

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 19 December 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 19 December 2013 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/gns0/gns0-transliteration-contact-20131219-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon - NCSG
Amr Elsadr - NCUC
Yoav Keren – RySG
Ephraim Kenyanito - NCUC
Petter Rindforth - IPC
Jim Galvin - SSAC
Peter Dernbach - IPC
Marc Blanchet – No SOI
Justine Chew – At-Large
Pitinan Koarmornpatna - Individual
Patrick Lenihan - NCUC
Sarmad Hussain - No SOI
Ching Chiao - RySg
Yoav Keren - RrSG
Guillaume Leclanche
Jennifer Chung - No SOI
Peter Green - No SOI
Ahkuputra Wanawit - GAC
Wolf Knoblen - ISPCP
Simon Perreault - No SOI
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Vinay Kumar Singh - Individual

Apologies: none

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffman

Mary Wong
Steve Sheng
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. I would like to inform parties today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. If you need assistance during the call please press star then 0. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Amy). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday, 19 of December, 2013.

On the call today we have Ephraim Kenyanito, Amr Elsadr, Ching Chiao, Chris Dillon, (unintelligible), (Jennifer Chung), Jim Galvin, (Justin Chu), (Mark Gonsend), Patrick Monahan, (Peter Durnbach), Petter Rindforth, (unintelligible), Sarmad Hussein, (unintelligible)...

Woman: You called my name already.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: ...if you could identify yourself...

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: And we have received no apology for the moment on today's call. From staff we have Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund, Steve Sheng, Mary Wong, Glen de Saint G ery and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to please mute their microphones in the Adobe Connect room. You can do this by clicking on the microphone icon at the top of the Adobe Connect toolbox. If you're on the audio bridge please mute your phone as we're getting background noise.

Thank you very much and over to you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And welcome, everyone. This is Julie Hedlund. And until we select the chair or chairs for this call I'll lead this session.

And then once we - as you'll see later in the agenda, once we select chairs, which we may do on this call or we may do also on the list, depending on volunteers, then from that point on I'll turn the call over to the chairs. But welcome, everyone, and thank you for joining and also thank you for joining so close to the holidays.

Just to review the agenda, which you see in the Connect room - it sounds like we need someone to mute their line. Thank you. So just to review the agenda, we're - staff will do an introductory presentation. This is going to cover a little bit about the policy development process for those of you who may not be familiar with it, some background on the translation and transliteration of contact information and the issues that this PDP working group will address, some background on the working group charter.

And Steve Sheng will provide some information on a feasibility study that is being conducted which will provide some information useful to this working group. And then we will have some administrative matters including proposals for our co chairs, chairs or co chairs, any other business that anyone wants to suggest and then confirmation of our next meeting and our meeting schedule.

And before we dive into this agenda I would like to ask if anybody has any questions about it, if anyone has anything they would like to add to it please go ahead.

Thank you. I don't hear any suggestions so I'm going to move into the introductory presentation and the slides are the ones that you see in the Adobe Connect room.

Moving to Slide 2 just to go over what we'll cover here. We have some information on the policy development process, the overview, the workload deliverables, background on the issue of translation and transliteration of contact information, some information on the working group charter and an overview of the feasibility study.

Moving along to the GNSO policy development process. And I see there is a question in the chat room from Jim Galvin. And I'm going to go ahead and ask that question as well. We have somebody in the Adobe Connect chat room who is identified just as W - oh, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. Thank you very much. I did not see - I didn't see down the list to your answer. Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich and welcome. We'll note that you are on the call and make sure that you're added to the attendee list. Thank you.

So some background. So the - as part of the GNSO improvements process - and I'm not going to read everything on the slide, you can see it there yourself. But there was a new policy development process that was developed and that established a working group approach.

And that established the working groups that we have that then look at a particular PDP, in this case the PDP on translation and transliteration of contact information. This revised PDP was adopted in December of 2011 and now all working groups and all PDPs follow these particular procedures.

