GNSO IDN Working Group Teleconference

27 February 2007

21:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO IDN Working Group

teleconference on 27 February 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.

   http://gnso-audio.icann.org/idn-wg-20070227.mp3

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

Participants on the call:

Ram Mohan - Working Group Chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Will Rodger - CBUC

Steve Crocker - Security and Stability Advisory Committee Liaison

Paul Diaz - Registrar c.

William Tan- Registrar c.

Yoav Keren- Registrar c.

Werner Staub - Registrar c.

Cary Karp - gTLD Registry constituency

Maggie Mansourkia - ISPCP

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Avri Doria - - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:

Kurt Pritz - Senior Vice President, Services

Tina Dam - IDN Program Director

Maria Farrell - GNSO Policy Officer

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Coordinator: Excuse me, Avri Doria now joins.

William Tan: Thank you.

Hi Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi.

William Tan: Hi, how are you?

Avri Doria: Pretty good, how are you doing?

William Tan: All right, just a bit.

Where are you based?

Avri Doria: Well, I have a home in Rhode Island and the US…

William Tan: Okay.

Avri Doria: …but I work at a university in Sweden so I go forth back and forth…

William Tan: All right.

Avri Doria: …but sometimes I'm in Geneva. At the moment I'm in Rhode Island.

William Tan: Okay.

Yeah., I mean, (reaching you).

Avri Doria: Uh-huh.

William Tan: Yeah.

                 So I guess we're just early.

Avri Doria: Yeah, yes, (a couple)…

((Crosstalk))

William Tan: …I don't know if you got my email, I just sent a reply on the issue that
                 you passed it on with (Chris).

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah, I received a couple of replies.

                 Yes.

Coordinator: Excuse me, Tina Dam now joined.

William Tan: Thank you.

Woman: Yup.

William Tan: Hey Tina.

Tina Dam: Good morning.

William Tan: Good morning. It's Bill.

Tina Dam: Who is this?

William Tan: William Tan.

Tina Dam: Oh, hey Bill. How are you?

William Tan: Good, thank you.

                 I'm in the US now.

Tina Dam: Of, you are?

William Tan: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

William Tan: …here two weeks ago.

Woman: Oh, where in the US are you?

William Tan: Virginia, Sterli, yeah.

Woman: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Tina Dam: …in Bali at 5:00 am.

Woman: You're where?

William Tan: In Bali?

Woman: You're in Bali?

Tina Dam: Yeah.

William Tan: The…

Glen Desaintgery: Hi Tina, it's Glen.

Tina Dam: Hi Glen, how are you?

Glen Desaintgery: Fine, thanks. How are you in Bali?

Tina Dam: I'm doing good. We just finished up the apTLD meeting last night and so I am out of here today.

Glen Desaintgery: (Oh).

Tina Dam: It's a nice - it's a very nice place. (Oh), I've got to say.

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible) spending a night) for a couple of days, huh?

Tina Dam: Well, I'm going straight up to a (Linux forum) - (IT University) (of Linux forum) in Copenhagen.

Coordinator: Excuse me…

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: …has now joined.

Tina Dam: And you know it's a (snowstorm) there. I'm really looking forward to the meeting. I'm going to go talk about IDNs to a group of like 5,000 application developers.

Woman: It's a lot of work.

Woman: But that's (your) time Tina.

Tina Dam: Yup.

Glen Desaintgery: Welcome Cary.

Cary Karp: Thank you. Hi, everybody.

Woman: Hi Cary.

((Crosstalk))

Cary Karp: Hi.

Glen Desaintgery: Welcome Steve.

Steve Crocker: Hi there.

I'm back in my home country.

Glen Desaintgery: That's even better.

Steve Crocker: Thank you very much for setting things up while I was traveling.

Glen Desaintgery: (Pleasure).

Coordinator: Excuse me, Ran Mohan now joined.

Glen Desaintgery: Welcome Ram.

Cederampattu Mohan: Good day. How are you Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: Fine thanks. We've got William Tan, Avri Doria, Tina Dam, Paul
                Diaz, Cary Karp and Steve Crocker on the call Ram.

Cederampattu Mohan: Excellent. Thank you.

                Welcome and we'll just wait for just a couple of minutes and then get
                the call kicked off.

(Maria):   Hi, it's (Maria) joining.

Coordinator: Mike Rodenbaugh has joined.

Cederampattu Mohan: Good evening (Maria), this is Ram.

(Maria):   Hi Ram.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's Mike Rodenbaugh as well. Hi Ram.

Cederampattu Mohan: Hello Mike.

Glen Desaintgery: Welcome Mike.

Man: Good morning.

Coordinator: Excuse me…

((Crosstalk))

William Tan: Hey everybody.

Glen Desaintgery: Hi, Will.

Coordinator: Mr. Kurt Pritz has joined.

Man: Okay.

Man: Glen, what's the code for today's call?

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, let me give it to you. It's 368…

Man: Uh-huh.

Glen Desaintgery: …-9038.

Man: Thank you.

Man: And how do we mute? (Star-2)?

Glen Desaintgery: Star-6.

Man: Okay.

Man: Was an agenda circulated in advance with this meeting?

Cederampattu Mohan: No. This is Ram.

                        The…

((Crosstalk))

Cederampattu Mohan: …and agenda that was set two meetings ago where we
                        were talking about, you know, we had a specific set of items to
                        discuss. And, you know, I'm reading last week we had two items of
                        which we covered ground - quite a bit of ground in the first but not
                        enough for the second.

                        And now, plan was to cover ground on the second item that you - the
                        existing gTLD string and then carry it forward to our priority (key) item.

Man: No problem. I just was, you know, looking for it.

                        I don't want to keep doing that. Thanks Ram.

Cederampattu Mohan: Okay.

                        We're just going to wait a couple more minutes and then get going. It's
                        about two - three minutes after the hour. We'll just wait another couple
                        minutes and then get started.

Coordinator: Excuse me, Maggie Mansourkia now joined.

Cederampattu Mohan: Welcome Maggie.

Magnolia Mansourkia: Thank you.

Cederampattu Mohan: We're literally about a minute away from getting kicked off here.

Magnolia Mansourkia: Okay. Great.

And I will have to jump off a little bit early so I'll apologize in advance.

Cederampattu Mohan: No problem.

Coordinator: Excuse me, Sophia Bekele now joined.

Cederampattu Mohan: Welcome Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: Hello Ram.

Cederampattu Mohan: We're just about to get started here.

Sophia Bekele: Great. Thanks.

Cederampattu Mohan: Okay, we're just a few minutes after the hour. Glen, let's - the poll going, if you could start the recording and then go through a roll call please.

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible) Ram.

We have on the call William Tan, Avri Doria, Tina Dam from (ICANN staff), Paul Diaz, Cary Karp, Steve Crocker…

Man: Yeah.

Glen Desaintgery: …, yourself, Maria Farrell --(staff, in place of Olof who is excused), Mike Rodenbaugh, Will Rodger, Kurt Pritz, (staff), Maggie Mansourkia, and Sophia Bekele.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you and welcome. And Glen, you've started the recording I'm assuming.

Glen Desaintgery: I will check Ram.

Cederampattu Mohan: While Glen is checking on that I just wanted to…

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Cederampattu Mohan: …thank you and welcome to this call of February 27.

The - what we have been doing is really following an agenda that we set forth in the - in our meeting on February 6 where we had the working group prioritize on behalf of the body to really provide us guidance - provide me guidance on where to allocate our time with a primary focus of our time going on introduction of new gTLDs followed by geopolitical details, existing gTLD string, and then existing domain name holders and techno-policy details.

Those are really - that's been the direction that I would be from the working group in terms of places to focus our time and attention.

Last week on the call, for those of you who attended and for those of you who have listened in to the MP3 recording, you will find that we had a vigorous discussion on geopolitical details and we actually have some clear direction forward that are going to make their way into a draft document that will come your way here shortly and again, a discussion of existing gTLD strings and the allocation of existing gTLD strings, and the run out of time.

And what I promised in our call last week was that we would place allocation of existing gTLD strings at the top of the agenda for today, and in association with that topic, also get into discussion of existing domain name holder in any issues that might - that we would like to discuss on that area.

In addition to that, really if we have enough time we will go and start to discuss techno-policy details, or else what we will do is discuss techno-policy details in next weeks call.

What we also intend to do, Maria and I had started work on a draft report document that starts to document what we have discussed and areas where we think there might be some level of broad agreement in other areas where there has been just a question or there has been support or different positions taken.

And we'll have that ready for you to review in the next couple of days and we will discuss and finish our discussion on techno-policy details and then go forward from there. In our meeting of March 13 we will discuss - really most of our time will be spent discussing the draft document.

Our goal is, on March 28, to finalize this draft document to actually get it to a final format and to publish it to the GNSO council on the 21st of March. And we're at this point still on schedule to go and get there.

And as you may recall, this working group actually comes to a conclusion and completes its activities at the end of the Lisbon meeting and I suspect that I'll be asked to make a presentation or two at Lisbon to the council as well as to potentially other constituencies as required and I will provide a copy of - a slide deck also for our working group to comment on before that happens.

Now, one of the things that we did do last week which was earlier promised was to go through the - to ask the membership of the working group that they talk that in addition to techno-policy details and existing dominion holders, if any of the other topics that we had earlier said should not really get allocated much of our time and attention, (but then) any of those topics should get our time and attention.

And I will ask that question again here and request that if you believe that there are other topics that require our time and attention, to provide that to the list and I will call that question to the list shortly because we have really pretty much one face to face - one conference call left before we get into discussing our draft document.

Before we launch into discussing existing domain name holders and existing gTLD strings, I wanted to take a moment and ask if there are any other agenda items that the working group members in this call would like to see discussed today.

Marilyn Cade: Ram it's Marilyn. I just wanted to announce myself. I was a bit late. My apologies.

Cederampattu Mohan: Welcome.

Sophia Bekele: Sophia.

Cederampattu Mohan: Sophia, hi.

