GNSO IDN Working Group Teleconference
6 March 2007
11:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO IDN Working Group teleconference on 6 March 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 recording may be heard at:

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/IDN-wg-20070306.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar

Participants on the call:

Ram Mohan - Working Group Chair

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Steve Crocker - Security and Stability Advisory Committee Liaison

Werner Staub - Registrar c.

William Tan- Registrar c.

Yoav Keren - Registrar c.

Cary Karp - gTLD Registry constituency

Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency

Tin Wee Tan - NCUC

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Hong Xue - ALAC Liaison

S. Manian - observer

Shahram Soboutipour - observer

S. Subbiah - observer

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Kurt Pritz - Senior Vice President, Services

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies

Paul Diaz - Registrar c.

Charles Shaban – IPC

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

(Subaya):   Are we the earliest here?

Avri Doria: I think we may be.

(Subaya):   Okay. And this is?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

(Subaya):   Oh Avri, this is (Subaya) here.

Avri Doria: Hi (Subaya), Hi, how are you doing? Well, it will still be a minute before
the actual time.

(Subaya):   Oh really? I'm on the exact time.

Kurt Pritz: Hi this is Kurt Pritz.

Avri Doria: Hello Kurt. You're in California!

Kurt Pritz: Yup.

Avri Doria: Wow. You're early here.

Kurt Pritz: Well, I'd thought I'd see what was going on.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) mic setup. Kidding.

Glen Desaintgery: Hello! This is Glen.

Ram Mohan: Hi Glen, this is Ram.

Glen Desaintgery: Hi Ram, Hi Avri.

Kurt Pritz: Hi Glen, it's (Kurt).

Glen Desaintgery: Hi (Kurt)!

Man: Good evening (Kurt).

Kurt Pritz: Hey! How are you (Ralph)?

(Ralph):   I'm good.

Glen Desaintgery: Have we got (Kerry) on the line too?

Man: Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: Morning (Kerry).

Man: I'm going to go on mute here for a minute.

Woman: This call is slated for two hours, right?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Coordinator: Excuse me, Mr. (unintelligible) has now joined.

Glen Desaintgery: Welcome Alistair how are you?

Alistair Dixon: Good. How are you?

Man: Come again?

Glen Desaintgery: And so, Mr. (unintelligible)?

Man: Hi.

Man: Mr. (Sansjury)?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes?

Man: Hello there this is your operator.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes?

Coordinator: Just let me know when you're ready for the download file to start.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, will you ask for Mr. Mohan please?

Coordinator: No problem Ms Mohan. If you just let me know and I'd get him for you.

Glen Desaintgery: Just take him off the call and ask him when he wants the recording to start please.

Coordinator: Okay no problem. Thanks.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you.

(Gran Map):   Hi Glen. This is (Gran Map).

Glen Desaintgery: Hi (Gran Map).

Man: How many are ready?

Glen Desaintgery: One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine people are all ready.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Glen Desaintgery: Hi Steve.

(Steve):   Good morning, how are you doing?

Glen Desaintgery: Fine, thanks.

(Steve):   Good afternoon for you I guess?

Glen Desaintgery: No, it's morning for me or mid day.

Sophia Bekele: It's out to lunch. We'll have to do…

Glen Desaintgery: And Sophia has just joined…

Man: Going to go on mute.

Man: (Kelly) just said that.

Man: I think?

Ram Mohan: Pardon me?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, Ram?

(Edmund):   Hello?

Glen Desaintgery: Hello (Edmund.)

(Edmund):   Edmund here joining..

Glen Desaintgery: Hello Edmund. Welcome. And we …

Ram Mohan: Hello I'm Ram Mohan

Glen Desaintgery: (Sharam)?

(Sharam):   Yes. Thank you. How are you?

Glen Desaintgery: Fine thank you. It's

Man: I'm back.

Glen Desaintgery: Is that you Ram Mohan?

Ram Mohan: That's me Ram Mohan.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes. Ram are you logged on to the meeting view?

Ram Mohan: I will be in a minute, just a moment.

Glen Desaintgery: Have you got the number? I will give it to you.

Ram Mohan: Just give me a minute

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Pardon?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, Ram?

Ram Mohan: Hello? Hi. Folks, we should get started here in just another minute or so. Thank you for being on the call.

Glen Desaintgery: Ram, would you like the number?

Ram Mohan: Just a moment.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Ram Mohan: I'm in the process of trying to convince my computer I am really me.

Cary Karp: Smash it into the table top or at least threaten to do so. They're normally responsive to that.

Sophia Bekele: Because they're making them more and more stubborn all the time.

Ram Mohan: Computers, you know, really haven't gotten rid of these pesky things. (Maria), I did get your email and I acknowledge your email.

Glen Desaintgery: Not on the call, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Not on the call. Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: All right. Well, we're just about five minutes after the hour. Glen, perhaps we could do a roll call and then we'll just get started here in just a minute or so.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, certainly.

Ram Mohan: And I'm ready for that number whenever you are.

Glen Desaintgery: The number is 623...

Ram Mohan: Uh-huh.

Glen Desaintgery: ...7363.

Ram Mohan: ...7363. Okay, got it.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes. I'll do the roll call.

Ram Mohan: Yes, please.

Glen Desaintgery: We've got Cary Karp on the line. We've got (Saruman), help me with your name please.

(Subaya):   (Subaya) would do, thank you.

Glen Desaintgery: (Subaya) will do. Thank you very much. Avri Doria, Kurt Pritz, Ram Mohan, Alistair Dixon, Mr. (Manion), (Ramesh Tawp), (Steve Crocker), Sophia Bekele and (Sharam), please help me with your other name. And Edmund Chung.

Ram Mohan: Excellent. Thank you very much. And we'll get the call started here. Glen, if you could begin the recording.

Coordinator: Excuse me, Mr. (Yuhof) can now join.

Ram Mohan: Welcome (Yuhof), we're just about to get started.

(Yuhof):   Hi.

Ram Mohan: We're just waiting for confirmation from Glen that the recording has begun and then we'll get ...

(Yuhof):   Okay.

Ram Mohan: ... the call kicked off here.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Coordinator: Okay, the recording has begun. Please go ahead.

Ram Mohan: Thank you very much. Welcome everyone to this next IDN working group call, March 6, the first meeting in March. Our goal today is to really finish the final item of discussion among the major items that we have set upon ourselves earlier in January and February which is the techno policy details is going to be the generic headline that we had marked out for ourselves.

But our goal here is to wrap our minds around that topic and to finish that topic up before we move on to the basic details relating to where we have agreement; where we find support and to navigate through the basics of our final report that will be submitted into the GNSO council.

For those of you who are joining new, I'd welcome you and I'm glad that you are here on our call. I'll remind you that we'd like for you to make sure that you review our prior call materials. Every call has been recorded, transcripts have been made available. So I'd encourage you to go through those given that our working...

Coordinator: Excuse, Mr. (William) now joined.

(William):   Hi, everyone. Good morning.

Ram Mohan: Welcome. So I'll - I will encourage you to go through our prior notes.
                 And just provide a word of - I guess an observation or a note from my
                 side that - given that our working group concludes its work in literally
                 two weeks' time. We will not have the luxury of revisiting topics that
                 have already been revisited for - unless we have absolutely new
                 perspectives that have never been considered so far.

                 Just to recap, last week we had quite a robust discussion. We finished
                 quite - we finished a lot of discussions on the major topics, existing
                 gTLD string allocation, existing domain name holders, the new gTLD
                 strings itself. And our goal here today is to spend some time on techno
                 policy details.

                 Now we had gone through some of these techno policy detail
                 requirement already but the first half of today's call will be focused on
                 the technology details that impinge on policy and policy details that
                 impinge on technology. And then we'll go to talk about areas where we
                 may have broad consensus areas.

                 So far, in the techno policy details area, we have identified three
                 subtopics. One was should single script adherence at all gTLD levels
                 be a requirement- where it can be adhered to?

                 Second was should the delimitations in which scripts are made
                 available for IDN and if yes, what are they. And the third techno policy
                 detail area that we have earlier identified was what are the policy

issues for IDN variance. Now, clearly there might be more topics and if there are then we'll get through them.

Again, for new people on the call, I just wanted to run a little bit by the rules of our - of engagement here. If you have something that you'd like to contribute then please ask to be placed in the queue. If someone else has contributed something that you'd like to comment upon, again, ask to be placed in the queue and I will do my best to accommodate your request to be in the queue and you get your point of view heard.

So with that said, let's get started. And I'll open the floor for both the placement of comments on these three techno policy detail areas and also for placements of comments on new technology (flash) policy areas.

The three areas defined so far are, "Should single script adherence at all TLD levels be a requirement"? Should there be limitations in rich scripts are made available for IDN and if yes, what are they? And what are the policy issues per IDN variance?"

Perhaps we should go at it one at a time and then if there are more high level areas that we should cover then we'll add those. So I'll pose the first question to our group. Should single script adherence at all TLD levels be a requirement? And I'll open the floor for comment.

Sophia Bekele: Ram, you can - it's Sophia. Could you say that again a little slowly? I'm trying to catch that.

Ram Mohan: Should single...

(Yuhof):   Excuse me, Ram, before you go on, this is (Yuhof). I just wanted to comment something on a procedural issue when we - before we go into the issues themselves if you - if I can take the floor for a minute and say something.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Why don't you go ahead, (Yuhof).

(Yuhof):   Okay, thank you. There's one thing that bothers me a little. I have the feeling that in some way we are kind of rushing on towards Lisbon to get everything done. I'm not really - it's not really clear to me why exactly we are doing that, you know, why are we rushing. Finally we have the time to have this very important discussion that a few are waiting for for years. And now we're kind of rushing.

                But anyway, even if we're rushing I would feel very comfortable because, you know, I had a lot of thinking after our last call. And there were many very important issues that we brought up and there was, as you said, a robust discussion. And I think that in some way it's not clear to me for what conclusions did we come. Because in some - on some issues during the calls, in fact we didn't come to a one, very clear conclusion – everyone with a consensus.

                So I would think that it will be very good if we want to - even if we want to go fast that we will have before the next call - as soon as possible, a draft regarding the issue that we already covered with the points that we covered and the views that were brought up. And if there were things I believe that you - I know that you took points and Glen, everyone.

And that the - in some cases we had different views. So that - those views will be there and we will have a chance, everyone in the committee - and you know, I know that because of the time and everything not everyone could take part in all of the calls. And we have new members right now I understand in the working group.

So that - everyone will be able - before we have, you know, we come to this last week and then we have a draft that there's no time to comment on. So we have something on those issues that we cover till now that we can go through, make comments if we have and come to a final paper that everyone can feel comfortable with.

And even if we won't come to a consensus, so at least when we bring it up to the council, these views are there. So then the council will be able, you know, to discuss it (spit it on) and to get their view on the issue. But it's very important that all of the - because we comment at really very important issues.

