

## **Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION**

**Tuesday 09 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 09 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-09jun15-en.mp3> /

### Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG  
Sara Bockey – RrSG  
Justine Chew – Individual  
Jim Galvin - RySG  
Rudi Vansnick - NPOC  
Roger Carney - RrSG  
Wanawit Akhuputra - GAC  
Wen Zhai - RySG

### Apologies:

Amr Elsadr - NCUC  
Petter Rindforth – IPC  
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan) – NCUC  
Pitinan Kooarmonpatana - GAC

### ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund  
Lars Hoffmann

Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody, and welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group Call on the 9th of June 2015.

On the call today we have Wen Zhai, Chris Dillon, Jim Galvin, Justine Chew, Sara Bockey, and Rudi Vansnick. We received apologies from (Peter Green), Petter Rindforth, 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. And let's just go into agenda point three, the statements of interest. So I - it's just the formal question I need to ask you, whether anybody's had a change in statements of interest since our last call, a very recent one. And seeing nothing in the chat room and hearing nothing, that means we can go into agenda point four, which is the draft final report.

Version 5.1 is the latest one, which I was proofreading earlier this morning. I got as far as the recommendations. That was about as far as I got. Now, Lars, I believe you had some comments from ICANN staff, so perhaps it would be a good idea to start with those. Would that convenient?

Lars Hoffman: That's great. Thank you so much, Chris. This is Lars for the record. Yes as it usual with these things, we have internally sent the working group's work to the team's from compliance especially and the main departments, to the registrar and registry services to get their view, because sometimes, you know, (unintelligible) technical people overlook things and they sometimes have suggestions that the working group might want to consider.

And there were in fact three key issues, three issues that came up. The first one, I'm going to start with the easiest, recommendation six if you don't mind. Chris, I don't know, you have the floor. It's maybe 20.

Chris Dillon: It's around about - yes, it's - goodness (unintelligible) good at.

Lars Hoffman: Here we go.

Chris Dillon: Yes, ooh no too far.

Lars Hoffman: You should see it on Page 19.

Chris Dillon: Ah yes. So that looks - yes, yes that looks...

Lars Hoffman: So recommendation six in the working group, and you see what it says. And basically the comment is at in fact we can leave it in if we want obviously but it's purpose is a comment from the registries especially simply because the idea by definition has the flexibility. So this recommendation will not change anything, and we might as well remove it. That's one comment.

The second issue -- I'm sorry -- that was brought up is the RDAP itself. And although the IATF has agreed on this and it's due to come into force, it was noted that if this working group was dealing with issues surrounding RDAP, it's recommending that it be used and that our recommendation can come as soon as the RDAP is implemented, whether we wanted to also make the recommendation about the RDAP itself that the working wants to be implemented so that registrars can - sorry, registrants can submit that data in languages other than ASCII and thereby kind of giving our arguments a better starting point. That was pointed out, because it doesn't say in recommendations that we recommend that.

And the third point -- I'm sorry, I'm just scrolling through -- oh yes, the third is recommendation two. And I'm just going to copy and paste. So it's about the issue of tags that we discussed beforehand, and so there's the wariness that we over-subscribe something that then would be very difficult to implement and won't be able to achieve what we actually want to achieve. So the

registry team provided a slightly different wording that I can paste into the chat. In fact I've done that right now.

And which will not change any other recommendation itself and it's obviously something that would be circulated among the mailing list as well. And on the same script in our finished recommendation four, because we're talking about the identification of data in different scripts in recommendation two, the last half of recommendation four through the language of script and text is also superfluous and obviously mentioned text again, which also has implications.

And I think that is it. Thank you, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Thank you very, very much for that. Now let's actually deal with the last one first and just get it out of the way. So that's just a matter of getting rid of EG through the help of language and script tags where applicable from recommendation four. And that's because it was picked up in...

Lars Hoffman: Recommendation two.

Chris Dillon: ...recommendation two. I've no objections to that, so unless somebody speaks up in dissent, I think it's for the - we say the (unintelligible), so we should get rid of it.

All right, well let us do that. And then perhaps if I just work through the other various things - or no actually I'm going to deal with the long one and the longer comment in the chat room, because if we get a conversation going it will disappear off the screen. And that is not a good idea. So let's knock that one off first.

