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

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO IDN Working Group teleconference on 20 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 found at:

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

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/idn-wg-20070320.mp3

Participants on the call:

Ram Mohan - Working Group Chair

Charles Sha'ban - IPC

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

June Seo - gTLD Registry constituency

Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Hong Xue - ALAC liaison

Tin Wee Tan - NCUC

Sergei Sharikov - observer

S. Manian - observer

S. Subbiah - observer

Alexei Sozonov - observer

Shahram Soboutipour - observer

ICANN Staff:

Tina Dam - IDN

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies

Paul Diaz - Registrar c.

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Coordinator: I have started the recordings. Please go ahead, thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you very much. Welcome everyone to the final IDN working group call. Before this working group disbands in Lisbon, I appreciate all of you who're being on this call. We have a relatively short agenda in front of us. We have an IDN working group draft ICANN report document to go through.

And our task is to – today, finish up on any areas where we had agreement and which wasn't finalized and then to swiftly go through the areas where we have had changes to - or suggestions for new support or alternative view requests. To have a brief but succinct discussions on those and end up with decisions on what you want to do.

I don't plan on us doing a huge amount of work (including) on the call. I'd much rather have folks' views be provided and then depend upon Olof to come up with some suggested wording. The goal is to release a document tomorrow to the (genitile) council for review which means that there's a great deal of work that has to be accomplished today. And I suspect that by the time we do get a report out tomorrow, it will be late in the day tomorrow when we get the report out.

I have also to bring to your attention a couple of administrative details. The first is that I'd request for all working group members to please publish to the working group mailing list their statements of interest. I have been delinquent in reminding all of you to do this but I would like to do so, so that before the end of this week, I would like for everybody who's participated on this mailing list and on the working group to have published their statements of interest.

Glen, if you could please make a note of this and if you could please send a note out to the working group, requesting them with a deadline of this Friday. And if you could also follow up on it after that to make sure that those who have not submitted it, you know, that those names are published in the list so that they get an opportunity to submit their statements of interest.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. I'll do that Ram.

Ram Mohan: I appreciate it. The second thing is I would like to bring to your attention document that Sophia had forwarded to the group earlier in the week which is the reserved names working group's final outcomes report. And the input from the IDN working group is already incorporated in there but I'll just point it out once again that there is –

this is like intonation provided in that document. If there – if you feel there is something that is grossly inaccurate in that document, please write to me and contact me directly and immediately.

The last administrative item is I will bring to your attentions that about 20 minutes ago, (Liz Williams) has posted to our working group the new tier - the GNSO new TLDs and the various principles – six principles and 20 recommendations, some of which have IDN relevance. And I bring it to your attention because there are – there has been discussion in the last few days about things that the IDN working group should be doing. And as (Tina) has pointed out, some of the suggestions are already incorporated in the new TLD's document both in the principles, as well as in the recommendations.

So, with that being said, our agenda today is pretty straight forward. We're going to spend about an hour going through the rest of the document and then, you know, probably another 15 or 20 minutes in final wrap up mode and I'm getting prepared for Lisbon. The Lisbon plan is the following, we will publish the document. I will be in Lisbon starting Saturday morning and I think there are a number of consultations that are going to be held. There is a face-to-face meeting that is also being planned.

And in addition to that, I'm sure there will be many more sessions and discussions on IDN in Lisbon. Some of these are going to be webcast, others are not. I'll refer you to ICANN staff for the full details on it or the web site for full details on it.

The - with all of that being said, I'd like to take us to the document at hand. We do not have – we have not published a new version of the

document because the changes have been coming fast and furious into the mailing list and what we're doing is really focusing on the final document rather than keep bringing out interim versions of the document, given that we have a published deadline of tomorrow.

What I would like to do at this point is to ask Olof if you could please walk through any new agreements that we have come up with and if there are any other agreements that we have not gone through, that we need to go through. I do not want to revisit agreements that we've already discussed and frankly agreed upon before. But if there are new ones that to be brought up, I know I suggested elevating at least one topic to an agreement.

There are others - some voices that had supported it but I want to bring it up for the call today. And then we go from there. Before I hand over the – this task to you, Olof, I would ask if Glen, you could do a roll call.

Glen Desaintgery: Jeff Neuman. On the line we have (Yusof), Olof Nordling and Tina Dam as staff. We have Avri Doria, (Edmon Chung), Cary Karp, (Ramesh Taw), (Alexis Susanauv), (Yuhof Karan), Steve Crocker, (Manem) and Subbiah.

Ram Mohan: Thank you Glen. Okay, Olof, what new agreements are there, or what agreements still remain, that have not been brought in front of our working group on a conference call and require discussion?

Olof Nordling: I think we should - if we take them sequentially in the order of the last draft, I think can we start with 4.1.1 which were there was a proposal from Sophia. And Ram, I think you concluded that there was a support for - that could be elevated to support and that is actually to take one of

the alternative views under the (one, two, third) and support statement of the 4.1.1. And notably, to resolve IDN policies you have before launch of application round.

Ram Mohan: I'm sorry. I guess my thought is let us first finish up on all the ones that have agreement before we go to the support ones.

Olof Nordling: Okay, well, which means that I will have to reshuffle a little bit.

Cary Karp: Can I ask a question just in terms of basic principle, (Cary)?

Ram Mohan: Yes.

Cary Karp: There are some things that we are spending words on that are going to happen whether we recommend them or not. And I wonder if we could either feed that last when we know that we have enough time. Or simply as matter of principle, not bother stating things that there are no alternatives to.

Ram Mohan: Understand Cary, I'm fine with that. Let us hit them as we get to each of those topics. Let us just, you know, bring it up and we can dispatch it quickly.

Cary Karp: Okay.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Olof Nordling: All right, if we then look at the agreements, we have - the agreements that we agreed upon was - were posted to the list for verification. There has not been any push back on those.

Ram Mohan: Right. Yeah. We're going to stick with those that have already been agreed upon. The question is (unintelligible)...

Coordinator: Tin Wee has joined.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, right, but if just to give some feedback because I think the three agreements which were posted to the list and none of them provoked any dissent. So, I take it that those are agreed upon and was like rewordings of quick software, 4. - 5.1 and (Alinea) too in one and such. But - okay, let's proceed to see what has happened on the other agreements. And there has been – now let's see.

Let's now proceed, well, that was one addition and I think, no that's not it. Like you say and I'm just reshuffling the whole thing. At 3.3 and that was the proposal from you to elevate the support statement. We're pursuing compliance with ICANN IDN guidelines to agreement and that's been the second (unintelligible). What I would (unintelligible).

Nevertheless, is certain rephrasing of it, and now it reads in your proposal agreement, all new IDN TLD applicants must comply with ICANN IDN guidelines. I think it's - the applicants may or may not comply but if once they become registered, (unintelligible) to apply, agreements to IDN registry must comply with ICANN IDN guidelines would be my suggestion.

Cary Karp: This is the type of example of what I'm wondering if we really need to include at all. But this is (boiler plate) construct ahead that's been opposed on all of the registries over the side of ICANN. We don't need to worry about it not being opposed talking about IDN case.

Ram Mohan: I'm comfortable leaving it out. If (Tina) is, I know that in the past (Tina) has suggested that we do, it doesn't hurt to add it in. So, I'm going to pose this (sort of the) recommendation here to leave it out all together. And I'm wondering (Tina) if you have a perspective on it.

Tina Dam: Not. Ram, sorry, not. I think that's fine if you want to leave it out.

Ram Mohan: Okay, is there any disagreement to leaving this out? Is - are there any dissenters? So, the proposal on the table is to actually take the 4.3.3 and remove it all together because it is moot. If you become an approved IDN, gTLD registry operator on with ICANN, you will be required contractually to comply with the guidelines. So what we're saying is it's kind of redundant.

Subbiah: Ram?

Ram Mohan: Yeah.

Subbiah: This is Subaya here.

Ram Mohan: Yes.

Subbiah: If it's redundant, what's (wrong) with leaving it in there.

Cary Karp: Can I answer that? There is a finite amount of attention that is going be paid to this (sweetness) of pages of report that council is about to weigh through. And if we want to minimize the likelihood that they'll be seeing things that are important, then we can put in all the redundant stuff we want. If we want to maximize the likelihood of them seeing

what's important, then we could probably dispense the things that are redundant.

Subbiah: I'd like to be on queue. Was Cary on queue?

Ram Mohan: Go ahead Subaya.

Subbiah: Thank you. Okay. The point is we've spent more time – I understand the point – but we've spent more time discussing whether this is moot or not. Then we -just leaving it and then moving on right now because if it's moot, who cares?

Cary Karp: I care. Sorry to (break) the queue.

(Edmon Chung): This is (Edmon).

Ram Mohan: (Edmon), go ahead.

(Edmon Chung): I think in 4.5.1 we already addressed the ICANN IDN guidelines, so removing it from 4.3.3 is in fact appropriate.

Subbiah: May I say something again?

Ram Mohan: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I get into the queue?

Ram Mohan: Sure.

Subbiah: I…

Ram Mohan: Subbiah then Avri.

Subbiah: Okay.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Subbiah: I'm going to hang up on this. I'm just simply saying that some of us
               have made a comment on this group about whether this is important or
               not. And if you're absolutely certain that this is actually covered
               somewhere else whether there are documents out there then, you
               know, we'll take it on your word. But what if it isn't the case? That's the
               point. So, if redundancy covers that, that's all. Avri.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah, I'm going to understand what Cary's saying but I see no
               guarantee that just because there are ideas and principles that a
               contract can't be written. So as to exempt some particular contract
               from living up to them. So, I'm not so sure that it's a given or that it's a
               foregone conclusion.

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

Ram Mohan: Sure. Go ahead Cary, you - and you have the floor.

Cary Karp: Okay. If it should be true that a registry can figure out how to avoid this
               particular contract wording, what overriding authorities does a
               recommendation made by a working group have over that situation?
               The ability to avoid (boiler plate), I think somehow to just the ability to

dodge any bullet that might be fired and just (unintelligible) that we are holding in this particular context.

Ram Mohan: Folks, this is Ram Mohan. I think I'm going to put an end to this particular topic because 4.5.1 as (Edmon) pointed out quiet clearly states that new gTLD registries must conform to the IDN guideline and must publish the language (table) from IANA registry. That is already there before we already agreed on it. So, I move right now that we delete 4.3.3 all together since it's already covered in 4.5.1. Any other dissent?

