

**Transcription ICANN London
GNSO Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP WG
Wednesday 25 June 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun>

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

Man: Good morning and welcome to the face-to-face meeting of the Translation and Transliteration Contact Information Policy Development Process Working Group. And, okay, I think perhaps if we start by going around the physical room and then we'll go around the virtual room. So this is that nervous moment in the meeting where they're wondering if you're going to go clockwise or anti-clockwise. (Jim), would you li- should we go anti-clockwise? Thank you.

Jim Galvin: Thank you very much. Jim Galvin. I'm here as part of this group from the Registry Stakeholder Group at GNSO. I also happen to serve as vice-chair of the (FS). Thank you.

Woman: Hi. I'm (unintelligible) from Thailand. I'm here on the Gac Team (Unintelligible) Government.

Jim Galvin: Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible). I'm here for IBC.

Man: (Unintelligible) from ICANN staff.

Woman: Hello. My name is (Lynn Jai). I'm from China Organizational Name Administration Center. It's a not-for-profit organization. Thank you.

(Chris Dillon): Thank you. I'm (Chris Dillon) and I'm one of the co-chairs.

(Rudy Vasnik): I'm (Rudy Vasnik). I'm actually the chair of the PC - policy committee of the NPOC and co-chairing with (Chris) (unintelligible).

Man: My name is (Unintelligible) from Thailand from the GAC.

Man: Good morning. My name is (Unintelligible). I'm from the NTAG Service Provider Constituency.

Man: (Unintelligible) NPOC and also GNSO council on here as the liaison for this group.

(Peter Jernbak): Good morning. (Peter Jernbak) from the Intellectual Property Constituency.

Man: Thank you.

(Jennifer Chung): Good morning, (Jennifer Chung) from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Man: Thank you very much. And I'll just have a quick look in the Adobe chat and see if there's anybody in there who isn't in the room. We've got (Mark Blanchey) in the chat. And...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Oh, is he?

((Crosstalk))

Man: And last, but not least, I'm going to struggle to pronounce this - we've got (Ubald Hip) (unintelligible). Then just moving into the obligatory next item on the agenda and that is statements of interest that we always have to ask if

the statements of interest have change between meetings with the working group.

Probably not. And seeing now hand anywhere, we can then safely move into the next agenda item which is the activities update. And for this, we've got a presentation which is similar to the one that we've given elsewhere and I think it's probably a good idea to run through this briefly in case there are people here who are less familiar with what we're doing.

And it also has one or two relatively recent updates. So can we - oh, thank you very much. Okay, so we have - you know, why are we doing this? And it's very important to consider the general background that this sits within, basically continued into nationalization of the DNS.

So until now, systems like Whois, for example, have been either English or (Asky) of the Internet international (light). Then there is a demand for data in other languages and specifically with a replacement to Whois. It is quite likely that future systems will allow unicode data the contact information.

This is a general background to all of it. Also, a need to allow for standardized query through the various systems and then there's just this - there's another point here just about the reforms and the directory services. So we've already touched on it.

So there are other - there is other work going on in this area. You know, on the reform of gTLD directory services and, in fact, related areas and at the moment, what we're doing is we frequently are - and we have people coming from other groups and we go and talk to other groups.

So there's ongoing communication within this general area. Okay, and then certainly the other background is requirement for, you know, exactly what the requirements for the registration data are in various stakeholder groups, so

depending on the group, you know, there can be quite different requirements and that's more or less the next slide if we could open the next one please.

Then more recently, as many of you know, we have been meeting every week on a Thursday afternoon at 2:00. That's the time in London. I think it's 1:00 UPG. We may want to consider changing that time. You know, I think one of the things I'm intending to do in the near future is poll and say, "Is this actually the best time to be meeting?"

Because we haven't looked at that for some time. But anyway, we'll be meeting most weeks since December last year. And then eventually we sent out questions to SOs and ACs and - yes we then relatively recently have done a summary of that in a tool.

So basically we've received responses from most - well, from many groups but not all, so the registrars, for example, are noticeably absent from the tool. And also we have had a lot of quality input from the GAC, particularly from Thailand, Mainland China and the EU but, again, it's quite possible that there are other opinions in that group that we are keen to listen to.

Officially, the - you know, the input for that ended at the end of May, but unofficially we are very much still talking to people, as I mentioned earlier. Again, recently, ICANN has published a feasibility study on the transformation contact information and as we were saying before, there are relevant efforts in this area but we are the only PDP.

Okay, so that's more or less that slide. So if we could have the next one. Right. Okay, so as I was saying, we've been reviewing the feedback and we have, during this meeting, provided updates to the GNSO council. You know this is actually the public - this is - and we did - we also did - that we were invited to the GAC meeting and - at one of the GAC meetings and presented there as well.

Okay, so I wonder if this is the right time to raise another recent thing. Well, it has to be done sometime. Let's do it now. The suggestion is, which is not in the presentation, that now could be a very good time to raise - basically to look at the feedback tool and create a straw man, so create some sort of drafting that would address those - address what is the content of that.

So I'll just raise that now. Generally speaking, we are at the stage where we are looking for what we really would describe as dogs that haven't barked. So, you know, it's really looking for examples like the registrars and, you know, some parts of the GAC. Even some people outside ICANN could be quite interested in what we're doing.

So the example there might be law enforcement and - oh yes, another thing I might as well raise at this point is the intention, if at all possible, to have a roundtable with some of the - with stakeholders and including some that have not been very involved so far. And we are requesting that in - during the Los Angeles meeting. Okay, next slide, please. Ah, and I should be saying any questions. Yes, Jim.

Jim Galvin: I'm sorry, Jim Galvin. Did you just say that you wanted to meet with law enforcement in Los Angeles?