And I have a kind of a feeling that, you know, we talked about these issues but it stayed vague. There's no- nothing was really clear, you can come to a conclusion or not. Maybe we won't, maybe in some cases we won't come to a very clear conclusion. And the council will need to decide about it and maybe even the council won't come to a conclusion. Then only the ICANN board will come to conclusion.

So - but it's very important that as soon as possible, we'll start doing this paperwork through the list. That's it.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Yuhof). And you actually have said a number of things that were on my mind as well. Our goal - we do work under a charter that has a deadline.

So I'm charged and I feel highly responsible for making sure that - especially these four major areas that we have defined for ourselves as high areas, the time allocation that we allocate time for each one of them. If there is a sense of a momentum then that's a good thing. Not a bad thing in this area.

(Yuhof):   Sure, sure. I agree, I agree. Okay.

Ram Mohan: And the other points that you made though is that the way I paraphrase it is we've had discussions and you certainly like to see those discussions be reflected in our document rather than, you know, just kind of have a final "final document" that we may not have a lot of time to review.

Now our goal is exactly the opposite. Our goal is to get a draft document out in front of the entire membership for discussion and to not just have areas of broad agreement alone listed in it. But to actually reflect some of the areas where there was merely support or in some other areas where there were merely -purely differing opinions and not even any level of support. So we will get there.

I also expect that when we get to discuss the various areas or, you know, we're going to be saying "we think there is broad agreement in area x", we're going to find voices who will speak up and say, "Have you thought of this other thing which will help shape our documents to better reflect our deliberation?" So I don't think you have to worry too

much about not having the prior discussions be reflected in our document.

My goal is to make sure that we do have a pretty faithful description of what we have discussed - appear in our document. Now I do not hold out a great deal of a requirement that in every single area that we've discussed we must arrive at a consensus position. I think really our job - my job here is to make sure that we discuss the topics; that enough light is shed on these topics and enough heat is generated so that we have a clear understanding as much as possible of at least the most major factors that affect the topic at hand.

And then we go really from there rather than, you know, look to just add every - so let me be a little bit more clear. My goal is not to have a document that lists everybody's opinion that was stated in total. My goal is for us to have a document that reflect as, where it is warranted, a consensus position and where a consensus does not exist, to reflect the perspective.

So (Yuhof), you and I are on the same page. And we will get...

(Yuhof):   Yeah.

Ram Mohan: ... to that same place. And I appreciate your bringing it up. We will certainly get there. And in fact, I would point out that we've probably not reached conclusions in everyone of the areas that we've discussed in the last two calls. And I'm very comfortable with that because our discussions are in topics that are pretty deep.

And in general, what we are - we're going to do is make recommendations to the council and the council will likely sit down and think about it. And maybe come to a decision that says the topics are yet - we have merely peeled the first peel of the onion. So let's go a little deeper because tears haven't come yet.

(Yuhof): Ram, just a question. So when do you think we'll be - will we be able to get - discuss this paper? Because as you say, in general we kind of think the same but what's the time table for getting this, you know, this paper so we can, you know, go through the points and comments?

Ram Mohan: Well we have set a time table at the get go and we're working to stick to that time table, (Yuhof). So I'll just remind to share with everybody what we had said was that we will have - we will arrive - try to arrive at draft conclusions by the end of this meeting and review a draft Lisbon report March 13, finalize this - the Lisbon report march 28th and issue the report March 21st.

So the goal here is to have at least two weeks to actually go through the document in two full conference calls to review the document.

(Yuhof): Okay.

Ram Mohan: So we're sticking to that time line.

(Yuhof): Okay, thanks.

(Ramesh): This is (Ramesh), just a question. Who is assigned to write the draft?

Ram Mohan: Actually, between ICANN staff and myself we've begun, since we have compiled some of the perspective from the members, we have begun work on it and we will issue a draft document to the group this week.

Okay. Let me get back to the topic at hand. We kind of moved a little tangential on to both calendar and some administrative stuff. So back to the techno policy detail, the first question that was in front of all of us was, "Should single script adherence at all TLD levels be a requirement?" and Sophia had a comment. And you're - you have the floor now, Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: No, no. I think there was a problem, static with the phone. I couldn't hear the question you were posing so I had asked you to probably rephrase or say it slowly or something like that. Because it's not anywhere in writings, right? It's not in - there's no paperwork. You're just orally telling us what the question is, right?

Ram Mohan: Well these are questions that have been placed in front of us from our January meeting; we don't have - no questions in this area. So I'm actually merely reading off of the Jan 23rd (unintelligible) that talked about techno policy details. But I'm happy to repeat the question more slowly.

Sophia Bekele: No, I have a copy of your, you know, PowerPoint presentation in front of me. But I just don't have that particular question so it must have been broken down.

Cary Karp: (Unintelligible) comment.

Ram Mohan: I'll refer you to January 23rd, 2007 and in there I refer you to - let me see here, this is slide number 8. Should single part - single script adherence at all TLD levels be a requirement? Cary, you had a comment.

Cary Karp: Yes. If we were to implement what you just said, it would invalidate every single IDN that is currently registered. What are we going to do about that?

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. I've been on the call for sometime. But could I perhaps comment upon this?

Ram Mohan: Go ahead.

Olof Nordling: That - well if you read the overview of the conference call on 23rd of January, it says that on Item 2 of techno policy details, slide 7, "Agreement as a single script adherence across all levels in an IDN gTLD is not a technical requirement, only a potential policy requirement." So we have discussed this at some length. "Agreement that the single script adherence across all levels is difficult to enforce especially beyond second level. (In) support for not requiring a single script adherence across all levels in IDN gTLD."

                 And it was mentioned in Sao Paulo also that well, single script adherence of course is not a current requirement. Quite obviously the contrary since in SP TLDs there are IDN second level domains. So just to recap what has already been discussed.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can you put me in the queue, please?

Ram Mohan: And you have the floor as well.

Avri Doria: Okay. So first, I want to be clear on what we're talking about. We're not talking about single script adherence within each level. We're talking about one script per all level in a name. If that is indeed the case, I think that one, it is a bad idea to fill out or to basically have to glance part of all the old ones would say no.

But I think on second - on a second (point), I think it's important that we be able to have the current ASCII or any of the new ASCII and allow them to have second level IDNs. Or take any of the second levels that currently exist and allow them to have a third level that is an IDN. I also think it's important - so that's already one kind of exception that seems to me, to be almost a normal one to not say you can only do an IDN in a pure language basis or a pure script basis.

Tin Wee: Comment by (Tin Wee). On the queue please.

Avri Doria: I'll stop now.

(Robin):   Yeah, this is (Robin). I would also like to be in the queue.

Cary Karp: Cary, too please.

Ram Mohan: Okay and - Cary in the queue. So who is the first person who wanted to be in the queue?

Man: (Subaya) is one that began at the queue.

Ram Mohan: (Subaya) in the queue. So (Subaya), Werner and Cary.

Man: No, there was someone else before.

Olof Nordling: (Subaya) wasn't the first.

Edmon Chung: Edmon (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Edmon (unintelligible).

Man: Tin Wee was first, I think.

Ram Mohan: Who is first?

Tin Wee: Tin Wee.

Ram Mohan: Uh-huh. Tin Wee, okay. Tin Wee, you have the floor.

Tin Wee: Thank you very much. I just like to comment that currently we know
                 that with the SP system, n is equals to 1 for one script. And that's
                 ASCII. And with the introduction of second level IDN, we have basically
                 increased that to N equals to 2. We are basically saying that, you
                 know, if you do not put in proper policies here to regulate or control the
                 proliferation of N greater than 2, you're going to get situations where
                 there are going to be a lot of homolific or homographic kind of
                 something and so forth.

                 And that has actually in fact resulted in quite a number of drawback on
                 the roll out of IDN (unintelligible) TLD. If you recall the situation a few
                 years back. So certainly, that is what I believe is one reason why I

think we are looking at this - we're looking at this issue again, more (closely).

And I'd like to suggest that possibility if we cannot adhere to a pure script that was mentioned earlier, that N equals to 1 for TLD IDNs, then maybe we could have an exception whereby the existing dot coms can actually continue. But it's no reason why we should allow the propagation of a mistake that has taken place sometime back. And to replicate this just because we have created N equals to 2 type of precedent.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Tin Wee. Next in the queue is (Subaya).

(Subaya):   Okay. I didn't think I was. Somebody else actually was in the queue before me but it's okay if you want me to speak here.

Ram Mohan: Was that Edmon on the queue before...

                Actually, Edmon is in the queue. Edmon, go ahead.

Man: It's (unintelligible) then me and then (Subaya).

Cary Karp: This is Cary.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Cary. You're on.

Cary Karp: I'm really not but okay. There's an extremely appealing intellectual construct that I think we're talking about. And let us assume that a script which has a very clear user community, none of the multiple language, political implications, that appears as a TLD label. The most

obvious desirable policy would it - would be for it to be the bearer of lower level labels in that same script. That would be the true localized, internationalized, or however you want to term it - a domain name.

But we can talk about the policies that we attach to the second level. We can talk perhaps about policies that we attach to the third level. But what control do we have, what ability do we have even to know what occurs on the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and however many levels down a domain name might end up actually going? So absent means we're propagating the policy throughout an entire main tray - what is the true value of, "Gee, we wish it were a possible policy."

Ram Mohan: So Cary, if I were to paraphrase what you're saying, since there is no ability to enforce policy, to not see - what you're saying is why are we, you know, this discussion is probably not germane because you cannot really enforce. Even if such a policy were to be agreed, it's hard if not impossible to enforce it at multiple levels down the three.

Cary Karp: Right. I mean, we'd need to to describe an implementable implementation mechanism. Sorry, an implementable enforcement mechanism for the policy to make particular sense.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Thank you, Cary. I am now going to go to (Subaya) then Werner then Edmon.

(Subaya): All right, this is (Subaya). I just want to, you know, in - on some other points I'm disagreeing with the previous speakers. I believe that the spoofing issue is significant enough as it warranted a lot of issues a couple of years ago and delayed the IDN launch a lot easier. In fact, we've got involved and so on. And I think that my opinion would be

despite the fact that, you know, domain names have already been issued with multiple languages have been put in a single script. That in the future, we could make it run further the ones before that. That's debatable.

But the (unintelligible) in the future that we should just stick to TLD should only be in a single script for a number of reasons. One is as I said, homographic spoofing. Secondly, the - it also - at least at the levels that we can endforce that is - that the unique user expectation with that, you know, right now with multiple scripts in there you've got (keyboards) and so on, you know, because of the languages, okay. So in between.