Thank you. (Olof) what's next?

Olof Nordling: When it comes to agreements, I don't see any additional agreement here but maybe I sorted things wrongly then in sequential order here.

Ram Mohan: No problem. And if you find something, you know, down the road let - we'll get there. So, that then concludes all the agreements that we need to discuss which is I will say to you that I feel quiet relieved about that because that means that we can actually get to the support statements. And we will have, you know, indigenous to report, we will be able to show that our group did come to agreement on a number of areas across the board.

Thank you everybody for your contributions and for your assistance in getting us to this point. Now, back to you Olof. Let's go to the support statements and let's go through the first ones and, you know, back to where you were earlier before I kind of tried to move you to finish up on the agreements.

Olof Nordling: Right, with pleasure. And then we come to 4.1.1, I'm just working it sequentially here where there was a from Sophia to move one over the alternative views under 4.1.1. The third support statement and the second alternative view to resolve IDN policy is to - before launch or application round and that would be elevated to support.

What's your suggestion and I'm ready, willing to do so. Although there is slight inconsistency with the very first support statements stand for avoiding hostage situation. So, want to highlight that it is proposed to be a support statement - so it'll be consistent with each other.

Ram Mohan: So, 4.1.1 could you read out the modified statements one by one and let's have a discussion.

Olof Nordling: Yes. The very first support for avoiding hostage situations in planning this, it is as stated before - planning on (unintelligible) IDN detail application round. Neither none IDN gTLD nor IDN gTLD should be late viewed to the other.

Ram Mohan: OK, great. Let's just hold that for a second. Is there any discussion on this first support statement?

Edmon Chung: Yes, Ram Mohan this is Chung. I need to buy - put me on to queue.

Ram Mohan: Yes, and you have the floor.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Ram Mohan. I think what Olof said is correct on the many (glitz) we noticed that the alternative view - most of the people who sent their notes said that they want to make it to the support. So, I think this will be opposite to this view.

So, I think this – if we want to move to resolve IDN policy issues before launch of application route to we - a support statements, we should move this to be on the alternative view, so, some kind – some how we are changing them.

Ram Mohan: Understood. Thank you. Let me then ask Olof, could you read out what is suggested as the – as the support, you know, the promotion from alternative to support view. And then, let us discuss resolving the inconsistency one from the other.

Olof Nordling: Right. Well, the support statement to promote this from alternative view is that support for resolving IDN policy issues before launch of application round.

Tina Dam: Olof, I'm sorry this is (Tina). I didn't get that. Could you do that one more time?

Olof Nordling: Oh yes. Support for resolving IDN policy issues before launch of application round.

Ram Mohan: It currently states as an alternative view that IDN policy issues before launch of application, a new gTLD application round. But what we have here is a proposal to promote the alternative view to actually support. That says – so the new statements would say, "Support that IDN policy issues be resolved before accepting or before the launch of IDN gTLD use."

Subbiah: Subbiah, I'd like to be on the queue.

Werner Staub: This is Werner. I would like to be on the queue.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Subbiah first and then Werner. Subbiah go ahead.

Subbiah: My view on the topic is that IDN – I understand that there are conflict issues about possible, you know, cross interaction between- in a limited way between IDN gTLD launch and non IDN gTLD launch.

But my view is that before any IDN gTLD's are launch, all IDN policy criteria should be set. Now, the – if that means that in some cases that the ASCII round with the gTLD application have to go forward even though there's some potential limited conflict views. In a conflict with, you know, doing that that way with the English goes first and the IDN later, then we'll just have to live with that.

I mean so, it resolves that hostage situation if you say that, you know, we're going to try to make both go together but if it doesn't then, you know, the English can go ahead and IDN will wait until all the policy issues are thick even though there maybe some cross interaction minimal.

Ram Mohan: Thank you Subbiah. Werner.

Werner Staub: The problem with resolving policy issues is that we don't know all the policy issues. And we know that some of the policy issues are things that would be confined to a given kind of problem. Such as to give you an example, the treatment of accents in Greek (unintelligible) which is quite different. The treatment of accents in or the best way to characters in a typical Latin based languages.

And then, again which does not exist at all in our geographic languages. Now, in the – we talk about the problem of resolving all the IDN issues within the scope of IDN. It is actually over kill to request they'll treat all the policy issues and hold up for instance, a simple Chinese – a (yin), on the basis of a discussion about the Greek as – or the Greek tonic and diacritics or Latin diacritic marks which they not make sense to require that everybody wait until all the issues that could be possibly associated with one specific detail would be resolved. And if you extend that to the – to all gTLD inside the IDN rounds should have to be halted, the path the best way to prevent the introduction of any IDN TLD and all the gTLDs for the next five years.

Subbiah: I would like to be in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Subbiah back again.

Werner Staub: Yeah Werner, I think.

Ram Mohan: There's somebody who wanted to speak. I thought I heard somebody asking Werner.

(Edmon Chung): Hi, it was (Edmon).

Ram Mohan: (Edmon), okay.

Man: Who was that?

Ram Mohan: (Edmon), go ahead. (Edmon) and then (Charles), okay.

(Edmon Chung): (Edmon).

Ram Mohan: (Edmon).

(Edmon Chung): Well, in general, I think – I don't think we should support both. I just want to say that we shouldn't support both sort of a statement. It seems to me fairly clear that they're contradicting and we just – in my point of view I would support the initial one that was on the paper, the original one that listed the support.

Ram Mohan: The original one as in avoiding hostage situations and planning new non-IDN gTLD application round.

(Edmon Chung): Correct.

Ram Mohan: Okay, thank you (Edmon). Charles.

Charles Sha'ban: Ah, yes. I'm with the other – unlike (Edmon), I like to - the change better for two main reasons. I understand what Werner said his thought is correct. This will make us move faster in IDN so, as not to hold everything including ASCII I think. This is one of the advantages.

Plus another issue which is having more ASCII gTLDs. Well, this is my personal view of course. We already have enough for me, (right). I know that some people say, "We still have 75 or even 100," maybe or something like that. But, this will make an additional burden on the businesses as an intellectual property people. And so, I'm just to reserve names as a protection as everybody knows.

So, I think the need now more for IDN more than additional ASCII. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Charles).

Cary Karp: Can you put Cary on the queue please, Ram.

Ram Mohan: And you're on.

Subbiah: I though I was (joining in).

Ram Mohan: Hold on Subbiah, I think…

Man: (Unintelligible) on the queue, please.

Subbiah: Subbiah here.

Ram Mohan: Hold on Subbiah, let me just find out who else wants to be in the queue before I give you the floor.

Yoav: Yoav (wants to be in).

Ram Mohan: Yoav wants to be in the queue. Cary wants to be in the queue. Okay. Thank you. Subaya you have the floor.

Subbiah: Yeah. I agree with Werner on that that he know one language and hold up the other languages so maybe the way to get out here is to keep the notion that IDN policy has to be, you know, fully settled, you know, for a given language before it's launched, you know. So, that solves the problem, you know. So, you know, then if you're going to launch any IDN, string it on to corresponding to a language, then it clearly

should - the issue to that should be resolved any related issues that should be resolved fully before it goes out.

I mean, in a way we extend this for those languages that don't exactly in Unicode yet. Well, we can watch them anyway, right? So, the way it's consistent with that way. Any language is prepared to go forward.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Subbiah. Cary.

Cary Karp: I agree certainly in forceful with the kinds of things that Werner is talking about. But I know that these are all issues that attach to the protocol rather than to the policy components of all of these. And if we simply accept that the protocol modification is being made mindful of its need to accommodate registration that is current - IDN registration that's currently being accepted. Probably the only thing we need to decide is whether the impending protocol envisioned is going to have any effect on our own time line or not.

We can't go into details with individual characters. So, either we accept that the current IDNA is an adequate basis for proceeding with some IDN on the top level or we decide that we need some - for the protocol issues to be resolved. But again, noting that the effort is - every effort is being made to see to it that that's the kind of disruptive effect on anything that could possibly appear in an IDN TLD (label), other than making new characters available for that purpose as Subbiah just mentioned.

Werner Staub: Could I be back on the queue? This is Werner.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. I have you back in the queue. I have Yoav right now.

Yoav: Yeah. I just called to (simply) to say that me personally, I think I have
                  no problem if ASCII TLD were to be postponed until IDN TLDs were
                  launched. I see no problem in having that posted while for ten years
                  the world has been waiting for IDN and nothing happened. So, waiting
                  the (little) for new IDN, this is - if for new ASCII TLDs. I don't think that
                  any real - how would happen to the world. And - but anyway, I think
                  that the last proposal of Subbiah sounds reasonable and then, maybe
                  we should go that way. That's it.

Ram Mohan: I have Werner in the queue.

Werner Staub: Okay, I would just like to caution again to you that the protocols handle
                  this policy issues. And I mentioned the accents because a protocol
                  consider if it's - characters that have an accent as different from ones
                  that don't have an accent. However in policy, they realize that this
                  actually conflicts based the actual use of language. Very, very often in
                  uppercase, the accents are removed. Sometimes have to be removed
                  depending on the language. In some cases, could be removed.

                  And then we have very quickly policy issues as to whether an accented
                  character must be reserved against another one and so one. And this
                  is actually not as easy as if we're looking. This is in specific cases
                  actually protocols decide to just to avoid looking at the problem, leave
                  it a registry issue under registry policy.

                  So again, the registry in a specific case will be able to deal with it. But
                  ICANN probably as a whole and IANA root would be in a two larger
                  group and two diverse groups to deal with a specific problem.

Therefore, I would really want to caution against to you that we could have solved all the problems before starting.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. So, at this point it seems that we are going to be stuck with an inherent contradiction in two statements and perhaps what we need to do is to promote this alternate view to - alternative view to a support view and have a note that says the, that the working group recognizes that this view is in conflict with the prior view stated, you know, or something like that.

Olof Nordling: Ram.