And so we've got the replacement text is recommendation two whilst noting that the new RDAP is capable of providing non-ASCII contact information. The working groups that data fields be provided in a way that allows for easy

identification of what different data entries represent and what language script is being used by the registered name holder.

Lars Hoffman: Just a couple of a words that have been changed.

Chris Dillon: Yes I have absolutely no problem with this rewording. In fact I was quite uncomfortable with the original wording. It felt sort of slightly clumsy, and I think this is an improvement. So that, you know, that's - I think that's a good piece of text to scribble away. Actually I think we should just adopt that as it just seems - I can't see any problem with that. But again, if anybody can see something, then speak now. I can see Rudi is typing something in the chat room.

Lars Hoffman: And if I can just add to this very quickly. I think this might be an issue of discussion obviously for the group and obviously on the list, seeing that not everybody's on the call today. But I think recommendation two is - if the group wants to mention the implementation of RDAP, I think that would be very useful. It fits very neatly there, saying something like the working group - recommendation two, saying how the working group recommends the implementation of the registration data extension protocol and notes that the protocol is capable of providing, and then continue.

Chris Dillon: Yes. I think possibly the only feeling I have - we've got one that are agreeing to some messages, a suggestion that Rudi's making about non-ASCII in the chat room. But yes as regards to that, the only thing is that I mean personally my knowledge of RDAP is not very - is not particularly strong, so although I don't have an objection to the change, I would quite like to hear people say yes this is definitely what we should do.

I think Rudi does know his way around it quite well. I don't know what you think about it, Rudi. May he can't speak for some reason. Okay. It's - I think from my point of view, it's all right to make the change. I would be slightly

happier if somebody sort of defended it more rigorously, but I think - yes, I think I'm - I am fairly happy.

Lars Hoffman: Rudi might be typing.

Chris Dillon: Yes I can see he may be typing something, so let's just wait a moment and do that. I think that would be good. And Rudi's saying yes he's trying to see which way to go. Let us not waste time on this. Oh, there was a hand up for a moment in the chat room but it's gone down again. Okay.

So I think at the moment my attitude to it is yes but it's not a particularly enthusiastic yes. But I am convincible. And Rudi's explaining that actually he's got technical problems. Okay. This is something we can - I'll just put a mark in my notes to come back to it later.

Meanwhile, I think the only other one that we wanted to pick up was the third one, which was the different wording about tags. So I don't know whether you have the alternative wording, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Come again, Chris? I didn't quite catch that.

Chris Dillon: Do you have - now the third - so there were three suggestions we got, and the third one was something about a different wording about it was either tags or tagging. And have we got the answer to that? That's really what I want to ask. Or have I misunderstood it?

Lars Hoffman: I think you might have - sorry, it was the...

Chris Dillon: Oh actually...

Lars Hoffman: There's the removal of the half sentence in recommendation four.

Chris Dillon: Oh sorry. Yes, yes. Okay. I will...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Because what happened was - mm hm, yes.

Lars Hoffman: And then recommendation six itself is superfluous simply because RDAP does that by definition, especially for recommending too that be adopted or that be implemented, then, you know, we can leave it in. But it makes no difference, because RDAP has this capability so as long as that's implemented, this will be one of its capabilities. Sorry, thank you.

Chris Dillon: That's all right. No trouble. That explains why you said at the beginning there were three suggestions, and I managed to note down four. So that was what was going on there. What we do need to do is I think just go back to the first one, which was basically saying that recommendation six won't change anything and should be removed.

So the working group recommends the Whois replacement system remains flexible so that contact information and new scripts languages can be added and expanded linguistic script capacities received in storing and displaying contact information data. Okay. Yes, Rudi's actually typing in the browser, "I'd keep that."

I have to admit I'm quite sympathetic to it as well. I'm being awkward today aren't I? Now what was the reason? And the reasoning was that this was going to happen anyway and so there was no point in stating it, but.

Lars Hoffman: No there - so if RDAP is implemented then by definition it has built flexibility that people refer to as script-agnostic, meaning that it doesn't matter where the script is being put in, it will be able to deal with it. That's part of - that is part of RDAP's nature.

Chris Dillon: Oh yes, okay.

