you know, rather than making a recommendation to this effect we actually have some text in part of the description which talks about the fact that we actually say, you know, there may be languages or scripts a registrar may not support at their own discretion.

You know, in essence this is kind of a business decision for the registrar. We do have that one sentence in there what I just said, "There may be languages or scripts a registrar may not support at their own discretion," is actually words that we use.

I mean, it occurs to me this recommendation if we could - I just don't know how to make this into a recommendation I guess is my problem. I think I appreciate the goal that we have in mind here and I'm wondering if having it in text somewhere so that the issue is covered because I don't know how you say that, you know, yes a registrant should enter it in their language or script and they should go find a registrar that supports that because not all registrars will support them.

So our recommendation is simply that registrars can choose the languages or scripts they're going to support and thus, you know, implicitly they are choosing which registrants they're going to support to enter their contact information. I think that's the principle we're trying to get at here. And please correct me if I'm wrong.

But just it's awkward to try and make a recommendation to that effect. And I guess that's what concerns me. And I'm sorry that's - I guess that's all I'll say on this point. I'll let the majority speak. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: No, thank you, Jim. I think that's - I think it's, you know, it's very, very well put. And I think there is a question about whether it should actually be a recommendation. Now Amr is asking or just picking up a few things in the chat room here.

"A requirement to support all languages or scripts would be especially burdensome on local up and coming registrars trying to serve their local communities." Yes, that was what came up at the Council. "Which would probably also be reflected on the registrant's paying for the services they are or aren't receiving." Yes.

You know, whatever anybody says there is a bit of a suspicion that those charges would end up with the registrant so I would agree with that. Okay, so, I mean, I think my instinct is to leave it as a recommendation but the recommendation runs something like registrars can choose the languages and scripts they will support, I don't know according to their business model or something like that - a redrafting.

The - Jim is agreeing with that. Amr adding something here - "not a suspicion, it's a bottom line registrars are businesses, not charities," absolutely. And, you know, we certainly don't want to make life any more difficult for registrars in parts of the world with little Internet coverage until now.

All right so coming back to the recommendation. And I think - well we've certainly got enough for a new version of it, probably sometime later today. And perhaps we can now move into Recommendation 4.

"The working group could," sorry, "The working group recommends that the registrar or registry assure that the data fields are consistent, that the entered contact information and data are verified in accordance with the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and that the data fields are correctly tagged," oh dear, "to facilitate transformation if it is ever needed."

Well, the "oh dear" of course was the use of the word "tagged" yet again. But if we just start using the word "marking" instead maybe that's better. Now, anything else here. And presumably they would be operating in accordance with the agreement anyway. So I'm slightly wondering whether we need to say it.

Okay and some suggestions - we always like suggestions for text - in the chat room. "Do we mean consistent or self-consistent?" So - and we have to sort

of think about exactly what the difference between those two things are so that the - what the data fields are logically arranged would be one possibility.

The other possibility would be that the data within them is consistent. So I think it might be the latter that we mean in which case this is not the best way of saying it. But anyway I'll just clear up one or two little things in the chat room and then I can see Jim's got his hand - oh and sorry, Lars has got his hand up. I didn't see that.

Okay so Justine is recommending identified. Yes, I think to be honest I'm slightly happier with marked more because we've used the word "marked" that's the only reason.

Amr is saying actually he's fine with tagging. Well, I'm happier to be vague because it's not an area I understand very well so that's why, you know, I'm not sure what the advantages are so I'm retreating into a vague term, that's all that's happening there.

Then Amr is saying, "Jim, not sure what you mean by self-consistent." I don't know. I thought the suggestion I made was correct. Jim, would you like to pick up some of this?

Jim Galvin:

So, thank you, Chris. Yes, in fact, Chris, you were exactly headed down the path I was thinking about as I was considering consistent versus self-consistent. For me the way I would interpret this is to use the word consistent suggests that I'm comparing it to something, something, you know, different than itself. So if I'm entering contact information and all I have is that contact information block then, you know, what's consistency? What does it mean to be consistent? What are you comparing it to that it needs to be similar to?