Ram Mohan: Yes? May I perhaps, because – well, we're not at the end of 4.1.1 actually because there were two modifications or proposed for support statements as well. And that is the third support statement to which this is a (croco) that's an alternative view. Support for options to reserve IDN gTLD strings in case the first application round can only address non-IDN gTLD application fully. Well, that has also been proposed by at least more than one that should be demoted to alternative view rather than having it.

So, maybe if there is - we can't replace that support statement with the resolved IDN policy just before launch of application round and put well shift those two even if there is some inconsistency with the very fist support statement.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Does the working group have an objection with this strategy?

All right Olof, please go ahead and do that.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Ram Mohan: What's next?

Olof Nordling: And also, in between there is again a proposal in 4.1.1. The second
                   support statement it says, "As it reads from the version 2.3 draft,
                   support for first application round open to both non-IDN gTLD's and ID
                   gTLD is possible. And there was an addition to that proposed by
                   Sophia, as long as the IDN criteria setting process is completed. To
                   add that, at the end of that statement and I see no objections to that
                   but whether that means attempt or oversight, I don't know.

(Edmon Chung): Could you repeat the phrase?

((Crosstalk))

(Edmon Chung): Could you repeat -- sorry this is (Edmon) – could you repeat the
                   phrase that was proposed?

Cary Karp: Can I ask for a point of clarification? The first.

Ram Mohan: Why don't you repeat it and (unintelligible) Cary's point of clarification.

Olof Nordling: Yup. I'll repeat this first. Support for the first application round open to
                   both non-IDN gTLDs and IDN gTLDs is possible as long as the IDN
                   criteria setting process is completed.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Cary your clarification?

Cary Karp: It is about the remit of this working group. Are we supposed to be commenting on the non-IDN (lamb) application phase?

Olof Nordling: Yes we are.

Cary Karp: We are. Okay.

Olof Nordling: I mean that's, in our remits. We should review the new TLD recommendations and comment on that in case to our opinions and views going astray with what's done in that one.

Tina Dam: Ram, this is (Tina) in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Tina). You have the floor.

Tina Dam: Okay. I just want to mention that in listed e-mail of today and I know it's just recently (suspended) out. Principle two says some new generic top level domains may be internationalized domain names subject to the approval of IDNs being available in the root. So, my comment is that with that principle and the PDP for new gTLDs, you know, I kind of feel like this support statement is maybe not so necessary.

Ram Mohan: Okay. So there's a proposal on the table to remove the support statement. Any comments?

Subbiah: Subbiah would like to make a comment.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Subbiah.

Subbiah: Yeah. I mean again, this is an issue. I mean if I understand (Tina) correctly, she's saying that this (clause) is already covered in the other thing. Therefore it's redundant?

Tina Dam: Yeah, (actually)...

Ram Mohan: That's what I heard. Sorry, go ahead (Tina).

Tina Dam: Yeah. I'm sorry. I might (unintelligible) meeting. So, I just - I mute and un-mute, so you don't get off the back noise and hence the little delay. Anyways – yeah, I mean, I think you know why. If it's something that the other group has already agreed on and not to, you know, keep in mind that we're just a working group. They're actually a formalized policy development process group. So this has already been agreed on and decided. And it's going to be implemented. So I don't really know why it's necessary for us to even have the conversation.

Subbiah: May I comment on that?

Ram Mohan: Go ahead.

Subbiah: Has that been voted on yet?

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

Subbiah: Has this been voted on yet, (Tina)?

Tina Dam: No. But it's the report. It's in the report that (Liz) sent out as the principles that has been agreed on.

Subbiah: My take on that this is a very straight forward that the first, it's not voted on yet. Secondly, our job as far as I understand is really a recommendation group, we just make recommendations. It's so, you know, if we're going to make a redundant recommendation then it just means that - I'm talking about it in terms of philosophically, you know, we're making a redundant recommendation and so be that. And the people who are going to vote are going to take a look at it.

And to leave it out means that potentially we're leaving the – if there's enough support for this from the rest of us. We're leaving the importance of that out. That's the point that I think I'm trying to raise and I think quite possibly, I may be paraphrasing, I'm not sure what Avri is going to be saying that. Anyway, Avri, to you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Subbiah. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes thanks. I think I'm saying something similar to what Subbiah assumed I'd be saying, is all of these groups are subgroups to the (count) (although) we all going to fit in the report to council. Yes, one of the committee of the whole that's specifically working on the policy. But it also brought the conflict that we need to understand any IDN implications and so on.

I think (Liz) is correct that assuming all work is done, there maybe IDN in any of the round but maybe it's still a loose work and I don't see any harm. I mean, in basically including a recommendation - support level recommendation in this. Even if it does complement, something that the people hope happens anyway and it's a point about the recommendation of the committee as a whole, not yet being approved

either by that committee and certainly not by the council yet. There's still a lot of room for discussion.

Yoav: This is Yoav, can you put me on the queue please.

Ram Mohan: Thank you and you have the floor.

Yoav: Thank you. I just wanted to say I think this is the third issue that we're discussing whether a point was brought up in the PDP, the working group and I – and there was also one on reiterating on the mailing list. And what I wanted to say is that I now understand that this was not at all even voted yet by the council.

             So clearly, since the council haven't seen our report and since there – these are issues that we have some support on. I think that it - for the sake of the discussion and for the process of deciding on each issue, it is very important not only that its not making (us hunger) like Avri said.

             I think that it's very, very important that we put everything in. Because, okay so Cary, there will be maybe another page in this report of things that are already maybe agreed on in other groups but we are coming from the IDN angle. And this is very important that things that are relevant to the IDN will be put here even though they are (unintelligible) in the same way or in a different way by other processes.

             And so, I think we should keep this point and other points that we're talking about in the paper. Thanks.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Yoav.

Shahram   (Unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Go ahead please.

Shahram   (Sharam) has a point, Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead (Sharam).

Shahram   Okay. First of all, I have to - it should all of you because I would ask
                something to (unintelligible) today too. Regarding this issue, I support
                it. Yoav. I think (unintelligible) (all the keys you write for me to).
                Thanks.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

(Alex):   (Alex), please.

Ram Mohan: Who was that?

(Alex):   (Alex), please.

Cary Karp: Ram, Cary too please, Ram?

Ram Mohan: And Cary…

Tin Wee: And Tin Wee.

Ram Mohan: …after (Alex).

Tin Wee: And Tin Wee.

Ram Mohan: Got it. (Alex).

(Alex):   Okay, thank you. I'll be short. I just support what Yoav said.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

(Alex):   Fully support, thank you.

Ram Mohan: Cary?

Cary Karp: I am one of the councilors. I will be voting on this. I am mortally concerned about the amount of documentation, not just in this working group but from all of the processes that are currently under way that council will need to wade through. And I am un-capable as in my other role being an IDN, (good contributor) of the IDN thinking. I just don't understand why we deliberately want to waste time asking council to read through wording that is not going to expect anything.

     If it is the consensus of this working group to waste council's time, it just makes it more difficult for those of us who are also going to go participating in council discussion to converged on the true value of what we are doing here. With that, I'm going to leave the subject.

Yoav: Can I comment on that, please. This is Yoav.

Ram Mohan: I'll have you on the queue. I have Tin Wee next.

Tin Wee: Thank you very much. I think it's still be a serious threat to the process of the discussions that we have and the few process that we've

undergone in this working group through selectively remove key critical items even though the fact that it exists as a support or what it's already present in this higher level document.

I seriously disagree with Cary's point that, you know, wasting the time off. In fact, we are actually re-affirming but certain points that for all you know, council maybe wavering on certain topics but the fact you said we have discussed it and we found it to be important. And it adds to their confidence in making certain decisions clearly and forthrightly and confident.

So, I think it's important for us to include this. And I certainly support what would you ask, and the others who have contributed this point – at this point.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Tin Wee. Yoav.

Yoav: Yeah. I just wanted to say that of course it's not my intention or anyone else to waste anyone's time. I think that what we're doing right now is talking too much on this issue. And - but I think that inputs, important inputs that we are putting in, even though they may be coming from other places also, it's not saying that we should delete it. It's important that we put it there. It's the time that is going to be spent on reading them is residual and it only makes the final result maybe is that these issues will be decided the same way by the council. So, I don't see the problem here. That's it.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I put in a comment, I'll make it short.

Ram Mohan: Yes. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, I guess as just as for what's another council voice. I think reading this extra paragraph is minuscule as compared to the amount of stuff that we're going to have to read based on our external comments in everywhere. And I think it's our responsibility to -- as councilors -- read every opinion that there is for us to read and understand that in processes. So, I guess I disagree with Cary on wasting our time.

Sophia Bekele: Ram, this is Sophia. Can I say something on that too.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead, Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: (With that), I speak also as a councilor, voting councilor and I just want to say that setting up a working group process to get their opinions and provide feedback to the council and not listening to their views is absolutely – that is more of a waste of time than it is, you know, not listening to - actually listening to what they have to say. So, in my opinion I think I will agree (consistently) with what Cary said. Thanks.

Ram Mohan: What's apparent to me – thank you – what's apparent to me is that we do not agree on this topic and therefore my default position from the working group's perspective, I'm going to suggest that we leave it as a support statement. And it doesn't mean that the council does have to do an extra work of filtering through what is redundant and what is not redundant.

                And, we just move on because I'm actually quite eager to have this talk about the support statements rather than the process for which of the statements should and should not be there. Let's move on as a result

folks. Let's just leave in here for now. And let's talk about the next issue which is – Olof are we at 4.1.3 then?

Olof Nordling: Well, we would be there but above precious little comments about that and I'll say (if there's anything). And it's probably...

Ram Mohan: Are there any comments on 4.1.3 then?

Olof Nordling: No. And it's almost perhaps something that could be considered for agreement. Support for promoting public awareness of IDN gTLD application opportunities at an early stage. I mean, we can say again that full scenes in other areas. And (Tina) you could certainly confirm that.

Ram Mohan: I'd like to leave it as is and if you're hearing no dissent or no other alternative views, we'll just leave it as is and we'll move to 4.1.4.

Is there any discussion? Let me call the question. Any discussion on 4.1.3?

Man: None.

Ram Mohan: Okay, 4.1.4, any discussion?

Man: None.

Ram Mohan: 4.1...

Avri Doria: Ah, yes. Sorry. I was just un-muting myself. I don't – I have mentioned in my note last week. I don't know what that is? I'm being ignorant and

further entrenchment of key word solution. I'm not sure I know what it means.