Lars Hoffman: So it'd be a little bit, you know, recommending that you buy a car and the also recommending that it has a steering wheel. That's - I don't want to cause this to be - so I mean if it stays in it's basically saying it won't change anything. It was just a point made by registry champs who are familiar with the RDAP that (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Sometimes in projects like this because they tend to go across quite a wide spectrum of things, you know, actually - because you end up in these situations where something that is absolutely obvious to one community isn't obvious at all to another. So I am mildly for keeping it at the moment but it's caused some amount of conversation in the chat room. So I'll just pick up on that.

So Rudi started off by saying, "I'd keep that." Justine came in with, "Can we use the reasoning in recommendation six to support adoption of RDAP?" Yes, I mean you see again Whois replacement system is just a more generic thing. And so the reason for using Whois replacement system is that if there is some issue with RDAP then we're still all right in the longer term.

And then Rudi oh is actually saying more or less the same thing. "It illustrates real thinking and future possible changes." Yes absolutely. I think it's an important consideration. I mean it's not that we're against RDAP at all, but it's just, you know, just one possible solution I suppose for the short term.

And Rudi is saying it - sorry, yes?

Lars Hoffman: No, no sorry, Chris. Go ahead please.

Chris Dillon: And Rudi is coming in with a good option. "Steering wheels are important but could become a joystick." Hmm, yes like in aviation. Hmm. So at the moment I actually think as regard to recommendation six, unless somebody convinces

me that it's going to harm things, my temptation is to leave it but - so yes. So there's just one or two editing things which we really need to sort out.

So yes, we actually don't have to do this immediately. We can make final decisions on the list. And actually in both cases, recommendation six and RDAP, these are not very strong feelings I have, they're just sort of mild things. And I am open to suggestions.

Lars Hoffman: Just very quickly, can I just add (unintelligible) in the chat. I think that actually if the tendency is, you know, six should stay in for, you know, safety first, you never know so you might as well add that, there's no harm. And I appreciate that. But combining it with the adoption of RDAP so we could, you know, we could say the working group recommends the adoption of RDAP as a Whois replacement system so that a flexible - you'll have to replace this -- but combine the adoption of recommended adoption of RDAP with the need for flexibility and that can take up, take in, I'm sorry, different script and languages.

Chris Dillon: Okay so Justine in the chat room is saying, "If we are keeping to Whois replacement system, then please leave recommendation six intact." Now I'm not totally sure why being, you know, more specific on a particular solution, which probably will be the one that is run with, but actually why that is, you know, why it's better to go that way. I almost feel rather similar to the sort of marking and tagging business that one uses marking rather than tagging in cases of issue with tagging.

Then Rudi has said, "While Whois will probably always be maintained as a definition." Oh yes, okay that's likely. Are we recommending adoption of RDAP here though? So the answer to that at the moment is that we're actually tending not to, but that's only quite in my - that's not sort of a strong feeling. There's a slight tendency not to recommend a specific solution.

But yes that is something that, you know, I am open to debate on it, but, you know, just I think, you know, it is rather like the marking and tagging thing. There are advantages to not specifying specific solutions.

Then now Rudi is saying, "Perhaps that would be a good combination." I'm not totally sure what that's referring to, to be honest. Okay. Oh yes so this is - so Rudi is actually saying it might be good to put it in there. So yes, I mean perhaps - I mean maybe it could be as simple as doing something like the working group recommends that a Whois replacement system, for example RDAP. Maybe that gets us away from it, I wonder.

Lars Hoffman: (Peter) just pointed something along the lines on the - I have trouble with chat, so I can't - for some reason it's lagged by about two or three minutes on my computer. But I can send a note. I put something, very rough obviously, what I had in mind for six when I talked about combining the recommendation of the RDAP and recommendation six itself.

Chris Dillon: Okay, that's sounds really good. We're having bizarre technical problems this week. Rudi, would you like to talk about this?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Chris. Rudi for the transcript. So I think it's important that we - that the working group mentions at least the RDAP somewhere in order to demonstrate that we have been thinking about. If we remove it everywhere, there is not trace that we have had this discussion and that we tried to figure out the best way to recommend. I would like to see and I'm quite happy the proposition that Lars is posting in the notes. It seems to me that putting in the RDAP will demonstrate to the world that we have been discussing on that and that we felt that it had to be there.

