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1. Executive Summary

It is an essential element of the work of any international organization that wishes to interact with a global group of stakeholders that meetings, documents, and core information about the organization must be accessible to those who speak and write in a variety of languages. This is seen as a fundamental part of success for this type of organization and has been for more decades.

As the Internet continues to grow as a truly global means of communication, ICANN is seeking to develop a more robust translation programme to allow it to work more effectively with stakeholders around the globe.

This programme has two main aims: to inform people about ICANN as an organisation, including its history, processes, component parts and evolution; and to allow people to participate effectively in the organisation’s ongoing decision-making and policy work.

The following types of documents will be translated by ICANN:

1. Outreach information – e.g. ICANN Fact Sheet, FAQ, information for first time visitors, glossaries, printed brochures on ICANN, and IANA information.
2. Strategic documents – e.g. Strategic Plan, Operating Plan, Budget, Annual Report and Accountability and Transparency Framework.
3. Policy documents – e.g. issue papers, preliminary and final reports, SSAC papers independent review reports (Nominating Committee, GNSO, At-Large, etc.), and IDN status reports.
4. Other documents (demand driven) - e.g. announcements and press releases, forms, contracts, and web pages.

The suggested translation programme is based on the following guiding principles:

- ICANN is committed to producing non-English-language versions of information where it serves to increase participation in the work of the organisation and general comprehension of strategic objectives.

- To the maximum extent possible within budgetary constraints, the substantive work of ICANN – policy development, strategic and operational planning, and supporting information for both - should provide non-English-fluent concerned stakeholders an equal level of access to influence, and participate in, the developments related to the same as are presently enjoyed by fluent English speakers.

- ICANN’s translation efforts should focus on holistic processes and not documents. For example, if a public consultation is to be held on a text, not only the document, but announcements and background reference information which provides context to and supports the document and the comment period should be translated, and it should be possible for public comments to be accepted in the same languages, with translation as required for non-English comments received.
Quality is key. Translations should be useful to the ICANN community and stakeholders. A process of quality control and (spot) checks by ICANN community members must be implemented to monitor quality. ICANN translations should be produced by the same translators as frequently as possible for consistency purposes; as translators learn about ICANN and translation memory databases grow, the need for review of their work will decrease over time.

English remains the working language of ICANN; all translated documents are non-authoritative and will contain a statement that reflects this reality.

An initial emphasis should be made on translating static documents but a process to determine the suitability of translating other documents that require global community input – or a document summary - in draft version should be closely examined.

The focus should be on producing translated content that supports the overall strategic objectives of ICANN internationally. New ways of producing translations should be constantly investigated and tested, but ICANN should avoid becoming a playing ground to test all new online based editing, collaboration and translation technologies.

Although the ICANN community can and should play an important role in reviewing translations, it is not realistic to expect that the community will actively create professional translations for ICANN on an ongoing, voluntary basis. A network of language reviewers and subject matter experts however would be very important to support translators.

Machine Translation (MT) is not suitable to translate policy documents given the nuances and subtleties in policy communications. With the possible exception of using MT in cases that have proven successful such as mailing lists ICANN should not invest in additional deployment of MT technology.

The key elements of the recommended translation programme are:

- Implementation of a document classification system that distinguishes content and documents to be proactively translated (outreach content, strategic and policy-related materials) in a standard set of languages, and reactively translated in required languages.
  - Outreach information to be available in: English, Chinese, Spanish, Japanese, French, German, Portuguese, Korean, Italian, Arabic, Russian (most prominent languages on the Internet).
  - Strategic and policy documents and related written materials to be available in: English, Arabic, Simplified Chinese, French, Spanish, Russian (UN and WHO languages), though it shall always be possible to modify the languages for a given process to suit the needs of that process.
- Adoption of a standard submission timeline for documents that must be translated prior to ICANN meetings (e.g. four weeks prior to a meeting).
- Evaluation and selection of a preferred translation supplier that has the skills, bandwidth and technology to meet ICANN's translation needs in the short and long term. Essential is the possibility to integrate ICANN community members in the translation process through an open translation environment.
- Adapt the ICANN websites to use the content management system’s internationalization features and create language-specific microsites or site sections with essential information about ICANN in the outreach languages listed above.

- Creation and maintenance by the translation supplier of two online linguistic databases: one that stores multilingual ICANN terminology (terminology database) and one that stores sentences that have been translated (translation memory database). These databases must remain property of ICANN.

- Providing interpretation during ICANN meetings in the national language of the country where the meeting is organized, as well as the most relevant languages for the region. For the online audio streams, interpretation in Chinese is provided.

- Development of standard specifications and requirements for interpretation during ICANN meetings to select suppliers in the country where the meeting will be held.

- Outsourcing of translation services to a medium-large translation agency combined with support from the global ICANN community. The Translation Coordinator manages the supplier selection, relationship and processes.

