

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 12 September at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 12 September 2013 at 1500 UTC. 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.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-transliteration-contact-20130912-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon - NCSG  
Rudi Vansnick - NPOC  
Vinay Kumar Singh – individual  
Amr Elsadr - NCUC  
Edmon Chung – RySG  
Peter Green -

Apologies: none

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund  
Lars Hoffman  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. Welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Drafting Team call on the 12th of September, 2013.

On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Peter Green, Rudy Vansnick, Vinay Kumar Singh. We are shortly to be joined by Edmon Chung. We have received no apologies for today's call.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and over to you, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, indeed. And I'll just - this is Chris Dillon speaking. And I'll just go over to the agenda. And there's a technical point in the agenda that we need to cover first and that is whether anybody has got a changed statement of interest since the last call a couple of weeks ago? Probably not but I do need to ask you.

Okay well hearing nothing we can move on. And we are very much waiting for Edmon to join us, in fact, on the next point which is the discussion of the draft. And I think I don't have anything, myself, to say about the draft but whether anybody would like to say something about it before Edmon joins the call.

Rudy Vansnick: Rudy Vansnick speaking. Thank you, Chris. I think that the draft as we have it (unintelligible) is, in fact, close to a final version. And most of the work has to be done afterward so I think that the (rules) are defined, the recommendations are there. There is flexibility in (unintelligible) for interacting with other (unintelligible) PDPs.

And what is important is essentially getting a view from non-English-speaking world and that could help us in (unintelligible). That's my view on (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you for that, Rudy. This is Chris speaking. And in fact we did have one piece of news which is rather important. And it was an email sent to the list very recently, really within the last couple of hours, which was from Edmon. And it was a short one-liner which was, you know, basically just saying that it looked good.

So that, I take, is seriously good news because Edmon is, you know, is involved with many of those other, you know, other PDPs and working groups. So, you know, if somebody was going to spot trouble it really was he. So, you know, he sent a short email saying, you know, it looks good. So I think that all goes very well.

But obviously it would be just nice to see whether there was anything perhaps minor thing that he found in that. So, you know, we're just really waiting for that now.

Julie Hedlund: And I see that Edmon has joined the call. Welcome, Edmon.

Chris Dillon: Oh well that was good timing.

Edmon Chung: Hi, yes. Thank you, Chris, for sort of the introduction, I guess. But I can't say that I'm on top of all the discussions. There is quite a number of discussions on Whois and IDNs and very subtle things.

But I think the charter strikes a pretty good balance on - and focus on the - I guess the work at hand. And there is enough hand-waving that says, you know, we know that all these other groups are going on. And I think we'll stay alert on all those development and that's one of the key reasons why I think it looks good.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, Edmon. This is Chris Dillon speaking. It's really good to hear that. And, you know, just to explain that we erred on the side of listing several other PDPs and working groups, you know, within the charter. You

know, so at least, you know, there is an idea of what else could be relevant to this.

And we also tried to write the charter in such a way that the working group, you know, had some amount of freedom. I mean, we - again we erred on the side of giving them freedom, you know, to make decisions. You know, we weren't sort of needlessly tying things down that didn't need to be tied down actually for that reason, you know, just in case, you know, there was stuff going on in one of the related processes that could be relevant.

Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: ...this is still Chris speaking just welcome Amr Elsadr to the Adobe Connect room. And, you know, just say that we, you know, we are now just really asking whether anybody has any comments to make about the charter even if they're quite small comments at this stage. And I notice, Rudy, you've got your hand up; would you like to speak about that?

Rudy Vansnick: Yeah, well thank you, Chris. Rudy Vansnick speaking. I'm just wondering, as I know that Edmon is on top of - or some of the new gTLD applications and has a lot of knowledge in - with regard to the Registrar Agreement. What I'm just wondering is there any timing issue that the working group should keep in mind?