So this graphic is an overview of the policy development process. And I'll explain then where we are in this process if it's not already apparent. First there is an issue that's identified. In this case the issue came out of the work of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group.

And one of the issues they identified was the translation and transliteration of contact information, who should decide who should bear the burden of that and whether or not there should be translation and transliteration.

And once that issue was identified it was scoped and an issue report was developed. There was a preliminary issue report that staff developed and that went out for public comment. And then from those comments there was a final issue report on the translation and transliteration of contact information policy development process.

And the GNSO Council approved that report. And the policy - the GNSO Council approved the initiation of a PDP on translation and transliteration of contact information.

So then, you know, the next logical step is to form a - to develop a charter which we had a drafting team that developed the charter for this PDP working group and that charter was approved. And several of you who are on this call were also in that drafting team and thank you for your work.

And that then - once that was accepted by the Council the Council asked staff to invite volunteers for a PDP working group. And those of you who were on this call and others I think also have volunteered for this working group and I thank you very much for that.

So that puts us right at the center of this graphic here. And what the working group does is then seeks the opinion of ICANN advisory committees and supporting organizations and has deliberations on the information it gathers. It will publish an initial report. And that will go out for comment and there'll be, you know, information collected around that.

We'll ask for statements from the stakeholder groups and constituencies on that report. And then there'll be a final report that will be presented to the

Council. The Council will deliberate on that. And just to go to the next graphic, there are several things that can happen once it goes to the Council.

The Council could say, "No, we don't adopt this. Send it back to the working group for more work." Or it could say, "Yes, adopted." And then that would follow appropriate voting thresholds in the - that are set forth in the PDP manual. And then there would be a report that would go to the Board and then following that there would be implementation. So that's the process. And we are at the working group stage just starting that.

And of course please interrupt me at any time if you have any questions, if anything is not clear. I know I'm moving fairly quickly but we have a fair number of slides and I want to make sure we have time for everything in our, you know, in our schedule today. Or you may also put a question into the Chat room and I'll keep an eye on that as well.

So some of the requirements that I've mentioned on the PDP is that there needs to be statements gathered from constituency and stakeholder groups. The working group needs to formally seek the opinion of advisory committees and supporting organizations. This has to happen early in the process.

There needs to be an initial report that goes out for public comment so that's a key deliverable. And there's a review of the comments coming out of that public comment process. And then those are taken into consideration in the development of a final report.

I'm noting that Rudi Vansnick has joined us. Welcome, Rudi. And I'm hoping that others are not having connectivity problems. I see that Patrick is having some connectivity problems. I'm noticing that there are various people typing in the Chat. Maybe I'll just wait for a second and see if here are questions that arise from that that I need to address.

Okay. All right then I'm going to ahead then and move ahead. So what can you expect as a member of this working group? What is your workload? First of all generally the working groups meet weekly for a one-hour phone conference.

Email traffic will happen on the list and that's something that working groups - the working group participants need to pay attention to because some of the work may be done on the list. Not mentioned here but worth mentioning is that there's also a wiki and information will be placed on the wiki for review and consideration.

And then staff of course will - can be tasked with producing various information to help the working group and we'll submit those materials prior to meetings to help with preparations, excuse me.

And these are just some links - and we'll put these slides out on the wiki as well - but some links for reference for you. Annex A of the bylaws talks about the PDP - the policy development process. There's the PDP manual and a new PDP overview.

And thank you, Amr, for putting up the link to the working group wiki. I do appreciate that.

So before I move ahead onto the background on the translation and transliteration PDP I want to give people the opportunity to ask about policy development process and the expectations for this working group. Are there any questions about the process or deliverables for this working group?

I see Amr, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Julie. This is Amr. Can everybody hear me?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, we can hear you.

Amr Elsadr: Great. I was just going to note that the slides you had earlier on the PDP overview did not include the implementation review team part of the process. I'm not sure if that was left out intentionally for some reason or if it's just not part of the process that you wanted to cover but just thought I'd bring it up. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Amr. I'm afraid I missed part of what you said, and I apologize. What was it that was missing from the process? And I apologize, I - for whatever reason I wasn't...

