

**GNSO IDNcctlds group teleconference
20 August 2007 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO IDNcctlds group teleconference on 20 August 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/idn-cctld-20070820.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Participants on the call:

**Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency group co-ordinator
Tin Tan Wee - NCUC
Bilal Beiram - CBUC
Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council
Yoav Keren - Registrar c.**

Absent apologies

Mark McFadden - ISPCP

ICANN Staff:

**Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat**

Coordinator: Yes, the recording has now begun.

Chuck Thank you very much.

Okay. So it looks like everyone's on except for (Mark McFadden) and our time scheduling for the calls hasn't worked for (Mark) very well so, this is going to be our last call barring anything that we learn differently today.

So, hopefully we'll be able to get through and finish up enough so that we can finish the document and send it to the counsel. The counsel will

be, you know, will then take it from there and review it and decide what to do with it. And of course all of you are welcome to continue tracking that process.

I'll try and keep you informed as well through our little list. Don't know what the timing will be on the counsel action. I do know that there's a lot of things going on there so. So I will get that to them either later today or tomorrow after we make the changes.

Now Olof is going to be editing on the document in Google accounts this morning. I'll be switching back and forth between that document and the latest Word document so that we both have notes on how to get this thing finalized. Any questions?

Let me start off by thanking everyone for their involvement and I'll do that again at the end, but since our last call last week, (Tin Wee) made suggested edits and (Sophia) you indicated that you were okay with those and I also sent some comments in that regard and we will go through those in our call this morning.

So, let's get started. What I'd like to do first, if nobody objects, is just take a look at the document I sent out in the Word version had highlights. The one in Google accounts won't show the highlights but I would like to just go through those and see if we have any changes to the edits were made then we'll go to the wording suggestions by (Tin Wee) and those were in response to some items that (Sophia) had identified in her comments. And then we'll take anything else in the document that anybody wants discussed. Is that all right?

Okay, and for the sake of, now is this being transcribed as well Glen or not?

Glen Desaintgery: It is indeed Chuck

Chuck: Okay, so make sure you identify yourself, I think we all recognize each other's voices by now, but the transcribers don't. So if you just indicate when, your name when you're saying something that will help the transcribers a lot.

Now, I'm not going to go over minor edits that are in the document, those are highlighted so you can see those in the Word version, but (Mark McFadden) had suggested and I'm in the paragraph just before Section A of the document and, if you're in the Word document it's page, it's still on Page 1.

(Mark McFadden) had suggested that we consider a set of general overall principles but he never did provide any text so I'm going to go ahead and delete that comment and we'll just leave it as is unless anybody objects to that. Okay?

All right, going on then to the next edit was a minor one, I'll accept all those later scrolling down to Section 1, which is – Which territories are eligible for an IDN ccTLD, and Question A – Should this relationship be maintained – there was an edit there that basically said in the one, two, looks like the second sentence, third sentence, third sentence where added with an IDN ccTLD label to get a full idea name. I don't think, I think that's just grammatical and wordsmithing. But I, if anybody thinks that's not the case, let me know.

In the second, what I believe is the second paragraph of that response it says – It is also noted that a number of territory-based ASCII ccTLDs now I deleted the word significant because I'm not sure what, you know, that there's a significant number of territory-based ASCII-ccTLDs or not operated as territory-based ccTLDs and (unintelligible) and then what is significant. So, anybody have a problem with deleting the word significant there? We do know that there are a number of them. Is that okay?

(Sophia): Can I just make a comment.

Chuck: Sure (Sophia).

(Sophia): Maybe who made that comment that maybe it's meant to say many and not significant in an important way but to say a number, like number many, so I guess number should cover that or are we...

Chuck: I think so.

(Sophia): Okay.

Chuck: That would my opinion, and anybody think differently?

(Sophia): (Unintelligible) of territory, yea I think that's fine. Yes.

Chuck: I mean, we're just making the point that there are some out there and I don't know if anybody knows how many there are, but there certainly are quite a few and a number covers that. Okay? Thanks.

All right, so that's okay. Then at the end of that section, a sentence was added there – If such restriction is not possible then the issue of unfair competition must be addressed to ensure that the technical, financial and operational criteria required for IDN ccTLDs is the same as for new IDN gTLDs.

And (Sophia) let me ask you for a comment. First of all I think that was my attempt to try and capture what you wanted and I had committed to do that on our last call. Is that the idea that you were trying to convey, did I capture that correctly?

(Sophia): Yea, that's fine.

Chuck: Okay, anybody else have a comment on that?

Okay. Now, going to Question D in the section and the question is – Should anything be done about ccTLDs already being used as gTLDs and in that quite a bit of, well there was some text deleted, our old text was deleted in the last meeting and the way it now, there's a lot of text that is highlighted in the document.

The part that hasn't changed are the first two sentences, so the proposed (GNSO) response does this seems to be an issue of primary concern for the government associated with individual ccTLDs, if it is agreed that the associated government should have sovereign control over their ccTLDs, then it seems to follow that they should be the ones to decide how to use their ccTLDs, a minor edit there at the end "s" added to ccTLD.

Then, the rest of the text and some of it comes from what we had before but it's been modified and I think we agreed to it in the last meeting, but let me read it and make sure that we're okay or see if there's more changes we want to make, whatever.

And so, it then goes on to day – in that regard, though, it seems appropriate that any IDN ccTLDs added should be done for the sole purpose of benefiting the applicable local ccTLD language community or language communities as applicable.

