

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION**

**Thursday 23 April 2015 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 23 April 2015 at 1300 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-23apr15-en.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

**Attendees:**

Chris Dillon – NCSG  
Jim Galvin - RySG  
Amr Elsadr – NCUC  
Petter Rindforth – IPC  
Justine Chew – Individual  
Sara Bockey – RrSG  
Peter Green – NCUC  
Wen Zhai - RySG  
Wanawit Ahkuputra - GAC  
Roger Carney - RrSG  
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC  
Pascal Haddad - Individual

**Apologies:**

Peter Dernbach - IPC  
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC

**ICANN Staff**

Julie Hedlund  
Lars Hoffmann  
Glen de St Gery  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recording has been started. Please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Ali). Good morning, good afternoon good evening everybody and welcome to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group call on the 23 April 2015.

On the call today we have Chris Dillon, Wanawit Ahkuputra, Wen Zhai, Sara Bockey, Petter Rindforth, Justin Chew, Jim Galvin and Peter Green. We received apologies from Peter Dernbach and Rudy Vansnick. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much in over to you Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed Nathalie. All right so let's just do statements of interest. And I need to ask you are there anybody's statement of interest has changed since we last met?

Hearing nothing and seeing nothing that means we can proceed into the next part of the meeting which is our continuing with the various comments received in the Public Comment Review tool.

I would like to thank all of you who sent comments in very much. We've - well Lars and I have worked quite hard to get through all of them. Quite a, you know, very, very grateful for, you know, some really long helpful comments there.

And so obviously we're running slightly behind schedule in the work plan. So what I'm intending to do is to go fairly quickly through in fact three different versions - well two and a bit versions of the document.

So we're going to - the version you have in front of you is the one which has Justin's comments then. And I'm actually intending only to pick up one of the comments in there. But we'll then have a look at two other versions of the document to look at some comments in those versions.

So we'll be looking at Petter's comments and Amr's comments. In fact so anyway obviously as we're doing this if at any time that there's you saw something and you'd like to bring up something which I'm not talking about you're very welcome too.

It may be slightly more difficult because as I'm saying I am intending to go through the document, you know, really rather quickly. We won't spend time slowly scrolling today. We're just going to go straight to the ones that we want to deal with.

And the first one is Number 86. And so I'll just go down there. I think you can - I'm hoping you can see what I can see on the screen. Oh, there (unintelligible) I managed to do, 86.

All right and here we have the comment that, you know, there's a question is a comment discussed in the final report and, you know, also does it not merit a response? And basically the - this comment is picked up in the report on Page 72. And what it's saying is that feasibility and consistency are also important issues.

So I don't know if anybody would like to raise anything on that but if not that is actually the last thing I'm intending to say about Justin's comments on the document. And after this we're intending to move on. And I'm just going through these I should just make that clear. I'm just going through these in order of, you know, receipt of comment.

So the next person to send comments in was Petter so we'll be onto that version just in a minute. So I'm glad to see Justin and Amr in fact are on the

call. So this is our last glance at (Justin)'s comments and the last one I'm intending to pick up is Number 86, right.

All right well in that case and this is magic behind the scenes. And I'm hoping we'll be able to see Petter's comments in a moment. And then we can continue with Comment 4 in that version of the document. Let's see if we meant for that to happen here. This is just nervous moment in a meeting and I wonder whether I should sing to you or provide some other entertainment. Yes I could always do the bit I was intending to do at the beginning of the meeting if we'd had had more time.

Okay yes well, I shall say I might think about St. George's Day I think because today in England it's St. George's Day. And St. George is very famous for slaying dragons. So this is a very good day to be solving problems.

Now I noticed the screen flickered then. I'm wondering - no I think we're still on Justin's version in fact. Okay I mean the other thing Petter is actually offering to do a spoken account of it. And yes that may also - oh yes, just that may also work, just a moment. So right, I'm actually thinking we probably should do that. And so Petter I'm sorry about this. I was intending to go through my notes but we actually can't do that.

