Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
Transliteration and Translation Contact Information Working Group
Monday 18 November 2013

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://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Julie Hedlund: Good morning, everyone. This is the meeting of the wok on the PDP for translation and transliteration of contact information. Thanks to those who are joining remotely. We'll be starting in just a few minutes just to give others a chance to join. Thank you. That might be hard to do.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Update on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information. This was to be a slot for a meeting of the PDP working group, that's the policy development process working group on translation and transliteration of contact information.

However, the most important update for all of you - and welcome to those of who remotely - is that while we have a charter for the working group the charter went some recent revisions and is now before the Council with a motion for approval. And the Council will consider it at its meeting on this Wednesday, the 20th of November and which point we are hopeful that the charter will be approved and we will form the working group.

So this morning on the 18th of November we're holding this meeting to provide information to anyone who may be interested in this issue or who may be interested in joining the PDP working group.

My name is Julie Hedlund, and I am with ICANN staff supporting this working group. And also with staff we have Lars Hoffman also supporting this group, who is waving, I can't see him. And I also should note this morning we are pleased to have with us the co chairs of the charter drafting team. They drafted the charter for the working group that is now before the Council. We have Chris Dillon and Rudy Vansnick.

And welcome to you. And we have a few other people in the room here. And since we don't have many people here perhaps I could ask people to just take a moment to introduce themselves? Thank you.

Peter Durrenbach: Good morning. I'm Petter Durrenbach. I'm a member of the IP Constituency. And I'm based in Taiwan so I'm familiar with some of the translation and transliteration issues of contact information in different systems particularly in Chinese.

Julie Hedlund: Welcome, Peter. Thank you.

(Runowit Acubutra):   Good morning, my name is (Runowit Acubutra) from Ministry of ICT so I'm the (unintelligible). Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much and welcome.

Steve Sheng: Hi, good morning. My name is Steve Sheng. I'm also ICANN staff, colleagues of Julie's and Lars. My involvement in this area is there is a - another group called - chartered by the Whois Review Team implementation that is looking at determine the internationalized registration data requirements.

So one of the things the two group want to work closely and complementarily so that, you know, the issues are being addressed together in some way and to avoid overlap and such. So that's why I'm here this morning. Thanks, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Steve, and welcome. Perhaps I'll just take a moment to update everyone on this issue that is being - that is under consideration for this PDP working group that will be formed shortly.

So referring to the slides that we have in the Adobe Connect room, this particular PDP addresses two issues that were identified by the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group. That was a join working group with participation from the GNSO and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

And that group produced a report that identifies several issues relating to the internationalization of registration data. And two of those that group called out for special consideration under a policy development process.

And those two issues are, number one, who should - should local contact information be translated into one language such as English? Or should it be transliterated into one script such as Latin? And, number two, who should decide who should bear the burden to either translate or transliterate contact information?

The IRD Working Group and the GNSO Council agreed that these were two issues that needed special consideration because they are fairly complex issues. And they were singled out thus for a separate policy development process.

However, as Steve Sheng noted, there needs to be close coordination with other groups that are working on other aspects of Whois or registration data and in particular the internationalization of those data. And so the work of this

PDP working group will feed into the Expert Working Group that Steve is supporting and will be considered along with other internationalization issues.

Before I go on to the next slide, are there any questions about the two issues under consideration here? And I'm looking to the Chat room as well to make sure we don't miss anybody there.

Seeing and hearing none I will move on to the next slide, status quo and next steps. As I noted, the charter drafting team has submitted the charter to the GNSO Council for consideration. It is to be considered at the Council's meeting on the 20th of November.

Once the charter is approved the ICANN staff will send out a very broad announcement to the GNSO community to all of the supporting organizations and the advisory committees asking for participants in the working group and particular for those who have expertise in languages and scripts in internationalization issues, in internationalized domain names, IDNs, and any of the aspects that may relate to this particular PDP so there will be a wide call for participation.

And then the working group will be formed. And the working group will reach out again to the supporting organizations and advisory committees to get input. And then the working group will draft an initial report.

While I have Steve Sheng here perhaps, Steve, I might ask if you want to say a little bit more about the issues that the Expert Working Group is considering if you can?

Steve Sheng: Thanks, Julie. So the Expert Working Group chartered to implement Whois Review Team recommendations in particular 12-13. Are tasked with two thing; one thing is to determine the requirements for internationalized registration data. And the second task is to create a corresponding data model that match those requirements.

We did a community-wide call for experts I think earlier in June this year. And we have I think in late October the team was formed. Currently it has eight members with expertise in registry registrar operations, linguistic, IDMA, policy and internationalization in applications.