Werner Staub: This is Werner, I might explain.

Ram Mohan: Please go ahead Werner.

Avri Doria: If I'm the only one you can explain it off line or just put it in a note.

Werner Staub: It may actually be a note in that – in a number of countries where the script is such that ASCII domain names are not as comfortable as they would be in the West. There are – there's a proliferation of key word solutions where people will basically type an expression that is going to be a resolved by the name server – that's the DNS.

But, it is just a single word without adult in it typically. And it is essentially not visible if you're not connected to the same kind of ISPs. The less we have IDN gTLDs and IDN domain names available, the more this kind of solution developed and causes this situation of entrenchment in that as soon it has developed and has developed a large following., it is almost impossible to take back because people start to rely in it. Yet it is the broken internet this people can not communicate on that basis with other people. And they don't even know it.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Yeah. The all thing that I strictly support that I just would recommend it maybe I missed it putting somewhere in explanation. I may be the only person in the world that didn't know what it was. But just in case there's another person like me, I think we just need to explain it in the document somewhere.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. Avri, I suggest to put a line on that in the working definition.

Ram Mohan: Thank you Olof.

Avri Doria: I think that would be great.

Ram Mohan: Okay, we're done at 4.1.4, let's go to 4.1.5.

Olof Nordling: Yes.

Ram Mohan: Where do we stand on this?

Olof Nordling: I think there is for the very first support for prioritizing language scripts for the IDN gTLD launch according to the month need, possibly using a notion of distance to ASCII. I think that remains as a support statement if I interpret the flurry of e-mails correctly.

Ram Mohan: That is my interpretation as well. So, let's call the question. Are there any dissenting views to this first support thing?

Werner Staub: This is Werner, which is basically I'd like to modify it in a sense that it is not sure for us to be considered the correct Latin is less important. We just don't know. But, we could certainly say that right-left script is certainly important. So, it deserves priority. But we cannot say that somebody did not deserve priority as we it is. But if you put it...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I agree with that. Would you please write a short amendment to that and send it to the list?

(Ralph):   Actually my proposal would be just to remove ("than") to decorated Latin, just those four words.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Ram Mohan: Okay, understood. Is there any opposition to removing ("than") to decorated Latin?

Cary Karp: Could you read the entire thing in context again, please.

Ram Mohan: Support for prioritizing languages/script for IDN gTLD launch according to demand/need, possibly using a notion of "distance to ASCII". But then parenthesis, for example by giving higher priority to light – to right to left scripts. (Unintelligible).

Cary Karp: Where does the decorated ASCII come in or go out?

Ram Mohan: It use to say, for example, by giving higher priority to left to right scripts – sorry, to right to left scripts then to decorated Latin.

Cary Karp: Okay, got it.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Thank you. We will close this one. Let's go to the next one. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yes. And there's been the support for preferential treatment of application for particular communities in need of IDN gTLDs. For example, so lower entry barriers and has been this expression lower entry barriers has been put into question by quite a few. And also a...

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Olof Nordling: ...number of alternative views after…

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Olof Nordling: …if we start with the support statement.

Ram Mohan: Let me call the question. Any support or any comments on this current support statement?

Charles Sha'ban: Yes, there is.

(Tin Wee):   I (think), yes.

Ram Mohan: Who was that?

Charles Sha'ban: Charles Sha'ban.

Ram Mohan: (Charles), okay.

Charles Sha'ban: Just…

(Tin Wee):   And (Tin Wee).

Charles Sha'ban: We need to explain a little bit what is meant when we say "to lower entry barrier" that's it? That's my comment or maybe an additional sentence or something.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Thank you (Charles). (Tin Wee).

(Tin Wee):   Thank you. And I like to clarify that whenever we say that we want to have a lower entry barriers that should be three aspect that we use to measure criteria that we use to define what lower entry barriers we're talking about. And in my comment that I actually put in, I made it very clear that we should actually prioritize according to financial, technical if you – as well as the criteria of determining – determination by language communities and others who has the technology of what is appropriate for that typical culture.

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

Ram Mohan: Yes, you're on the queue.

Subbiah: Subbiah on the queue.

Ram Mohan: Cary, Subbiah. Okay, Cary.

Man: Yes.

Cary Karp: Let me start by noting that I firmly believe that there is need for some stratified the - that of entry level requirements here. But that lead can also attach to small non-profit organization in any linguistic or cultural context. So, the battery of metrics that we apply to this. It needs to be

somewhat richer than what we're currently discussing. And in fact is not exclusive for the IDN issue at all.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary. Subbiah.

Subbiah: First, I would say that, you know, the issue that Cary brings up about being applicable to non-IDN but to small non-profit in - - I'm sorry, to IDN but it could also apply to non-IDN small profit. I think that's taken as reasonable and it should considered.

But certainly, you know, this is an IDN way. So, I'm going to focus my comment in the IDN aspect of things. The – I think the issue of financial and technical barriers that (Charles) brought up the question. And I actually put out a lot of e-mails and, you know, just several hours ago, I'm not sure if anyone read it. But I like to sum up by saying that – if the question is "what is lower financial and technical criteria and so on."

Well, I think the key here is what is the minimum requirements that are required? Because it appears there's some instability out there, you know, some (adding) to that. So, is it going to come down or whatever? Because of lower technical stand, and so, entry requirement then, you know, the real issue is what does it- and who decides and what is it then (unintelligible)?

That's what (Charles) want to know. I think the point is that in IDN communities which are large and not necessarily but I think most of the IDN communities were looking at right now for. That's not just IDN got ASCII but IDN that, you know, where it is a truly a big need for the IDN gTDL.

Then, those communities tend to be logically poorer ones. And so, and they're more used to, you know, lower levels of general technology, general finances and so on. This doesn't mean that, you know, it's a questionable things like uptime, you know, registry in the U.S. or the West could expect servers in power out, it used to be at .00001% or something or is that not the case of this.

So, but they're certainly acceptable in this communities because that's how they live, the telephone works that way. In fact, the best yard sticks in my opinion to assess what the appropriate technical and financial strength. You know, they have to meet minimum standards like IDN – a software to be there and, you know, stuff like that, you know, minimum stuff.

But, besides that the way you decide how much you can lower these standards would be very much probably just looking at the local ccTLDs today. So, if you're talking about a country that has a particular – let's say a single country with a single IDN language. Well, a poor country.

Today it's running a track ccTLD of some kind, you know, in English ASCII. And they're operating based on much lower budgets, much lower technical levels and nobody is really complaining most – the vast majority of cases. It needs ICANN central because the servers are all dying, the root's dying or even local customers because they're used to that level of performance.

So, that could be a way of measuring, you know, if an IDN is going to be given - TLD is going to be given related to a language (of at least)

to a particular country. Then, whatever operational levels they're shown that is necessary to operate a sufficiently in the last (that we used to) ccTLD equivalent.

Well, that's the kind of standard that we probably need to set as a lower entry barriers. Because that works and, you know, and most of the IDN TLD uses would be – even though it would be a global TLD in that language. Probably most uses would come from that country anyway the one with this ASCII TLD has been operating in an ideal case.

So, my summary statement is that the metric to use, it cannot be solo that it screws up things but a good place to look is the local country's (unintelligible) that's vastly less, if you'd look at it that way in terms of local ccTLDs. The criteria, financial and technical - especially the financial, is likely to be a vastly less then what ICANN is used to using and awarding ccTLDs in the past. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you Subbiah.

Shahram   (Sharam) has a comment.

Ram Mohan: I have in the queue now after Subbiah, I have Steve Crocker, I have (Sharam) and (Alex). And before we go forward I would like to also make just a very quick observation which is that - I'll just point out that regardless of the (Nexus) of usage since we're talking about gTLDs, that is, you know administered by ICANN. We will end up having to worry about or need out geographic characteristics necessarily.

So, I have in the queue Steve Crocker, (Charles), (Sharam), (Alex) and (Tina), those are the request. So, time for you Steve.

Steve Crocker: Thank you very much Ram. I listened very carefully and with some empathy to the suggestion that the standards for ccTLDs in less advantage parts of the world, that that standard might be lowered to accommodate their needs. And though I'm very empathetic, it makes me very nervous because the trajectory, the path that would place is not a very comfortable one.

Things are likely to get much, much better very rapidly even in relatively poorly connected parts of the world. The kind of activity is improving, technical skills are improving. The availability of equipment is improving and as the network takes off, as the number of users and the number of registrants in any domain increases. Then very rapidly what looks like an entirely local problem becomes part of the global network – the global fabric.

There's plenty of help available and I think that we all and I'll speak for my self would be happy to help organize and get additional resources for anybody who feels the need for them. If from ICANN or from the Internet Society which engages in lot of outreach either for operations or for education or for technical assistance would respect to IDN and other things.

So, the idea of having a small enclave that meets with the local needs in a way that is disconnected from the overall fabric. It's easy to understand the appeal of that but I think that ultimately that would not serve that community very well for a very long period. It will only work

for a very short period of time and it would be to their ultimate disadvantage.

So, I counsel pretty much against that position and suggest that an alternate way to serve that need would be to sort of grasp hold of the issues and move forward rapidly as possible with the underlying technical issues and whatever support is required.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Steve. I have (Charles) next.

Charles Sha'ban: Okay. No. Sorry Ram I don't need to talk. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Okay, thank you. I have (Sharam) next.

Shahram   Okay. Thank you, Ram. Related to this issue I suppose to wave idea and I think this is obvious that there are big difference between the poor country and the rich countries. The reason is of - the First World the Third World, and fell of an (equation), the equation if we want to (unintelligible) limitation and the limitations for the applicants from the poor countries, who are you going to set this limitations.

I think in this issue, the only man who can have a point on this are the community of that country. There must be some people that know what's going on that country. And what is the potential of that country and I think a community from that country or that language I think. That language can not be said much better. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. I have (Alex) next.

(Alex): All right, thank you. I'll be quick. I'll talk for the course for (RAN) are used two years ago, was only 25,000 a year. So, that was before the oil get much more (unintelligible). So, actually, to have insurance, that looks more reasonable but just arrived to answer (unintelligible). So, we can make some fees their bank. So, the higher entry level not showing (unintelligible). So, I support to Subbiah, so, that we need to put just a reasonable entry barrier in the same time. We can afford the insurance for our business. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. I have (Tina) next.

