GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO
Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper on IDN ccTLDs
December 3 , 2007 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper onIDNccTLDs on December 3 , 2007.
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/idn-rework-group-20071203.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec

Agenda:

http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-cc-idn-tld-rg/msg00009.html

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency group co-ordinator

Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee

Olga Cavalli - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Bilal Beiram - CBUC

Adrian Kinderis - Registrar c.

Absent apologies

Stefanie Lai - NCUC

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

(Chuck):	Maybe I better…
Man:	Sir, the recording have started.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Oh, thank you. Okay. So it did work. Very good. All right. Get the agenda in front of me here.

Okay. So, we've got (Bilal) and (Avri), myself and (Adrian) are all on and Glen's with us and (Olof)'s with us. So, if the others get on, good.

I think everybody understands our purpose here. There was a working group that developed the draft statement in response to the ccNSO (GAC) Issues paper and (IDNCCTLD)'s. That was completed quite a while ago, several months ago by that group.

And since then there have been some modifications to it based on input form the council and particular on Saturday in the Los Angeles - in Los Angeles. We made some changes. Well Saturday the council talked about it and then a subgroup got together and made some revisions to the executive summary. And I think there's been a few little minor edits since then.

So I sent around the latest version of that which I think has a 28 October date version three is the right one that everybody should have. Is there anybody who does not have that version?

And there are just a few highlighted items in that. The items that were highlighted were the very latest changes that occurred in the draft.

Okay then. The next - so our task then is to go through that and see what other revisions might be necessary. And I think there will be some others that are needed now that there's been more discussion.

Yes. Question.

Bilal: Would you mind sending me that copy of that draft please?

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Okay. Yeah, but Bilal I had resent it to you…

Bilal: Okay.

(Chuck): …and you're not getting it. Huh? I will do that.

Bilal: Thank you.

(Chuck): Okay. And I'm not going to put any text in my message but let me get to that right now. And it was sent also to the list. You didn't get either one. I wonder what's going on there.

Bilal: It could be our mail server here just acting up.

(Chuck): Okay. I will try again. Oh, wrong one. Okay. Yeah, I just clicked send again. So let's see if that works.

Olof: And do likewise for just for good measure to see if it…

(Chuck): Okay. Thanks. Yeah, that's a good idea Olof.

Adrian: (Unintelligible). It's Adrian. It's a 28 October version, yeah?

(Chuck): Yeah, version three. Yeah, that's the one. And actually version three isn't too much different than other 28 October three that I had. They were 28 October that was the most recent.

I just got a reject from, but I don't think it's related to this. Okay.

Bilal: Got it. Got it. Thank you.

(Chuck): Got it. Okay. Good.

Bilal: Okay.

(Chuck): Okay. That's great. Then so the - as far as the agenda, I sent one out last night my time. Hopefully you've had a chance to look at that. Any changes to that - is everybody - anybody not comfortable with the agenda as is? Okay. Then I will proceed.

As far as the work plan, I think the first step that we need to do, and we can talk about this if it's necessary, is to basically identify what areas of the document may need further work now.

Once we do that, and we'll come back to that in our - on our agenda here, we need to decide how we're going to accomplish that task of ultimately revising those sections that we identify.

And I proposed some ideas. Please don't limit the ideas to what I suggested. And also it's important to recognize the ones that I mention and any you may come up with that are different, don't need to be mutually exclusive. In many cases, we could combine them.

So some of the approaches that I had listed, and I want everybody's input on this, is we could actually work through the issues together as one group. That probably is a little bit more challenging in terms of scheduling especially to the extent that we have to schedule teleconference calls.

We could, unless volunteers to, you know, one volunteer for each issue to take the lead on it and maybe come up with a draft revision and send it to the group for review.

We could form subgroups of two or three people to work on each area, understanding that there probably be, you know, each of us will be on, even if we divide it up among us for primary responsibility or initial responsibility, we probably still would have to do - each one would have to do multiple areas.

Email list discussion, I hope is certainly something we can use to minimize the teleconference calls. I think we will need additional teleconference calls. We'll talk a little bit later maybe about how to plan those.

Anybody have other ideas in terms of how we could proceed on this?

Avri: I have one. This is Avri. I have one possibility.

(Chuck):   Okay.

Avri: I started it but didn't finish it in time for this meeting. But I put a copy of the current document in one of those docs, online docs, things. And so

that struck me as, in addition, a possible way where we could have this document that we could all share online.

We could start initially by all adding sort of comments to each other's comments and so on and sort of get it going. And then possibly even try to use something like that for suggesting language changing, et cetera.

Coming every once in a while, yeah, we would have to sort of stop and have it be aggregated in talk, but it might be an additional tool as opposed to just email lists and others. So I'm not suggesting that that is an only tool, but I'm wondering whether that might be a useful tool.

(Chuck):   Yeah. It…

Avri: So people know what I mean.

(Chuck):   Anybody not know what Avri is referring to?

Adrian: (Chuck), it's Adrian. Can I comment on that when you get a sec?

