

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
GNSO Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP WG
Wednesday 11 February 2015**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb>

Chris Dillon: All right. So might as well just go - is the recording actually on now? Thank you, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes, okay. So well we do the roll call first and then SOI check. Roll call we might as well just go around the table, I think, and then people look nervous so would you like to start?

Jennifer Chung: Jennifer Chung, Registry Stakeholder Group.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

Wanawit Ahkuputra: Wanawit Ahkuputra, the GAC Thailand.

Amr Elsadr: Amr Elsadr, Non Commercial Users Constituency.

Pitinan Kooarmornpatana: Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, GAC Thailand.

Peter Dernbach: Peter Dernbach from the IPC.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick, NPOC co chair.

Chris Dillon: Chris Dillon, NCSG co chair.

Petter Rindforth: Petter Rindforth, IPC.

Lars Hoffman: Lars Hoffman, ICANN staff.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you very much. And officially we need also to ask whether there have been any changes to the SOIs since the last time we met. Probably not but just double checking.

Okay. As I was saying earlier we were going to do a sort of status update but the only reason for doing that would be if someone listens to this in the future. I think probably if we just go straight into the main document and if you look at the document, basically there are quite a lot of results of the recent public comments. I think 95 altogether.

That puts us in the difficult situation; we cannot get through 95, you know, 95 lines of a spreadsheet in 90 minutes, it's just not possible. So at that stage we have to, you know, we have to do something to make that more manageable. And so what we've done is we have - I say we - Lars has very kindly marked out things which we think are new things which we need to pay attention to. So basically I'm going to go through and pick those ones up so not all of them.

However, if, as we scroll down, you spot something under one of the ends, which, you know, we're not pick up otherwise, then just say, you know, actually we think we should pick this one up. So I'll just - I'll just go through it quite slowly. Yes.

Lars Hoffman: Just very quickly for the record, so we need to pay attention to all of them but the ones that are marked might be more important during this meeting...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: ...so it doesn't mean that anything else should not be paid attention to. Just, I mean, I know you meant that just to clarify.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, yeah, that's absolutely true. I mean, as regards edits to the final document we'll be circulating looking at all of them. But, you know, really the thing is that because of time today we'll only pick up the Ys unless somebody spots something under one of the Ns, in which case fine.

All right. Well that said, let's get going. And in fact the first one is a Y so we might as well pick that one up. And so I think the new thing - or the newish thing here is that the burden of accession and understanding contact information is best placed on the request of the data requestor.

Okay so I think probably just stop me if there's something you'd like to pick up there but, yes, yes.

Lars Hoffman: Yes so, I mean, it'll come to the point there's basically - the submission that supports it our recommendation of not mandating translation and transliteration has said that the people who submit the data should bear the burden and the cost. And others said it should lie with the requestor so these are basically - it's an issue that we should probably discuss in conjunction of one another where we think this should lie whether it's with the requestor who submits.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Lars, I don't think I understood fully what you were saying. Could you repeat that, please?

Lars Hoffman: Yes. It's still yesterday really. So submissions that said that don't agree with the preliminary recommendations and they would like to see mandatory

transformation said that the burden of that financially and otherwise should like - financially and otherwise should like with the people who submit and own the data, i.e. the registrants, registry, registrars.

Whereas the submissions that supported the preliminary recommendation as they stand and said the burden of translation and transliteration if and when needed and the financial implication of that should like with the requestor of the information because they need the information therefore they should pay for that service.

Amr Elsadr: Sorry, I'm just having my first cup of coffee.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Petter Rindforth: Petter here. I can understand although I do not support that requestor should pay for it. But did I hear you correctly that the one that also asked for the information should make sure that it is translation and transliteration, that's a little bit odd.

Lars Hoffman: No. What I meant is the one who requests it's up to them to make sure that there is a - well they should translate it themselves. If you want - if their information - the person who submits the information needs to make sure the information is correct regardless of script. And the one who requests the information should be able to access correctly submitted information and should then carry the burden of translating or transformation - transforming it into whatever script they might require it.

So I put in my data in Cyrillic script. Petter, you would like to access this. The people who say it should not be mandatory translated say you should have access to correct data in Cyrillic but if you want it in ASCII you will have to pay for that translation yourself.

Petter Rindforth: Petter here again. So I will have to pay for the translation and it may come from the part I ask for or I'm free to get these sort of big local version of it and then go to some external and pay for it to have it translated. Okay, just so I understand what that side want to see of it.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, just on the issue of accuracy, I don't think that we have - I don't think this was in the scope of this PDP at all to discuss the accuracy of information. I'm guessing that we've always worked under the assumption that the data is accurate because that is an RAA requirement that it be validated and such.

So we are working under the assumption that the data is accurate. But in the event that it's not it is not within the scope of this PDP to determine or try to fix that; we're just very strictly discussing the issue of transformation from many scripts to one. Thanks.

Petter Rindforth: Sorry I didn't say that - again, no so that - yes, I fully agree that that's a base. The thing we discuss is how to read it.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars for the transcript. We should actually say our names I suppose really, though we see each other. Yeah, I mean, I did the same mistake. And there's more outside, more coffee.

No why I said that and why I think we do have it - I believe somewhere in our initial report that the transformation should be validated by the registrars but obviously registrars who are dealing in gTLDs at the moment do not receive on ASCII registration data.

So if we mandated the transformation it's not up to us obviously to demand validation. But I think it is within our remit to point out that just because it's a language - or a script they don't currently handle if they will then have to accept that script in the future they need to have the capacity to validate it in line with the RRA. So it's not - absolutely nothing new but I think it's worth

that something that we just point out within the report. And I think that will be acceptable.

Peter Dernbach: And just on that point because I think these are all important distinctions and that we should keep the focus of our working group very clearly on the remit from our charter. But I am a little confused by the wording here that's underlined, "The burden of accession and understanding contact information is best placed on the side of the beneficiary of such data, i.e. the data requestor."

The registrar, under the agreement, as Amr and Lars were just saying, obviously needs to have some level of understanding of the contact information. So I think that it's very easy for these issues to be conflated. What we're talking about is whether or not the contact information that may now be entered in a non-ASCII script should be translated or transliterated as a mandatory requirement at the time of registration.