So the group has been working weekly - meeting weekly so far. And the group has finished - just finished its charter which I think, you know, in the interest of cross pollination, Julie, if it's possible want to forward it to this - going to be newly formed PDP working group so that we, you know, the right hand knows what the left hand is doing.

With respect to - there's another area of overlap. When the Board tasked staff to implement Whois Review Team implementation there is a specific task for staff to work in consultation with the community to do a study on the feasibility of today's available solutions for internationalized registration data service.

So one part of that project then might be - that would be useful - I think this is also aligned with the GNSO resolution when it passes, is to stuffy the feasibility - the commercial feasibility of the translation and transliteration systems.

That study will begin shortly so the contract is in the process being finalized. And it's expected to take about six months. In fact, I have Marc Blanchet - Marc, if you want to come up here, introduce yourself a bit who will be one of the researcher for this study. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Welcome, Marc.

Marc Blanchet: I wanted to be in the back. I'm now disclosed.

Steve Sheng: Yeah, so the study will, among other things, look at, you know, commercial feasibility of translation and transliteration systems. Other things we'll look at

is the amount of information lost, you know, when things are translated or transliterated. And, you know, how the perceived cost versus the benefits of things that are currently available today. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Steve. That's extremely helpful because one of the aspects of the charter is that the working group may look into the cost and the benefits of translation and transliteration of contact information so I think that the results of the study could be extremely helpful for that.

I want - and I'm cognizant that you need to leave shortly, Steve. I just want to ask if anyone has any quick questions for Steve. I know he has another meeting to go to. Rudy, go ahead.

Rudy Vansnick: Rudy speaking for the transcript. As you mentioned the study will take six months. That means that it will take several months before our PDP working group would be able to have an indication of what the cost would be from - view from that study which is going to be quite important as we reveal that in the discussions we had that registrars are eager to know but in fact they should be the indicator of what would be the cost and what the working group itself because if you allow it to be done by the working group and we know that we will not have that many people around the table it could give an indicator of cost that could be out of the ranges.

So I'm just wondering when we start this PDP working group do we already have to consider that we have to take at least six months for our work in order to be able to capture or do you think that there will be data coming earlier in the process before the end of the six months? I think that's quite important for the working group to know what the timeline is for us.

Steve Sheng: Thanks, Rudy. I hear two things just kind of play back. One thing the question you raised is the data that our study provide will be important for the PDP deliberation. And you are wondering whether there is opportunity for early input regarding the data, is that right?

The second question is, correct me if I'm wrong, it seems you are saying that, you know, registrars will be maybe providing valuable input regarding the cost but that should not be the only indicator. Is that correct? Okay.

I will take these questions. I think these are important. And thanks for raising that. I will take these questions. I will discuss with the study team and see if there are potential ways that can collaborate and provide additional data. But I can't make early promises. Yeah. Thanks. But I'll promise to get back to you on this and to Julie, yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Steve. Do you have time for one more question if there are any? Okay, any more questions for Steve? Then I would like to add one thing I think to the point that you raised, Rudy, and this is Julie Hedlund for the transcript. I apologize, I'm not introducing myself each time I speak and here I am supposed to be enforcing that rule.

So at any rate we will reach out to the Registrars and the Registry Stakeholder Groups to ensure that we have representation in this working group. I think it's absolutely essential. In fact, I was, I think, lack of representation that made it so difficult for the Internationalization Registration Data Working Group to full address this question beyond the fact that, of course, it's a very complex question.

So I do think we need full participation from the groups that might be affected by the burden of performing translation and transliteration. And so we will certainly seek to do that as staff to engage these groups. Thank you.

And thank you, Steve. I think if there's no other questions we'll let you get to your next meeting. Thank you so much for joining us.

Steve Sheng: Thanks, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: And at this point - this is Julie again - I want to mention also that we have another member of the charter drafting team who has joined us, Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: Good morning. I'm sorry I'm late.

Julie Hedlund: I didn't mean to put you on the spot.

Amr Elsadr: Sorry.

Julie Hedlund: But thank you for joining. I was wondering if it might be useful at this point, particularly for people who were not part of the drafting team if I pulled up the draft charter, the charter that is before the Council. I could put it into the Adobe Connect room.

                   And perhaps we could just run through it and also to point out some of the questions that were more recently added in the version that went to the Council. And I see some heads shaking so I'll go ahead and pull that into the Adobe Connect room; it'll just take a couple of minutes, thank you.

Rudy Vansnick: Meanwhile - Rudy speaking - meanwhile I think that Chris also and myself, having been the co chairs, I would like to point out that the difficulty of producing that charter was essentially that we didn't have all the information available and we were lucky that we had Julie helping us to go through all the difficult elements of the charter, a charter that has a lot of impact.