For example, for a fictitious ASCII ccTLD.xi serving a territory called Island X and IDN ccTLD for .xi should only be added using a specific script that is used by an Island X language community and the purpose of that ccTLD should be to serve members of that particular language community on Island X as well as any of its members that may be located elsewhere in the world and IDN ccTLD for .xi should not be added to serve a generic global purpose, i.e., making it a defacto gTLD.

Any questions or comments on that? Anybody not okay with that language?

Okay, going on then. And I'm scrolling down to the main question, how many IDN ccTLDs per script per territory. The main question in the Word document is on Page 4, I don't think you have page numbers in the Google one. Yea, question?

(Tin Wee): (Tin Wee) here.

Chuck: Oh good.

(Tin Wee): I'm back. I'm back. I'm reading your blue stuff that is in Part D.

Chuck: Okay good...

(Tin Wee): I'm just wondering...

Chuck: Go ahead.

(Tin Wee): Will anybody be, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Chuck: We're down to question –How many IDN ccTLD, and it's on the bottom of Page 4 in the Word version if that's, if you have that,

(Tin Wee): No, I just wanted to go back to the Island thing.

Chuck: Okay, lets go back there. That was what I was going to ask next.

(Tin Wee): Sorry about that, yea.

Chuck: To see if you had anything there. Okay, please, I'm back there, go ahead.

(Tin Wee): Yea, my question was, is there any way in the text that sort of covers the ground in between. I believe we know very clearly that we should try to benefit the local community in local territory.

And then, of course, we had tried to avoid the situation and something that's intended for local territory is now used for a global purpose beyond its original purpose right?

So the question is what happens if a territory that is not quite global but extends outside of its particular territory? So for example, like the community in the camel community, they're used by the people in Tonga and Sri Lanka, they're Island X people, right?

Chuck: Right. Now, if I'm understanding you correctly, I think it is covered in there. That's why it said, and let me, let me pick the words there. If you go to the, I think the last sentence it says for example, for a fictitious ASCII ccTLD...

(Tin Wee): Okay, as well as any of its members that may be located elsewhere in the world, right that is referring to its members you see, so it must be its should actually refer to members of that particular language community...

Chuck: As well as any...

(Tin Wee): That may be located elsewhere in the world right?

Chuck: And as well as any that, oh yea, let's just delete of its members, is that okay? So in other words it would say, as well as any that may be located elsewhere in the world.

(Tin Wee): Yea.

Chuck: Is that good?

Man: Or even including any.

Chuck: Okay so.

(Tin Wee): That's fine with me, yea.

Chuck: So, including...

(Tin Wee): Any that may be located elsewhere in the world. Okay that's all, yea.
That's just my (unintelligible).

Chuck: Including any that may be – that's good, good changes, thank you.
Any, so it now reads, just to make sure everybody's with me on this, for example, for a fictitious ASCII ccTLD.xi serving a territory called Island X an IDN ccTLD for .xi should only be added using a specific script that is used by an Island X language community and the purpose of that ccTLD should be to serve members of that particular language community on Island X including any members that may be located elsewhere in the world. Is that okay?

Good. Okay. I'm going to hit a quick save on mine, so. Going down then to where we were, where we were at the bottom of Page 4 where it, the main question is how many IDN ccTLDs per script per territory and then, then going on to Page 5 in the Word document, Question A was – Should there similarly be only a single IDN ccTLD for a given script – and so on.

And again, we have quite a bit of new text in the first paragraph of the response, the sentence stayed the same as if there are multiple official scripts used in a territory, the best user experience would be to provide IDN TLDs in all those scripts where feasible.

And then it goes on and the rest of this is all new text, however means should be foreseen to mitigate any excesses, for example, if a government applies for a multitude of IDN ccTLD strings that might conceivably denote its country in a wide variety of scripts/languages such behavior could enter (unintelligible) force brand owners to make costly defensive registrations on all such TLDs to prevent domain name squatting, fishing or other abuse.

One way to address such concerns could be that every government wishing to implement an IDN ccTLD should adopt a mechanism for taking into account views from its own local language communities as well as from relevant language communities outside its country/territory. Another approach could be to implement an objection process whereby governments and other entities could voice their concerns prior to adoption of any IDN ccTLD. Any questions or comments on that addition?

Any opposition to it?

Okay.

(Tin Wee): I'm sorry, I'm trying to find where that thing is because it speaks out that I'm from a Vietnamese web browser and from a government Vietnamese location and its this (unintelligible) anybody knows how to read Vietnamese.

Chuck: It's question A under the question – Apart from some exceptions there are, under the statement, that apart from some exceptions there is one single ASCII ccTLD per listed territory.

And the major question, and I don't know if it's bolded in that document, I'm not looking at that right now, but how may IDN ccTLDs per script per territory, so, lets let you get there so that you can see the language in writing.

Again its' at the bottom of Page 4 out of 17 pages to give you a general context and the top of Page 5.

(Tin Wee): I'm looking at the thing that, the hyperlink that Glen just sent me, I'm just trying to trace out where that was.

Chuck: Okay, lets let you get there because that's a long set of text and I'd like you to see it.

(Tin Wee): Was it blue or something?

Chuck: Is it blue in the Google document?

Man: It's not blue, not that one. It, well for some reason or another it didn't survive with...

(Tin Wee): Okay, I got, I got it.

Chuck: Got it, good. Okay good. I wanted you to get there so that we can...

(Tin Wee): Now the approach (unintelligible) concerns about the adoption, okay sounds good to me.

Chuck: So that you're okay, you see that that, so it's a, the first paragraph of the response most all except for the first sentence is new text.