Sophia Bekele: Hi.

Just a couple of ideas (for the administrative side). That maybe you can put a (span). One had to do perhaps what with - just sending some of the paper work or the summaries that I guess you just mentioned earlier that you're working with Maria on some of the items after we complete the call.

So, just to get an early notice of the draft that's been discussed so we could comment on them before we go in a call.

Cederampattu Mohan: Yes. Sophia, the plan is to get that draft out by the end of this week.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, for example (when)?

Cederampattu Mohan: As soon as we have something that is actually presentable. And it will be in draft format and the goal is to really span a good two weeks working through the document that we get to March 13 and we can say "yeah" or "nay" on the document.

Sophia Bekele: Okay. So you're talking about the overall draft. It's not by the priority group draft document.

I misunderstood. I was thinking maybe last week for those of us who are not in the geo-political detail group, I though you said there was a document coming our way now on some of the issues.

Maybe you were saying it's the bigger draft…

((Crosstalk))

Cederampattu Mohan: Yes that's correct. Sorry if I misspoke, but yeah, there is a bigger draft that's coming and I'm turning frankly more and more of my attention on to that document because that is our final work product and I'm starting to focus much more of my attention and I'd like to focus our working group's attention on that work product and to kind of direct our time and energy on booting a document that discusses items that we think might, you know, are appropriate for the GNSO Council to think of PDP process.

Sophia Bekele: I understand.

Okay, the other one I had commented, I think I responded to Maria's email to us regarding our proposal made by Marilyn in - last week on the geo-political names and geographic names.

And I just kind of made a comment and if you want to talk about it later, to the side administrative that it's about defining the role people have on this working group against any other one in other to streamline the job so that, you know, whoever is assigned as an expert, as a liaison,

and so forth could work on a narrow issue and bring it to the group versus, you know, the way it's proposed.

So maybe I have a little concern on how it's proposed so we can talk about it at the end.

I want to raise it up as an issue because I responded to it.

We can talk about it now.

Cederampattu Mohan: Let me see if u understand the - so, the agenda item you would like to propose is discussion of the role of liaison or…

Sophia Bekele: No. Just role of liaisons and experts. And if we're going to keep on defining these kinds of things, you know, with the small time that we have until Lisbon, and probably - you can call it - (unintelligible) of people as it is streamlining the process, in the working group.

So, it's more of an administrative but I think it's very important.

Cederampattu Mohan: I agree. I'll certainly schedule that on our agenda and make sure that we cover that today.

Thank you.

Are there any other suggested agenda items?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Cederampattu Mohan: Well, I have one to suggest which is to really start of our call perhaps with a brief report from - Sophia, perhaps yourself in - and I could provide that as well in terms of what was discussed at the reserved names working group because we provided expert advice as well as liaison into the working group and in the recently concluded meeting, (reserve name working group) meeting in LA just a couple of days ago.

That's the only other agenda item that I would like to propose before we get started on.

Cary Karp: Ram, but the procedure was you - that we've looked at but they've actually not done anything about that. It might actually be opportune especially given suggestions to the GNSO council that Bruce recently made about opening our working groups to (grow the) participation of what was the word observers.

And that's simply the pro forma declaration of incest. There are a lot of people on this call who I suspect are very interested in submitting these for IDN TLDs and then those same people are involved into this discussion that we'll end up influencing the trends of reference to that call and at the very least I think this sort of stuff has to be openly declared upfront (just) to avoid real unpleasant issues a little bit further down the road.

Marilyn raised this issue a couple of weeks ago and I do believe that that - that was a good opportunity to inject them -- merriment -- into the discussion. And I regret having (done) that.

So if we can revisit that issue it might be useful.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you Cary. I'll certainly add that as well to our list of items discussed.

So perhaps them I'm going to suggest the following agenda and time allocation for today was spend the next 15 minutes or so with the reserve name working group report, the declaration of interest as well as the discussion of the role of liaison and experts, and then, basically about 30 minutes or so into the hour, get into our topic of IDN itself if that works with everybody.

Man: Fine.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thanks.

Sophia, could I call upon you to provide a brief support on the reserve name working group meeting that was held in LA last week?

Sophia Bekele: Ram, I would love to do that but since the role of liaison is something I better ask you today I think I will defer that to you because you were on the call. That is not a report that I have prepared or I'm not sure if that role could (unintelligible) if I wasn't sure. But I'm not at all prepared for that.

Cederampattu Mohan: Okay. No problem. No problem.

I mean, really, I guess my perspective was to provide an informal - kind of summarization of the general topics that were discussed rather than an actual report into the meeting.

Let me provide my recollections. I do not have or prepared notes on this at this point either. And I would like to request Sophia that, you know, perhaps we can come together and so provide some notes from, you know, from the meeting.

The reserve name - so I'm just going to be providing a general report to all of you on the working group here.

The reserve name's working group met in person. I was not there in person. There were a couple of members on this group who are there in person -- Sophia I believe, Marilyn I believe -- were there in person. I don't recall who else is there in person…

Woman: Avri…

Cederampattu Mohan: …on the call.

The - and the reserve name's grouping group discussed a draft document that spoke about what kinds of names and what kinds of categories to reserve.

In the area of IDNs the recommendation that we had made was to recommend that at the top level and at other levels, at the second level as well, domain names that had the - that can conform to the characteristic of character-character hyphen-hyphen be generally reserved. And Avri Doria who was there in person - also - I think was there in person, but Avri made a friendly amendment which was - unless that - unless such named character-character hyphen-hyphen domains are approved for use by some appropriates party, it was at a

very high level that was the outcome of the IDN input into the reserved name working group.

If there are others who are on the call or who are on the reserve name working group meeting last week, if you'd like to add anything to what I was saying, please feel free now.

Tina Dam: Hey Ram, this is Tina in the queue.

Cederampattu Mohan: Tina, you're in the queue, you have the floor.

Tina Dam: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Tina Dam: So, I wasn't at the last call but I'm on the reserve name's mailing list as well. And we do finished the apTLD meeting here in Bali and one of the topics in their agenda was exactly the reserve name's working group and/or this IDN working group.

And one of the things that the apTLD group came up with was that they were a little bit concerned that the reserve name's working group was working in a really fast and potentially without inputs from either apTLD or perhaps ccNSO or at least some ccTLD consortium or the GAC. Because according to the people at the apTLD meeting, they want to have reserved, you know, the localized equivalent of - for example, the current country codes or maybe the - and another - well that was one definite thing that they agreed on.

And since we don't have the list of internationalized country codes or I don't really know what terminologies you use for it, but anyway I hope you know what I mean. But since we don't have that list it's kind of hard to put it on the reserves list.

The other comment that they had was that they thought that they needed - (saying) the ccNSO and the GAC needed to take a look at whether you should translate and transliterate geographic names or at least country names and has those reserved at the second level as well.

Marilyn Cade: Well, this is Marilyn…

((Crosstalk))

Tina Dam: …some input from the apTLD meeting into the reserve name's group.

Marilyn Cade: Ram, would you put me in the queue on this topic.

Steve Crocker: And me as well Ram. This is Steve.

((Crosstalk))

Cederampattu Mohan: Absolutely Marilyn and I have Steve Crocker in the queue again, Marilyn?

Avri Doria: And if you can put Avri in the queue also, please.

Cederampattu Mohan: And Avri.

Okay, Steve, you have the floor.

Steve Crocker: Yeah, very briefly.

I want to echo - essentially a - the things - (sentiment) of Tina but from a very technical perspective in response to Avri's comment.

I think the general process has got to be relatively (unintelligible) names because this only goes in one direction. So, if you allocate too much to begin with you can't get it back.

And with - to x-x hyphen-hyphen I would - I think that kind of suggestion where we came from is motivated by trying to reserve special characters where future purposes and I would probably like to expand that.

I haven't studied it and I don't like things who got rather stupid to look at, but in general, rather to stay within a fairly conservative set and then leave all of the punctuation and special characters where the - sort of purposes of being able to expand later. So it just strikes me that x-x hyphen-hyphen is the beginning rather than the end of the - what that reserve ought to be from a technical perspective.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you Steve.

Marilyn, you're in the queue and you have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

Can I - it's Marilyn. Let me speak as the (unintelligible) of the statement of work on the reserve name working group about the intent. I don't think Chuck Gomes who is the second author on that and the Chair of the group is here, but let me just assure everybody that in the statement or work- and I'll take this back to him as well, in the statement of work, the intent was to study things not to rush to judgment, to take input from the - Ram I'm going to borrow your word which I think is techno-political aspects of making any changes on any category of reserve name make the information into account decide whether there's any low hanging fruit, make recommendations in many cases about longer study and analysis.

So, I'm thinking back - as - and I'm working on two of the subgroups, one is the second letter side -- the single letter and two letter categories of characters -- and the other was (controverse) domain, but - and I'm really confident Tina that this is exactly the kind of input that the subgroups want and need that idea that we talked about and it's just really good to reinforce it and maybe even invite Chuck Gomes as the Chair to comment on it Ram.

Is that, it's important to carve out the space to allow further discussion and examination before recommendations are made, but also remember that the purpose of the reserve name's working group is to present recommendations to the council, not to make any decisions themselves because they're just a working group.

And now, just to say something about Steve Crocker who - Steve you are high on the list - or at least one of the good time on to spend some more time talking about symbols.

The hope that at least we're assuring about the intent of the…

Man: (Excuse us), but that you Marilyn.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you Marilyn.

Steve Crocker: Thank you Marilyn. I was muted which is why I was (unintelligible) you're responding to.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thanks Steve.

Avri Doria: Okay, again, I wanted to comment on two things.

One, following up on that matter that you said about the subgroups. The one on the geographic name hasn't really done anything in it so well.

We're moving quite quickly. This is something that - we're still at and I agree with Marilyn, we have to take all these other things into account.

And I just wanted to - for Steve and others since I was the one that put in that assemble amendment. The amendment has been - that the original statement - has (its) no changes been made in tag name reservation requirements. In other words the (xm back dash) and that was regarding all (pp back dashes).