Thank you very much.

Petter Rindforth: So Petter here. Do you hear me?

Chris Dillon: I think I can hear you but I think we have your version on the screen. And no, just a moment. Does this look familiar? Just a minute. I was intending to start at Number 4 and no something has - actually something has gone wrong here. This is another version. It's not the version it should be. So yes, if you could start Petter that would be - I'd be grateful.

Petter Rindforth: Okay hi, Petter here. I go quickly through some of the comments because well I'm most to facilitate them and point out what we already said and be a little bit more because when it comes to a couple other requests or some comments.

So if we start with point 4 just wanted to point out that IPC does not agree with a recommendation stating that it's not desirable to make transformational contact information mandatory as IPC support mandatory translation transliteration.

And what I suggested that as a possible rephrasing for the - if the majority of the working group agree could be that the working group could recommend that transformation of contact information does not need to be mandatory. I could recommend instead of that is not desirable. Now if I quickly go through the rest, that's what...

Chris Dillon: Yes that - well actually I was myself intending to start at Number 4. And I don't as far as I'm aware there would be no difficulty with using does not need to be instead. So I think there's probably no problem with that.

And yes Amr is asking what the - and, you know, what the change is. And as far as I understand it is desirability versus need. And moreover we've got the correct version of...

Petter Rindforth: Yes.

Chris Dillon: ...it on the screen so that is happy to see.

Petter Rindforth: Yes Petter here again. My - this is my personal views based on what I have discussed within IPC. But I feel it's a little bit too strongly or the majority will leave it to its use of to take on our recommendations here.

I think it is a little bit hard to say early in the document that it's not too desirable even if we talk about the mandatory. So that's why I wanted to cut the edge on that comment.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes indeed. Obviously to some extent because we've got desirability in the question that we, you know, we can't touch that but we can do it in the response. Jim would you like to pick up something there?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim for the transcript. I guess I'm concerned that we're not taking a real position if we, you know, don't say whether it's mandatory or not. I mean my concern with the suggested phrasing from Petter is just that it's a way of not really - it sounds like we're not deciding whether or not it's mandatory or not. That's my comment.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes I - we would not want to, you know, we certainly would not want to give the impression that we weren't making the decision. I think we do, you know, we do need to make that decision. It's, you know, that really is a key part of this. Petter would you like to pick up something?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, just a note. I can accept that. But if we still can find some more diplomatic wording so to speak that can read as the majority decision that it's not desirable but rephrase it in a way that cut off the tag so to speak. So I'm open for any suggestion. I don't have any specific secondary suggestion at this moment but if you can think about it that would be good.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes. I mean our intention is to take the various comments in the Working Group response column and add them to the draft of the final report. So we will do that and try and sort that out.

All right now I was intending next to pick up something under Number 22. I don't know whether you have something you'd like to raise before then. I can see also Amr has his hand up. Amr actually would you like to go first?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr. I actually I think it's - I think the initiative on Petter's part or the IPC's part to sort of try to change the language of the recommendation to try to achieve consensus I appreciate that actually.

I'm wondering if maybe we could work further on this. But I don't want to do this now on the call. And I would be willing to pick this up on list if it's okay with Petter and others.

And maybe we could try to discuss sort of rephrasing of this recommendation which may also take into account on list discussion of a certain set of circumstances we could point to to change this recommendation. But for now I think it would be okay to just move ahead with the rest of the rebuttal. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes the comment is very much appreciated yes absolutely. But indeed let's, you know, if it would be possible to pick it up on the list that would be really good.

Okay so unless there's anything I'm intending to go down to such as 22, 23 well, oh, I'm sorry. I now jumped down to 40 when I'm supposed to be going to there we are 22, 23 around here.

And so and this is the whole business about changing the operator and the two supported by. And, you know, as far as I'm concerned, you know, I have no problem with that.