                   And it didn't - the first motion didn't pass due to the fact that there were some additional questions that the GNSO community wanted to add to the charter. And yesterday we had the NCSG Policy Committee meeting. And we agreed that it would - we asked our councilors to vote in favor for the second version of the draft of the charter.

                   However, during the meeting we had also Stephanie Perrin, if I'm not wrong, from the Expert Working Group, who has been giving some information that

is quite helpful. And my question is, is this working group going to be allowed to have close communication with the Expert groups so that we would be alarmed if something is going in a totally different direction. Because what I (unintelligible) yesterday is pretty sensible.

They are using the EU as a basis for some of the discussions that's going on in the EU. But the EU is not the whole world. And we have different regions with different registration to cover. So I'm really wondering where this working group is going to go in the future knowing that so many things are happening in the same domain. I don't know, Chris, maybe you have a other vision.

Chris Dillon: No, I think that's, you know, I think that's a very good description of the situation that we're in. I mean, certainly when Julie goes through the document - you know, there are some - well, you know, there are some drafting in there which is actually specifically because, you know, it was leaving things open quite a lot so it was trying to give the eventual working group lots of flexibility to act.

So, you know, so I think that does, you know, come through. But I'll flag up the various parts of it as they're on the screen and that's probably best.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie. To the point also that Rudy has raised I think it is absolutely essential that this PDP working group should have close communication with all of the groups that are doing anything that relates to Whois whether it has to do with internationalization or not.

I think the key group is the one that Steve Sheng is supporting. But there is also the Expert Working Group that is looking at the purpose of the data registry services. And that group has now come out with another report. And the work of this PDP also feeds into any policy that may come out of that Expert Working Group's work.

And one thing I think that's important to point out is of the groups that are working now on Whois data it is this group here, this working group that will shortly be formed, that is part of a policy development process. The Expert Working Groups are looking at key issues that may or may not result in PDPs.

And I think it is anticipated that, number one that this working group was started first because this is a very key element of internationalization of registry data. And any policy development process that result from the work of the Expert Working Groups will come together with the results of this PDP. So there was some urgency in getting this PDP started first.

And then I think we need absolutely close coordination and liaisons with this other group. I think - and I don't want to speak for him so I won't say this for sure.

But Jim Galvin, who is the leader of the Expert Working Group that's looking at the internationalization of registration data I think is interested in joining this PDP working group which I think would ensure very close cooperation between the groups in addition to the fact that Steve and I are colleagues working together. And as staff we'll make sure that we are coordinated as well. Thank you.

And so for the benefit of all of you here and also in the room, I have put the charter into the Adobe Connect room. And if you all don't mind perhaps we could go through the charter and look at the various elements for those who may not be familiar with it.

And of course I'd be very happy to hear Chris and Rudy give their views as to how we arrived at particularly some of the questions that are in the charter. Is there anything that, Rudy, you or Chris, you would like to say before I get started?

Chris Dillon: Actually not so much about the charter. This is Chris speaking. It's more or less - it was more about the previous thing about the working group on the purpose of the data registry services. Now for me depending on the purpose the costs come out of that.

So it was almost it was a hierarchy there and depending on the purposes then, you know, some purposes are going to be very expensive, others are not. So for me that's actually really key.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Chris. And since we have - I was going to say since we have Amr here I was going to see if you wanted to say anything but he's busy at the moment.

Amr Elsadr: (Unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Amr. I have that prerogative. So let me then turn to the charter. And so we are looking first at Section 2. And that is the mission purpose and deliverables. I didn't mean to give short shrift to Section 1 but we have sort of mentioned it and that is that - I don't know why this is not scrolling right.

But Section 1 just talks about, you know, essentially when it will be approved, which we put in a preliminary date of the 20th of November. And then just to note there will be a liaison established from the GNSO Council to this working group. And that liaison will be a - likely be a councilor but who also will be a working group member. And that is something that will be decided on Wednesday as well.

But looking at Section 2 and I think what I'll do is I'll stay and keep this synced so I'll move through it. As I mentioned previously this PDP is the result of an issue report that was provided to the GNSO Council on 17-October, 2012.

There were three issues identified by the Internationalized Registry Data Working Group and that was whether it is desirable to translate contact information into a single common language or transliterate contact information into a single common script and who should bear the burden of this translation or transliteration. And the IRD asked whether to start a PDP to address these questions.