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

Adrian: Avri, I think it's a great idea in having a dynamic document that everybody can see and also so long as it's checked out. I'm not sure whether this software checks out the document or at least indicates someone's working on it at the moment because that can otherwise be a little ugly.

But outside of that, the only comment I would make is about when potentially moving to a consolidated version, is that you keep the commented version because it always helps us to later one when we're presenting these potentially to the rest of the council that we may want to make a comment as to why wording is like it is.

It's easy to refer back to the original comments that we had as to why we made those changes.

So, yeah, I would think that keeping, you know, a version of that document with comments in it is handy, but I certainly think it's valuable to do it that way.

Avri: Okay. Yeah, the tool that I've been using with fair success lately is the docs in Google.

Adrian: Yeah.

Avri: And that one keeps copies like every 15, 20 seconds. You get to save particular actions. Multiple people can actually be working on it at the same time and then you do catch up.

             Now I haven't seen how it works - I'm not totally experienced with if three people were editing at exactly the same moment how it renders everybody's different edits, but it seems to be doing it fairly competently from the exercises I've done so far.

Adrian: Okay.

(Chuck): Now how does it work if multiple people can work on it at the same time?

Avri: We may want to try a quick experiment at some point just to see, but all the work I've done with it so far, it basically just collects these different versions and maps who's done what in what version.

Adrian: It saves - Chuck I think that the and I'm not 100% sure and now that you said Google Avri I'm not - I've got a bit of a recollection but I think what it does, because you're actually logged in and online and because it's obviously on mine, it's monitoring what you're doing every move…

Avri: Yeah.

Adrian: …as opposed to a document that sits on your desktop and then gets saved back to a certain area. This will indicate to you as someone logs in to start adjusting and changing the document and you'll see those changes as they happen.

(Chuck): Oh, okay. So if more than one person is working at the same time, you would see each other's changes.

Adrian: Yeah, that's what I believe it works. And that's why I think it's a good tool.

(Chuck): Okay. And that would - okay so that would really facilitate online working and so the - if somebody at a later point in time goes in to work on a document, they would see the latest version.

Adrian: That's right and I think also for these calls (Chuck) that if we wanted to make some changes on the fly or go through the document, I think you could even look at everyone could be logged in and looking at the version that you're looking at and would see the changes as you made them.

Avri: Yes, that's for sure.

(Chuck):   Now, that sounds like a really good approach. Anybody think differently? Then, you know, it would be good to Avri if you could or maybe…

Avri: Right. I've already…

(Chuck):   …if Glen already has them, send everything around to this…

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Right. I've got it set up. But since I was still just adding my comments, I didn't bother to - and I didn't want to do it until we had spoken in the meeting. I will send everyone an invitation to be an editor on the version that I've got up at the moment.

(Chuck):   Okay. And…

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   …instructions how to use it for those who don't know.

Avri: Sure. It's pretty straightforward, but year.

(Chuck):   Okay. Okay. Well, whatever, I mean just whatever…

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Right. And certainly I'll respond to any questions. Yeah.

Adrian: (Chuck) I have a question.

(Chuck):   Go ahead Adrian.

Adrian: Just to sort of backtrack on the comments you were making before. I believe everybody should be involved. It's not a big document but a long document as such.

                  And I think my opinion would be to allow anyone to comment on any part of the document because there are threads and seams throughout. And I think if you isolate certain areas, potentially you may have different voices throughout the document.

(Chuck):   Yeah, of course also (unintelligible) that's what we'd end up doing anyway even if we divvied up responsibilities. But that's fine. Anybody disagree with that approach? So there's agreement on those of us on the call today that we would work together as a group. Okay.

(Olga):   Chuck.

(Chuck):   Yes.

(Olga):   This is (Olga).

(Chuck): Oh, hi (Olga). Welcome.

(Olga): Yes, I just jump in 10 minutes ago. I think that the idea that Avri presented is great. I think that we should work as a group, but perhaps in a - in a moment in the near future we could revise all our comments and perhaps we decide to work in groups. Not in the first moment, but after a while. Could you clarify for me which is the timeframe for doing this work?

(Chuck): Well that's going to be up to us. I don't think we want to drag it out too long. But that's on the agenda later to actually talk about a timeframe for getting this done. So we'll actually come back to that. No deadline has been set by the council. Avri you want to comment on that and then we'll come back to the details later?

Avri: I don't have much to add because I - we don't have a deadline. I mean, you have certainly made very good arguments for the fact that we should, you know, get this completed as quickly as we can at this point.

I think given the work that's starting with the (IDNC) with the fact that we need to have a clean GNSO position on these things. But it's probably good that we get it done, you know, as soon as we reasonably can, but we should take sufficient care with it.

(Chuck): Right.

Avri: But at this point I think that, you know, while I was in favor of waiting until after this last meeting to see what else developed that would

affect our perceptions. At this point, I think it's time to get our stake in the ground.