Man: No, not necessarily. We are interested in talking to law enforcement at any time. You know, they are a community that may have quite strong views. It may - you know, not necessarily in Los Angeles.

In Los Angeles, generally we want to bring together certainly people within the ICANN community and this - and not necessarily only the ones that have been involved so far. It's more general than that.

Man: (Unintelligible). Thanks for the summary and I'd make some notes before that and I'm afraid it's - my questions and the need for action are still there. We always mention that there are other groups also meeting with similar issues.

And I personally had the feeling that when we go through these issues on the meetings with (our) - fantastic. Now we'll have information from that group. Then they're waiting for us to make a presentation (at that stage).

And I guess it's not just we have to wait for some more efficient way to deal with these issues. So one question I have is if it's not (been yet), if it could have some kind of meeting with other groups to make sure what are the issues, what are the timelines and also to make clear for everyone, including myself, what are the specific issues these groups are working with.

I presume that there were still be some gray zones and we have to deal with that. But - so that each group does some efficient work and at the same time, we don't deal with the same questions.

And also, I want to see the action plan we have with the more - as far as possible, a little more specific action points. And I think that now we have been dealing with this for half a year, and what we have is, even if it's not replies from each groups of interest, but we have comments and you have put them together in a summary and sometimes I - from my other practice, I know that sometimes it could be hard to get people to make initial comments if they don't - can't squeeze into what is this about?

But now we have - actually or we can prepare a specific paper with the questions and our summary of what we have (up here). And if we send that out, I'm pretty sure that we will also get replies from some of those that you haven't heard from yet. And that can also be some distinctive (up face). And from that paper, I think we can move on in a more quicker and specific way.

Man: Thank you. I think that was some very useful feedback there. Perhaps we are, to some extent, guilty of being ad hoc with the meetings with the other groups. It is quite complicated matrix and, you know, we can certainly look at doing something more dedicated.

Then I think also possibly going straight into creating some kind of straw man out of the comments may be moving too quickly. There's no reason why we can't send out the paper widely first and then move into the straw man.

Man: Well, I want to pick up on your first question. And I had the same feeling that there was a bounce back from several groups that have the same topic of - and are working on the same issue, if I may say, being the Whois and the contact information.

And I was - I've been talking to (Jonathan), the chair of the GNSO about this problem and I still have to draft out the proposal. I propose to have a final sitting together being the chairs or co-chairs of each of these groups so that we can - we could align the work we are doing and avoid doing the same work over and over again without progressing because I'm afraid that we are all going in a certain direction but we don't know which direction that finally is.

Is it going to solution or is it going to putting other problems on the table? Because at the end, if we come up with recommendations that don't fit in what all other groups are doing, we will make us a little bit stupid.

So in order to avoid that, I propose to (Jonathan) that we should try to have a panel that allows us to have all the chairs sitting together and allowing us to make progress in what is finally the best outcome. And I'm still trying to get that done today and we'll send it around to the group before we get it out.

Man: Excellent.

Man: Yes, (Unintelligible) speaking. (About) fully supported - so you know, for what we are doing is preparing for the PDP, (consulate) PDP. So this PDP is embedded in certain rules. So - and it's embedded in the procedure of how to deal with.

So in - as you have seen, so people like (unintelligible), we also couldn't, at least, pay at every meeting, so it's good that you don't talk about the timing of the meeting, for example, it could help us.

On the other hand, the interest of different groups behind us are different. Some have more interest in that. Some, just to certain aspects which is reflected in the participation as well.

And so if we have the - if we are of the opinion that there is (unintelligible) to other groups, so I think nobody is going to hinder us to contact those groups, the chairs of those groups immediately as you're suggesting.

That's the one thing. On the other hand, you already reported to the GNSO council on the GNSO, on the recant. So we have to come back to them as well because they are mandating us.

And if we are of the opinion - it's going not in the right (way we) think about, you know, or it's - well, it's just we cannot move forward. Please help us. Give us the mandate. Give us different mandates or cut it or what else because this has to be put on that level to the council to make them aware that there's something going on.

I remember that because that time when I was on council, so several times we had this issue that people were of the opinion of why should we deal with that in this scope as well because the (article) may cover that aspect. So we have to make clear our mandate, to make clear what we have done.

And as far as we have (going, send the) report back. Nothing else. So don't care about that we, as our group, are not here in the position. We are to do more. If something is wrong, we try. You do your best to do so. Just report that back and the council - it's up to the council and we discuss that and really to think over the mandate. Thanks.

Man: Thank you (Rolfe), (Rudy) for the transcript. What strikes me especially is the fact that - and that may be something we have to put on the council as a point of discussion is that fact that the board is requesting some studies to be done on the same topic.

And that (frightens) me because at the end, if they're launching studies sideways what we are doing, it means that - it looks to me as if they don't trust what we do because they're asking others, external consultants that maybe don't know what we are doing.

And we didn't even get any contact with this study group or these consultants so that's maybe a point that we have to bring to the council and ask to bring it to the board and ask for clarification. Why did they launch these studies on the similar issue so that we have a clarification? Why is this done? Is it because there is a lack of trust? Is it because they want to bring other inputs to us? But it should be clear because we are volunteers. Those studies are not done on a volunteering basis.

Man: This is (Unintelligible) record. And do you think this study was just published that Steve Chang presented on two or three weeks ago?

Man: There was - I believe it was part of the initial request by the GNSO council that there would be a study in parallel with the working group that would inform the work of this group. Now, I have to look at the wording but I believe that was the case. I'll check and get back to you.

Man: Yes, I mean, I think it is a complicated matrix. As you know, during our meetings we have systematically gone through all of the other content that has been produced over the recent months.