Subbiah: Subbiah would like to be on queue later.

Ram Mohan: Okay, thank you. (Tina).

Tina Dam: Thanks Ram Mohan. So, I just want to mention from an ICANN stand point. It's really important that there's equal treatment of everybody. And that is really difficult because high entry barriers in one part of the world are really low in other part of the world. And so, it's really difficult to provide some sort of equal way for everybody (who are) applying for processing like this.

I know that this is something I think (unintelligible) or new gTLDs have discussed on how to make it possible for a particular community to have an easier way to apply and be a part of the process. Or at least for them to have an entry barrier that is similar in their regions to what it is in other regions, which means that they could be different.

It's also for example, some of the things that the registrar community is talking about in terms of ICANN accreditation of registrars where it is

difficult for some applicants to become accredited. They – they not
have - as far as I know none of these groups who have discussed this
before in their community and (unintelligible) community have found a
good solution on it.

So, it's something that, you know, is huge really importantly but it is
also something that needs a lot more work in order for it to work from a
practical implementation standpoint.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Tina). Subbiah.

Subbiah: Yeah. I just want to touch on a couple of things. Based on what
               (unintelligible) said, I think that his points at two types of criteria (we
               should be speaking). One is financial and one is technical. I don't think
               that what, from what I understand anything that's (Tina) said, you
               know, regarding the financial side of things. So I think, that you know,
               financial issue and (treated) separately, I don't think we took in real
               objection to that (unintelligible).

               Now, on the technical side, I think maybe (unintelligible) I am not
               saying that (thing as standard using) what I'm saying is that currently
               the ccTLD's that are functioning. All of the 600 of them or more, that
               are functioning fairly well with standard (unintelligible) with whatever
               standard they're using right now, probably will not - would be far away
               from any criteria that has been used in recent years for new gTLD
               applicant in English and in ASCII.

               So, whatever standard thing allows us around probably was
               significantly higher than what is in practice in running in many of these
               countries this ccTLD, lots of them. And without any great, you know,

concern at this point, (it should have been) but as of today, today is when we're talking about our next year, when we we're talking about IDN launching.

So, at that point in time, we know that from a technical standpoint, you know, lots of ccTLD are able to operate reasonably well without too many complaints from so many sectors at a certain level.

It's a lot less than the current applying (to that) maybe given to the gTLD standard (that they don't give us) on this application. So there's a lot of room there (that used to) standard without actually on a local basis, region by region basis by looking on what's going on there without actually affecting anything terribly. Plus a very long (unintelligible), everybody is going to move on anyway.

The existing ccTLD today, that are operating today, you know, probably didn't want using the same service of the same standard and they were five years ago things have moved. They're moving up as well.

So, I think the gap is very large. The point is can we move some of that gap down in these cases. That's the point that I try to (implicate). And secondly the - as regard to what (Tina) mentioned, I believe (Tina) brought up the (burdens) of that to be (fained) to the things that ended group that ICANN mandated.

Well, if that were the case, then what we're now seeing is, it's fair because it makes sense to everyone. I mean that's on the financial side. Well, you can make it today by saying you speak for everybody. You know, you could - that was being suggested as well in my original

e-mail that you want to keep it fair and useful for everybody saying, "We'll make it easy for everybody." So, the more expensive guys – can also participate. If that's the issue is that we're trying to set, you know, if it's fake it can be fair to lower level as in. It doesn't have to be prepared to the higher level. Okay.

So that's the point. And lastly, I'd like to (unintelligible) specifically required, if I'm not mistaken, of the GNSO in a recent document that there should be more regional diversity in TLD applicants coming round. I think they meant that both in English and IDN and generalizing and I think, you know, the - but it's going to certainly happen in English. If it – the standards are awfully high, you know, but in the IDN case, if that's can be, you know, essentially (unintelligible) lowered to meet the (recently used) the only regional in many ways. If you ask global, people are using it in probably 95% of regional areas.

Now, you know, if we can lower that standard, it's still standing that would be an easier way for - to meet the GAAC request of, you know, a more distributed. You know, things out there. So, the more IDN TLD will probably come out in IDN regions where English in TLD continue to go to the Western favors but overall there'll be a geographical data specified. Like the way by simply, you think the areas various (in recommends that) to everybody. But GAAC is pretty serious about this issue, well, and if you don't ever mention this to automatic output. Well, in principles, GAAC in the future could be (mandated), you know, the (unintelligible) that would be even worse I think most people in ICANN.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Subbiah.

Werner Staub: (Unintelligible). Could I enter the queue?

Ram Mohan: Werner, go ahead.

Werner Staub: Yeah, I think we – a simple example might show how Steve Crocker
                 and this Subbiah agree. In 2000 there was criteria used in terms of
                 throughput shared registry system in terms of how many have
                 requested for new domain per second send. And of course, depending
                 on the number of expected domains in the TLD which is total
                 (unintelligible) 100 new domains per second. However, on the other
                 hand, if we talk about the revolution towards these of the settings gTLD
                 service, nobody would reasonably say that the given gTLD should be
                 okay with 95% revolution capability. You know, and 5% of the time, the
                 domain would not resolve. That is of course would be nonsense.

                 So, as Steve said if it become available to make sure that it's easy now
                 (unintelligible) TLD service and there's actually current tracking the
                 TLD's in the community. There's no problem in that than
                 (unintelligible), so, if we could think and rephrase referring to support
                 statement, such as without endangering adequate service that will stop
                 to communicate.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. Werner. Are there any other..

Subbiah: I just wanted to make one other point Subbiah might have pinpoint.

Ram Mohan: Okay, if you could make it quick and briefly.

Subbiah: Yeah, you know, on the second side - on the technical side, if the
                 settings is very high, the difference is cost, you know, between very

high and a slightly lowest is actually it's on linear, you know, if you asked for, you know, .001% on auxiliary as opposed to .01 auxiliary.

You know, the cost could be dramatically depicting, you know, and that's the kind of thing that we could allow for while we know that, you know, that the lower one will not probably brake in, you know, the calamity (unintelligible). Thank you.

Man: (Hear me out) and search it briefly. I'd be delighted to have that discussion on the side, not bother the entire list. And try to sort that out in a sensible way.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. In fact that's actually direction I was moving which is that I think we've allowed adequate opportunities for everybody to have their perspective thing for 4.1.5 the same statement. I think we have a reasonable proposal from Werner to modify the factual statement. Olof, if you could please take note of that out as a, you know, suggested modification and allow us to move on to 4.2.1.

Olof Nordling: Could, please repeat your statements or the addition that you wanted to make to (unintelligible)...

Werner Staub: What I propose without endangering adequate quality service for the respective community.

Ram Mohan: Ram, I would like for Werner to post that to the list and for other…

Werner Staub: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: …members who want modifications to modify, please. And I'd like to move on to the next topic which is 4.2.1. 4.2.1 currently says the support for considering local regional pre existing development regarding IDN gTLD's, for example the experimental IDN systems supported by the (unintelligible) when considering introduction of new IDN gTLD's. And Yoav had some suggestions as of others. Let's open this topic for discussion now.

Olof Nordling: Could you put me in the queue? It's Olof here.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Right. I think, I've seen a lot of the comments going in quite a few and rather second base into territory where I would feel that it would be tantamount to some kind of language recognition that will turn it to blue. And that is - well, then we're, addiction to ICANN's mission review which is the single route.

So, I think we've, as we forward right now for considering, well, yes. (Consider) you can always do but to go further than that, I mean we should also keep ICANN's mission in mind here.

(Tin Wee):   (Tin Wee) here.

Ram Mohan: Okay, (Tin Wee) you're on the queue and I...

(Tin Wee):   Thank you. Can I come back on that point and I think that is precisely the point. You recognize that these alternative so-called alternative rules of independent deployment or as Avri mentioned, those that run the hits experiment with IDN gTLD's without center support. If you

recognize that, you will certainly realize that this is indeed ICANN's mission to de-fragment an already fragmented domain name phase. And that's exactly what we're trying to bring them back into the fold because if you don't, they will forever be out there.

So, this is entirely within the ICANN's mission, bring them back by supporting them to some degrees of recognition that they have not have center support deploying ahead with the IDN, belatedly ICANN now, and ICANN really now has recognized that what they are doing is the right way forward that we should take into consideration IDN at the TLD level and therefore in this state, we're basically trying to say please come back in the fold because that keeps the unified group.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Tin Wee).

Cary Karp: Can Cary ask a question please?

Ram Mohan: Sure Cary, go ahead.

Cary Karp: I'm wondering, this recognition of the root aside of the segments of the name space that we are now welcoming back into the fold. Do the labels that appear in any of those root zones have any priority in the way you're looking at this in the application phase for the legitimate TLD labels?

Subbiah: Subbiah would like to be in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Subbiah in the queue. Anyone else who'd like to be in the queue?

Tina Dam: Ram, this is (Tina) in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Okay (Tina).

(Alex):   (Alex) here.

Ram Mohan: I had Steve Crocker, I had (Alex). Okay. All right, Subbiah.

Subbiah: I'd like to say that, you know, basically, the statement as it stands is just as considering. No one is, I think at this point saying that they have to be accepted that these things that have already been done have to be accepted. I think...

Ram Mohan: Actually, sorry to interrupt Subbiah, I think on the mailing list there is such a request. That's not in the document but on the mailing list.

Subbiah: Okay. But anyway, my own take on this is that the idea would be that before I can proceed in a IDN gTLD launch in a particular area, it will consider what's happened, you know, what could the local community figure out what's happened in that area.

              Now, if it so turns out that there is a pre-existing development, now, you know, as far as this alternate roots and as Olof brought it up. I've never heard a proper definition of alternate root over the last ten years. It is always changing, that changes every single time. We've been, you know, I've been involved in IDN development from 1998 or '97.

              Every other year, ICANN's idea of what an alternate root seems to change, you know, and this is the police law, and what is allowed is so-called an IDN view has changed. You know, depending ASCII label to

the end and resolving was completely disallowed or at least, you know, they thought it could be a bad idea in year 2000 or 2001. It keeps changing. There's nobody at ICANN with very much institutional memory who pronounces on these things, every three years, somebody else.