- Recruitment and appointment of a full-time Translation Coordinator to chair a Translation Committee and select the appropriate mix of translation suppliers and ICANN community members. The Translation Coordinator will be a full-time position for at least the first year of policy implementation.

This translation programme is the first step in introducing standardized decision criteria, processes, and quality levels in ICANN’s multilingual communication. Considering potential changes in ICANN’s mission, community, and communication or publication processes it is recommended that this programme be re-evaluated on an annual basis.
2. Mission Statement & Overview

The mission of ICANN's translation programme is to provide those concerned with its work who are not fluent English speakers with an equal level of access to influence and participate in the work of the organisation as a fluent English speaker. This will be done through, inter alia, use of the highest quality multilingual translation services in the most cost effective manner possible as part of ICANN's continual effort to broaden communication with and enlarge participation by the global Internet Community.

ICANN will fulfill this mission by:

- Providing interpretation and translation services at public meetings
- Translating key written materials and publications into an agreed set of languages
- Translating information provided via ICANN's website
- Investigating and adopting, where appropriate, best practices recognized by international organizations
- Enlisting community participation to ensure the continual improvement of ICANN's translation services

As part of the development of its translation programme, ICANN has initiated an effort to:

- Develop a classification system for ICANN documents to determine how various classes of documents will be translated;
- Establish a document numbering system that would be suitable in a multi-language environment, including electronic tools for making documents accessible via search systems, for both internal and external needs;
- Develop the business processes for development of policies and for other consultative processes so that participants are able to work in several languages;
- Determine the appropriate mix of in-house and outsourced resources to facilitate the successful implementation of the translation strategy, and if it is appropriate to develop in-house capability, to set out a plan for building that capability;
- Establish a set of guidelines for translators, including standard approaches for dealing with technical terms and acronyms;
- Develop a budget for the above policies and processes.

The translation programme development process consists of the following five phases:

- Phase 1 - In-takes and refining the consulting project scope with ICANN Translation Committee, including who to interview, what information to analyze.
- Phase 2 - Interviewing ICANN stakeholders, documenting interviews, and confirming understanding with interviewees.
- Phase 3 - Preparing first draft report with findings and recommendations presented for initial consultation and feedback from the ICANN Translation Committee and ICANN senior executives.
- Phase 4 – Publishing the final draft report for public ICANN community consultation.
- Phase 5 - Updating, delivering and presenting the final report
- Phase 6 - Board Review & approval

The current document is the output of Phase 3.

Inputs for the policy development process include:

- Documentation: icann.org website, translation pages on icann.org, multilingualism for ICANN’s websites functional specs, inputs from translation meeting in LA November 2007 meeting, Kieren McCarthy’s *Translation Framework* document, translation policies from other international organizations.
- Inputs: meeting participants’ info (only number, country, and preferably language), website statistics (page statistics for translated pages, country of origin, etc.).
- Interviews: Patrick Sharry (PS2), Yu-Min Lin (www.nii.org.tw), Khaled Koubaa (Internet Society Tunisia), Mandy Carver (ICANN Global Partnerships), Pablo Hinojosa (ICANN Regional Liaison Latin America), Marc Salvatierra (ICANN Web Content Developer), Carole Cornell (ICANN Director, Project Office), Janis Karklins (ICANN GAC), Dave Piscitello (ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee), Sébastien Bachollet (ICANN At-Large), Bart Boswinkel (ICANN Account Manager – RIRs), Denise Michel (VP Policy Development), Anne-Rachel Inné (Regional Liaison for Africa), dotSub management, Anthony Harris (CABASE), Glen de Saint Géry (GNSO Secretariat), Omar Abou-Zahr (former chief of Interpretation Services at UN).
- Independent review: Omar Abou-Zahr.

Additional inputs will be collected through public consultation during the public review period.
85% of Internet Users could be reached via Translation into top 10 Languages

Top Ten Languages 85%

- Chinese 16%
- Spanish 9%
- Japanese 7%
- French 5%
- German 5%
- Portuguese 4%
- Korean 3%
- Italian 3%
- Arabic 2%
- Rest of the World Languages 15%

10 Top Internet Languages

- English: 366 millions
- Chinese: 184 millions
- Spanish: 102 millions
- Japanese: 85 millions
- French: 59 millions
- German: 59 millions
- Portuguese: 47 millions
- Korean: 34 millions
- Italian: 31 millions
- Arabic: 29 millions

Rest of World Languages: 175 millions

Copyright © 2007, www.internetworldstats.com
3. Definitions

In the context of this translation programme the concepts and disciplines of translation, interpretation, and subtitling must be clearly distinguished:

- Translation is the conversion of **written text** from a source language into a target language, or rather: locale. A locale is a country- or region-specific variant of a language, for example French as spoken in France or Spanish as spoken in Mexico.