And then 23 is slightly more complicated because this is, you know, there was a suggestion that perhaps I think effectively what this means is that our,

you know, UN languages which are Latin character languages so that's Arabic and Chinese and Russian would be transformed to ASCII.

So, you know, I guess here it would mean that it wouldn't be possible to submit data in something like Thai which isn't a UN language or Japanese for that matter.

So yes, I think - so I think we can certainly note this. But, you know, certainly one of the positions is that, you know, if we start talking about UN languages it's in some ways it is a slightly unusual distinction to make but I just - I'd just like to note this comment. All right and unless there's anything else about that we get to go as far as about Number 28 perhaps and let's try and get down there without jumping.

And there is this whole issue about tagging and marking. And, you know, the key thing in the background here is that, you know, the language is easily identifiable. That's really what has to be in there. You know, however that's done and, you know, tagging may or may not be the way. Marking is possibly a more neutral expression. Petter would you like to pick up something there?

Petter Rindforth: Petter here yes. Sorry my comment there was just that I was not fully 100% clear what the suggested Working Group response was to this as it was a little bit short to sort of say than what IPC suggested.

So I mean as I read it it's okay. But I presume that this proposed Working Group response will be in a little bit more detail so that we can compare it to what we said yesterday originally. So that's - so I was not 100% sure about what the suggested Working Group's response was to this.

Chris Dillon: The - there have actually been several positions here. So I think originally possibly slightly naïvely the idea was just that there would be a tag saying that these dates are in Japanese.



It then became clear that the various fields within the data could be in different languages. So in fact it seemed that if tagging were to be used then it would be necessary to tag each field.

And of course at this point there is the issue that the number of fields is starting to go up and there could be problems with technology. So at that point there was a suggestion that instead of using the word tagging which is only one conceivable way of doing it a more neutral term so something like marking might be used. Because, you know, as I was saying a moment ago the key thing is that people know what language the data are in.

And in a sense it doesn't really matter how that is done. But the key thing is that it is done. And I'm hoping that that - okay so there are also a few comments in the chat room. And Amr was asking what is marking about? And, you know, that's how I'm using it. Jim would you like to pick up something there?

Jim Galvin: Thanks Chris. This is Jim for the transcript. I just wanted to go one level deeper in what you were saying. You know, you were talking about, you know, elements themselves. Different elements could be in different languages and scripts.

But to even complicate it further you can go inside an element like an address line is kind of the conical example and you find that multiple scripts can be in use there and it might in fact not be a single language. A conical example being using, you know, the Roman numbers zero through nine, you know, mixed in with address fields is kind of a common thing to do.

So, you know, the conceptual issue of marking or tagging however we decide to describe that is important and essential for the future but is a very complicated problem from a technical point of view. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes that is, you know, that is certainly an issue.

I mean to some extent, you know, one almost wants to say something like Arabic numbers and Roman alphabet, you know, they're almost a sort of international thing that, you know, they are highly likely to occur I mean, particularly the Arabic numbers. Actually they're highly likely to occur in other addresses, you know, certainly Japanese and Chinese ones.

And at this point we need to have a look at a few comments in the chat room. So oh yes and Peter Green is saying that marking could mean labeling the languages of the fields of the data elements. No Peter. I think that it was really more a matter of standing back and saying, you know, there may be problems with tagging.

So for me marking is more just a, you know, this needs to be done and obviously it's outside our scope for deciding how to do it. So it's really just a way of saying, you know, it needs to be done and we - and tagging may be - it may be a possibility but there may be better ways of doing it and that's really it. Okay. Jim would you like to pick up something on this?

Jim Galvin: Sorry old hand.

Chris Dillon: No that's all right. No problem. Okay. Now the next place I am I would like to stop is around about 46. Okay and so it's, you know, there is this whole issue about contact ability.