And, yes, occasionally there may be a small amount of overlap but actually, you know, I feel that we can still, you know, do what the charter tells us to do and we can take all of this stuff into account as we draft.

So I think it's not - I feel that it's not the case that some think is really doing exactly the same as we are. I mean, we do have advantage, certainly, linguistically that, you know, we are coming from various different backgrounds and looking at this.

And so I think that's one of our fortes. And also, you know, that we do meet regularly and we are very systematic and what we produce is publicly available in - and systematically available. Everything we've done is completely open and it's in that Wiki.

I mean, I feel quite confident about what we've done. You know, that said, you know, perhaps it's not the case that we're just necessarily just going to plot on with that. I mean, we are open to - you know, to change.

But I think we can be confident about what we've done so far. The one area that does concern me, as I mentioned before, is the - you know, the charge that perhaps we haven't gotten written input in (IS).

We haven't gotten written input from all of the groups. Very often we've had, you know, people have spoken to us but effectively when doing this kind of work, you really do need the written input.

And that was why earlier I was highlighting the importance of getting that input from other, you know, from other players. I feel if we don't - if we are unable to get that input, it does endanger the timeline.

So at the moment, we are hoping to meet the December timeline, I think - if we don't meet that timeline, then I think a lot of the worry that were expressed earlier could become much larger.

(Rudy Vasnick): (Rudy) speaking. Yes, last - it's clear that it was recommended by the GNSO but maybe we need to go back to the GNSO and ask for clarification on the

real reasoning behind it because it's good to have that (unintelligible) but it's good to know also eventually what I would consider is that this study which has started before we started in order to enable us to start with good input already.

Man: Great. (Unintelligible) with the - I mean, the study obviously can't produce a policy that hasn't come out of the PDP. And because it's a very technical issue, not - the question necessarily whether or not you do translate in terms of iteration but how this actually would work and how this could be implemented is something that requires some expertise that I think the council felt at the time should be explored by an expert study on this so the group is informed of what can and cannot be done technically. I don't think it's meant to assume any outcome of what the recommendations of this group are but just to show, if you want, the technical limitations.

(Juno): (Unintelligible). I have to leave for the GAC, so - to be able to address whether we point out the problems or we - is that the solution or what we try to do is we try to work the problem out rather than guess.

So we have been agreed with (the registrar) in Thailand that we will (conduct) the trial on translation, (transliteration) to see where the problem is then. We're working on - like, we would (disable) the main (cart). We try to conduct not only translation, transliteration but go for the UPU (syntax) and how it is (affecting) - because we start with the Thailand. (unintelligible).

Because that's the only (unintelligible) to accountabilities and validation, verifications, we tried to work the problem out. It's not guessing (unintelligible) because we try to see that if we want to do the mail verification validations, how much it's going to cost for the projects.

And we've been (unintelligible) in Thailand working to get to reform the groups. And we hope, cross the finger, that we can come out with the first report back to this before the (RA). That's during the time we work it should

address because we tried to answer the three questions who need to do it at what cost.

And I think, if not, coming out from study on the paper, we agree to put people in together and work the problem out. In fact, we have a workshop in Korea together with the Korean Post and (Unintelligible) in that forum. And we raised the concern, not only translate, but even we need to go for UPU in-tax, how it affects.

And if like we discuss from the working groups we raise questions on hands corrector, which in Korean leaving in Beijing and how it is being done, I think that's the only thing we try to (unintelligible) to help to find out what the problem is.

Man: Thank you very much (Juno). We are very grateful for the amount of work you and your colleagues have put into this area.

It is interesting that you raise the UPU because that does seem to be a very key part of this. I mean earlier on in our calls, you know, we spoke about, you know, very simple solutions. But the problem is with so-called simple solutions, you know, they may be unfamiliar to some people, so even if it's simple, specifically in this case, it would be something like, you know, if it's a name then use official English translation unless it doesn't exist in which case transliterate it. So that might be the sort of simple approach.

However the UPU offers what I would regard - the reason we shied away from what the UPU is doing is because it is actually a very large collection of systems. But on the other hand, it is all code defied; people are very use to using it. So therefore it becomes very attractive and it is an absolutely key area.

(Rudy Vasnick): Rudi speaking for the transcript.

I'm just wondering; I'm putting this on the table for this group. Should we have a closer contact with the UPU and see if what they are doing can help us in giving us guidance in possible solutions. As you say, it's all coded, and indeed there is (unintelligible) definition the way they are handling the data.

We triggered one sample in the Whois with the Chinese domain name and we ended up in having complete false information in the Whois. Remember we did it a few days ago.

Man: General speaking, these things get much easier when you actually try to do things. Talking about them is often really, really hard. If you actually do something concrete certainly you see things.

And the reason I'm now highlighting the UPU is that when there was a mention of the straw man, the first thing I thought was, "Well what role does the UPU play in that?" And then I thought, "We probably need to know more about the match."

(Chris Dillon): (Chris Dillon) for the record.

I'm just wondering, I agree that there's a lot of players that come into this and that have expertise and strong opinions on this.

But I - going back to your first point that, you know, what the study has to do with this. This is a working group that should make the (unintelligible) recommendation. I think it might be easier to gather information and feedback and opinion from others to see about feasibility from an initial report.

So if the group were to come up with something, even if it doesn't have full consensus, that will certainly draw out comments from within the group and from outside the group. An initial report essentially is what it is; it's an initial report with draft recommendations that do not need consensus.

And so that might be a way to facilitate debate with others and to seek opinions. And also if you have people like law enforcement, they might be much more forthcoming in their views when they see what's on the table, especially if they don't agree I assume.