Chris Dillon: Rudi, I think we've got technical problems again. We've lost you. However, I would really like to say that that is really, really good. I mean RDAP does need to be mentioned somewhere. At the moment I am fairly sure that it not mentioned, so yes I think, you know, obviously we're waiting for some text in

the chat room, but I think there is an agreement it would be mentioned and the only question is exactly how it will go in. So my suggestion is that we just put for example and then give it as example of a likely system.

I can see there's a little bit more content coming on this one as well. Oh (Roger) is just saying yes to the idea. Oh and so is Justine. So that looks as if we may have made a bit of progress with that issue. Good, good. But we might want to polish text a little bit.

Now that then takes us to what I would like to suggest is that we have a look at the recommendations and the suggestions and then perhaps look at other parts of the report that have changed. But actually there are relatively few other areas of the report that have changed. So we'll see if we can get off early today, although we do need to leave a bit of time to talk about next steps and procedures at the end.

All right. So I'm just wondering, oh yes. Rudi is back in the chat room and I don't know whether you heard the conversation that we, you know, we were just saying - we were agreeing with you and saying that, you know, as far as we know RDAP is not mentioned in the document. It does need to be mentioned, and the only question is where and how. And at the moment there is a suggestion that we just put, you know, for example RDAP in that one. And that would actually - that might make everybody happy. Yes and you're saying so far.

Lovely, okay. Now I wonder what the best way to do the recommendations is. I'm happy to read them out again if you can bear it. If anybody has things that they know they want to pick up, then that is also possible. Okay well maybe if I go through for a final time and let's just see where that gets us. I'm open to better methodologies but I can't think of one off the top of my head.

Number one, 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. If not undertaken voluntarily by registrar/registries, the recommendation number five, the burden of transformation lies with the requesting party.

All right. I don't think - I can see Rudi saying yes to that one. As far as - I'm not spotting anything there. You know, you read things 100 times and you stop seeing things eventually. It's horrible. Okay.

Recommendation number two. Whilst noting this Whois replacement system should be capable of receiving input in the form of non Latin script contact information, the working recommends its data fields be stored and displayed in a way that allows for easy identification of what the different data entries represent and what language script is being used by the registered name holder.

Rudi's got his hand up. Would you like to go first? I've got something as well.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Chris. Rudi for the transcript. I hope you can hear me now.

Chris Dillon: Beautifully yes.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Just a little question about the non-Latin. Should it be non-Latin or non-ASCII? I'm still about that. What's the best we could do?

Chris Dillon: The - you see - depending what you read, you see three different terms here. You've got non-Latin, non-Roman -- in the U.K. we use non-Roman usually -- or non-ASCII. Now in this particular situation, the precise form I think is actually non-ASCII. To the best of my knowledge, the best thing to say is non-ASCII. So it should be changed.

Lars is agreeing with that. Okay. It possibly wouldn't do all that much harm to do it, but possibly better to change it now. Can I remember - oh yes and I've

even remembered what I spotted as well. I'll just get it in because it's a really small edit, so before I go to Lars.

And what languages or scripts, because there could be more than one, and what I would like is to have the S in brackets and then that - because you could get more than one language and script in the same record unfortunately. So I think we should perhaps cover ourselves for that.

Lars, would you like to raise something?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, Chris. No it's the Adobe playing up. I didn't mean to raise my hand.

Chris Dillon: All right. Don't worry. Yes we've got the plague of technical problems. All right. Oh Rudi, would you like to pick up something?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you, Chris. Rudi for the transcript. Well I'm also referring to recommendation seven, where we are saying - we are also talking about non-ASCII. So maybe it's good if you align them so that we are talking about the same stuff through all the other recommendations.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very, very much. Basically in situations like this, you know, often there are terms that are almost synonyms, and the main thing is actually just make, you know, to make up one's mind and just always use one form, so. Okay so certainly we'll leave number seven as it is and change number two.

Now Justine is saying, "Didn't someone query the word stored before?" Ooh, goodness. We're not still using that are we? We possibly shouldn't be. Okay. So the working group recommends that data fields be stored and displayed in a way that allows for easy identification of what the different data entries represent.

Now I reckon that stored is actually all right here because if we were talking about RDAP, then it doesn't work, but because we're talking about the

system, whatever it is, actually I think we may be able to use it. So my instinct is to lead it and in fact Rudi has just backed that up.