So, let's leave that aside this idea, what is being used, either – whether it's an alternate root or a proxy or whatever. The issue is - the core issue that people have gone ahead and done what they thought is possible while pretty much following the IDNA standard and every other standards that's out there.

Besides that, they added a layer to something that they're that doing which allows them to do it themselves while there was no central coordination, by ICANN or anyone. So, you know, so that's what happens. So, characterizing in different things is really, you know, as long as they kind of followed IDNS - IDNA and they're generally right, that's okay.

Then the issue is, once you look in and say look, a group or have already done something in that country or region. The question then is to figure out with the local community. How genuine is that? How much support is there for it? And on a case by case basis figure out what to do.

Now, it may well turn out to be the case that in some countries like we all know about China, they're not going to give up. Then most likely, they just going to say, "We've already done this, please accommodate us". That's probably what they will say to ICANN then, you know, they

have in the past injury, you know, in the 2000 to 2003. They've been very vocal about all these.

So, they - if that's what happens and they turn out in that particular case, what will end up happening in a compromise situation, would that – is that ICANN will pretty much work together with China and that they will sort out that language case with the country. So, in the sense, you know, everything will become unified. So, you know, there won't be de-fragmented, as (Tin Wee) says.

Now, in other countries maybe, in other situations, it may turn out that when they go into that country and you take a look and you realize whatever deployment, there's small or there's no unified group that, you know, there's reason to think that, you know, that whatever happened before is not, you know, doesn't go above except the boss. So, you know, and you've different kind of paradigm will be worked out of the day. And, you know, and this is would be on a case by case basis in the two places where people have already done this.

Now, to answer Cary's point, is there a priority that whatever people have already launched in this country. So, that becomes - one can apply for it. Well, I don't think that - at least in my opinion - that is the case, you know, it'll be considered on a case by case basis.

On the other hand, if you're not going to consider on a case by case basis, you're going to a country group and you realize somebody have already done something with the particular TLD equivalent, and you want to go ahead and, you know, ICANN wants to go ahead and issue the same thing. It'll be, you know, ICANN probably could. But it'll be

rather be fool hardy because you'll just be making worse a confusingly - a confusing situation worse.

You know, where as everybody's looking for centralized support to make all of these be right as Avri pointed out. You know, so, if ICANN doesn't take the opportunity that, going forward to resolve some of these issues on a case by case basis, if nothing as a given, you know, then, you know, that will be a very sensible thing to do. And ICANN will be applauded for stepping in finally into the space to do something good for everybody.

Cary Karp: Using this case by case treatment could be prior to the formal application for a domain or after the complete form of said requirements, following an application has been met.

Subbiah: Ram, it's Subbiah. May I answer Cary since I don't think...

Ram Mohan: Yeah. Please go ahead. Yeah. That seems to be clarifications. So, please do go ahead and respond.

Subbiah: All right. So, I don't – so, repeat that question so that I can be very quick about this Cary, please. Cary could you please…

Cary Karp: What I heard, the question was…

Subbiah: Yeah.

Cary Karp: …whether this consideration is prior to new applications coming in or after new applications come in.

Subbiah: I would suspect, if you are going to require the local community. I mean obviously it can be done at both level. But in my opinion, it'd be sensible to do it prior to taking, to find out because, you know, I mean it's easier to fix the problem if you already know, at least find out what's going on in each place. And if a local language community input is being put in, I bet they'd certainly know. I mean, you know.

I mean, for instance, when Avri asked the question about what's the key word, sorry Avri, I don't mean to be rude at all here, okay. But you're a councilor with some deep interest in IDN and you know, at this stage in time, you've asked what key words are but there are people like, "We're no." I mean there are people who in the language community would know automatically that key words are quite flourishing in a number of countries, extremely flourishing.

And, you know, and if you ask people in those communities, they would say immediately. You know, they would know what the issue is and so on. So the best place in general is to ask the community. And when you ask the community, before you do this application process will be a sensible thing to do. I would imagine.

Yoav: It's Yoav here, can I be on the queue please.

(Luna Cadabe):   This is (Luna Cadabe). Can I be on the queue?

Ram Mohan: Okay. Thank you. I have (Tina) next.

Tina Dam: Thank you, Ram. So, I think this is a really difficult topic. Of the alternate IDN system setups that I know at least something about, it's not everything about in some cases. Not all of them follow the IDN

standards. Not all of them follow the IDN guidelines. Not all of them are representatives of the community that they plan to be serving.

So, I think it's really – well, at least it's not possible for me to support on this 4.2.1 statement as it stands because - or as it's suggested to be expanded. Because it's just not possible for ICANN to provide special consideration to setup that do not follow ICANN's mission or the standards that ICANN recognizes.

Now, another thing about this and Subbiah, you brought up several times, the community that's being supported and so forth. I actually believe that a lot of this alternate setup and the way that they should be handled belongs much more under the CCNSO GAAC joint working group than the GNSO working group on IDN policies.

And the reason for that is that a lot of them looked, you know, at least to me on the face as if they were some sort of internationalized ccTLD or territory representatives, top level domains and not generic top level domains. So, I actually think that this support statement should be removed completely from this report.

Subbiah: I would like to address (Tina's) point later on.

Ram Mohan: Okay, I'll put you in the queue, Subbiah. (Tina) any other point?

Tina Dam: I think for now I'm good. I might join the queue later.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. I have Steve Crocker.

Shahram   Would you put (Sharam) on the queue?

Ram Mohan: OK. I'll have (Sharam) on the queue as well. Steve Crocker you have the floor.

Steve Crocker: Yeah, I'm not sure exactly which point I'm responding to with this – this is...

Ram Mohan: Ah, this is – where on the 4.2.1 support for considering local, regional preexisting developments regarding IDN gTLDs. For example, the experimental IDN system supported by the Arab league when considering introduction of new gTDLs, that's what was written but on the mailing list we have other suggestions including the incorporation of "alternate root system."

Steve Crocker: Yeah. Well. So as, you know, as we heard earlier that the term "alternate root" seems to not be clear in everybody's mind and what it means to my mind is always been extremely clear. It means that instead of sending a DNS query to one of the 13 official root servers. It goes off to some other database that has got a different list of top level domains

That's not a very helpful path and leads ultimately to fragmentation of the network. And I understand that there' this strong desire to have local needs meet and a sense of frustration that they're not being met fast enough. And I also understand that there are other ways of accomplishing things that have the same end effect by having translations that are buried in the - or embedded in the local interface- in the user software.

That's a wholly different matter from a technical perspective even though from the end-use's point of view it might seem similar. And the test as to why that's different has to do with what happens if you take that machine with you to go to another place around the world or you try to resolve names from a different place around the world or you sent the domain name to somebody else and they try to resolve it.

The basic idea is that once you are able to trade names back and forth and everybody should get the same answer wherever you do it from. So, the idea was establishing alternative roots and having different operators sell or encourage the creation of new top level domain independently, it's simply going to lead to collusions and fragmentation all over the place.

And I think that has to be discouraged. I would choose words of the order not based on authority or what kinds of things ICANN chooses to decide. But on the basis of what things are feasible and what works, I think ICANN's fundamental role is to help the community with the things that are technically feasible as opposed to making arbitrary decisions.

And so, it's not really so much a question of authority or political brokering although I know it looks that way sometimes.

Ram Mohan: Steve. I have (Alex) next on the queue.

(Alex): Thank you. I think I can contribute much more if he will considering in case by (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) work was done in local level. So, I actually agree with Subbiah and that's it. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. I have Yoav.

(Yuhof Karan):   Yes. First I would like to – start with a very general, say that either fix it for once or it will break. And it's already kind of broken and I think we should fix it. I think - I hope everyone understands what I mean. I don't want to (unintelligible) where other people were talking about. I don't want to repeat it, just one point that (Tina) brought up that some of the implementation - I don't know, I'm not too familiar with the – all of them that are not colored by (unintelligible) in a protocol (unintelligible).

Well, that could be (Tina) something that once ICANN comes and decides as I brought up in the email on a case by case basis. To require a change and to require whatever it says (unintelligible) this time with implementation. And it is something that you cannot ignore then in order to include it formally within ICANN to require the changes that should be done. I don't think it would be too complicated to accomplish.

And finally I want to be a little practical, the funny thing here, is that this issue became controversial after it will already support the statements in this – the paper and don't have to elaborate because there is only one example coming from the Arab league and I certainly think that in China case should be if we talk about the Arab league and clearly talk about the China and the other, you know, generally the communities and the communities (unintelligible).

And I think we should maybe try – I certainly think (unintelligible) things (unintelligible) also here support for this point in the working group. I think we should try maybe to walk through the final wording that was

proposed by (Kori) or (Hong Su). And maybe accept one of the bows – one of them that's so the final word. That's it.

(Tin Wee):   Can I come on queue? (Tin Wee) here.

Ram Mohan: Okay. I have you on the queue. Thank you Yoav. Werner.

Werner Staub: Yes, I think (unintelligible) to tend to create a alternative root and sell pre-registration. And generally accept the promotion it has been brought about by a bit of attention as an intermediary (unintelligible) solution in view of actually getting the final solution which is the IDN TLD.

And in this case Arab league and the Chinese solutions are certainly things that should be accepted. And we could probably include a phrase such as developments that are related to (unintelligible) the unity as a provider. In terms of what (Tina) said but this would be only an IDN ccTLD question, I beg to disagree. Because specifically the principles of China we have two probable (unintelligible) which worked introduce word for equivalent to commoner that means company of network that we're introducing there – certainly not IDN ccTLDs there are certainly (unintelligible). So, it is not something that (unintelligible).

(Hung):   Ram Mohan this is (Hung). Can I be in the queue?

Ram Mohan: Sure (Hung) I have the queue.

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: And Ram Mohan at some point (unintelligible) with (Tina) so I should
                be in the cue again.

Ram Mohan: I do have you in the queue...

Subbiah: That's OK, no problem. Let the others get on with the issue. Thank
                you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. And in fact you are next in line Subbiah go ahead.

Subbiah: Oh. (Hong Su) wanted to say something. She can because I've already
                said it.

Ram Mohan: I understand but...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: There are others between you and (Hong) so I appreciate it if you
                would get in the line (unintelligible).