And the Council did indeed decide to initiate a PDP on the 13th of June, 2013. And following that the charter drafting team was established and that team, led by Chris and Rudy, and with participation from Amr and also Yoav Keren and Volker Greimann, established a charter.

There were actually two versions of the charter, just for a little bit of background. The first one did go to the Council earlier in the fall. And during that discussion the Council - members of the Council asked for some additional work on the charter.

And that was done quite quickly in the last few weeks. And we'll point out some of the additional information that was added to the charter as part of that process.

Moving to the mission and scope, the PDP working group is tasked to provide the Council with a policy recommendation on the translation and transliteration of contact information. And as we noted this will be considered by the Expert Working Group that Steve Sheng was talking about previously. And also in that group is, you know, is working on data requirements and a data model for registration data directory services.

And so, again, the charter reiterates the two issues that I've mentioned already. And the charter provides some background relating to the issue that text requesting content returned by Whois historically were encoded using US American Standard Code for Information Interchange, otherwise known as ASCII. And this is based on the English alphabet.

And I'm not going to go through all of the text that's in the charter. That would be very boring I think for all of you. I'm assuming that you can read this. And of course these documents - this one currently is not loaded in the Adobe Connect room but I'll see that it is so that it is available to people remotely after the fact.

But I would like to move down to some key questions. So - and actually I'm going to move down to Page 4 because I'd like to get to the questions that were added in the most recent iteration of the charter.

So I am on Page 4 in the middle of the page. And I'm looking at the questions that follow the text, "Finally, as part of its discussion on this first question that working groups should also consider discussing the following questions." And by the first question that is the first issue that is whether it is desirable to translate or transliterate contact information.

So we have five questions that were added here. And these, I think, are to tease out a little bit more some of the complex issues involved in translation and transliteration.

At this point, and now that I have these questions up I guess I would like to see if Chris and Rudy have comments they'd like to add. Thank you Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Julie. I do indeed have. One of the explanations which I mentioned earlier which I'd like to bring up at this point and that is if you go through the earlier parts of the document what I hope is clear is that it may be that we're not looking at a binary situation where information is either translated or transliterated. Those are options, yes.

But I hope this is drafted so that some parts of the information may be translated and other parts may be transliterated. I really hope that's what's coming through here. But this is a very good time to bring this up because,

you know, we're just kicking the, you know, the options coming up so often that I think it's really important to stress that.

And that's effectively one of the areas where we wanted to give the working group freedom to decide which parts could fall into any of those three ways of going ahead really.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Chris. Rudy or Amr, now that...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yeah.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, this is Amr Elsadr. Yeah, Chris, so a good point and I think that was a very good addition to the charter because I think this is pointed out in one of the bullet point questions that was added whether it was a good idea whether it was mandatory to transliterate and or translate contact information across - for everyone or just in certain geographic regions.

I would like to point out a few things that I did discuss with the NCSG Policy Committee. And Rudy is right, we did recommend that this - we did recommend our councilors to approve this charter.

But I do have a view comments and let's say they are borderline concerns with the way the charter - and especially the additions are drafted. And I would just like to put it on the record here and now - and I hope we can convey some of this to the working group once it convenes.

Well let me start first by saying that the charter does explicitly mandate the working group to consider all other Whois work. And that's a good thing. And the gives us quite a few examples including that Expert Working Group on gTLD Registration Services.

But coming to the bullet points on Page 4 which were the additions made after this had initially gone to Council - and I mentioned this during the first GNSO working session the first question about weighing the balance between the benefits of translation and transliteration of contact information versus the costs.

I personally believe that this will be a very difficult question for the working group to answer and I feel might not be fair to ask them to do this. Although I do agree it's a very good question and it should be answered. But putting it in the charter way it is right now I just might expect that there might be some trouble with this.

And I think this might be a good thing to bring up early on in the working group and let them know that, well, it may be just good enough to try to sort of give an estimate of this and just sort of what potentially might be the issue.

But trying to really nail it down is something that I believe if we insist on the working group might come back to us saying, well, we've tried and we lack the capacity to do this at this point.

The second comment I have is regarding an addition on the next page, which is Page 5, which is - which reads, "As part of deliberation on who should decide who should bear that cost of translation/transliteration working group members might also want to discuss who they believe should bear the cost bearing in mind, however, the limits and scope set in the initial report of this issue."

One of the mandated missions of this working group will be to decide on who decides doe the - bears the cost of the translation and transliteration. And yet we put this in here. And I think it's understandable that some folks, especially on the Council, might be concerned about what these costs might end up being and who's going to end up paying for them.

And - but looking at these comments here these three lines in the charter, the new draft, I guess this is what we're asking the working group for here is just sort of an - to go into a bit of an advisory role.