So that could be avoided at least at the enforceable level. Then certainly, I'd like to say that even the IDN (domain) standard came out a few years ago while it was not explicitly, you know, stated in the IDN (domain) standard, there was a belief in the community, at least large parts of the community. That the sort of roll out have happened at lest at a policy level that single script adherence will probably be - would recommend it, you know, (might latch on) to do it.

The - another reason that one could bring up is they also (unintelligible) policy (unintelligible) something about as what Olof pointed out. Not about technical implementation ability. I'd like to remind everyone that a number of years ago, there was a, you know, there are possible concerns in extreme cases of the political issues that one wouldn't want to necessarily go and bite. Which is of course at the end on enforceable level, this may happen.

That certainly at the enforceable level might want to present it which is that a number of years ago, I believe there was a issue when IANA went out and accepted a language table on a European country in both Arabic and Hebrew from the same group. And a country that's put in this table wasn't actually from either Hebrew-speaking or Arabic-speaking.

There was a big uproar with the Arab league who went out and, you know, I believe the ministers put out a statement saying, "Please don't tamper with our language. Only us can do the characters in this language." You know, "Arabic is ours," and so on and so forth. So, I mean, it's not quite that a little tangential.

But the point is that if you're going to have (linked) scripts someday and you've got Arabic and Hebrew in there and so on and so forth invites this kind of thing, I mean, it's potentially possible in some cases. So again, there's political undertones (spot), you know, actually down the road.

Another - the - and I'd also like to say that just because if we feel that the original sort of a implementation in terms of multiple scripts under a TLD in the past and the SP TLDs in the past was a mistake; there's no reason to go repeat this in new things that we're going to do. And address - finally to address the point that Cary brought up, which is since it's unenforceable at deeper level than, you know, therefore we might as well just not enforce it at any level.

Now that - I think that lands it off to two things. One, we're just saying we can't - if we can't reduce the mess, let's just leave it be a full mess. I

mean, that's one way of looking at it which, you know, it's debatable. I would rather be of the opinion that we should try to reduce the mess.

So finally, the user expectation, the user out there is opted not worry when a domain name is presented. You know, when I use a domain name on a daily basis, I don't remember for what level. Typically a domain name that I remember and I'm going to use often as just the first, second, third levels you know, levels. It's not the lower levels.

I couldn't probably, you know, having used the Internet for so many years, I probably couldn't recite to you a single domain name in (all) four levels. I couldn't probably memorize that, you don't know what I remember. And what people remember, just a couple of thought levels. And that's where we will be solving if we keep everything to a single script.

Ram Mohan: So, (Subaya), thank you. If I were to paraphrase at least what I understood, it seems to me that perhaps if you say for instance, at levels where registries maintain control, single script adherence should be a requirement is what it seems to be that you're recommending. That at the levels where registries do maintain control, adherence to single script should be a requirement.

(Subaya): On a net net base on all my thoughts, that is true.

Ram Mohan: Okay, thank you. Werner, you're in the queue and you have the floor.

Werner Staub: Okay. I support to a degree what's just been said about making this a requirement. But I would not recommend making the requirement draw a recommendation. And making the requirement that if the

recommendation is not followed, then the registry must have equivalent procedures to prevent spoofing.

The reason why I would not make it a requirement is that there are languages where there is a need to meet - to make scripts, you know. And there's also a question what it means to have a script. In the case of Japanese for instance, you know, is katakana and hiragana and kanji a separate script? Well yes, logically they are separate scripts. But they are normally mixed or they have to be. That's the language.

There are other cases in a specific communities where there are needs to make scripts. Many countries do have the need to make ASCII to a degree with their own script just for practical reasons that have a long history. They all have their own capabilities to police this. So we should not try to impose a global solution for all of them but say, if you do make scripts or allow them to make a script in their own registry level, then you must introduce methods to prevent spoofing. They will hide those message, they know how to do that.

Cary Karp: Can you put Cary back in the queue, too please, Ram?

Ram Mohan: Okay, you're back in the queue. And thank you, Werner. Edmon, you're next.

(Subaya): I would like to be back in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Who was that? Excuse me, who was that who wanted to be back in the queue?

(Subaya): (Subaya) wanted to be back in the queue.

Ram Mohan: (Subaya) back in the queue.

Cary Karp: Cary as well.

Ram Mohan: Who was that?

Man: Cary wanted to be also back in the queue, I know...

Ram Mohan: I already have Cary back. Yes, thank you. All right, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Well I think the intent in general I support. However - and, you know, with the enforceability as Cary has mentioned, I completely agree that, you know, then if would render all existing IDN second level into the problem.

                But more importantly, I think I wanted to raise an issue in that in terms of the addressing the issue, I would feel much more comfortable sort of making it a pointer to the IDN guidelines. Rather than create new description or create new discussion here or in any recommendations here. But, you know, instead, to point to the guidelines and say, you know, at least within the label.

                And for example, for TLD applications, if you will, new gTLDs, I mean that the - if that it should rather than say for example, that it needs to be in a single script. That it needs to comply with the IDN guidelines. And, you know, it needs to have a language table in the IANA registry. You know, those types of language rather than specifically mentioning single script anywhere, sort of in the recommendation or document that we're producing, so to speak.

In terms of the, you know, I guess at lower levels, again, it's the - you know, I would generally feel that it would be a problem where if it's sort of taken into an enforcement mode. One particular example for - you know, it would be, you know, let's say there's a Latin script that has an accent with the - in the TLD.

But it happens to be - that the second level domain happens to be in a different language than English but uses only the LDH repertoire. Then what happens there, do we allow it, do we disallow it, you know. Then we get into that type of succession as well.

So in general, the enforceability is problematic I think to a degree not only for lower levels which is obvious but also for a second levels to a great degree. And sticking with, I guess, the pointers to the IDN guidelines would be a - I think a better approach. Because there, it's much more, you know, there are certain exceptions.

For example, Chinese table does allow certain key ASCII type as the LDH repertoire. For example, when one mentioned, the katakana, hiragana, kanji issue. So I think it will be much better off just making pointers there.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. Thank you, Edmon. Before we get back to Cary and (Subaya) on redirect, I'd like to very briefly just summarize what I've understood from this discussion so far. Starting from Tin Wee, you know, going through all the others.

Clearly there is some level of strong support if not even broad agreement in ensuring that user confusion is reduced and to not allow

script mixing in the TLD. Avri has a - has presented a - I guess a variation to that talk which is allow it only in so far as it does not cause confusion.

But what I've heard really so far are two suggestions. One is, perhaps something that would reduce to the following – at the levels where registries maintain control, the working group recommends single script adherence. Should registries not implement this adherence, they must implement clear procedures to prevent spoofing. And that is one thing that we could say.

And what Edmon says here is, the way I understand it is let's not reinvent the wheel. This topic has been sufficiently studied already and a well-written or at least a document exists that they can - you're - simply points to. So we could instead (opting) a lot of the things we've said before. We could simply say new gTLD applicants must conform to the IDN guidelines and must publish a language table in the IANA registry. And basically, use that as the reference source.

I'm actually comfortable stating that at levels where registries maintain control, the IDN working group recommends single script adherence while keeping in mind procedures to prevent visual confusion and spoofing. The IDN guidelines, new gTLD applicants must conform to the IDN guidelines as a general statement of our working group.

But that's what I'm summarizing from what I've heard. I'd like to get back to Cary and then (Subaya) on redirect here.

Avri Doria: And could you put Avri back on the queue, please.

Ram Mohan: Avri back in the queue. Okay, Cary.

Cary Karp: You got very close to going to where I would like to go now. And that there is in fact a mechanism that makes it possible to propagate a single script across all of the dots in the domain name. And that's simply by seeing too we've got some - there is only one registry for that entire hierarchy. The flaw there is that it's contrary to the basic administrative delegation principle that underlies the DNS.

               But nonetheless, it might be conceivable that somebody requested a TLD label in a given string and the model on which they intend to operate it was single platform name service for all names that appear on lower labels in that specifically to guarantee the unary script aspect of that particular name (unintelligible). But again, that's ought to gnaw at the edges of really fundamental DNS principle.

               So then I suppose one of the questions is, are there any aspect of DNS canon that need to be reviewed as we internationalize the domain name space? And I suspect that people on this call which I met with their own - it's (unintelligible), it's precisely that.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary. And I'm sensing that you are suggesting at least one of the canons be revisited, right here.

Cary Karp: I'm actually not suggesting it. What I'm doing is taking inventory of all of the kinds of things that we could do that are more or less radical. And if indeed, the most important thing is to see to it that there is one script across all dots in a given name. Then we do have to revisit the fundamental precept.

I'm not suggesting that this is something we should do but it's a consequence. I mean, if we're going to make a recommendation that requires a mechanism for enforceability, this is the only conceivable mechanism to - that provides that that I can think of.

Ram Mohan: Understood. Thank you for that observation, you know, at this point I guess we're - I sense our working group going is to recommend (single script) adherence without requiring it at the policy level. And also pointing out and reminding registries that they need to implement clear procedures to prevent visual confusion for users and conformance with the IDN guidelines.

And Cary, what you're saying here is it's an observation or a question to the group which is are there any aspects of, you know, fundamental DNS principles that do need to be revisited.

(Subaya), you're in - you were in the queue and you have the floor now.

(Subaya): Okay, thank you. I want to jump into what Werner brought up. It was a mistake on my part when I meant single script, right. When I meant single script adherence, I did say it clearly but what I did actually feel it means is that single script in the other course.

Meaning that, you know, adding ASCII characters because some languages require certain numeral, 0 to 9, you know. Chinese (unintelligible) I'm sure from the (unintelligible) languages may want it. So in some languages people do want ASCII to be mixed in because of historical reasons of English. For instance, you take a Chinese

name and you can put 'e', something to mean 'e', you know, electronic company or ...

Ram Mohan: We've covered that - I'm sorry to interrupt but I think our - based on Werner's suggestion, we've moved away from - requires single script adherence to recommend and added, you know, add another sentence that says, "Should registries not implement adherence must implement clear procedures to prevent..."

(Subaya):   I did understand what was there. And...

Ram Mohan: Okay.

(Subaya):   So I am pointing out that, you know, yes, it is true that in cases, you know, a lot of cases maybe ASCII should be included as a double - you know, a second script that could be added. And that could be certain, you know, unknown cases to us right now in some countries, some languages. People want two languages to be mixed for some reason like the, CJK languages, you know, Japanese, Korean and so on. Or they could be yet others who do not know.

The whole point would be to limit that, you know. So when an applicant comes along, and it asked for TLD, then he says, "Okay, in this language," and they make a case. They want English to be part of it as well. Okay, that seems reasonable. Or in the case of Chinese, Japanese, okay whatever it is.

The idea is to limit it to a three or one script that mark what actually happened, you know. Back in the past, for those who have institutional memory when the Verisign Test bed was launched. I think there was a

lot of concern and a lot of people said that may not be a good reason to go ahead and put hundreds of languages in front of the TLD which we went ahead and did anyway.