And the same certainly goes to certain stakeholder groups and constituencies in the GNSO I believe. And also the idea of a roundtable in Los Angeles, well there's certainly a good one in talking of (unintelligible).

They remind that, you know, this group has been chartered by GNSO to deal with those issues. And so essentially what the recommendation is of this, the expectation would certainly be that, for example, whatever the outcome may or may not be of the EWG, this still goes through the GNSO process, right. I mean even if this goes through in LA and then enters into a PDP, you know, I mean the best case scenario would be at least 12 months from now and I think that's a very optimistic view on this.

But they would have to take into account the echo of this working group essentially because we make policy on a very small issue that affects the EWG. But you know, the policy recommendation, if it goes through whatever it may be, if you want impact on the EWG rather than the other way around.

So I think we should try to come to some preliminary recommendations and see where we stand with that. And they will comment. And whoever disagrees will come and let us know; I'm very certain about that.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible). I agree with that, and sorry if I haven't looked at it for awhile now. But I remember from our agenda, we have a few specific more detailed points, but otherwise it's just (unintelligible) our meetings.

And if it's possible, and I presume that we can assist in dealing with this by email between now and the next meeting, but to have more specified issues for each upcoming meeting so that we also afford ourselves to have specific deadlines for the work. It will also be more clear what and when we will meet of the deadline's topics. Thanks.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Pitino): Hi, (Pitino) for the transcript.

I'm able to agree with you with the UPU. And actually from the workshop I had last week, UPU really looking for something like Dot Post for the next round if it happening. So they are really - there will be someone who really knows about what's going on in the ICANN from UPU. And ICANN can have reference to that person.

And I don't know if for the - I look in our questions. The last one is the validation - validation, right. So I'm not sure if part of it will be - how do we translate.

From our study locally, we're conducting this registrar and someone who in charge of the translation for Thai to English in Thailand. So we will come up with how we translate. But that will be only for the Thailand case.

And we are quite sure that it's quite different each country. So that could be in your report. But I really encourage other members here to take a look at how to translate for your script as well.

For now, I will call this the (unintelligible) and be the countries around Thailand.

Man: Thank you. Jim please.

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin for the transcript.

I guess I have a question and maybe it's directed at the Chairs. I'm still struggling to understand what question we want to ask of the UPU and what specific advice we're looking to get from them.

And I ask that question because at least the context that I have for this is they have a set of regulations, if you will, that define what, you know, contact information, postal information, is supposed to look like. You know, they're understood in spite of the fact that they're rather ambiguous and open-ended. But nonetheless, we know what's there.

So that's why, you know, it would be helpful if - I'm just trying to understand exactly what we think we need to get from them and what we're going to ask them. Thank you.

Man: Thank you for that, yes. The UPU has certainly a lot of information in this area. So it's, you know, it has templates for representing the draft data. It's obviously done a huge amount of work. I mean we know from what we've looked at during meetings that it's certainly a major player.

And you know, I guess, you know, the question is to what extent it is actually a system which it's already in a particular context and it's just in, you know, snail mail, is actually answering - practically answering some of this. That's why it's interesting.

Oh, the other - sorry - the other part to it I should say is just that it's such a big system. So because you concern letters, well, more or less anywhere I think. That is very attractive because certainly some of the other systems are surprisingly small.

So some of the translation and transliteration systems, you know, you're only talking handfuls of languages - well 75 or something like this. These are very small numbers whereas UPU is a far larger system so that is the attraction.

Jim Galvin: Okay, so I'll follow-up then. I'll offer my perspective on the rules that UPU has; someone who has looked at this stuff because of other context and needing to understand this stuff.

I think it boils down to a few things that one could understand. First thing is that it's a heavy lead manual system when you come right down to it. It depends a great deal on people. In the end, the only thing that matters is what your local postman is able to do.

You know, but from a top-down, there's very limited rules that are required. You know, you need the country name needs to be visible in a globally recognized language which is almost always English but doesn't have to be. Past that, it's kind of like the DNS. As you get down through levels in the system, entering the country, you know, province down into the city, they can all have their own rules and do their own thing, and that's the way the system works.

And the framework that specified for who addresses look can change as you drop into each level because they can all have their own rules.

As I understand it, there's no actual translation or transliteration that goes on in the system anywhere. You know, you're obligated to present the address in a way that the destination postal person can deal with it.

And you know, there's really only guidance on what that looks like and fairly accepted ways in which we do that. So at an international level, you know, you sort of have to put a certain amount of information but not that much, you know. It really just depends on what that end person is going to do with it. If you know what that is, you just do it.

So again, I mean I just come back to my question. Not that I'm objecting that we bring someone from the UPU to describe this to us, but if we have a more specific question from them or are we just simple looking for a presentation from them on how the system works.

Man: I would say that we need more information about that system. You know, certainly, for example, a Japanese postman knows what to do with a letter which has been sent to a Japanese address within Romanization. So it's actually quite interesting to know how that is, you know, how that is working.

Yes, I feel of all of the systems though, that is the one which we would do to - I mean it actually sounds as if you have more information about it than we do. And it may be that it's just one of those things that looks attractive at the beginning and then you get into it and you find problems.

It may well be that policy we suggest has a fairly heavy manual element in some areas, you know, particularly translation.

So yes, I think really all I'm saying is, you know, it's such a large system I really would like to know more about it because I feel (unintelligible) because it could inform what we're doing.

(Rudy Vasnick): (Rudy Vasnick) for the transcript.

I think we need to go back to our (unintelligible) objectives, and it's all about the contact information which means addresses. And if I'm correct, the objective is to end up in having correct addresses for the contact information; that's the end goal. If it's in a language that we don't understand or that a large group doesn't understand or cannot read, we are looking into a mechanism that allows to translate it or transliterate it into a language that is understood.