Yeah, and because they're not - the working group per se is not going to decide who is going to bear the cost; they're going to decide who decides on bearing the cost. So but we are asking them to deliberate on this and provide some insights based on the work they are doing.

And I'm guessing that this is going to be based on the discussions on the benefits versus the costs and who the benefits will actually - who will reap the rewards of the benefits. But I just wanted to point that out.

And I think it is important that members of the drafting team who hopefully do join the working group point these things out. And I think I'm good for now. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Amr. I think I see several people who want to speak so I'd like to start a queue. I think Peter, you - I have Peter. I have Chris, Rudy so we'll go in that order. Peter, Chris and Rudy. Peter, please.

Peter Durrenbach:This is Peter Durrenbach from the IPC. And just a point of clarification that might be addressed by some of the co chairs is can the working group just address an issue more generally in terms of identifying the general benefits of this in light of the cost?

Acknowledging that there are costs but not doing any kind of detailed cost benefit analysis because I think potentially that could be a rabbit hole that we would never come out of. So having not participated in early working groups I just had a question of clarification about if that is the charter then the working group should address that.

But could it be done more generally in identifying what the benefits are, who they appear to - who appear to reap the bulk of those benefits and then that might inform the discussion of who should decide who should pay.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Peter. Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. This is Chris Dillon speaking. Yes, this seems to be quite a complicated network of interconnections here. One thing that really comes up is what the difference between the various purposes to doing this work and the benefits of it.

Now I'm hoping that those two are going to be pretty close but for me that's really the issue so exactly, you know, if - and I suppose you might have some benefits on group that are almost side effects. But fundamentally I guess you're looking at things which are matching the purposes and benefiting those.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Chris. Rudy.

Rudy Vansnick: Rudy speaking. During the last calls we had in the drafting team we have been trying to figure out if the best approach would be to try to work with a kind of matrix which would allow to address part of your question, if we can define groups that are particularly impacted by the translation then you could make it much easier to define also costs that are related to that group and would probably not affect other groups.

So we didn't have the time to go more in depth during the drafting session. And I think it's something that I would personally propose in the working group to try to start up defining a matrix with all affected groups and then try to give priority to those groups and see where do we need to have more information to be able to ask for the questions.

It's not a small group we are addressing; it's a huge group of people who are going - people and organizations who are going to be affected as Chris was highlighting.

My first reaction even was - and I discussed that even with Amr yesterday, something that came up in my mind as a kind of proposal that will not fit in this working group, I imagine, is wouldn't the solution be to try to create a kind of subset of the Whois data where you would find nonnative language information, first of all, and that would be made available for specific groups, targeted groups that want to have that information rather than making it public for everybody.

But just for instance, as a sample, law enforcement or other groups that have to look into, for instance, the intellectual property and so on that they have the chance to go and I'm a bit referring to the trademark clearinghouse sample that you could make it easier to define what is the cost and who is going to pay for it.

It's something that came up in my mind yesterday. I don't know, Chris, if you have any?

Chris Dillon: I like that - I like that approach very much. I mean, you know, it goes back to, you know, if we were - if the purposes of coming out of the other working group were largely security purposes that might be a really good way forward I think.

Rudy Vansnick: And just to add to that is that it's a bigger reflection from what I heard yesterday also from Stephanie Perrin who is the Expert Working Group for the RDS. That in fact there was also the question of should the Whois data be spread over or is it just going to be located in one location? There were a lot of ideas and it's still not clear what way it would go.

And that purpose, having subsets, would help already say okay that's data that can be centralized. And, you know, because it's not a huge group of data while others may have to be spread like the native language registration information should stay when it is for China, for instance, that it stays in China or in Asia. It's with that in mind that I was thinking about what about the idea of having a subset?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rudy. Thank you, Chris. That's a very interesting concept. Somebody else want to comment on the thought - the suggestion that Rudy has made?

Amr Elsadr: A question, I'm sorry, Peter? Yeah, this is Amr. Your suggestion for a possible scenario on answering the question of cost versus benefit, I personally imagine that that is exactly what is going to happen once the working group starts to try to answer this question unless we manage to attract some folks with some serious insight on how to estimate the cost of translation and transliteration of contact information.

And I think that would be great if we could answer this question. I think it would be wonderful. I think it's a good question to ask. But I do imagine that the scenario you refer to on determining what the benefits are, who will enjoy them versus some sort of cost, some sort of - I imagine that would be it.

On Rudy's suggestion I - well, I'm a fan of less Whois, to be honest, and not more Whois. I think, well, IPC folks are great intellectual property rights. There are some law enforcement is awesome but I am more in favor of less Whois across the board and more privacy and less exposure and less information.

