

**Transcription ICANN London
Update on Translation and Transliteration Contact Info
Saturday 21 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://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun>

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

(David): Okay so the next is translation and transliteration of contact information. And I believe we have the co-chairs of that group to talk, (Rudy) and (Chris).

Over to you.

(Chris): Thank you very much. Not too many slides, three or four slides and I'll go through them fairly quickly and then bring up a few things.

So general background to all of this is as probably most people here know is just the internationalization of the domain name system and need for standardized query of the registration data.

Also in the background reforms of gTLD directory services and requirements for internationalized registration data so that's really what's the background to all of this. Could I have the next slide please? Thank you.

So this PDP has been running weekly meetings since December 2013. And we send out a request for input on SOs and ACs.

Officially that's now closed but in fact well I'll come back to that later. We may - there may some amount of flexibility there.

There is quite a lot of other work going on in the area. And so, you know, frequently during our calls we are keeping up to date with that and it includes this feasibility study.

Yes I guess next slide please. I'll do that one.

And then so from now on we have been using a public comment review tool which is just actually quite a small document. It's not so onerous and, then obviously us now we're providing updates to this council now.

If you have a look at the slides there are a few other slides about the background to the PDP but I'm actually going to leave those out. So if we just moved to the next slide I'll ask for questions in a moment.

But before I do I just thought that I would list a few - no that's not going to work. I will list a few what we might want to call dogs that haven't barked.

So these are things which perhaps haven't come up in our review so they're perhaps, you know, we're aware. It's very interesting listening to your discussion earlier about, you know, general issues with PDP working groups.

You know, certainly there are some players who haven't been represented as much as they should have been. And, you know, certainly one group the registrars in fact who don't have input in that review tool.

Now as regards input from the GAC we have had substantial input from Thailand. They're really quite long reports, very high quality mainland China. And that's more or less it. So that's where we are on that front.

Also, you know, looking further afield beyond ICANN even we think that law enforcement could be quite interested in some of the, you know, some possible outcomes of this PDP. But, you know, obviously there's nothing in that area.

So I guess the conclusion is that the input - the input we've received has been good quality. But, you know, there may be issues about, you know, to what extent it's representative.

And so coming out of that we would like to set up some kind of roundtable in Los Angeles and that would actually get the stakeholders, you know, we could invite particular people who haven't embarked, who haven't taken part before and get them around the table.

Now just one last thing, the timescale we think that it still may be possible to keep the original timescale which is basically December this year.

But obviously the more we can, you know, the more input we can receive as soon as possible the more likely it is that we will be able to stick to that deadline.

Okay I think that was all I was intending to say about the presentation with the one exception that we continue to keep everything of importance in the wiki.

And so effectively as far as I know everything important is in the wiki. So you actually don't really, you know, you can look at the mailing list and you can listen to calls and look and read transcripts. But actually we've tried to keep everything together and we're intending to do that into the future.

And before we open it up to questions (Rudy) have I missed anything else?

(Rudy): No pretty sure you didn't. I would like to add to what (Chris) has been mentioning is what I perceive being a co-chair and essentially sitting in the back seat and allowing (Chris) to do his expertise in language which was very fruitful to our working group.

But still we have some issues that we are not able to solve. He already mentioned about the certain lack of input that we have on specific domains where we need to know what is the perception, what's the feeling, what are the suggestions of that group of people and group of participants.

And on top of that we have seen that many other working groups and PDPs are running at the same time touching up on the same domain which is the Whois data. And that impacts also our domain.

In fact what's coming up is that each of the working groups are waiting for output to be input in the other one.

Now what we hear is that you're getting in the wait situation at the end where another one is waiting because yours is done and it's bouncing back and forth without allowing us to have a real result.

And I think that is an issue that is in fact also popping up through the difficulty of having volunteers being the participants in the working groups.

I have touched upon what has been said already earlier by Marilyn also. We have a very quite specific working group. Touching up on languages is that something that you do every day. It's quite specific.

And maybe that's one of the reasons why we didn't get the right people, you know, in our working group. And I would even suggest that in the future. And maybe it's something that (Maria) can take up in the process of trying to help setting up a good participants pool for PDPs is that maybe in we have to review a little bit the charter concept of the PDPs in which we can have the aspect of observance but also the switching element.

