

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
Translation and Transliteration Contact Information PDP WG Update to the
Council meeting
Saturday 07 February 2015**

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/#feb>

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

(David): All right, okay. The next item on that is translation and transliteration of contact information for the PDP working group update. So I would like to welcome the co-chairs of that group (Chris) and Rudy and please let us know what's going on.

(Chris): Thank you very much and could we have the next slide, thank you and the one after that too. Okay I'm in order to save time I'm not going to read all these things but just pick up a few things.

We tend to use the word transformation rather than translation or transliteration because life is too short to be tossing that thing out the whole time.

Then the timeline is quite important. We started in December 2013 and we're hoping the final report will be in May this year. We have just released (unintelligible) in this report and received over ten public comments about that.

Then an important point, working group has always been and remains open to everyone and there are some details about contacting us there and also on the left (unintelligible) the next one please.

So here are the key arguments on both sides and I think generally speaking again I'm not going to read all of these out to save time but generally speaking what's happened is that as time has gone by we've had more and

heavier arguments on the opposing mandatory transformation side, there's no doubt about that.

Although admittedly during the comments, you know, the other side the pro mandatory transformation side did become a little stronger than it has been, you know, throughout the process.

Yes I think rather than fishing out various things from that, that's going to take too long so let's move onto the next slide. Okay and here we come to our recommendations.

So, you know, as you may have guessed from what I was saying a moment ago no mandatory transformation that's really part of it. Then in the new RDF and this particular recommendation the second one may need to be slightly more tightly drafted than it is at the moment.

But basically the idea is that whatever happens on the transformation front that the contact data would - you would definitely know what language it was in. So that's what the tagging is about there, so that tagging is there to say this is in Mandarin, Chinese.

And, you know, we feel that it's good practice whether there is transformation or not, you know, the idea of a database where you've got data and you don't know what language it's in is not really very useful.

So then moving onto number three, submit data in language or script used by registrar. It has been suggested, a suggestion that that should be supported by the registrar. That still needs some debate. And then registrar verification there at the bottom, according to the RAA and correctly (typed) I think I have already mentioned and next slide please.

Okay so I've already mentioned some of the impressions from the public comment, you know, as we were saying 11 comments. I think, you know, over quite a wide area, you know, really several communities voicing opinions there.

The majority are in support of the recommendations. Those opposing are so they are the business constituency IPC and Rudy I've forgotten one, there are three of them, anyway yes actually the main one is IPC and business constituency.

And okay so they are generally concerned with the need for transparency. Those supporting the recommendations are concerned with cost, you know, just balancing the cost and benefits and actually feasibility.

I'd like to put some weight on that. One thing this is not controversial I think everybody believes that Whois data must be machine readable. So what we don't want is a, you know, images of Chinese data or any other data, that those images are really very unhelpful so it definitely needs to be machine readable.

Okay and then some concerns raised about the place of this policy development places within the (unintelligible) Whois reform efforts but I would like to stress that we have spent a lot of time reading everything that we were aware of that was relevant and we can continue to do that.

We also have, you know, certainly people putting a lot of time into coming and seeing us and attending our meetings. So, you know, we really have done something to balance that.

And next slide please, and there is the initial report it's quite a short report. You can see the public comments there; there is also a summary document. There is also a Webinar, which is basically a short or rather a more detailed explanation to what I've just been saying.

But if you want absolutely everything we have been very careful to put as much stuff into the Wiki as possible. There's the address for the Wiki as well. Any questions please?

James Bladel: Hi, can you go back to your slide with the squares, six. Yes there we go. So I just want to point out that one of the other I think principles that I think this is captured also in the registrar stakeholder group comment is one of the reasons that we support the idea that translation, transliteration should not be mandatory is that it really has nothing to do with feasibility or cost benefit.

It has more to do with the principle that the information provided that goes into Whois is provided by the registrant and they are responsible under threat of losing their domain name to keeping it accurate and maintaining that.