(Chuck):   And the (IDNC) group that is being formed, it's going - this document will probably be a key basis for our representatives on that group in terms of the GNSO position and so forth.

So that's probably the most pressing issue right now. And with the short timeframe that the ccNSO has established, I think that we're going to want to get this done as quickly as possible. And we'll talk specifics on that later on the agenda.

Bilal: Excuse me (Chuck). I've already uploaded the document that you just sent me, the ccNSO GACissues paper on the dual documents you have (unintelligible), Avri and Olof are in the group so you can actually see it there.

(Chuck):   Oh, okay. Good. All right.

Avri: Okay. So the one I'm working on I should forget about because we've already got another one. Okay.

(Chuck):   Well and you know, I actually went through the whole document and already inserted a bunch of comments and possible edits and so forth. So…

Avri: Oh well, if we…

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Go again Chuck).

(Chuck):   What's that?

Man: Looks like you ought (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Okay. So I should - now Bilal the one that you entered there, did it have - it was just the basic document, right?

Bilal: No, the one I got is a redlined document, but on Google document it doesn't show the redlines or remarks…

Avri: Right. Yeah. What I was doing was I was moving those off to the side so they could be seen separately. But okay, I guess when we receive your invitation, we can join and start modifying. I was just about to send the invitations out on the one I had, but okay.

(Chuck):   Now how does a Google document show redlines or does it?

Bilal: That's the question I was going to ask Avri if it shows redlines and remarks. I'm not sure.

Avri: I don't believe. Let me see.

(Chuck):   So how do we keep track? That makes it very difficult going forward to know what people have done.

(Adrian):   That could be a deal breaker.

(Chuck): Yeah, it really could. Otherwise it becomes so time consuming to try and figure out what was done.

Bilal: You could - what you could do is highlight the comments that you enter and we should agree on each one using a…

Avri: That, yeah, that was the practice that I was in the process of typing in that you basically put your comments in brackets. I haven't checked to see whether there's a way to actually - it changes the document live. So what I had been doing as opposed to editing the document itself had been adding my comments in brackets underneath them and then initializing it. But…

(Chuck): Well that would work. Now ultimately we're probably going to get to a point where we need to have a call to go through those, but that would be a good way to get a reasonable start on it.

Avri: And what we could have was basically one sort of editor who was putting in these changes and having the rest of us always able to see and comment. And so one person actually holding the pen on so-called official text while everyone else was just adding comments to the document.

(Chuck): And we could probably at whatever point we decide initiate that and in the meantime just get a lot of good interaction going with people's comments. And then once we get to a point maybe where we hold a teleconference call, going through these and making a decision at that point, it'd be very important to have a - identify an editor. Does that make sense? Silence. I assume it does. I'm not necessarily convinced that it does, but okay.

If you think otherwise, please speak up. So we will need to - we'll need to put comments and edits in brackets with initials. Right?

Bilal: Right.

Adrian: (Chuck) I think also that if this goes south very quickly within a week, we can always change tact and go back to the conventional method of sending around a sole document or something, but…

(Chuck):   Sure. Sure. But I think it's a good thing to try right now. Anybody disagree.

Adrian: I think it's well worth running up the flagpole. That's for sure.

(Chuck):   Okay. All right. Well that's good. Any other discussion on how to proceed? Okay. All right. So we will go ahead and proceed on that.

                Now let's talk about the timeframe

Bilal: Excuse me, before you start on the timeframe. While I think, will everybody send me their email so I can add them to the - invite them to this because I don't have everybody's email. I have yours and I have (Aubrey's). But the new numbers, I don't have.

(Olga):   Okay. I'll do that Bilal. I'll do that sorry.

Avri: Okay. So I should just kill the copy that I've been working on, right? Is that what we've decided?

(Chuck):   Yeah.

Avri: That I already had in Google docs and I should just kill that one. Okay.

(Chuck):   All right.

Avri: Because I guess I should have sent people addresses earlier. Okay. Never mind.

Man: Have you done a lot of work on it Avri?

Avri: I've done some, but that's okay. I can just cut and paste it into the new one.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   Yeah, that's what I'm going to do. Yeah.

Avri: I mean, as opposed to sending out invitations to this particular document, I'll - Bilal can send out invitations to the one he's put out and yeah, okay.

(Chuck):   All right. Sorry about that Avri. I'm going to have to do the same thing. But I can cut and paste, so.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Yeah, I can cut and paste…

Man: …another document in Google docs in about half an hour just to get everyone to send to that one as well.

Avri: Oh, okay. That's good. Yeah.

(Chuck):   You were being facetious. Is that right?

Man: Yes (Chuck). I was…

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   I just wanted to - I wanted to clarify that. Make sure everybody caught that.

Man: Might be in (unintelligible), but I'm still an Australian (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Okay. Anything else then on the approach going forward here.

Avri: The other thing people can do to make life easier is, you know, you can color stuff that you write too. So if people have different colors, it just makes it obvious. It's a way of doing it. So I had started coloring mine with some awful shade of pink purple because I like that color.