Or am I wrong? (Unintelligible)?

(Chris Dillon): (Unintelligible). I think the initial goal is to determine whether contact information data put in by a registrant is or is not translated or transliterated. So that does not mean that anybody needs to be able to read it because then, I mean - so that's an initial hurdle that it's almost a black-and-white issue to start with; should it be done or shouldn't it be done.

If it should be done, the group can certainly recommend what should be done. For example, if a Russian person puts it in, should that be also then transliterated into (Unintelligible), right. You know, why should it just be Asky that the question it certainly would come up if it would be a yes as a next step.

If it is not translated or transliterated (unintelligible), and then you can say registrants put in the data in the language that they would like too. It needs to be verified and those people would like to access this is up to them then to find a way to translate it or transliterate it for themselves. It's just important that they be able to access the data in the language of the script that has been put in.

So that if I search for a URL in a Chinese top level domain, I'll be able to get on my computer, on my Asky computer, the Chinese letters of the person (unintelligible).

So I think the initial black-and-white should or shouldn't it be done, is the first hurdle. And then from that may follow may be different questions that the group needs to address afterwards.

Man: So I'll just comment on that very briefly and then go to Jim.

And so we have the two questions; we have about desirability. You know, should transformation be done at all? That's one question. And then you have

this other question, you know, if it should then, how should it be done effectively.

So the way I feel about it is that I'm an absolute total no is actually quite unlikely to the first question. You know, it should not be done at all. There are people that believe that the NCSG, if I'm correct, their position is fairly close to that.

However, most of the time you might be saying, you know, their might be a case where they're saying, "Generally no," but in particular for special reasons you might want to do it.

So what I'm trying to say to you is that the likelihood of us not having to answer the second question actually what it is, is very low. So we will almost certainly have to answer the second question about, you know, translation or transliteration or conceivably something else; tagging may be involved for example.

So therefore, we can, I feel, we can answer the two at the same time because the likelihood of not having to answer that question is very low.

(Rudy Vasnick): I see a queue. Jim was first.

Jim Galvin: I will yield to my colleague on the corner because she had her hand up before me and then I'll go after her.

(Nia Katani): It's (Nia Katani) from (JPhoenix). Just to introduce what we do, we run our own Whois for IP address for our community with Japan.

And related to the issue of translation, maybe a little bit preliminary to going into the details of discussions, to what extent we're going to go to translation, but we might also want to identify whether we also translate the content or just simply the field so that people know, you know, what are the contents of

the information, and they can just like look into it and do the translation themselves about the content. That's one thing I want to flag as a possible consideration.

And the second point, again, back a little bit earlier about the discussion as a reference for the UPU. Maybe this is already looked into, but I think a lot of the ccTLDs, they run their own Whois and probably supporting their own language. So that might be something that we want to look into as a reference.

Man: Thank you. Most of the time in the group we have been talking about content not fields, but I've made a note about that. We need to think about fields as well.

Yes, exists - again, existing over Whois systems, we've touched on them but that's probably another area we need to look up in more detail. Thank you.

Steve Chang: I have put in the queue.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: So Jim Galvin. I have to admit I'm becoming even more confused here now as we move along. We've tried to say a couple of times what question that we're answering and I was - and at first I was agreeing with Lars but I wanted to shape it a little differently, and after some responses I'm actually a little confused and I would appreciate some clarity on this point here.

I thought that we had two questions that we're answering in this working group. The first one being, should there be a single universal language or script used for registration data. And the answer to that will necessarily affect the answer to the second question which is should there be transformations. And then the important part of should there be transformations is who should bear the burden of that cost?

So I thought our real focus here as a primary staff is whether or not information in the system for the entire system meaning from a registrant, right, to the registrar to the registry and out the director of service should be in a single language and script or not.

And I mean if we say no then that certainly affects what we're going to say about transformations in the second question. If we say yes, then there's a very significant question that we have to answer in the second one.

And that's my characterization of the two questions that we're answering. But I haven't heard you say it in that way and so I would appreciate some clarity on what we're doing. Thank you.

Steve Chang: So Jim regarding your first questions, should it be - oh sorry, for the transcript this is Steve Sheng from ICANN Staff.

The original RD group looked into this issue, and what I think in the report it says we need to balance the capacity of the users submitting the data, right, as one of the primary motivations for internationalizing these things. And therefore, users should be able to submit registration data in their own language and encoded in the script.

Now that's a decision, it's a working group decision that has not probably gone through a PDP, so maybe this PDP working group would want to rectify that. Of you could disagree with the original already conclusion. So that's something I think Lars can provide some guidance here.

And I also want to plug in that we keep looking to the registry practices. We did a report looking survey of how registries and registrars are currently handling international registration data. And that's a document that's in a report that we published for public comment.

And I think Mark here is one of the lead authors for that. I'll also present it to this group. And I think that's a useful information point to take into consideration. Thanks.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars, just to that very point.

Yes, I agree obviously with what Steve just said. And in fact, if you read the - Jim if you read the first charter question, it (unintelligible) that very effect that registrants can or should put in the Whois data or the registration data in their own scripted set where that is desirable to translate contact information into single script. So therefore, assuming that is put into different scripts and then whether or not this should be then translated into a single one.

(Peter Jernbak): Well (unintelligible) it would be different steps we have to go through. Then I can say shortly that we have actually done the first set. And the short and clear conclusion is that is there a need? Yes, if it's possible. From that we can move forward.

Jim Galvin: I'm sorry, just a quick, yes, what is possible. Could you expand on your antecedence there so we're clear on the statement you're making saying yes too?

