Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 13 November at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 13 November 2014 at 1400 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-20141113-en.mp3

<u>Attendees:</u>
Jennifer Chung – RySG
Chris Dillon – NCSG
Mae Suchayapim Siriwat – GAC
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Emily Taylor – RrSG
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual
Wanawit Ahkuputra – GAC
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan)-NCUC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP

<u>Apologies:</u>
Jim Galvin - RySG
Lindsay Hamilton-Reid – RrSG

<u>ICANN staff:</u>
Amy Bivins
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Excuse me. Recording is now started. Please proceed.

Terri Agnew: Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed.

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 13th of November 2014.

On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Ubolthip Sethakaset, Rudi Vansnick, Petter Rindforth, Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Amr Elsadr, Jennifer Chung and Emily Taylor.

We have an apology from James Galvin. From Staff we have Lars Hoffmann, Amy Bivins and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state their name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Okay we've managed to get Adobe Connect to display both the draft document and the comments. We're - probably won't display the agenda because we're using a, you know, just completely standard agenda.

But I'll - yes Amr is writing, "It's very clever." Yes we were rather pleased - very convenient. Anyway so just have a quick look at the sort of standing items.

So Statements of Interest is I have to ask officially whether there have been any change since our last meeting. Seeing nothing in the chat room and hearing nothing I think we can then move on.

And as I suggested a moment ago the main thing on the agenda today is the discussion of various comments we've had in the last - well since we last met.

And yes we've got them displaying on the screen and so I'll just - yes so that we can - we're in more or less the right place. So for those of you who've got paper copies of the document I think it will be round about Page 11.

That's the sort of - here we are. No. Okay with that. Paste the last feed. There we are. This looks more or less right. Hey. And so what I'll just be doing is - oh heavens this is - does not behave like the paper.

Okay so basically I'll just be working through various comments that have come in. So we've got several comments from an email that Emily Taylor sent and we'll just be, you know, going through those.

And sometimes, you know, we have mentioned some of the issues in previous calls. Sometimes perhaps we haven't - always round. The hope is that next time we release a draft version that we can reflect the comments that have come in.

So let us - oh yes, before I plunge into them I'll - yes okay and I've - so I've made that point. So we can actually start with the first comment up here at the top, which is talking about costs.

Now let's see if I'm clever enough to get us down to Page 12. Oh heavens, we're on Page 21. How did that happen? Yes well this looks good. This is more or less right.

Okay so we may be referring to some text here, and we have this comment about the externalization of translational or transformation costs to Registrars.

This is something we have spoken about before but often it, you know, with - when mandatory transformation is mentioned it's not really very clear where the costs will end up, and so there is a possibility of the moving of costs.

I mean, the only comment here I would say is it's not just to Registrars. It could be to other entities as well, so Registrants/Registries on occasion. I think all of that is possible and, you know, also often, you know, a particular actor is specified so, you know, the idea is that somebody could have costs.

But the strong suspicion is that that person may - that actor may actually pass the costs on to somebody else so it's a - it's quite a complicated matrix. Amr would you like to pick up something on this topic?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks Chris. This is Amr.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: I think it is noteworthy here to not just point out that there's going to be a shifting of costs from one actor to another...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: ...but also to point out that there will be significantly more costs incurred because of this policy. If this policy doesn't exist and whether it's law enforcement agency, IP attorneys or any other person who wants to do a WHOIS lookup and is required to - and has to do a transformation of the contact information, that's on a case-by-case basis.

But what this policy will effectively do is require Contracted Parties or Registrants to transform all the data whether this data is actually needed to be transformed or not.

So I think it's not just a matter of shifting costs but it's actually a lot more cost and a lot of money spent unnecessarily too actually. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Yes now that's an aspect of it I think we have to some extent covered. That was why I was scrolling the document up. There are several paragraphs starting at the bottom of Page 12.

Accurate transformation is very expensive. Yes it may be that we actually need to develop those, you know, the - this point rather more. It's already a long point but, you know, it may be that we need to add some elements to it.

But, you know, certainly, you know, there is a suspicion that transformation, you know, does make things more expensive. Emily would you like to pick up something there?

Emily Taylor: Thank you very much Chris. And I just wanted to state my agreement with what Amr just said and I think it - to my mind there's two closely related issues bound up in this.