So I just - I don't want to get too picky because we do have a lot of comments to get through but (unintelligible) - I don't think we have anyone from the Registrar group here. That's unfortunate because I would just like to make sure that we're really getting clarity about what our comment is because I'm interpreting it that way but I'm a little confused by the language.

Chris Dillon: Yes, thank you. I agree, the language isn't very clear. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks. This is Amr. And not to belabor this point any further than we actually need to but this is also one of the reasons why I thought it would be helpful when going through public comments to also consider the comments in their entirety and not just using the review tool because sometimes looking at some of these points out of context of the full comment it may cause confusion and difficulty in understanding what the submitter is trying to say.

So if we do have any problems with some of these comments we might want to go back and look at the actual comment in its original form. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, I think that's a very good point. All right let us continue down, move us down the document. Now I've got a slight technical problem with scrolling here. It's not letting me do it, so - oh yeah. So we need to be going I think to Number 6, but I may have gone too far. Yeah, that looks good.

So Number 6, this is - so this is basically a start of the discussion about searchability. And so, you know, there is basically an argument about whether data is more easily searchable if it's in ASCII or whether it's more easily searchable in the original language.

And so one of the other interesting things in this comment is that if we use sort of the plural, so languages, the idea that there may be transformation not just into ASCII but into other languages as well which I can't really imagine that that's going to happen. But it'd just be so expensive. So but flag that up.

But that really comes to the whole thing about whether it's easier to search ASCII so you've got everything just in the one character set or whether you - whether it's easier to search in the original language. And I think there are actually arguments on both sides here. So if you're searching - well first of all you actually have to think of well what are we searching for. And we may well be searching for the name, for example, you know, the contact name.

And here this sort of links up slightly with comments further down because there is a thing further down about it really has to be in searchable text so it mustn't be an image whether, you know, the data that is submitted must be searchable.

So probably what we're doing is we're searching for the contact and so we've got something that's machine searchable. We can select that, we can copy it

and we can then go looking through the database for other, you know, for other records belonging to that contact.

And so the question is, is that going to be easier if you search in the original data or is it going to be easier if it's transformed? Technically in some ways searching in the original data is slightly more difficult because you have to have software - oh no actually you don't. That's interesting. You could just copy it. Okay, good point.

Sometimes, yeah, actually come to think of it that really makes a huge difference. Okay you're just copying that original data. Now on the other hand - on the other side of the argument is that, you know, if it were in one script then you'd never have to fiddle around with special software but then if you're copying you're not going to have to do that.

What you are going to have trouble with is transliterations because if you've got a language where there's more than one transliteration you're going to get major differences. So, you know, like in Japanese you'd have to remember you're not just searching for SH, you're searching for SY as well all the time.

And, you know, with a long vowel you would be searching for U with a macron on it and double U or just U so all of these. So the whole thing just becomes incredibly fuzzy.

So I think this is actually something where personally my opinions have changed. You know, the more one thinks about it, the more one realizes that searchability is actually more difficult if it's transformed which is not the - it's not intuitive because at the beginning you're thinking well are we going to have type this data? And if we are we're going to have to have software. But actually if you think about it you realize you can just copy the data so that isn't a problem as long as it's machine readable.

That wasn't at all clear. I wonder if there are any questions about it. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. This is Amr. I appreciate the issue and I - maybe perhaps regarding this and some other points that we will probably go over later on in the comments regarding the translation of the field labels, I appreciated some of the input provided on - just by some of the registries. I think they pointed out that some of these issues clearly need to be discussed further and a lot more work has to go into these before an actual PDP recommendation may be given on these points.

And it may not be the best place to do this here in this PDP. I'm hoping that the recommendations coming out of this working group, whatever they may be, will eventually go through Council and then the ICANN Board and hopefully feed into the post EWG new RDS PDP whatever that is. And we may want to point out that we considered these issues but they do need further discussion.

And they may actually - it may be a better idea that they take place over there where the whole RDS is going to be designed and discussed in further detail. But it would be important for us to mention that we did consider these issues and that we do recommend that they be included in any issue reports for that PDP. And I think that might be the safe way to move forward.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yes, there was certainly a comment further down which was really indicating it's surprisingly difficult to get our meaning across. I mean, the idea is that ideally you would have a database and it would be really easy just to, you know, just for somebody who comes along and is using Cyrillic Mongolian and they want to have field labels in Cyrillic Mongolian and they need to be able to put them in. And you'd actually have a database where you could gradually build up those different interfaces.

It's actually surprisingly difficult to say that, that's the intention. That's what we mean. But it's surprisingly difficult to say that. One ends up in knots. So I think I'm fairly happy about saying, you know, fundamentally this is an area

that needs - it needs further attention but we don't have to, you know, we're not in the position to say the best way of doing it because we just - we don't know what the technical issues are though, we just don't know how easy that's going to be. It may be easier just to do it in tranches or, you know, there are really various possibilities I think. Thank you.

All right, so - and so moving down we've got Number 7 which is also a Y and this - talking about provision for contact information to be maintained in two forms. I think this is a newish argument. So what it's really saying is whether - whether we recommend mandatory transformation or non-mandatory transformation there should always be two - there should always be two - oh no, sorry, totally wrong argument here.

So there should be provision for it to be maintained in two forms so original language and transformed form. So, yeah, in fact this only applies if it's - if it's - sorry, I've got rather confused about this. It's early in the morning. So it's saying transformation does not have to be mandatory, okay. So there should be - but there should still be the provision for the two forms. Yes, that's what we said. It's actually - it's not a new argument, it's actually one we've seen before.

Lars, would you like to pick it up?

Lars Hoffman: Yeah, just to clarify, this is actually a point exactly to what Amr said earlier, it's a - for the ALAC comment especially it's good to read the whole submission rather than maybe in this case the little snippets that I've tried to put just the key issues in there.

What they essentially propose in their submission is that it should not be mandatory yet there should be two fields so if you wanted two - it is too early - two - if you make a request for a Whois request you get two responses. One response is the original data as submitted and one response is the transformed data.