Amr Elsadr: I'm sorry. The slide with the PDP overview the process ended with implementation in the last box...

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: ...I guess you could also add implementation review team as another - oh this is - yeah, after...

Julie Hedlund: I went back, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, there would also be an implementation review team - oh and this is part of the process I suppose.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I think that's correct. We - for the - this is a, you know, graphic that was produced to show sort of the PDP itself is sort of - seemed to - if you look at the PDP manual it sort of ends at implementation because that part passes off to, you know, the implementation team and staff and so on. And so it's not shown here but you're absolutely right, that is still a key part...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: It would make sense because implementation review is not actually part of the development process.

Julie Hedlund: That's correct.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, I just thought I'd mention it because I do note that there are some new participants to working groups on this one so I just thought it would be a...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I think it's very helpful to mention, Amr, and I really appreciate it.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: And I see that there is a question from (Peter Durnbach). "Is there a time with which - sorry - within which we should come up with the initial report and final report?"

There are some guidelines. There's not a strict deadline per se. And just to - I'm just going to go into - I actually have it up in front of me. You can't see it but I have the - I have the policy development process manual in front of me. There's not a specific timeline but staff has some - sort of some guidance timelines. And in general I think that at - okay. All right hold on. I seem to have - okay, pardon me, I lost my Adobe Connect page for a second.

So I think that it's expected to take several months to develop an initial report and final report. Part of it is that once the initial report is developed there will also be then the public comment process. That may include a reply comment as well depending on the comments that are initially received. That alone can

take a couple of months. And then, you know, and then the production of the final report.

And I see that Lars Hoffman has his hand up and followed by Rudi Vansnick so let's start a queue. Lars, please go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: Yeah, thank you, Julie. Just for everybody this is Lars. It's also probably useful if we, you know, once we have agreed chairs for such that the group to work at come up with a work plan so that, you know, that we look at what issues we're going to sort out and at what time we would like to - or the group would like to come up with the - realistically come up with the results.

So that might help also to push along discussions and to help focus the group's work. It's worked for other groups and I think it might be a good idea.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, thank you Lars. And in fact there is, in the Working Group Guidelines a requirement that the working group should come up with a timeline of deliverables. So I think once the working group has a sense of the amount of work and study that will go into the issues then they have a better idea of planning the timing for that as well.

And then, Rudi, please go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Rudi speaking. Well with regards to the report I think it's also important to mention that this PDP working group depends on a lot of others. And others are going to influence also some of our decisions and maybe objectives to go and search for especially recently I was in the call for the Whois (unintelligible) Webinar. It was quite interesting to know that in fact the study didn't yet take care of what contact data is translated or transliterated. Does that have an impact on Whois misuse?

So you see it's - we have a lot of relations with other working groups where input from those working groups could influence our report too. Just to

mention that it's not just our (unintelligible), it's a bit larger, it's all - affects the Whois data. And I think we have to look like (unintelligible) direction.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rudi. That's absolutely correct. There are other groups, as we'll mention here later in this presentation, whose work could be funneled into or must be take in consideration by this working group. That's a very good point. Thank you.

I see that Petter Rindforth has said, "To summarize: Our timeline is generally ASAP." Well, yes within reason. And I see that in the Chat Ching Chiao has said, "For the timeline I guess we also take into account of other three recommendations in the IRD report."

He says, "It seems to me 1-2 years to get everything done." And Rudi, oh my God, yes, well. Let's see if we can't do better than that but we'll see. But thank you for all your comments, I appreciate it. Any other comments before we go forward into the next part of the presentation?

Lars, I see your hand is still up so I don't know if that means you have another comment?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, Julie, yes. It's basically off-topic but I thought I'd leave my hand up. Nathalie just pointed out to me that there's a couple of people that are in the Adobe room and also on the audio bridge - and/or on the audio bridge - that have not formally signed up to the group. And obviously this is - it's an open group so anybody can join us.