            But, you know, that's the other thing we can do while we're working is we can work in different colors. You can either work a different color font or you can work in different color highlighting.

(Chuck):   Okay. Good.

Avri: So if people pick colors. And I'll add notes to that kind of suggestion at the top of Bilal's document when I've gotten access to it.

(Chuck): All rightie. Good. Okay.

Man: Sounds a little reservoir dogs with Mr. Orange, Mr. Pink, Mr. Brown.

Avri: Exactly. Use pink please. Yes.

(Chuck): And it sounds like (Aubrey's) got dibs on a color already.

Avri: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Okay. Let's then jump to talking about timeframe. Probably one of the questions we should talk about, you know, how are we going to be able to proceed with this over the month of December with holidays and so forth or do we need to take a break?

Avri: I'm Jewish. I don't care.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Olga): I will be available in December, perhaps not in two weeks of January but I will be available almost all the time.

(Chuck): Okay.

Man: I think a break will be a good idea.

(Chuck): And what time of a break? What dates?

Man: Last week of December between the twentieth and the twenty-seventh, I guess.

(Chuck): Twentieth and twenty-seventh. And should we extend that over New Years or does that matter?

Adrian: I think twentieth to at least like the fourth or something.

(Chuck): What do others think?

Bilal: I'll go with Adrian.

(Chuck): By the way, that doesn't mean that you can't do something on the online facility during that period, but we certainly wouldn't schedule any teleconferences during then. So twenty December to four January. Okay. Is that all right? I'll put no teleconferences then.

Okay. All right. Now in terms of target, we may not be able - we don't have to firm up a completion date today. That's wasn't my intent because I think once we get into it, we'll have a better feel. We should - whatever we do, try to finish as soon as possible. So that should be the - a guiding motivation.

But in my opinion, I think it would be good if we can at the outside make sure we complete this in no more than two months. Earlier would be better, but I'll just put that on the table. That would be an outside target that we would try and beat. But is that reasonable?

Bilal: I think it's reasonable.

Avri: Yeah. When did you say we'd be taking a break?

(Chuck):   Twenty December to four January.

Avri: Okay. I think it'd be really cool if we could be at a rough draft of where we were going before that break just to be…

(Chuck):   Okay.

Avri: …just to be pushy on schedule.

(Chuck):   Okay, that's a good milestone. So rough draft before twenty December and then the completion of recommendations to the council not later than three February. Is that…

Avri: Yes, so that's basically essentially two weeks after we come back from the break.

(Chuck):   No, that would be less - that'd be more than two weeks. So maybe we ought to make it - I think you're right. We probably ought to make it two weeks after - not later than so forth, so if we add - that'd be the eighteenth of January.

       I'm not looking at a calendar to see what day of the week that is, but that doesn't matter too much I don't think. We can always adjust that. So not later than eighteen January.

Adrian: Eighteenth is a Friday (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Okay. That's good. That's probably a good day. So…

Adrian: (Chuck), can I say something here?

(Chuck):   Yes. Please.

Adrian: I guess with respect to timelines and I'm must apologize, I was not at
                (ICANN) on the Saturday and I only sort of got this document as the
                basis of this, but how significant is the shift going to be that we're
                working on and I'm talking about this putting it to timelines obviously?

                And, you know, how much work do we think this is going to be?
                Because that, you know, that might influence how much time we need
                to give ourselves. Is there a generally feeling that there needs to be a
                hell of a lot of work done, a medium amount of work done or just a
                little, you know, bit of wordsmithing? Where are we at?

Avri: I think it's…

(Chuck):   It's medium but I think the dates we're talking about are realistic. What
                do others think?

(Olga):   I agree. I agree with (Chuck). This is (Olga).

(Chuck):   As I went through it pretty thoroughly last week in preparing for this, I
                think it's - the key point is to be able to - what will take more time is if
                we're not in agreement.

                And so far I haven't detected that we're going to have a lot of trouble
                reaching consensus. There may be one or two items like that. I think

it's more of just refining and maybe saying some things that weren't said in the first version.

Adrian: All right. That sets the scene nicely and having said that, I think that the timelines you've allowed for are adequate.

(Chuck): Okay. Any other comments on that? Okay. That's great. Thanks for the input on that. Now, how many have been able to or maybe I should ask it this way, has anyone not been able to go through the draft document thoroughly again yet?

Bilal: I haven't. This is Bilal.

(Chuck): Okay. So it's really important to do that as soon as you can. So the - and then now that we're using this other method of using the Google docs, you know, the sooner people can get their comments in, the better. And I'll try and get mine in maybe today or if not, by tomorrow I should be able to do it.

Avri: I just got Bilal's invitation to join the thing and thanks Bilal for sending that.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Adrine): (Chuck) and Avri, can I ask sort of a positioning question please?

(Chuck): Yes.

Adrian: Having read the document and I don't know whether - (Chuck) I've just looked through the agenda just to see where this question will fit in. Hopefully I'm doing it in the right spot.