So they were maybe not strict guidelines at that time but there are a lot of people talking about this end guidelines, you know. In - maybe not encoded but it was discussed that people just ignored it. So what I'd like to say is that first, yes, I do not see this as a net net single script. But a small group of script has perhaps attached it. But at the time of the applicant it will be decided on a case by case basis.

But in terms of just leaving it as pointing to the guidelines, you know, and leaving it as saying, "Let's just recommend it to the registry." My own feeling is well, you know, that's obviously doable. But one may wish to go even a little bit further and make it to really more like a requirement at the time of the application. At the time when the TLD's applied for, you say, "Okay, this is the number of - a set number of scripts you can put in." And that's a requirement at that (stage) then.

You can be flexible at the time just to (unintelligible) what it is. Because if you don't, we may be revisiting the next - that happened, you know, several - years ago now. And, you know, sort of a - recommendations from all parties not to launch all these names. But the people did anyway. Registry went ahead and did it anyway. They happened again.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. So (Subaya), if I'd kind of paraphrase what I understand, what you're suggesting is single script adherence must be a requirement for all new gTLD applicants.

(Subaya):   Not quite. I mean, at the time that they apply, they can make a case to say that more than a single script or some other scripts they want would like to mix with and (unintelligible), whatever, you know. And basically, and that would be decided on a case by case basis and then it becomes a requirement for that.

Ram Mohan: I'm sorry. I guess I don't understand how we would expect a - the council or ICANN to actually implement such a recommendation. Because the case by case basis decision making seems to be something that requires someone who has prior knowledge, et cetera. And not some standardized approach and...

(Subaya):   All languages are not - they're all different, different cultures, different - as Werner pointed out. Different languages have different needs, right?

Ram Mohan: So what you're saying then is the following – single script adherence must be - actually perhaps I shouldn't try to put words in your mouth. Can you give me a sentence that summarizes what you're recommending.

(Subaya):   The philosophy - the general idea and philosophy is to reduce script mixing.

Ram Mohan: So to reduce script mixing...

(Subaya):   Right.

Ram Mohan: ... okay.

(Subaya): In clear cut cases, it could be single script. But in other cases, because there are needs in a local community and their local language or TLD that the applicant is applying for. We could allow and limit at number of scripts that have – pre-agreed to by the applicant with - before they get the TLD issued. To be the ones where, you know, they'll be allowed to register in. And that should be a requirement. So they could go...

Ram Mohan: What I'm hearing you say is to reduce confusion, script mixing should be discouraged. In exceptions, script mixing may be allowed.

(Subaya): Yeah, I mean, you know, it - I'll give you an example. If somebody comes along and applies for a TLD in a particular script, then, you know, and they say, "Look, for us we don't need anything else." This community says, "We don't want anything. We don't have - no need in this script except for one single script." That script itself all across the board, at least all across the enforceable (date), okay.

And fine, that's the agreement. That TLD is issued under those conditions, okay. That there'll be a single script to (us). Another community comes along and says, "Look, in my script - this TLD I've got, you know, this is the scrip that I want. But I also want some ASCII characters thrown in." Okay.

Ram Mohan: I - okay, I understand what you're saying. I guess what I'm reviewing what you're saying with the amendment that Werner has suggested, it seems to me that we may have actually achieved your goal. Because what I've seen here so far is - us saying the following, "At the levels where registries maintain control, the working group recommends single script adherence. Should registries not implement this

adherence, they must implement clear procedures to prevent spoofing and visual confusion for users."

That seems to allow this ability for a new gTLD applicant...

(Subaya): Let me (go) a little bit further from that.

Ram Mohan: ... to - may I finish?

(Subaya): Yeah.

Ram Mohan: I think it allows new gTLD applicants to actually submit a requirement with script mixing with the necessary justification for it. And in terms of an evaluator, it seems like they are then provided criteria by us that says, "Does the script mixing cause visual confusion or spoofing?" And if it doesn't then it's okay. That's what I'm seeing us doing.

Alistair Dixon: Ram, can I join the queue, please? It's Alistair.

Ram Mohan: Alistair, fine.

Edmon Chung: Edmon as well.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Edmon. Let me go to Avri then (Subaya), I'll have you up on redirect. I just want to make sure that we continue the discussion. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay, what I think you're calling consensus on this perhaps a little early in terms of single script across all labels. In fact, sometimes if I listen to the conversations I get confused because I sometimes - sounds like people are talking about (unintelligible) within a label.

Which is a foregone, you know, sort of conclusion I think. Although perhaps not - there are cases which are certainly not, you know, I don't know that we've gotten there across multiple labels. I know that I'd still want to reserve the ability to sort of write a dissenting view on it.

I think Cary's point of not making rules that are unenforceable is an important one to take into account. I think making decisions about places that have multiple scripts, multiple languages, within a country and sort of saying, "Sorry, you know, we've decided that, you know, only one script is pertinent in your case," is something that ICANN shouldn't be doing. I certainly think a rule about don't do something confusable being a good thing. But I don't think that we should be making a strong recommendation to the single script across all labels.

And finally, perhaps I've been misreading the IDN guidelines that we've got now. We've got people on the call that wrote them. But the way I've read them, I thought they were always talking about within our label, not across all labels. So ...

Ram Mohan: I can confirm that. That is correct interpretation.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Olof Nordling: I can confirm that, too.

Avri Doria: Okay. So just say that, you know, we're following the current guidelines, okay I'm comfortable with that because that means no script mixing within our label. And that one I'm not arguing about. But it doesn't say, you know. We're expanding the single script mandate if we say it's across all labels. And again, as Cary said, we can't enforce

that. We might be able to enforce it at second level. But beyond that, it's totally not enforceable.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Avri. I have Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: Thanks, Ram. I'm just - I guess a question on my mind is - are we somewhat overcooking the goose? And certainly in terms of the proposed rules for new gTLDs, we, you know, there's a proposal for requirements against confusingly similar labels. So I think if the concern is that we shouldn't mix scripts because of risks of confusing similarity, then I think we've already got that there.

I guess how we've, I mean, it seems to me - and I guess - I would actually share Avri's views that there might be some communities that actually want to need to mix script. So I guess if you could have it thought as possible to mix scripts on the - so you can have a single script to a label. But you could have multiple labels with multiple different scripts being there.

You know, I guess that I could live with it but it seems to me, if we're going to be saying only one script at all labels, I think we are not going to be meeting users' and communities' needs. And that would be my concern. And it seems to me that we should be looking for other ways to solve concerns about (boosting) and the like. And perhaps, as you have suggested Ram, look to the registries to do that.

Cary Karp: Can you put Cary back in the queue please, Ram?

Ram Mohan: Sure thing. Thank you, Alistair. And just to paraphrase what I've heard from Avri, is that we as a working group should not even say that we

recommend single script adherence across all labels. That we reaffirm that we recommend single script adherence within a label. But across all labels, Alistair, what I'm hearing you say is that, you know, perhaps it should be less at the local (flash) registry label.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, that would be my idea.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Thank you. Edmon, you're on the queue and you have the floor.

Edmon Chung: All right. Actually I also mentioned what I want to bring out is that, you know, if the concern is that there's the confusing TLDs and the part about confusingly similar would have covered that already. And I guess, that - and I want to point out that in terms of the - I actually agree with Avri in that the, you know, we really - I don't see - I mean, having one script across all levels is you know, at least problematic. But it may not be something we want, either.

For example, let's say, well I'll take for example(Dot Asia) as an example. We - from the start, we're interested in introducing IDN TLDs for (Dot Asia) itself. And the concept from the community is that each particular TLD that sort of "matching TLD" would run the same zone (fall). In that case, you would definitely see different scripts matched with, you know, the TLD.

And it is not a - I think it's a completely sensible approach. At least that's from fairly sense of discussion when we were at the initial stages of, you know, when we were thinking about having IDN TLDs. So I - not only in terms of the enforceability but in terms of whether it makes sense at all. I think, you know, I would question that the notion of enforcing a single script across all labels.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Edmon. So here is what I've heard so far that I'm trying to -
                what I'm trying to do is to build up - build it into a set of few statements
                that we can then discuss. Because we have, you know, folks who are
                making multiple points.

                What I've written down here in trying to summarize and paraphrase the
                following – at the levels where registries maintain control, the IDN
                working group recommends single script adherence within a label.
                Where script mixing must occur across multiple level or multiple labels,
                registries must implement clear procedures to prevent spoofing and
                visual confusion fro users. New gTLD applicants must conform to the
                ICANN IDN guidelines, publish their language tables in the IANA
                registry.

                That's, you know, between the various points that I've heard, to me it
                feels like that accommodate or at least address the points that Avri,
                Alistair just recently made about script mixing within a label as
                compared to across labels.

                (Subaya), you have the floor now.

(Subaya):   Just to say that, you know, while within a label, it's clearly I support
                what's been said. Across labels, I - the distinction between allowing all
                types of combinations, you know, the distinction is really an issue of -
                it's less of a concern, obviously, across labels.

                But the distinction is between are we allowing a set of few scripts or
                are we allowing unlimited number of scripts? You know, in terms of
                mixing. That's the distinction I'm looking at. It means (unintelligible) of a

single script per se. Because a country that could need more than 20 scripts or whatever for their particular purposes.

So what I would recommend that even between scripts - between labels, I mean, across - not within a label but across labels. Even that very large numbers of scripts, you know, being allowed should probably be discouraged. You know, rather than, you know, where hundreds as opposed to a few. That's all.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Subaya). And can we - that seems to be congruent with what Tin Wee has said earlier, were, you know, of not encouraging many situations both N greater than 2. So I - that's an interesting addition to what you're saying a large number of script variance should be - should not be recommended or something like that.

Tin Wee: Can I have a suggestion? Tin Wee here.

Ram Mohan: Yes, please.

Tin Wee: You have made a lot - very good summary of all the points. Is it possible for you to sort of put it in the wiki site (somewhere) so that all of us on the - in the web right now could sort of take a look at the emerging consensus statement that you're trying to (get here)?

Ram Mohan: Doing it right now. Thank you.

Tin Wee: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: Okay. While I'm doing it, next person in the queue was Cary.

Cary Karp: Yeah. I think there's a common element in many of the observations that we're making here. And it focuses in the direction of propagating policy across a dot. And whether we're talking about limited numbers of scripts that may appear in a given - for some qualified domain name, a single script no control. Still, the underlying issue with that is there is going to be nay control at all?

It has somehow to be coordinated either with the notion of contractually, far more powerfully worded terms of delegation than are commonplace. Or we fall back to the single unary provider of names service for all names in the hierarchy. And I wonder if they sent the note to the list about the contractual options not being fully developed?