Okay. Yes. And this I think brings us into number three, which is the working group recommends that registrars may choose the language or languages and script or scripts they support for registrants to submit their contact information data in accordance with their business model. I read that very badly, but I can't see any trouble in it.

All right. Number four, the working group recommends that the registrar or registry assures that regardless of language script used the data fields are consistent to standard in the registrar accreditation agreement, relevant consensus policy, additional Whois information policy and any other application policies.

There's a typo but I'm not going to raise that. Entered contact information data are verified in accordance with the aforementioned policies and agreements, and the language script used must be easily identifiable, e.g. through the help of language and script tags where applicable.

The language has changed a little bit over the last few days on this one. I actually don't see trouble but Rudi is saying he agrees. Okay Number 5. The working group recommends that if Registrars wish to perform transformation of contact information and if the WHOIS replacement system is capable of displaying more than one data set per registered - no, per registered name holder entry, these data should be presented of additional fields in addition to the authority's local script fields provided by the Registrant and that these fields be marked as transformed and their source indicated.

Okay I have spotted one thing in there. I wonder if anybody spotted anything else. Okay and in fact what I've spotted I think it's actually a mistake. Anyway I'll leave that. Wait a minute. No, maybe it's important to raise it.

The thing at the end that - and that these fields be marked as transformed and their source indicated - now the question is because this is English and there's always the possibility of using the plural, whether we actually need to have that as source with the S in brackets again.

I think I - because I think here could be more than one source or whether that would be an improvement there. Feel it possibly would be quite a minor one. And in the meanwhile - so Rudi's saying whether marked should become tagged.

Now wait a minute. No it's the old argument on this. So marking is a vague term - deliberately vague because tagging is one possible way of doing it but not necessarily the best way.

Rudi's then - say, "Could indeed have more than one source." Yes okay. Yes and Jim is agreeing with that so source with the S in brackets it is. A few just don't believe that there is anything more to spot and there it is. Okay Jim would you like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: Yes Jim for the transcript. And as long as we're spotting things is it really - do we really mean to say just if Registrars? You know, perhaps it should say, "If Registrar or Registry," or in fact why are we focused on any one in particular. If anyone performs transformation.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Well maybe we have to be a little more careful than anyone but...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Anyway I think you get my question at this point. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes. Yes that's great. So I think we use a passive. I would suggest a passive so if we do something like, "The working group recommends that if transformation is - a transformation of contact information is performed," now then we're out of the trouble you see so that would be a possible way around that.

Now I've missed - there are hands up in the chat room and I'm not sure which one went first. Rudi would you like to go?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you Chris. Rudi for the transcript. I'm agreeing with Jim and I was just making the same reflection that for Recommendation 5 we are in fact just pointing to the group of Registrars while it could be Registries also.

So perhaps we could do the same as we do in Recommendation 4 that the Registrar or Registry - we need to...

Chris Dillon: Also good. Also good. I mean, I'm...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: I'm not convinced that the Registrant will be the one that will be deciding on the transformation. If the platform doesn't allow the Registrant to do any translation or transformation he is out of the game.

The ones who have the ability to offer these services are a Registry or a Registrar.

Chris Dillon: All right. Thank you for that. Jim would you like to pick up something there?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you Chris. This is Jim. What occurs to me is since we're picking this up now out of Recommendation 5, I think rather than what - well the point that I take from what Rudi is suggesting is we should do the same thing throughout whatever we decide to do.

I was actually liking what you were suggesting Chris where we take it into a passive state and not actually identify who is doing the transformation, which I think suggests that we do the same thing in Recommendation 4.

And I think Recommendation 3 is fine. We want to leave that or maybe not because if we're going to focus on gTLDs then I think it's fine to say Registrars.

But if we would prefer that our recommendation has potentially broader applicability, we should do the same thing in Recommendation 3 and take out the reference to Registrar and just point out that you have to support Registrants.

Whoever is communicating with the Registrant can choose the language and scripts they want to use to support. So coming back around I like the direction that you're suggesting here for 5 Chris.

And to key off of what Rudi was saying we should probably do the same thing throughout. Since we're not going to mandate transformation let's take out specific references to who may or may not do it. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very, very much. I think that is the way I would like to turn over as well, you know, at least for the recommendations so I, you know, I would like to suggest that we do it.