- Interpretation is the conversion of the **spoken word** from a source language into a target language. Interpretation activities encompass both real-time audio interpretation during ICANN meetings or audio interpretation during audio conference calls. Conference interpretation is done in different ways (see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interpretation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interpretation)). ICANN has used *simultaneous interpretation* during meetings.

- Subtitling is the conversion of **subtitles** embedded in online video content from a source language in a target language. Subtitling activities encompass both creating subtitles that represent the original spoken video text (transcription) as well as translating these subtitles.

- **Static documents** - Static are documents are those documents that are presented to the community in a finished state for review. Note: this can include documents that form part of an ongoing decision-making process.”

Translation activities encompass both human translations, machine translations, and computer-assisted translation:

- Human translations include literal translations of technical content as well as modifications and adaptations that make the text more suitable for the target audience or understandable in the target language.

- Machine translations are automated translations from one source language into one or more target languages using a Machine Translation system such as Systran or Google Translate.

- Computer-assisted translations are translations that are created by the use of Machine Translation (such as Systran) or Translation Memory technology (such as SDL TRADOS) and then post-edited and finalized by human translators.

Note that translation, interpretation and subtitling are different skills that require different resource profiles, technologies, pricing models and processes.
4. Document Classification

4.1 Translation Framework

The following content and document classification system has been defined by ICANN:

1. Outreach information (proactive translation – 10 target languages)
2. Strategic documents (proactive translation – 5-6 target languages)
3. Policy documents (proactive translation – languages may vary)
4. Other documents (on-demand translation - languages vary)

Below we have outlined the scope for each of these three categories and the decision criteria used to determine whether a given document or piece of content should be translated. Note that with respect to documents, it is understood that a single document alone should not be translated without the accompanying information that supplies necessary context, and, when documents are to be posted, announcements related to the same must themselves be translated into the same languages as the documents to which they relate.

4.1.1 Proactive Translation

Outreach Information

Content that falls in this category includes: ICANN Fact Sheet, FAQ, Fellowship information, For first-time visitors, General information, Global partnerships, Mission, Participation information, Glossaries, Policy process summary, printed brochures on ICANN, IANA information (optional), ICANN Monthly Magazine (optional), and announcements related to the same as relevant.

- Estimated annual volume: 25,000-35,000 words
- Languages: English, Chinese, Spanish, Japanese, French, German, Portuguese, Korean, Italian, Arabic, Russian
- Language selection logic: The 11 languages listed above cover 85% of all Internet users – source: www.internetworldstats.com).

In addition, the following statistics from CommonSenseAdvisory (www.commonsenseadvisory.org) were considered: "The first ten mega-languages give you 76.3 percent of the TOP. The next nine laboriously crawl in one-percent increments to 88.3 percent. Six more languages each add at least one-half of one percent to push the number up to 91.9 percent. Then it takes 25 more to get you to 95.9 percent."

Strategic Documents and Information

Content that falls in this category includes: Strategic Plan, Operating Plan, Budget, Annual Report, Accountability and transparency framework, President's Strategy Committee Report, and (optional) board minutes/resolutions, as well as accompanying announcements and supplementary information necessary for context or understanding of the main texts.

- Estimated volume: 50,000-75,000 words
- Languages: English, Arabic, Simplified Chinese, French, Spanish, Russian (UN and WHO languages).
- Language selection logic: Baseline is UN languages (historical ICANN approach, generally accepted).
• Considering the relatively low percentage of conference attendees and web visitors from the Russian Federation it should be considered to replace Russian by Japanese, German and/or Portuguese, depending on budget.

The web statistics outlined in Appendix B support the possible addition of Japanese and German as languages for the strategic ICANN documents, considering they rank as number 4 and 5 of ICANN web traffic sources.

**Policy Documents and Information**

Content that falls in this category includes: issue papers, policy drafts, final reports and other similar documentation, comments solicited from constituencies or communities related to policy development, working group charters and mandates, announcements related to all Policy-development activities.

- Estimated volume: 50,000-100,000 words
- Languages: Any subset of the languages listed above. These materials should be generally available in several different language editions.
- When defining or implementing a new policy development process, sufficient time should be allocated for translation (assuming 2000 words require one day of translation per language).

### 4.1.2 Demand-Driven Translation

**Other Documents**

Content that falls in this category includes: public non-English comments or blog postings, forms, brochures, contracts, announcements, older materials on the website, content not included in the outreach or strategic categories, mailing list postings, announcements, any web pages not offered as official translations, etc.

- Estimated volume: 20,000-40,000 words
- Languages: Any subset and/or direction of the languages listed above.
- For some content types, such as contracts, a translation must be followed by a legal review in the countries where the document will be used, unless the translation is only provided as reference and the English document remains the only legally valid document.
- For some content types, such as non-English blog posts, a direct link to a Machine Translation engine could be offered to ICANN web visitors so a rough translation can be translated on-the-fly. Refer to the Translation Technology section below for more information.