And I do imagine that, well, the dynamics of Whois is changing at the moment; it will change further once there's a PDP on the new model suggested by the Expert Working Group on registration data. So I'll have to

keep a close eye on that and see how the work of this working group will fit in there. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Amr. I think I'm coming from the same place on that. You know, the - you know, this idea of nebulous people using information for I wouldn't know what kind of purposes is rather dreadful.

No, the way forward is, you know, is certainly to stay small and stick to the purposes. And I'm certainly, although as I say, I come from a similar place. I have no problem with doing something which - let's just take a concrete example, it's certainly easier.

So, okay, let's imagine that we've got a company somewhere in Tokyo and, you know, frankly to contact them you've got to know Japanese otherwise you're sunk.

I think it's - I think it's reasonable and I'm - I'm presuming a lot of things by saying this, I think that - I think it's reasonable that presuming we are doing this for security reasons but we provide to - just going to make it easier for people to contact them if something, whatever that's going to be, goes wrong. I have no problem with doing something like that.

Julie Hedlund: Any other comments? One thing I will point out getting back to the issue of - well, really the issue of whether or not, number one, the working group is mandated to look at the cost and benefits it does say here that is part of its deliberation on who should decide who should bear that cost of translation and/or transliteration.

Working group members might also want to discuss who they believe should bear the cost. Bearing in mind, however, the limits in scope set by the initial report. It is not for this working group to decide who should bear the cost. And while the working group can discuss this they may not make that determination. The issue report is quite clear on that point.

And, secondly, there is the study that Steve Sheng mentioned at the beginning of this meeting - and I think, Amr, I don't think you had the chance to hear all of that. But there is - there has been a group commissioned to do a study. The contract is nearing its - nearly done with the negotiations so that work should start very soon. It is envisioned to take six months. That is an issue I know that Rudy pointed out earlier.

And that is a feasibility of translating and transliterating contact information. One would expect that the feasibility would take into consideration the various methods that one might use to do this and perhaps also the costs involved in using those methods.

And I think, as Rudy pointed out, and Steve Sheng agreed to take back to the Expert Working Group is the sooner that this PDP working group can get any information on feasibility and cost the better because this working group, unless it did have access to this information itself, which is unlikely and even if we have registrars and registries participating they may not be able to share information that might be proprietary with this working group.

Although they might be able to share it under a nondisclosure agreement with those conducting the study so there might be a way to get that information. It may take some time depending on how long the study takes. And I think that's part of the reason why this PDP was stated before all the other work because of the complexities of it and the need to take time to gather information.

So, Amr, I don't know if you have questions about that because you didn't have a chance to hear some of the things that Steve Sheng said before you were able to join. If you don't, that's fine, but I just want to give you that opportunity. Okay.

So I think there's some very interesting issues that have been raised during this discussion. I hope that it is useful. Even though we don't have our official working group there clearly is a lot to be said. And we will, as staff, move quickly to establish that working group as soon as the charter is approved.

I'd like to give everyone a chance to make some more comments. We do have plenty of time. I'll start a queue. I think I saw Rudy first. I have Amr. Who else do I have in the queue? And, yes, so let me start with Rudy please.

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Rudy speaking. My first question is about timing so that we have an indication when we are expect to start doing the work and what would be the timing and the frequency of calls in order to be able to schedule my agenda with other discussions that are going on. I think that's something that you can probably help us most of - thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. I'll wait and let everybody speak and then I'll try to address the questions. I have Amr and - I've got two other people in the queue but I'll go to Amr next.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Julie. This is Amr. I have to questions for you actually. First - and I apologize if I've missed this but the last draft of the charter I got was the one without Chris's suggestion of adding a question at the end on when the working group thinks this policy, if implemented, when it should be implemented.

So I was hoping we could get - if we haven't already because I looked for it and I couldn't find it. During our last call Chris had suggested adding that - a fifth bullet, I believe. So if you could circulate that I'd appreciate it because I couldn't find it and I think it would be helpful just to provide our councilors with the latest draft before they vote on this charter.

My second question, early on in the discussions of the drafting team we had suggested identifying elements of the contact information to be translated and

transliterated. And you had suggested that there would be another PDP dedicated to this. I was just wondering when this would happen? Do you recall this? Does anyone remember this?

We had suggested adding this as an element in this charter. And, Julie, if I'm not mistaken you said that there would be a separate PDP addressing that question of what the elements are in the contact information that would be translated and transliterated. Yeah, thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Amr. I'll go to Chris and then I'm taking note of all - I'm sorry, I'm sorry, this gentlemen first. Please go ahead.