(Tin Wee): Okay, I think I can almost live with it. Olof any points to comment? You there Olof?

Olof: Yea. No.

Chuck: You okay, okay. Anything else (Tin Wee)?

(Tin Wee): No. I haven't spotted anything and my eyes are all blurry, I had the whole day of teaching.

Chuck: Yea, I apologize for that.

(Tin Wee): No, no, no, that's okay.

Chuck: Mine are blurry for a different, for a different reason and (Sophia's) are blurry for a different reason, so.

(Tin Wee): Age, you know.

Chuck: I didn't name that (Sophia).

(Sophia): That's true we're all blurry.

(Tin Wee): Was that (Sophia) on the phone.

Chuck: Yes she is.

(Sophia): Hi (Tin Wee).

(Tin Wee): Oh, hi (Sophia), how are you?

Chuck: Okay. All right, going on then.

(Tin Wee): Wake up, wake up!

Chuck: We're trying. Okay, going down then to the let's see, under the major question – How many scripts per territory, and then Item C, there was some text deleted and reworded there in the proposed GNSO response so that it now, and the first two sentences didn't change.

But then the third sentence it now reads – that said, consideration should be given to whether or not adding an IDN ccTLD increases the possibilities of one, homographic spoofing, two, creating TLDs with little demand except for defensive registrations and three, adding a risk of TLDs being misused for political ends – and then in parenthesis the warring groups that have little need for each others language and therefore may attempt to abuse each others language.

Man: And this was the point that you have brought (unintelligible) about something about this (unintelligible) any comment there you have? Is there any script being used by.

Man: Where are you I lost you for a minute.

Chuck: Okay, let me.

Man: Which point?

Chuck: Okay the major question is – How many scripts per territory?

Man: Yea, okay.

Chuck: And underneath that look at Item C. Okay. And then look at the proposed GNSO response, the first two sentences, or first three sentences I guess did not change. Okay and then from there on it says – That said – and why don't you read that and make sure you're comfortable with what's there.

Man: Okay just a second.

Chuck: Take your time.

Olof: In the meantime, may I just make, I think I've already made a little (unintelligible) but...

Man: Yea, I think it says what I meant in the last call I participated, yea.

Chuck: So it's captured okay?

Man: Yea I think it is.

Chuck: Thank you. Anybody else have a comment on this and then I'll come back to Olof?

Okay (Olof) go ahead.

Olof: Well just minor, minor edit possibilities of one four, well actually that's very superfluous preposition, so I suggest to delete four.

Chuck: Oh I, that's the edit I made in your version of the document that you edited (Olof).

Olof: Okay.

Chuck: So in my version that's taken care of. Okay. But go ahead and make it in that one as well please.

Olof: Okay.

Chuck: Okay, yea, I caught that one, when I went through your edits I saw that. So.

Olof: Okay.

Chuck: Okay, any other comments on that?

Okay, scrolling down let's see, and again I will skip minor edits. All of you would have been able to see those in the red line version, the Word document that was sent around. So I'm scrolling down quite a ways. Maybe I ought to cover this one. If you go down to major question – Are there any rights attached to a given script?

And then scroll down to, let's see, to Item B and the proposed GNSO response in the, it looks like the last sentence there were some changes made in that sentence, so let me read that sentence. And since, they're basically just some deletions in there. Okay.

And since there's nothing that can be done to prevent the country from unilaterally stopping by legal or other means the use of any script or

TLD in that script within its jurisdiction, it would seem prudent and sensible for ICANN and a prospective IDN TLD registry wishing to deploy their TLD – and at that point we delete in a given country say Japan. Okay?

So that's gone and so it says and a prospective IDN TLD registry wishing to deploy their TLD in a given script say (Kanji) to approach that country and/or the local language community in question to vet – and we deleted or approve, so it's just to vet their intent particularly from the point of view of commercial viability and market acceptability.

And now I'm wondering do we still want to say (Kanji) in parentheses?

Olof: May I comment on that, I think we don't because I mean (Kanji) never occurs all on its own. It's always together with hiragana or katakana, so...

Chuck: So we should delete that, right? To say Kanji. So the sentence then reads and I'll read it without commenting on the deletions – And since there is nothing that can be done to prevent the country from unilaterally stopping by legal or other means the use of any script or TLD in that script within its jurisdiction, it would seem prudent and sensible for ICANN on a prospective IDN TLD registry wishing to deploy their TLD in a given script to approach that country and/or the local language community in question to vet their intent, particularly from the point of view of commercial viability and market acceptability. Any comments?

Man: And the reason for this, there's a good reason for this I think because Kanji script and Hanja script and Chinese script coincide in the context of the (CJK).

Chuck: Yes, I agree. So any problems with those changes?

Man: So remove say Kanji right?

Chuck: Yes we did. I did and Olof is doing it on the Google.

(Olof): All done.

Man: And...

(Sophia): Just (unintelligible)Chuck, but on Question B it brings up the Kanji script as a question right, and it seemed like talking to that?

Chuck: Well, as an example. It says for example.

(Sophia): Okay, and are we using the answer as an example as well or, or as in a sentence.

Chuck: As I think it's a sentence now. What's we've done.

(Sophia): That's fine.

(Olof): Oh, okay I get, I get (Sophia's) point because there is explicit mention of say gTLD registry getting Kanji's script accepted and the protocol whether it should be approved by, by Japan or not or approved by Japan or not, but the answer then should also cite for example that

there's well in actual fact gTLD registry trying to get Kanji script accepted on the IDN protocol should not only get it improved by Japan but also all countries that actually use that script or overlap with that script including China, Japan and, China and Korea.