And if they give that to the registrar and the registrar changes that information who is now responsible for that data? They can't be anymore, is it us, is it Google because we use Google to translate?

I mean it's really a question I think that the working group should at least examine is this chain of responsibility of ownership I think, you know, Stephanie is going to smack me for using the wrong word here but ownership of that data (unintelligible) if it's altered against, you know.

So I guess that's my question is for those supporting and the comments supporting mandatory translation, transliteration is this question encapsulated in those comments of now who is on the hook for maintaining that and making sure that it's readable and accurate and that the translation is accurate because I don't know the answer to that.

(Chris): Thank you very much. I think the hope in the working group will solve all of these problems and I have to say to you that that is - there are five or six issues, which are quite similar to that.

If you look at the report you can see what they are. But there are issues around the sort of, you know, whose responsibility - who is responsible for, there are five or six of these things that are really difficult to answer.

One could almost say that that in itself is almost an argument against transformation because as soon as you do it you end up in this situation.

James Bladel: Well it certainly I think raises an interesting scenario if someone were to for example lose a domain name based on having invalid Whois information and the invalid Whois information was information that they didn't provide.

I think that is really the scenario that I'm getting at is that, you know, is it now who is responsible for restoring that domain name if their original information was accurate in one language but has now become invalid in a transliterated...

(Chris): Thank you.

James Bladel: ...it sounds like it's something you are...

((Crosstalk))

(Chris): Yes and as I say there are a cluster of issues there that's interrelated. Now I know that there was a question over here I'm not sure whether I've missed any, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record.

(David): Thank you Susan, could I remind everybody to say their names for the transcript as Susan just did.

James Bladel: Sorry that James Bladel with the previous transcript, I'm very bad at that today, sorry.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I did read this report but it's been a month so I may have just not remembered all the points. But do you envision that going forward a registrant can choose any language in any character set in the whole wide world to enter into the Whois record?

(Chris): Basically the idea would be that registrants would be free to register their contact data in their language. And so I guess the short answer is yes.

Susan Kawaguchi: So how does that work if there is no transformation, you know, that's not mandatory and, you know, even just the simple mechanics of the registrar taking that information but may not be able to read it and may not have the character set, you know, implemented on their site?

It just seems like if we don't have some sort of - pick some sort of universal character set that it's transformed to then I think that would be difficult for the registrar and the registry also.

And we made this point in our comments but, you know, I can see, you know, privacy and proxy right now is a haven for misuse. This is just going to be another way for the bad guy to leverage the Whois record and use it to their advantage to not be contacted.

So I mean I can understand some things couldn't - may not be able to be transformed but having a universal and whatever we decided as a community, pick that universal language having, you know, maybe they could enter it into their own, in their own character set.

But then it has to adhere to a certain standard too would be helpful in improving the Whois record.

(Chris): Thank you, so I mean hence the possible modification supported by any language but supported by the registrar is part of the answer to that.

Rudy Dekker: Can I just briefly add to that (Chris)?

(Chris): Yes.

Rudy Dekker: So I think it's important to point out. So the short answer in fact Susan to your question is I think it's more no than it was yes. Not any - you can't just choose the language.

So it is that as a registrant, you pick a registrar to buy your domain name and whatever language that registrar supports for their own business purposes, which might be Ascii or it might 100 different scripts.

The registrar or the registrant can then enter the data in the script that the registrar offers and supports. The verification for that as it is now with Ascii or with the registrar so they are obliged to a (unintelligible).

If they want to operate in Mandarin Chinese or in pick your script then they're responsible to be able and the same obligation now is to verify that. And so the idea is that the market will push the registrar's to offer script in different languages so people from countries that don't speak any Latin can actually register their Web site.

But they need to verify in the same way and rather than having a registrant who doesn't speak Ascii put in their name Latin script and that being more likely incorrect than being able to put it in the script that communicate with the registrar on the Web site by the domain and that's it.