Are you able to give us a broad GNSO statement if you will and I know the executive summary does to a degree, but I really want to understand. Maybe you can answer better if I ask you these questions. Number one, are we pissed off? Excuse my language. Are we upset with the ccNSO or the (GAK)? Number one.

Number two. You know, what is - I guess it's maybe not - how can I phrase this the right way? Maybe I'll leave it to you to say. I won't put words in your mouth. Maybe I'll just leave it and say can you please give me a positioning statement of in general out position with - I know I'm being vague, but does that help?

(Chuck):   Yeah. I think I know what you're asking. I think maybe the best way to respond to you is for each one of us to respond to what you're asking and I'll start it off.

Adrian: That would be great. Thank you.

(Chuck):   My own personal opinion is no. I'm not upset with the GACor the ccNSO. I think this is a legitimate issue, a very important issue that needs to be resolved.

It overlaps with GNSO work tremendously and that's where we need to very carefully establish our position so that whatever they end up doing doesn't negatively impact the GNSO space and there is a risk for that.

I for one think that if there was one theme that I would support adopting in a GNSO position that would override everything and in fact you'll see this in the draft document quite a bit.

And that is is that user experience is really important whether it be in the CC world or the GNSO world and that should kind of be an overriding factor as we go through this thing that we make sure we don't create situations that are going to create a bad user experience whether that means that disputes get more complicated or user confusion or whatever that may mean, so that's kind of my personal response. (Adrian) let me let someone else respond.

Avri: Should I take a go at it at, this is Avri?

(Chuck):   Go Avri.

Avri: Okay. I think I've been trained already too much diplomacy to say that I am pissed off.

(Chuck):   If you want to though you can tell this group.

Avri: Extremely wary, and extremely nervous about some of the changes that I see in the definition and that was the one, the e-mail that I sent to the council of you know, do we see it as (Philip) fairly accurately I thought outlined it, that there is domain name space and all except the defined two character (CCTLD)'s are part of GNSO's remit and anything outside of that requires a redefinition of the remit, which I think the GNSO has indicated a willingness to do, but the redefinition that's coming out of this particular effort and some board members that I've been talking to is that no potential domain name space does not

belong to either the GNSO or the (CCNSO), it's when a name is defined if it's defined by a (CCTLD) type then it goes to (CCNSO) space. If it's defined by (GTLD) process or GNSO processes then it goes into GNSO space.

I find that very worrisome because it changes the whole constraint of what we're dealing with. I understand what (Chuck) is saying about user experience but that's one of those relatinistic things that scares me almost as much as defining things based on morality because a country, a group can define user experience to mean that they need 25 (CCTLD)'s one in every possible script and in fact several for every variant of the name that is in common use in the United States, I mean, common used in their country and I use the United States as an example, USA, United States of America, United States, U.S., Land of the Home and the Free, etc.

That all those things are national names, therefore we should have those in all the scripts of anyone that anyone might use in this country and that becomes important for our national user experience. So I'm wary of using experience as a criteria and I'm very nervous about this.

The last thing is I don't know that we have a GNSO position and that's why I asked the question that I did and that and hope that we talk about it some in the meeting because that's just my personal view that this is a scary thing.

(Chuck): Now one of the things I think I want to go back to your first main point there Avri and that is the idea of what fits into the GNSO space and the (CCNSO) space and at present only the ISO 3166-1 two letter country code names are in the (CCNSO) space, it's really important in my

opinion that everybody fully grasp the significance and the meaning of that. Is there anybody that's not clear on the importance of that because I think that's something that's really not in the statement right now that needs to be added and it's fundamental to the issues involving the GNSO and the (CCNSO) on this. So, is there anybody that feels like you don't have a grasp of what Avri said with in that regard?

Edmon: This is Edmon and I just joined.

(Chuck): Thanks Edmon.

Edmon: Sorry I just skipped; I didn't quite get it, could you very shortly just highlight what was said. I think I can pick it up pretty quickly.

(Chuck): Avri you said it better than I can say so.

Avri: Okay. Basically there's two ways to look at the unused name space and one way is the traditional way I think we had in an (ICAN) which is name space is in the GNSO's remit except for that part of it, the 3166-1 two characters that is assigned to the (CCNSO) agreement. There's a second way of looking at the name space that's been developing over the last couple weeks and that the (IDNC) proposal fits squarely in and that's the unused name space is not yet in anyone's remit and it only comes into your remit when a name is assigned. If that name is assigned to a (GTLD) or is applied for even by a (GTLD) then it becomes (GNSO)'s remit and (GNSO's) policy.

If however it's a (CCTLD) or perhaps a nation applying for that name then it is not in the GNSO's remit and it's as it's only a potential name it

then would fall into the (CCNSO)'s remit. So this, the (IDNC) exercise if one looks at it makes a presupposition that they are not reapportioning name space away from the GNSO to the (CCTLD) but rather they are taking a portion of unused name space and claiming it as their own.

