

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 04 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 Thursday 04 June 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-04jun15-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG  
Sara Bockey – RrSG  
Amr Elsadr – NCUC  
Justine Chew – Individual  
Jim Galvin - RySG  
Petter Rindforth – IPC  
Rudi Vansnick - NPOC  
Roger Carney - RrSG  
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan) – NCUC  
Peter Dernbach – IPC

Apologies:

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid  
Wen Zhai - RySG  
Amr Elsadr - NCUC

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund  
Lars Hoffmann  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recording is started. You may now begin.

Woman: Thank you very much, (Drew). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody and welcome to the transliteration - translation and transliteration of contact information PDP working group call on the 4th of June 2015.

On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Rudi Vansnick, Petter Rindforth, Sara Bockey, Jim Galvin, Peter Dernbach, Justine Chew and Roger Carney. We received apologies from Wen Zhai and Amr Elsadr.

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. Now, I think there may have been an additional apology from (Lindsay Hamilton Reed). I don't know whether that - well, let us note that.

Oh, yes, okay, I can see in the chat room. That means we can move into things of interest. And it's a standing item, whether anybody statement has changed since our last meeting. And hearing nothing and see nothing in the chat room, that means we can move forward into the first substantial agenda item which is the draft final report.

And as promised, during Tuesday's meeting, the idea is to start at recommendation five. We had a look at the first four on Tuesday and then we get into just, you know, as we looked at number five.

So I think the - what I would like to do is started number five and then go to the end of the recommendations and then come back and just double check that we're happy with the redrafting that was done after Tuesday's meeting.

And then we can move forward and have a look at some suggestions. And I can see Rudi agree with that. Thank you. All right, so now (unintelligible) control, which is great, so I'm just going to come to 17 or 18 or somewhere down there.

All right, and - okay, so I'll just - what's the best thing to do here? Maybe if we put eight at the bottom of the screen like that, then you can have - I mean, five at the bottom of the screen - and it's not going to work, whatever the page. So five goes to the top of the screen.

Okay, so at the moment, it's reading the - okay, so I'll read this out first and I can see Jim's making a suggestion but we'll - it'll be here if we have the sort of recommendation in our short-term memory so I'll just read it quickly.

The working group recommends that if registrars wish to perform transformation of context information, and if the RDAP is capable of storing, and there's a bit of a typo, but it should be reading displaying more than one data set per registered name holder entry, these data should be presented as additional fields in addition to the authoritative local script fields provided by the registrant, and these fields be marked this transformed and their source indicated.

So that's the current state of the drafting. And Jim has picked up a few useful looking things. Oh, actually the first one is referring back to recommendation number four. So actually we might go and pick that up because I think it will save time.

But let's just deal with this thing about our - or not actually be able to store, so that would seem to be just a matter of getting rid of storing and saying is capable of displaying the one conceivable way around that one.

And Rudi is talking about RFC 7480. And Jim is saying yes, that works. Brilliant. Okay, so I'm going to actually back slightly so that we can pick up something from number four because then that make sense.

And again, I'll do the same thing and just read it so (unintelligible) can get the whole recommendation on the screen but it's not going to happen so I'll just read it quickly so that we've got it in our short-term memory.

The working group recommends - I'm reading from a paper version of the document. The working group recommends that the registrar or registry, I think assures - and I'll go with the singular form here, that regardless -- that's a typo -- of language script used, the data fields are consistent to standards in the registrar accreditation agreement, that the entered contact information data of (VeriSign) in accordance with the RAA, and that the language script used can be identified easily, e.g., through the help of language (tags).

And Jim is - Jim has this comment - that I'll just go through a few things in the chat room and then I can see he's got his hand up. Through the help of language (tags) and he's saying through the help of language and script (tags). Okay so that's at the end of that recommendation and I'll just cover a few other things.

Lars Hoffman: Chris, this is Lars. Can I just add something really quickly to that?

Chris Dillon: By all means, yes.

Lars Hoffman: It's on Jim's comment. The reason I think that there are language tags here is because I believe that the new RDAP, which was formed the data that is input and stored into the (union code), and by definition the (union) code has and (in-build) script.