And I think one key thing here is that in the response we actually said emails. And that it may well be better to replace emails with communications because it's just a general issue here. But, you know, basically the, you know, the issue here is, you know, just contacting people in a language that they're not fluent in.

So if you, you know, if you contact, you know, for example Japanese people and they may well speak English but it's just if you contact them in Japanese

it's more likely you're going to get the response and if you contact them in English because it's just easier. So I think that's the sort of thing behind this one. Amr would you like to say something about number 46 or something else?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris this is Amr. Yes I would like to differentiate what contact ability as and what a requirement to respond to a contact is regardless of the language and the ability of a domain name holder to respond to a message being transmitted via email or any other form the requirements in the RAA is that the registrant is contactable. And this is achieved as the assistant notes via email. There is no requirement that the registrant responds to an email that he, she or it has received.

So I think key systems the comment they provided here is spot on. Registrant's contact ability is indeed guaranteed via email address. And this is done by verifying the email addresses during registration domain name registration.

If the IPC has concerns about registrants responding to messages regardless of whether it's in a language the registrant understands or not this is - I don't see this to be an issue that we should address or that we could actually address here.

Because the reasons why a registrant may not respond to an email may go well beyond the issue of not understanding the language the registrant has received.

I mean the - may go well beyond the fact that the registrant doesn't understand the language in which the email he or she or it is receiving. And there may be many other reasons why a registrant may choose not to respond. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Indeed yes. Thank you for that. Petter would you like to pick up something there?

Petter Rindforth: Petter here. I just wanted to point out that as I said here independently on how you tried to contact the holder, you know, many cases where they don't respond either why they refuse to respond or they have actually filed some false contact information it's up to the holder to make clear contact information.

And I can just make reference to when we have domain disputes and for instance WIPO send out they initially used the email information. But they also send by courier to the traditional postal address. And I mean if nothing on that works out the - they have done what they could do to contact the holder.

Chris Dillon: Indeed yes. Yes all right, a few things going on in the chat but to save time we might just go a little bit further down and we can always come back. Forty-nine, that's luckily just about on the screen. Oh in fact things are starting to come up. So Jim is saying we need to be careful to word things consistently with existing contracts and requirements.

Yes I think this is a topic that comes back in fact. A bit further down if I remember correctly. Okay and another comment from Amr. A registrant's email address is verified so that registration of the domain name is not possible until the applicant verifies that the email is indeed his, hers.

Registrants should be in violation of a RAA requirements if they do not perform this check and if the respective languages is (unintelligible). And Jim is then writing in particular not to overstate by guaranteeing that a registrant is contactable.

Okay and then Petter is saying that that's a term that that's only initially. Many then change that update as they need to do per their contract. Okay, now

whilst we're just waiting for that conversation to come through there is number 49.

Basically the issue here is that we're talking about the draft final report from the WG on the internationalized registration data but it's a long document and I wasn't sure exactly which part was being referred to there. So that's what that issue is. So we can bear that in mind as finish dealing with number 46.

Amr is saying to Petter I'm still not seeing the correlation with this PDP. There's also the issue of privacy proxy services making it more difficult to contact registrants or let's use irrespective of language as script.

Okay, quite a few other comments coming through there I think. Right now if we move on while it's still at the top of our minds we can have a look at 49. And really the issue there is that we've got this long document I suspect that it may be something at the beginning of it such as page 16 or page 20.

It may be something towards the end page 17 around there I'm not very sure so if somebody knows which part of that document that would be helpful for number 49.

Now, meanwhile on number 46 just in saying to Petter not necessarily only initially you might also use the domain names in scripts and in renewal notices but I agree with Amr the context of the issue is independent to transformation. Okay, Petter.

Petter Rindforth: Sorry, Petter quickly to end this discussion. Yes I know that contractually you need to have your contact information updated. What I once said that initially you have to otherwise you will not get the (resignation).

And then you obviously in so many cases the contact information that is impacted, changed which means that you can be reached out by when it

comes to dispute resolutions or when it comes to reminders of renewals but that's up to you as a domain holder.