But this transformation is going to be optional but the protocol should allow for both to be - I'm going to say spat out and - but the second one, the transformed one is a voluntary action to be performed by the registrant and/or the registrar.

Chris Dillon: Petter, would you like to pick that up?

Petter Rindforth: Not on this specific topic but I just wanted to add that what we're going through now is there are new arguments and I note that the IPC reply is not noted as a new argument. No, it's not a new argument, that's - they still think it should be mandatory.

But I also - when we said that some of these documents really need to read through by yourself and what we have tried to make this time is also to collect ideas on how to solve this in a cost efficient way. So I hope that there will be some possibilities maybe not here physically but can at least discuss and see if there is anything in - on these topics and solutions that can actually agree about.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you. Lars, would you like to pick something up?

Lars Hoffman: Yeah, this is Lars for the record. In response to Petter directly you're absolutely correct, what I've done is - because of the structure of this document it's usually - the recommendations and the comments directly related to that. And then at the very end if you scroll through it to the very end it's the - I put in a long section of additional comments and questions.

And the IPC suggestions that are in the document are all listed there. And I believe they're all marked as new as well so it's not something that was overlooked, it's just not in the sequence. But I appreciate in the submission it obviously comes right after your initial non-support, opposition, if you call it to the preliminary...

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Yeah, okay probably go into the details of what, you know, optional transformation actually means on the ground, possibly a bit later on. But (unintelligible) stage probably if we keep on moving down to see if we can cover as many things as we can in the meeting.

So we've got Number 8 which is another Y. And so registrars should provide registrants with the option of entering both while creating new entries or editing existing ones. Yeah, it's the sort of newish argument is that isn't it and actually related to the previous one.

Okay Rudi, yeah.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. I think that that's the logic. I don't see this as a real high level requirement. It's needed if you want to enter two different information you need to feel so it has to be present in the form the registrar presents in order to be able to register a domain name. And if it's not, then you're blocked (unintelligible) to only one.

Peter Dernbach: Peter Dernbach for the transcript. I understand the motive here, but I have a slightly different take on it because I think that the requirements actually do have some requirements and I think that for many of the things that we were talking about the registrant, when they enter the data, have some responsibility with regard to that.

And if you allow them to opt to provide two and there's a discrepancy between the two then it might be unduly increasing the requirements under the RAA agreement. And we don't know which one is the (unintelligible) data.

So I think that if this were to say the option of entering either or and one of them is treated as the data, the initial contact information or registration directory data I think that might get us closer to what we're talking about

whether it's the contactability or to have a more accurate basis upon which there might...

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. We - so far we've always said that if there is a question about which (unintelligible) then we want, you know, we really want the original data to be (unintelligible) very, very interesting. If there are other opinions but that's certainly what, you know, what the approach has been. Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. In the case we offer this condition of two form fields proposal I think that we - in that case would also suggest that on that form it's mentioned to the registrant (unintelligible) responsibility of assuring that both data are about that registrant and not about a second one.

At the other side the question that I have if we allow this two level registration in that case I'm just wondering regards the searchability should we offer in the context of the search the possibility to search on one or the other. Because actually when you search it's on the one that is there. But if you have two are we going to allow a search on the transformed one or only on the native one? I think that's something we keep - to have to keep in mind further on.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Pitinan.

Pitinan Kooarmornpatana: Pitinan here. (Unintelligible) agree with Peter that you increase - because if you input two things then I believe in the RAA the registrar needs to somehow verify that information. So I think it quite impossible for the registrar to verify under transformed information. And I'll go back to Chris, I think the original data is suitable for search because one thing an original can be written in many kind of (unintelligible).

Also, yeah, so I think it okay to provide two forms but it has to be very clear that they can (unintelligible) go to the original one and only verified by that or searched by that.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. All right, well let's gradually move down towards Number 14 which I think is the next one.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Oh sorry, 13. Okay, something strange has just happened. Here we are. Okay so actually this picks up on it very nicely because it's saying registrants should be able to enter contact data in their own language and to do so will enhance the overall accuracy of the distributed database.

Yes, I mean, I think that's, you know, that certainly would seem to be the case. I mean, you've not got the kind of fuzziness that you end up with you have a transformed version. You know, it is more accurate, it's the original thing.

Okay, then down to 14 which is as long as transformation is mandatory the IPC has no objection. If transformation is not mandatory (unintelligible) oh yes, we've dealt with that. So, yes, we - I think this is actually not very controversial.

That also gets us through Number 17 which is really the same point. And so we then end up at Number 18. "All ICANN databases, forms and documents should provide for capturing, displaying, storing and maintaining both of the forms."

Rudi Vansnick: It's a bit unclear.

Chris Dillon: Yes, I mean, (unintelligible) it's incredibly wide ranging. So- but really a bit difficult to know how to pick up some of that, very, very general.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. Maybe a suggestion, could you eventually ask ALAC to clarify a bit more what they are proposing here? Because it's complex.
Yes, Lars?

Chris Dillon: Yes, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Lars for the record. If you like I'd be very happy to pick this up with my colleagues who support the ALAC and see who submitted this and get in touch if that is in any way helpful.

Chris Dillon: Yes, by all means. And, you know, it does seem really a lot of it (unintelligible) beyond the scope of what we're doing so, yeah, that would be very helpful. Oh, and Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, this is Amr. I'm not exactly sure what the confusion is on this comment. If you could point it out...

Chris Dillon: It's just that the comment is - I think it's incredibly wide-ranging so it's not so much that it's confusing it's just saying it's a very, very wide remit (unintelligible) that we just don't touch so it's rather difficult to know what to do with it as a result of that I think.

Amr Elsadr: Okay sure...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: I appreciate that and perhaps we should ask the ALAC for clarification what they mean by all ICANN databases, forms, documents, what exactly they do mean. But and to be honest I didn't really pay attention to that, I was sort of just - when going through their comment I sort of just related this to their earlier recommendation of making sure that there are two fields made available in the event that transformation occurs.