(Runowit Acubutra): It's (Runowit) from (Titleman). So I have some of the points that I would like to raise because it's not only the issue that's who do the translation. I think the experience we have because we came from the country that is not using any ASCII (unintelligible) and even though the contact information looks (unintelligible) but a problem is there are no international standards that (unintelligible) to the contact information in really a detail.

For example, the geographical names and locations even a country name and city name they are two international standards, ISO 3160, that's one, that's two. And you indeed (unintelligible) and both of these standards refer differently in - you're talking about IDN, they tend to follow the United Nations expert on geographical names.

But when it come to new gTLD they follow the ISO 3166-1 and dash 2. The key point I'd like to raise is that the registrar or registry or the registrant giving the information and the intricacy of the information is very important.

In Thailand I can tell that even Bangkok, that you know, it doesn't exist in the United Nation group of expert name, they call (unintelligible) because they're using the phonics.

And this is binding by law because we have the national contact point of United Nation of group of experts on geographical names. All the road and the cities and all the (unintelligible) and it's not only Thailand is where affect the complex grammar structure groups like Laos, Cambodia, Burma and even some of the (unintelligible) collective because the way you spell is the friendly.

So we know that it's our problems and I hope that the PDP working group is aware of how to encourage the local government to assist because a stakeholder in one country maybe one or two and that's why I'm sitting here and try to learn and how could we helping to be sure that the information that they all put it in, they don't need to do it again so it's that bore the cost and which direction we will go so that are the points I can make. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Those are very important points. Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. I'll do my thing the other way around so that it works more nicely because I have some comments on that. I think the - what I would really like to say here is that validation is a huge issue because, you know, if you've got an address in London the validation algorithm looks at London, goes ka-ching, it's London, no trouble.

You then got a situation like Bangkok and (unintelligible), you know, which is much more complicated. But once you get out into the countryside even in countries where there are standards, you know, governments have actually decided this will be done this way, this will be done the other way, you know, very often you may have more than one standard that is really common.

Even in Japan there are maybe three or four different standards. And what you actually see when people Romanize place names in remote areas particularly you actually get this horrible mixture of standards, yeah, the just wince as you look at it because people have got really confused.

You know, there was a really common standard that everybody used and then the government (unintelligible). This happened in Korea as well. The government (unintelligible) said, no, we're stopping that standard, we're starting a new one and that causes chaos.

Obviously there are then countries which have no standards at all. So what we're really talking about here is validation trouble, capital VT. And then going back to I think it was now somebody, I'm afraid I've forgotten who it was, raised the issue of timing and frequency. I think it might have been Rudy.

And okay so frequency I would certainly like to suggest that a similar approach is taken with the actual working group as we talked during the charter and that is simply that you start frequent and then as things become more easy to manage you drop down from once a week to twice a month, to once a month or however that would go. But I think in the early stage probably you're going to need more meetings.

And as regard to timing, yeah, I mean, the fact that the cost information looks as it's going to take a very long time to acquire may cause some delay but, you know, fundamentally as soon as possible I would like to suggest.

Julie Hedlund: Does anybody have anything else that they would like to add before I address the questions and issues that have been raised? Thank you. And this is Julie Hedlund for the transcript.

So timing I agree with you entirely, Chris. Once the working group is formed then the first task we will have is to establish timing. And I think that group can decide weekly, biweekly. It's entirely up to the working group. And actually I think the very first order of business would be to select a chair, cochairs, vice chair, you know, whatever and then to set the schedule for the meetings.

And then, I agree, I think moving quickly to do as much as can be done whilst understanding that there will be a study on the feasibility. I think there are plenty of other things that could be done, the matrix I think that Rudy mentioned.

And I think also the very practical first step of establishing a timeline for deliverables and perhaps subgroups depending on how large a working group we have to work on various aspects to be able to split the work. We may have calls to support the subgroups, that's also a possibility. We have a lot of flexibility with how we can do this.

The one point I would make is that the timing is perhaps a bit unfortunate in that we will get this charter approved and then dive in in December into holiday season which is more significant for some countries than others, depending on which countries are involved. So we'll have to take that into consideration and we may have to adjust the schedule a bit accordingly.

As for the latest version of the charter, the final version that includes the fifth bullet it was sent to the - this - the drafting team. And it also is linked or should be, and I will check to make sure this is the case, it should be linked to the motion so the motion should have a link to the latest version. But I will check that, make sure it's correct and I will also send that link around to the drafting team list.