So in 5, 4 and then as - I think also 3 I really, really like the idea of it being something that could be applied to ccTLDs as well so for me that's something very, very positive. Now I can see Rudi. Would you like to add to the discussion?

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks Chris. Rudi for the transcript. Well for Recommendation 3 it's indeed the service - the platform that is - that's what we are focusing here in

Recommendation 3 is the platform that Registrars are offering to - a Registry in fact is never offering a service to a Registrant.

It's always to a Registrar so that's why I didn't pick up here the discussion about having both mentioned, because it's only a Registrar who is able to offer a platform for a registration of a domain name and as such the ability to address in the language of the market they are focusing on.

But again indeed as Jim was saying if we want to widen open the recommendation to the larger - to the TLD group if I may say then indeed it's not only Registrars. That's another discussion I think.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. I think there are, you know, there are some benefits to leaving Recommendation 3 close to what it is. But I - my instinct is actually to go passive with Recommendation 3 as well to, you know, to cover, you know, it would be very, very nice to consider that over our other model at the same time so that's what I would like to suggest on that.

All right. I'll hand - I can see Jim agreeing. Thank you very much. Yes and Rudi's saying, "What's the feeling? What do people think about the idea of turning Recommendation 3 into basically passive which is not mentioning Registrars?"

It's just the working group recommends that the languages and scripts are chosen or something like that. We'd have to play around with the wording slightly but, you know, the idea is not to indicate the agent of the action.

And Roger is saying he likes the passive. Yes and I think - I suspect in my case in Japanese there a lot of verbs that are either intransitive or passive so I think that's where my love of the passive is coming.

Okay. Right. So I think there's a little - there's something else coming in the chat room but I'll make a little progress, and Justine is actually saying she has no objection to either approach.

I, you know, I don't feel very strongly about it. I feel - I have a weak feeling that the passive is the way to go. Now very quickly Recommendation 6 because we've already dealt with it but just - oh I'm actually not - may not totally know what we've - I seem to remember exactly what we're doing with Number 6.

I think we are keeping it pretty close aren't we? The working group recommends the WHOIS replacement system - oh yes, for example all time remains flexible so that contact information and new scripts/languages can be added and expanded, linguistic script capacity for receiving, storing and displaying contact information data.

All right, we have spoken quite a lot about that one so let us have a look at Recommendation Number 7. The working group recommends that these recommendations are coordinated with other WHOIS modifications where necessary and implemented as soon as the WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters becomes operational.

The - that WHOIS needs to be united and possibly upper case/lower case so upper case W and then the rest is lower case. That is just proofreading really. Working group recommends that these recommendations are coordinated with other WHOIS modifications where necessary and implemented as soon as the WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters becomes operational.

One of the changes I made elsewhere in the document was actually about this because, you know, I checked the Background section and I coordinated that with the section in the draft final report from the WG and IRD because they had the lovely section on this.

And I was really keen that we picked their brains and so that's what I did, and so that meant adding a, you know, a certain amount of information and which if we've got time we could have a quick look at.

Okay. Then moving on to this last thing, finding in relation to Charter Question 2, which we spoke about quite a lot last time, based on Recommendations 1 to 7 the question of who should bear the burden of translating or transliterating contact information to a single common script is moot.

Then we move - I can see Jim maybe wanting to something about that. I think - might have a look at the suggestions perhaps and then come back. Oh wait a minute.

Jim is saying he likes the definiteness of the finding but I - but has to admit it's rather final.

Jim Galvin: I'm sorry. I'm just, you know, I'm reacting a little bit with a chuckle in my tear. I'm like, "Wow it's moot. Go away. Don't bother me. Don't talk about it anymore."

I'm not sure, you know, how to soften it and I'm not sure I want to soften it but it does - it just stands out and it strikes me. That's all so thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes I had this sort of strange feeling as I read it as well. But yes I've got a sort of vague feeling that it may be possible to improve the wording here but I just can't think of how. Rudi I'm hoping you're going to help us.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Chris. Rudi for the transcript. I would keep it short and straightforward, otherwise you have to start explaining the different angles of who would have to bear the cost on what combination of requirements.

And I think then we are going for another two or three months. That's at least - I'm - what I'm afraid of.

Chris Dillon: Yes, I mean, actually in some ways this is quite - it's a bit blunt but it's - yes it is certainly straight - it is straightforward. There's a little bit more stuff happening in the chat room.