One is the cost itself and I think you're right. We have got some acknowledgment of that on that bullet point at the bottom of Page 12. The other issues that Amr mentioned is proportionality and the fact that the mandatory policy will affect all WHOIS data, you know, however many hundreds of millions of records.

And it's not quite clear whether that is a proportionate response to the need that's been expressed. And so I think that perhaps if we're expanding in that area the proportionality is something that we can address. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. And I should thank you again or use this opportunity to thank you again for the work you've done both in summarizing other people's comments and also adding your own.

I mean, it's a very substantial contribution. I'll just say something about proportionality. I can see Petter's just put his hand up but I'll just mention proportionality.

So yes you read my mind. I think the next thing I was going to do was to add something about that to this same bullet point. So it's getting - this bullet point is getting slightly out of control but I think, you know, certainly it needs to be reflected.

We did have - in earlier versions of things that we discussed we did, you know, talk about the - this issue. But I think it would be good to add it somewhere and, you know, this bullet point is one possibility for that. Petter would you like to bring something up?

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Petter Rindforth here. Just about the costs I think we can - one of the few things we all can agree about is actually that it will be extra costs. But - and what you say is that it cannot be put on one single participant so to speak.

What many of you think is okay but I don't think is okay is to push all these extra costs on the user that wants to have some kind of globally readable WHOIS information.

So what I want to see as a final solution is yes there will be extra costs. We have to split it on the Registrars and Registrants and also the end users in a decent way. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Petter. Thank you very much for that. When I was making rather a clumsy point earlier on in the discussion about actors, I think this was really the way my mind was working.

So there is a bit of a suspicion that, you know, that actually a lot of costs could end up with Registrants. So, you know, all I would like to say is that in a situation like this where, you know, there will be extra costs, it's very important that, you know, one particular group of actors, you know, doesn't end up carrying everybody else effectively.

You know, there has to be some way of stopping that. And I think a little bit further - I think a little bit later there are specific suggestions about how that may work.

And I think this version of the document doesn't have anything about that but we may well be wanting to add something. All right. So unless there's anything else about costs I'll just double check we've not missed anything.

Okay just to - yes okay so we've got, "Contracted Parties are justified by benefits to others." Yes I think we've picked that up. Oh yes. Aha. And here we go.

In fact I thought it was further down the list but it's active immediate. So those requesting the data can pay for the translation or transformation. Yes that is - that's certainly an idea that existed earlier on so that might be those requesting it or those needing it to pay, something like that.

All right. And then we have scale so why transform all the data rather than just the ones that happen to be of interest at the moment? So actually again in earlier versions this concept was there.

So yes I think we may - we really may want to add something about ad hoc, you know, just having some kind of organ that would transform if it was necessary for a particular purpose.

So one thing I'd just like to pick up is actually we have to be careful about not oversimplifying our arguments, because often it's quite easy to say, "Oh these are arguments, you know, for mandatory transformation or against mandatory transformation."

But actually it's more complicated on the against mandatory transformation side. In fact it's not saying that it should never happen. It's saying that there

may be situations where it is necessary for it to happen and, you know, at that point there needs to be more work to indicate exactly how that would happen, so yes this connects I think. Emily would you like to pick up something there?

Emily Taylor: Just to say I think I didn't - so my reading of these comments that others made rather than my own. But I didn't read that second comment as a suggestion that, you know, that there should be some sort of mandatory rule that there should be transformation on the fly; rather that tools exist. You know, there are automated translation and transliteration tools out there...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Emily Taylor: ...that could do that very efficiently on a - on an ad hoc basis. And it's sort of - so we - what we would need to be doing is exploring whether that system is sufficiently efficient if you like to satisfy the needs without reinventing it within the Contracted Parties environment.

I think, you know, so in other words we're saying, "Well okay, people who have the need for transformation of this data - can they not simply do that themselves on an ad hoc basis outside of the ICANN environment? What is the need for it to be placed into the ICANN environment?"

Chris Dillon: That's - thank you very much. That's an interesting refinement. So I think certainly until now the presumption always was that if there were something ad hoc occurring it would be inside the environment.

But maybe it was just that, a presumption that shouldn't have been made. Yes I take your point: ad hoc and not necessarily within ICANN. Yes. That's - Amr would you like to pick up something on that?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thanks Chris. This is Amr. I just wanted to say that I certainly agree with this point and I agree with Emily's reading of it. And I would also like to point

out that it does help us answer another question that we were asked on who do we believe should carry the burden of the cost.