So I'm just - I just thought they were sort of just stressing this in any sort of Whois database that this option is maintaining both these forms is available. So, yeah, we should probably get back to them. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: May well just be a drafting thing this actually. All right, I think that brings us down to 21. Okay recommendation be amended to read the working group could recommend that any DNRD-DS now and in the future. We've been recommended to use DNRD-DS so Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service for that.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: We're on 21, yeah.

Rudi Vansnick: Look on the screen.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes, but one of the criticisms of our report is that we didn't unify the terminology so sometimes we think Whois database, there are lots of terms and we were quite rightly picked up on that. So the current suggestion is that all of that nomenclature is replaced by DNRD-DS. I'm very happy to discuss that but certainly that we need to do is unify the terminology.

I got to the stage where I almost thought maybe we just (unintelligible) then we know what we're talking about. But, you know, the idea really is just that we unify the terminology.

Rudi Vansnick: Even then there is no guarantee.

Chris Dillon: Yes, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, just to clarify - and I apologize if the point being made by this statement here is not very clear. But the actual recommendation from the NCSG here is to not use any new registration directory service, which is why it's kind of crossed out and replace that with Whois database now and in the future as the sort of the standard term to refer to Whois in our report.

And the purpose of that is to avoid sort of associating what we are discussing with any of the EWG final reports which is still subject to a GNSO process and (unintelligible) before is actually policy in any form. So it's just - it's just - it's a semantic really more than anything else. But if the purpose is to have one term that sort of just points - we're talking about Whois here and it just needs to be understood by everyone so we do - we had recommended we use Whois database now and in the future.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Are we happy with that? Peter.

Peter Dernbach: I'm happy to unify the term and I'm happy with DNDR...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: That's a horrible term isn't it?

Peter Dernbach: My issue with the Whois database is that the - or using that as the unified term is that that carries with it a certain number of qualities that everybody understands to mean the same thing. So all of the information - contact information is open, all of it is searchable by anyone. There's no - which I think is potentially what it will be in the future. But it's also possibly not.

And since we're looking at contact information, which I think is defined in the agreements, I think that we're looking at the contact information that is submitted at the time of domain name registration.

So I think regardless of that the database is in the future I think that also goes beyond the remit of our charter, I think. So if we can focus in on whatever is the unified term that people agree that when we're talking about apples we're talking about apples. I think that would be helpful. And I think that in terms of some of the ways this might be searched, what may or may not be publicly available, what may or may not require certain steps to go through I think that's beyond the scope of our working group.

Rudi Vansnick: And I would say on top the contact information is only a subset of the Whois and not the whole Whois. Because that could create confusion.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Okay then - sorry, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Just a quick reminder that to state your names when take the mic.

Rudi Vansnick: Don't take the mic anymore.

Chris Dillon: Okay. Chris speaking for the transcript. So then we have 22, "Registrants should be able to fill in the registration data in the language or script provided such script is supported by the sponsoring registrar." And this is a change from what's in the drafting. We have different wording there.

And certainly when I was giving the presentation to the GNSO Council I felt that the consensus was that language supported by the registrar was really the key thing. So, you know, there are other possibilities there which I think we'll see in some of the options further down.

But I felt that in that - I think, you know, in the GNSO Council thing I felt that that expression, "supported by," seemed possibly to be the way to go. I don't know whether anybody has feelings about the wording. It will come up later on so this is only the first time I'm raising this. There are alternatives further down.

Okay. And I think then we go down to - yes, sorry, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks, Chris. If you'll just give me a couple of seconds to - if I'm not mistaken this part - we're on 22; correct? And this is part of the key system submission under we do not support (unintelligible) Number 3; correct?

Yeah, I had a little exchange with Volker on this. And, yeah, and the impression I got actually was that he doesn't actually object to the working group recommendation. The impression I got was that he misunderstood what we were recommending in the initial report.

And I think what we had discussed and what we were actually recommending was that we give flexibility to the registrar to provide service to the registrant in the way they see fit and in the way they feel is beneficial to their customers.

I think this is the same point Volker was trying to make here except he understood what we were recommending differently. So we might want to think about rewording it just to make our intention very clear on this recommendation.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you. It's Lars for the record. I had a similar exchange with Volker as well off list to clarify why they objected to this because (unintelligible) the rest they supported. And in fact if that was to be changed our recommendation to support it - language is supported by registrars as opposed to operates. Then there would be no objection at all from his part. Lawyer talk.

Chris Dillon: Okay, well that sounds a bit of progress is being made there. Okay Number 23, I think we are. The numbering is slightly complicated here, I think it changed in the versions. IPC supports this if transformation is mandatory otherwise transformation should happen if the submitted data is not in Latin characters of the UN language.

That seems to be rather a nice refinement to me. It makes very clear that obviously if it's in ASCII already you don't transform it and so that would be a nice suggestion, nice addition to the drafting. We need to pick up Number 24 as well.

So, "Supports this recommendation provided the transformation is mandatory. We suggest the language of the registrar's term of service." Oh here we go, this is another possibility. We've really dealt with this so we're saying - we're really saying supported by which is, you know, which is a - which gives more possibilities actually, more languages.

And moving down to 27 I think is the next stop. That - "This should be strictly optional as neither registrars nor registrants can be expected to know the tag to every given data set." So I feel that the idea of tagging hasn't really been understood so the original idea behind tagging was that basically there would be one tag and it would say this contact data is in Japanese.

Now that's - actually there's a whole problem - there is actually a logical problem there because we could expect that the address would be in Japanese but what if we have Herr Mueller who is a German guy living in Japan so it means that this name is German, he's got (unintelligible) just to make matters difficult.

So his name is one language and his address is another language. So (Werar Mudar), yes but the problem with (Mudar) is that you might get a bit - you might have some difficulty getting from (Mudar) to Mueller. Yes, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. Maybe we have to make a distinction in the contact data information. A name normally is not translated or transliterated in itself, company name or family name. I don't see my name being translated as such because that is changing could be that somebody else has the same name in that language at...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: And indeed there is a second Rudi Vansnick in Belgium and is living not so far where I'm living. That's a confusing aspect. So I think it's very important that for the name of the registrant we should be very, very clear. It's different from the address when you look into Google, for instance. They translate or transliterate sometimes addresses but they will not translate or transliterate the name of the company.