Chris Dillon: Yes okay, yes. Petter what about - no sorry I'm asking the wrong person about this. I'm not sure whether we can deal with 49 today anyway, you know, it's not the last time we'll be coming here.

So, you know, if somebody does, you know, if somebody can shine some light on number 49 at some point then let's just do so. After 49 we go to 64 but before we do so Petter would you like to pick up something?

Petter Rindforth: Hi, Petter here, unfortunately I don't have the report in the list in front of me right now but they were in fact and their list is in our initial reply from APC a number of examples when a so to speak when a normal search on the Internet, normal (OE) search are done without the need to pay a lot of money for having it translated.

You wanted to make a quick search to just identify the holder in some initial way. So what I mean is it's as I understood the comments in 49 was that still that transformation or translation it's for those that wanted to pay a lot of extra money to get that information.

And what we have in the final report that I refer to it's in fact a list of examples when you need to do a cost efficient initial search without having to reach out to well people like me expensive lawyers or translators or so just to make a quick identification.

Chris Dillon: Okay yes that is enough to get the bit in and I have a vague recollection of it but I think that's one that's going to, it's going to be better to pick up on the list. So I'll just put a note to myself to come back to it at some point within the next couple days I'll email something to the list about that one.

All right, I think possibly 64 at this point. And so I think a point that I wanted to make here was that, you know, we've got the suggested solution but for me there are actually two solutions here and we have two possible solutions and the whole time we would really need to know which one we're talking about.

So one would be essentially organized transformation which, you know, conceivably could have something to do with the GAC or some other central organizations, you know, what would be a centrally organized solution which would be likely to produce high quality results.

The other solution would be, you know, some sort of automatic transliteration tool or transliteration or transformation done on a voluntary basis. And that is a very different solution because in that case it would be much more scattered and much more error prone.

So, you know, I'm almost commenting on the comment in that for me that, you know, that distinction really, really needs to be made. All right and I noticed (Amara) has his hand up during that I don't know whether I've explained the point or...

Amr Elsadr: Chris this is Amr I actually had my hand up to respond to Petter's last comment on question 49 but we seem to have moved ahead so...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Well if - by all means do that I mean we can still remember 49 right I think.

Amr Elsadr: Okay thanks. I'm not sure how the issue of a regular user doing a quick Whois lookup that may not result in or may not be instigated by a law enforcement query or may not result in something like a UDRP would help in the argument of cost efficiency.

If this is simply about a user who wants to do a Whois lookup then this is also a question of whether this justifies the added burdens of costs and liabilities to transformation.

Is it actually worth doing that or is not and I would suggest that it is not necessarily a good enough reason to mandate transformation and the costs and burdens involved with that.

So I do recognize that there may be other reasons why people may use a Whois lookup besides a law enforcement query or the desire to hold a UDRP but I still don't see that this is a good enough reason to mandate transformation, thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. All right, perhaps unless there's anything else about 49 or 64 we can hop down and I think the next may be something like 70. So I think there's nothing controversial about the first part of this.

So we've got internationally readable Whois is necessary for that. But, you know, at the end here we've got, change the Internet from a global base to a number of local info bases I think, you know, if there are several scripts and several languages or many languages in the database it doesn't mean that we end it with different databases with modern uni-code, you know, the language in the scripts can live together in the same database.

So that would be the response to that part and, you know, obviously, you know, the key thing here is that accuracy, you know, is more likely to be higher if it's in the original language. And, you know, there is a suspicion that transformation could involve some loss of information.

And there is also the claim in the middle here which is saying search only in each local language will increase the expenses. And actually no because if you have the various languages in the database you can, you know, you can



use copy and paste in the search facility and I think it shouldn't increase costs.

And now in the - and there are a couple of things going on in the chat. Petteer is just saying that 70 is in fact his reply to what Amr was just saying. And then Amr is saying there is also an assumption that transformation will be accurate useful. Yes okay.