And in this case under this model if there was an ad hoc transformation of contact data occurring on a case-to-case basis, then that would pretty much mean that we are recommending that mandatory transformation does not occur and that we are recommending that the costs - the burden of any transformation be placed on the entity or person who - requesting the transformation rather than on Registrants, Registrars or Registries. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes so that's an interesting point. I think that we'd probably have to overtly state that. But yes I think that, you know, that would seem to work as a model and actually link, you know, ad hoc to those, you know, to entity requesting yes.

Now coming back to the endpoint of this second point we've got the sentence, "Status quo is several orders of magnitude more efficient," which I think - well I think we'd probably - we may want to disagree with that comment because although in a sense it may be more efficient in some meanings of the expression, it's also not doing as much as what we hope a replacement system will do.

So yes that's really the sort of - I don't think I will pick that up when updating things. Amr would you like to say something there?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks Chris. And I just wanted to ask are you on the third point, Accuracy and Responsibility?

Chris Dillon: No I'm still on the last sentence of Number 2 so I'm talking about the status quo...

Amr Elsadr: Oh okay.

Chris Dillon: ...is several orders of magnitude more efficient, and I'm just about to go into the next bit.

Amr Elsadr: Okay, apologize. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay no problem. Right. Okay so then we're on who accepts responsibility if Registrars are required to alter those data? Okay. I think that, you know, that - here we - as soon as you have transformation whether it's mandatory or not you start getting difficult questions.

                  And I, I mean, my - the way I read it is that the responsibility is on Registrants but I would be very interested to see what people say to that. Okay right. And then we got to talk about the...

Emily Taylor: I'm sorry Chris.

Chris Dillon: ...proposals impacting WHOIS data accuracy complaints. But yes Emily would you like to pick something up?

Emily Taylor: I - yes just offering a point of view on that and I think that's right. Ultimately it is the Registrant's responsibility for the data. And I think that this sort of highlights - one of the interesting and challenging issues of this is that if you have somebody who is entering WHOIS data in a non-Latin script, the chances are that they may not have the skills or the capacity to check that any transformation is accurate.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Emily Taylor: But there's a capacity issue there but there's also if it's automatically done by the Registry or Registrar, then that is a third party sort of just intervening, making an intervention...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Emily Taylor: ...and transforming that data perhaps without a Registrant's knowledge and handing the Registrant the responsibility for that. And of course as we know the responsibility for your accurate data if it turns out to be inaccurate could lead to the cancellation or suspension of the domain name.

So this is quite - it sort of goes to the core of the contractual relationship. It's also an area where I think that the Contracted Parties, Registries and Registrars would be hesitant to go to because if they're starting to kind of mess around with or that the - sort of unilaterally make these changes, then there is the, you know, query whether they are assuming risks or potentially opening themselves up to liability if it all goes wrong.

So I think it is a complex area. It - so I just thought you asked for some feedback on that. That's how I'm understanding that. That's quite a complex area. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. And it's picked up in greater detail further down. I mean, transformation almost becomes a euphemism. It's transformational, you know, just, you know, adding something which, you know, the feeling really is that the thing is starting slightly to get out of control.

Something is being added. So yes - so transformation almost messing up. Okay now Amr has been picking up a couple of points in the chat room and so he's suggesting that we could add something on this now and it's the first bullet on Page 12 where that could go.

Okay. Oh yes. Okay so yes that does look like a logical place to put that. Okay. And let us return and see what else we have to have a look at here. Okay so we're now - yes so, "How would the proposals impact WHOIS data accuracy complaints and WHOIS verification requirements?"

So the verification requirements end up being much more complicated. That's my gut instinct on that part of that. And so I guess the complaints are going to largely become a problem for Registrants under that sort of model.

Okay and perhaps we can then move down to Point 4 on Data Integrity. So yes, "WHOIS should be displaying what the client entered. Our trying to interpret..."

Another possible euphemism but, "Our trying to interpret that only leads to more data errors, less accurate data." So yes I - this is hugely interesting and - oh in fact oddly enough I wrote a note to myself that this could be added to the same bullet point so yes we're on the same wavelength there.