I'm not using the right word but I'm going to say tag (in build). So by the (uni) code itself, you will know what script it is and therefore - that's why it just says language here. You will be up to know what language it is but the script used.

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you for that Lars. That is my understanding as well. So for (uni) code, you know what the script is but you don't know what the languages. Okay, right. (Justine) was asking the chat room, is RDAP spelled out anywhere early in the report?

Yes, it's there earlier in the recommendations. (Justine) is saying haven't had time to look at version two. It's not a very major new version. You're probably not missing all that many things, in fact.

Rudi is saying a reference to that will be put in the footnote. Okay, and yes, Lars is just confirming that it is. So, however, (instead of that), sorry, RDAP, maybe we should use Whois replacement system.

Yes, certainly elsewhere in the document, I think we are using Whois replacement system. I have - yes, I have no very strong view on this other than we need to use the same thing throughout the document.

But I don't mind so much which way we go. Actually my - I have a slight preference to the Whois replacement system. But anyway - then Jim is saying, well, you know, the script could be, since it's not necessarily unique in ambiguous - okay, this is the difference between scripts and languages.

Someone which is unsupported by multiple scripts. That's also true. I think this is (solvable) algorithmically, not absolutely certain yet but others have told me that should be the case.

Okay, (unintelligible) with got some background noise so please mute when you're not speaking, if that would be okay. And Petter is just (raising)

something in the chat room - just so that we are clear, if changing award in one place, it has to be fully replaced.

Yes, I mean, so you know, the idea is whichever way we go it will either be reading Whois replacement system or RDAP but probably bringing them together.

And Jim is saying - I guess then saying - is agreeing with Lars - withdraw comment toward script (to) example. Yes, okay. Yes, so that would seem to work out. It'll certainly work as an edit. All right, now if there is nothing else on recommendations for and five, I think we should just continue with number six. Jim, which like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: Yes, sorry. Jim for the transcript. I - it just occurred to me, since I was typing and listening at the same time, what did we decide about RDAP in rec five? Are we going to change it to a Whois replacement system or not?

Chris Dillon: So tentatively at the moment, I am intending to unify the terminology and just have Whois replacement system. But if somebody feel strongly that we should be using RDAP, and we can also do that. The only thing is, though, is whichever we do, I think we probably have to do the same throughout the document. RDAP was a relatively recent (edit).

Jim Galvin: Yes, I actually like that change. I prefer to do something like that, the reason being that RDAP is a prescriptive specific solution. I realize it's the only one at the moment but, you know, the document will stand longer and more generally if we're not overly prescriptive. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Jim. Yes, that's my instinct as well. That we have Rudi in the chat room saying RDAP is more in the IETS field while Whois is well recognized in ICANN.

Okay. I think, at the moment that (ballot) is tilting toward Whois replacement system. Yes. And that means we get to have a look at recommendation number six.

Then I'll read this from the paper. I think it's a bit easier. The working group recommends that the RDAP or the Whois replacement system remains flexible so that new scripts and languages can be added and expand its linguistic script capacity for receiving, storing and displaying contact information data.

Now I don't know whether anybody has some comments on that. I think I do. So I thought it wasn't totally clear whether we were talking about the data or the field names, actually, and perhaps that needs to be made clearer.

And Jim is pointing out that again, you know, we've agreed of the global change so that doesn't mean Whois replacement system instead of our RDAP. Yes, that's fair enough.

So I don't know - data in description languages possibly. It may be an improvement, like, I think it just makes it a bit clearer. But other than that - oh, and the English was very slightly strained as well.

The working group recommends that the Whois replacement system remains flexible so the new scripts languages can be added and - oh yes, I think that's why. It expands - it probably expands. We've made that clear that its linguistic script capacity for receiving, storing and displaying contact information data.

And Jim is saying probably database to database systems. Yes, yes, okay. I was just double checking that we weren't falling into the same trap about saying that our RDAP can store stuff. I think if we change the language we should be all right there.