Subbiah: I just want to point out again what Werner said that about what (Tina)
                mention. We're talking about IDN ccTLDs right now meaning the
                country does really need – I mean IDN.ANS only for the Western
                scripts in many ways already.

                So, if this is a group they're looking at, the truly disenfranchised of IDN
                TLD. China comes probably a third of the (unintelligible), you know,
                probably a third of the (unintelligible) and they've gone ahead more or
                less to gTDL as Olof pointed out. So, by far it seems about numbers

out there probably (unintelligible) gTLD is the one that has been deployed in this sort of alternate way at this point in time.

Okay. So, it's not – I would say. Secondly I like to address as a way of solving this issue. Maybe if we focus on the actual text and see what alternate we can all live with and move forward. So, from that point of view I think (unintelligible), you know, I'm - in what I'm – propose as the (unintelligible) the original text probably (unintelligible) Avri suggested earlier and number of others have suggested earlier.

So, my suggestion is to keep the (unintelligible) statements weighted except for adding a thing in a clause. First the key thing to worth considering (unintelligible) so it doesn't obligate anyone, you know, 100% or anything. Okay.

So, what I want to know (unintelligible) the support for considering and then you can add a phrase and not penalizing any local regional preexisting development bla-bla-bla. So, I just consider that (unintelligible) previous exceptions to penalized, OK, as long as their willing to (unintelligible).

And considering and not penalizing blah blah blah and then run by the Arab league, run by the Arab League followed by China and other (unintelligible) of smaller skills. So, we include, you know, recommend others (unintelligible). When considering a new action of new IDN gTDL serious that's what it's for.

Where we could add the phrase to avoid potential confusion and backlash and leave it at that. So, now read the whole thing one last time and then get off the line. What I am proposing support for

considering and not penalizing any local interesting regional pre-existing development regarding IDN gTLD.

For example, the experimental IDN system run by the Arab league, China and other countries in a smaller scale. When considering introduction of new IDN gTDL coma to avoid potential confusion, backlash. And that's the right thing and the last point is that which – almost everyone with modern IDN (unintelligible). More or less 80%, 90% followed IDN (unintelligible) in fact they're very well known cases that didn't follow IDN for a while.

For instance Kuwait, Kuwait it was used in very (unintelligible) years before they (unintelligible) more or less it was – the format was different (unintelligible). And it doesn't meant that the requirement is ICANN what to reach out with this principle in cases where what they have done might be accepted in some way.

Then, you know, the people – they're obligated to fully follow the IDNs (unintelligible). Thank you.

(Man):   Thank you. I have currently the following people on the cue. I have (Sharam), myself then (unintelligible), (Hong) on the cue. Anybody else on the queue?

Tina Dam: Ram Mohan this is (Tina) back in the (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: OK. (Tina) back in the cue.

(Man):   Ram Mohan this (unintelligible) there's something (unintelligible)
                there's a lot of echo on the line. Someone is using the speaker, please
                put it to mute I think we are all suffering from the same thing.

Ram Mohan: Thank you ...

Avri Doria: This is (Avri) (unintelligible) can I be in the queue?

Ram Mohan: OK (Avri) I'll put you in to cue. OK, (Sharam).

Shahram   (Unintelligible). Pardon. Pardon.   Do you hear me?

Ram Mohan: Yes, we can hear. Go ahead.

Shahram   I want to report about the support at this point. And there was an
                argument at this point. So, someone I forgot to (unintelligible). Are not
                helpful. I want to say that there are two aspects, one is technical
                aspect and the technical aspect is this are truth. Then maybe the
                (unintelligible) development have a company called (IDN). But I think
                (unintelligible) will not finally affected the situations. Because I find
                (unintelligible) finally for this rules and every applicants must obey the
                rule.

                But there is another (aspect) that I want to mention. (And this is the
                cultural aspect) I want to state that (unintelligible) very interesting
                development have a very important (position) aspect in the use of the
                Internet much more. I think the – this developments are now playing a
                role in creating the culture of using the IDN.

And this might be – (might not be mentioned). So, I want to support this issue and I think it's a great idea on the changing the - and the (unintelligible). The Arab league working on this situation and (unintelligible) which is working in corporation with the (Iranian Registry).

That's all. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Sharam).

(Man): Good Afternoon, (Unintelligible) (Tina) and Avri.

In this topic, specific issue I am going to take off my chair hat and speak as an employee or fiscalist which operate the .info to TLD. I'd like to say (state the following) if for instance .info has been already used. Exactly the initialism not some other word semantically meaning similar. But, exactly the initialism of the .info if let us say it has been used in some other language or some script.

And we follow or we recommend that such a – what I consider from the .info registry clearly confusing, clearly fragmented and really something that is a rouge registration system. If that is then incorporated into the mainstream, my concerned as a .info registry operator is registrants would probably come to ...

((Crosstalk))

(Man): ((Foreign language spoken))

(Man):   ...probably come to us and ask for us to support this (system). I'm also concerned about other issues such as dispute revolutions. The fact that the legitimate users in the .info TLD potentially get the – got pre-empted by some set of people who decided to just go and you know, create some name space as they roam. And then, there was a request to integrate in.

So, I'm pretty concerned about those kind of aspects – I am very convinced that there is going to be user confusions in terms of would be users' experiences. And I also do things that although it is a – the suggestion is that it will unite what is already a fragmenting - without a due care and due caution. I actually think that all of these going to result in is further fragmentation rather than unification.

So, that's just directly from a .info registry perspective. I will now go back to putting my chair hat on. And pass the floor to Tin Wee.

(Man):   Can I have a clarification on the last comment that you made, ah Ram Mohan. Wearing your hat as a (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Sure.

(Man):   And that is why do you think that they will lead more fragmentation when our all exercise here is that there are countries, there are groups out there who have been telling ICANN all the while ever since that they've been waiting for the deployment to along. That now finally I can realized it's a good way going forward for enabling a new way of expansion of the Internet being the global information infrastructure that would cater to the needs of all languages. Why do you think that it will increase the fragmentation?

Ram Mohan: Because I think what will happen is between the time the recommendations goes in, if it is actually acted upon. I expect probably 20 to 30 other new groups to come about who will simply go and register .info in new alternate system, because we now have said that will going to grant all of that in. And the – and that's where I see there's going to be a problem.

And again, I'm talking about .info initialism rather than some semantic equivalent.

(Man):   Yeah, well I did the survey last year and we looked at it and we've found that people has fairly responsible about making sure that there is collision. So,..

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I understand what you're saying but is the responsible players I don't think this – that the world we're in consist of primarily of only responsible players. And that's my concern

(Man):   (Rey) back in the cue.

(Man):   Was that Werner?

(Warner):   Yes.

(Man):   Well , yes, it's very convenient, well if that's your point then I – basically saying that the least you could do is not to penalized those people who have already – that have been pioneering the IDN for a

long time basically pointing the wave for the IDN (unintelligible). And what's (the way forward) for ICANN and here you are turning around and saying "Oh, well thank you very much, that's very much for all the pioneering effort and good bye to you."

I think we should not penalize this group who has taken the risk of testing up this pioneering these IDN deployments to pave the way forward. And to basically not recognize them or to fail to rectify - consider them and as (Tina) said and I actually wonder if I can make this comment that you should have completely removing this statements. Actually it helps them all.

In fact, by removing these statements I would say that it would further extends the problem by stating to this result. We don't recognize you, I'm sorry. But we are going to do exactly what you're doing now five years later. And exactly what you are doing and you stand in the cue.

Other fundamental (inherent unplanning) is going to become so obvious that you're going to have a lot of problem. And if you continue to fail to recognize (unintelligible). The (unintelligible) is voted out (unintelligible) the flood gates have already opened. And people who choose not to recognize this sect continue to live it in an unreal world.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Timothy). I acknowledge what you're saying but, you know, I going to keep moving the – our cue forward. I understand exactly what you're saying.

(Man): Thank you.

Ram Mohan: (Hong Si) is next in the cue.

(Hong Si):   (Unintelligible).

The issue raised in 4.2.1, my opinion should be looked at some two perspectives. The first perspective is looked at the local language community. With some pre-existing IDN developments, I can – could sense that the local language community and they are genuinely serving the community. And it's really important to praise the difficulty to widen that community.

In certain circumstances I really don't believe ICANN should deprive the user in that community for enjoying the services of such IDN development. And that if I can just show it would be inconsistent with purpose of development of IDN.

And inconsistent with the principle of internationalisation and multi-lingualism. Ah, look at the second perspective of which I believe is equally important- whenever this preexisting development has been bring – brought into the ICANN IDN process they should be able to be confined with all the ICANN requirements- including the policy requirements and technical standards.

Now, that should be complying with IDN.guidelines so it's not a question at all. And they should also be following the ICANN policy. And many people mentioned about this PC that (unintelligible) sort of test that cc registration for that – that equivalent to .network and .company. Well, I don't know their technical design but as a user for .CN, I can explain that. They are fully operated and the .CN so arguably they are NOT alternative ccTLD. They are not alternative

group. They are operating fully on the .CN so, this a authoritative group.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Hong).

I have (Tina) next.

Tina Dam: Thanks Ram Mohan. Uh mm, so, I actually don't know if I'm understanding things the right way. But, if we talk about not penalizing and allowing these ultimate IDNs set up to be considered so anyone else can apply.

And if we're talking about grandfathering them in and all of those things that have been said. That to me seems like preferential treatments. And preferential treatments because somebody has setup an alternate system and in some cases and alternate root system. I think it's not OK.

Anybody can set up an alternate root system if they want to. It's not that difficult. If we put just a support statement in their we're going to have a flood of alternate root set ups of all kinds of people across the world who wants preferential treatment like that. I don't think that's OK, I think that's directly against ICANN's mission and I think that's very problematic.

Now, I think everybody should have equal access. I think participation is OK. I think everybody can apply at the same level as everyone else. But there should not preferential treatment to people who set up alternate roots. You know people who have done early IDN implementation of course, should participate in the IDN development.

The protocol development is open. There's lots of working groups that are open on – for participation. There is – there's working group who had added up servers to include some of those people who have done early IDN implementation.