I mean, I'm just thinking out loud. As you all know that the new gTLD is going to be launched. Anything that would require a certain kind of urgency to review this agreement so that the Registries or Registrars are able to (unintelligible) what will come out of the final PDP working group.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon speaking. Chris, if I can I guess respond?

Chris Dillon: Absolutely. Thank you, Edmon. This is Chris speaking.

Edmon Chung: So that's a very interesting question. When we - I guess when we first had the discussion at the IRD the previous working - joint working group with SSAC, that same question was kind of asked as well. And we said anything that came out of this would be, you know, way after the new gTLD launches.

Well we sort of experienced some delays. And short of major, major delays I think most of the Registries would be at least a good number of them would hopefully be in operation before this wraps up and have a final report that could then be implemented to affect those contracts. So that's sort of what I'm thinking.

I don't think we - however fast we rush this is not - well, hopefully not going to be fast enough to make it in this immediate first round without some adjustments later on.

But I think there are enough - there is enough interest and enough placeholders actually in the contracts to allow if this - if the outcome of this and other working groups on this topic get to the point where it could be implemented it could then be implemented over a period of time to the existing new gTLDs as well.

That specific language - I need to check whether the final, final version did eventually add back what I suggested to the ICANN team at that time. But it was brought up. And I think I'm pretty sure it has been added to say that - to say specifically that the Whois or directory services stuff, especially on internationalized data, is being reviews. And, you know, as it progresses the Registries should abide by those standards or policies.

So the short answer to the question is I don't think we need to - I don't think rushing this or creating an urgency is of high value at this point. But, you know, that doesn't mean we should take years to get - come to conclusion on

this. Let's - there is already, I believe, a placeholder that acknowledges this work being done.

Chris Dillon: Okay...

Edmon Chung: I don't know whether staff has any further information on that as well.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Edmon, that sounds - that sounds right to me. I don't have the exact wording in front of me. But because there is a tremendous amount of work occurring right now relating to directory services I think it is correct ah there is language in there that is a placeholder anticipating changes that will result from all of the various efforts.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you very much. This is Chris Dillon speaking. I mean, I just - yeah, you know, I completely agree with all that's been said basically. But, you know, effectively this is something that applies right, you know, right across, you know, whether it's, you know, whether it's existing TLDs or new ones.

So, you know, there isn't really a, you know, there isn't necessarily a link to either of those; it just applies right across the board. And, you know, that means that, you know, effectively, you know, we can - we can get it right but that doesn't mean that, you know, we can take our time to get it right. But that doesn't mean it will end up being years.

Okay and so well just any - any other aspect. I don't know whether it would be helpful to have one final look at Sections 2 and 3 or whether people have really done that and have nothing more to say about it.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie Hedlund. Just I have unsynced the document in the Adobe Connect screen so you can scroll through the document as you wish. And I've made it larger. Or you can make it larger yourself, I don't know that that

shows up for you but there's a little plus sign if you want to make the document larger; it's at the bottom of the screen.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Julie. You know, certainly I've been through it and I really, you know, I really have nothing of any large substance to add to this. So we really are, yeah, Rudy is typing now that he thinks this can be the final draft.

You know, I would - I agree with that. You know, if anybody would like to bring up anything this is probably more or less the last chance to do so.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. I just should note I did talk to Ching Chiao - well chatted with him during the Council meeting last week. And he had said that he did want to review the charter. I do want to ask him again if he has any comments on it.

But what I can also do is the next step here would be to accept the changes and to also staff - I will draft a motion that would go with the charter to the Council essentially with the Council approving the charter. That would be the purpose of the motion.

And I would send that draft motion and the final document with the changes accepted to this drafting team list and perhaps give, you know, everyone to look at the two of those, ask if there are any changes to the motion and then perhaps by early next week we can go ahead and send it on to the Council, which is well in advance of the deadline for motions for their October meeting. So they should have plenty of time to look at it.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Julie, for that very much indeed. Just before I - I think Amr has something he wants to say. But just before I ask him to speak I'll just say briefly I think probably what we need to do is now set a deadline, you know, one of those days early next week. I think that might be helpful because, you know, it just makes it easier for people, you know, it has to be done by whenever that's going to be.