You know, again, you know, this transformation under the two definitions I was mentioning earlier really and one (sort) may be better than the other. All right let us move perhaps to number 73, I stopped anyway.

I mean we mentioned the GAC very briefly earlier and I think, you know, it may well be good to put some sort of encouragement in the report, you know, to encourage the GAC or possibly some other central solution, you know, really along the lines I was mentioning a moment ago because, you know, that's sort of the coordinated transformation would be a lot better than an automatic or voluntary one.

All right and now we - now if we move on we go quite a long way because we end right at the end sort of 92 and 93 around there. Okay, now so here so the IPC doesn't agree in saying it's up to the provider of the data to make sure the tool is fully understandable.

And then later obviously ICANN will have a responsibility to support these regions so there's two comments really. But some I think, you know, there is this thing about fully understandable but, you know, it really doesn't - there isn't a link between the information being understandable and it being (unintelligible). So that's a slight (unintelligible) I think.

And then ICANN having a responsibility to support these regions. Yes but, you know, the budget for some of these things may be very, very high. Not necessarily to do too much on the transformation front.

All right, now I think what I would like to do is to ask that we load the other version of the document now because it may take a moment to load (Amar's) version but whilst we're loading it we can then deal with anything else about (Petter's) version. I think that might be a good approach.

So Lars if you can - that looks very good. In fact we have luxury we can do either we can either discuss (Petter's) or (Amar's). I should just wait a moment before I plunge in.

Okay and Amr is saying to Petter there's also an assumption here that transformation will be addressed. So we've had that one. At some point we will need to rework the language in the recommendations of the final report.

Yes absolutely but we - that's probably it's over a meeting away perhaps. Okay so the first one of (Amar's) comments that I'd like to pick up is in fact the first one and it's quite an easy one.

So Amr is not keen on the word accession and I'm wondering what would be an improvement to put Amr on the spot.

Amr Elsadr: Hi, this is Amr. I don't have a ready answer for an alternative to accession but I actually have to look up the definition of accession and when I first read the (unintelligible) response in the public comment but yes I don't think it is necessarily the right word.

Chris Dillon: Okay well, that can be another thing which is some homework for me so I will keep track of that so that, you...

Amr Elsadr: I'll do what I can to help I'm not twelve.

Chris Dillon: ...that would be much appreciated. I try to have the memory of an elephant for things like this and I'm pretty stubborn but that would be very helpful, okay.

Onto number 6 perhaps, smiley faces in the chat room. Now, as far as I am concerned I would quite happily add the wording of (Amar's) comment number 6. I think it just makes things a bit clearer.

And what he's writing - actually I'll just drive down to number 6 so people can actually see it. We're stopping at number 7 as well so we'll have the two at the same time or actually even the 3 because we're stopping at number 8 as well.

I hope everybody can see the correct place it should be 6, 7, 8 anyway. And so the wording goes something like agree with the working group response but we'd add that also we'd add that the argument here to oppose the recommendation is necessary to the continued development of a secure interested Internet specific subset of Internet users using Whois lookup.

Amr Elsadr: Apologies Chris this is Amr. Could you please desynch the document because the text is way too small for me to see on the screen (unintelligible) right now.

Chris Dillon: That's something I can't do but Lars may...

Amr Elsadr: Someone else just did so thanks for that, yes that way we can zoom in and be able to read the text, thanks.

Chris Dillon: So and familiar with the language script in which contact data will be transformed. Other registrants and contracted parties will be disparately burdened.

So as far as I was concerned that was all just, you know, just a useful increase, you know, expansion of the comment but I'm just raising it in case anybody wants to pick up some issue with that comment, which perhaps I haven't seen.

All right, moving on into number 7 just a bit further down. So basically I think there is a questioning about whether, you know, registrants submitting data, you know, this is just one circumstance.