Woman: I was just thinking, somebody asked the question, so I'm sorry (unintelligible)

Chuck: Well again, we are not now referring to the example, we're just responding to the question and we're saying...

Man: In general I think.

Chuck: Yea in general, yea. So I think it covers the example and we're saying that, yea, the it would be a good idea for ICANN and the prospective IDN TLD registry to approach the country and local language community in question and to vet their intent.

Woman: I'm fine with itChuck, it's just I was just commenting on the question maybe the answer was addressing that. It's just a statement that's fine, it's acceptable.

Chuck: Okay.

(Tin Wee): So, I take (Sophia's) point because they actually explicitly mention something which is probably a misconception on the part of the people who asked the question and I hope I'm not insulting any of the ICANN staff here because it is, ouch, sorry, it is sort of like mistaken understanding of the fact, of the fact that the (CJK) script is only split, is actually split in to Kanji, which doesn't overlap with the Chinese,

which doesn't overlap at all with the Hanja, when in fact they actually do overlap.

So you get into trouble now if you say that, you know, you don't address the question so people just carry on with the misconception that, you know, oh it's Kanji, so I'm not sure whether it would be undiplomatic to point out the emperor has no clout here.

Chuck: Well, in other words are you suggesting that we shouldn't delete the things we deleted?

(Tin Wee): No maybe we should just follow exactly as the example said, principles and illustration of the principle by way of an example. The question was asking a general question followed by what do you mean exactly by that sophisticate the conceptual question, well here's an example, Kanji.

So in response to that, we should say yes, here's our general answer and well, in the case of Kanji we would make sure that you like, whoever asked that stupid question, actually pay attention to the fact that Kanji overlaps with hanji and with Chinese simplified and traditional script all under the umbrella of the unified, unified (CJK).

In that instance it would be extremely prudent for all the countries involved in using, sharing that same script to get each others approval or each others intent to share the (unintelligible), share each others intent.

All right, so if you consider say for example, the Arabic script right, that's used by, you know, a whole bunch of people including Arabic

speaking people, Dujawi speaking people, Urdu speaking people and so on, and again, it's just not one script right?

It's used by a lot of different people in different countries, so it's prudent for them to actually ask the other guys who are using the same script, right, what do you think if I use this?

Chuck: Well, it sounds like what you're suggesting then is leave the changes as they are but add a sentence that deals with the example that was given in the question.

(Tin Wee): Yes, which then throws light on the fact that, it sort of expands on that limited question, on the limitations of the question that was posed.

Chuck: Okay then...

(Tin Wee): To shed more light on, on (unintelligible) otherwise these guys go around with a misconception.

Chuck: Okay (Sophia)?

(Sophia): No I was just saying, I think, if I understand what (Tin Wee's) saying, it's almost addressed, the question is a bit vague, it needs clarification if it's, if it came up already, so by answering at the bottom like, what (unintelligible), we need to add on a sentence clarifying the question. Because it's not very clear, or it's not been addressed.

Chuck: Anybody opposed to that?

Then let's draft the sentence. Okay, and let's do that on the fly here.
Okay, so, should we say something, and I'm just trying to get it started, it doesn't have to be my language, but in the case of Kanji or, how would you do it? (Tin Wee) you made a pretty good stab in what you said of, of saying a sentence, do you want to take a cut at it?

(Tin Wee): Right, okay I'll state it slowly – in the case of the cited example, Kanji script, it should be noted that the script (unintelligible).

Chuck: So it was in the case of the cited example, Kanji script.

(Tin Wee): Kanji script. It should be noted that it is shared with Chinese script and Korean Hanja script under the (Unicode) unified CJK.

Chuck: Okay, now hang on, hand on a second, I don't know how (Olaf's) doing but I'm a little bit blind, so in the case of the cited example Kanji script, it should be noted that it is shared with, go ahead and continue from there for me. My typing is not fast enough.

(Tin Wee): In the Chinese language and Korean.

Chuck: That it is shared with the Chinese language...

(Tin Wee): Open parenthesis simplified and traditional, close parenthesis and Korean open parenthesis, Hanja, close parenthesis among others.

Chuck: Is Kanja k-a-n-j-a.

(Tin Wee): Hanja, h-a-n-j-a.

Chuck: I mean Hanja, spell it again please?

(Tin Wee): H-a-n-j-a.

Chuck: Okay got it. Okay. Now hold on a second I missed the, the one part of it so, in the case of the cited example, Kanja script, it should be noted that it is shared with the Chinese language – and what did you want me to add after Chinese language?

(Tin Wee): Open parenthesis, simplified and traditional, close parenthesis.

Chuck: Okay, simplified and traditional.

(Sophia): (Tin Wee) you better be there in GNSO if we forget how to explain this.

(Tin Wee): Well it's just directly what, it was your point that you raised right? I was about to let it go when you reminded me so I went out to read the thing again and sure enough there was this example.

Chuck: Hi, so I think I'm with you now. So I've got so far –in the case of the cited example Kanja script, it should be noted that it is shared with the Chinese language (simplified and traditional) and Korean language (Hanja).

(Tin Wee): Don't (unintelligible) the under the (Unicode) CJK unified script.

Chuck: Under the Unicode unified CJK script.

Man: Shouldn't we say script instead of language?

(Tin Wee): Shared as a script with Chinese or is the script shared with, okay, so actually it's wrong to say the Kanji script is shared with Chinese, they are all shared under, they share bits of it under the CJK unified.