And then Jim is saying that the database comment is actually in number seven. Yes, yes, so it is. Yes, and Rudi is saying, yes, it all works with database and database systems but it doesn't work with RDAP.

Okay, so unless there's anything else about number six, perhaps we can move in to number seven. So we've already started on number seven. So the working group recommends that these recommendations are implemented as soon as the Whois replacement system or any other database system they can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters becomes operational.

I think this recommendation is quite a new one, a new addition to the document. All right, unless there's anything else about number seven, I think we can have a look at non-recommendations, number eight.

And that is saying, based on recommendation numbers one to seven, the question of who should bear the burden of translating or transliterated contact information to a single common script is moot.

The working group notes that the burden of voluntary transformation should lie with the request of such a transformation. I get very nervous when I see the expression voluntary transformation because I always worry about quality way through the word voluntary.

Jim is saying in the chat room - would we consider of finding is supposed to a non-recommendation? Truly just a question. So, yes, okay, so instead of using the word non-recommendation, would we use the word finding?

The word non-recommendation is slightly odd, isn't it? But then on the other hand, we've got this list of recommendations. Are we okay to (just assigning in there)?

I think we - I would actually be happy to do that. Yes, I quite like that. I think Petter have an opinion on that. And as we're waiting for, I'll just mention, Lars



is going to do a bit of a piece about the level of consensus and also the schedule of our next meetings just later on.

So the consensus level thing comes under any of the business, then the future meetings comes under agenda point five. And that has been enough time to see Petter's comment. I suggest should lie to be changed to may lie.

Okay, now there's quite a major difference in meaning between should and may. Are we happy with changing that? Okay, Jim is preferring should, although I guess there might be a sort of a thing - there might be appointed if we're talking about a finding, you know, should is quite a strong word to use in a finding.

Rudi is agreeing with Jim in the chat room. Okay, my instinct is to leave it as should but I am - I think there are arguments on both sides here. See, this is ca- yes, I can see a couple of other people (chatting) away. And, in the meantime Petter has put his hand up. Petter, would you like to bring up something here?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here. Just a question. And now (unintelligible) down but so what is meant with non-recommendation compared to recommendation?

Chris Dillon: I think what it's doing is where the - the recommend- the non-recommendation is more - it's more like an observation and that is why I was wondering whether the use of should in what isn't a recommendation, whether actually should is too strong a word to be used in an observation or a finding.

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here again. That was what I also thought, though, when I suggested the change. That it's more of a possibility. Otherwise, this would be more recommendation that I personally cannot accept this as (such).  
Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Well, all right. I can see that this is - there is a little bit of movement in the chat room so let's see if that helps us at all. So Rudi and Roger are happy with should and (Peter Dunbar) - so is saying and recommendation number five, we consider that registrars may wish to perform a transformation. In both cases, there may not be a request.

Yes, so I think we have to be very, very careful about possible inconsistencies. Thank you for spotting that. And then Jim is pointing out, wouldn't the registrar be the requester in that case? Okay, Lars, would you like to raise something at this point?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. It's Lars for the record. Yes, two things I would like to raise, if I may. Chris, as to why the non-recommendation, I think we use the term because charter question two asks if we recommend mandatory transformation, then we should decide who should decide who carries the cost.

And since we do not recommend the thing in the first place, the second one is moot and so therefore it's a non-recommendation in (unintelligible) in response to charter question two. Not at all married to the term, but that's where it came from.

And I think I agree with what Petter - well, two things. As for the wording that is it's a non-recommendation, and that obviously picks up what we said in recommendation one, that the (burden of) information should lie with the (party).

Whether I do agree with what (Peter) said in recommendation five, and it's true that could be - I mean we understand that, you know, the request is, in the case, (my understanding is) the request is not the registry or the registrar who decides to do a voluntary transformation.

But I think you could be rephrased. We could've requested, you know, we could add to that. If the data has not been voluntary transformed as under recommendation five, then the burden of confirmation should or may lie -- whatever the group decides -- with the requester, so that could then be changed in recommendation one and on recommendation eight respectively. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Okay, that - let's see where that brings us. And then Jim adds to this - rather than being moved, why don't we answer the question regardless and call it a recommendation?