Okay then into the various subpoints, Amr would you like to pick up something at this point?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks Chris. This is Amr. Just on the last sentence in Point 3 as well as Point 4 of Data Integrity, it is - I would advise of - that this Working Group recommends that regardless whether transformation of data is mandatory or not, that the authoritative set of contact information always remain as the original data provided by the Registrants in their native language and script just to avoid issues of WHOIS verification requirements and everything else.

So the authoritative set will always be the one provided in the native language and script, and it is that contact information that should be verified and validated. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. There is something in the document on that - on this subject. I will double check that it, you know, that it's - that it reflects what you've just been saying but there is some text there.

I'd struggle to find it quickly but I think that is still in the document but I will check that it is still strong enough. Okay so then off we go into the subpoints of Number 4.

So, "Will there be rules on how to transliterate non-ASCII characters?" We've spent a lot of time suggesting what the rules could be, but I think to some extent it actually falls outside the scope of what we're doing.

So, you know, this, you know, personally this is an area I would really like to get involved in in the future because I've got very strong feelings about this. I'm sure lots of us have having done this.

But yes, you know, basically the suggestions we were - we have been making were that, you know, that national standards should be used and, you know, even saying that there are problems because there are countries with more than one standard so you have to decide which one you're going to use.

Also even worse there are countries which don't have a standard so then you're having to use a standard for the script. And if you have to do that then it can be a nightmare because different languages use different scripts in different ways and so, you know, what is that in Urdu?

It's a sort of heavy deal on our back and it's just, you know, this is a really complicated area. "Can it be done programmatically?" Sometimes depending on the script.

"Is there some standard system to be used?" Yes we've answered that. So sometimes there's one. Sometimes there's several. Sometimes there are none.

"Or are we all just counting on Google Translate?" Heavens no. I mean, it's - Google Translate is very good for certain languages. It is absolutely horrible

for other languages and also most of what we were suggesting is transliteration.

I mean, the only exceptions to that are the country fields, which would be translated so you would get something like China. Even the organizational name - I think the last work we did we were just suggesting that the organization decided how they wanted to transform their organizational name so, you know, it may well be English in some cases.

But, you know, there are certainly many Chinese organizations with no translated English form so at that point they may transliterate or do something else.

But I think the last thing we said on that was that it should be up to them how they wanted that field to appear. So most of the time we're talking about transliteration anyway so, you know, Google Translate's not much use.

Okay I got quite excited on that one. I'll just wait a moment to see if anybody wants to pick up anything. Okay. So moving further down, "If human judgment is required who is responsible for doing it?"

So this specifically refers to the situation where there is no transliteration - well, two possible situations. It's either there is no transliteration scheme which is a nightmare because you don't have to create one, or there is no tool that will automatically transliterate which is quite a common situation. Many languages, you know, there really aren't adequate tools for transliterating.

So in that situation, you know, somebody would have to do it manually. And the default situation would be that the registrant would be responsible unless something else is set up. I'll just wait for that to sink in.

Oh yes, and in fact it's picked up in the next point which is if the registrant is responsible, which is what I was just suggesting, what if they don't know what it should be?

Well, it might be possible to give some guidance. And (Unintelligible) earlier today, I had somebody in my office who spoke another language and he didn't - actually, it was yesterday, but anyway. This person was in my office and he didn't actually know how to transliterate his language. But after, I had spoken to him for a bit; that was a language there was a fairly good rules.

Usually people (unintelligible) quickly. But you know, it might be, you know, typical situations are that, you know, in order to represent and sound like long (unintelligible) of E sound like that, a lot of people will write E-E. But many transliterate would actually have that as I-I. It's little things like that.

But you could actually set up some sort of resource that would be of help to people. You know, that is certainly within the realms of possibility. Wiki like knowledge-base perhaps with, you know, it could be (unintelligible) to that.

What if a third party disagrees with the accuracy of the transliteration? Well, fundamentally what we're talking about here is the adherence to rules. So basically, if you've got a standard, if it's a good standard it will actually decide. So you can look at the standards and say is it nearing to that or not.

You could imagine validation systems having problems because typically, when there is a difference between transliterations, you're talking a couple of letter size aside. So the example I gave a moment ago, we might have two E's where really ideally we'd want two I's.

So if you have a system which is a little bit tolerant and will accept things which is slightly wrong, then you're doing much (unintelligible) of them if you have a validation system which just completely rejects something over from my era.