So possibly one way to deal with this may be to make it more neutral and say something like if there were two different forms there could be an issue of discrepancies between the two data sets.

So an effectively, you know, I would say that this sort of things gives us all, you know, it could go on a list of issues we might want to make another PDP aware of. So I think that should cover it so, yes Amr would you like to take that up?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris, this is Amr. Yes I just wanted to point out in my, in what I said here in that in reading the ALAC response or the ALAC comment on this it doesn't seem to me that they are necessarily suggesting that the registrant provides the second form of transformed data anyone could possibly do that.

What they are simply suggesting is that there are two fields the transformed data could be provided by anyone who has not been and they haven't specified who would be doing this in their comments.

So in the working group response to assume that it's the registrants who might do that and there might be a discrepancy as a result is not necessarily a helpful response from the working group.

But again this goes to something that is beyond the scope and for one would like to see a number of recommendations coming out of this PDP saying that,

well we looked at all these issues and we believe that there may be some viable solutions to assist in having two forms of data on a non-mandatory basis but this would need to be looked at more closely by other PDP's and I'm just thinking this is something we could recommend, thanks.

Chris Dillon: Indeed, yes. Okay I do think making it more neutral may help this so but yes point taken. So a non-mandatory basis but hopefully not another (unintelligible) basis okay.

And then in fact I'm intending to go onto number 8 and so this is actually another case where I think the response, you know, the working group response, you know, is very brief it's just saying here's another response.

But I would actually be happy to replace the responses here. The only exception to that is the bit at the end and so providing an option for second non-authoritative data that is not necessarily - it's not providing me the conjunction it's providing an option for second non-authoritative dataset is not necessarily useful.

I say, you know, I would tend to go down that panel but, down that path but I would like to suggest that we replace the comment with this rather more helpful comment and go for useful there.

All right, after this the intention is to stop around about number 24. That might be quite a brief stop I think we've been there before but anyway let's just go and have a quick look at number 24 in the few minutes that remain to us.

Okay, so yes so the term of service thing I mean I'll be honest here I'm feel quite out of my depth here. I mean really this is just one I would really like the group to consider.

So with the term and enforcing this policy with a term of service to say the BC supports this recommendation provided the transformation to us is

mandatory. We suggest that the language of the registrar's term of service be used to determine the appropriate language.

I mean obviously we're in this hypothetical situation where either award the recommendation for transformation to happen mandatorily or just, you know, possibly, you know, people were or some group were carrying out transformation.

All the tripping over these terms and term of service. Amr would you like to rescue me, thank you.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris this is Amr. Yes I think what the BC is suggesting here is that there is, there should be a combination between making the transformation mandatory as well as reflecting this in the registrar's term of services with registrants.

And I think if there is a policy for mandatory transformation the registrars would have to do this anyway because they would be contractually obliged to do this with ICANN in their contract with them.

But I'm seeing my understanding here is that the BC is supporting mandatory transformation and they are supporting that this burden lie on the registrant through a term of service, through the terms of service between the registrar and the registrant.

And the burden here may not necessarily be the cost but may possibly be liability it could be either or. And so I was just voicing my disagreement with this comment and principle.

Chris Dillon: Yes okay yes that has made it far clearer for which many thanks. Okay that will certainly help with any drafting I think and we are horribly close to the end of the hour.

So I think rather than trying to go further down because it is quite a long jump to the next one that it might be a good time just to round off and obviously we're not ready to look at the final report.

But I can just mention anything about any other business? All right, well in that case, you know, we've made good progress, you know, really much better progress than I was expecting today with the comments.

We will pick up and finish them at least the comments next week and we will do other things as well but at least try and finish the comments next time. So that is on the 30th of April the last day of April.

So many thanks for a good call.

Man: Thanks Chris bye-bye everybody.

Chris Dillon: Goodbye there.

Coordinator: Thank you very much (unintelligible) of the recording.

END