### 4.2 Translation Decision Criteria

Decision criteria for on-demand translation should be based on answers to the following questions:

- **Audience**: Is the document or content aimed at an international or national audience?
- Does the material address country-specific information or information that is mostly relevant for a specific region? For documents aimed at a national audience or communicating only country-specific information, only the language of the country in question should be sufficient. For information that is relevant for a specific region (e.g. IDNs for Asia) Asian languages might be more important.

- What is the estimated number of people who will be reading the translated document for each language? For documents with a limited number of readers in a specific language (e.g. less than 50) translation might not be required.

- Depending upon the answers to the above questions, a selection of languages must be defined through the following questions:

  - **Language Requirement**: Does the intended audience demand, require or expect local language versions?
    - Is the document or content targeted at a specific institution or organization that expects a translated version, e.g. national government? For official publications translations might be expected or even required.
    - Can the intended audience use any of the existing language versions of the document (either the original version or translations) to understand the content?
    - Is there no inherent risk or disadvantage for not having the document or information available in the requested language?

- Once the languages have been identified, the amount of content to be translated must be determined through the following questions:

  - **Document**: Would it be sufficient to have the introduction or executive summary in the local language?
    - Does the document contain a short but comprehensive executive summary that provides sufficient information about the document?
    - Is the document or content part of ICANN's strategic thinking or initiatives, or a policy development process? If yes, the full document should be tagged for proactive translation in the predefined languages.
    - Is it possible to omit particular chapters from the translation, such as appendices?

- Once the languages and content to be translated have been identified, the feasibility of producing a translation in time for its intended purpose must be investigated through the following questions:

  - **Timing & Lifespan**: Is there sufficient time to translate the document?
    - What is the life span of the document? Will it be relevant for a longer period of time?
    - Will the document or content be updated in the near future? For content that will be updated soon or regularly, the translation should be done once the document has reached final or near-final state.

The answers to these questions would lead to a translation decision: yes, no, or partial translation (e.g. an executive summary only).
4.3 Naming & Numbering Conventions

Currently ICANN does not have a document management or versioning system. Documents are often only differentiated by file name or date. Translation naming and numbering conventions should be integrated with an overall document naming and versioning process. Many software products are available that can automate document management, which in addition to versioning also manage permissions, audit trails, lock/unlock functionality, backup and rollback, collaboration. Until such software has been implemented, ICANN documents should at least have the following attributes in the file name:

- Document identifier or name (standard convention, e.g. GNSO Domain Tasting Issue Report)
- Date of publication (standard date format: e.g. 21 February 2008)
- Locale (see below)

The header in the beginning of each document should have a fixed set of attributes with at least the following information:

- Document description
- Document owner and/or authors
- Document version (major new version: 1, 2; update: 1.1, 2.1, etc.)
- Document status (draft, final, retired – exact flow to be defined)
- Document history (versions, summary of changes)

Include a disclaimer notice in all translated documents that states that the document contains an unofficial, non-normative translation of the official document; make sure to add a link to the name and location of the original source version.

Locale codes identify the language and country:


The country identifier is added in case ICANN decides to release language versions for specific countries, e.g. Portuguese for Portugal (pt_PT) and Portuguese for Brazil (pt_BR), French for France (fr_FR) or French for Canada (fr_CA). Adding the country argument illustrates which language variant has been chosen for translation.
4.4 Multilingual ICANN.org Website

Today, the ICANN.org website contains the following language support:

- A static Read more about ICANN page accessible from the home page in 10 different languages.
- A Translations page showing which documents have been translated and are planned to be translated.
- Various strategic documents available in the UN languages.
- Site navigation and news items are in English only.
- Subtitled video content (using dotSub technology and translation services).

Based on the document classification section in this document, we recommend the following changes and additions to the ICANN.org website:

- Add a language dropdown list to the home page so users can navigate to a basic microsite with "outreach" information about ICANN in their preferred language, i.e. an extension of the existing "Read more about ICANN" option on the icann.org home page.
- If possible, add a list of ICANN documents in the selected language to this microsite. For example, if the Strategic Plan is available in French, this should be listed on the French language microsite, preferably generated through Drupal language metadata.
- Add an "ICANN in my region/country" section to the ICANN site with information about ICANN's activities outside the US and ways in which local ICANN representatives can be contacted.
- In the main, English language ICANN.org site, Drupal internationalization functionality should add a language choice whenever a particular page or document is available in a target language (already planned).

For pages, documents or weblog postings where no translations are available, a machine translation option could be provided, for example using Google's free translation widgets: http://translate.google.com/translate_tools. It should be very clear to the visitor that this translation widget produces an automated on-the-fly translation of the page which might not meet quality expectations.