Okay, I have some sympathy with that because this is - yes, as soon as you get into the subjunctive, it does get more difficult. You know, hypothetical situations do tend to be much more difficult. Rudi, which like to add something?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, Chris. Rudi for the transcript. With regard to the question of who it's going to burden and the cost of the transformation, I have some doubt about the fact that we have to define who is - who should bear the cost in the sense that if, for instance, it's a law enforcement, law enforcement could oblige another party to pay for the expenses related to translations that has to be done in a lawsuit or in a specific legal case.

So I'm wondering if we points in our recommendations, in which direction it has to go and who should bear the cost. I'm wondering if that sentence could be used by any party in the future as saying, "Look, that's what ICANN said. You have to pay it. It's written there." So it's just a question - a legal question I have, yes.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Rudi. And this also connects with the fact that we have to be careful that, you know, we are deciding who decides. We are not deciding ourselves, that it's that one which we visited on - during previous discussions. Lars, is that an old hand or would you like to add something?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. This is Lars. It's actually a new hand. Two quick points - so I think the charter question two says - I have to go back to it but I think it says that if mandatory transformation is recommended in the group should decide who should - the group should, you know, (unintelligible) who should decide who should bear the cost, and so I'm wondering whether we can fit a recommendation in that, considering we have not recommended the first requirement to answer to question two. But I'll leave that out there.

And then (directing it) to Rudi for the law enforcement, please bear in mind that obviously any (concern with) policy that we agree, and that's part of ICANN contractual agreement, are superseded by any criminal or civil cases that might be brought.

So if the law enforcement wants to take somebody to (court) in a particular jurisdiction, and a look at the ICANN laws but that will not bind any court decisions. And so I think that's something we mustn't be too worried about in this context, I believe.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that, Lars. And Petter, which like to add something?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter. Just a quick (comment also). I mean, it's one thing if you have a case, a real (civil) case or (unintelligible) case that you have come to the (place to) be (unintelligible) in a court and with all the costs involved with that. But what we forget all the time is the initial simple Whois such that you may for a few seconds, just to give an idea of is there - who is the holder - is it seems to be the same as I have on our other lists so-to-speak as there can be the normal Internet user and the Lee (sic) assistant or secretary in a company that deals with Internet in a way; the initial basic search. And that kind of costs thousands to have translated.

Chris Dillon: Petter. I think we - did you finish or we have we lost you?

Petter Rindforth: I finished.

Chris Dillon: I think we had some technical problems there. Could you repeat the end part of what you were saying?

Petter Rindforth: Can you hear me?

Chris Dillon: No, yes.

Petter Rindforth: Yes. I just - in short what I meant to say was that it's two different cases. If you have (reincourt) action and with all the translation and all the costs involved there. And the normal initial Whois versus (sic) should be simple and be so-to-speak included in all the costs to make just the initial Whois first to see to compare with other information you have to make a basic identification of all the matters. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you; that was very clear.

All right, one comment in the Chat Room and then I can see Jim has got his hand up, so I'll just go with the Chat Room and then we'll go to Jim.

So Peter is saying, "I would suggest that Non-Recommendation 8 become a fine thing and we just leave the first sentence in the current draft deleting the second sentence currently in red.

Yes, I have to admit my own instinct is to leave the second sentence there but to change - I'm happy with finding rather than non-recommendation. I think should is a bad word and I think we should be using may, but I'll just watch what the reaction to that suggestion is.

And Jim is saying, "To Peter, agree, because these sentences actually already in Recommendation." Oh, I see. That's a very good point.

Okay, so Recommendation #1, the working group recommends that it is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory. Any parties requiring transformation are free to do so on an ad hoc basis outside the Whois replacement system. The burden of transformation should rely with the requesting party.

Oh yes, okay. Thank you very much Jim. I think that's a really strong reason to get rid of the second sentence; it just slightly lost track of that.

Lars is saying, "Just transformation lies with (unintelligible)." I don't think we need it twice there.