Given the choice between point of delegation rigor and simple unary operation of a domain, assuming that these are two ways that would allow us to support the kinds of policies we're all talking about, which of those might be the preferable? Which should we prefer- along which line should we - could we most productively proceed, assuming that there is such a thing as productive proceeding along that line?

Sophia Bekele: Ram, may I make a comment? This is Sophia. Or, put me in the queue.

Ram Mohan: No problem. You're in the queue. Cary, so you have a question for our group here...

Cary Karp: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: Could you restate the question?

Cary Karp: If we simply postulate at this time that there is some viable notion of propagating some script limiting policies across the dots, which of the two mechanisms that have (been so far) suggested as the one that we might want to talk about most first? Unusually rigorous contractual obligation or unary service for an entire name hierarchy?

Ram Mohan: Thank you. And I will pose that question to the group here in just a moment. Sophia, you had a comment.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. I think Cary put it very wonderfully. But aren't we discussing, you know, this is a mixed issue that we are having at a - in trying to set the policy. So, you know, there's a strict - having one script is restrictive, is the (point) of many. And then we're trying to have a contractual obligation. The contractual obligations deal with actual risk that we're taking in terms of the spoofing and the phishing and so forth.

And then I guess there was also the guidelines, that overall policy guidelines or IDN guidelines that we're going to look at. So I just like it to come from - it's a well-compromised (unintelligible). One, without the other - there's someone - okay, to take one out other, the original proposal or policies Ram just put together with everyone's ideas.

So I think it's a very good compromise, you know, taking a risk. Addressing the risk as well as giving the users what they want. So that's just from the policy level. Thanks.

Ram Mohan: Sophia, what would you - thank you for your point. What would you like to see changed in where we're going?

Sophia Bekele: No, I think what I'm saying is what you've read out - very good compromise that accounts it for the risk that we're taking as well as what we're trying to present to the users. Me, it's a comfortable statement.

Werner Staub: This is Werner. May I just add a comment?

Ram Mohan: Sure, Werner.

Werner Staub: I actually would like to support what (Subaya) said in terms of requiring the limitation of the number of scripts. That is - single script is recommended. If you do not follow this recommend that (you must) put in safeguard and it is required to delimit the number of scripts within and across label.

Ram Mohan: Okay. So what I have - Tin Wee, I had followed your suggestion on the wiki page now which for those of you who do not recall the wiki page, it is idn.wat.ch. That's IDN watch with two dots inside. In idn.wat.ch I have put in now the emerging statement on single script adherence.

And I'm just going to modify it as we speak to change what Werner has just written which is - earlier I had said large numbers of script variance should not be recommended. Instead, what I'm hearing, you know, Werner say is registries should be required to limit the number of scripts across labels.

Okay, is there any other discussion on this topic of single script adherence?

Man: Well, we do have...

Ram Mohan: And perhaps I should say and this is to Avri's point, in the final document perhaps we should better qualify the topic to say, "Single script adherence both within and across labels."

Okay.

Tin Wee: Ram, which page do you put the - which page do you put your definition?

Ram Mohan: Right on the main page.

Olof Nordling: Under "Discussion" tab. It's Olof here.

Tin Wee: Oh, it's in the Discussion tab. Okay, I understand now. Okay.

Sophia Bekele: And do you mind if we - you tell us the address?

Ram Mohan: ... idn - there is no www, it is just idn.wat.ch.

Tin Wee: And when you're on there use the Discussion tab.

Ram Mohan: And when you're on there click on...

Sophia Bekele: I got it.

Ram Mohan: ... the Discussion tab on the left hand side.

Sophia Bekele: Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Let's - it seems like we have I guess exhausted discussion for now on this particular topic. And in fact, the last piece of the discussion leads us into what was earlier our second topic which was, "Should there be limitations in - which scripts are made available for IDN? And if yes, what are they?" And the way I view that topic is actually a - the number of scripts across labels is really how I had viewed that topic.

And the question that's being asked here is if you do want to have limitations in the number of scripts and then what scripts are made available? Then what are those limitations? Do we have any policy thinking or guidelines to provide the council as well as the community in general?

So I will open that topic up now for discussion.

Cary Karp: Cary to speak please.

Ram Mohan: Cary in the queue and has the floor.

Cary Karp: Okay. There's a very glib first sentence to my reply. And that is we should limit the available script to those for which there is unicode support. I mean, it's one of the things we need to recognize in this internationalization exercise is the queue, the scripts that are waiting to get into unicode. And the potential for IDN, the availability of IDN to drive that mechanism more expeditiously forward.

So one of the grand protocol conundrum in all of these is how on earth do we establish a mechanism that will allow for – it's not automatic, at least as close to real time as we possibly can have availability of Unicode code point as they are added to the repertoire. So whatever

the answer to the questions just post ends up being these working groups own thinking. We have to be aware of the fact that there are scripts that need to be available that aren't yet available.

Ram Mohan: Thank you Cary. So what I'm hearing from you is limit scripts, limit scripts to those that have Unicode support.

Cary Karp: Yup, that's totally logical. We have no choice but to do that. What I'm suggesting is that the notion of limiting scripts within a repertoire that itself is not expansive enough. It's something of a contradiction in terms or a contradiction in concepts, if there's such a thing.

Ram Mohan: Got it, thank you.

(Subaya):   (Subaya).

Ram Mohan: Any other discussion on this topic?

(Subaya):   (Subaya).

Ram Mohan: (Subaya), you have the floor.

(Subaya):   I think it's – what Cary…

(Sharam):   (Unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Sorry, who was that? I'm sorry (Subaya), just a moment. Someone else wanted to be in the queue?

(Sharam):   (Unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: You're on. Okay (Subaya) you have…

(Subaya):   Yeah. This is a (Subaya). I think Cary's point is basically obvious because, you know, this is based on Unicode and without Unicode we can't get there. Okay? Now, I'd like to point out because Ram explicitly asked what guidelines there are. We're considering, you know, what delimited to across (unintelligible).

               So I have four suggestions. One is clearly – if you are applying for a particular script and then ASCII as a sort of a unique position amongst languages at least in the internet people want the numeral, they want (unintelligible) or something. So that's obviously when someone says, "Look I've got this, my scripts and I would like to throw an ASCII in there." That makes sense and obviously that's something as you want to useful and reasonable.

               That's the first one, that's within the guidelines. Second one could be the script itself in some senses (unintelligible) like CJK or something like (Wilma) suggested and so on. There are languages like that, there's a (urgence) of Arabic and Persian, you know, as sort of the communities themselves and naturally in a way it makes to the scripted. So someone brings up a case like that, that's what would naturally consist of a guideline.

               The third possibility in some of the guidelines is official languages of significant languages spoken in a country. So, you know, understand that the differences of being official and significant, there are countries where official languages are not used much but there are other significant languages where large populations speak it. An example

could be, you know, say in Canada with French and English, we might say, "Okay," you know, it makes sense you know. Either slash significant or official, well that brings up the case of wanting to make (things).

Then the fourth point that I'd like to bring is sort of a guideline. It is overall limits despite the fact that the three issues could generate combination. And overall limit, you know, limits could be something. I mean if it has been decided that maybe on a script limit but a guideline limit, this could take not more that any five languages or makes it ten or, you know, something of 100 whatever. Some thought along that line and maybe some others may want to add to what I'm suggesting as sort of guidelines to be of support that they can think of sort right away.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Subaya). And I was taking careful notes and somewhere along the way my care went away. So, though I have – I understand number three and number four and number two as well. But what's – what was the first guideline you were recommending?

(Subaya): Oh, simply that the – that a lot of languages, you know, almost in every language, every script that people want to put anything (unintelligible) the meaning, they probably want to ask you to be distinct with it. I mean, lots of them do I would say. So ASCII is a sort of special, I mean in a sense that, you know, English effective.

Ram Mohan: I understand, okay. So I have four things then. The notion is should there be a guidelines to limit available scripts? Then what the suggestions from (Subaya) are: number one, at the guidelines ought to be ASCII mixings should be allowed as a special case where the

language itself requires a script mixing, it should be allowed. And the third consideration, perhaps not a guideline but a consideration is where official or significant languages exist in a country. And fourth, in spite of all of these perhaps an overall limit should still be imposed with a mechanism to determine the overall limit not yet identified.

Okay, I think I had to be in the queue right after you (Subaya). No, I'm sorry I had you on the queue after you. You obviously have the floor.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: (Unintelligible) would ask to be in the queue.

Man: No, no. not me.

Ram Mohan: Oh okay. Then I mis-spoke. So I did – I certainly heard someone wants to speak.

Man: I think it sort of sounded like (Sharam)?

(Sharam):   Yes, I'm (Sharam) and I want to be in the queue.

Ram Mohan: (Sharam), I'm sorry, my apologies. You have the floor.

(Sharam):   Okay, thanks. May I speak now, please?

Ram Mohan: Yes, please.

(Sharam):   Okay. Regarding the script and the (unintelligible) the way I understand that the part of the (unintelligible) of Mr. Cary. Regarding the limitation

there should be a limitation in the script but I think, you know, it depends on every language. We have many (rules) all language officially I'm speaking about my language – (unintelligible) Persian. We have many written and unwritten rules, must be discussed and I think the only man who can discuss about these written and unwritten rules are those professions from that language.

That limitation should be – it should be down through the – should be discussed by itself from their language. And this is my comment.

Ram Mohan: So (Sharam) would I be correct in paraphrasing what you're saying to say something like in all cases, local considerations should be accounted for or something like that, or I just summarized what you just said.

(Sharam):   Yes, yes. That's right.

Sophia Bekele: May I ask a clarification question, Ram?

Ram Mohan: Sure Sophia. And go ahead.

Sophia Bekele: This is to (Sharam) or if you've heard that. His voice didn't come across well on the lines but I think what he's trying to say is where mixing is allowed, what – I know, where scripts are - restriction is being done, then there has to be maybe a consultation with the local language group. Is that what I'm hearing, in order to – is that where he was going? (Sharam) is that what you meant?

(Sharam):   Sophia would you please repeat your comment.

Sophia Bekele: No, I was saying just trying to clarify what you were saying. Were you suggesting that in the event that there is a script restriction and you support that, you are suggesting that there is a consultation with a local language group or something like that? Is that where you were going?

(Sharam):   Yes, yes, that's right. I think Ram Mohan you have made corrective in the old language and I think it differ in any language. And that's my language. We have many rule, many unwritten rules.

Sophia Bekele: Uh-huh.

(Sharam):   We have to know them. And these are not written in any book.

Sophia Bekele: Okay.

(Sharam):   There must be some (unintelligible) I think.

Sophia Bekele: Okay.

(Sharam):   Right.

Sophia Bekele: Did that clarify it for you? Ram.

Ram Mohan: Yes, thank you Sophia. So what I have here is in all cases local language authorities should be consulted is what I'm summarizing what (Sharam) has said, you know, because there are many written and unwritten rules about a language and the scripts that make up the language.