Okay, Amr, would you like to say something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I'm using the audio on the Adobe Connect room. Can you all hear me?

Chris Dillon: Yes, it's good.

Amr Elsadr: Great. Thanks. Yeah, I had been going through the 2013 RAs and I just wanted to confirm that I did somewhere see that issues of internationalized registration data and ongoing work on that would be taken into consideration. I think this point was brought up - was being discussed when I joined the call.

I had one other comment though, it's not a drastic change to the charter but I was wondering, because this charter outlines that the PDP working group will have to consider two separate issues outlined in two different bullets the first being whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language and transliterate it as well to a single common script.

And the other bullet being who is going to do this in the event that the working group does determine that contact information should be translated and transliterated.

The five options outlined, although they are not - they are not - the working group is not restricted simply to these five options. But I was thinking that the fifth option with the end user being required to do the translation and transliteration wouldn't that be the case in the event that the working group found that no translation and transliteration will not be required?

And so it would be up to the end user if he or she chooses to do this themselves. So is this something we would want to maybe change the language in the charter slightly saying that okay these first four options are in the event that the working group decides that translation and transliteration



should take place as a policy as opposed to the fifth option being in the event that the working group finds that no, it's not necessary to do translation and transliteration? So if the end user would do this himself or herself and can go ahead and do so. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that, Amr. Now the key thing here is that the five options are only examples so, you know, it could be that the working group actually produced another option which, you know, is either closely related to one of the existing ones or not particularly.

So the key thing really is that those five options are just examples. You know, that was really - when I said earlier on that we had, you know, we had purposefully given them a certain amount of freedom about how to draft. So I feel that we probably don't need to tie down any of the options more because, you know, they are just examples. And the working group needs to feel free to either use one of the options or to do something else.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Okay, sure. Go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Sorry well I'll just go ahead I guess. So, yeah, I think I agree with Chris. And there are situations I can - I guess I can immediately think of where we ask the registrar to, let's say, that they need to provide the information. But the registrar can then, you know, subsequently ask the registrant to actually provide it, right.

So even if we create a policy whereby the registrar is - has the responsibility of doing it they might provide an interface where the end registrant can actually provide it. So it doesn't preclude or is not quite a fallback, I think. So I guess I side with Chris in saying, you know, at this point we're just listening as examples and I don't think we need to try to sort of lump it together or in any case further deliberate - further talk about that.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you, for that, Edmon. The language we used is the PDP working group will not be limited to considering the above alternatives but will be encouraged to consider all possible alternatives. So really, yeah, I think - yeah, you know, they are free to find a solution and so we don't actually have to make sure that the solution will be one of these five. It may be but it may be something else as well. But thank you for that, it's rather interesting.

Okay well I - because it's our last opportunity I will just ask again is anything else anybody would like to raise about this charter? Okay just - I'll just wait; there's something going on in the chat room at the moment. Yeah, okay, that's fine.

So I should have asked for any other business at the beginning really if anything else anybody would like to raise? Yes, Rudy, would you like to speak?

Rudy Vansnick: Yes, thank you, Chris. Rudy Vansnick speaking. I'm just asking myself has there been any reaction to this topic from the GAC? And when we just spoke about the five models the one we didn't list up is one about translation and transliteration done by law enforcement and so on. Do we see that under the (main) end users or is there any other issue that we have just not covered?

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Rudy. This is Chris speaking. I am not aware of any comments that they've made. But that could theoretically just be because they've read it closely and realized that, you know, actually they are, as we've been saying, they are only examples.