Peter is saying, "I think that also it exceeds the scope of our charter which was determine who should decide who got the burden, not decide who bears the burden." Yes, it's very easy to slip over that line. And then saying, "I appreciate though that this is a minority opinion."

Well actually, I think the charter is quite clear there. So, you know, we do just have to reign ourselves back when we get the pats, when we get tempted to make suggestions about who should because, you know, decide it rather than saying who should decide it; that's really the distinction.

Lars Hoffmann: Chris, this is Lars. Could I just add something really quickly?

Chris Dillon: Yes, by all means.

Lars Hoffmann: So I fully appreciate that, you know, the restrictions of the charter. I think why it's crept to the Recommendation 1 there is that the charter asks us to decide who decide who should burden the cost in case of mandatory transformation being recommended.

And so I think what we did in Recommendation 1 is said, "Well, we don't recommend that."

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffmann: And as part of our - so, you know, Question 2 is not being answered, and so we don't recommend them. And as part of our discussions, we thought if somebody needs a transformation, this should not be mandatorily done but the burden of that should therefore be carried by the requestor.

So I think it's been - I mean I'm not a lawyer I don't try to weasel myself in there, but I'm just trying to see how this comes. This is part of Question 1 essentially and not of Charter Question 2 which is much more restrictive. And I'm going to leave it at that.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Okay, so - and Jim is agreeing with that. All right, so we've just got to be careful about what these things are applying to. I think that's the key thing here.

So at the moment that probably means that we need to leave the red sentence in the number eight, whatever we're going to call it, possibly with a change from should to may. And we need to confirm whether a running with non-recommendation is the best way of doing this or whether perhaps we do want to use finding.

Now, I've missed the order of the hands here, but I'll go to Rudi. Rudi, would you like to pick something up here?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Chris. Rudi for the transcript.

In the discussion about the transformation in the takeoff (sic), as we say, we are not recommending it. But if it happens, I'm just wondering if we need to consider that when transformation is done by any party that in the end, if it's going into the Whois database or whatever database system would be put in

place, that there is the requirement of the confirmation of the registrant because it's about the registrant's information -- contact information.

So shouldn't we put somewhere that it should be done in agreement or by approval of the registrant?

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Certainly if transformation is carried out, and especially if there are possibly quality issues with it, then certainly you may end up with a situation where, yes, fundamentally agreement of the registrant is required. I mean I guess the registrant is in the good position to say yes; you know, that's a good representation of what I intended. So yes, I'm quite sympathetic to that I think.

Now let me just - oh, now Lars, would you like to raise something about that?

Lars Hoffmann: That was an old hand you caught.

Chris Dillon: Okay, no problem. So just have a look in the Chat Room for some responses to some of the discussion that we've been having.

So okay. So Lars is saying, "Finding in relation to Charter Question 2." Well, I'm, you know, something clear and precise like that always gets my vote. I think that might be a really nice way of solving this problem, so I would be keen to do that I think. And I can see Peter is agreeing with you.

Sara comes in and says, "Could we just delete non-recommendation and have it just be a new paragraph stating based on Recommendations 1 through 7?"

Yes, I mean essentially what we're doing is we are going to delete Non-Recommendation. But I think what we might do is be really precise along the lines that Lars has suggested because, you know, that really stops the confusion.



Rudi is saying, "Just avoid transformation is done without the approval of the registrant and engage in the registrants and eventual legal action."

Yes, I think, you know, as I was saying a moment ago, particularly if these things are done on a voluntary basis, the quality becomes an issue. And, you know, those things could be problematic. I'm quite sympathetic with this comment.

All right, well that has got us to the end of the recommendations or at least the first part of them. What we can do is have a quick look at what we would - although we have looked at some of what we did last time. But perhaps if we have a quick look at what we did last time and then move into that suggestion thing which follows, I think that is the - oh, we did do...

Lars Hoffmann: Chris, I didn't quite catch that. Do you want me to put up the next step?

Chris Dillon: No, I'm actually intending just to go back and look at the redrafting that we did. And in fact...

Lars Hoffmann: Okay, very good.