But if they do I'd just like to remind everybody that they should submit - just write an email to the GNSO secretariat and then also they would have to submit an SOI so that all the formalities are kept. But obviously you can stay on the call for today though it's no problem.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Lars. Yes, for those of you who've not formally joined the working group we do of course welcome more participants. It's very important that we have broad representation on this working group so I urge you if you are interested, after you have listened to this call to join, please do get in touch with the secretariat. We'll be happy to have more volunteers. Of course by the time you've finished listening to this call you may all want to run away but hopefully not.

So background on the translation and transliteration PDP. So as I mentioned, there was an initial issue report was published on March 21 of 2013. I'm sorry, the - that was the - actually that's the final issue report I should say.

And following that the PDP was initiated by the GNSO on the 13th of June of this year. There was a drafting team formed that submitted the charter to the Council on the 30th of September and the Council approved the charter on 20-November in its meeting in Buenos Aires. And following that the staff called for volunteers for the PDP working group on the 27th of November. And I do, again, want to thank everybody for joining - for those of you who have joined.

Lars, I see your hand is still up, did you have another comment?

Lars Hoffman: This time it's definitely residual, I'm sorry, I'll put it down immediately.

Julie Hedlund: That's okay. Just want to be sure. So some background on the issue and why it's important. So text requests and content returned by domain name registration data services, and by that we mean such as Whois, are encoded using US Standard Code for Information Interchange, ASCII, for those of you who are familiar with it. That's based on the English alphabet and script - the Arabic script.

Currently there are no standards or conventions for all Whois protocol implementations to signal support of character sets other than US ASCII. And

I should mention here that this is really a summary on the issue. There are a lot more details. And we do have a link to the issue report. I urge you all to read the final issue report. There's much more data and information there.

And I know that people such as Jim Galvin in particular who's on this call are extremely knowledgeable on these issues. And I know, Jim, you probably understand that we're summarizing to a certain extent. But there's a lot more detail that I urge you all to look at in the final issue report. We'll send a link to that when I follow this call as well.

But some more background. Translation is the process of conveying the meaning of some passage of text in one language so that it can be expressed equivalently in another language. Transliteration is the process of representing the characters of an alphabetical or syllabic system of writing by the characters of a conversion alphabet.

So for example, something might be translated but not transliterated; something might be transliterated but not translated or you could have a combination of the two. Both can be important for helping people understand information.

And what is contact information? So that enables someone using a service such as Whois to contact the domain name registration holder so that's the name, organization, postal address, registered name holder, technical contact as well as administrative contact.

You might imagine then if I, for instance, pull up - if I - for instance I'm an Arabic speaker and I pull up information from the Whois and it's all in English and it's all, you know, in a language that I cannot read or if I'm, you know, a Mandarin speaker and it's not in a script that I can read or in a language that I can read, it would be very difficult for me, conceivably, to contact the domain name registration holder if I can't read that information.

So the RAA, that is the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, specifies the data elements that must be provided by registrars but it does not require that these data elements be translated or transliterated.

So as I mentioned before this issue grew out of the work of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group. And just for background to all of you, that working group was a joint working group formed by a Board resolution to look at the issue of internationalized registration data.

And that group looked at many issues relating to internationalized registration data but called out the issue of translation and transliteration of contact information as a key issue that should be addressed in a PDP. And that - by that way that group had participants from the GNSO and from the SSAC and was chaired by Jim Galvin who also is here with us today so Jim has a lot of background. So - keep putting you on the spot, Jim, I'm not asking you to say anything.

So the IRD Working Group noted that many language translation systems are inexact. There are likely to be problems with consistency and accuracy. Translation and transliteration may vary across languages using the same script. Things may be translated or transliterated differently even within a language. How would a registrar determine which spellings to use for each registrant? How would a registrant verify the correctness of a translation or a transliteration even if it's presented such data by the registrar or by a third party translator or transliterator.