And I'm just looking into the way of eventually having outside participants. Like (Chris) was mentioning the law enforcement is not present. It's not they are not catch up in the GAC I think so far as I know.

They are not coming up from there. But we need them in order to understand if our recommendation is for instance requiring a kind of mandatory translation that would help certainly our enforcement.

If and the other way we decide to not at all suggest and recommend translation law enforcement will look at us and say well you forgot to think about our problems.

So I think it's something that we have to try to catch up in the work we are doing. And we need to look into those that are not participating in ICANN today.

We need them tomorrow probably much more than today but it's today that we need to think about are we going to address them yes or no?

And for us like (Chris) was mentioning or at least to bring to the table in Los Angeles all participants that can help us and put on the table a good recommendation.

Don't forget that this working group is already a repetition of a previous one that didn't end up with the success.

So in order to increase our level of success we need some more help in this.

(David): Thank you (Rudy). And we'll move on to questions now. And the first question is from (Nat Ching).

(Nat Ching): Thank you (David). And thank you (Chris) and (Rudy). I mean I don't want to actually undermine the work that you have been doing. I mean actually I mean great applause that you have been - I mean taken us this long and this far.

And also maybe a quick suggestion is that I understand that you've sent out questionnaires to the groups and some did respond as you mentioned, the Thailand government, the mainland China government, they did respond well.

And some group that you have concern that you need the written - I mean the data from did not actually respond.

One suggestion I probably - probably it's I should bring it up also and I mean in the working group because I mean there is that potentially we can take a reference at other - how other working groups are doing.

I remember there are more complicated on working through like the IGO - I mean the INGO Working Group. And this actually break the question, those two fundamental questions down into maybe 20 or 30 smaller subsets and ask the - each stakeholder groups even to - I mean directly to vote on potential whether they support or they have strong support or they have less support and what will be the minority views on that?

So I guess that could be one way to actually to tackle and probably get more (unintelligible) I mean direct responses from different groups and fully agreed on the ideas and to support the ideas of getting together kind of a roundtable kind of a discussion in Los Angeles maybe actually should happen earlier.

And one suggestion that I will probably make here is that maybe this time if we do it in the Los Angeles maybe to help the participants to actually to visualize what actually will be looking like when a registrant or the registrar to access the registration data other than English how we should process this.

So maybe I know that in the initial IRD working - I mean the IRD issue report they have done some good jobs in terms of I mean screenshots couple, I mean the practices that is used by the registry.

So I would suggest that it's probably one of the options that I mean the working group can take, just my 2 cents here. Thank you.

(Chris): Thank you very much for that. We are very keen to from other working groups about, you know, how they solve some of the issues we've raised.

We have also broken down the questions into sort of - into many more questions to solve that one. And they sometimes feel will this ever end? But

yes I think we take that on board that it is fundamentally a good thing to do.
Thank you.

(David): Okay next question from Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So I guess building on what (Chris) was mentioning I think the idea of convening a roundtable in LA is a good one.

One of the issues that you raised is the ability to have different stakeholders participate in the process.

I guess just because law enforcement doesn't really have a constituency here doesn't mean that they can't participate in a working group.

The problem I guess is how we invite them and whether we have the, you know, the access or network to get them in.

So if you guys already know somebody then obviously, you know, the co-chairs are welcome to try to draw them in.

The question really is then for situations like this is there a way perhaps, you know, whether the staff team could potentially - I mean if the working group identifies a number of stakeholders that are important for the deliberations of the PDP how could we, you know, leverage the potentially ICANN staff team to say hey reach out to them, cold call or warm call whatever and try to get them into the discussion?

So that's really the question I guess we probably need to ask ourselves.

And if that's very important at least to get them on to the table at the LA meeting to voice some of the - their views on the issues.

(Chris): Thank you Edmon. I did have contact in the UK law enforcement area. But they've moved on to other things. I think there are a lot of reforms going on there.

So to cut a long story short, you know, we would be very grateful for any contact the ICANN staff may have.

(David): Thank you. (Maria)?

(Maria): Yes thanks (Chris) and thanks (Rudy), just a quick factual question. And what if any is the relation between this working group on translation and transliteration to the study to evaluate solutions for the submission and display of an internationalized contact agent?