(Chris): Thank you (Makaley).

(Makaley Neilan): (Makaley Neilan) for the record. Speaking in my capacity as a registrar and somebody who did submit comments on this, just for those of you who haven't read all the comments or aware of things I mean you have to recognize that transformation, transliteration, translation or anything which touches on the Whois data or any of the data provided by a registrant is also touching on matters of national sovereignty.

It's also touching on matters of culture, it's touching on matters of cultural sensitivities. I am Irish, I am subject to Irish law, which may include the Irish

Constitution but I'm not (unintelligible) from 1937, which gives me the right as an Irish citizen to conduct my business (unintelligible) or (unintelligible).

It's with the Irish language, it's with the English language and my clients do choose to do so. It is perfectly legal within Ireland for somebody to have their (unintelligible). All my documents are in both languages, I can have my address in the Irish language (unintelligible) not (unintelligible), which is the English language.

You know, the old kind of 800 years of foreign rule. We had a couple of rebellions, War of Independence, we even had a Civil War as well just in case the Americans think that you're the only ones who have ever had a Civil War.

And addresses in Ireland are available in both languages. I mean Lars have covered it I mean obviously some of the ccTLDs, this is dealt with. (Unintelligible) for example you specify which language you support.

So if you were Chinese and you were using a Chinese script and you wanted to register domains and interact with us you would have difficulty we don't support it sorry and we're not going to.

But if you want to come to us and you want to interact with us in the Irish language fine you want to interact with us through French or Italian or possibly some other language within Europe we're going to do it.

But expect - but for us to start screwing around with the contact data provided by our clients, if they choose to do so in the Irish language would put me straight up against the Irish Constitution, which to be perfectly honest ICANN should not even attempt to force me to do, thank you.

James Bladel: So just another thought here I think I heard Susan mention something about a universal language. Are we presuming that that would be English with a Latin script because I assume that there would be others that would be interested in a universal language being simplified Chinese Mandarin.

And that we would have to convert all of the legacy Whois records to that or what's the argument that that wouldn't be the case? You know, as a service provider I don't want to pay to do that.

Susan Kawaguchi: That was not my assumption (unintelligible).

(David): Microphone.

James Bladel: Yes, just to be very cautious about someone saying that I need to do a universal language because I may not get my language or the language of my customer or a large number of my customers.

Susan Kawaguchi: (Unintelligible) a universal language then there is a - we can figure out a solution to transform that into a language that I understand.

James Bladel: So my concern is that there wouldn't be one that there would be six. It would be the UN plus...

(Chris): Okay, the - within the comments the plural is used on a few occasions, languages, which obviously is very alarming. That would amaze me if that were to happen within the system.

I think the - we spent a lot of time realizing just how difficult it would be to get the data transformed into one language with the idea of doing it into several. I don't think it's realistic to be honest, but in the comments you will find the plural here and there.

(David): I just want to remind people that if you - even if you're speaking to another councilor don't talk to your microphone and speaking of microphones.

(Jim Baskin): Thank you, (Jim Baskin). Two questions, first I haven't followed the details of what's been done over time so I may be getting into things that are already well understood.

But it seems that from what I understand we're talking about the possibility of having the primary record if you will converted into a - some common language or not.

But it would seem more useful to have both the desired language of the registrant and a conversion to some possible standard and both of them available.

And if that's something that hasn't been...

(Chris): Yes that is effectively one of the two possibilities. So the recommended possibility is that you have the original data and just that. The obligatory mandatory transformation argument would be that you have the original data and then a version, which would probably be a transliteration in Ascii largely but maybe one or two minor exceptions to that but basically that may be it.

(Jim Baskin): And my other comment is and I have to speak carefully because, not carefully but I have to think about what I'm going to say because I'm a native English speaker.

There are industries in the world that do already agree on certain required standard common language. I believe that the airline industry is one good example.