Whereas the idea of self-consistent makes sense to me in this context because as you were saying, Chris, it's about which fields, the order of the fields and in fact that the fields make sense with each other. So, you know, if

I've got an address it goes to the issue of verified, you know, or the use of the language or script that might be used with the given location that's being indicated.

So I'm only looking at all of the elements, you know, in their own little box as opposed to thinking about the elements in a larger context. So that's what I was wondering about with consistent, it was not immediately obvious to me what I was comparing it to outside of the contact information block itself.
Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Jim. Now in fact Amr has picked up an interesting side of this in the chat room because he's saying that actually consistency has a sort of a technical meaning so consistency is an RAA requirement response consistency was also an issue addressed by the thick Whois PDP in that context. So the RAA consistency and response consistency, this all certainly needs clarifying.

Sorry to keep you waiting, Lars, would you like to add something?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, Chris, no actually Jim picked it up so I should...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Okay, right. Okay. And Amr is saying it's, "Consistency in the RAA is against standards made clear in the 2013 version of it." And Jim is then saying, "If that's our definition of consistency we should say that. I'm thinking of footnote that defines consistencies needed." Yes. And Justine is saying that "Self consistent has a less clear meaning than consistent." Yeah, okay.

I think the - yes, okay so this needs to be a footnote. And I'll draft it based on the chat room, I think that's the - that's the best way around this. Make that clear.

All right, five minutes to go. And I think what we might do rather than plunging in - or maybe we start to do Number 5, but first of all just do a little bit of any other business so that we can make the best use of the time. And the any other business is really just to say that we're intending to complete this discussion on Thursday during the regular meeting.

And actually also to ask is there any other business apart from the date of the next meeting effectively? No, okay well then in that case we can at least start to consider Number 5.

Okay so "Recommendation Number 5, the working group recommends that if registrars wish to perform transformations of contact information these data should be presented as additional fields in addition to the local script provided by the registrant to allow for maximum accuracy."

Okay now comment in the chat room Rudi is saying, "Have we closed the discussion on Recommendations 1-4?" I think so more or less for today. But what I'm going to do is draft another version of them probably later today and that we can pick up on Thursday because we may find that actually the wording I've get is not ideal or something like that. So I feel that's where we are.

Amr, would you like to pick up something?

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks Chris. This is Amr. Yeah, I think it might be helpful to clarify in Recommendation 5 that the local script provided by the registrant is the authoritative set of data elements that need to be subject to the RAA requirements as - and not the data in the additional fields that are transformed by the registrar in the event that the registrar chooses to transform the data. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, I'm quite glad that we're just finishing at this recommendation because I think it may need a bit more thought. And it's

always good to finish on one which isn't particularly straightforward because you can then start there and cover it again.

So the - so, "The working group could recommend should registrars wish to perform transformation of contact information these data should be presented as additional fields." Yes. "In addition to the local script." Oh, and then what you're saying, Amr, is just that that local script is the authoritative version of data according to the RAA or the - it's the requirement for the RAA isn't it? Okay. It would be certainly good to change the drafting to make that a bit clearer.

Amr Elsadr: Chris, this is Amr, if I can come back to that please?

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, I just think that on especially the last part of the sentence to allow for maximum accuracy is a bit vague and may be misleading. It's not - readings this I'm not sure if the intent here is for maximum accuracy of the original script or the transformed data. So this could be understood as a maximum accuracy requirement for the transformed data which I believe we are not recommending to be considered authoritative in any way.

So I just think it's important to make that explicitly clear here that the local language and script is the authoritative form of the data that needs to be complied to the RAA requirements. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes, that's certainly very important. I'm actually wondering if we would be better to get rid "to allow for maximum accuracy" altogether. It's easier if we do that. And then Rudi is just saying just something that comes to my mind - oh and this is going back to the first recommendation. "How could one see the registrar has transformed the contact data at their own expense?"

Well, yeah, so I think the idea is that even if people do things at their own expense that there would be the fields in the database for them to do - to do the transformation there. I mean, there is this other possibility that they do it outside the database. And I guess there are advantages and disadvantages of something like that.