Yes, thank you, Jim, for pointing out the IRD Working Group also co chaired with Edmon Chung.

So those are the issues. But to go into more specifics we need to look at the charter that's been approved by the GNSO Council. But before I do that I want to ask - I'll go back a slide - I would like to ask if there are any questions about the background that we've given you on the issue? Then I'll move

along but of course you can ask questions at any time and also when we finish this presentation.

So the charter, the most important thing about the charter is the mission and scope. And the charter really is based on the issues that were identified in the final issue report and there were two issues: Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script? And who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information into a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script?

And I should just note that, you know, there are many sub-issues really connected with these two issues but these are the two main issues that were identified in the issue report for the PDP.

So, in developing the charter, the drafting team wanted to highlight some other important questions and I want to highlight them here for you as well. And, so, you know, main question is, what are the benefits to the community or translating or transliterating contact data? Particular in light of the cost.

Should the translation or transliteration of contact data be mandatory or only for registrants or only for those based in certain countries or using specific non-ASCII scripts? When should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?

And maybe I'll just go back to those and also I'm going to just look again at the charter. I'm just pulling out some of the other things in the charter. You know, actually I think it might be useful - well, let me move ahead and then at some point during this call. I don't have it loaded here in the Adobe Connect Room but I can load it pretty quickly.

I think it might be useful for us to just scan through the charter but let me go through this presentation and make sure we have time for it and then if we've

got time within the call, I'll pull the charter up as well. But we can certainly do that at our next meeting and ask people to do some preparatory for the next meeting of going through the charter as well.

So, just to cover the next steps. We're having our inaugural working group meeting today now. We need to nominate and elect chairs for this working group. We need to develop a work plan and we need to reach out to the supporting organizations and advisory committees to solicit input from them.

And as noted, we also have an expert working group that's looking at internationalized domain name registration data requirements concurrently and also outcomes from this PDP and Jim Galvin is chairing that group. So as Rudi mentioned, we have several things that are sort of tied together in this effort.

Ching Chiao was asking if there's anyone from the LEA sector. I don't know that we have anyone from LEA as a participant. Is there anyone -- and I just don't know that from the top of my head -- is there anyone on the call who identifies or is a representative from the law enforcement sector? I think that's a good point, Ching, and perhaps we need to reach out to someone in that area.

So, just some further information. We do have a working group wiki space. There is the charter and the final issue report is also very important. And Jim, you've raised your hand. Go ahead, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Julie. Jim Galvin for the recording. Ching just made me think more generally about the question of whether or not we have representation in this group from all of the groups, the EWG in particular has called out. EWG is a working model of a list of purposes of registration data and they've identified a number of constituencies, if you will, that have a reason for having access to the data.

And it occurs to me that we should try to make sure and do our best to get representation from each of those constituencies in this group, law enforcement just being one of them. But intellectual property jumps out at me also. I'm pretty sure we've got registry and registrars covered. But that might be something to investigate. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jim. We do have - so I'm looking at the list of membership in the wiki. We have got representatives from registry, registrars, NCSG, IPC, NCUC, NPOC. So, (unintelligible) they're a fairly good representation but I am cognizant that we do want to make sure it's as broad as possible and I see that Rudi's mentioning isn't that the task of the work group to reach out to them rather than getting them inside the working? That's a good question, and I see that Ching Chiao also has his hand up as well. Ching?

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Julie. Can you hear me okay?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, we hear you just fine, Ching. Thank you so much.

Ching Chiao: Thanks. I just want to point out and thanks to Jim to bring it up. I think the composition of members in the EWG and how it gets formed, it's different than this PDP working group as it's pretty much a GNSO (buttoned-up) PDP process and the EWG is kind of a board or staff-driven implementation working group.

So, I do appreciate that the thinking and the planning to reach out to other constituency. But (unintelligible) I think we'd just like to emphasize that this is a GNSO working group and I will hope that someone actually very capable like Jean can also take the lead or others can take the lead on this working group. Just want to point this out (unintelligible).