No matter what airline you're flying in the world the pilots speak English. And when they're communicating about flights I believe they're most - they're usually speaking English.

Now I said English, they use English but it doesn't have to be. But there are examples where an industry or group can agree that there can be a single language and we don't necessarily have to have five or six.

This may not be one but I believe there are a lot of good arguments as to why it would be very useful and important for security and other things even within the domain name system to have some standard way of identifying that data globally, thank you.

(Chris): Thank you, one of the issues is that some language have several transliterations, several transliteration standards, others don't have any standard at all.

So, you know, just ideally it would be great if we could automatically transliterate in a consistent way but this is a very long way from where we are at the moment. Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Yes Lars for the record. Just very briefly as a reaction. I do like a good analogy but I think in this case you have to think about the airplane companies being and the pilots being the registrars who have to communicate with ICANN and with one another and they have to be able to verify.

Whereas it's the passengers that are still allowed to speak their own language and to book that ticket in whatever language they require. So it's a slight difference here.

You're asking millions if not billions of people to be able to let's say make a transaction and script they're not necessarily familiar with.

(Jim Baskin): Just to respond I think the - sorry.

(David): State your name, thanks.

(Jim Baskin): (Jim Baskin) again. I think that the airline analogy is still pretty good because I don't see the owners or the registrars - not sorry the registrants being passengers. I see them as being pilots of their domain.

And so they even if they can't on a day-to-day basis converse in say the standard language at least they might, there might be some way to have the information about their airplane, their domain be understandable or be consistent or common across all - now of course automatic transformation may not be something that's easy to do.

This may be a very, very difficult thing and can't be done very quickly but I think as a goal it might be useful and that the idea of the airline is that they're not the passengers, they're piloting their domains and we don't want them to crash into other domains or into civilians on the ground.

(David): Okay, we are over time and so I'm going to call on Volker and then I'll get - I mean you can have a reply and then I think we'll end it there if that's okay with everyone.

Volker Greimann: Yes Volker Greimann speaking. Just one brief to the last comment. I think it will be greatly received at the GAC if we suggest that you can't have a domain if you don't speak English.

I would rather use a different analogy when you look at domain names and Whois. Whois to me always looks like a phone book. You look it up, you look up what the address is for someone who has a domain name just as you look up a telephone number and pass the address of someone, you know, who has an address or a phone number.

Now if you look at a Chinese phone book you will Chinese characters in that phone book. If you look at an African telephone book you will see the address in African in whatever type they use.

If you look up a phone book in Korea you will see Korean characters and so on. And it's upon you, the user of the telephone book to make sense of what's in that telephone book and the same goes for the Whois in my opinion.

(Chris): Many thanks and I think that also eloquently answers the last question, which was, you know, if this analogy about the airline pilots speaking English if this is the thing we're talking about.

No, what we're really talking about is that. We're talking about it's much more like that as an analogy, many thanks and to you all.

(David): Thank you very much.

Man: Can we just get where is - what's the status of this PDP? I know you have an initial report closed for comment, what's next?

(Chris): It's closed to comments. Well it's closed for comments but, you know, we still have meetings on Thursday afternoon at 1400 hours UTC and they're open so people can just come and join.

Man: But a timeline for a final report is?

(Chris): Is May.

Man: Thank you.

Rudy Dekker: And for those who are interested - Rudy for the transcript. For those who are interested we have our sessions, workgroup session this week on Wednesday morning.

It's early I know but that's not our responsibility. At 7:30 we have a workgroup meeting and you're all welcome to discuss the comments we got and try to get us into a final result.

(Chris): Seven thirty Wednesday morning in (Hallet), many thanks.

(David): Thank you, thank you for (unintelligible) and actually for the - I think the lively discussion of that list was great. Actually we often - often not a lot of discussion about this particular working group.

(Chris): More interesting than one might think right.

(David): Yes, okay so I'd like to thank the translation and transliteration working group.