And the change that I've recommended was, no change has been made in the tag name (unintelligible) requirement at second level without standardization activity and appropriate (unintelligible).

So the idea behind this was, it pretty much states that it is, but if the idea that perhaps some other IANA group, those in activity defines another tag and the proper rules and methods of doing it, and, you know, IANA accept it, then at that point people could think about having a different tag. But certainly not willy-nilly and certainly not, you know, just this open.

So - but also not tightly closed if someone does the work who - the (IDF) define another tagging method, then it could get in becoming used.

Thanks.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you Avri.

Any other discussion on this topic?

Marilyn Cade: Ram, it's Marilyn. I just have one.

We're transcribing this Paul. I think it would be really helpful if Glen might clip this section of the transcript - the transcription and forward it into the reserve name working group.

In the mean time, Avri and myself and anyone else who is - and the liaison, Sophia, can be sure that this topic is put on the agenda for the reserve name working group this Thursday. Aren't you going to actually participate in that call? Are you, Ram?

Cederampattu Mohan: That's my plan, yes.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So maybe we could just - you could be in touch with Chuck and make sure that this is very high. You know, very early in the working agenda for discussion.

Cederampattu Mohan: Absolutely. And, you know, I'll coordinate with Sophia as well on this. So thank you.

Okay. The second item that is on our agenda today is - with the broader part participation of observers carry (basis) point that perhaps we need to get to declaration of interest, that the interest of the parties who are attending or who are members of the working group be openly declared.

I'd like to open this topic up for discussion and, you know, I just want to warn you that it probably allow a short discussion and then request that the rest of the discussion if it's going to be longer moved to the list.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I be in the list?

Cederampattu Mohan: Avri in the queue.

Marilyn Cade: And this is Marilyn. Could I be in the list for the proposal?

Cederampattu Mohan: Marilyn, you're in the queue, anyone else?

Sophia Bekele: Sophia.

Cederampattu Mohan: Sophia. Anyone else?

Okay, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah. This is something that we've done (only) at the group. It's a click one or two paragraph saying who you are, what your involvement is, where you're working and why you're participating in this.

I think it's a great idea and it doesn't need to take a lot of anyone's time.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you Avri.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: And my concrete proposal is built on what Avri said. I think it's also incredibly important for the integrity and respect that people have, but the important thing to people to understand is, that it isn't that it's bad to have an interest, it's that it's important to declare the interest and be transparent about it.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you Marilyn.

Sophia?

Sophia Bekele: Okay. I'm confused again. Are we talking about the existing working group or bringing people from outside of this working group?

Cederampattu Mohan: I think we're talking about the existing working group. The working group as it is constituted or - in other words, the working group as it is constituted. And if there are external - if there are other people

joining the working group, everybody who is a member of the working group mailing list would have to conform.

I'm assuming, Cary, that's what you intended.

Cary Karp: Yeah, that I would like to see a very clear president established before there is any influx into this working group.

Sophia Bekele: Okay.

The only comment I have is that, if this is - any new people to be added to this working group that has shown interest has seen something - we've talked about the last few weeks and it's supposed to be at the GNSO level versus the working group, I would love to see this working group (create) or agree to getting participants from outside so it could I guess getting (triple) end. But if we're talking about the already existing group and we didn't provide the interventions and so forth, then definitely I will agree with both Avri and Marilyn.

But if we're talking of anything outside of that, I think that probably requires a separate discussion and - or talking with Bruce again, because the last discussion I had with him in LA was we - he opened it up to observer status for anyone interested to come into the IDN working group, however, he wanted to get the consensus of everybody on the counsel to see if there is opposition for the said practices because there has been new people added to the reserve name working group for example.

So…

Man: That's the discussion…

((Crosstalk))

Sophia Bekele: …the prior (things) and requirement of - for having (unintelligible) the
                   GNSO council. I mean, constituencies and so forth has been
                   dismissed in my - that's my understanding and now we can take in
                   people as observer status and their people interested to come in.

                   So, if we're going to do it at our level, then I would like to know
                   because I would like to communicate with the people that are around
                   me that want to join in.

                   So there are two fold issues. One is, if it's for the existing group, yes I
                   would agree with what was said, and if it is for some - anybody who we
                   are recruiting or interested to come in, then we would like to have a
                   separate (card) about it or agreement just to get a consensus of
                   everyone and then we can move it on the agenda.

((Crosstalk))

Cary Karp: …to that as a counselor.

Cederampattu Mohan: Cary, just a moment.

                   Sophia, let me just paraphrase what I thought I heard you say. A), you
                   agree about working group members providing the declarations of
                   interest, and B), what you're seeing is, whether observers should be
                   added or not is a topic of separate discussion. And should observers

be added, do you have a perspective on those observers providing a declaration of interest?

Sophia Bekele: Yeah.

Cederampattu Mohan: Okay. Okay. Good.

Sophia Bekele: That the group agree on that. And can we take that to Bruce and say, we had agreed on it or not.

Cederampattu Mohan: Okay.

I mean, my take away so far on the discussion and actually before I give you the takeaway, Cary, you had something you wanted to say.

Cary Karp: Yeah, I just wanted to note that Bruce has made a proposal to the Council, this proposal has not been discussed by the Council, no (discussion) has been taken by the Council so it would certainly be premature to issue any invitation under the assumption that the terms in the current writing of that proposal will be adapted.

Man: Thank you for the clarification. I appreciate it.

I think really, all - what we're going to be doing here is - it seems like - regardless of observer status it seems like I - there is strong support for the declaration on interest to be provided by each member of the working group. And - so I'm going to request then that, you know, Glen, if you could put out a request to the working group members to provide such a declaration of interest they could do it at either directly

post it to the list or give it to you and you could compile it and post it to the list. Either way is fine.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: …can we just propose to the group that standard requirements would be applied to everyone who participates in the group as it comes to making a statement of interest. And I would just speak in support of the - that decision about allowing the observers to be made quickly.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you.

I'd like to move now to discussing existing gTLD strings and tying that to existing domain name holders as a straight up topic.

Now, just to be clear what we've meant in the past by existing gTLD strings is really about allocation of existing gTLD string, you know. And in our discussions last week, just to quickly summarize, some of the notes that have come out is - are the following.

One; use of a particular string in a non-IDN representation may not automatically follow to the IDN representation.

There is also - at the registrant level there may not be an expectation of carryover of an existing gTLD string to an IDN representation.

And also, there has been some discussion that just because someone registered a domain name in a non-IDN TLD they should not be granted or do not have any right to that name in the IDN TLD level.

There was also some commentary last week that at the top level of domain name. you need to cautious about assuming that just because a registry is allocated management of the string of a non-IDN string at the top level that ICANN was allocating all the right regarding how the name appears in IDN as well.

The other piece of discussion that has come up so far is that perhaps sponsored communities and sponsored top-level domain should be treated differently than an on sponsored string. Cary Karp has posted something to this - in this general area to the list that I will recommendation for you read through before you comment on that topic in this discussion.

There was also one telling comment made last week which was that perhaps there is no difference in principle between the allocations of the off IDN strings when it comes to the root as compared to the second level. In other words, existing rights applied the same way at the second level as they do at the top level.

So that's - I provide this as a summary of the discussion points, we have not actually gathered these into areas of broad support or broad agreement, et cetera but I mentioned this in terms of what's been discussed so far and I open the floor for discussion on this topic today, now.

Woman: Ram can we perhaps go one by one on what you said so we comment on it? On the points you made?

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure.

Woman: That's easier to tackle I guess.

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure, no problem.

                The first of the comments that were made was that, at the registrant
                level, for existing domain name holders, there is not an expectation
                that the - just because you're a registrant at a second level for a non-
                IDN TLD that you have a right automatically in an - in the - in an
                equivalent IDN TLD.

                There might be certain rights that can be claimed due to other policy or
                other properties but there is no inherent right just because one is an -
                registrant of a domain name at the second level in a non-IDN TLD.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question? This is Avri.

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, I'm not quite sure what you're looking for. Are you looking for
                people to say whether they agree with that? I'm glad you went through
                at the second time because the first time I thought you are making a
                descriptive statement as opposed to a normative one. So - but here,
                you're recommending a normative statement, correct?

Cederampattu Mohan: Actually I'm - I guess I'm making a normative statement and
                I'm asking for push back or acceptance.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: And so Ram - this is Marilyn. So would you just (board it), for those of us who - I'm beginning to think I'm not English speaking, would you just give me a concrete example using a couple of illustrations, do you mind?

Cederampattu Mohan: I can try...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Cederampattu Mohan: …and I need help from all the rest of you when I fumble on this.

So for instance if I own mohan.com…

Marilyn Cade: If you hold mohan.com.

Cederampattu Mohan: If I hold - if I'm the registrant of mohan.com as a presented in a non-IDN fashion…

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Cederampattu Mohan:…let us say there is an equivalent of dot com in an IDN string that I as the registrant of mohan in the non-IDN string do not have automatically some preexisting right merely because I am the domain name registrant.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, I - it's Marilyn again and I want to back up for a minute.

First of all, I think the - when we say an equivalent of an existing legacy as the character string such as dot com, dot info, dot biz, one of the

challenges that we need to look at I think is what is an equivalent. So is an equivalent, the word commerce or business in a IDN as opposed to is an equivalent or representation of the exact string dot com or dot biz.

Cary Karp: And if I can just sneak a question from the side here, how is this specific IDN issue? Notions of equivalence…

Woman: Right.

Cary Karp: …can also be - they can be a translated version of an established string that's represented also just using ASCII.

Marilyn Cade: Exactly, Cary. Thank you

Woman: Can I comment on that Ram.

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure.

Woman: Well, this takes us back I think to that confusingly similar description of what we're trying to get. If we're going to pay a string as, you know, exact copy of the as versus confusingly similar or versus equivalent, then I think what we're struggling is the word equivalent or the word. Does it say equivalent or confusingly similar, maybe we could just clarify, you know, the, you know, by saying exactly mohan.com, the IDN equivalent of mohan.com with C-O-M versus - assuming that there is another equivalent of what's com means.