Man: Hello. Did we lose Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Hello, Julie is here and I was on mute. I was speaking. I'm saying wonderful things that you all missed, and I'll just shorten it all to say thank you very much for your many comments. They're all very important and we will indeed capture all of this in the chat room as well. So, I'm going to move along and actually turn things over to Steve Sheng and he's going to talk about the feasibility study that's ongoing and actually I think that we have a separate set of slides here from Steve that I can pull up.

Let's see. Hold on a moment as I get them. Okay. Steve, I'll go ahead and turn it over to you and these should be the slides that you provided.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Julie and hello everyone. I'm going to provide a quick update on the related feasibility study. As part of implementing the Whois review team recommendations, particular in the area of internationalized registration data that is recommendation 12 to 14, the Whois review team has called for a study to evaluate available solutions for internationalized registration data.

We recently kicked off this study. I'm going to provide a very quick overview of what the study is covering. In essence, the study is covering three areas. The first area is to document the submission and display practices of internationalized registration data at a representative set of gTLD registries and registrars. As Julie mentioned earlier, one of the issues in this space is, you know, there's a variety of practices. Most registries don't handle the IRD very well and there's a variety of practices. So the first order of business is to document those.

The second part is to consider and assess the cost and functionality of commercial and open source solutions for transliterating and translating the internationalized registration data. I think that part will be probably particularly relevant for this working group. And the third part is to consider and assess the accuracy implications for transliteration and translation of the internationalized registration data.

As Julie mentioned, you know, also some of the other high level questions along with the charter questions. So those are to be considered by the study. We have a study team. Some of them are here as well on this call. We recently kicked off the study is meeting - right now we're meeting weekly and aiming to produce an interim draft report by the Singapore ICANN meeting.

So that's a quick update on the study. The study team was also thinking about providing, you know, more or less regular update to the PDP working group as the areas overlap and there will be interest. There might be interest from the working group to consider, you know, the study updates sooner. So that's kind of a general quick update on (unintelligible). I'll take any questions on this.

Julie Hedlund: Any questions for Steve? Steve, I'm wondering - I do have a question, too. This is not related to the feasibility study. But oh, one question, and I apologize if I missed it, but do you a sense of when the study might be completed?

Steve Sheng: So the current timeline is an interim report by Singapore meeting with some additional consultations in Singapore and a final report by London in six months.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Steve, and I do think - and I think we discussed this in Buenos Aires as well, that some regular updates would be quite helpful to this particular group. And I see Amr has his hand up. Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Julie. This is Amr Elsadr. I was just wondering if we could get perhaps a link to the terms of reference of the study, so we might know more details about what to expect when we're reading it. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Amr Elsadr. That's a very good and valid request. I think we will be able to post that fairly soon as those have already been finalized. So, when those are posted, I'll send a link to this PDP working group, the location

for the terms of reference, as well as the study team members. And, you know, regular progress. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Steve. That's extremely helpful. Any other questions for Steve? I see Petter Rindforth has his hand up. Petter, please go ahead.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Sorry if I missed some of the information but just a general question. Do we have any summarized on how ccTLDs have been working with us because some of them that have now quite a long practice of dealing with in this (unintelligible) station data?

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Petter.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Very good question. So the answer to that is probably in the original IRD report that was done probably three years ago, we did some very, very informal survey of ccTLDs. We probably did 17 ccTLDs and asked for their submission practice. It was a very rough survey but it would provide kind of a general, you know, kind of a baseline of what the space of practice is around that timeframe. For this study, you know, we probably want to do a more thorough job in terms of, you know, selecting a more representative set of ccTLDs and gTLDs.

As in terms of registration practice, although ccTLD and gTLD face very different constraints but I think the lessons from the ccTLDs can be, you know, it will be a very useful background and shared with the g space. So, thank you for that.