So the fine difference is, is it a reapportionment or is it just a first apportionment of something that's only potential but not yet actual?

(Chuck):   And one of the things that we need to keep in mind that is really critical here in my opinion is that the, all the players, the providers in the GNSO space have, and I'm talking registries and registrars, have relatively heavy agreements with (ICAN) and are required to follow those agreements that it's much more restrictive in terms of how they function. At the same time, they're competing with players on the CC side that have virtually no agreements, almost not requirements that they have to follow and so that's a real critical GNSO issue. Does that make sense?

(Adrian):   Yea (Chuck) it's (Adrian), can I comment please?

(Chuck):   Yes.

(Adrian):   I understand, I'm just trying to grapple and maybe because I get a bit of an insight with what I do in my day-to-day life maybe I see things a little differently while obviously respecting my position within the GNSO. So am I getting this right that, if for example, (Qatar) got the equivalent of, or no let's use (UIE), so they got (dot emirate) in Arabic script and then someone applied for a TLD with United Arab Emirates. In Arabic script that what you're saying is that's because of the

separation that (Aubrey's) pointing to, if I'm understanding correctly, that would not be a CC issue.

(Chuck): Well I don't think we know the answer to that, but that's something that we need to figure out how we're going to come up with an answer.

(Adrian): Because I think that that speaks to the core of where (Aubrey's) coming from because I think that's the concern of the (CCTLD)'s or the (CCNSO) rather, is that having sort of say in names at the new, at the TLD level and new TLD's that cross over and that's why I'm trying to get, this will help shape my response to the document by getting a better understanding of the council here.

Avri: Right. Well as I said, we don't have the council yet but I think it expends beyond that. I think at one is at the moment within the GNSO response the new (GTLD) policy they would certainly have a cause to object to that being assigned to someone. But by the other token it sort of says that from the start they can't claim any names that have the word emirates in it because well that's their national identity.

(Adrian): (Unintelligible) Emirates Airlines might have something to say for example.

Avri: Exactly. And so but they could say, but now emirates is what we call ourselves and we want emirates, not only in Arabic script but we want it in every other script to protect our, you know, national identity. So I don't think, so yes the space is fuzzy between, that's why we put in the objection process that allows them to say, no, you can't take United Emirates, you know, in Arabic script, even though we haven't taken it yet. But you know, and we object and there's an objection process, but

by the same token we want to make sure that it's not possible for, you know, them to sort of take any name in any script that has the word Emirates in it. And if we don't constrain things somehow that becomes an open possibility.

(Adrian):   Yea, I hear exactly what you're saying. It may be that, so that'll help me with writing the document, when reviewing the document here to say the potentially, excuse me, we need to be highlighting the features if you like, of the recommendations as they are to give them the comfort that they require, am I correct?

(Chuck):   Yes well again, you know, whether we're going to be able to give them the comfort they desire or not remains to be seen, it kind of depends what they, what it takes to make them comfortable because I don't think we want to create disadvantages in the (GTLD) space just to make them comfortable. Now hopefully we can come up with a position that both sides are comfortable with. But we'll have to see as we move forward.

And I want to come back to one thing Avri mentioned. Again, it's very important to everybody on this group understand this, the new (GTLD) recommendations which are designed to work for (IDNTLD)'s and ASCII (GTLD)'s clearly the recommendation is not to reserve geographical identifiers okay, and as Avri said, there's a dispute process that allows a community to challenge a use of geographical name, but there's, the recommendation is that there not be any reserve names for geographical identifiers. So it's very important that everybody understands that because that is one decision the council has already made.

Avri: And if I could add one thing, the (IDNT) here is not going to make a decision on you know, they're trying to stick to the one name, one script, one country. They'll have difficulty doing that because of India and other claims, but they're trying to stick to that. What was a more important consideration to me was the equality of representation because without equality of representation on this, the presumption of, well this is a problem we all have to solve in terms of the name space becomes this is (CCNSO) (gap) name space and we'll talk about how we allot that and you guys get to advise and (unintelligible) but not actually to be an equal part of how name space is apportioned.

(Chuck): Okay. Now let me come back to Edmon. Edmon did you get the clarity that you needed?

Edmon: Yes I'm sorry, I apologize for joining late actually. I got my calendar set up wrong, but yes I got the point and actually on that last point I think it, I think it's actually quite important as well, and I agree with Avri that we should figure out a, you know, a position and I remember quite clearly when we brought the discussion up in the (gap) joint meeting I remember maybe with from the Bulgarian (gap) representative that they made it very adamant that, you know, they didn't want to carve out a space in the (IDNTLD) space that is (gap) (CCTLD) or (CCNSO) specific and which we should not touch kind of thing.

(Chuck): Thanks Edmon. Okay let's go, again going on to others in response to (Adrian's) question that Avri and I have responded to. Who else would like to respond to that?

(Olga): This is (Olga), (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Go ahead (Olga).