But on the other hand, I suppose you could say that, you know, also some minor difference might be enough to cause a lot of confusion and trouble.

Okay, just have a quick look at the Chat Room because I can Amr is typing something. So Amr is now saying his name is transliterated in different ways. Yes, so I guess that a lot of people are wanting to put a vowel before the M and the R there because English usually does that. Yes, that's a nice example.

All right, moving slowly down, is the registrants consent is required before a transliteration is published in the Whois? I would suggest the answer is no. But you know, I think effectively I wouldn't have thought that this would be data that we would want to hide behind some kind of protection. Watching the possible responses to that.

And Emily is giving some lovely examples earlier - a case, yes. Here we have a combination of the sort of transliterations which are probably adhering to some standards. And then you just have some really idiosyncratic ones as well.

Luckily with individual names, our suggestions would have been that basically, really the individual is the person who decides how that name is going to appear.

And the example I give there is that, you know, looking at various things people may think at the time Christopher Dillon or Christopher J. Dillon or Christopher James Dillon or Chris James Dillon; there's so many possibilities. The right answer is actually Chris Dillon. I was born Christopher Dillon but actually I'm really Chris Dillon. And I'm the guy who decides that. That's certainly the approach that (Livery) would take.

And so, you know, there are occasions where (Livery) actually have to write letters to authors and ask them, "Who are you?"

Okay, and then Amr is saying about confusion - oh yes. So you could also have things which actually end up becoming distant names. So (Elsa), (Alsa), (Elsy), these are names which are quite close, but you know, just a slight difference in the vowel; there's a lot in a name.

Okay, Emily, would you like to pick something up?

Emily Taylor: Yes, just to, you know, raise an issue here about the general sort of level of involvement of the parties in creating a domain name record. I think that we have to, you know, we're interested in this stuff, and you know, by definition by being on this working group, we're very interested (unintelligible) transformation.

But you know, experience suggests that getting registrants to be interested at all in the quality of their data even in their own language is quite a challenge to get them to click on a validation email. I mean we were hearing in the London ICANN Meeting that that is not going very smoothly in some cases.

And I just wanted to kind of, you know, challenge ourselves with a reality check on sort of how likely is it that we are going to train all of the registrants in the world to respect and take onboard this very complicated standards of transliteration into a language they may not know the script, they may not even be familiar with.

So it's just a really fine sounding, you know, and a note of caution on that. Interesting though it is and interesting, you know, very interested in your insights into this Chris of course (unintelligible). That was what I wanted to say; thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. I guess a library may be one of the few areas where people, you know, were paid - so these days actually - to look at data very, very carefully. This is a completely different situation from what we're talking about.

And I agree completely. You know, just trying to get people to be interested in this is a massive problem. Yes, I'm not sure we've actually picked this up to an adequate extent, and you know, heaven knows we've picked up so many aspects.

But you know, just the motivational thing here is a real killer because unless you have some way of motivating people to want to do something, your chances of success are really quite low. So yes, I mean it's another - it's certainly is a major facet to this end.

But we have a duty to try and make suggestions but there are occasions where one almost feels as if one is being asked to do the impossible. You know, it is just so hard.

And moving further down, can a registrant withhold consent?

Now this is something, I'll be honest with you, I don't know very much about. I believe the answer is yes, so there are legitimate cases where registrants are able to hide their identity and a proxy is used. Now that's really, from my perspective, it's just sort of general knowledge and I believe that is the case. I am really happy to be correct by somebody else; that's outside my area really.

Amr, would you like to add something to that?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks Chris.

I believe, and I'm also open to being corrected, but I believe that if a registrant wishes to use a privacy or proxy service to keep his or her or its identity hidden in the Whois database, it doesn't mean that transformation of the contact information wouldn't happen. It would just mean that this information would also be hidden.

So I don't think it would mean that the registrant could withhold consent on the transformation occurring, it would just mean that this transform data would possibly also be behind a proxy. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. That is - and Peter is agreeing with you in the Chat Room. That makes that much clearer; withhold an agreement from transformation.

Okay, so moving further down, what if a registrant wants to change and approve transliteration?

Okay, I think I picked this up earlier on. So yes, I think there is a whole thing about transliteration where, you know, it isn't completely black and white. I mean typically you get lots of wavering over a digital, so you know, one (karat) may be changed for another or there may be a hyphen or something like that.