Any changes in the English content that is used to create a language-specific microsite, such as the About ICANN information, should be reflected in the translated versions as quickly as possible. The versioning system of Drupal should be used to determine which English language version corresponds to which translated version.
5. Resourcing Approach

5.1 Translation Models

Generally, organizations choose from the following translation models:

- In-house team of full-time employees.
- Outsourcing to external suppliers:
  - Outsourcing to one or two medium-large translation agencies who produce all required languages and tasks (project management and translation outsourced).
  - Outsourcing to a network of smaller translation agencies or freelancers for each individual language or set of languages (project management in-house, translation outsourced).
- Outsourcing to a network of community volunteers.
- A combination of the above.

The potential advantages of outsourcing translation to external suppliers include:

- Easier to deal with fluctuations in workload and to scale in times of high demand.
- Variable costs instead of fixed costs for translation.
- External translation suppliers can apply best practices and tools to your projects and introduce efficiencies in terms of cost, speed, quality and flexibility.
- No need to invest in technology or infrastructure to support an internal translation team.

The main disadvantages and risks include:

- Cost escalation, due to possible management overhead and vendor profit margins.
- Reduction of translation quality through change in resources and distance from organization.
- Possible dependency on vendors and loss of internal knowledge and skills.

Organizations that have a steady stream of documents to translate in a fixed set of languages, such as the EU, choose to establish an in-house team of professional and trained translators.

Companies or organizations with fluctuating requirements for translation or language combinations generally choose to outsource translations to external suppliers. Organizations that need have demand for high-volume translations, such as leading software companies, generally outsource translations fully, including all project management, technical production tasks, and language quality management. Organizations with very specific or complex content that requires a close collaboration between the content creators or product developers might opt to augment an in-house team of linguists or translators with an external network of translators or agencies.

In the open-source community, having a network of volunteers translate software or documentation is common. The advantages are clear as the volunteers know ICANN well and the costs are low. However, considering that timing is critical and high quality is key in ICANN translation projects it will be a challenge to get volunteers to commit to deadlines; besides, the linguistic quality of translations might become unpredictable considering that a majority of ICANN community members has a technical background.
5.2 **Recommended Resourcing Model**

So why not build an in-house team of translators like the UN and EC? The main reasons why it is not advisable for ICANN to build an in-house team of translators and/or interpreters include:

- **Fluctuating workload** – most ICANN translations are required in the weeks leading up to an ICANN meeting; volumes require more than one resource to deal with volumes during this time. In time periods between meetings it is unlikely there will be sufficient volume to keep an in-house team of translators busy.

- **Varying language needs** – depending on which documents require specific languages, the needs for languages will vary. An in-house team will probably not be able to support all required languages in the long term.

- **Fixed costs** – an in-house team of ICANN translators would introduce significant fixed cost to ICANN. Assuming the need for a team of six translators (UN languages) with an average salary of $60,000 (Source: Institute of Translation and Interpreting – ITI, the UN P-2/P-3 salary indications for translators, and the CommonSenseAdvisory 2007 report *The Wages of Localization*) the salary costs alone would be $360,000 (exclusive additional costs for office space, computers, and translation technology).

- **Industry trend** – the trend since the mid-1990s in commercial organizations has been to outsource translation services; governmental organizations usually combine a core in-house team with external resources although the balance is shifting to less in-house and more outsourcing. In 2006, the United Nations, in a series of management reform recommendations, proposed to outsource its translation services fully (“These expenses could be greatly reduced by outsourcing translation services. Moving translation work out of New York could significantly reduce overhead costs for staff and rent while creating jobs in developing countries. Given current technology and time zone differences, we could achieve a virtual 24/7 operation, whereby work sent from New York to a remote site during their core business hours could be completed overnight and then returned to New York for review. Competitive bids could be used to determine the most cost effective and efficient commercial providers of these services.” – source: [http://www.state.gov/p/io/rls/rm/46642.htm](http://www.state.gov/p/io/rls/rm/46642.htm)). A full feasibility and return-on-investment study has not yet been done for this initiative.

- **Technology developments** – professional translation agencies will invest in R&D of the latest translation and language technologies aimed at reducing cost and time for translation and improving quality. An in-house team will not be able to invest equally in new technology developments.

For ICANN a combination of outsourcing to a medium-large translation agency combined with support from the ICANN community of volunteers is preferred. The translation agency manages the process and translation technology, translators produce translations according to agreed productivities and deadlines, and the ICANN community reviewers ensure that the translations are correct.