So, it will get us - we have to be really specific and I don't know, there may be a thousand ways of being specific but.

Woman: But I might - Ram, I think we have - to Cary's point, I think we are talking about a rule. Let me call the framework Cary. I think we're talking about a framework in the other work that's going on that we're just now trying to test in the IDN world, are we not?

So, the Cary's question of why is it different from an ASCII translation?

Cederampattu Mohan: So this is Ram.

I have - I guess I have two responses and also a little bit of a comment on Sophia's and I've been thinking about how to simplify description because even - if you ask me to repeat what I just said I think I would have a problem. So perhaps a simpler way to represent this is the following, priority rights for new strings do not derive from existing string but could derive from IPR or other rights.

Woman: Right. Right.

Cederampattu Mohan: Is that not the real principle that we are trying to say we agree on…

Woman: Right.

Cederampattu Mohan: …that priority right for new strings whether they be at - and we really don't care whether it's at the registrant level or a registry level.

Man: I could not applaud that more. And that we are talking about a situation that is not anchored in the discussion of IDN. IDN is at the mode of

expressing a string, anything that vaguely resemble the discussion of who has right to what is more fundamental at that.

Woman: Yeah and…

Man: Yeah.

Woman: …Ram, I will just offer a friendly amendment to what you just said.

IPR or other rights, present string holders do not have IPR rights in that string. They might have some other form of establish identity and relationship to a string but it is not necessarily an IPR rights.

Cederampattu Mohan: So perhaps then, the statement that I - that we should make is, priority right for new string do not derive from existing string but could derive from other rights.

Woman: That's a bit…

((Crosstalk))

William Tan: Yes, this is Will, other rights such as IPR rights perhaps.

Woman: Yeah, yeah.

William Tan: Yeah.

I agree in (terms of this) everything is premature in saying.

Cederampattu Mohan: So the statement that I have here is priority rights for new strings do not derive from existing string…

Woman: Period.

Cederampattu Mohan: …but could derive from other right such as IPR rights.

Man: Yup, Ram, this is (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) anyone give an example when will a string - when you are saying IPR rights, are you saying trademark, what are the thing - what are the other things that cover?

Marilyn Cade: Okay, so it's Marilyn.

Let me give you an example. In the - it is entirely possible and practical to envision that a sponsored - a sponsoring community such as today sponsoring a string that happens to be in the ASCII string as - they came together with the global community, it involve the large number of non-Latin or non-English speaking parties. We have talked about in the PDP '05 about whether there is a unique relationship for the sponsoring community.

We also - so that's one question to ask ourselves.

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

Cederampattu Mohan: I'm sorry, who is that?

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

Cederampattu Mohan: Absolutely you're the only one in the queue so you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Cool.

I would recommendation that we kind of avoid to all of the complexities about trademark, intellectual property whatever, you know, that encompasses on all of the other thing and take your first declarative statement that those, you know, I mean as you said it better then I'm going to quote you now that, you know, no right to derive from having a string in another, you know, from having a string period. And that you go not into the clause of other places where right maybe, you know, entailed or gotten because that covered in many other places what you really trying to say is like in other string, IDN strings do not - no right to derive from having another string period.

Marilyn Cade: So let me ask a question, if you look at the GAC principles and if you look at the principles of PDP '05 you'll see the requirement. And remember, that PDP '05 does apply the IDNs, you'll see the requirement to - I'm not reading from it but it's something like avoid - gosh, I may have to look it up. But it's something - the GAC principle is about reducing the confusion and the need for duplicate and defensive registration.

So, if we follow - if we put a period where Avri wants to put a period, Avri, where do you, you know, my view is, IDNs are going to have to have a sunrise or protecting the rights of other's space as well as non-IDN. Where do you see putting that in relation to the phrase of that you just proposed?

Avri Doria: Basically I think that falls…

Cederampattu Mohan: And Marilyn, I will place that as a question but I also want to ask if there are any others who would like to comment on Avri's…

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Cederampattu Mohan: …proposal before we, you know, we get back to redirect.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

William Tan: Yeah, it's Will.

I mean, I think I'm saying basically what (things) she's gaining out here. But it's, you know, looking at this Marilyn seems to be saying that - well, I know I'm saying that well, I'm simply - certainly suspect what Avri is saying to anyone but a (lawyer) and even then only some, stopping at do not (rise), derive from rights to other strings period, to me it comes dangerously close to saying we don't recognize trademark and, you know, the fact that we do. Whether or not, you know, people say you don't have a right in this string because of your trademark directly…

((Crosstalk))

William Tan: …splitting hairs and I'm the one saying, if people, you know, have rights to a top level domain essentially through their trademark just saying, you know, rights to a second string do not derive from the first comes very close to almost saying there, you know, the trademark issue is not there. That's one way it could be read.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you, Will.

                        Any other comment.

(Johab):   Yeah, this is (Johab).

                Will, I'm not a lawyer but I think I want to disagree with you because saying that one - if you own one string, it doesn't automatically means that you have rights for the other.

Man: That's right.

(Johab):   It doesn't say - I think that phrase period, doesn't say that you don't have - this is the only logic, okay? It doesn't…

((Crosstalk))

(Johab):   It doesn't say that you don't have other rights that might provide you for that string so this is…

((Crosstalk))

William Tan: I agree but what I'm saying is I think it's unnecessarily provocative. I guess that's what I'm trying to get at. And by saying IPR, I don't think that we are giving too much to IP. I mean it's the really so I'm just saying that…

(Johab):   I disagree on that because it really…

William Tan: Okay.

(Johab):   …depends on which level.

Cederampattu Mohan: (Johab)?

(Johab):   So, I think - yeah.

Cederampattu Mohan: Sorry, before you comment I think have somebody who - I
                  think Avri wanted to redirect.

(Johab):   Sorry.

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

(Johab):   So put me in the queue (later).

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank God. So I have Avri, then (Johab), then Cary.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

                  Yeah, I mean I wasn't trying to -- at least not in this case -- take any
                  (unintelligible) away from trademark rights. What I'm basically saying is
                  in within all the other processes we've got whether it's be the
                  protecting rights of other working group or the reserve names working
                  group or the '05 itself that's stuff is being covered.

                  This group as I understood was about IDN, some things that were
                  specific to the IDN case. So if we try to cover all the other implications
                  of, you know, not because of this, yes because of that, not because of

the other things, then I think we complicate our work and we may come in conflict with the people like to PRO who are focusing on, you know, what are the trademark rights that one get based on, you know, different rules in difference parts of the world, one compared to the comments, et cetera, et cetera.

So, I'm not trying takeaway from the right of mark holders in this case, I'm just trying to say it's not relevant to this group's sake.

Man: Yeah, I mean I think we're in agreement it's just a matter of tone. And, you know, personally I don't feel like this is a life and death matter but I'm just - to me this is more a question of politics in this substance. I think you're intellectually absolutely but I just don't want to send a wrong signal.

In other words, who (has gored you) - appear to be - who (unintelligible) appeared to be (goring), when you say one or the other and that, I'll certainly defer to their judgment about - as the people have, you know, really clear arguments one way or there but, you know.

Avri Doria: Because if we put in the IPR rights, then I have to start arguing for the right to the public in the comments.

Man: You know, yeah, I mean I'm just - I'm trying to…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: …needs to grow…

Man: In fact I'm trying to be - trying to - paradoxically I'm trying not to get into the IPR right, you know, but (better).

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you.

(Johab)?

(Johab): Well, yeah. (Unintelligible) of what I want to say is that I agree with this general ID and I don't think that - I think in some level there was some mixture between the top level and the second level and I think that the cases of second are usually and are sold by sunrise period and we've seen it in other TLDs and I think in general for IDN, this is the same way we should follow. I think that the discussion that we in this group should cover if the discussion about the TLD and whether they are rights or they aren't rights for existing TLDs for other versions and - or variants or any other way you can say that - of that TLD in other languages and I think this is the main issue that we need to cover and discuss whether we agree or not.

My opinion is no, it's not having a right for one existing ASCII TLD doesn't say that you automatically have a right for variant or a variation of that in an IDN and it doesn't say that you won't get it to other - like this is (clear).

Cederampattu Mohan: (You know), I just wanted to just distinguish one thing from what you are saying. I think when you meant variant you did not mean it in the IDN sense of a variant, you just meant it as an alternative…

Man: Yeah.

Cederampattu Mohan: …rather than as a variant.

Man: Yeah, it could be either, you know, the equivalent, okay, you can use equivalent word for dot com or dot biz or dot info, dot org, it doesn't matter in Chinese or the transliteration or in, you know. And the other thing, you know, it's - probably if you'll take a string, this short ASCII three letters or four letter strings in ASCII or in English and try to translate it, maybe you'll want to transliterate it to another language, you'll get a few variants, a few variations of that single - a few equivalent for the string.

And so what does it mean? So it means that if you have - a registry like now have that - could be - it can be a gTLD or ccTLD, okay?

Does it mean that it's automatically have the right for the all variations, all the equivalent that you could think of, how can you cover of the equivalents. So I think even on the practical side, we must go to a route where we say no, it's not automatic, okay, and it's not - it doesn't say if you have these rights, you have that right but for now we need to say, okay, when - if we do think that there is - there are some places that there are rights, we need to say where, okay? And that's the way I think we should go.

Cederampattu Mohan: Got it. Thank you very much.

Cary?

Cary Karp: There seems to be something that every single one of us is saying and that is acclaim on a second string does not derive in and of itself from acclaim to a first string so whatever it was - and essentially it was with

my own case, (staff museum) whatever it was that the sponsoring organization for the museum was able to put forward as justification for being given dot museum can also be put forward as justification for some other language correlate to it.

And it would think if I were an independent who wanted some correlate to that museum, I wouldn't be saying we want our language version of .museum. They'd be saying what we want is (only) independent of .museum. And we don't wish to generate any discussion about our being our being - riding anybody else coattails.