So what if the registrant wants to change it? I mean one comment I would make is okay, but as long as its bringing close to the standard.

And then there is the follow-up question, is the Whois certification required every time one of these fields is updated? Yes, I think so because, you know, although the change may be small, it's still a change and it would still need to come under that. And yes, I mean I guess there is a possibility that a small change could in fact be enough to change it into something else at which point verification would be necessary.

Okay, further down, where does the requirement to data transformation end? Oh yes, now. If I've understood it correctly, I think this may actually be a relatively easy question; there had to be one.

This came up before at one point. And the conclusion was that we are talking very much about transforming from non-Roman script into ASCII. And in fact, as I said earlier on, most of the time we're transliterating from non-Roman script into ASCII. So we're not, you know, doing any other kind.

Yes, I mean theoretically there are all kinds of possible transformations. But effectively, nearly always we are talking about transliterating from non-Roman into ASCII. Very occasionally - well the country names may well be a translation, but they may be the only exception.

All right, and then we're on to - a bit further down, just checking, you can see things. Oh yes, okay.

So we've got something on Compliance Number 5 (unintelligible). Who will and who will this be policed? Okay, and there's even a suggestion that it could be ICANN. Well yes, and then the idea that this could well end up costing more for the registrants. Yes, this is something we visited a little earlier.

Yes, I mean ICANN simply doesn't have the technical ability to do this stuff, so that isn't really an option unless they, you know, acquire the capability.

So yes, I mean these are all questions that I think other groups would need to answer. And you know, we may have strong feelings and say, "Well, you know, if you're going to do this, you know, we might want to suggest about how that might be done." But yes, okay.

Amr, would you like to pick up something there?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks Chris. This is Amr.

Just to point out that ICANN does have a Contractual Compliance Team that does check on Whois accuracy I believe every year and provides statistics on how well Whois accuracy is being maintained.

And so if this does become a policy, then I assume that the same Contractual Team would carry out these functions which would probably add yet another layer of costs to what making this workable. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, that's a much better answer than the one I just gave. So yes, there is that existing team.

What they would need to do would be to hire a network of linguists who would be able to check every major world language. That is a large expense.

Not a small thing at all. Not impossible, but you know, quite expensive to check every major language. And obviously, yes, so we've picked up the thing on higher charges.

Into the next one on internationalization, and this is quite interesting because it's bringing up an ICANN principle. So my language, my Internet, and the concept is trying to erode that.

Compelling the use of English or Latin or ASCII, certainly it is North American thinking. We must translate everything into English.

Wow, this is going to be a surprising moment during our calls when Chris Dillon actually gets to descend the English language - well, not quite. But I've spent many, many years listening to languages.

But no, I think this is when I say no, I think I actually feel that this is going too far. So if there is going to be transformation, the idea that we would pick a simple alphabet, 26 letters, it doesn't get much more simple.

We're not really - it's certainly not English. And you know, as we've said before, we hardly translating.

If it's going to be transformation, I would say ASCII makes huge sense. And you know, I would really struggle to be able to make, you know, what alternatives could there be; IPA, the International Phonetic Alphabet, but it's much larger than ASCII and a lot of people don't know it.

So no, I feel this one is going too far. I think, you know, if there is a group which requires transformation, then ASCII is the way to go. So for once I'm going to rebuff that one.

All right. Then Number 7, Competition; if the contracted party doesn't want to sport a language - okay, this is an approach which we had in earlier versions of what we've been working on and possibly has got a bit lost in this one so we might want to reinstate this.

Okay, so it ends up being something like decide what business you're in and pay for what you're going to use; something like that almost.

Amr, which like to pick up something there?

Amr Elsadr: Hi, this is Amr. You know, when this PDP working group was performing its initial outreach to the community on comments for this PDP, NCSG had something to say on competition but it wasn't framed exactly like this.

It was framed more towards start-ups for new registrars, for example, that were starting in countries where IBMs were being introduced. It was from a competition perspective, we felt that - the NCSG felt that they're your entry for

some of these contracted parties if there was a policy like this in place that would force them to incur costs than they normally would.