There is a need for a full-time Translation Coordinator to act as the central point of contact and driver for anything related to translation within the ICANN community, especially during the implementation phase of the programme, expected to take between six months and a year. Appendix D contains examples of job descriptions and profiles of similar roles in other organizations.
6. Interpretation Approach

6.1 Background

Considering the fact that most of the policy making and participation effort is conducted during ICANN meetings, supporting the international ICANN community through language interpretation dramatically lowers the barrier for those not proficient in English. Experiences during the last two ICANN meetings has shown that many participants prefer to communicate their views in their native language. Where the passive English language knowledge of many of those involved in ICANN is sufficient to understand what is being discussed or communicated (especially with all text being transcribed during the presentations), lacking active English language knowledge prevents many from speaking up during public meetings.

Interpretation during ICANN meetings should be based on the requirements of those attending the individual meetings. For each ICANN meeting, a different set of languages may be required. Also, the annual budget set for translation and interpretation should define how many languages can be offered during each ICANN meeting or breakout session.

In addition to interpretation during meetings, ICANN should facilitate oral interpretation of key conference calls. This is a service that can be obtained from a telecoms provider like Adigo. A Translation Committee will be able to advice on process and costs with regards to conference call interpretation services.

Apart from hiring interpretation resources for each of the required language directions, the logistics must be considered prior to the meeting, including:

- Closed booths for the interpreters
- Audio equipment including headsets for attendees
- Audio Installation & Setup

Interpreter booth specifications are described in detail in ISO 4043:1998 (mobile booths) and ISO 2603:1998 for built-in facilities). These and additional professional standards for interpretation can be obtained from the AICC worldwide association for conference interpreters (www.aicc.net). Additional information about the interpretation process and best practices can be found at the website of the European Commission’s Directorate General for Interpretation at http://scic.cec.eu.int/europa/lcms/l_8/home.

6.2 Languages

Based on historical data of ICANN meeting participation (see Appendix C), the primary languages represented were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2944</td>
<td>57.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The location influences greatly how many people attend in a given country. For example, Portuguese is overrepresented in the statistics because of the meetings in Rio and Sao Paulo - in the LA 2007 meeting only 22 people Portuguese speakers attended (compared to 59 Spanish and 49 German for example). In the table above these country-specific attendees have been removed.

The statistics and information gathered result in the following requirements for interpretation during ICANN meetings:

- If the national language of the host country is not English, interpretation will be provided in the official language of that country.
- In addition to the national language, interpretation will be offered in the languages most relevant for the region where the meeting is organized:
  - Latin America: English, Spanish, French, Portuguese
  - North America: English, Spanish, French
  - Asia: English, French, Chinese, Arabic, Japanese (Spanish optional)
  - Africa: English, French (Portuguese, Arabic optional)
  - Europe: English (French, Spanish optional)
- For the webcast streams, interpretation will be offered in Chinese; the success of webcast interpretations in terms of quality and number of online listeners should be analyzed and evaluated after each meeting.
- Meeting session organizers can request additional languages for their specific meetings; a Translation Committee will study feasibility.

The number of languages offered should be limited to a maximum of 2-4, to keep meetings manageable and costs under control.

Prior to the meeting, a selection of sessions should be made in which interpretation will be required, plus required languages. This decision should be based on attendance, subject, budget, and/or specific requests for interpretation.

### 6.3 Resourcing

Considering the fact that ICANN meetings are held at different locations around the world which may require different language combinations, a fixed team of interpreters will not be feasible. Instead, ICANN should identify interpretation resources for each country or continent where an ICANN meeting will be held well in advance. The supplier should be given sufficient time (as soon as dates, venue and language requirements are known but not less than four weeks prior to the meeting) to respond to ICANN's tender and prepare for the sessions. Suppliers who can offer full solutions (including technical infrastructure and multiple languages) are preferred although it is also possible that individual interpreters are contacted who have the necessary qualifications and experience. If the meeting is held in a conference center, the location will most likely provide interpretation booths and technology; if the meeting is held in a hotel, the interpretation...
equipment must be obtained from an external supplier.

Ideally, for each ICANN meeting, an internationally recognized or accredited interpretation services supplier should be selected that can offer both services and equipment in one offering, to avoid technical issues or miscommunication between various suppliers.

A basic tender template should be created that outlines what is required from an interpretation services supplier during an ICANN meeting. This can then be sent out to potential interpretation suppliers by the Translation Coordinator in advance to the meeting to ensure the supplier can meet all requirements and offer the best available price to ICANN.

The tender template contains the following information specifying ICANN requirements:

- Required language directions
- Required number of interpreters (and their qualifications)
- Number of meetings to provide interpretation
- Timing
- Technical requirements (based on ISO standards referenced earlier)

Once a suitable supplier for interpretation services has been identified, the following information must be communicated to the supplier of interpretation services:

- Logistics - location of meeting, accommodation, transport, agenda
- Copies of presentation slides that will be shown
- Background reading materials
- Terminology glossaries & translated materials
- Target audience profile information

A process should be defined by which the performance of the interpreters during ICANN meetings is evaluated and scored for future reference. This evaluation should focus on: 1) quality of services provided, 2) quality of technology solution, 3) communication prior, during, and after meeting, 4) cost.