(Olga):   Yea. I have the same concerns that you (Chuck) and Avri have (unintelligible) and that has been mentioning. I think it's a very challenging process as it includes interest (unintelligible) by the (gap) by the (CCNSO) and some (unintelligible) are in the responsibilities of the (GM) itself, so this is my biggest concern, that's why I was interested in working with the group because I wanted to really understand and get involved with this. But what we see the most is to put this in an understandable frame for everyone, for the countries, for the (CCTLD)'s and also for the general community of Internet. So if a country would claim 25 or 30 different scripts, it's (unintelligible) correct, it's finally one (unintelligible) three or four, which is the frame to give a quite nice answer to everyone and make the thing work.

             And also what worries me a lot is security, or do we know how many scripts can we finally define to be allowed and to have a secure and safe Internet, do we have this input from the security and stability committee?

(Chuck):   Well this issue of course has been debated for years now with regard to how many (TLD)'s can we put into the root. I think it's accurate to say that it's a pretty high number. Okay now, the some people in the technical community are being conservative and not wanting to say it's unlimited, and it may not be unlimited, but it's a large enough number that I think, within the GNSO we're not concerned about that number right now, now that could change but as far as the technical issues of the names added to the route, there's I believe it's pretty well established that it's a fairly large number. Now, somebody else comment on that please?

Avri: Yea. I think that most people have determined that we'll reach an operational limit of (ICAN) can handle long before we'll reach you know, the technical and that, I mean people know that name servers can handle, oh how much does that comma handle. So you know, whether the numbers in six figures, seven figures or eight figures is debatable, but you know, that it's in those levels of magnitude that we talk about if there is a concern, you know, obviously there's upgraded of equipment and all kinds of stuff like that. But the technical limitations are far, far further away than the operational limitations.

(Chuck):   Did that make sense (Olga)?

(Olga):   Yes it makes sense but my concern is still to target establish a logic number for each encrypted part, (unintelligible) thing that comes to my mind. If it's a huge number then how many for each country, how many for different script and is it safe in (unintelligible) space. I think that's something that we should work on because if not, it's like there is no limit and how, I think that there may be many disputes and problems with names and scripts and as there are many scripts, many languages that can be really a lot of information going around, that's my concern.

(Chuck):   I don't think it's the remit of this group or even this paper that we're working on to deal with the maximum number of TLD's that can be added to the root. So and if we start getting off on that direction which is one that nobody's ever been able to assign a definitive answer to for years, it'll distract us I believe from the task at hand.

(Adrian):   (Chuck) can I make my comments?

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

(Adrian):   If I may, I'm coming from the perspective that you know, hearing what Avri said I certainly agree. I think that there is space for both entities to co-exist but you know, I think that the (CCNSO) needs to get their act together and I think that they certainly do have a jurisdiction, if I can use that word, over a set but you know, it's about agreeing upon what that set is and getting an understanding of that, and ensuring that it doesn't infringe upon what the (G) world or the (GNSO) world is studying about doing.

And so long as there's visibility and transparency and that I think we'll go a long way. I certainly believe we have built comfort, and I know (Chuck) your comments about whether they'll accept that it's comfortable, I think we have put, you know, checks and balances in the process going forward, so hopefully we can use this paper to highlight some of those, you know, to maybe eradicate some of their fears.

The other concern I have is that this paper, if I'm reading it correctly, says that we will not be slowed down by the (CCNSO) and if they're not ready with theirs then that won't retire the (GSNO) progress. I think the same should be said in reverse and I'm not sure the paper necessarily spells that, is that if they decide, for example, that they can do their country codes and each one gets one, and that, you know, as we know the likelihood of that happening is minimal, if they do that before we're ready I see no problem with that going forward. If there's a (GNSO) council position on that I'd certainly like to hear it, but I can't see where what's good for the goose shouldn't be good for the gander.

(Chuck):   And keep in mind with regard to (GNSO) position, like Avri said a couple times, we haven't got to a point where the full (GNSO), or certainly not the full council, has come up with a position on a lot of these things.

(Adrian):   Well then I should have said view point (Chuck).

(Chuck):   What's that?

(Adrian):   I should have said view point is what I meant, (unintelligible) view point rather than a position at this point in time.

(Chuck):   Hopefully the council will approve a position based on what we give them in this document, or you know, quite a few positions in this. Avri you wanted to say something?

Avri: Yea I wanted to say one thing on the, you know, I think you're right about geese and ganders in terms of, you know, who is ready, however I do want to point out that at the moment the only thing that keeps the (GNSO) from being ready is staff implementing the policies we've already made. So it in a sense we're ready now and we already had target dates of opening rounds in six months.

(Adrian):   With all due respect, those implementation issues we have, well that (ICAN) has, yes we are ready as such, but I think it's not necessarily that the (GNSO) is ready, I think that the whole process needs to be ready and those implementation questions don't have a lot of answers at this point in time and I certainly see the implementation and, you know, I'm just saying let's not rule it out if they can beat us let them.

(Chuck):   Yea.

(Adrian):   (Unintelligible).