Chris Dillon: Oh, now that is a very, very interesting idea. Sorry, Chris for the transcript. Yeah, I mean, that is a - that is quite a thought. I mean, it's a suggestion that there could be different rules applying to different areas of the contact information. Okay, that's really worth noting. Yeah. Okay. Yes, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Can we just have a (unintelligible) - I just tried to upload a different format of the tool so that might fit the page better. One second.

Chris Dillon: Oh yes, yes that would be more comfortable for us.

Rudi Vansnick: There's more white space and...

Chris Dillon: Yes, I was originally hoping to do this without my glasses perched on the end of my nose but when I saw the size of that it just had to be - this is the approach.

Rudi Vansnick: A little coffee break. Rudi for the transcript. As I was just mentioning this issue of translating a name of a company or a name of a person seems to me a bit dangerous aspect. And if it's the registrant itself or the company I would say okay, I don't see immediately an issue. but if it's not the registrant doing it then there should be an approval by the registrant to be sure that they are not creating confusion especially related to trademarks because if you transform the name you're creating a trademark issue.

Chris Dillon: Very interesting.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: Twenty-eight.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, actually - yeah, 28 now, yeah. All right so, yeah, that's much - that is much nicer - worth doing.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Peter Dernbach: This is Peter for the transcript. I think that perhaps you were responding to this when you said there's some lack of clarity about what we (unintelligible) when we were talking about tagging. But I was a little confused by this comment just because I think we're talking about the finite number of fields where there it could be that you indicate that I am Herr Mueller and entering my name in German and I'm also entering my address in Japanese because that's who I am and where I am.

So I do think that there was some - perhaps we need to look at the language to make it clearer but I think we're only talking about the finite fields that are involved in the contact information.

Chris Dillon: Logically speaking this is an area where I think there has been some development so my original rather naïve idea was that contact information just got one tag, it's Japanese, it's German, like that. And it doesn't work. If you actually think that through that approach doesn't work because it is

possible that different parts of that are in different languages and therefore require different tags.

And then of course you might have potential for technical difficulties, as this database is starting to get rather complicated. But that's thinking way, way ahead of this. But just logically speaking the naïve approach of this is Japanese I think probably doesn't work.

Peter Dernbach: This is Peter again for the transcript. But I do think that having that tag is important because...

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Peter Dernbach: ...it could be that as you know there are any number of scripts in the Indian - among the Indian nations.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Peter Dernbach: And so just for someone to identify that they're entering it in Tamil script or they're entering it in whatever script...

Chris Dillon: Yes, I think it's just that (unintelligible) to say simply this is in Tamil you would probably have to mark each field as being, you know, whatever language it was. So it's not just a single tag, it's several, one for each field, that's the difference.

Peter Dernbach: Peter again. We might be getting into the details a little too much.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, I think we are.

Peter Dernbach: Because it could be that you choose one for all of the fields.

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Peter Dernbach: You know, so if it was someone who, if Pitinan was entering in Thai both name and contact information or if she was using the Romanized version of name and then Thai it would be optional. But I think that again goes beyond...

Chris Dillon: Yeah.

Peter Dernbach: ...the scope of what we need to decide.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, yes. But we need to be careful just to - to say that the likelihood of - it's not just a single tag it's probably several, one for each field, that's the key thing. Probably.

Okay and moving down to 28 so suggestion for a change in the text which is, "The working group recommends that the registrar and registry assure that the data fields are consistent." This is done. But the entered contact information verified in accordance with the RAA, yes that's not controversial. Data fields are correctly - I'm sorry - it's the same thing isn't it? Yeah, okay.

Down to...

Lars Hoffman: Fifty-two.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, if you complete that sentence it says (unintelligible) to facilitate the mandatory transformation. So this is actually the reverse of what the recommendation is in the initial report.

Chris Dillon: Oh just a minute.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, Petter here. That's correct.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah.

Chris Dillon: ...oh, yes that's a totally different - sorry, yes it's really important to go right to the end isn't it? (Unintelligible) facilitate transformation well, I mean, I guess if there were mandatory or any kind of transformation it would need to know what the original was, yeah. But then that's - I guess that's the sort of raison d'etre of the - of tagging in the first place or one of them anyway.

Okay so I think we're at 32, beyond that. And then we've got sort of - well read it so "Whois data should be treated similar to the postal addressing system where transformation is strictly optional. Ultimate it is the responsibility of the sender to ensure that the recipients can be reached if a different script is used than the one used locally."

Yeah, I don't, however...

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. I think that that needs, again, a little bit more clarification on what they really mean. It's really difficult to say that the sender will know that the address he is sending it to would be correct if the information that, as a sender, you are collecting is based on information that is not accurate. You cannot certify that destination will be okay.

Chris Dillon: Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, I think - this is Amr - and I think my reading of this comment was that similarly to the fact that if, for example, you have an Egyptian sending a letter to a Japanese person from Cairo to Tokyo or Osaka, then - and the Egyptian is going to write the postal address on the envelope in Arabic according to his understanding of what the address is in Tokyo, it is not the responsibility of the person sending the letter or the post office to sort of ensure that the transformation occurs accurately because if - in the event that it isn't accurate, the return send address it's just going to go back to the person who sent it.

So I think they're just kind of comparing that situation to what we're talking about here in terms of transforming contact information in Whois and things you should treat them both equally. So that was my understanding of the comment here.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. Peter.

Peter Dernbach: Peter for the transcript. I - that's helpful because I was frankly quite confused and concerned because I think that a basic part of the RAA is that the contactability has always been one of the requirements for contact information.

So the - whether it is a third party requestor or the registrar themselves, the registrant is signing up with the registrar and needs to be providing information that is contactable. And the registrar has certain requirements to make sure that they are contactable.

Now that could be through an email or a phone number, not necessarily the mailing address, which is a lot more about what we're talking about in terms of translation and transliteration. But I was quite confused about this. Ultimately it's the responsibility of the sender.