I'm actually going to have a bit of a look at this. Wait a minute. No. I like the current wording. I think it's necessary based on our findings. Okay but may - well that - thank you.

So that makes me a little more confident with that. Yes, a niggling feeling that's very strong actually. Now time management. Do we spend the remaining time on the next steps and procedures? Or do we have a quick look at the suggestions? Now the suggestions - I'm going to try and do both. Let's see what happens. Well actually, Lars, how long do you think it's going to take to explain the next steps?

Lars Hoffmann: Chris, I think it's just a couple of minutes.

Chris Dillon: Right, okay. In that case I'll go for it. So should data in the Whois replacement system be machine readable? Oh, gracious me. Please, yeah. If transformation's ever carried out, transformation standards will be required to void discrepancies between the original and transformed data set. Yeah, I feel very strongly about that personally. If anybody would like to raise something, just do so at any time as we go through.

Should the language of non-Latin Whois data fields be indicated, marked, inverted commas -- that's almost defining how we're using marks, and it's quite useful. If so, is there a better solution than tagging out? Yeah, that's pretty much what we mean, isn't it?

Is the registrar's consent required before a transformed version of Whois data is published in Whois? Okay, a bit rhetorical that one. Maybe it's good to leave it in. Instinct is to leave it in. I can see Rudi is saying leave it in. Okay.

Is the Whois verification required every time a transformed field is updated? Well that was a question that was asked, and we're fairly sure that the answer is no, maybe not 100%. But, Rudi, would you like to take that one up?

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, thank you, Chris. Rudi for the transcript. It's quite similar to the question just before. Is registrant's consent required? Well it's a kind of verification, so I think it's (unintelligible) than just the least verification required. I would say yes, if it's binding for law. Then the need to verify, that's the big question.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Rudi. I would be keen, based on what you just said, to leave it in. I think this is - depending who you talk to, you get different answers. It needs more work.

Okay. Further work is required on how all of the current Whois works together. There's part of me that would really like to take this out, because I think we have worked really hard on this, and it's just inviting negative comments from people which we don't really deserve.

What do we think? Oh, the only thing is it was raised in Number 25, so perhaps we do need to - Rudi's saying out. This is a difficult decision. Well we actually have done some work. I mean that work I was telling you about before wasn't exactly this. So, Rudi, would you like to pick it up?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, Chris. Rudi for the transcript. Yeah, I would prefer that we take it out. It looks like - if we leave this one in, it looks like we didn't - have been - worked this.

And the Whois - the discussions and all the work we have been doing in that context was quite long enough to say that - well if somebody thinks that there is other work that has to be done, well they'll just have to start a PDP. But I would remove it from this one as I think we tried to cover everything so far.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Rudi. I did some extra work on this, as I was saying, just triangulating with the EWG's report. Oh, I would really like to get rid of it. Ideally we might have had a different comment in the review tool saying, you know, we've basically - well not actually writing. We've done it to death.

(Unintelligible) but, you know, ideally the review tool comment might have been slightly - our response to the comment may have been - might ideally have been slightly different. But yes, I think unless somebody votes very strongly for it, I think it should go.

All right. And last but not least, what are the responsibilities on registrants and registrars as regards contactability? This was sort of a relatively minor thing that came up. Perhaps a little bit of work, you know, might be good just to clarify that area. I can see Rudi is typing something.

But given many directions, yes, it's a bit of a sort of loose end, isn't it really? Yes. All right. And then Rudi's saying quit proxies, for instance. Yes. I can see (Sara) is typing something.

I think we might have enough time to just have a quick look at Page 24 whilst that's coming through, because that actually is this new text which was a result of my triangulation of the CWG's work and this thing about this report.

So that's the stuff in red, (SSAC) report on the domain name registration model was released in June 2012, and confirmed information associated with the domain name from the creation of its registration till its expiration, and proposes a structure (unintelligible) generic data model. And that was just to

beef up our background and, to some extent, justify the deletion of that suggestion.

All right. Now there are some other edits in this document, as I was telling you at the beginning. I proofread the document as far as the recommendations. I think there was one occasion where I found a paragraph that had basically been duplicated.

But with the exception of that, I only found tiny little things that are only interesting to linguists and librarians. So I won't trouble you with them now. Obviously you're welcome to have a look at those in the document. They're all there as edits in the document.