Man: Can I ask a question just from my own personal ratification directly to that?

Ram Mohan: Sure, please.

Man: What about in situation where there is no identifiable such as (ROD)? I'm thinking primarily of languages that are not and never has been used by governmental authorities but are used by widely diasporic people.

(Subaya):   I have a comment.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, me too Ram after (Subaya).

Ram Mohan: Okay. I'm sorry I did not find out who – if you could please identify yourself when you have comments because I do not yet have the ability to…

Sophia Bekele: Sophia after (Subaya).

(Subaya):   (Subaya).

Ram Mohan: (Subaya), okay. Okay (Subaya), go ahead.

(Subaya):   I just have - I think that since and I played it out four conditions earlier. I guess that the condition that (Sharam) suggested is a very good one which is language community. Now, if you address that language community to at least local authority to somebody from that group should also be in the decision making process of the guidelines for that language or that script that is being considered. Now Cary pointed

what if there is no such group or something? I think the key on the applicant itself based on obviously an applicant coming in asking for a (TLD) in that script. Now if they honor such authority to whatever, well, then it's – well then the applicant asking for it – the one presumed that the applicant is (kick) from aspect to find out in that language what the story is so it will default to that person I would suspect.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. Sophia, you're next.

Sophia Bekele: I think I may have to agree with what (Subaya) said, the (TLD) applicant would be in a position to know that and for the lack of knowing that or at least if the issue is imposed obviously you would think that they would go to the local groups that would be empowering that language even though it is not a formal governmental authority. So maybe a nomination process would take place of some sort to identify the people that are linguistically qualified or some sort of thing but I think we will probably cross that bridge when we get there. But I think that the overall principle is probably correct.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. Any other discussion on this topic? I'm going to post what we have here, again on the same Wiki page in just a minute. But I've certainly, you know, continue to open the floor for any other discussion on this topic.

(Hung): Hi, Ram. Can I be in the queue? This is (Hung).

Ram Mohan: (Hung) hi, welcome and you have the floor.

(Hung): Okay, thanks. I want to second what has been talked about language community. First of all, they should be consulted before any restrictions

that's being adopted. And secondly, how do to define the language community? That I don't believe this is really an issue of finding authority. Old stake holders should be involved in this community building process. For example in the Chinese Language Community there is a (better) of initiation, that's called CDNC, Chinese Domain Name Consulting. This is formed by the Community Speaking Chinese from China Mainland, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macau and Singapore. I say this - we can see such (buttoned) up process that help us to define the language community for (IDF). Well, thanks.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

(Subaya): I could make a comment.

Ram Mohan: Okay, (Subaya).

(Subaya): Yes. I supported (Hung) said. I mean, you know, as (unintelligible), I mean, that (senior's) very instrumental in getting CDNC started off a long time ago, you know, the Chinese community originate somehow from 78 years ago. That's a model community that despite the differences between Taiwan and China. Initially I think they were arguing with each other a lot within the community of link and they were actually told go away and settle your differences privately and that's how CDNC got initiated a long time ago. And they came out with a very successful story at the end of the day that the bottoms up initiative that included government but it was a bottoms up initiative.

Separate initiative is I think exist in the Tamil world. I happen to be Tamil. And instead I believe I heard some money on the call, you know, and they – that part of community of several countries and it's,

you know, bottoms up initiative as well. They came up (unintelligible) standards for Tamil Unicode and so on and so forth, that, you know, (Unicode) itself has come up with standard that has been no less than Microsoft's followed in many ways and so on, it's a bottoms up community too. So bottoms up communities do exist now.

Another point I thought that (Hung) made was I think coming from I understand from – correct me if I'm wrong but I think this can be a large community. So it's probably been in this is abuse of that community which is that, you know, it should be a widespread input process not thinking the queue from that I would like to say that perhaps when such a consultation process is done, you know, with the language group in a particular language group, that one should bear in mind that maybe instead of, you know, that you don't just get one individual from that language group but perhaps a small group, you know, five, ten whatever, will be identified. And that five or ten people may end, you know, more than, you know, if he's like Chinese for instance. Chinese are taken cared of many years ago. But it can come from, you know, geographical representation or something, you know, a couple of people from China, one from Hong Kong, one from Singapore but the point is that these have happened bottoms up already.

Now, in the future they could happen up bottoms up but there should also be a process that one could recommend from the perspective of ICANN itself is that when a language comes up with TLD election then, you know, that the group of language consultants be convened - that they convene in such a way that they actually capture the – in an approximate way the geographic distributions of the people. They're not limited to just one country.

(Canrie):   (Canrie) comment?

Ram Mohan: Okay, (Canrie) you have the floor.

(Canrie):   Yeah, I just like to follow up on the point that (Subaya) made and (Hung) made. And I think that it's quite right that what has happened in the past has been that whenever – and if you such as we're going to deploy Chinese (IEN). Okay, who are the stake holders? And please stand up and come forward and be represented, and in this case for CDNC for example, they've been trying to get community together to sort out the problems that they have amongst each other.

And in the case of (Demo Internet) by mention, they have proper council, they have a general council that convenes meetings, and they have also executive committee and I happen to be an adviser on the (Demo Internet) forum for IT (internal). And they actually have their own processes and their own constitution to self regulate. So, we can see that happening also in the (Civic) Community and also to some degree in the Arabic Script Community emerging.

So if ICANN can come up and coordinate all these things then certainly it will be very much in the same direction which M-I-N-C, MINC has been carrying out all these years.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. Could you put me in the queue, please?

Ram Mohan: Yeah, you have the floor Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you. I think what we are approaching here is to what I would like to call definition of portative language tables. Is that correct? That's the question. And if so, would that then impose that there will be only one such language table that would be accepted within the IANA language table repertoire and that would be the one to follow.

Ram Mohan: Let me move briefly on that to (unintelligible) that one Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: On that one would be half said already is that, it is not ICANN's role to define what language table must be used and in fact it is a registry's responsibility to define the language table it's using and then publish that to the IANA guidelines. So I don't think we are – already we have precedent that, you know, ICANN's job is not to define or specify language table. In fact it's pretty much it's only role is to merely act as a storage repository for them.

Olof Nordling: That's correct for us now but it changes a little bit when ICANN is supposed to accept new IBM, (TLD) string and should (vest) them against some kind of language table to say that, well, these are within that particular script or language. So…

Ram Mohan: I would suggest Olof in that area that ICANN would end up inviting appropriately qualified folks to make that call. I think I would caution us from making a larger scale, appears to me to be a slippery slope which is that ICANN get into the job of defining or identifying which are the correct language tables that represent the language. I don't think any

single body is going to be qualified to do that better than the local community or local authority.

Olof Nordling: No, I do agree with that but I just wanted to raise the question because this could become - if the applicant, registry applicant defined the language table to which - against which the IBM top levels – labels should vetted, well it becomes a bit incestuous, doesn't it? So there is some need for a vesting of the stream towards a particular language and script. And that is within the bounds and that's – I had the impression that the discussion was going along those lines (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Okay, I understand there's a little better now. So what I'm hearing is if the – so again, I have posted some of what you discussed here on the Wiki page but in terms of limiting script availability in the TLD, you're saying we should limit available scripts to those that have (Unicode) support and in terms of guidelines asking mixing should be allowed in a special case and where the language requires script mixing, such mixing should be allowed.

But Olof, your expansion is where a local language authority or community consultation where there is no benchmark and where the applicant defines the table for which no comparison should be made - can be made. What should be the policy in evaluating, you know, this application and to me it seems like that comes back to the points that (Hung), and (Canrie), and (Subaya), and Cary and others have made which is in those cases go back to the local language community or authority.

(Subaya):   Let me just add one more thing. This is (Subaya) here.

Ram Mohan: Okay, (Subaya).

(Subaya):   Yes, that if in such a case, you go back to the language script community and if there's no support from the language community for this particular table, I mean the case that Olof thinks has happened, right. Then this – almost by default there'll be, you know, from the perspective of ICANN trying to issue a TLD, that would be, you know, no case. I mean then, you know, you would say, "Well, the language community doesn't support it." So, one would almost (unintelligible) there is no demand for this or something along those lines and I mean, they'll be exactly the case but application process itself (unintelligible) questions, that's all.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Can I be placed in queue? This is Avri.

Ram Mohan: Avri you're on the queue, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. I very much support the notion of language community but I do think we need to be very careful when we think about it that we don't end up – I wanted a better word for the tyranny of one community against another - for the tyranny of a large language community against a smaller not as well formed one. So I'm not calling anyone on that. I know it's in the work, I've just been doing with (Sami) people and trying to get a community together to look at, you know, (Sami) script even in something as close as that, there's rivalries, there's jealousies, there's majority communities and minority communities.

So while I support the notion of community, I don't necessarily think that we want to get too far in having one community being able to borrow something else without. And this is where I think ICANN does have a role as the honest broker. ICANN doesn't necessarily care that one script versus another one be an accepted script. It cares that script be properly constituted properly, you know, well formed, technically has a community perhaps.

And so, this is perhaps one of roles where ICANN does come in as sort of possibly the honest broker between various language communities, helping to find the people that are the language community that is the minority community that hasn't gotten its organizational self together to be able to stand up for itself. So I just want to be careful, I don't want denigrate language communities but I also want to be aware that it's not a kumbaya world in the language community.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Can you repeat the comments Ram.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: And Cary before Olof. I think before Olof I heard Cary. Okay, Cary you have the floor. Sorry, who is the third person?

Edmon Chung: Edmon, (Wee).

Ram Mohan: Edmon, okay thank you. Can we, okay?

Cary Karp: I think we're – we keep (unintelligible) script with language. One of the comfort that is provided by taking as much policy as we can to script is that it relegates in significant low goal notions of how to write what is nominally the same language so if there is support for example for the entire Latin script, every decorated single code point character that it contains which is just one step to the script mixing context.

There's one script that as far into this as can be done with a protocol level constraint. There's just this immensity of intricate rivalries conflicting opinions in language (expansiation) that isn't ICANN's headache, that isn't a domain name headache. Anyone can express themselves to the extent that expression is a reasonable concept in the identifier space using those characters that they deem appropriate for expressing their language.

So ICANN doesn't need to mediate in all of these. But if we are going to say that there has to be language tables, then we're going to turn back the clock to the very outset of the (IDNA) exercise. Then we're just going to be dragging ourselves on to what they do. The exact same set of headache that led us into freeing the policies from a language based moorage to scripts based moorage. And admittedly, we do need to combine the both of them. That's kind of where we are now.

By all means let's not ask for the kinds of difficulty that we, a can't resolve and b really don't need even to – we don't need to be asked to resolve.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary. I have Olof. Thought it was Olof, perhaps I had it wrong, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: I just really wanted to echo what Avri has said and, you know, the

issue about – I completely agree that language communities should be

involved about who we look to and where we look to in terms of

"definitive" and so would be kind of important. And also, you know, not

forgetting some minority views and minority interest would be a tough

job. So this is similar also to a discussion about communities for TLD

string itself.