So that was one aspect of competition that I don't feel is necessarily reflected by this caller, but I thought it might be helpful to just mention it. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. So what you're saying is that - maybe this is just a related idea. But the idea that by, you know, if transformation were mandatory, then that could affect competition and make it very difficult for smaller actors. Is it that sort of an idea?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, that's exactly Chris. And especially for actors or startup registrars from developing countries where they are developing a market for internationalized domain names and when their clients wouldn't necessarily be English speakers or users of Latin-based script.

Where they would just prefer to register the domain names in their local language and script, but then this registrar would have to pay to have this data transformed. And that would be a significant cost for a new startup in a developing country. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. In my opinion, that is the strongest argument against mandatory transformation and it is reflected in the document.

Okay, then we're into the - well, actually I better be a bit strategic here because before going into general comments and further down, I've realized we've - the hour has gone very quickly today.

So I'll just ask quickly whether anybody has any other business before we use the remaining minutes of the call on other things.

Okay, Amr, would you like to pick something up?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks Chris. This is Amr again.

A few weeks ago, I had suggested that we try to find a middle ground as opposed to looking at the recommendations of this PDP working group as a sort of a binary issue; it's either a yes or a no.

And one scenario I came up with was to recommend that transformation is not mandatory at this point. But since there is so little supporting data to justify mandatory transformation, perhaps part of our recommendation could include that future studies be done once this is becoming more of an issue. So just to look at it and see and take a closer look at it using empirical data that does not exist now.

I was wondering if this might be a form of a middle ground between these two recommendations of yes or no, and whether that might be something - for example, the IPC might be willing to look at. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay, yes, this is certainly a very interesting approach. You know, there is certainly a possibility that, you know, we may, you know, we could conceivably say something like transformation shouldn't be mandatory but other, you know, other works should be done for the cases where - you know, if there are cases when it is necessarily.

However, there is a situation whereby - sorry, I've completely lost the track of my thought. These things happen.

Okay, so let's just - Peter has just - we're running out of time. So Peter, would you like to say something?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Just a very quick comment.

If you want a quick answer to that question, it will be a no. But still, if you could send out again a proposed mix of these new comments, I promise to

take it back to IPC and also to discuss it with other IP groups to see what we can come up with. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Peter. Yes, I'll certainly do that after the meeting.

I've remembered what my additional thought was and that is that we have several comments in the pipeline, so there are comments coming from the Legal community next week; I hope they're in time for the meeting.

So the bottom line on that one is this story is not yet over. There may be other things that we just don't know about. So once we've had those comments in from the Legal community and related comments, then you know, we can be more sure of where we are. But until that happens, you know, we can't be - I was going to say entirely sure. I don't think we'll be entirely sure of that; never mind.

Okay, so I'm just going to pick up a few things in the Chat Room - and okay.

Yes, in fact, similarly enough, Emily is picking up this concept of further research and to the extent. And in fact, that is a fairly good summary of much of the rest of the things we would have done if we had enough time.

So yes, I would really like to encourage you after the call to have a look at some of the other comments. Everything is in the Wiki.

So yes, this is really the key area. So do what extent - do we know the extent - you know, to what extent do we have statistics about, you know, the need for languages? What is the scale of this problem?

And the short answer as far as I know is that we have very little. And it may be necessary to commission further research. But you know, that's just a very quick comment on what is quite, you know, a long piece of text. But I'll say that just to hopefully awaken your interest in this.

But yes, that might go some way to suggesting what else, if in this particular comment - and there are a couple of smaller comments as well. I think three of them all together. But with a good wind, we should be able to cover those and possibly a rather longer comment from the Legal community next week.

All right, well we're at the top of the hour and I think this may be a good time to round off because, you know, otherwise we are heading into other things. So perhaps we can leave it for this week and perhaps continue some things on the mailing list.

And I will work on a new draft which will include, I hope, reflections from last week's discussion and this week's discussion. I will do my best.

And you've probably heard me taking notes as we've been speaking; I've been really trying very hard to get it all down. But it may be that I come back to it and can't read my own writing, so if that happens I beg for forgiveness.

Okay, and people saying some rather nice things in the Chat Room. Well it's been a pleasure to go through the comments because they've been extremely helpful to us. Just hang on for a few moments.

Okay, well, in that case, thank you very much for today and, you know, for what's been a very interesting discussion. I look forward to another one next week. And have a great week until then.

Good-bye then.

Chris Dillon: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible), you can please stop the recording. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Have a great rest of your day and please remember to disconnect all remaining lines.

END