So everything we say bearing it of an existing domain or equivalent with existing domain, we're arguing against the - any case that might be made for independent delegation of that thing.

And yeah, sure, it's entirely possible that the other thing can be constrained from acquiring some other .com.

But I would like to see anybody succeed getting that .com with the VeriSign's opposition to it. And this isn't an IDN situation that we're talking about. We've been on the phone for an hour now agreeing that we're talking about something that's really not an IDN concern and we should be talking about IDN concern.

We don't need to justify noting that the - this is more of the concern of some other group, (we're notably) stating that. We don't have to go to into intricacies of how we would word our statements just simply say that there are concerns here that are of being considered by other working groups, they are not inherently IDN issues, these were the IDN issues that we've been focusing on.

So, maybe we should focus on IDN issues.

Marilyn Cade: Ram, I'm Marilyn. Can I interfere?

Cederampattu Mohan: And you have the floor.

I think Cary is right. And, you know, perhaps part of this is just because some of us are - have been PDP05 for some time and know that - that he gone through in trying to weigh out what I could call a challenge process in relation to confusingly similar string at the top level.

Practicality dictates that whether we individually support this idea or not, we do have to be pragmatic and practical about what we can achieve. And if someone has some kind of identity arise in the name or a confusingly similar version of that name, we felt in the PDP05 that there should be a challenge process that name would end on reserve and wouldn't get out to anyone.

I do agree fully with Cary that this is not an IDN specific issue. And maybe we could find a way to document the questions and then see if there are any IDN specific issues not addressed in the broader proposed approach in PDP05.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you, Marilyn. I think that's a productive statement to certainly make.

What I have here is a statement that I had made which - with the IPR rights component is what (sparks) further discussion.

I agree that, well, it's not inherently an IDN issue. Those who work in this area expect that the IDN working group will have a statement on this or will have covered it which is what we will do.

One of the things I wanted to also mention was in last week's call, there was a -- what I would consider a proposal or at least a discussion on this topic. And I wanted to bring this up now to this week's call because there is something that is germane.

I will read from my notes from last week. It says, "Sponsored community may perhaps be treated differently than unsponsored community for a gTLD string. If the sponsored operator has global buy-in, it might be a different situation."

And then there were two - so there were two kind of sub-points suggested there which is should sponsored TLDs be treated differently, and should registrant be treated differently based on the steps taken up protected name and languages.

Now, the second question is not germane for this topic at this point. But the question that did come up last week was, "Should a sponsored - should sponsored name be treated differently because of the prior stated reason that a sponsored community has or at least said they have global buy-in?"

I'll also call your attention to the statement that has been read into the record earlier from the .travel registry on this topic.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn.

And I will just - I think I spoke already on this topic in support that such statement. There is a demonstration of global support and we have required the sponsored community in order to get the sponsored category to show global support. I think we have to respect that.

William Tan: This is William. I'd like to be placed in the queue.

Cederampattu Mohan: Okay, William.

(Yulov):   Yeah. This is (unintelligible) queue.

Cederampattu Mohan: (Yulov) in the queue.

Anyone else who want to be in the queue?

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, Ram.

Cederampattu Mohan: Sophia?

Okay, William.

William Tan: Yup.

I think I'm in support of the - your statement that no priority rights in the new string can be derived from an existing string. And I think that in itself already - and what Cary said, is very true, I believe.

So, a sponsored community does - who wants a new IDN TLD has not need to base the application on rights to ant existing ASCII TLD. It already has support so I don't know if - why do we need to - that to me

it's very clear that sponsored community is indeed in different from gTLDs.

Cederampattu Mohan: So, if was to paraphrase what you're saying, William, you must saying given the very definition of sponsored TLDs, any such set aside written in our document is redundant.

William Tan: Yeah. So given the definition of sponsored TLD, plus the statement that you just made (part) all these discussion, if that is gratified, for us the definition of that sponsored TLD means that sponsored communities do have different rights from the gTLDs. That's just what I'm saying.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you, William.

(Yulov)?

(Yulov):   Yes. I want to say that I don't have firm opinion in this case. And I want to raise a few questions probably hear some answers. And it would be interested to Cary's answer because he's coming sponsored TLD.

And I'll raise two issue. I think that I have less problem than in saying .museum have some rights in other IDNs which again I'm not sure if this - if I agree with this - than for the organization that is bidding, that is currently in process for .xxx TLD.

My personal feeling is that there is some difference, okay. Or is that - can you take these cases as similar? I'm not sure.

And the other thing is if I'll go back for .museum, it'd be interesting, Cary, to hear what you think about it because I'm not too familiar with all the rules for .museum to provide a .museum name.

But let's say for example - let's take India for example or China. I believe - I just have it a feeling -- I really don't know and maybe you can correct me -- that it might be very possible - really possible that in India, there are certain organizations that are called locally by the - or local government or maybe the Indian government or maybe - it could be the same in China and as museums, and they might not be a part and be eligible to get a .museum ASCII domain name.

Now, are we saying that if we let's say tomorrow provide .museum the current body manages the .museum top level domain, the rights for the Indian language .museum, so then the eligibility will be the same eligibility for the .museum. Well, actually, locally, what it means that there are many, many possible bodies that are called as museums but won't be able to get the Indian equivalent.

So, is that something that could happen?

Man: Can I respond to that directly, Ram?

(Yulov):   Yeah.

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure.

Man: The .museum policy that set by the International Council of Museum which is an aggregate of something like 150 national committees. That's…

(Yulov):   Okay.

Man: ..Indian National Committee, that's Australian National Committee, the
                  Japanese National, you name it. Any country that is likely to - any
                  language that is likely to appear in the discussion of IDN is used by
                  some national committee in ICANN. There may be one or two
                  exceptions.

Man: Yeah.

Man: And it seems to be very, very unlikely that anyone of the national
                  committees will decide that the organization that it is part of is
                  somehow acting (counted) the interest of that committee.

                  So that there may be an example that you could find that would
                  support what you're getting, but I'm - the museum case is probably a
                  poor one.

(Yulov):   Okay, yeah, this - I know. This - I specifically talked about which I think
                  I thought in the case of .museum it will be - this will be the case. But do
                  you say about it's in fact the equivalent of .xxx and .museum which is -
                  which are both sponsored TLDs which is - you know, this is a two very
                  different cases.

Cederampattu Mohan: And I'll point out the .xxx is not really a TLD as of yet, so
                  perhaps…

(Yulov):   Right now, yeah, but let's say it gets there, okay. You know, it's on the
                  process. ICANN is trying again to…

Cederampattu Mohan: But I mean, (Yulov), may I request that you go - that you actually use - if you're going to use an existing TLD then...

(Yulov):   Okay, so take .jobs, okay.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you.

(Yulov):   I think .job is very easy.

Cederampattu Mohan: And that was the question redirect to Cary.

(Yulov):   Yeah.

Cary Karp: Once again, what am I supposed to come out in here?

(Yulov):   I'm asking - I think that there's a (unintelligible) let's say .jobs right now, okay?

Cary Karp: Yeah.

(Yulov):   And I think that's - there's a difference and .jobs I think it's sponsored by a company called Employ Media and it's I think that's the case - .jobs for example might be very different from the case of the .museum?

Cary Karp: Yeah. Well, the argument has to be that - I mean .travel and .museum, I believe are unique in the vocabulary of the TLD labels and being actual dictionary words of jobs, (these two), okay.

So to the extent that you have a dictionary word, there is an immediate Lexemic's correspondent. Museum said in some other language is still the exact same thing, okay?

(Yulov):   Yeah.

Cary Karp: So in that case, what you would be arguing is the extent of representativity of the sponsoring organization.

Now, I'm not quite sure what ICANN expected during the second of sTLD application, but the first time out, we needed to demonstrate that we - as much that we were representative of our community, but that we were globally representative of our community.

So to the extent that that (unintelligible) was imposed upon the so called sTLD round sponsors, then, that's not a valid argument either. What I would do if I were looking for an IDN label that that was somehow vaguely derived from a preexisting label would be to argue just absolutely no such association whatsoever, to the extent that this a new organization wishing to end to the market with a brand new label. And if anybody thinks that this label is inspired by a preexisting label, they're simply wrong. That would be the way to do it.

But again, if there is a label that is a dictionary word that's been associated with the sponsoring organization on the basis of its global representativity, (unintelligible) in imagining how that could be somehow transcended.

(Yulov):   Yeah, so would you agree for generally saying that we cannot say in general that there is some rights for sponsored TLDs but we need kind

of go on a case by case because just saying generally sponsored TLDs would cover some cases maybe that should be different, should be treated differently specifically (unintelligible) .museum case?

Cary Karp: Well I mean again, it's about who - what is it that somebody is requesting. I, as the president and CEO of the .museum sponsor would be quite happy if some entity using a language and script that we don't understand in Europe where to come forward and say we would like to operate our - a version of .museum. And of course we will adhere to the policy that have been established for the initial .museum. This is an attempt to extend the value of this.

(Yulov):   Okay.

Cary Karp: That we would probably be delighted by that.

(Yulov):   Okay.

Cary Karp: If someone came and said that you are not globally represented if - you don't certainly don't represent (DM) in our country, we want our own labels, our own .museum labels, I just don't see how that could possibly work.

              If it were to be able to work, then ICANN would admit that there was some basic law in the 2000 round that .museum was created in, and there would also enough need somehow to override the authority of an NGO that was created 60 years ago specifically to be representative of the museum community globally.

(Yulov):   Okay. Well, I agree with what - with your view. I think this is the way to go. Okay.

Cederampattu Mohan: (Yulov), would you - just for the help of the document, et cetera, would you mind taking a minute and just summarizing your - what you're agreeing with?

(Yulov):   Well, I think if I understand right that what Cary said right now is that he doesn't mind that - Cary, correct me if I'm wrong - that other - that in case of an IDN, if a body is some kind of an organization comes and asks for an equivalent of .museum in another language, that - and they will come and agree with the same eligibility or rules of the current .museum, that that specific organization will be able to manage the IDN TLD.