For example, you know, a hotel or library was one of the discussions,

that library I mean who - which sort of community do you look to for a

certain response from? I think we need to somewhat relate those to-

similar to things that when Alistair and I sort of suggested that

confusingly similar part also be appointed to other areas. So I think –

I'm not saying that it's completely in that area but at least it should be

print into the consideration of the biggest scope of community.

(Canrie):   May I, (Canrie)?

Ram Mohan: (Canrie) you're next.

(Canrie):   Thank you very much. I'd like to applaud the point made by Avri for

bringing up this particular issue about minority groups and I think

historically you have seen that CDNC for example, originated with

Taiwan, Macau, Hong Kong and China. But they have included so

called minority of Singapore by injecting discussion and tie ups with the

Singapore's NIC.

So I can see that internally within this language group they will have

their own processes. I'm a little bit more optimistic than the – what has

been discussed that people might turn out to be the tyranny of the majority so to speak. Because they all know that if they do not get their own house in order the credibility of that and the legitimacy of that community – that language community would be come in to question. And that what it is in their interest in order to track the level of legitimacy and the level of credibility at the international level, say at ICANN to be basically a resolve all issues including minority group issues.

So I see this as a very positive face forward even though ICANN may not be actively or deeply involve in arbitration or regulating or coordinating this activities. The fact as Cary mention, I think there's a lot to be set for this process to be implemented at a level of this language groups but simple policy that says any group that once to launch in the federal script for their language, please get your own organization set up. And make sure that you do not neglect minority voices. And in that same (den) the (unintelligible) in that community too has already tried their very best in order to be as inclusive as possible.

So a simple policy going out from ICANN speaking less, whatever group that come for it, to seek recognition and to apply for a TLD look. You got this look for the language community of authority to enforce it – endorse you and that you might not neglect minority voices and you must be at sufficient level of general representation before you can reach level of credibility that ICANN recognize.

So this will avoid embroiling ICANN into problems of local communities fighting with each other. You detect the case of the problem of the handscript, right because hot (Unicode) has a hand unification system. The entire handscript may well end up in conflict because kanji of

Japanese language, (hanja) of the Koreans, and of course the Chinese Hand Language itself and also in Vietnamese, you want to show that in. We'll have possibility of conflicts within that script state.

How do they resolve it? Well, historically what they have done is convene an inter language handscript forum and that is the JET, Joint Engineering Taskforce. It has representation from this three major language groups. So I'm pretty optimistic that it will look because historically it has.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Konich). The way I'm link to…

(Manem):   I am (Manem).

Ram Mohan: (Manem), hi. Please go ahead.

(Manem):   Hi to everyone. All of almost about one and half I've hearing to the discussion it's my first (peninsula) here. Very interesting, I'm glad to share that all of the discussion taking place in the linguistic perspective. I'm based in Singapore and previously heard (Subaya) (unintelligible) talking about the demo computing forum called (INSET). I am the Chairman of the (IDN) committee just from since 2000.

And as what can we as talking about it. This forum had been the (tech list) to congregate the Indian Committee that is from Europe, USA or in the India target mailing, conferences from India to (unintelligible) every year. This committee has been the liaison for the (Tamel) committee to come up with standards and any kind of discussion, will it grossly terms, (unintelligible) and coding issues. Likewise, (IDN) has been issue now.

So when you are talking about having language community. Yes, they have the right forum to advice anyone whether it's ICANN or (INO) or anyone on the language perspective because as what we are dealing with everyday. And we know what is required for all community. And I think that language community will play a very good role to advice ICANN agencies on this matter. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you very much.

(Subaya): This is (Subaya), can I comment later?

Ram Mohan: So what I have heard here between the various comments is some – I guess from Avri, what I have heard was perhaps ICANN has a role in coordinating or maybe encouraging such a forum to come together and the CDNC and instant are some model to watch. And that in general it seems to me that at the jungle statement is that language community should be broadly consulted and not consisted of just a few narrow – or not even narrow, of only a few voices.

(Subaya): (Can I give one more) comment later?

Ram Mohan: I heard you (Subaya). What I was going to do is to actually move us forward on to the last part we topics earlier kept together for techno-policy details. And so, I'd certainly welcome your comments but encourage you to keep them reach because I'd like to move on to policy issues for (IDN) variance.

(Subaya): I understood. May I speak?

Ram Mohan: Please go ahead.

(Subaya):   I just wanted to point out one way to solve this issue in a way, if the applicant itself – if applicant for particular script TLD with (taskforce) is, you know, is to come from the language community itself, from the country it concern, also from a script community. Some way from that community country script language group whatever, that could be applicant himself, the principal applicant is department with technology partners or anybody else from outside of that community but if the applicant himself comes from that community, it doesn't has to be viewed as responsive thing in general.

              The applicant himself comes demonstrate they come from that community later on in general the company that they've applied or whatever. Then to some degree, naturally the language issue also comes up. They bring along with them typically, you know, all the voices that we necessary to make this (probably happen). That's the point.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Subaya). What I would like to do now is move to what was earlier define as at least we're down at our last of the three topics to discuss under technology and policy which was, what are the policy issue for IDM variance and this is a fairly open question. I will state that and open it up for discussion. The question is what are the policy issues for IDM variance?

Werner Stauv: This is Werner Stauv, (can I get back into the queue)?

Ram Mohan: Sure Werner and you have the floor.

Werner Stauv: My – I think the question against to tour about the question. What are the policy is surveillance seems to me like an actually broad question. So I think we should fancy downing to whether we talked about it should in quality level there is (TLD) allowed to same TLD or should be require registries to support variance or to protect variance within their technical level and so on. But I think we have too many different points.

Ram Mohan: That's – thank you for the clarification. In my mind our primary focus is at the top level of the TLD level and therefore the discussion, I would like to direct more of our discussion at the TLD level down in the second level. Is that helps any Werner?

Werner Stauv: Okay. Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Ram, Olof as well.

Ram Mohan: Sure, So that's Olof and before it was Avri (as you may).

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: Avri?

Avri Doria: My question (unintelligible) is I don't know what you mean but the question. Maybe it's similar although I think Werner had an idea of what you meant. I don't know what you mean by IDN variance.

Olof Nordling: May I answer that? I think I know what we have meant so far and if you look at the (broad) definitions we've made, variance in this context is

rather limited concept meaning, character variance. If you have a string which is done in full blooded Chinese, let's say. And you have a few characters which within that string which have simplified Chinese variance. How do you deem with those? I think it's rather limited to that when we talk about (unintelligible) and policy details.

Ram Mohan: Olof, that was my (half process) as well that we were focused on. So let me try to at least provide my understanding on the topics that I probably we're going to discuss. My understanding is the following, should when a new TLD is applied for, a new IDN TLD is applied for? Should that TLD have variance associated with it? What policy should apply in the case where a variance – all variance or a variance exist for and applied for IDN TLD? Olof, would that adequately represent what you talked about before?

Olof Nordling: (There again). And just for good measure, I could have retest what we said on the 23rd of January. We had, well, for example is that an agreement that variance of an IDN, gTLD string which to the analogy with contact as with IDN as to deem this labels. That is variance are not to be available for registration by others. For example…

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Some set forward for enabling a choice for an IDN, GTLD string with variance to only block variance or alternatively to use the variance of (A-leasing) purposes. And I think there's still some discussion on the mailing list as well, with comments about just the Chinese character string and simplified Chinese character string which would be, well, possibly case for alias.

Ram Mohan: Thank you Olof. So Avri, the way I look at this and other working group members, the way – the question that I look for us to discuss here is when an IDN TLD is applied for? Should that IDN TLD have variance, what policy considerations should apply for such variance?

Werner Stauv: This is Werner, I would like to propose a…

Ram Mohan: Thank you Werner, you're on the queue. You have the floor.

Werner Stauv: Okay. All right, based on what Olof just said, I think we should probably be unanimous in saying that there in should be protected in the sense that nobody else would get on the TLD level of variance of an existing TLD. The second question that (I will rephrase) was whether there should be an alias available and I believe that this would be – have to be answered in a specific case by their respective applicants.

And one could expect that there should be minimum level of comforts for the community to be able to work with the TLD which may depends specifically on the script. And they could actually come up with examples, some of them being Chinese and signifies in traditional and the characters such as the China which has the word and the means country in it. There's two ways of spelling and of this playing this traditional and simplifying, of course will be highly uncomfortable.

And if just one of those was accepted and this (unintelligible) could be coming with an example of decorated (ask key) where in most probably in (unintelligible) would be in necessary because the decorated character will not always be available in the – on the keyboard or input message that the key user may have.

Ram Mohan: Got it, so Werner the first point I've heard you say here that is to paraphrase is where variance exist fro an IDN – given IDN TLD. No other…

Werner Stauv: Registry applicant.

Ram Mohan: …registry applicant should be allowed to get that variance of an existing TLD. And the second is should an alias be of – should a case for an alias be made by the applicant then ICANN should work with the community. I did not understand where you were going or what you are recommending there.

Werner Stauv: I think the criteria could be that in every community has a right to minimum level of comfort in the actual usage and on practical comfort with the TLD. If you have a TLD that is dramatically or orthographically correct but you know, difficult (unintelligible) that 50% of the cases then they're certainly justification to allow for a variance in respective of whether that bear and is actually dramatically or orthographically correct or just basically an accepted in graceful degradation.

Ram Mohan: It might able to (unintelligible) by noting that there's no such thing as a grammar or domain name.

Werner Stauv: Well, I mean the grammar of respective language.

Ram Mohan: Yeah.

Werner Stauv: It may be big grammar or maybe it's just orthographic call or spelling and configuration.

Alistair Dixon: Ram can I join the queue? Alistair.

Ram Mohan: Sure Alistair and you have the floor.

Alistair Dixon: It seems to me – I used to us generally supported, well, (unintelligible) that promote competition. But it seems to me on the case of variance, as we following the script definition of the word at least it is on the Wiki.

Ram Mohan: (Unintelligible), just to clarify, that is our intend. So when we talk about variance, we are seeking about the strict definition of the word variance.

Alistair Dixon: So we're not talking (unintelligible), are we? We are talking technicality (unintelligible) small CON (unintelligible). And that seems to me that this is an issue of that years of point of you cause – could cause confusion. And so, and domain with from, I mean, the example, you know, of the two Chinese scripts. It seems to me that there is actually potentially an issue of user confusion as for they were two different registries that they operated both China with just using variance.

So I think they might actually be potential basis for basically limiting variance. And variance, I mean just circling on the definition of variance, should the thing will operated to avoid confusion. I guess that would be the principle that I would propose.