(Peter Jernbak): Actually I listened to both versions of the initial question, but is there a need. And there is some differences. But is there a need for translation or transliteration. And I would say yes, if it's possible. And then to kind of move forward and say in what way.

Jim Galvin: Okay, so it's Jim again. But my concern is I don't think that's the first question, okay. The first question is, is there going to be a single language or script?

(Peter Jernbak): Yes, if it's possible.

Jim Galvin: Okay, that's what your it is. Thank you.

(Peter Durmouth): This is (Peter Durmouth) for the transcript. I actually think the first question is, is it desirable for there to be either a single language or a common script?

So I think that the first question is, is it desirable, to which I heard (Peter's) response is yes, it's desirable, but now we need to look at whether or not it's possible, which informs the second question.

And the second question is not who bears the burden or which system is that, but who decides who bears the burden. That's what I understood to be our two questions.

(Rudy Vasnick): (Rudy Vasnick) for the transcript.

I've asked to put on the charter to give it clear definition. It's very clear what is mentioned there. It's whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script. I think the question cannot be clearer than this one.

Man: Yes, I think from now on we have to be very careful with these two questions. We probably need to have a slide in every meeting because it's very easy to sort of paraphrase them.

Now I would like to answer (Peter's) point. The input we have in the review tool is very mixed on this question, so it is certainly not a straight yes; certainly not.

(Juno): I have to run but I'd like to have my perspective on two issues.

When we start up with this question, we really study and in Thailand we find out that only 20% follow the domain with their local ccTLD. And we just think that hey, if TLD is all over the place how the Thai person provide contact information in Thai into the system in US or in somewhere else all over the

world, will this effect that the registrar or that registry would limit to the local boundaries only. So that's how we start to work.

How could we create the combinations that enable the latest trend to be able to file something anywhere which the registrar might have that accountability and verification required. So how could (unintelligible) find the Thai scripts language for that? That's what we do see in the initial beginning when we study.

That's why we try to help that if we need to transcript it into English, that's how we're going to do it and is it required to have that standardization helping to be sure that information provided is correct and is open up the way the registration process the domains do remain the same as it use to be in the old times and that the origin when we start off.

And secondly on my perspective on UPU is because if you want to do the verification, the post is the means of doing that very effectively. And I do see that there are a lot of manuals issued in more, they have their local syntax.

The UPU also has been adopted and discussed in the Expert Working Group in UNC facts which we led to (unintelligible) validations. They are in deliberations process of changing that.

They have the work that they call - I don't want to go into what they call (unintelligible) that every country have to use when they do this kind of international trade. And at best, it's one of the chapter including persons or a person in (unintelligible).

So I think the movement for having a common script in English and a common syntax and that (ization) is leading to that way.

I remember Rudi mentioned about that. That should be linked to the other work. And I just made it back from (Janua). The Expert Working Groups, they

are looking to adopt the UPU in the (unintelligible) validation chapters for that additional information.

Man: Thank you. Thank you very much for that input.

Yes, those who say that it is not desirable tend to use cost as the reason for that.

(Rudy Vasnick): Rudi for the transcript.

But that's an answer to the second question. So I think we need first to stick to the first question and decide if it is desirable. I think that's where we need a final decision because if it's not desirable the second question is even not worth to discuss.

It is the first question. Is it desirable? Yes or no.

(Xuen): Hi, I just have three points I want to mention. My name is (Xuen) from China.

For the first point like translation and transliteration, I use to be a Chinese teacher for international students in China. It reminded me of when I was talking to my international students in China when they were trying to find places with Chinese names and Chinese addresses.

They find huge frustrations when they tried to ask for directions when they were using translation like north, south, west, east especially. Because all those people they are asking about are just common people on the street. They are not that highly bilingual or trilingual.

So from my own perspective, it would be highly more helpful to transliterate addresses than translation.

Another point is I heard that there are test studies in Thailand or Korea or Japan but not in China. So I would try to contribute more. And also there's a colleague who regretfully can't be present today and I'm sure he would like to together with me to promote some of the studies in China if you need any contact with the Chinese (unintelligible), we would try to do that although we can't promise anything.

Another point is just considering the ICANN strategy overall, I remember they published - sorry - something - helping the under served regions in the world about Internet. So who should burden the fees of the translation/transliteration?

I wonder if this PDP will go into the direction of actually considering into aspects like developing countries registrars and registries and developing countries registrars and registries.

I remember in that report they mentioned something like asking for volunteers or something from developed countries to (unintelligible) registrars and registries in developing countries. There are surely some volunteers from those big companies that might actually help solve part of the problem.

And another point is who should decide what language or the common language it should be translated in to? I think it is - well, a fair way to discuss this issue, but I think it's in the charter of this working group, it's a common sign that English is actually the most commonly used language. So if we put English into a vote, if majority wins that maybe that will move this process faster.

Man:

Thank you for that. Just to pick up some points from that.

Certainly the sort of simple system that we have on occasion spoken about during our meetings would very much been talking about the transliteration of addresses than the translation of organizational names if there are official

translations but then transliteration if they're aren't. So that's a very simple system.

But when you look at individual cases, you will find particularly famous streets do tend to have English version. And so using that very simple system of ours with only transliteration, you are set to be ignoring that. But the locals will - yes the local people will understand that.

You raised the issue of developing countries. And I think those who say it is not desirable, those are often people who are concerned about developing countries that transformation could impose on them. So that is something we, you know, if you read the document you'll find that that comes out quite clearly in that.

As regards which common language, really - well the common language is very likely to be English. The common script would be some version of probably Asky with - actually it isn't Asky at that stage. It's going to be the Roman alphabet but perhaps there's some dire critics on occasion.