I think that was an output of the Whois review team and I think it was one of those slightly free-floating reports that are kind of informing Whois but not directly part of the process. But some - just to really just so I can understand what if any relationship there is between your working group and between that report which is currently at public comment.

(Chris): Thank you for that. There isn't a formal relationship but we spent quite a lot of time on our call going through the report.

And with these other - with the other work in the area basically what happens is that, you know, they often present to us, we listen to what they're doing. We study what they're doing. That's really how it's working.

(David): Okay. Next up is Volker and then...

(Chris): Just answering...

(David): Or you're answering the question?

(Rudy): Yes, just a quick clarification to (Maria)'s question. In the GNSO council resolution that launches the PDP the GNSO also request a study commissioned on the feasibility of the translation and transliteration systems.

So the Whois Review Team as part of the implementation it also asks for that study. So what we do is we combine the two studies into a single study. That is the report that is currently out for public comment.

In the report I think several sections on the commercial viability and the accuracy of translation and transliteration systems those will provide input to the PDP.

And the study team has also presented the study result to the PDP team.
Thanks.

(David): Thank you for that. And we've got two people left in the queue, Volker and (Peter). And I think if it's okay we're already running late so if we can leave it there.

Volker Griemann: Okay. I'll cut it short. I have a three part question which I'll just outline putting on my hat as a bit of a heretic here.

Are you also looking at the question of desirability i.e., comparing net value of such efforts to transliterate and translate versus the cost of implementation and having to do it?

The second one is when you're saying a single common script that presumes from the discussion that I've heard here that it's English but it may not be.

I mean we could be talking (handle) or other scripts here which might not help law enforcement in Europe.

The final one, have you considered any alternatives to translation or transliteration which might serve the same purposes for law enforcement not

situated in such countries such as simple (slag) that's delineates which script is in the Whois and might help law enforcement in all countries more than the single script might help?

(Chris): Thank you very much. Well the first one has a very short answer the desire - are we considering desirability of doing it? Yes we're spending a huge amount of time doing that. It's a simple yes.

As regards to language I think there is a - there is quite a strong suggestion that the language would be English.

Also as regard to scripts there hasn't been another suggestion apart from some sort of - something based on the Latin alphabet, you know, that hasn't - we haven't really - there's hasn't really been a suggestion for any other script.

Now on the other front of, you know, things apart from translation and transliteration another word that sometimes comes up is transcription which has a sort of a phonetic element.

But I think really translation and transliteration is the important part of this. But there is a strong suggestion that tagging may be necessary.

So it may be necessary actually in databases to say to have a tag that says this is simplified Chinese or some awesome such thing because, you know, a lot of systems are not going to be able to tell just by looking at strings what language they are.

Volker Griemann: Thank you. That was helpful.

(David): Thank you. And (Peter) with the last question.

(Peter): What is up? First as I'm sitting in this working group as well I just - and I really wanted to say thanks for the really hard work you do as chairs.

As being described this is - the topic we're working with is it's closely related to other topics. And we're sometimes waiting for other groups to come up with their suggestions. And I have a feeling that some of them are actually waiting for our (unintelligible) also.

So we really need to find a solution for that so we're not stuck in this part.

And talking about stopping I mean we have now worked for six months to collect initial comments. And although we don't have any replies from some groups I don't think frankly we can wait anymore for that.

One suggestion would be to actually do a conclusion from the comments we have got and send out that for review. Because I think also that some groups that may have problems in getting into details from the start.

Once they get formal paper we're not just a number of questions but we actually these are the conclusions we have from those that have participated.

We'll probably have replies immediately from some groups say oh have we missed something? So maybe speed up the process. Thanks.

(Chris): Thank you. I think all we can do is, you know, is just continue with the constant communication with the other groups in the area.

You know, obviously if there is some easy way of doing that work, you know, we're very interested.

I think eventually we will have to just say right we can't wait any longer. We will have to run with what we have. You know, just with the caveat that we are aware this is - that it is, you know, it's we're not doing that particularly joyously. We would much prefer to have more people on board. Thank you.

(David):

Okay. Thank you. And with that we'll draw this item to a close. Thank you to (Rudy) and (Chris) for attending and answering our questions and we'll end the recording on that item.