Chris Dillon: ...about the first three recommendations because we covered Recommendation 4. But just to make sure that we're happy with the various redrafting that happened after Tuesday's meeting.

So at the moment what we've got is Recommendation 1 and we've touched on this. But the working group recommends that it is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory. Any parties requiring transformation are free to do so on an ad hoc basis outside the Whois Replacement System. The burden of transformation should lie with the requesting party.

All right, we have actually touched on this. I'm surprised there isn't any upshot.

Recommendation 2; while noting that the new registration - well this will be - while noting that the Whois Replacement System is capable of receiving input in the form of non-Latin script contact information, the working group recommends RDAP data fields be stored and displayed in the way that allows easy identification of what the different data entries represent and what language script has been used by the registered name holder.

Now I would say that because of what we've agreed, we probably need to get rid of RDAP and just say its -- its data fields referring back to the Whois Replacement System. Yes, which Jim was also simultaneously fixing that in the Chat Room; many thanks.

Let me just double-check if there's nothing else in there. Now also just Recommendation #3 really quickly.

The working group recommends that registrars may choose the languages and scripts. Actually the S is in brackets; language or languages and script or scripts they support for registrants to submit their contact information data in accordance with their business models.

All right, it isn't the last chance we have to come back to these recommendations. You know, Lars will explain what the deadlines are about doing various things a little later.

But I think what we can do now is go now to the suggestions briefly because that's newly drafted text. And then I'll just be very, very careful with the time management. I think we can only do this for about five minutes because Lars will need the time for various things but we may be able to come back if we work quickly.

So here we have suggestions for further policy work which is newly drafted text.

During its meeting, the working group discussed the issues surrounding its charter's main questions those highlighted in the Public Comment Review Tool; see the Annex listed below with a number of relevant comments.

Should data in a Whois Replacement System be machine readable? I should explain our views sort of bold which I'm hoping that the bold enables people to read this more quickly. But if there are people who find it confusing, we can take it out quite easily. It looks like technical problem here which I'm thinking about that.

And then the numbers refer to the comments -- the public comments -- which they come from. Sometimes there's more than one number.

Should there be two sets of fields in the Whois Replacement System in case transformation is carried out? I'm thinking that may have been - I think we've dealt with that in the Recommendations haven't we. So that may - it may be possible to work that one out. Yes, so that one can come out. In fact, so about - yes.

So if transformation is ever carried out, standards would be required to avoid discrepancies between the original and transformed data sets. This may be slightly indirect. Perhaps we need to say something like that we recommend work on standards - or (unintelligible) can't recommend but we make some suggestion about standards.

Reading slightly indirect here, but then on the other hand it is a suggestion so we can't be too direct.

Should the language of non-Latin Whois data fields be indicated/marked? If so, is there a better solution than tagging? So that's actually addressing this sort of whole marking/tagging nightmare.

So standards - okay so yes. This is too vague. It should have been - well, we could say transformation standards. So mostly it's going to be transliteration, but there might be a bit of translation in there. So yes, maybe transformation standards would make that clearer.

And okay, and then is the registrants consent required before a transformed version of Whois data is published in Whois? This actually really comes back to what we were talking about just a moment ago. So you know, it's certainly a major issue.

And as I was saying before, if the quality is low, then the necessity for concern typing (sic) goes up voluntary; automatic transformation than - yes, there's a link here.

Then watching the time; we're just about getting to the end of this.

Is the Whois verification required every time a transformed field is updated? I don't think it is but this is just responding to this particular comment.

Interesting; Rudi is saying he thinks one is necessary. Okay, well Rudi, would you like to address that?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Chris; Rudi for the transcript.

I think it is in the sense that referring to how it appears essentially, when (unintelligible) Whois is modified, the registrar has certain responsibility to reflect in the database that they are using for their customers in such a way that it is consistent with the public Whois.

And I think a verification is probably needed to assure that both data sets are correct, and I'm also referring to the RAA. If I'm not wrong, I think it's kind of an obligation when you modify something in the Whois database that it is verified.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. I think, for me, this really leads me with wanting to leave something in here for further work because I think different people are saying different things on this point. So that would seem to be an indication that it may, you know, require more looking at. You know, the question is really how much.