Except for a few characters that are pictograms which are pictographics are not used in Chinese actually. I reckon most of the Japanese is a subset, Japanese Kanji is a subset of Chinese. Except for a few.

Chuck: So, are you suggesting that we should leave out the reference to Chinese and Korean and just say that it is shared with the unified, under the unified CJK script?

(Tin Wee): Okay, so it is shared under the unified CJK code with the Chinese, Korean and etc.

Chuck: Oh okay, so I move that.

(Tin Wee): Yea, and therefore, and therefore it would be most – they should actually – that each others intent...

Chuck: Hang on to that, just a second. Let me get this other change that should be noted.

Olof: I'm, I'm running a bit behind here.

Chuck: I am too.

Olof: In the case of the cited example, Kanji script, it should be noted that the data script shared under the – and then I lost something here.

(Tin Wee): The Unicode CJK.

(Jason): So here's what I have Olof and I did it a little bit differently than you did, so let's agree on what we want to do. In the case of the cited example, Kanji script, it should be noted that under the Unicode unified CJK script, and then it is shared with the Chinese language – with the parenthesis - and the Korean language. Is that what was supposed to happen?

It should be noted that under the Unicode unified CJK script, Kanji is shared with the Chinese...

(Tin Wee): Chinese simplified and traditional and Korean Hanja.

(Jason): And should we say script or languages.

Olof: Neither.

(Tin Wee): These are scripts.

(Jason): Okay, so it should say, and I'll just...

(Tin Wee): We know it's – it should be noted that script A is shared under the unified ABC script with script B and script C, okay? And then if you like; the same could be said of the Arabic script which is shared by the Arabic language and the, and the Urdu's and the (unintelligible).

Chuck: So the same could be said, and continue from there please.

(Tin Wee): And the same could be said also for other, other, how would you call it, widely adopted, or the same could be said of other scripts that are widely adopted by many different languages, like the Arabic script is adopted widely by, you know.

Chuck: That are widely adopted, so the same could be...

(Tin Wee): Widely used, right, widely used.

Chuck: Widely used by. So the same could be said of other scripts that are widely used by – and what'd you say after that? By other communities?

(Tin Wee): By more than one language community.

Chuck: By more than one language community. And do we want an e.g. there the Arabic community or?

(Tin Wee): The Arabic script. The Arabic script is used by both the Arabic community, the Farsi community, the Urdu community, the Findhi community – you know? And of course, you would never equate the Findhi guy with the Arabic guy or the Urdu guy, you know, although they may wear turbans, but their turbans are quite different, you know.

Chuck: Now let me see, let me tell you what I have so far and Olof feel free to chime in on what you have there. What we've added so far is – in the case of the cited example, Kanji script, it should be noted that under the Unicode unified CJK script Kanji s shared with Chinese (simplified and traditional) and Korean, Hanja, the same could be said of other scripts that are widely used by more than one language community for example the Arabic script.

(Tin Wee): That's fine with me.

Chuck: That do what we wanted to do?

(Tin Wee): How about Cyrillic does it include Cyrillic?

Olof: That's okay, Cyrillic you can use, I mean it's slightly different, used in Bulgarian and the Russians use and use them and so on, same thing with Serbian and...

(Tin Wee): And the Azerbaijani's overuse it, right?

Olof: Yea right. And well, they're slightly, they're different subsets of Cyrillic actually.

(Tin Wee): That's right, yea.

Olof: And Cyrillic letters aren't used in Russian anymore but they keep on using them in Bulgaria.

(Tin Wee): Including actually, we should actually include English as well, yea.

Chuck: For example the Arabic, Cyrillic and English script.

(Tin Wee): Yea.

Olof: Suddenly the English character set is, is used by Indonesia for example. And Malay, a different language, right?

Chuck: All right, let's get our sentence finished here, so do we want to add other examples besides the Arabic script? Do we want to add Cyrillic, do we want to add English.

(Tin Wee): So that it doesn't look like we are singling out the Arabs right?

Chuck: Okay for example the Arabic, Cyrillic,

(Tin Wee): Comma, etc. – and then it should do the trick. Example A, example B, example C, etc. Yea. Too many to enumerate.

Olof: Azerbaijani, that's used for many languages as well isn't it?

(Tin Wee): Yea that's right.

Olof: Unintelligible.

Chuck: Yea, for example the Arabic, Cyrillic and – what was the one?

(Tin Wee): I think, don't get ourselves into trouble, just put etc., you know. So just put one, if you put one you look like you're singling out Arabic, right? And if you put too many you might get in trouble that there are differences that people might not, well I can't swear for them and agree, so I wouldn't say (unintelligible) Cyrillic is right. Cyrillic we are quite clear, right? And then leave it to the language experts and specialists to actually fill in the gaps.

Chuck: Okay, so that last sentence now reads – The same could be said of other scripts that are widely used by more than one language community and in parenthesis I put e.g., Arabic, Cyrillic, etc.

(Tin Wee): We may leave it as that.

Chuck: That okay?

(Tin Wee): That should be safe right?

Chuck: I think so, but we're okay with what we've added now? Does anybody want me to read what the two sentences that we added again? Okay here we go. So here's what we added after the text that we had previously edited to make some deletions in.

And it says – in other words at the end of where it says market acceptability, okay, then we added two sentences as follows – In the case of the cited example Kanji script, it should be noted that under the Unicode unified CJK script Kanji is shared with Chinese, simplified and traditional and Korean Hanja, the same could be said of other scripts that are widely used by more than one language community (e.g., Arabic, Cyrillic, etc.).