**6.4 Translation Technology**

The main types of translation technology used in translation projects are:

- Machine translation (MT): an automated translation engine that produces translations from one to another language.
- Terminology management: a database system that stores key terms for use during the translation process; normally linked to Translation Memory (TM) for automatic term look-up. See the Terminology section below for more information.
- Translation memory (TM): a database system that stores translated sentences for later reuse during the translation process.
- Subtitling tools: tools used to add subtitles to video footage and add translated versions if required.

ICANN so far has only invested in a Machine Translation tool (Systran) that produces rough
translations of one language to another. Systran has been used to translate some online content (mainly ALAC mailing lists) but does not produce translations that can be published without extensive editing and polishing.

Systran's rules-based MT engine was also the tool used by Google for its Translate service (http://translate.google.com/translate_t) but has recently been replaced by Google's own statistics-based machine translation engine. The main difference between using a free, public MT engine such as Google Translate and using a licensed MT engine such as Systran is that a licensed system can be "trained" in ICANN terminology and language use. Without this training and terminology management, using the free Google MT engine and API is very similar to using ICANN's current Systran license.

Without training and customization of the tool and some level of standardization of the source text, both tools will provide a gist of the text in the requested target language. Both tools will not aid translators in producing high-quality translations as in most cases it will take more time to post-edit and fix machine translations compared to creating the translations from scratch. Considering the highly diverse and complex nature of content published by ICANN and the lack of resources available to train the MT system, we recommend to not invest in further expanding the use of Systran for translation of static documents.

Translation memory technology is already used by the translation suppliers used by ICANN. There is no need for ICANN to invest in this technology because the savings will be specified by the translation suppliers producing translations using TM tools.

Another tool used by ICANN (through its partnership with dotSub) is dotSub's video footage transcription and subtitling technology. This technology is used to add English and translated subtitles to various videos posted on the ICANN global website. The technology can also be licensed so ICANN's preferred translation supplier or community members can create the translated subtitles.

Considering the fact that video-based content is more likely to reach the intended audiences than online textual content providing subtitled video footage could have a big impact on increasing the ICANN community and participation. It is key though that the resources producing and translating the subtitles using dotSub technology stick to the agreed ICANN standard terminology and style conventions.

6.5 Translation and terminology standards

Terminology

Understanding the terminology in ICANN communication is essential. The ICANN policy documents and related information contain many acronyms and terms that are ICANN-specific or have a very specific meaning in the ICANN context. For this reason, establishing an extensive terminology database in multiple languages for ICANN terminology should be the first investment in professionalizing ICANN's translation programme. The terminology database should also clarify which ICANN terms should remain in English, regardless of the target language.

The terminology database combines the existing IDN glossary, ICANN translation glossary, and online English definitions glossary (http://www.icann.org/general/glossary.htm) into one central database. Languages to include in the glossary are the ones selected for Outreach information. The multilingual terminology database should not only serve the translators but should also be publicly available on the ICANN website for the community and people new to ICANN. Examples
of terminology databases created for other international organizations can be found at http://jiamcatt.unsystem.org/english/unjiam27.htm.

The terminology database should contain the following record fields:

- English term or concept
- ICANN domain or other metadata
- Acronym
- English Definition
- Equivalent in each of the "outreach" target languages
- Definition in each of the "outreach" target languages (optional)
- Variants

The Translation Coordinator should ensure that the terminology database is kept up-to-date and contains all the latest ICANN terms and acronyms, including all approved target language equivalents. The Translator should maintain the terms in the database as an ongoing process.

Translation Quality Standards

To create translations that are useful to the intended target audience, literal translations of any source text must be avoided at all cost. It is essential that the concept or process described in the English source document is understood and then rendered in each target language. Translators of ICANN content should therefore be fully familiar with ICANN's history, goals, organizational structure, processes, language, and terminology.

The Translator in consultation with a Translation Committee should facilitate onboarding training for new translators who start work on ICANN documents or content. Also, a direct line of communication should be established between translators and ICANN community members of the same language who can provide ongoing support and/or evaluate the quality of the translated document. This review should not focus only on language or translation quality but primarily on the utilization of the translated document. In other words: is the translated version understandable and does it reflect exactly what is communicated in the English source document?

Incentives for ICANN community volunteers who provide these review services or translation support remain to be discussed.

The ICANN community members who review translations created by Translator should be given sufficient information about what is expected of them. For example:

- What to focus on during review, i.e. not only language/style but rather how well the translation communicates and clarifies the message of the document.
- Consistency check with ICANN standard terminology and style rules.
- How to report issues found in the translations.
- Understanding by the translator of ICANN objectives, goals, and processes.
- General impression of translation.