I think that the sender bears the responsibility to address their communication in what they believe is the most reliable way that it will be delivered. But part of the RAA requirements for providing contact information is contactability. So there needs to be some way that the registrar, at the time of registration, knows they're obtaining data that allows that registrant to be contactable whether by the registrar or a third party requesting that information.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yeah, Okay. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yes I'm sorry if I was - if I actually confused everyone by my last comment. But here - and the analogy the way I see the person sending the letter is actually the person using the Whois lookup service. The registrant in this analogy is the person meant to receive the letter.

He's the person meant to be contactable. And he is contactable because he does have an address in Japanese. And the postal authority in Japan, whatever that is, I mean, they have a listing for his address or her address in their local language and script.

The question is whether the person using the Whois lookup or the person trying to send the Japanese person a letter from Cairo can understand and transform that address in a manner that allows him to contact him. But he is contactable, so but the burden of being able to use the contactable information lies on the person sending the letter. So I think that's the point that's being made here.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

Peter Dernbach: Peter. Just responding to that. And I was saying, yes, that's actually quite helpful. Because when I read the comment which says ultimately it's the responsibility of the sender to ensure that the recipient can be reached if a different script is used than the one used locally, I was actually confused by what they were saying because I actually think that in the way this process happens the registrar at the time of registration that is the gate at which the registrant is required to provide some information that allows them to be contactable.

So if we're talking about I'm choosing to contact you in a script or a language other than the one that the registrant was - used when they registered, I completely agree. That is the individual sender's choice using that would be more likely to reach the desired recipient, the registrant, if you used a Roman script or an ASCII script. That's your choice. And anyone has that option.

But I was confused here because I actually think it's the registrar's responsibility under the RAA to make sure that at the time of registration that the registrant is providing - is contactable. That was my...

Chris Dillon: Yes, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Yeah, Lars for the record. Just to (unintelligible) what Amr said, I think the reachability is exactly about in this example the postman who - so if I send something - I use a script that means the person I'm sending it to you is reachable through the means that I'm using. And you're absolutely correct that the original submission of the data need to be correct lies obviously with the person submitting the data. It needs to be verified by the entity collecting the data.

And I think that the registrar's example here is a little bit cumbersome to understand what they're trying to get across. But I think that's where they're coming from.

Chris Dillon: Yes, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr again. Peter is absolutely correct, it is the registrar's responsibility to make sure the registrant is contactable which - so, yeah, so reading this sentence it's strictly in the context of a situation where a different script is being used by the sender.

So they're not saying that the post office - it's not their responsibility to make sure that the person receiving is not - it is the responsibility and it is their responsibility to make sure that the address is listed correctly wherever they are. It's just in the situation where different script is used the transformation occurring, that's the sender's responsibility. So you are absolutely correct, yeah.

Chris Dillon: Okay, Rudi, would you like to go next?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Rudi for the transcript. I think we have to be clear that it's dangerous to say that it is the registrar's responsibility. Just taking the sample that the transformed address is partly in - the sample of the Arabic and Japanese that for instance the street would be in Arabic and the city would be in Japanese entered by the registrant.

How can a registrar guarantee that it is correct. I think that that's a difficult issue. They have responsibility but at a certain level they cannot guarantee everything. And we have to be clear on that one I think.

Chris Dillon: Pitinan.

Pitinan Kooarmornpatana: Yeah, Pitinan here. Well maybe I'm not correct - correct me if I'm wrong. (Unintelligible) that the registrar has the responsibility to verify that the address is contactable at the point of registration. I am not sure if that is possible for some - if - how can you know that the online mailing address - mailing address that you receive online you can verify at that point is actually contactable.

So for me I see the data in the (timeline) so at the beginning the registrant it put something and then over time, maybe a day or two so maybe a week, the registrar be able to use that contact information to verify. Once it's verified and, okay, this is the contactable data, and then the one who want to use the data use that contactable, verified already, (unintelligible) to do whatever transform or just copy and paste and send.

So I see the data as a - there's a lifecycle of it. I'm not sure if - is it possible to verify at the point of registration at all. Yeah, so I think maybe it's useful we lay out this and, yeah, make it not (unintelligible) in time.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Yeah, I mean, it wouldn't (unintelligible) immediately. Peter.

Peter Dernbach: I think that those are very interesting questions. And I think that there's a lot of discussion going around - going on around what can and cannot be verified at the time. But I think that for the purposes of our group we're just looking at the contact data which is a subset of the registration data.

And so I think that there currently - (unintelligible) session I think it was yesterday where they were talking about Whois and is there - what kind of validation needs to happen and identity validation needs to happen and identity validation versus other things.

So I think that that will definitely pose challenges and we'll be continuing to (unintelligible). But I think that's beyond - luckily I don't think we have to bite off all of that.

Chris Dillon: Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Lars for the record. Yeah, just to emphasize exactly what Peter said, that I think there's a lot of people probably around this table and at the community that agree that verification and validation are challenging and are maybe a problem. But that's beyond our remit. So for us it's that what we can recommend is that the data that's submittable is easily maybe verifiable or validatable. It's possible, you know, depending on what we recommend but how that is done is beyond our remit.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, Rudi for the transcript. A more general comment it would be good if registrars could send somebody when we have this type of discussion because we are making assumptions that that's what they mean but it's difficult that we are taking so much time on trying to get clarity and they are not present. So it would be great if they could send somebody to the meetings that we are able to interact with them.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: Petter here. Just to add to what you said, Peter, we have a specific limited issue to deal with. But on the other hand there are other working groups and other topics that are actually waiting for our response to this. So, I mean, it's a detail but it's necessary to solve to fit into the general more - you know, more complicated Whois work.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Jennifer.

Jennifer Chung: Jennifer Chung for the record. I completely agree with what Lars reminded us of. Like validation is a topic that is very, you know, difficult and is being discussed right now. And it is outside of this group's remit. And to the point that Rudi made about having the registrars participate in I guess the face to face and in the teleconferences, I just wanted to remind everyone that Emily has been participating, you know, and contributing a lot of really important viewpoints from the registrar side.