(Tin Wee): But somebody expanding on it, etc., could also include the English of course the Arabs will say, it includes English, and the English being they could say, oh no, it doesn't so we just leave the controversy to their language specialists to solve.

Chuck: Exactly. Okay.

Olof: For example, now it will, just to double check, because I, we're I've got it on the Web as well, for example Arabic, Cyrillic, etc., is that or do we have anything else?

Chuck: Well the etc. is to, we're not trying to be all-inclusive.

Olof: I know, but what, was there anything I missed in that, for example Arabic, Cyrillic, etc.

Chuck: That's correct.

Olof: Then we're home.

Chuck: Yea, I think so. Anything else on that?

(Tin Wee): All of you're sure Cyrillic is used by most, quite a number of different languages, right?

Olof: Yes it is.

(Tin Wee): I see those under, under, Russian in the Russian, sorry the Soviet Union...

Olof: Well, the former Soviet, yes. Pretty popular (unintelligible) and so, but in eastern block, notably Bulgarian and Serbian.

Chuck: And Olof what I will do is send you my red line Word version after so that you can see what things are from this perspective and compare it with what you captured there.

All right, scrolling down to, let's see we're now going down to Section 2, Introduction of IDN ccTLDs. The first major question under there is – Should a list of IDN ccTLDs strings be mandated? And then

underneath that, going down to Item C – Should such a list be mandated?

Is the question that I'm looking at, okay, and we added a little bit to the end of the proposed GNSO response so that it now says - Only if there are not other means to avoid security stability, (interoffability) and user confusion issues or – this is what we added – or if consensus develops that such a list be mandated.

Any concerns about that addition?

Okay, going on. And I, and most of the edits I'm seeing now are fairly minor and that you could have seen if somebody thinks there's one that needs discussion, let me know.

I'm going down to major question – Who selects the IDN ccTLD string in the absence of a mandated list? And underneath that, Item B, the question is who will develop the criteria and policies for determining the designation of an IDN ccTLD? And we added a sentence to the response there.

So the response says, and the first two sentences didn't change – The technical protocol criteria will be termed by the ITF and the revised IDNA protocol but non-technical policies for selecting ccTLD should be determined by the ccNSO at the policy-making body for ccTLDs with input from local stakeholders, sovereign government, local and language communities – and then we added this sentence – currently the process for selection of a ccTLD is coordinated by IANA in its role as staff support to the ICANN Board of Directors.

Any comments, concerns, changes to that?

Okay, going on. I think the next edit is fairly minor, which may be irrelevant, so I'll just go skip on to that, skip that one because that's, I don't think that's, I think it's a good edit, but now, we in going down now to major question – What coordination should exist between the different actors?

In Question A – Who are the appropriate actors? We added IANA last week and in Question B – What are their roles? We defined the IANA role as providing experience of ccTLD delegation, processing and registrants and potential registrants.

And I probably, it looks there's a,

Olof: There's a semicolon.

Chuck: It should be comma, right?

Olof: There's a semicolon in between, so it's actually, well it's a line up that IANA providing experience of ccTLD delegation processing; registrants and potential registrants, the user of IDN. So, it doesn't connect actually to IANA, ...

Chuck: Oh that's right, that's totally, yea, so oh, okay, so should we change, you think we should change that or is it okay?

Olof: No, no, it just wraps, well...

Chuck: Okay, so it's okay and I see why that confused me, okay. And okay, anything on that?

All right then the next edits are fairly minor I think. Scrolling down and we're now getting into the section where we're going to talk about the issues that (Sophia) raised and (Tin Wee) suggested some language on but we'll get to that in just a minute, so bear with me. I just want to make sure we have all of the noted edits. Okay, that looks minor.

Okay, going down now to, again we're under, in Section 3, Delegation of IDN ccTLDs. And then underneath that the if not Item A who can apply to have the IDN ccTLD delegated or to be the delegate for that ccTLD we, in the GNSO response to that, we deleted the present ASCII ccTLD operator. Any questions, comments on that?

Okay. And then under Item B – Who decides on the delegation and particular there's some, four sub questions. We spent a lot of time on this last week and the response to question B in the sub questions was – A GNSO response to these questions is probably inappropriate, at the same time a question that should possibly be considered is should local legitimacy be a guiding principle in this context?

Let me start off the discussion on that. (Aubrey) who is one of the observers on this list has made a, I think a helpful comment. She's questioning whether we should, whether any GNSO response would be inappropriate because they've asked the questions. So, and she may be right there.

And so, we could delete a GNSO response to these questions is probably inappropriate anywhere that occurs and just rephrase what

we have there and just say, a question that should possibly be considered is, should local legitimacy be a guiding principle on this context. Is that okay?

(Tin Wee): You mean for each of these bullet items?

Chuck: Well no, we're not answering, we answered these collectively and we spent a lot of time on this last week in how to do this, so the proposed GNSO response is to Question B and the four sub questions and the response would be – A question that should possibly be considered is: Should local legitimacy be a guiding principle in this context?

So we're answering a question with a question. So I'm, we would delete then the first sentence – A GNSO response to these questions is probably inappropriate and we would delete - at the same time - because we don't need that lead in anymore.

So it would say, start with A question that should possibly be considered is: Should local legitimacy be a guiding principle in this context? We're raising a question for them to consider in this, in the context of all those questions. Is that all right? Any questions or comments?

Man: This is (unintelligible). Why aren't we answering the questions, I wasn't here on the last call and I'm not, it's not clear to me why are we stopping our self from questions to, answers to those questions.

Chuck: Well, some of the original thinking, at least on my part was is that, these really aren't GNSO issues, they're ccNSO issues.