Participation is OK but preferential treatment when we talk about applications is not OK. We're going to have a flood of people doing if we allow anything line that. And it's just damage the whole set up and it means that those who legitimately needs these international top level string won't get them. Or if they will get them it will take years from now and I don't think there's anybody on the call who wishes for that to happened.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Tina).

I have (Avri).

(Avri): OK, yeah. What are the things I guess one concerned I have was was adding (specificity) to the notion of who would be supported. And what I have time to suggest is that there should be a general statement of the court. That people who had worked previously on trying to do IDN development when ICANN was quite ready for it shouldn't be penalize for that - shouldn't be called illegitimate.

Now, by the same token, I'm not saying that they should get preferential treatment or in any way be grandfathered in. And that's why I was suggesting that we should do our utmost to support the legitimate work that has gone on before. And not exclude it or penalizing it but I think to go so far as to say that anybody that worked

on IDN before was in some sense illegitimate. And supporting them would be against you know, ICANN principles is going to fall in the other direction.

And so really what I was trying to call for it, let's not single out who needs to be supported. Let's just sort of say recognized that there has been work done before, you know, the ICANN centralized work is being completed. And that ICANN should do its utmost to support that work in so far as it fits in with what is being done. Without the all the second (unintelligible).

Thanks.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Avri).

Werner.

Werner: I actually would like to say again try to get those two of use together. Because certainly what (Tina) says is correct we shouldn't make any preferential treatment. On the other hand we all know that the legitimate efforts that are supported by the language community of (unintelligible) supported by the entire language community.

And we should give an adequate consideration. Right now we have to work consider in it which is not to strong which is not say give preferential treatment. And the changes that Subbiah put in I think are useful or probably we would have to add specifically provide in terms that they wants this to be – developed as a task that are generally accepted by the respective language community. Not something that has been done in a speculative fashion just, you know, in the corner.

And say here no, here I am the pioneer. We have this trend ten years ago already.

(Man):   I would agree.

Ram Mohan: Thank you Werner.

                (Edmon).

(Edmon):   Ah, yes. Looking at (unintelligible) please. Most of what (Tina), (Avri) and Werner said I, you know, pretty much agree. And I want to bring up one issue that (Tin Wee) mentioned that it would be sort of unfair for those who have trunked it out. I guess that could be so much of concern if – because those who do have the support from the community will eventually will go to the ICANN process as, you know, any other applicant. And that would be any problem. So making that sort of assumption or statement probably premature and most likely (on considering to).

Ram Mohan: Thank you Edmon.

Shahram   (Sharam) on the queue again, please.

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

Shahram   Okay. Should I speak now?

Ram Mohan: Yes please.

Shahram   Okay. I want to again, I want to say that's I'm not (unintelligible) of what (Tina) says, I think we don't know we should not (adjust) we'll get at this point technically. We should have a view in all our stakes in all views. Okay. Thank you.

Subbiah: Subbiah. I just would like to be on the queue, just see whether we can get some wording we can all agree on.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Subbiah go ahead

Subbiah: Let me reemphasize again. The draft as it stands, the one with the original one with the modifications, I suggest that we can include the one that, one that said looks support with the language community or something. Which Hung (Zu) will perhaps just said in effect if she got to mention the same thing as well. If we add that one in as well, the current statement just says it's considering. It doesn't grandfather anything. It doesn't do anything of that nature. Okay.

               To say that, I don't really see where (Tina) is getting that from. I mean it doesn't say it's grandfathering. It doesn't say automatically these people will get it or any of those things. It just, and as I mentioned earlier, is on a case by case basis. Right? I mean, you know, you can add that if you like, in there.

               Now, it's the reality of the situation. The reality of the situations no matter what you write here or you don't write here. There will be a time and point where in the future where something will be launched, say in a particular language, as some movement has already happened previously. Let's just say, you know, in some cases, you know, I can't,

way of doing it, go forward and a new TLD would turn up and it will be supersede what happened before in that community.

Now, there will certainly be some communities where that will not happen. They will fight back. In this real world, they won't stay (therefore). I suspect China will be one of them. And I suspect the Arab League is likely to be another one. Okay. So, this is what it is.

So what do we, is this what is wanted? I mean the reality is going to be that certain of these large group will hold it (again). So, all these statement does is as (Avri) points out, essentially is to say, is a recognition and that, in some support of considering what they've done. And talking with them, making sure whether we could find a workable way in the a case by case basis to move forward. It doesn't say that they have to be grandfather or any of those things.

Now, in terms of, to be addressing the issue that Ram is saying which is legitimate. Lots of people will go off and will register something and do they, do they automatically get it ? Well this thing doesn't say they ought to go in anybody's getting automatically, and you think, as far as I can tell.

So, there's no real issue there. Now, the question is, should you also sort of consider them because...

Ram Mohan: I'm sorry Subbiah. I didn't mean to interrupt but I was saying that because there is a proposal on the mailing list…

Subbiah: Right.

Ram Mohan: …that they should be integrated, not just considered but should also be integrated. Now, that's should be...

Subbiah: Okay. Now, my own point is I, you know, I don't know, maybe I'm hearing something different. But I don't think there seems to be support for that at the moment. I don't think that there seems to be support for saying that "automatically everyone has applied ever before or in the future in the land (rush) to say that in months or weeks, you know, should automatically get this". I don't think. I mean I think we're beyond that. I mean, you know, I don't think there's support for that neither would at my opinion be fair, okay.

But, so, I'm trying to see, what it is that minimally that we can agree on. I mean one has tried to hit that way too. Now, then we can see whether at least what we're proposing is acceptable to enough that we can go forward. Okay. So, that's all I'm trying to do. So, I'm just saying, the way to achieve as far as, you know, the notion, the words like "pioneering" in there exclude essentially people, sort of exclude the people who'd be starting up soon or something like that in some sense.

Secondly, you know, the – everything will still be a case by case basis. And what I'm suggesting also just considering only so its a weak enough statement that, you know, my again to reemphasize, I mean one I can work out a way into insert another clause in there saying "appreciated by the community" if necessary, (unintelligible) but I'll reiterate what I had put out. Support for considering and not penalizing, you know, and not penalizing.

And if you want we can throw in the word "pioneering" which consider some kind of time line. Support for considering and not penalizing pioneering local regional pre-existing development starting IDN gTLDs.

For example, the (expressing of) IDN system run by the Arab League, China and other countries in a smaller scale when considering introduction of new IDN gTLDs to avoid potential confusion backlash. And you know one I can throw in something about the language community generally appreciative of (probably) at the same thing. That's my suggestion.

Ram Mohan: Subbiah, I would ask that you put that on to the list and we continue these discussions on the list.

Folks I note that we are about ten minutes beyond our original allocated time and I didn't want to cut this important conversation short but we are out of time. And we are also at the end of this call. I would like to make the following observations:

First, you all have been absolutely wonderful in working together and in bringing - I think a great deal of forward momentum in the over all area of IDN, especially an IDN policy. And for that I thank you and I appreciate your work and effort. I think we will find as is inevitable when we have bright people together (unintelligible) by areas that we agree on another area that we do not agree on.

But I commend you for, in general keeping a civil dialogue and being able to present your points of view in a reasoned manner. I appreciate it very, very much. And I'd also like to say that we would not be here

without the able assistance of Glen and Olof and all the other staff who have helped us form the ICANN (side) I'd like to thank them.

And I'd like to say it's been good working with all of you. Of course, we'll be working much more together as IDNs are only at the early stages of life. And as Sophia says the "usual subsets" will be around. And we will have the support published for you to come in time before we actually make it final. We will have that out, the goal is to publish a (final report) account to the council by end of day tomorrow. So, it will require your attention between today and tomorrow.

And, Yeah?

Subbiah: I have one last operational point. We've just found out that in the last of the day that some IDN (leading) or just came up on the website. That's on Sunday at 9 am presenting to the GNSO or something. And this was not on the website until a couple of days ago, a lot of us have made arrangements, I believe, that don't include coming in early on Sunday. Can that thing be moved around?

Ram Mohan: I just have to request in. I was not involved in getting that organized so I was…

Subbiah: I mean, you know, someone like me actually spend a lot of time in the last two weeks checking the website to make sure that there nothing that would happen on that Sunday, you know, and then we went ahead and made decision just a few days ago. And now it just turns out that few days before and I think it's critical for people who have contributed to this work to be there.

Cary Karp: I'm Cary. I might be able to comment on that because I actually
               request them to (Bruce) and I can transmit the explanation I was given.

Ram Mohan: Please go ahead.

Cary Karp: That there are two meetings on Saturday and Sunday morning and this
               is the new gTLD action. And the first of them is an opportunity for the
               reserved names working group to interact with the TLD folks and the
               second of them is for the IDN people to interact. But it is not and was
               never intended to be a meeting of this working group.

Subbiah: So then, is there going to be any representation from this working
               group at that meeting?

Olof Nordling: Well, we can take anywhere. I'll be there.

Ram Mohan: I will be there for sure. But, I believe Sophia will be there as well.

Subbiah: Well I think a whole number of us will not be able to and I think it's, you
               know...

Ram Mohan: Subbiah, I would like to say the following. If you could – I understand
               your perspective and you know, I'm not in charge of central scheduling.
               So, I will pass your request on and if you could please make a note
               into the mailing list as well and into the…

Subbiah: Okay.

Ram Mohan: …(gene) of (secretariat). But I understand what you're saying and
               (unintelligible)...

Subbiah: It's frustrating at every level, you know, it's to define that every time, when everybody makes a fair effort, there's something that is done operationally. At ICANN that seems to generally exclude people as much as possible. You know, and that's the point that we're trying to address.

Ram Mohan: And your point is made. Thank you.

Subbiah: Thank you.

Ram Mohan: I would like to just say thanks for everybody for your participation, we will have a report that will come out for your consideration in the next day or in the next, actually today and we'll have it. My intent is to close on this report by end of day tomorrow which will require your cooperation and your assistance.

And it's been actually quite enjoyable at chairing this working group and we will conclude our work once the report is completed. You know, I will stay on to provide a few reports on Lisbon, but basically as of Lisbon this working group completes its tenure.

Thank you for participation and I look forward to working with you closely in the future.

Subbiah: Thank you, Ram.

Man: Thank you, Ram.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you, Ram.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

END