Julie Hedlund: And Petter, you have a follow-up question.

Petter Rindforth: I guess (unintelligible) there, that sounds very good because I think it will be good for us, both groups to learn of the platform (managers) on network, how

they deal with it and what kind of problems that have come up. And also to have it updated because much has happened during these last three years so it's good to have update.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Petter. And Ching Chiao, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Julie, and thank you once again, Steve, for the update. I have a quick question on the current slide on the feasibility study and I'm glad to see three distinctive items. But maybe to think a little bit ahead. So Steve, do you suggest this PDP to also to work with you and with other members from the Whois review team of these three areas?

Do you suggest that we, I mean, do not make effort or do not, I mean, duplicate our efforts on these three areas? I mean, just to think ahead, what do you suggest here? I mean, given that you have already have those, I mean, (unintelligible) study being initiated. So, just look for your thoughts. Thanks.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Ching. I think that's a very good question. One of the challenges of, you know, probably as we have seen on the call is there are lots of moving parts in different efforts, and the challenge I think overall for us is how do we coordinate and enable sharing of information on that?

So, my I'd like to take your question back and think a bit more on how to collaborate. But I kind of, you know, would agree with you. You know, there's a lot of expertise even, you know, in the registry, especially in registry and registrar practice and other areas in this PDP, and it will be very useful of that some of those knowledge can be shared, you know, with this study.

So, let me acknowledge your question and think a bit more on how to collaborate and come back to the PDP working group with a proposal. How is that?

Julie Hedlund: And Ching, go ahead. You have your hand up.

Ching Chiao: Thanks for - yes. Thanks Julie and thanks Steve. And yes, I fully agree with you. I think more coordination is definitely needed. And it also help us for this working group as a working group that will be focusing on the policy development and it seems this feasibility studies, you guys are thinking (unintelligible) summarizing the industry best practice on the IRD and also the contact info translation and transliteration.

So I definitely think there is many layers and levels of coordination (unintelligible) but thanks again.

Steve Sheng: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Ching. And are there any other questions for Steve? Steve, I'm wondering if you could just mention briefly that we do have another - we have an expert working group that's looking at the internationalized registration data. The group that Jim Galvin is leading, could you mention just the name of that group and indicate briefly what they're looking at?

Steve Sheng: Sure, Julie. I think as we may recall, the original IRD working group has about three or four recommendations in the areas of internationalized registration data. In this particular working group that PDP is taking upon the issue of translation and transliteration issue, which is, you know, probably the hardest part and if not more controversial.

With respect to the output of Whois, there are other elements besides just the contact information, and those also needs to be - the internationalized requirement for those also needs to be discussed. So that is kind of sets the context for this Whois review team, you know, group that to define the requirements for internationalized registration data. That includes, you know,

all the major elements that output today in the directory service to define requirements with those.

So that's what the other working group is doing. Where I think very similar to the feasibility study, the two groups, the PDP and the other requirement groups also needs to closely coordinate I think in a way to, you know, take input and take feedback and provide feedback. So, that's where we are on that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Steve, and I should point out to everyone that that particular expert working group is led by Jim Galvin and Jim Galvin is also a member of this working group, and Steve and I of course work closely so we will ensure that we coordinate and as some of you may have seen in the chat room, I will add to the wiki, this PDP working group wiki, the link to that expert working group so that you will have it at hand.

And Yoav Keren has his hand up. Yoav, please go ahead. Yoav, if you are speaking, you may be on mute. Yoav, we're not hearing you. I see you are typing. Not on mute. Nathalie, perhaps the Operator could see what the situation is with Yoav. It appears that we cannot...

Yoav Keren: Can you hear me now?

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible) muted. Thank you so much. Go ahead, Yoav.