Man: Yea but they're asking for.

Chuck: Okay, so what would you say? What would you say?

Man: I don't know, the different things to say here, but on some of these issues, first of all, I'm first asking we should or not answer these questions. I understand that you would prefer not to.

I think it's, you know, it's still something that is, you know, is consent (unintelligible) knowledge of government required? My belief, some involvement should be there for in these cases. You know, it really depends on, on each others view, but do you think we should or shouldn't answer it at all?

(Sophia): May I ask a question Jack here...

Chuck: Go ahead (Sophia). Yes.

(Sophia): Okay, B is what we're addressing right, and it says who decides on the delegation and in particular it asks about four bullet items. And so the answer being proposed GNSO response to question B and it's sub questions about, and so if we are to keep that as is, what we're saying is should local legitimacy be a guidance sensible in this context, then is that supposed to be a question for all those four bullet items? And we're not answering all those four bullet items?

Chuck: Yes, let me, for both of you, you weren't on the call last week, okay.

What we had last week was, we had tried to answer each one of the questions separately and the answer was coming out essentially the same in each case. So it was very redundant.

So yes, the answer that's there is intended to address all of the questions, not in very much specificity as you have pointed out, okay, but in answer to your question (Sophia) yes, it's supposed to address all of the main question and the four sub questions.

Man: Okay, Chuck, let me just say, I've seen e-mail some correspondence between you and (Tin Wee) on this issue. There were four different answers for these answers right?

Chuck: That's the part that we're going to get back to in just a moment, okay and so maybe the best thing to do is to finish going through all of the highlighted edits and then go back to those.

Man: Aren't these the same questions that you were corresponding on?

(Sophia): You have already answered each and every question for us, you know, your final comments and then we looked at it via e-mail so, I mean, if we're going to change what we're currently proposing or adding that question, then it does, the others would be, it doesn't make sense even to go over the old edits you've done, because it's going to illegitimize the answers. So maybe we can go over that, what we've done over e-mail and then come back to this.

Chuck: That's fine, that's I thought what I was just suggesting.

(Sophia): Oh I'm sorry.

Chuck: So, all right. And I just, all I want to do because we're very close to the end, is make sure, let's do that and then let's try and remember to come back and make sure we cover the rest of the document, things that aren't related to this.

So, let's go over to the e-mail from (Tin Wee) and me and (Sophia) chimed in too and, let's see that's not the right e-mail, let's find that one. Okay so, what (Tin Wee) suggested and I'll let you jump in (Tin Wee) in just a second, so we are on this, who decides on the delegation (in particular) are there, so the question he was talking about was Question B, okay, who decides on the delegation (in particular)?

All right, okay, so there we are, and the first one is a GNSO response. So (Tin Wee) what you're suggesting is, is that we respond to each of the sub-questions separately, correct?

(Tin Wee): Yea because, the overall question is the issue of delegation of IDN ccTLDs and we made it very clear that the proposed (unintelligible) response is that this is primarily it is used for ICANN and (CCNS) (unintelligible). Right?

Having said that, it asks us, if not, so then it addressed these specific questions under A, B, C and then the sub-B1, B2, B3, B4. So in other words, it's just very much like the question that you have in the Kanji thing. They are trying to be more explicit here and that we should actually, it is just an effort on their part to ask if these explicit questions because some questions cannot be answered under generalities.

So they're trying to find out any exclusion clauses here if not, right? So that's the way I understand this question in total. Delegation of IDN ccTLDs belongs to the responsibility for ICANN and CCNS or blah, blah, blah and then other supporting organizations that drives these committees, blah, blah, blah, right?

Chuck: Right.

(Tin Wee): And then that's the reason why under item bullet 4, I recall that there was this case or committee who (unintelligible) and advisory committee, so if not, the allocated committee has actually mentioned this point, right?

So that's the reason I wrapped it out with that suggestion because it was something which triggered my memory I think. Who was it who reminded me about this, was it you, (Sophia)?

(Sophia): It was (unintelligible) (Tin Wee), it was from the work we did on the previous IDN...

(Tin Wee): Right, okay because you were in the...

(Sophia): Group as well, I don't know, the last two years.

(Tin Wee): I wasn't in that group, yea. So I did recall that there was this (Cato) thing right? So, I suspect that was the reason why the people raised the question or framed these questions actually was, I'd have to say, okay these are the general principles, however are there any exception clauses, and if so, would GNSO like to tell us, right?

What the (is not) are? Okay, so they're explicitly elaborated on what the (is not) are in A, B, and C and D sub 1, D sub 2, and D sub 3 and 4 and we should actually oblige them with the potential exceptions. In the case of A, we just basically said to them that well, it's up to you, it's your decision, right?

However, which is what exactly they're looking for, what's the however? And what's the nonetheless? Okay, and it's basically, we basically constituted the comment, the useful comment that says that the approved applicant should be at (least some) all be supported by local authority (unintelligible), right?

And then it explicitly asks us about, okay, let's be explicit here, who decides on delegation in particular, right? (Unintelligible) brought us this reason to their consent in the government or is there or is your incumbent and presumptive right over the cost funding ideas.

So I think if we don't answer these specifically it will sound very much like a (GNS) or cop out. Because they are getting really down to the number of the issue.

Chuck: Now without, without minimizing what you're saying, we need to keep in mind that these questions were raised for a much broader community than the GNSO, so it's not as if each of these questions were addressed specifically to the GNSO, they were directed...

(Tin Wee): Yea, yea, yea right.

Chuck: In the broader community the GNSO is one part of that broader community.