                Is that what I - you were trying to say, Cary?

Cary Karp: Not quite. What I'm saying is that suggestion would be something that we would certainly be interested in discussing.

(Yulov):   Okay.

Cary Karp: We don't award TLD label.

(Yulov):   Sure.

Cary Karp: And if somebody were to say we want this set up (Antropogeni) Museum, the (Antropogeni) word for museum, but it's not going to be based at all on the policy that applied to ASCII .museum with the very

specific consequence that eligibility in the one does not imply eligibility in the other, then the value of the global sTLD has just been destroyed.

If somebody says that we wish to reinforce the value of preexisting label, that's very much of the interested of our community, again it's…

(Yulov):   Okay.

Cary Karp: …what benefits museum, not what benefits the domain name industry, sorry to say that. But there has to be our overriding concern.

(Yulov):   So, what's you're saying actually was I think and I agree for is that you don't think that the current .museum registry should get what I've said before automatically that .museum equivalent (Bagan). And but if there is someone asking for a .museum as (Bagan), it should be in someway reinforcing the current .museum top level domain.

Cary Karp: Let's put it this way, if there are 350 languages that are likely to figure in the IDN space, I would love to see museum in every single one of them. And I can envision numerous business models that would make that happen. And I would be delighted to see this thing move forward.

This is not - this doesn't say anything more than the notion of a whole bunch of museum, is very appealing to me and I'm quite sure that any operator of any TLD would kind of like that unless the essential thing is this singularity of that label, in which case suggestion of having a translated variance of it would be that would have to be opposed.

So there's just so many different things that can happen. And I'm sort of assuming that the application for an IDN label or a new TLD has the

greatest chance of success if it brings something absolutely new the marketplace.

(Yulov): Yeah, sure.

Cary Karp: This notion of wishing to derive secondary values or something that somebody else's branded by using another script is probably a weaker case.

(Yulov): Uh-huh.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you, (Yulov).

Marilyn Cade: This is Marilyn.

Can I ask Cary a question when you get your answer?

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure. I'll put you in the list here. Is it directly about what's been discussed here, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: It is.

Cederampattu Mohan: Then why don't you ask your questions.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

I heard Cary saying expressing his point of view as the manager of .museum, but I want to be sure that I understood Cary. You were not proposing to speak for the other sponsored parties; you were giving your individual opinion. Was that right?

Cary Karp: Individual cannot be overemphasized here. And I've been following this process as astute - as anybody else has have (unintelligible) my ability to be astute. And this is what I personally think would be a reasonable development in the very specific case of TLDs that benefit the museum, (unintelligible) museum community.

I don't suggest that this is extensible one job into any other TLD.

Cederampattu Mohan: And I would suspect Cary that whatever our statements are, you will take it into sponsored TLDs and ask them for their perspectives and bring them back as well.

Cary Karp: Uh-huh.

Cederampattu Mohan: Okay, thank you.

Marilyn, was that the extent of your question?

Marilyn Cade: It was.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you.

Sophia, you're next.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, I guess what I want to say after listening to perhaps (Yulov) and Cary is finally they came to an agreement maybe I'm not sure that the sponsored community, the statement started by saying sponsored communities can be treated differently in gTLD. That's what we were deliberating. And then…

Cederampattu Mohan: In IDN string.

Sophia Bekele: In IDN strings. And then I think they're treated differently with the word that we were all struggling with what does that mean, right?

And so, Cary, I think you were trying to say that the .museum because it's an established, it's sort to have more weight because it comes with the established community and it's recognized at the dictionary level and so forth and so forth. So therefore, you're not saying that the IDN issued the .museum in a different language, (adhere) to the principles of the sponsored community at it said out at the gTL - the ASCII gTLD.

My understanding is what you're saying is anybody can have .museum in their languages as long as the principle adhere to within the sponsored community, principles which is recognized by a higher established institution or community. That's what you were saying, right? Because anybody can have the .museum in their languages.

Cary Karp: But we don't award TLD label to anybody. I can't say that anybody can have .museum in their language. I'm saying that if some language community were to express an interest in a .museum label in that language and was proposing it to be operated on the exact same policy basis as the current .museum, that I would think that suggestion would have clear interest and merit.

Sophia Bekele: Excellent.

Cary Karp: Yeah.

Sophia Bekele: I think we - I think that I agree with that principle, period.

But the question we went - just to go back to the first statement we made is sponsored communities can be treated differently. I'm trying to merge what was discussed with that statement if that is what we're going to use. What does that mean, treated differently in IDN? How were they treated now that we're going to treat them differently within IDN?

That's my problem. Is the sponsored community right now within the ASCII community, you know, they have a generic principle? I mean I'm trying to figure out what that statement means as it relates to what we just discussed. How are we - you know, if we're making a policy over this, how are we writing a policy?

So that's a clarification question I would ask after this discussion because we started out with the statement saying sponsored communities can be treated differently in IDN. What does mean as we - because I think - is everybody there?

Cederampattu Mohan: Yes, absolutely.

Man: Yeah, sure.

Sophia Bekele: I think what (Yulov) said earlier was the Sunrise period, the case by case could be treated differently. I think that sort of - I would agree with that too in a sense if we're saying that the current process of sponsored community were treated, you know, with a case-by-case basis where they didn't have in the ASCII world where they did not have an established (principles) like the .museum and when somebody

goes in and ask .jobs or any other TLD in a different language. They don't have to go back to the, you know, I suppose the Sunrise within the IDN World, the Sunrise period would take care - because there's no structure already made for sponsored community right now in the ASCII world except maybe the .museum has its own because it's a very well established community.

So I'm just little confused how we set policy on this. What would be the statement of policy? That's just my question.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you, Sophia.

Why don't I ask that directly, you know, redirect back that into the working group here and ask if you have any comments or discussion on Sophia's question.

And, Sophia, perhaps you could just repeat the question.

Sophia Bekele: My question is that we started out by saying sponsored communities can be treated differently in the IDN world. And so, we establish that yes, they would be - according the .museum principle which is already established one, we're saying, yes, you know, anybody can come and ask have an IDN TLD for already established community which is the sponsored community.

However, when we're going to a non-established group like .jobs that didn't have - that has a smaller community support versus the grander one.

And so, we're saying IDN should - IDN feel this should be treated on a case by case places or they should be treated differently.

So I mean, I have two scenarios there with case by case treated differently for sponsor TLD like jobs and then we have the .museum which if everybody applies for a .museum in a different language then what we're saying is if they adhere to the principles of the existing .museum sponsored community then we - it's an acceptable principle.

So what is the policy statement that will resolve this particular issue? Or are we all in agreement that sponsored communities in the IDN - in IDN can be treated differently? But what that treatment is, I don't know if it was crystallized to a point of is it case-by-case basis for IDN or can just say that or are we graduating it to a higher community like the .museum?

Cederampattu Mohan: Understood. Thank you. Any comments or discussion on this?

William Tan: This is William. I like to comment?

Cederampattu Mohan: Okay, anyone else?

All right. William, you have the floor.

William Tan: Yeah. I just like to revise my earlier statement which was I said that sponsored communities are inherently different. What I really mean is that given that someone has - (Yulov) and you guys have come up with the .jobs example, that was clearly not something that's similar - that's clearly different from .museum case. And so, what I really mean is that

that is - I don't think we should have to say that sponsored communities should be treated differently. I think we should just defer that to the sponsor TLD group in the IDN.

So when you take a sponsored TLD case, an application for an IDN sponsored TLD, that should just be no different than someone applying for sponsored TLD ASCII. And yes, that's it.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you.

I guess one of the talks that strikes as we get towards the close of this discussion is that, you know, in earlier discussions we have spoken about the concept of what I will call generically bundling of TLD labels. So in the case of sponsored TLD, such a concept probably works quite well.

So I'll just leave it there and let's move to the next topic.

The next topic here or that is the next question that had been posed earlier was should registrant be treated differently based on steps taken to protect the name in different languages.

I think if I remember right, Marilyn, you had stated something to this effect in our call last week.

Marilyn Cade: I did. You're right.

Cederampattu Mohan: Would you care to elaborate?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I asked the question of whether - and I'm thinking primarily about probably a semi-process. But I think the example I used was a famous and well known brand holder who may have who may have registered a trademark and protects that trademark in 120 countries -- let's just pick that as a number. And someone like nk.net who did register a domain name and occasionally uses it or does use it or whatever, but hasn't even bothered to trademark it in a single country.

And, you know, I think trying to understand the expectations of that - those - I think we need to be thinking about what the Sunrise or protecting the rights of others approach is going to look like in IDN.

There are, I understand the number of IDN at the second level that have already been, (say), IDN UDRP at the second level have already been done by WIPO and perhaps by others. But I'm aware of the numbers of other had been done by WIPO.

And I think we might want to hear from them and see what lessons can be learned from what they relied on in making the determination today at the second level.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you.

Mike Rodenbaugh: This is Mike Rodenbaugh. Just a comment on that. It sounds like that's more appropriate for the working group dealing with protection of rights of others.

Am I missing the point?

Marilyn Cade: Mike, are you asking me?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure you or anyone in the group.

Marilyn Cade: Sure. Before I'll make a comment on that, I think we have to be careful to be sure that we maintain the involvement of the expertise of the IDN working group. I'm not proposing necessarily for the work to be done, but I am making a recommendation just because people are in another working group does not mean that they necessarily have all the expertise necessary. So I'd like to be sure there's strong reflection just as we earlier talked about having strong involvement of the IDN working group on geopolitical names and country codes, et cetera, that we make sure there's strong reflection of the IDN working group expertise in any such consideration.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. I guess I think I understand what you're saying, Marilyn, but I mean, ultimately the issue is one of - whether IDN are confusingly similar to existing ASCII domains, correct?