So I suppose if we drafted this in a stricter way and we'd actually said you have to pick one of these five then the GAC or some other organization could have looked at it and said well actually we don't like any of them. So, you know, that was one of the reasons why we drafted it in this way. As far as I

know, you know, there has been no reaction or at least if there has, you know, we haven't heard of it.

Okay so we haven't any other business. We also have no other meeting because this is basically - well it's the end of the scheduled meetings now. But may I just ask Julie whether she would be happy to name a day next week for the, you know, for any final comments which, you know, I guess would be done on the mailing list before the, you know, before the final draft of this is finished and also the motion is drafted whether you'd like to set a particular - oh, yes, okay.

Rudy is actually typing that officially we've got the 19th of September on the schedule. That's nice and alliterative isn't it? Does anybody really want to do it earlier than then? I guess we could just about do that. I'm tempted - unless anybody else has views on this matter I'm very tempted to stick to that date because it's easy to remember and we've said we'll do it.

Rudy, would you like to say something about that?

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you, Chris. Rudy Vansnick speaking. Just as Julie has mentioned that there will be a motion drafted (unintelligible) perhaps it's good that we could have the reactions for the 19th so that we could finalize the 19th that we close this work and it be done and accepted (unintelligible) we have to follow. I'm just asking Julie if (unintelligible) clarify if she has another process to cover.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Don't think I quite heard all of that, Rudy, it was kind of fuzzy. But I'm gathering that you're suggesting that we should have the date of the 19th for, you know, to ask - as the deadline for anybody's comments or objections.

There is no - there's no specific process that the drafting team has to follow. But I think we'd probably be - if we - while the drafting team is a working group as such so the Working Group Guidelines would apply.

And I think that would mean that we would be seeking rough consensus which would basically be sort of a majority accepting the, you know, the charter. And if there were any objections those would be noted. I don't think we're looking for a unanimous approval.

So I think what I would be asking for in sending out my message today with the document finalized, with the changes accepted and the draft motion is, one, for any comments on the motion, any changes or comments on the motion, any final changes or comments or in particular are there any objections to sending the motion and the document to the Council for consideration. I hope that's helpful.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Julie. That all sounds very good to me. And the likelihood is that we can do that by the mailing list. Okay well I think at the end the only other thing to do is to thank everybody for their participation during all of the calls and all of the emails and all of the drafting, especially Julie because, you know, she's done just so much of this drafting work and it's much appreciated.

And just be interesting to see, you know, how it goes with the working group and, you know, certainly speaking personally I wish them really all the best and actually intending to be part of that process. So, yes, many thanks to everybody for getting this on the road and by the deadline as well which is always a good - good idea.

Okay I'm just checking; there's nothing else in the Adobe Connect which I think there isn't. Okay many thanks to everybody. And, you know, obviously we'll be in contact by email next week. And, you know, the key date now is

the 19th. And obviously I hope to be seeing many of you in the working group. Good-bye then.

Rudy Vansnick: Rudy Vansnick speaking here. Would like to thank Chris for his marvelous work in chairing this. I was really (unintelligible) very well. Thank you again.

Chris Dillon: That's very kind of you really.

Rudy Vansnick: I'll see you all on the 19th. And after the 19th too.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, everyone. Certainly appreciate your help. And if indeed we need a call on the 19th we can have one but otherwise I assume we probably will not. This is Julie speaking.

Chris Dillon: Yes, I mean, this is Chris speaking. If, you know, if the email list gets very busy or there are, you know, there's something that we haven't spotted and is tricky then it's conceivable we may need another one. But my feeling is we probably don't need it. But, you know, it wouldn't be impossible.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie speaking. What we'll do is we won't cancel it until we get closer to the time next week but we'll get try to get cancellation out, you know, close, you know, not too close beforehand so as not to make people's schedules difficult.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. That sounds like a really good way to play it. Okay well let us look forward to the discussions on the list next week in that case. Okay.

Rudy Vansnick: Bye, bye to everybody.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone.

END