But there is also, if you go into some of the documents, mentioning the pivoting whereby it might be possible to transcribe from Chinese into English and then to pivot the Romanized English into (Sanilac) or into Greek or something like that automatically. So again, if you read the documentation, that is also an idea that comes out.

(Xuen): Sorry that I haven't been following this working group very closely but that's just something that came to my mind during this meeting.

Man: Very interesting point, thank you.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, it's Lars for the record.

So the desirability, you know, that's the first talking point, so if the group thinks why is it desirable to translate or transliterate it, surely contact ability right, so that law enforcement, IPC, Internet users, can contact the person that has registered his name, right.

Now if I'm somebody in Sri Lanka and I put it in Sri Lankan script, the chances are that I don't speak English; that's why I put it in in the first place. Anyway, there's a chance I don't speak English.

So if you wanted to contact me and you use Roman English email or any other language than my own, I won't be able to answer.

So that is where the fields would come in. Say if I want to contact somebody who put in a script in their language, (unintelligible) or not, the key is that I know what the email address is, what the street is and what the other information is. And whether it's in the original script in English is almost secondary because the person will only speak, most likely, that language that they speak.

If I'm the policy and I want to knock on their door, I still have the Chinese script open address or translation into English. Once I go to that street, my guess is that I will go with the Chinese script and find somebody who can point me to their address rather than somebody translated somewhere.

So I think is it desirable? Of course it's a good idea, it's a great to just be able to see it. But I think desirability comes with necessity like why would we want to do this and that's contact ability.

And there we only really need if you want the fields themselves to be this so we know which one is the street, which one is the name and which one is the email address. And after that, I suspect that as a lawyer, you probably will want to do the translation yourself, and as the police you will want to do the translation yourself and not rely on a third party.

I'm just putting that out there from the field translation which would make the job of the working group sure a lot easier as an added benefit there.

Man: Thank you for that. Just before going to Jim, let me just say reading the input tool, the thought crossed my mind there may have been a misunderstanding when people said it is not desirable. That's what some of the people said in the input tool; there is no doubt about that.

I mean there is almost an idea that what they were saying is it's not desirable because it would be very expensive but that was the thing driving it you see. But that is not what they wrote. So if want to pursue that one we would need to get back, and it may be stretching that point anyway. I think they were writing it is not desirable unfortunately.

Jim next.

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin for the transcript.

If we go back to what the Directory Services Expert Working Group did, right, it's work was driven in large part by defining purposes for registration data.

So to the extent that we want to answer this question in the same context, I think that that's interesting, but it does require additional work on our part to make sure that we understand those purposes and that we don't make assumptions that we actually have some real facts to consider as to the purpose of translation and transliteration in the purpose categories that the Directory Services Expert Working Group has put up there.

So since we've using law enforcement as an example, I'll just go down the path and offer the following comment.

If the goal here is that the contact data be useful for its intended purpose which is operationally that it represents a postal address that will result in a delivery to some physical destination, I think that you could make a very strong case for saying, "No, I don't want to translate it or transliterate it or transform it in any way because presumably I'm a registrant, I know how to put my address in so that it's going to get to me and I simply take that onboard."

That's what should be in the system and then anybody who wants it, asks for it and they get it out the door. And that's what you put on an envelope and it works. If you do anything else to it, you risk it not working.

And if you go looking, as the detailed study that ICANN had commissioned on translation and transliteration, solutions for doing that, one of the things that they emphasize if you want reliability in transformations, then there is some additional information that you have to be careful about. You do need the language in script tagging, but you also need context tagging; you need to know what it is that you're dealing with in order to reliably do transformations. And so that becomes a part of this puzzle too in an operational context.

So anyway, I guess my main point in that is just that however we're going to answer this question, if we're going to answer it in the context of purpose, I think that's interesting. But if we're just going to answer it in another context, let's make that decision too.

And then as a final comment, I apologize but I am going to have to duck out of here in just a few minutes. I have a presentation at ten o'clock and I don't want to be late for that. Thank you.

Man: Thank you for that.

(Rudy Vasnick): Thank you James for this input. But I want to pick up on what you were bringing to the table and probably that's a more detailed technical issue that we need to consider later on.

When you say we have to consider if it's translated or not, I would rather say, do we have to look into the fact that the data should contain data fields that allow us to have both languages in the system rather than having only one contact data field. And that's one of the aspects that is yet for me not clear and makes our decision quite difficult.

If you have the possibility to have a field for the native language and a field, as we say, for the single common language, then we have a solution because then you can for let's say the native language, use (Exsimultac) in order to define which language it is and that can solve quite a lot of problems. Anyhow, it's still something we need to explore I think.

Jim Galvin: Just a quick follow-up. Yes, to me in the solutions document about translation and transliteration, one of the observations, they made two, is if you transform the data you should keep track of that. You need to know that you're no longer looking at the original data, that it was transformed, and you should in fact keep track of the changes that you've made to it.

And so an implementation question, once we get past our questions that we're answering here, is if it's going to be transformed, should there be obligations on maintaining each of those transformations and logging, you know, what algorithm used for transformations and that kind of thing too. But I think that's a second order question and not a first order question. Thanks.

Man: I think the next question was (Unintelligible). Oh it was (Unintelligible), I've got the wrong order.

(Xuen): So this is (Xuen) speaking again. I think the point that that - I'm sorry I don't know...

Lars Hoffman: Lars.

(Xuen): ...Lars has made was very interesting because this is exactly the kind of issue that we're facing with our Whois. We provide information in both Japanese and English. So the people from overseas are able to find information to contact our Japanese network.