(Canrie):   Can I have the question? Can I ask? (Canrie) here.

Ram Mohan: Sure (Canrie) and you have the floor.

(Canrie): Thank you. I'm just trying to think. You said that variance definition is to be in the sixth sense of the word. I like to ask the question of – can someone explain to me but I see pedal in Francoise is the same as Francois with the spell – with the C. Is that a variance or in the case of Chinese I'm quite clear that "wu" is simplified in traditional they are actually, the country – the word meaning country is actually a variance. But I'm not too clear about the decorated Latin scripts.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. Could I comment on that?

Ram Mohan: Go ahead, Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, well, but strictly speaking it would not be considered a variance. I mean, those are, well, they look very similar but the C where there's a V, produces an S sound in front of hard vowels which is C instead would become a K. So, well, there are not exchangeable. But it is of course so that many French domain names since the C with the D is not within the LDH repertoire. And they use that kind of spelling. So, well, it is a borderline case but strictly from a linguistic point of view they're not variance.

(Canrie): Right, that's what I want to clarify then. They're not variance because they're not excellent because each one means a separate thing. And that's for the – while they may look confusingly similar and they might be reason from that community to say that Francoise spelled with the C, it should be equivalent to Francois spelled with C (saddle). And that – up to that community but strictly speaking if we go by the definition at Ram reiterated, and this particular point should be out of (unintelligible).

Werner Stauv: This is Werner. I just wanted to add something.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Okay, Werner (unintelligible).

Werner Stauv: Can I go ahead?

Ram Mohan: Yes, please go ahead.

Werner Stauv: I think in respect with the protection the confusability with the non-confusability requirement made for – I'm not particularly sure but I believe you may actually be sufficient to achieve sufficient protection. When it comes to (unintelligible), I do believe that we do have to extend the concept as variance to what would be force variance or just practicability based variance. And such as (Fungkua) and (Fungsua) or Espana and España, just for practicability in questions because in the specific community even very often the actual character is not available, difficult to type.

(Subaya):   (Subaya) would like to join the queue.

Ram Mohan: Okay, thank you. I have Cary then (Subaya).

(Cary Karp):   Okay.

Ram Mohan: Cary, you have the floor.

(Cary Karp):   Yeah, I'm very, very uncomfortable with this notion of strict definition of equivalence in any way shape performed. Language is as open end to

this can possibly be, writing are as open ended duplicative non-logical as can possibly be. And there's numbers of ways in which two characters, (two different) characters can be compared for whatever the purpose might be. It can't really be counted.

So I mean, at some point if we're talking about request for TLD label, someone will going to say we would like to have the following labels where the two TLD here is the justification for that request and that is going to has to be assessed on it's own merit of regardless of any attempt that we might make to do the kinds of things that lots of other people have thought about and decided just can't be done. And (unintelligible) this notion of defining what a corresponsive – is corresponded by this between two characters or two strings in any kind of a general sense is just light up on capital list of waste of time I would almost say. Not quite. I mean, there's a purpose to discuss that for sure. But I don't know what the notion of (Rick). I don't what the definition of (Rick) correspondence can possibly be.

Ram Mohan: Cary, what do you suggest we should define at that?

(Cary Karp): It has to have some context projected into it. And this is the notion of course (unintelligible) may simplify as traditional (unintelligible) Chinese characters. Certainly it's a clearly bounced to context. I don't have tingling of the expertise, that's already up as do one says. In alphabetic round, and this just considering the numbers of ways, the Swedish language, the orthographic rules that are applied to Sweden or representing a dotted (unintelligible) is "O" when there is no mechanism available for entering or representing that (unintelligible).

All possibilities have been tried, they change, there is no standard. So at the moment of review of an application, the review team need to have some sort of a list of things that they might want to keep in mind as they have set the string but some sort of prescriptive binary rule, apply this and things will work out where they have to. It's just not a meaningful initiative.

(Tin Wee): Yeah, I think that's an excellent point. This is (Tin Wee), may I comment?

Ram Mohan: Please.

(Tin Wee): Having that excellent point (unintelligible) by Cary and you're certainly right in pointing out that different languages may treat set of (capel) characters (this) with another, using the same set of character may not consider them to be variance. So maybe at the point of registration, the selection committee that does the selection should actually come from expert within that language committee that actually do know whether this should be nationally used as variance in the speak sense or in the (unintelligible) sense or whether it can be a matter of a visual similarity or homographic similarity that might confused people.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I'm sorry, is that (Sharam)? Who is the other person who asked to be in the queue?

(Subaya):   (Subaya) I said.

Ram Mohan: (Subaya), okay.

(Subaya):   I was – that was (Sharam). I just wanted to say that as more
                concerning what might be used out here. I'm whole heartedly pretty
                much in agreement of (unintelligible) as far as the specific definition as
                Ram started saying what IDN policy variance meant (unintelligible)
                variance in that context. I'm completely agree with Werner in sense of
                it should be protected (in the sense that's in a) block that the TLD
                (unintelligible) somebody is getting it.

                But in the case of the community of the applicant, if somebody makes
                a good taste, you know, comfort reason, practicality reasons whatever.
                That perhaps aliases should be considered and that should be
                considered. So as part of that IDN policy variance as defined by Ram,
                (this thing) I completely agree with what Werner says.

                Now, as far as confusingly similar, things that (unintelligible) by
                variance with C, or with something like this (unintelligible) brought up. I
                am also because that would be, you know, categorically different from
                IDN policy variance. Well, that I'm also agreeable that confusingly
                similar capture that notion then who decide in all of that. And I think
                there's a thing in Cary is saying in those things that it should be the,
                you know, in the sense the community itself or at the time of that the
                string is being awarded. Somebody in that nexus of, you know, (actual)
                language.

                People would clarify that issue and that's how it would be decided until
                (I say).

Ram Mohan: Thank you. I note that there are about eight minutes after the hour. And we had begun at just about 67 minutes after the hour and I've been particular for keeping our call to a two hour discussion time period. And I therefore regretfully have to say that we cannot complete this discussion on the conference call regarding variance. I would suggest that we move some of this discussion onto our mailing list, and/or the Wiki as we prefer.

I'll also point out that there are two other things that we have in front of us, you will see exact document coming your way shortly that'll solicit comments. And we will make a copy of that document available on the Wiki as well as on the ICANN GNSO page. And we need you when you come for the next week's meeting. We need to make sure that you all get read through the document. We have some prepared comments or some specific items of discussion.

We have a very short amount of time literally, just for four hours to go through the document and try to arrive at consensus on a call. Because I think it's almost impossible to do merely on the call. So I – once the document comes out I strongly suggest and request all of you to please review the document and start providing comment right on a mailing list which is all in the most efficient way of doing this.

I also remind folks who on live in countries that conform to changes of time – daylight savings time, et cetera, at least in the United States' daylight savings time will apply for next week's call. So please make a necessary note in your calendars. Glen will of course accommodate that when she puts out her meeting request.

With that I'd like to continue today's call. I appreciate all of you.

Sophia Bekele: Ram I have this (sign out), I'll comment. This is Sophia. Can you please give me a minute?

Ram Mohan: No problem Sophia, go ahead.

(Sharam): And Ram and please I have important issue about this variance. Can I speak now after Sophia?

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Sophia Bekele: Mine is going to be very quick. I just wanted to remind, Ram, I thought you would want them to produce a report for the reserved name working group. So I did prepare one and I distributed to everyone, just this before the meeting. So that you know you have a copy, right?

Ram Mohan: Yes, Sophia. I was actually going to get to that as (second autumn) of this working group to go and review in addition.

Sophia Bekele: Oh no problem. I thought you're going to just say finally and hang up. So anyway, if you want to say something, go ahead and say. But the only thing is I put the report in a metrics format where everybody can be able to contribute some comments from this group. So – because I think I have to take this back to check who has reserved name working group with many of you don't know, so, for his input by Thursday because they have a deadline also on their side. So I appreciate everyone's input for this.

Ram Mohan: Thank you Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: And also there was also – one thing, there was also a comment that was brought up an issue on the (tagging) report, so I distributed for everyone to solicit their views on it and I would also appreciate the comments that come back on that. So I could incorporate it within the document and give it to check. So thank you, that's all I've got.

Ram Mohan: Thank you very much and you're welcome.

(Sharam): Okay, can I say my comments?

Sophia Bekele: That's (Sharam).

Ram Mohan: That's (Sharam), I'm sorry.

(Sharam): Okay, thank you.

(Subaya): This is (Subaya), I just – wait. It wouldn't be…

Ram Mohan: (Sharam) go ahead.

(Subaya): No.

(Sharam): May I have – okay (Subaya) you can speak now.

(Subaya): All right, just to…

Ram Mohan: (Sharam) you have the floor.

(Sharam): Okay.

(Subaya):   (Sharam) go ahead.

(Sharam):   There is a very – okay. There is a very, very important to what a variance IT. The variance at least in my language in (unintelligible), I know somehow (unintelligible). This is an important issue. Variance are intent so that in this character they are not in the middle – the meaning is the same in (shape). And they are in different character, right? And there is some issue in the applicants for the TLD. And this – the issue is that when the applicant were the TLD, comes out, and comes ahead and we wants to get the TLD.

Maybe there already be different as (two) maybe, at least in (Persian) and Arabic. It will happen. There's – there can be some (unintelligible) in different two applicants from two countries. Example, we can find a TLD that can be done and can be given even to Arabic and Persian people. I think this must be to the (variance) (unintelligible). Okay?

Ram Mohan: Thank you and (Subaya).

(Subaya):   Yeah. I just wanted to make this serious and somewhat humorous comment which is that, you know, I think that (Sharam) said use some Iran. And your Arabic is from Israel. They'll not be a good idea to confuse the two. That's all.

Ram Mohan: Yes, and I am unfortunately I'm quite poor. I'm just picking up from someone's saying put me in the queue and don't know who they are. So I make sometimes uneducated guesses.

(Subaya):   That's when – can I comment on the point that was raised (Sharam) because the solution already is in (flair), for example, right now between Japan and China and Korea when they are talking about conflicts in terms of variance and within their language which is a variance in one language and not a variance in the other language.

Ram Mohan: Got it, thank you.

(Subaya):   Okay.

Ram Mohan: I would like to conclude the call with really two pieces of homework and actual work for us to do. One is to please look at the document that Sophia has distributed to us, here view comments into that – into the reserved means of working group in just a couple of days time. And they have a chartered deadline that they were working with as well. And so, please go wipe some attention to that document.

                And the second is to provide your comments and attention to the draft outcomes document that will be made available to you in the next – in the few hours or at least in a day's time.

                With that thank you for staying on the call. I apologize for being about 40 minutes over the allocated time line. But it was interesting discussion again. And thank you for your participation. See you next week.

Sophia Bekele: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Man:		Bye.

(Sharam):	Thank you, bye.

END