Yoav Keren: Okay. So, I have a very quick comment. I just want to remind everyone yes we have this working group but the expert working group has no formal stand in the policymaking process at ICANN and the GNSO and this working group has the entire - the option to decide on the policy unrelated to anything provided by the expert working group. Saying that, of course it's very important since they are doing very important work that we will collaborate and get information. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Yoav, for making that point. And I should note that, though, I should add that that expert working group cannot, of course, make policy. That can only come out of a policy development process. So, the recommendations from that expert working group could indeed then become an issue that can be taken up in a PDP, but I think that's a very important distinction that you've made. Thank you.

And Yoav, you have your hand up again. Would you like to follow up, please?

Yoav Keren: No. It's okay. Sorry. I just didn't take it up.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Thank you. Just wanted to be sure. So, I should note that we have just four minutes left and we have a few matters that we need to take into consideration. First of all, we do need volunteers for co-chairs and I think that it might be helpful if we ask for volunteers here and if anybody wants to volunteer on this call and have their name put out there, that would be great.

And I think that staff should then follow up and put those names out on the list, ask if there are other volunteers, and then perhaps we could make the decision of how to proceed if there are multiple volunteers at our next calls. Does anybody want to volunteer for the role of role, co-chair and we can have co-chairs, we can have vice chairs. It's entirely up to this group how you want to do it.

I see that Chris Dillon is offering to be a co-chair and I should note that Rudi Vansnick and Chris Dillon were co-chairs of the drafting team for the charter and I see that Rudi Vansnick has nominated Chris Dillon and Amr Elsadr has seconded Chris. And (unintelligible) has nominated Rudi. And I see that (unintelligible) said that Ching Chiao is applauding and (Justin Chu) has seconded Rudi and Amr is applauding as well and plus one.

I'm seeing a lot of support here for our two candidates. I think we have quite good representation on this call from our list of working group members and

so I think that what I could do is go ahead and announce to the list that we have Chris and Rudi nominated and seconded and that unless there are any objections -- and I doubt that there will be -- that they will take up their posts on our next call.

Is that okay with everyone? And thank you, Chris and Rudi, and we will give you all the help that you need. Amr has asked, "Wouldn't someone from the contractor parties like to co-chair this working group?" I think we can certainly ask that and we can ask if there are other volunteers before we close this out. Thank you, Amr. And we can certainly have more co-chairs as well. There's no reason that we only have two or we can have vice chairs as well.

So, our last order of business is to set up our schedule of meetings. I think no one wants to meet over the holidays and if you do, I'm sorry, I'm not going to schedule anything over the holidays. So, pardon me, there's some background noise here. So, looking at the calendar, if we looked at two weeks, we would be looking at the 2nd of January. Would that be a time that would work for people or do we want to move out? Is that a little bit too soon after the New Year's? And would we want to instead look out to the 9th?

I see 2nd is okay with Chris. Would the 2nd work for you, Rudi? I'm seeing okay, okay, support for the 2nd. Then let's go ahead and schedule for the 2nd of January and I see actual that Jim Galvin's not available until the 9th. Ching Chiao will be available after the 7th. Let me ask again, are others available on the 9th if we want to make sure that we have everyone?

Okay. I see Chris has said the 9th is also good and Patrick, Petter, yes, I'm seeing support for the 9th. All right. Then we'll schedule for the 9th just to make sure we have fuller participation. Then I have no other business other than to wish all of you a wonderful holiday and an extremely happy New Year and I'm very much looking forward to working with all of you in the New Year.

Coordinator: Thanks very much, (Amy), you may stop the recordings.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. And I'm sorry, just to note that I see a question in the chat room from Jim Galvin. It would be at the same time, the call would be at the same time as it is today. We'll stick with that time unless we have to change it.

Jim Galvin: And we move to weekly then starting on the 9th is what we're seeing.

Julie Hedlund: We'll move weekly. Thank you for that confirmation, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone. Happy holidays and...

Man: Happy holidays (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: ...I'll see you in a few weeks.

Man: Thanks, everybody.

Man: Happy holidays.

Man: Thank you, all. Bye-bye (unintelligible).

Woman: See you next year.

Woman: Bye-bye, everyone.

END