(Chuck):   And by the way (Adrian), just in that regard, in some of the edits that I made, I tried to deal with that in terms of it being a by directional type approach on this and I think (unintelligible) now I've only got four minutes before I have to be in another meeting that conflicts with this.

(Adrian):   Now can I just make one more comment very quickly to finish off mine?

(Chuck):   Yea. As long as it's quick because I'd like to give a couple other people a chance to respond.

(Adrian):   Sure, sure, I understand. We, the word delegate isn't referenced very often in this entire document and it concerns me that I know full well that the (CCTLD) manager is not necessarily, depending on the context you use it's a delegate nor is the government necessarily the delegate and I think we need to be careful of, if we're talking about those sort of context that we include delegate in there as well, and understand what that means.

(Chuck):   Okay, all right. And there are a few questions that they ask that deal with that. Does anybody else Edmon, let's see (Olga), Avri, myself, (Adrian) have all respond, commented there.

Woman: (Bilal) hasn't.

(Chuck):   (Bilal) did you have anything to add (Bilal)?

(Billel):   No (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Edmon?

Edmon: I'm good for now.

(Chuck):   Olof.

Olof: Just an observation. I think it's very much that I think we have identified sort of a core issue which we haven't really addressed in a comprehensive way in the paper and that's the whole issue of the apportionment and name space and well that could affect a few different answers depending on our outcome on that so maybe that's, if we should concentrate on something that may be it in a first instance to try to seek some agreement about just this apportionment of name space and what we mean by that and the two various approaches and how we address those that Avri brought up. That's a quick observation.

(Chuck):   Thank you. Now, just the last two things before we, before I adjourn this, what's a good milestone for all of us having put in our input into the document online? Is a week good? I mean should we shoot for a week from today?

Woman: Yea.

(Chuck):   Is that okay? Anybody opposed to that?

(Adrian): (Chuck) I should be able to get it done, I've just got a presentation started that I've got a lot of work to get to, but I should be able to get this.

(Chuck): Okay. And so…

Avri: Are we generally going to meet on Monday morning. I mean it doesn't matter to me, I move around a lot so, I'll get (unintelligible) anytime but is this the time slot we (unintelligible).

(Chuck): That's the other thing I want to cover before we adjourn here. So what's a good time for meeting, and now I in particular would appreciate it's not quite this early for me whenever we have these meetings because I have to get up at 4:30 just to make sure I'm awake to lead the meeting, so I'd rather it be at least an hour later, but is there a day of the week and a time, is one hour later than this a fairly good time generally or not?

(Olga): Yes for me okay, yes. For me it's better one hour late.

Avri: For me I'll be in a reasonable time zone for the rest of the month so it's fine with me yea.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Adrian): (Chuck).

(Chuck): Go ahead (Adrian).

(Adrian):   From December 17 I'm back in Australia and an hour later would make it 2:00 am so that's (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Oh well that's, that's okay that's not good then so.

(Adrian):   But I, yea I think, when are you planning on the next call?

(Chuck):   Well that's the next thing, I think we're probably going to determine that based on our progress rather than try and set it right now. What I'm trying to get to is get a general feel for days of the week for calls and times, you just made a good point so we may, I'm going to have to, I'll put some things on the list with regard to the, we may not even have a call before you're back in Australia depending on our progress on the list. So we're going to have to deal with that 2:00 am issue because that would be unacceptable. So we actually either have to go, well I don't know, I'll play with that one, I don't think we're going to resolve that here.

(Adrian):   I can take a hit if it meant, that's not too bad, if we can work that out sort of on the fly that'd be better, but I'm prepared to take a hit if it means everybody else is suited.

(Chuck):   Yea. Now what about days of the week, are there days that are really bad for people? Friday doesn't work very well again because of the Australian issue, but Monday through Thursday are there any days that tend to be bad? No comments on that? Okay.

Avri: Well Thursday, every other Thursday we (unintelligible)…

(Chuck):   Yea and I'll be aware of the council meeting, so that's probably easy to manage but I just wanted to find out whether there are any bad times so, how early in your day works for Australia (Adrian)?

(Adrian):   I think we normally do the council calls at like 7:00 or 8:00 in the morning, so I think (Glen)'s got a really good visibility on all this sort of stuff, she's probably the go to person here.

(Chuck):   Okay, good. So (Glen) are you still on?

(Glen):   Yes I am still on (Chuck).

(Chuck):   If you can just send me or you can even send it to the list just some proposed times. We don't need to set one up right now, but so that we've thought that through in advance and we can kind of test it among one another, that would be a good idea.

(Glen):   Okay I'll do that.

(Chuck):   So our action items before the next, our action items regardless of when our next teleconference meeting is will be for each of us to provide input into the document and do your best to do that by a week from today. And I need to jump off onto another call and want to thank everybody for participating in this first call. I think we accomplished what we needed to so we can get moving.

Woman: Okay thanks.

(Chuck):   Okay.

(Adrian):   Good work (Chuck) (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Okay, bye.

Woman: Thank you bye.

                        END