And that's not an IDN issue, obviously. I suppose it's an IDN and an ASCII issue.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. I guess my point is we just want to be careful not to duplicate work. And I think I volunteered or was volunteered to be a liaison between those two working groups.

Sophia Bekele: I think that's what I was - let me - can I jump then, Ram? I think...

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure, jump in.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. It's Sophia.

I think that this is probably a good time to bring up the issue I was raising at the end that I was hoping they will raise at the end, the role definition. And I think Mike brought it up. If somebody is working on a particular group in the reserve name group or any other one particular - dealing with particular issues and their liaison is established for that, bringing the whole issue up to a working group level, not only repetitive, it (unintelligible) the purpose of what the liaisons are supposed to be working on.

So for me, I need a clarification on that role, otherwise, I thought then the working group of IDN should be previewed to every report and every issue working group that are - that we are all working on so that they could make their comments. Otherwise, you know, it's - that's when I mentioned we need to streamline the whole process if we're creating all these liaisons, let them be assigned to do what they need to do and present to the group or…

((Crosstalk))

Cederampattu Mohan: Understood. Sophia, let me speak very briefly and hopefully crisply on this topic.

My view a liaison is fairly clear in the sense that the liaison is - my expectation is that the liaison provides a summary of what the working group that they are a part of, what input that working group may have. To provide that input into the working group, they are a liaison to on the one side,

Now, in the other side, where - in their judgment, the working group, there are liaison too is discussing topics that are directly relevant to the original working group to bring those topics back. I do not think the liaison's job is to pass every email or every document that is being discussed. However, where the liaison does believe in their judgment that there is an overlap or there is an area of interest. It is in my opinion the responsibility to point that out.

The experts are invited on to the working group because of their specific knowledge or expertise so to speak. And they may or may not actually attend all the calls or may not provide or attend all the discussions in the other working group they're in while the liaison is expected to pay attention to those - to the discussions in the working group, their liaisons too as well as be on the call.

So, for the liaison's role is kind of more - it's a two-way bidirectional communication role and summarization and communication role, while an expert role in general us unidirectional into the other working group they're an expert on.

Man: Okay. That makes sense to me, Ram and Mike Rodenbaugh, so, you know, I would just suggest that these issues about confusing similarity and how we deal with that between ASCII and non-ASCII strings is better left to the group protecting the rights of others.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I'm just going to make a final comment about this.

When we say better left to another group, I think we need to be - I just want to support what Ram was saying that there are going to be times

because of the speed of the work that needs to be done where it's more expedient to draw in a joint discussion involving experts that are in the IDN group than spend a lot of time (chewing) and throwing with liaison statement.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I say something?

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure, Avri.

Hi. Yeah. I mean, I think we've got a sort of (continuum) - a space between a formality of the liaison statement and the - having experts cross-pollinate the group. I think having a liaison is good as sort of a continuous process of keeping track what's going on, of alerting the two groups to what's going on, of knowing when an expert is required in the other. I think we have to use the experts whenever is necessary, and I think we should avoid, you know, the formality of liaisons.

Certainly, if we have something written that would be useful to have our liaison take over to the other group and say, "Hey, you know, they've written this. They think it might be useful, let's talk about it." But I think there's sort of a rational middle here where we can use liaison quickly and usefully without a whole lot of structure and process.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I guess, Avri, it's Mike Rodenbaugh. Again, just to respond to that, I completely agree with what you're saying. I'm solely trying to avoid this group getting hung up on issues that are going to be dealt with in another group, particularly when that other group is more focused specifically on this issue, you know, right? I mean…

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: …rights of other's group is all about dealing with confusion amongst users. And whereas the IDN group, I don't think necessarily needs to go down that road.

Avri Doria: Except for when the confusions are specifically IDN issue.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

Cederampattu Mohan: What I'm actually hearing from Mike is even if the confusions are specifically in the area of IDN that the IDN working group would provide input to the PRO working group rather than take it on itself.

(Yulov):   Ram, it's (Yulov). I would have to comment on that. I disagree with Mike. I think that I've heard about three or four times during this call, it's time for someone else that we raise an issue and saying that oh, this issue is not - we should not deal it with it in this group. I think that we should deal with all issues under - that are relevant to IDN. We should use liaisons to other group that can provide input. We should provide our input to other group regarding IDN. But if we want to provide a real good advice regarding what should be done for IDN policy, we should talk about confusingly similar. This is one of the issues. This is a very important issue in IDN and we cannot leave to other groups. I really think it will be wrong.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: …unconfusingly distinct.

Cederampattu Mohan:	(Yulov), I understand what you're saying. It's a concern to a everybody. I completely understand what you're saying.

(Yulov):	Uh-huh.

Cederampattu Mohan:	Is it also a concern however, outside of the IDN context. It's just a concern that's exacerbated by IDN.

(Yulov):	Yeah.

Cederampattu Mohan:	Definitely. So I'm - you know, again, what we're trying to avoid having two groups to consider a very substantial complicated issue and potentially come to differing conclusions.

(Yulov):	You know, the solution for that will be to have a liaison to get inputs from what that group is talking or what are their general views and see whether we think these views are similar and are right, you know, on the IDN World. And that's - that will be, so we won't do, let's say, we won't go through the same process and spend all the time that they spend (on as) an issue.

	I agree with that that shouldn't happen but I don't think that we should just say, "Look, this is not our issue," and not discuss it all. We need maybe to be very careful that will be the work of the chair and to make sure that we're not, you know, spending too much time on issues that are done - are covered by other groups but maybe to try an get some inputs from those groups to our issues.

Marilyn Cade:	Ram, it's Marilyn.

I think that there's actually a much simpler approach to this and maybe we're making it. And I think it's kind of what we're using in the reserve name group.

We were sort of instead of just relying on liaison, we're actually inviting some collaboration. Isn't that perhaps just the easiest thing to leave open as an option to say on a particular topic, it may be appropriate to have a collaborative meeting - working session between…

Woman: Marilyn, I think that's also - our current proposal to what we're talking about. Now, that opens up a whole group-to-group meeting versus the, you know, what's we're currently talking about, about the role of a liaison, what should they be doing and then the duplication of work which I think Mike is stressing.

And I think all is valid, but for example, let me just mention when the e-mail came today, the geopolitical group, I said I was sitting in LA, Ram was there, (Tina) as there, and I sensed like, okay, they are there as expressed observer, and I appreciate that and they're needed - their input is needed at all times and they could be used. But as a liaison, when I come back, I - you know, since I had to report on the major issues of all - what's relevant to the IDN, it will be my role, that is what I thought it would be.

And then I'll be reporting to the group on all the issues that would catch up on IDN and then get the view of our group and then work with the chair to just to get the consensus and report the issues and then, if there's another reserved for the next meeting of the reserve working group, then we will provide what IDN working group (has saved).

So we're not missing any topics, but at least we're not duplicating, you know, work and we're not, you know, putting people, you know, into - we get all the consensus during our own sessions. We don't need to create a third session to get people to talk about the, you know, the similar things that, you know, and that's being addressed in both groups.

So I'm just trying to sort out. I've never been a liaison and I don't know the work of the liaison, but if it is not that, it should be that. This is just my opinion.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's Mike Rodenbaugh again. You know, I guess, Sophia, I believe - I agree with every thing you've said. I think on this specific issue just to bring it back to context, you know, I think that the issue that we've been talking about, about bundling or aliasing, or (the name) record or however you want to look at is certainly something we need to continue talking about in this group as the top level.

I think it's also consideration if people want to consider and talk about how that might work at the second level. That would be good information to feedback into the PRO working group, because clearly, the PRO working is going to be dealing with the second level issues regardless of what this group does.

Woman: Ram, can I ask you to take up the question of clarification of the role and work of liaisons with (Bruce) and maybe comeback to us in writing, so we don't - because I think that debating this we're putting us all in all in a big circle and everybody's trying to do their best and lend support, but it might just be - would you mind doing that on our behalf and then

we can comeback to it and see what the suggestion is in - after your consultation with (Bruce)?

Cederampattu Mohan: I'm happy to do that. Thank you.

And I guess back to the question of - I mean, Mike, you have a concrete proposal in front of us. (Yulov) suggested a deferring perspective. Your proposal was that, you know, when it comes should registrants to be treated differently based on steps taken to protect name and other languages. Your suggestion was, that in this case, if - in all our report, for instance, our report would say that this question was asked and the working groups suggests that this question is best discussed in the PRO working group with the specific focus on languages in IDN or something to that effect.

Now, I heard (Yulov) say, no, we should discuss it here, and then provide whatever input we have when it comes to languages in IDN into the PRO working group.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think - and then I just - we just last said that I think I agree with (Yulov) that yes, we want to consider that and (feed) the inputs into the PRO -- that is a good idea. I would just urge the group to not get too carried away with discussing lots of other issues relating to confusing similarity, right?

Man: I agree.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Most specifically the trademark issues, so…

Cederampattu Mohan: Understood.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Cederampattu Mohan: So, let me open up this topic for just a couple of minutes because we've spent more time discussing whether we should discuss it rather than just (unintelligible) it, so let's actually discuss that if you want to.

Should registrant be treated differently based on steps taken to protect the names and or the languages or scripts? The question on, you know, for discussion now.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can someone explain better to me what it means to make a step to protect? And as are we suggesting that…television, that there would be reserved names, that there would be - that this is just something one would pay attention to during the contention part and the challenge part of a process? I'm not what sure what steps some people are suggesting we take.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And are we talking just about the top level or the second level or both?

Cederampattu Mohan: Well, since the working - our working group is focused on the top level, and we're also talking in this - in this agenda today, we're talking about registrants who by definition therefore will be at the next level or levels lower than that. The answer really is it's IDNs TLDs and registrants in those IDN, TLDs, Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. To me the issues again just no different than it is - than already exists in asking ASCII TLDs.

Avri Doria: So would you propose a Sunrise process, Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think again, those are - those issues are being resolved by the
                  PRO group as to what will happen with sunrises or not sunrises or
                  post-launch, take-down mechanisms, modification to the UDRP, all
                  those things are potentially on the table in that group.

