

## **Executive Summary**

The ccNSO Improvement recommendation to translate ccNSO related documentation is based on a survey from early 2010. The survey was limited in scope regarding translations. Since March 2010 the landscape has changed, both in terms of availability of tools, translation policy and need for translations.

The ccNSO Council is recommended to direct staff to:

- Launch a survey to seek a better understanding from the ccTLD community for the need of translations.
- Provide an overview of the different methods for translation of documentation, including the costs associated, the quality of the translation and the languages.

At the meeting in Beijing the results from the survey and the overview will be presented to the community present and the Council will revisit the implementation of the recommendations.

## **The recommendations 2 and 3**

### *Recommendation Reviewers 2*

Consider the translation into the main UN languages of key documents concerning and produced by the ccNSO (Bylaws, the Rules and Guidelines document, major Policy papers) of a brief summary of ccNSO position paper.

### *Board WG recommendation 2*

Recognizing that it is an objective within ICANN to have essential documentation available in the main UN languages, the WG views this recommendation in a positive light. However, such an objective cannot be open-ended without regard for the budgetary context and there is a need to carefully consider the costs in relation to the potential benefits for translations in each individual case. Such assessments are best undertaken by the relevant community and the WG leaves this for the ccNSO community's consideration and resolve for each detailed suggestion put forward. The WG also refers to its conclusions regarding the closely related recommendation 3, below.

The WG further notes that comments received do not express overall support for recommendation 2. Some call for limiting translations to only core documents and some state that financing of translations should be resolved first, before undertaking any translations. The WG also notes the resolve by the ccNSO to consider translation of key documents, provided a cost effective methodology can be found.

### *Reviewers Recommendation 3*

Due to the significant cost of translating documents on a regular basis we suggest that the task of translating all documents related to the ccNSO's activity could be carried by

the ccNSO membership itself. This could be facilitated by the setting up of a multilingual wiki (as used by Wikipedia). In this way, the translation of documents would become the responsibility of the linguistic communities themselves, and there need be no limit to the number of languages that documents could be translated into. If such a mechanism were adopted we would also suggest the appointing by the Council of a “linguistic community manager” for each language who would have responsibility to check the accuracy of the translations.

### *Board WG recommendation 3*

The WG agrees that this voluntary approach could be beneficial for the community and notes that it would not contradict the WG's conclusion for recommendation 2 above. Accordingly, this is an approach that is left for the ccNSO community to decide upon, as and when and to the extent it is considered useful and practical. At the same time, the WG notes that some community comments express doubts about the viability of the proposed approach. The WG also notes the willingness of the ccNSO as expressed by the ccNSO Council to consider the concept of voluntary translations.

### **Analysis of the recommendations**

The recommendation of the Reviewers was based on the survey they conducted from January 2010 until March 2010, and validated by interviews at the Nairobi meeting (March 2010). According to the survey out of 54 respondents, 8 indicated language was a notable factor to participate, and 9 that it was a major factor.

The results of the survey do not indicate:

- The type of documents that need to be translated (ranging from draft papers to ccNSO guidelines and policies);
- The required quality of translation, i.e for what purpose it is needed ( a working understanding to get up to speed quickly to certified translation fro legal purposes).
- The preferred languages.

At the same time there different methods are available to provide a translation:

- ICANN has published a draft translation policy. Accordingly core documents could be translated and available in the 6 UN languages and has been updated.
- Since 2010, the on-line tools for translation have improved considerably and are readily available. These tools may not provide a word-by-word accurate translation, but provide a cost-effective and reasonable level a translation, for example At –Large has been using these tools on its wiki’s.

Further English will remain to be the working language in ICANN and the ccNSO.

In light of the above, it is therefore recommended that as a first step to implement ccNSO improvements recommendations 2:

The secretariat under auspices of the ccNSO Council launches an additional survey to seek a better understanding from the ccTLD community for the need of translations.

The secretariat looks into different methods for translation of documentation, including the costs associated, the quality of the translation and the languages.

At its meeting in Beijing the results from the survey and secretariat research will be presented to the community present.

**Background to the recommendation**

According to the external reviewers in any international, membership-based organisation like the ccNSO, language is likely to be a constraint unless adequate measures are taken to translate documents, and engage the broader international community through the organisation of meetings, teleconferences, working groups etc. in multiple languages (or, at the least to allow participants to have recourse to interpreters). Yet, at present, it would appear that all documents produced by the ccNSO, whether for internal use or communication with the ccNSO members or the broader community of ccTLD managers are in English.

At the same time the external reviewers noted other limiting factors, such as the financial and time constraint of travel and the difficulties and considerable costs of obtaining visas to attend meetings.