Yesterday during a brief registry registrar session it was mentioned that they wanted to keep more close I guess attention to working groups such as ours so they can input and clarify their points of view. So I think it's really important for us to, you know, if we have questions about their response maybe like ALAC we could ask them for some clarification. And also to Amr's point, when we I guess review their response to review it as an entirety so we can understand the context. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you. Yes, Pitinan.

Pitinan Kooarmornpatana: Hi, Pitinan. I just to make clear that I understand that the validation is our (unintelligible) of this working group but for us to be able to read

comments we might have to be clear at point in time of the data we recommend to translate mandatory or not because is, means quite a different things, right. So if we want to talk about the data at the point of registration then that's a registrant needs to provide best possible way he can. So that's the data we're talking about.

But if we talking about the data that already verified in the registrar database - Whois database - then there is another recommendations, I mean, it's quite different purpose of the data. So I think what we have to deal with is also the same question that we are mandatory - non mandatory for translations but we have to be clear at what type of data we are recommending.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Thank you. Now any questions I've missed? No, good. All right...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Yes, we're not going to - I think we've actually got further than we think because our conversation has actually addressed things that come up further down. Anyway, so that means - yes, 33, yes I was just going to say.

The IPC suggests that this recommendation be amended to read, "The working group recommends registrar's mandatory transformation of contact information shall be presented with additional fields in addition to the label script provided by the registrant to allow for mandatory accuracy."

I actually think we've already covered that unless there's something lurking in there I've missed. Down to 34, Amr, yes.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, this is Amr. I may need to look at this comment again in the context of the entire comment. But I'm not sure I understand what the association is between having two fields and equating that to mandatory accuracy. So I think I may need to go back and look at this comment within the context of

the whole comment. Having two fields - I don't see how that ensures accuracy.

Chris Dillon: No, I mean, I think fundamentally that, you know, there do have to be two sets of fields here whether, you know, if there will ever be transformation happening whether it's mandatory or any kind of transformation we need two sets of fields. I think it's to do with that.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, my question is just on how this allows for mandatory accuracy - those last few words in the sentence. I'm not sure I understand.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: ...for mandatory accuracy. That's a very strange expression, I would agree, yeah. Thank you.

Peter Dernbach: That's actually the recommendation. Our preliminary recommendation is the working group could recommend that if registrars wish to perform transformation of contact information these data should be presented as additional fields in addition to the local script provided by the registrant to allow for maximum accuracy.

So the concept of then two fields to allow for maximum accuracy is not the comment, it's the recommendation.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Thank you, Peter.

Chris Dillon: I think maximum accuracy I've no trouble with. Mandatory accuracy is rather - is a little odd, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Okay. So - sorry, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Yeah, I think - and I think the mandatory accuracy is probably also referring back to the fact that data according to the RAA needs to be verified and, i.e., therefore, you know, mandatory and therefore needs to be correct. Once it's verified one would assume, in any case, that it is actually correct or accurate I should say.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you. Thirty four, so Business Constituency supports mandatory transformation but otherwise supports the recommendation that the transformed data be presented in additional fields. Yeah, I don't think this is actually anything beyond what we've just said. You know, those fields just need to be there don't they - oh and we need to scale down, sorry.

Okay and as far as - okay as far as 37. Oh doing strange things. Okay, Business Constituency does not object to this recommendation but we would point out the translation of field names into as many languages as possible is vague. And will impose additional costs on the entities displaying field names for user entry - for entries.

Okay so we actually picked this up earlier that, you know, actually saying what we want, you know, there would be a flexible system where you could add these into (unintelligible) that, you know, there's, you know, that is something quite difficult to draft. And is - it's just trying to get something which is within our remit there.

And as regards to additional costs, yes, it's true. However, I would say that those costs are likely to be very, very small. I mean, there aren't all that many fields so for me this is not a very heavy argument actually. Okay there is an additional cost but I don't think it's a very large one. I mean, again it's beyond our remit and, yeah, I think it's unlikely. I mean, certainly if you compare it to

the cost of transforming the data, this is very, very small there, really, quite a small issue.

All right, down to Number 40 perhaps. Then the main burden should lie on the parties collecting and maintaining the information, registry, registry and reseller. This is the burden of the costs. Okay. Yeah, I mean, we've spoken about this sort of thing before. And there's always the (unintelligible) okay the burden may be on those - on those people but it's quite easy for the costs to be transferred to other parties. I think that really is the issue here.

Forty-one, the burden should lie with the beneficiary, i.e. the requestor of information which is - yeah, hmm. Well, yes it's sort of the other isn't it really? Yeah, so, I mean, in a sense it's more straightforward because as I was saying before, you know, there is a feeling that the people collecting may well pass on charges so it may, you know, I think there is a feeling here to be absolutely blunt, that it's going to end up on the registrant whatever it is officially. Yeah, okay.

Peter.

Peter Dernbach: This is Peter for the transcript. I think that on this question we very easily got into the substantive discussion of who should bear the burden. And I think that depending on your approach if you think it should be mandatory it - the burden would likely be borne early on at the time of registration.

So sometime whether it's the registrars or it's shared between the registrars and registries whether it's a cost of doing business now you support all of these languages and have all these potential customers that you didn't have before. So it's a cost of your doing business for selling all these domain names.

Or if you think, no it shouldn't be mandatory, so then whoever requests it should bear the burden. I think our charter question though was who should

decide who should bear the burden, which I think is a slightly different question. I think that that's a - more a process question. It could be that this is a cost for the entire community.

This is something that we think ICANN as a community should develop an effective tool for this whether it's done at registration or at (unintelligible) or whether we think that that cost - who should decide who should bear the cost. I think is a - it's a different but important question that I think we've not to say overlooked but we've kind of rushed past and jumped to who should bear the burden.

Chris Dillon: That's a very good point. Yes. Guilty I think. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: You're absolutely correct in some misunderstood the charter question, maybe read through it too quickly to realize that we weren't actually being asked to answer the question who should pay for it but who should decide who should pay for it.

But I do believe we did address that very specifically in our own deliberations in the working group. And in considering the recommendation of transformation not being mandatory we considered that under that context that it's the registrant who will decide who will bear the burden because effectively the registrant could opt to transform his, her, its data or they could opt not to and leave that burden for somebody else.