Cederampattu Mohan: So, Mike, would I be right in saying that what you're
                  proposing to us as us a working group is that the rights of registrants
                  and the right of others that the treatment - deferring treatment based
                  on IDN, the languages, what are you suggesting there? Are you
                  suggesting that it not be studied in this working group and it'd be
                  studied in the PRO working group?

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question differently?

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure, please.

Avri Doria: And maybe it's not the same question, but I guess what I'm looking to
                  understand is - and maybe this would be an answer to Mike is what is
                  specifically different about the situation in IDN than in the normal case?

                  Mike has sort said as far as he can tell, it's the same case and
                  therefore there's nothing for us to talk about that's specific to the IDN
                  group.

                  We had just…

Cederampattu Mohan: Okay. That's well worded, Avri. And I was getting to the same thing, is - so perhaps the question, is there a difference?

Avri Doria: Well what is the difference? Assuming there is, if people have said there is, what is it?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. I'm open. My ears are open. I'll just say, that the UDRP currently already addresses both IDNs and non-ASCII IDNs in precisely the same manner.

Cary Karp: Ram, Can I make a comment?

Cederampattu Mohan: Sure, Cary.

Cary Karp: It's generally through about IDN. It's been noted and stated and stated again and any number of regards that IDN doesn't introduce new problems into the discussion. It just makes the existing problems worse; in many cases, unimaginably worst.

But other than the issues that's specifically related to Unicode in the computing environment, IDN is just the same old stuff.

Cederampattu Mohan: So, Cary, you're saying that there's no difference in your opinion? There is no difference.

Cary Karp: Well, what I'm suggesting is that if it's category, IDN makes some existing problems worse, that then perhaps what we should focus on is the inventory of that worst stuff and calling attention to situations where it's really a lot worse.

So if there are people on this call who are familiar with some problems that we are addressing as they manifest themselves in the non-IDN context then - and feel that there's no fundamental difference, if we can't determine any fundamental difference perhaps we should relinquish the issue.

Cederampattu Mohan: I think it's an excellent idea to look at a little bit further. For example, we could look at all the UDRP cases that have involved the IDNs, and we could take a subset of non-IDN UDRP cases or just go on, you know, the knowledge of people who deal with those everyday and come up with any differences.

Avri Doria: So, Mike, what I was suggesting we might actually hear from the WIPO staff. Is that similar to what you're proposing or were you thinking that someone might do just drafting analysis exercise?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, if WIPO staff will do it for us, that would be best in my book.

Avri Doria: If they would agree to be on the call with us?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Since they'd agree that to look at the IDN cases specifically and let us know if they've seen any peculiarities or differences in the way those cases are presented or decided.

Avri Doria: I doubt it. I doubt if they have time to do that in our timeframe that they might be able to be on the call with us.

(Yulov) Cary, this is (Yulov) here.

I want to actually - you said that in some cases, it makes it extremely worse. Can you give example for what you think? Where will it make it extremely…

Cary Karp: Well, I actually hate to do this because I'm - I've heard all the talk about confusing similarities and I really (unintelligible). But confusing similarity, if we're dealing with the 26 letters and the 10 digits in the ASCII frame of reference, there's confusability between 0s and Os, between Is and ls.

(Yulov) Uh-huh.

Cary Karp: But that's it, with three cases. And for every new script that we add, this just becomes a larger problem and the similarities between two different scripts larger still. And the really scary stuff is all of the script that nobody's really talking about that we're not capable of recognizing the dangers in. but nonetheless, we need to make policies (unintelligible) of them. One example.

(Yulov) Yeah, but what - isn't - you know, I think that - just in my thought that if - although I understand where you're coming from, but it's kind of something that's related to the same script. It's very easy for me to think about the Hebrew script or I don't know, the Chinese script is a very different from the English one. And I would think that if someone has - as much as I know, if someone has a trademark, let's say in Israel for a specific English letters, English word or an ASCII word and they would need legally to protect their trademark, probably they would on some level need also to have the Hebrew equivalent that they use usually.

Avri Doria: That's right.

(Yulov):   So, then it looks like in this case, it's not too different for me because the similarities are not, you know, are not too close. It will be relevant in cases of other languages that have Latin or - Latin letters in them and then those IDNs would probably be very, very problematic. But in the (MOFAR) script, I don't think it would be more - would make more problems. I don't know.

((Crosstalk))

Cary Karp: If we can identify problems that are truly unique to IDN, and I mean truly, that'd be great because it gives us something clearly the focus on.

(Yulov):   Okay.

Cederampattu Mohan: So, to Avri's question, I have not heard a definition of an answer other than perhaps such a case does not exist, Avri. That's, I guess what I was - what I've been hearing here. You mean that the difference is you're talking about 250,000 or whatever languages instead of one.

Cary Karp: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Well, actually we're talking probably at one language a time now.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm not following you, Avri?

Avri Doria: Well, I mean, unless we're mixing all the languages in a label, what we're really talking about is one language at a time. And yes, we may be talking about a lot of languages, but we're not compounding the problems in such a level's complexity that we're throwing all possibly confusing character symbols, what have you, into the same label.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: We're talking about, at least I assumed, you're still talking about single labels, single sort of characters. Each one of them having some confusing aspects on the nature of the type of 0 and O. We don't necessarily know them all. We could probably and safely assume that every script has some of these confusions in them that will need to be dealt with just as 0 and O need to be dealt with.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I don't think we're dealing with the whole basket all at once.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. But we are dealing on a comparative basis what's been happening in UDRP cases involving IDN because you're essentially comparing an ASCII string to an IDN string, and deciding whether that meets the bad faith (unintelligible) interest test of UDRP.

Avri Doria: Okay. And that indeed is the extra piece that is IDN, is that you have to have a complete string in a different script that looks the same…

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right.

Avri Doria: …as a script in - I mean as a label in another script.

Mike Rodenbaugh: You know, all thoughts in which the Hebrew (unintelligible) looks like an "O".

Man: An "O."

Mike Rodenbaugh: There are thoughts in which the Hebrew (unintelligible) looks like an L. So these circular things and these vertical things just about in this - the various scripts that are used. And it is possible artfully if your intention is deceptive, probably to mimic a whole bunch of scripts with a whole bunch of scripts.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Not putting any numbers on it.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Including Hebrew being confused with Latin.

Cary Karp: Uh-huh.

Cederampattu Mohan: And honestly I think that it would be great for this group to continue looking at that issue because we really do have the sort of expertise in this group to think about that. That would be A - a big A to the other group.

Avri Doria: Yeah. So that sounds to me like that's what's significant is the script to script, you know, identical looking strings.

Cederampattu Mohan: Cary, one day, you'll need to tell me how much - how do you know so much about Hebrew.

Cary Karp: I don't know anything about Hebrew. I don't understand a word of it, but you (know something) about the scripts.

Cederampattu Mohan: Very good.

Sophia Bekele: Ram, can I just add something into that?

Cederampattu Mohan: Please.

Sophia Bekele: Sophia. It's not adding but I was just saying it looks like, you know, there are two groups parallel, the UDRP expertise there and then there's the IDN working group of ICANN, you know, looking at sort of the same thing. But what Michael is suggesting (resource) of outsourcing -- if that's the right word to use -- let's outsource the work to the expertise that are actually dealing with this on a daily basis.

And then I think you mentioned during the `05 meeting also in LA, right? And let's just put the liaison function to bring in the issues from the UDRP as well as IDN working group and see if, you know, we could - I don't think we can - even in our group, I don't think we can be able to address this, even create that policy to a point where we would look at every language and there's a statement that would cover everything. I mean that is my personal opinion of the linguistics.

And then we will have a problem of making decision. ICANN will have if there are, you know, even 50 languages have the TLD level that, you know, somebody needs to apply for. I mean, you need - how are you

going to prioritize this based on language, based on which one is considered, you know, a high priority language, are we going to have five languages like the UN, which language are we going to pick.

So the best way I think is to use the UDRP process and create that liaison function that would strengthen the relationship and the idea of sharing of broad groups. And I think, Michael, is that what you are suggesting?

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's exactly what I'm suggesting. I mean to the extent there's expertise in this group that can feed into the other group then…

Sophia Bekele: Sure.

Mike Rodenbaugh: …let's pursue it. Absolutely.

Avri Doria: Yeah, as long as we see transparency what the other group is doing on a briefing on a regular basis and somebody has the time on this group, and the concern in us to make that point, you know, (Yulov) probably will be interested in everything that, you know, if there's a thing about policy on the Hebrew language or anything that touches upon that. And then I'll be interested in anything, on Amharic, which is the Ethiopia language, and that sort of thing.

So, I mean that's an excellent base to start from and so we don't have to replicate information and work and so forth, so.

Cederampattu Mohan: Thank you. I'm going to request two things. One is that perhaps, (Maria), if you could extract Mike's proposal and, you know, pass it on to Mike as well as to - and just copy me on it and let's make

sure that it's accurate and then have that proposal be placed in front of our working group for input. And then kind of move forward on this particular topic.

I notice that we are at the conclusion of the second hour of our call here. And I'd like to draw this meeting to a close. And I'd like to kind of set the stage for what we plan to do next week, which will be at the earlier hour in the morning my time. But it will be an early hour in the day for - or later hour depending on where you're at.

And next week, our plan is to discuss techno policy details and then to spend time discussing the draft out comes of report that we'll have in front of you and start to arrive at, you know, areas where we agree and areas where we disagree on it and move forward from there.

I also recommend that if you have - if you believe that there are other topics, worthy of discussion that have not yet been discussed in our working group so far that you present them to the list and that you help initiate and stoke the discussion on the list directly.

We are moving into our last three weeks of the working group and our focus is swiftly going to move to outcomes rather than only discussions.

And with that, I'd like to bring the call to a close. Thank you for your time and we look forward to seeing you in a week's time on the call and before that on the working group.

Thanks.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you…

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks, everyone.

END