If it's outside the database then you just end up with this myriad of other systems and very, very complicated linking systems. On the other hand, the advantage is that if it's outside the database then people can structure things exactly as they want, they're not tied down to a particular system which may or may not suit them.

Rudi, would you like to pick up something?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Chris. Rudi for the transcript. I hope my connection is stable enough.

Chris Dillon: Very stable.

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, well but the problem is it's (unintelligible) you get the contact data into that - has been entered, how could one see that that is the original or a transformed version with the actual status of the Whois itself? There is no field available today so I think it's something that maybe we need to add somewhere that if it's done by the registrar at their own expense there should be an indication somewhere that that is transformed information.

Chris Dillon: Yes, so actually for several reasons. Yes, I mean, it's a - yes, I would agree with that totally. Okay, and just to pick up various bits and pieces in the chat room, so Amr is saying in response to something similar that Rudi typed, that's an interesting question, the registrant could submit a second set of transformed data that the registrar can just say oh my goodness. Yes, okay.

And then Sara is saying, "Does recommendation Number 5 run against Recommendation Number 3?" Not sure we've got time to check that now but we can certainly do it after. Registrant is not necessarily providing local script but script supported by the registrar. Yes, but, I mean, I think the idea is that if you're using a local script you're going to go to a registrar that supports it.

There could be another situation which is actually quite likely in the short to medium term where registrars actually, you know, where with smaller languages you're actually struggling to find a registrar that supports the script so, you know, then, you know, you're going to have a situation I guess where transformation is going to be happening.

Okay and then Jim is saying, "Going back to Amr's original point, what needs to happen is we need to know what is the original authoritative data." Yes. Absolutely. Interesting that they use together as well.

Okay and then Jim is saying, "Then all other data are transformed, it needs to be flagged as such and the source of the transformation needs to be noted." Oh that's interesting, I guess it does. Source of the transformation, yes, okay.

Then Amr is agreeing with Jim pointing out that the authoritative set would eliminate the concern behind transformed the second set of data. Oh I'm not - but would it though? Authoritative set would eliminate the concern - but the authoritative set probably hasn't been transformed, it's just the original thing isn't it?

It's only maybe we get nervous about transformations, you know, who's doing it? Have they been rigorous or have they just done something automatic or something of low quality, I don't know.

Then Jim is saying, "So the display is two blocks of the same data flagged appropriately." Yes, okay, yes so one is the original and the other is transformed perhaps.

And then Jim is saying to Amr that, "There's not necessarily a concern about who transformed the data but I think it would be useful to know the source."
Yes. Yeah, okay.

All right, okay. I think we've made a lot of progress. We're probably more than halfway through or well it depends how long we spend on the suggestions. But I think this is probably the time to start rounding off now. Amr is just saying well - Rudi is agreeing with Jim and then Amr is saying, "Yes, although the source of transformation is helpful do we want to recommend a contractual requirement to display it?"

Contractual requirement, okay. I think this one may be one for further thought. And, yes, so let us end - and Sara is agreeing with Amr. I think this is the place to finish today. And we can then start up on Thursday with the continuation of the debate. And, you know, we'll also have a new version of the document in front of us.

Chat room to go quiet and then we'll end. Yes, Jim is saying to Amr. "Additional discussion would be good. I think it would be helpful that we would like to hear as a point of view." Well we have a couple of days to have a think. And, you know, also encourage other members to pick up their points in the recommendations.

Okay. Quite like to cover one last point in the chat room (unintelligible). Okay so this is Amr saying, "I agree that it might be helpful; it does not necessarily guarantee any added accuracy though this depends on the arbitrary ability of whoever is performing the transformation." Yes. Yes.

Thank you very much. Let us come back to this, as I was saying, with an upgraded version of the document on Thursday at the normal time. Many thanks for the special meeting, it's really great to make the progress. Good-bye then.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, everybody. Bye-bye.

Chris Dillon: Good-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Jane), you may now stop the recordings. This call is now closed.

END