And as for the - the group that is looking at the internationalization of the various elements of all of the Whois data, that is actually the group that Steve Sheng is supporting led by Jim Galvin. It's actually not a PDP stage, it is the Expert Working Group.

It is actually developing a model for internationalizing registration data. In the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group that produced the questions from which this - this PDP working group will be looking actually

had a - also requested a data model for the internationalization of all the elements of a registration data directory service.

So that would be in addition to the translation and transliteration of contact information. And I should note that contact information and those elements are actually defined in the RAA. And so when we start this working group on of the first things we will look at is what is contact information as defined in the RAA and it's very specific.

So we'll have to start with a very clear set of data that we will then - the working group will understand is the set of data that would be considered to be translated or transliterated.

And that, you know, that includes things, you know, elements of the address. And it's very - it's laid out. And I think that gets to the point also - points that have been made here about standards and that there are international standards that are not necessarily followed in different countries. I think we will very definitely need to look at existing standards, how they are applied or not.

And then to Chris's point the very, very difficult issue of validation which to an extent crosses over into the area of purpose, the Expert Working Group that's looking at the purpose of data because the degree to which you say that the information you were receiving is accurate and validated may depend on your use of that information, if you're a law enforcement official you will want to be perfectly accurate and, you know, to be validated.

If you are - if I was just out of curiosity wanting to see, which I can do now on the Whois with probably a low degree of accuracy depending on what I'm looking at, but if I want to see who owns a certain domain name I can call up that information probably with the understanding because I know that it's really not likely to be validated or even accurate.

So to some extent I think some of the issues of validation may be outside of the scope but - of this working group. But the issue of validation of contact information when it is translated or transliterated I think is very definitely within the scope of this working group and it's a difficult issue that this group will have to look at.

I think we're all deciding here that - and correct me if I'm wrong - but this working group will have a difficult task, a very important one. And I'm already seeing that we have a very good group if all of you who are here are interested in participating or at least those of you who are interested in participating. And I think we also need to make sure we get some very deep experience and broad representation in this group, which we will certainly seek to do as staff.

And I encourage all of you if you have anybody that you think might be interested in this group and have expertise that would help this working group please let me know. Please send me names because that will be our next task to reach out.

And when I say we'll send an announcement I'm not - staff will not just send an announcement; we will go to the people that we know in the community and say, hey, this is an important effort. Please let us know who you think might want to participate.

I want to - we're getting close to time here because I do want to let people have a chance to get to the welcome ceremony. I want to ask if anybody has any final comments or questions. Thank you.

Rudy Vansnick: Rudy speaking. A last question. Is there a minimum number of participants required in the working group?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rudy. This is Julie. There is no minimum number but I think the charter makes it clear that this group needs to be broad. At the very least we

will seek to have a representative from each of the stakeholder groups and from each of the constituencies.

We would also like to have someone from each of the supporting organizations and advisory committees. And so that's what we'll strive to do to have at least broad participation from all of the SOs and ACs and their constituent groups and stakeholder groups.

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr. I believe that there is some sort of process involving the Council. And I believe, if I'm not mistaken, this was discussed on the SCI - on the Standing Committee Improvements Implementation of whether a PDP might be suspended if it does not attract the necessary amount of participants.

So I'm not sure about the - I'm not sure the details of this but I do believe that there is some sort of process that does exist. We would have to look into it to answer Rudy's question. But if a working group or if a PDP does not attract the required number of volunteers I believe it is the Council's prerogative to suspend it.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Amr. Actually there is a very definite procedure in the PDP manual for suspension of a PDP. It's a fairly detailed process. A PDP cannot be suspended without a justification. There are a number of reasons that a PDP can be suspended. I don't recall if lack of participation is one of those.

But if there - if a PDP is to be suspended the Council has to give a written justification that covers a number of issues as to why that PDP is being suspended. It can't simply just disappear. But thank you for that. And we'll certainly check into that. We hope we won't come to that because we will try very hard to get our participation but thank you for that.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. This is Chris speaking. I think, you know, we - talking about this this morning we have noticed just how many areas are, in some way, involved with this. There are a lot of areas. I think we should (unintelligible) if

we, you know, if we cannot get vital data from a particular area. And, you know, effectively we get stuck that could happen here.

And so that's why the, you know, that's why the sort of outreach thing at the beginning is very, very important.

Julie Hedlund: Any other comments before we close this session? I see none remotely but I'll give everyone here any chance for a last comment. Seeing none I do want to thank everyone here and everyone remotely for joining us today in this important meeting.

And thank you very much, again. Also we will be posting the transcript and the audio link to the - this node on the ICANN meeting schedule. And I will say, from Julie Hedlund, that this meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

END