So that would sort of create expectations that you are able to - the person on the phone are able to speak English. But in reality, it's not so we - we want to look into what kind of this purpose that we want. So do we want the meaningful way of providing information or we just simply want to be, you know, the contact information to be visible.

So one pro that I can see of just translating this and not translating the content, it doesn't build expectations if, okay, people can speak the language, they're English.

So maybe who contacted law enforcement or whoever would be prepared to have somebody who would speak the language in their local registered information. So I just wanted to share our information.

Man: Thank you very much for that. Tony.

(Tony Harris): I'm scrabbling to finish my notes. (Tony Harris) of the ISPCP constituency.

I was involved with Whois since 2001, believe it or not. When we had the first year, we were a big working group and actually ICANN did a survey with 3500 responses from the community at large with a whole set of questions on the use and usefulness of Whois, which was quite interesting actually. And

after years and years and years and years of debate, you always come back to the same point.

The registrars do not make enough margin to have any type of costs associated to checking information or to transliterating or to do anything with it, so that will be opposed by them for legitimate reasons, for market reasons, as long as we live.

I think one possible solution - it's probably very basic and I'm sorry I wasn't in and people probably already covered this; I arrived late.

But you could have, when somebody registers a domain name, you could have a pull up but you have many Web sites and they want to book something or an air ticket or whatever, you select the language of which you're going to put in the information. So a pull up could open up, you know, multiple languages, the same field of data that you have to fill in when you're a registrant. That doesn't set any costs on the registrar at all.

And similarly, I don't see the value in transliterating because who would want to see contact information in the Whois database. It would be basically I think the major groups would be people who want to know who has the name because that should be mine, I have brand rights or "I want that name because I've just developed a product and I need it so how can I get in touch with this guy and buy it from him or send a lawyer and put him in jail," or whatever it is. That's one group.

And the other would be when there's cyber piracy or malpractices, then law enforcement will go everywhere they can to find out where they can get to the source of the problem.

So if it's in Chinese or Arabic or whatever, I mean all these organizations usually have well wide reach. If it's law enforcement, they can do it through (Interval). If it has anything to do with legal questions, normally they have a

worldwide network of IP lawyers and organizations that can do that. So that's probably one way you could do it.

And basically, I mean that's why registrars are concerned. You can register a name in Chinese or English or you could register a name in language and address and contact data, a registrar doesn't care. You could say, "I'm Napoleon Bonaparte, I live on the island of (Alba) and my address Block Number 4." And they're going to say, "Well put your credit card in. The name is free, the credit card checks, it's yours."

And they don't care. I mean they don't have the time or the money to look at your contact information.

So that's a fact of life, there's nothing wrong with it. That's the way business is handled. So that would be my comment and I'm sorry if you've already covered these things and it's just what I mentioned.

Man: Thank you very much. In fact, there hasn't been official input from the registrars but we have an idea of what they think on this subject.

Now, next one I think is (Peter).

(Peter Jernbak): Well I know that the official description is contact information, but I would say that what you really want to see when you look at the more general international translation is information. So I mean yes, this is contact information but it's used for identification information.

And as you say, whether it's Interpol or a single company with one person that needs to know for any reason, legal reason, the information, that company doesn't have that money to bring all these huge law firms. So it must be available for each one to identify.

And I like the system if we could have, if it's possible to have, the official address that is legal (amending) in the, so to speak, local language. And then an additional version that is more of identification information that is globally. And whether it's Donald Duck, but at least it's searchable to see if the same person that holds these domain names.

Man: Thank you for that. We are starting to run out of time so I think the next person is (Volk). Then Steve if you'd like.

Steve Chang: Thank you, this is Steve for the transcript.

Just following on Lars and Tony's point, in the original IRD report - because knowing that some of this issue needs to go through a policy process - what the interim effort they recommended is have the contact information in one's local language and script. But in addition to that, have a language tag, so for in the case of the consumers of the data who want to do the transformation can at least do it themselves.

So I think there needs to be some check by the technical experts here, you know, how feasible is that because for address, they generally they are more than one language, you know, and in many cases there's a mixed language of script issues so hard to tag that.

But I think it doesn't have to be all or none, you know. You could tag it and then for the consumer to do it or you could even ask the registrar to say on demand if there's a request, then this address needs to be transformed. You know, the registrar can do that. You know, those are the more options there. Thanks.

Man: Thank you very much. I think there was one last question.

(Jennifer Chung): Just a comment and it's (Jennifer Chung) for the record.

And I've heard opinions and suggestions about using perhaps maybe the field - translating or transliterating the field instead of the actual information. I think Jim mentioned before that, you know, we need to remember the purpose of providing this contact information is to identify people; identifying a person who registers the domain.

So having that in consideration, having to look at, you know, maybe we can look into just a field or even the tagging, technical aspects, that would be very I think helpful. And it would also answer a lot of the confusion for the first question.

I see that in our table, even though (Peter) mentioned before it was, you know, a definitive yes, it's actually very mixed reaction. And I think that might help or might allow other groups to decide that it would be desirable; it would be beneficial to do this tag information. Thank you.

Man: Thank you very much for that. We will certainly be revising fields.

We've now timed out. Let me just say before we close the meeting thank you very much for coming. Next week, Thursday, 13:00 UTG will be cancelled to let us just catch up with things, and we'll start off as usual the week after. Thank you very much.

Lars Hoffman: And I'll send out a (doodle pole) in the meantime to reconfirm the timing.

Man: Thank you very much indeed.

(Rudy Vasnick): And we stop using producing this interim report as a sample of what direction we want to go, especially having this initial question on the table. I think it's important that we start having a consensus whether it is desirable, yes or no, because that's the stop or go.

END