And then realizing I'm treading too now, but (unintelligible) (unintelligible) this now. Further work is required on how all of the current Whois work fits together.

Possibly not very much. I mean, you know, the thought - it might be that we can take this out actually. But at the moment, it's just about staying in there.

And last but not least, what are the responsibilities on registrants and registrars as regard to contact ability, which again is addressing something that came up in one of the comments.

All right, nothing very much happening as the results of these things. You know, we're just certainly not at the same level of importance of some of the other things we've been discussing which is why they're relegated down here.

Lars, sorry for keeping you waiting on the next two agenda points. But if you would like to map out our next couple of meetings and then the thing about the consensus call, that would be really good.

Lars Hoffmann: Thanks Chris, yes. I'm just going to put up the document; it will just take one moment hopefully.

So I didn't just make this up; I checked with Chris and Rudi before (unintelligible). We felt this might be a (unintelligible) way if we want to submit in time for Buenos Aires.

I will share this and then we can go closer in, and I'll share with the list obviously afterwards.

So we have the meeting today, and then on Monday at midnight UTC or 23:59 is the deadline for (unintelligible) edits to the final report excluding the recommendations. So edit to that can't be submitted until later.

And then on Tuesday morning following those edits, a new draft will be circulated that will also include the Executive Summary.

We have our meeting on -- the Extraordinary Meeting -- on Tuesday. And then Tuesday 23:59, final deadline for the recommendations.

And then on Wednesday morning once they've been implemented, the final report will be circulated to the group with the indication asking people to indicate whether they agree with the content is reflected, and that will be closed on Thursday at 12 UTC.

And then we have our meeting on Thursday 1500 UTC that obviously, in case, you know, the previous timeline we can't adhere too, then, you know, that will obviously change. It will be just a normal meeting, we continue running this. But otherwise, you know, we're just I suppose to thank our Chair and plan the next steps and (unintelligible) questions that people might have.

And then on Friday, we would submit the report to the GNSO Council on the Web site, and would coordinate with the council liaison. I think that's Amr who would have to post a motion to the Council by Sunday the 14th.

And so that would be a possible timeline to get this sent in time for the Buenos Aires public meeting.

And then Chris asked me also to quickly talk to you about consensus calls. And let me just copy and paste into the Chat that links to the working group guidelines in case you want to read it all.

And in case you don't, the key issues that it tells that - sorry, it states that (unintelligible) call should always involve the entire working group. And for this reason should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all working group members have the opportunity to fully participate in the consensus process. So basically that's, you know, part of the timeline that you can see up on the screen.

And what is also usually done is that a consensus call would go out and with an explicit note that if people don't respond, it is assumed they consent. Just so that, you know, we work in a tight deadline that there's no issues. But this will also be made extremely clear on the call and on the mailing list that this (unintelligible) procedure.

Thank you very much. Chris. That's all for me; back to you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, thank you very much indeed. And I don't know whether there are any comments at all about this agenda. I'm really happy with it because it's really clear what we're doing.

The only slight thing I would add, and this is just that obviously I'll work and hope to be able to circulate a version of the document which takes into account the various drafting we did today. And that will probably come out sometime - well, it's tomorrow morning British time anyway more or less UTC. Sometimes you're in the morning tomorrow, but I think that's the only thing I would like to add to this.

Obviously within the document, the working group guideline, you know, I just (unintelligible) correctly for a change. But the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, within that document there are precise definitions of the various positions. And so, you know, we really have to be quite aware of what the definitions are and just make sure that, you know, that our consensus level accords with one of these. You know, (unintelligible) correctly, that's really I think that's the game.

All right, I think we're probably done for today unless there is any other Any Other Business.

All right. Well in that case, I would like to thank all of you for a lot of work this week. And you know, there will be a lot of work next week as well. But anyway, thank you very much for today and looking forward to next Tuesday.

Have a great weekend everybody which is quite soon. Thank you very much.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you so much Chris. Bye-bye.

END