When the quality is generally poor, the reviewer should not spend time fixing or
redoing the translation but should notify Translator immediately in order to get the translation improved prior to a new review.

The Translator who coordinates the translation process and review cycles will ask each ICANN reviewer to rate the translation and track these results to see how well Translator does in each target language.
7. Appendix A: ICANN Web Statistics

Stats for main ICANN website (http://icann.org):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Reverse sort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States (US)</td>
<td>4,312,411</td>
<td>54.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (CN)</td>
<td>358,354</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (UK)</td>
<td>269,492</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (DE)</td>
<td>235,013</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (JP)</td>
<td>223,210</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (CA)</td>
<td>206,159</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (FR)</td>
<td>192,122</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (AU)</td>
<td>124,200</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (ES)</td>
<td>110,763</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (NL)</td>
<td>105,832</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (IN)</td>
<td>94,421</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore (SG)</td>
<td>91,611</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (IT)</td>
<td>78,450</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation (RU)</td>
<td>73,084</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (SE)</td>
<td>72,610</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (TR)</td>
<td>66,223</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel (IL)</td>
<td>64,784</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (BR)</td>
<td>63,315</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe - country unspecified (EU)</td>
<td>58,332</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (BE)</td>
<td>56,176</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>6,856,562</td>
<td>85.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>1,120,128</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,976,690</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stats for ICANN public participation website (http://public.icann.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Reverse sort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States (US)</td>
<td>118,162</td>
<td>72.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (SE)</td>
<td>8,364</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (CN)</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (JP)</td>
<td>2,634</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (FR)</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (DE)</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador (EC)</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (UK)</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (CA)</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway (NO)</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Romania (RO)</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Korea (South) (KR)</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Russian Federation (RU)</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Spain (ES)</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Australia (AU)</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Belgium (BE)</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia (SA)</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Netherlands (NL)</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Western Europe - country unspecified (EU)</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Czech Republic (CZ)</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 151,995 93.34%

Other 10,851 6.66%

Total 162,846 100.00%

Visit to Los Angeles meeting site ([http://losangeles2007.icann.org](http://losangeles2007.icann.org))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>United States (US)</td>
<td>51,985</td>
<td>63.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Japan (JP)</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>China (CN)</td>
<td>2,981</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Germany (DE)</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sweden (SE)</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>France (FR)</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>United Kingdom (UK)</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Canada (CA)</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Australia (AU)</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Taiwan (TW)</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Romania (RO)</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Netherlands (NL)</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Spain (ES)</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Italy (IT)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Singapore (SG)</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Russian Federation (RU)</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Uruguay (UY)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Brazil (BR)</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Western Europe - country unspecified (EU)</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Korea (South) (KR)</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 73,247 88.90%

Other 9,146 11.10%

Total 82,393 100.00%
### Visits to Taiwan regional meeting website (http://taipei2007.icann.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan (TW)</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>33.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (US)</td>
<td>5,069</td>
<td>31.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (CN)</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (JP)</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (AU)</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania (RO)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (DE)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore (SG)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong (HK)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (SE)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (UK)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation (RU)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (CA)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam (VN)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (NL)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (FR)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (ES)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea (South) (KR)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius (MU)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (IT)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal for rows 1 - 20: 14,995 (92.87%)
Other: 1,152 (7.13%)
Total: 16,147 (100.00%)

### Stats for ICANN blog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States (US)</td>
<td>134,030</td>
<td>46.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (CA)</td>
<td>15,278</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (FR)</td>
<td>13,369</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (UK)</td>
<td>11,816</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (JP)</td>
<td>11,618</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (DE)</td>
<td>9,323</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (ES)</td>
<td>8,872</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland (IE)</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (CN)</td>
<td>6,581</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine (UA)</td>
<td>5,606</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation (RU)</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (IN)</td>
<td>4,885</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe - country unspecified (EU)</td>
<td>3,663</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand (NZ)</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country (ISO)</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Sweden (SE)</td>
<td>3,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Australia (AU)</td>
<td>3,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Portugal (PT)</td>
<td>2,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Italy (IT)</td>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Hong Kong (HK)</td>
<td>2,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Luxembourg (LU)</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>258,735</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,964</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>289,699</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. Appendix B: ICANN Meeting Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>LA 07</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3079</td>
<td>47.11%</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>68.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>16.08%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>5.51%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6536</strong></td>
<td><strong>1031</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings included in these stats:
- LA (Oct 07)
- Puerto Rico (Jun 07)
- Lisbon (Mar 07)
- Sao Paolo (Dec 06)
- Kuala Lumpur (Jul 04)
- Rome (Mar 04)
- Carthage (Oct 03)
- Montreal (Jun 03)