So that's the approach I thought we were taking. So effectively we were saying that the registrant will decide who bears the burden whether they decide themselves or someone else. So...

Chris Dillon: ...is only if it's non mandatory. Yes. Yeah. Yeah. Okay thank you. Pitinan.

Pitinan Kooarmornpatana: Pitinan for transcript. For the burden (unintelligible) is a liability so if you translate or transform is it not correct then (unintelligible) is included in the burden so just want to make point.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, that is a very nice refinement. So let's just think - so non mandatory there's some sort of agreement there. What about mandatory so if it's mandatory who decides.

Rudi Vansnick: Nobody.

Chris Dillon: Yeah, Pitinan.

Pitinan Kooarmornpatana: Yeah, it's Pitinan, yeah, can I just share? Because for Thai we don't have the English as official language. So any official documents that need to be used across the border we need to first translate by the registered translator and then you (unintelligible) to do the notarize and then go across. So this is manually happening now.

I'm not sure if there are electronic can pass on this steps. So I think that's a food for thought that happening when you don't really have the English as a official language at all.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. In case of electronic verifications and certifications there are now more and more electronic signature services that allows you to do it quite quickly and not have that long circle of data going around before it can be really validated and used. So and maybe we have to add the (unintelligible) to what we are identifying when we talk about certifying a translation.

Chris Dillon: Yes, okay. Thank you for that. And, Peter.

Peter Dernbach: Peter for the transcript. As someone (unintelligible) question it would be reasonable to expect I would have an answer for that question but I do not. I think that this goes a little bit back to Pitinan's point earlier about we need to look at the lifecycle of this information because I think that depending on where we're saying the transformation takes place that would inform who should decide who bears the burden.

So it could very well be that it - that the community decides that that is a burden for supporting registrants from any of these countries in any of these scripts to purchase domain names, to register domain names. It could be that the registrars might prefer to say no we want - we need to comply with our RRA requirements so the entry really should just be in one - there should be one canonical data set. And we are legally responsible for that. We bear the burden of that.

But the transformation should be something that's shared broader among the community. So it could be that there's another mechanism or platform by which those costs are shared among all the members of the community. It could be that it's decided that the people who really bear the - who get the commercial benefit of all of these increased registrations are the registrars and the registries.

So somehow there's some community-wide sharing among the contracted parties. It could be that it's a cost of doing business and thriving for the entire community so we have a recommendation for a funding request for ICANN as an entity.

So I think that if it were to be mandatory the question of who should decide who bears the burden might be informed by where - which step in that lifecycle, as Pitinan pointed out earlier, we think that should take place.

I personally think the earlier it takes place, the more reliable the transformation is likely to be, and I think that there are certain fields that

inform other fields meaning that it could be that in Thailand if you've already entered the tag that you are registering whichever registrar - if you're the registrant and you're in Thailand and I'm submitting it in Thai script it could be that Thailand actually has an official transformation system for how that address or that contact information would be represented in the Roman script.

So it could be that there's a tool by which once you've indicated these fields it flows from that. But I think that who should decide might depend on where we think that should take place.

Chris Dillon: In the cycle, yeah okay. Thank you for that. And, Petter.

Petter Rindforth: Just a quick addition to that, as we have discussed previous meetings the possibility to have GAC involved for each respective country to get the more official way to translate and transliterate. I personally thought that if that's possible it seems also to be a more safe and official way to find the correct in that specific country correct way to translate or transliterate.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. We are now slightly over time but I think this is a really nice place to stop because it gives a lot to - it gives us a lot to think about.

I will just add the linguists view of this, and that is that from a linguistic point of view I would like to stress that really effectively the fewer people doing the transformation the better because the more people who do transformation each of them doing it slightly differently using different tools and in slightly different ways, the worse your accuracy and consistency are going to get. So - and, yes, and there is a direct link between those issues and searchability, absolutely.

So, you know, as a linguist I would, you know, if it does go - if anything goes the transformation route I'm saying do not think you're going to save money

by getting lots of people doing it, it's the reverse. By doing that your costs will go through the ceiling because you're going to then have to clean the data which is a very nasty thing or else you'll have data that will be very, very difficult to search.

Well, thank you all for that meeting. And, Lars, would you like to pick something up before we wind up?

Lars Hoffman: I would just (unintelligible) on the next meeting suggest that as is normally custom we skip next week to readjust to our respective lives/time zones. And meet the week after.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: The date eludes me.

Chris Dillon: But we know what you mean. Yes, let us do just that and pick up where we've just left off. As I said earlier, we've only got about halfway through the document officially but in fact I think we've done rather - oh yes, over 26, yeah, brilliant. In fact I think we've done rather better than that because a lot of the arguments we've had that we brought forward, a lot of the discussions we've had have really covered things that are further down so yes, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Sorry to drag this on but I've taken some notes, you've seen in the - in the review tool the WG response column I've made some comments. I'm going to cross reference them with Chris and Rudi first and then I'll send an update out with those for you to review as well at your leisure. There we go. End of the sentence.

The review table is usually not in the final report. There is usually a pro section, let's say, that summarize this. But if the working group would like to see this as an annex there's no reason whatsoever why it couldn't be.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, this is Amr. I think that would be a good idea because it would allow for folks who submitted public comments to understand exactly how we addressed each one of the (unintelligible) in this way.

Lars Hoffman: Consider it done. That sounds good.

Rudi Vansnick: It's Rudi for the transcript. Is that a general perception of the group so that we can really start building in and correct text if needed and have the tool cleaned up?

Amr Elsadr: We've done this before on other PDPs. I think we did it on the thick Whois didn't we? I think the thick Whois we did get a lot of comments in there and we included the review tool as an annex as Lars suggested so that everyone who did submit comments would know exactly how the working group addressed each one of the issues they submit. So I think it's a considerate thing to do.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, Petter.

Petter Rindforth: Just sounds very good. Excellent way to do it.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. Well in that case let us continue this on the 26th and in fact before that on the mailing list. Thank you very much.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you.

END