But, you know, according to the list that I have, this really is the last thing that I want to raise. I'll just say briefly whether there's anything else somebody would like to say about the document. And if not, whether Lars could do the next agenda point, which is next steps and procedures.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you, Chris. This is Lars. Yes, so the timetable was obviously turned around. (Sara) very helpfully (unintelligible) pointed out that I'd put the wrong time down for our Thursday call. I put down my own time rather than the UTC time. So it's (unintelligible).

But the next steps are, before that even, we're going to circulate another version by tomorrow morning at the very latest to the entire group, with the track changes from this meeting. And then - I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I got it wrong.

So by tonight we're going to make a call for more changes added to the recommendation itself only, (unintelligible) 2359 UTC today/tonight/tomorrow morning.

Then on Wednesday at 0900 UTC we circulate the final report on the list to the group, and that will include, based on the - unless there's controversial

comments coming in tonight that need further discussion of the whole group, it will be up to the chair's discretion to determine whether we have consensus or not, and he will indicate it to the group.

And then there can be confirmation or rather denial of that by group members on the list, and that line will then be Thursday at noon UTC. So basically up until another eight hours, nine hours, edits on the recommendations. Then the new version goes out nine hours later with a call to confirm that the consensus has been reached. And then it runs for 15 hours - sorry, 27 hours.

And then on Thursday it's closed, and we have a final meeting on Thursday where we show the motion that will be drafted by then, if everything goes well, that will be presented to the GNOS Council to adopt the recommendations. And those have to be submitted by the Council liaison, so a member of the GNSO Council, which I believe is (Anna). But that's formality. So yes, the deadline (unintelligible) now.

Chris Dillon: All right. Many thanks for that very good summary of what we're looking at over the next few days. Sounds as if they're going to be just as busy as the recent days have been.

All right. Beyond that, let me ask you whether there is any other business on the meeting. And so I think at the moment it's actually looking as if we may not have in us content for another call on Thursday. I mean we've got one scheduled if we need it, but at the moment it seems as if it may not be necessary.

So in case we do not meet again on the telephone at least, I'd just really like to say thank you to all of you for so many meetings and so much input over a prolonged period of time. For me it has been just the most wonderful learning experience.

And, you know, it's been an enjoyable experience, and I really look forward to - you know, well working with you still finishing this one. Don't get me wrong. But, you know, on this and similar things in the future. So just I'm actually going to really miss these calls. Many thanks.

Jim Galvin: Chris, I think we can echo obviously, and thank you for all your hard work that you put in. I'm sure (unintelligible) the same. I still recommend we keep this (unintelligible) so we can always say good-bye also. I think it's a nice thing especially because people are missing today, even if we just do it for 10, 15 minutes.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, that feels right. You know, who knows? Perhaps we will get, you know, more content than this. And perhaps I think we've advertised it as well. So that's absolutely fine and various people are agreeing to that. Jim, would you like to raise something?

Jim Galvin: Yes, just a related question. I apologize if my attention wavered for a moment and I missed this point. Will there be a presentation or a session scheduled about this result and this working group in Buenos Aires? Or are we (unintelligible) at this point?

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffmann: I can take that.

Chris Dillon: Yes, by all means. Yes.

Lars Hoffmann: Thanks, Chris. And thank you, Jim. This is Lars. And so because - if everything goes well, if the report has been (unintelligible) on Thursday and it's been signed off by the group, then it will be put to the GNSO Council. The co-chairs, Rudi and Chris, will present to the GNSO Council, on the Saturday preceding the meeting, the findings of the report.

There will not be a meeting of the working group there, because the final report will not go out to public comment before it goes up to the GNSO Council. It will go out to public comment again before Board consideration. So it's usually presented, the initial report. But the final report nominee has not a special presentation session, as it were, to the community as a whole, if that makes sense.

Jim Galvin: It does. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Okay, well thank you very much. It sounds as if the likelihood now is that we will have a brief meeting on Thursday, as Lars was saying, and that's fine. But anyway, as regards today, many thanks and, you know, just, you know, very, very grateful for what has been a very positive experience.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Chris.

Lars Hoffmann: We'll be in touch.

Chris Dillon: Indeed. Good-bye, then.

Rudi Vansnick: Bye everybody.

((Crosstalk))

END