(Tin Wee): Absolutely, right.

Chuck: So I don't necessarily think it's copping out if we think that certain areas are maybe less appropriate for the GNSO to respond to, at the same time, if this group would like to respond to each one of these things, I'm perfectly okay with that.

(Tin Wee): I'm sorry I always use extreme language, I'm sorry, I apologize.

Chuck: That's okay, I just wanted to, wanted to. So now, let's look at each of the sub-questions and the proposed responses before we start redrafting text, and see where we have agreement. Okay, is that all right?

Man: Sounds good.

Chuck: So the first sub-question then is – Are there specific reasons for deviating from the standard practice guidelines that a zone should only be delegated with the support of the local Internet community which includes the government, and that's, that's basically the response that we were just working on before we changed directions a little bit here.

And we're going to eliminate GNSO response to these questions is probably inappropriate and we're just going to say, a question that should possibly be considered is should local legitimacy be a guiding principle in this context.

And that's what you had suggested (Tin Wee) that looks fine to me. Any concerns there? So instead of having that as a response to the all

four sub-questions collectively, it would be the response to the first sub-question. Is that all right?

Okay, now. The next, the next item, the next sub-question is – Is consent involvement knowledge of government required? And what (Tin Wee) suggested is, and again let's forget the language about a GNSO response to this question is probably inappropriate, we'll delete that wherever it occurs unless people object to that.

And so we would say – A question that could possibly be considered is particularly in cases where local legitimacy is in question clarifying the legitimacy by requiring government consent or knowledge.

Now if you looked at my response to that, where I had a concern was requiring government consent. As soon as we start requiring that, that being required, it gives governments and/or the GAC, an operational role which they really don't want and one that the white paper talked against and everything.

So, what I suggested and I won't read everything I wrote on that, because you can do that on your own, that you know, we word the response like this, and forget again the first part, so it would say – A question that could possibly be considered is, particularly in cases where local legitimacy is in question, clarifying the legitimacy by encouraging government involvement and knowledge. I just took out the requiring part.

(Tin Wee): In the consent.

Chuck: The consent part, yea. Requiring consent, so it's, it what are your thoughts on that, I'm not trying to dictate things here, I was just sharing my thoughts personally.

(Tin Wee): So, just trying to understand your position here. You're thinking that it's just way too much, that if we, in terms of process, ending orders and all that stuff, that clarifying, what you mean by requiring government consent is just takes us down too far on the road.

Chuck: Well, first of all, I think the option is still there for the ccNSO and the parties that they work with to require consent if they want to. I guess I shy away from us suggesting that it should be a required issue.

I definitely think it's, it's wise to involve the governments, but should there be a required consent, I don't know, I'm not sure that's really for, a good thing for the GNSO to chime in on, but if the strong consensus here is in this group is that that should be the case, we can put it forward to, for the counsel consideration.

(Sophie): I'm fine with the way it is with the way Chuck edited it encouraging government involvement versus the consent which makes it mandatory for the government to, you know, to get a hold of or push things so, I don't know, (Tin Wee) what do you think?

(Tin Wee): Yea I was just trying to clarify what is the thinking behind what Chuck was saying, so he clarified it and I understand.

Chuck: If you get a government that's not working very cooperatively within the ICANN processes, they could, if you give them a veto power, they could actually bog things down for awhile and, you know, again that's

not our decision to make, but that's a little bit more about a concern that I have. I don't think there will be very many of those but it's probably not unlikely to think that there will be a few cases like that.

Man: Sure I understand.

Man: I'm okay with it too, as I said before I think that an involvement should be there and consent is too strong. I agree.

Chuck: Okay, anybody else?

Olof: Could I add a small edit?

Chuck: Sure.

Olof: The start of with an aspect that could possibly be considered is, instead of starting with a question, because we don't end up with a question actually.

Chuck: Oh, yea, let me write, okay so, an aspect that could possibly be considered? Okay good, yea, I won't take the time to get it in my version right now, but I'll get that later. That's good. Anything else before we go to the next sub-question?

Man: Nope.

Chuck: Okay, so the next sub-question was - Is consent involvement knowledge of incumbent ccTLD manager required? And (Tin Wee) suggested, and again I'm going to skip that first part, and so an aspect that could possibly be considered is particularly in cases where local

legitimacy is in question, setting aside the need for the incumbent's consent.

My comments there, I thought we were stepping over our bounds, but I may be wrong on that, because I think it should be, my personal, and this is just me personally thinking okay, it should be up to local authorities to decide what role incumbent ccTLD managers should play, but it would seem desirable to encourage involvement by the local ccTLD manager because of the experience they bring to the table

So I suggested a re-wording something like this - Whatever role the incumbent ccTLD manager plays in this process, it would seem desirable to encourage involvement by the local ccTLD manager because of the experience they bring to the table.

(Sophia): (Unintelligible) scope of what we addressed in the first question, this is (Sophia), because here again we're bringing the government a little bit closer to the decision-making and that's the only issue I see here versus what (Tin Wee) has added up there, but, I don't know how else to word it.

I understand where Chuck is coming from, but at the same time there is also, it's also giving sort of the power to the ccTLD manager although we're saying encourage involvement, but definitely from experience, those people get involved so much anyway, so, what do you think (Tin Wee).

(Tin Wee): You know, I'm trying to be thinking what was the back of the minds of these people of these supplementary questions to the specific (unintelligible) standard practice.

Chuck: I think that some of the ccTLD managers probably want a situation where they have to, where they're consent is required, and I'm not supporting that, okay.

Man: You're not what?

Chuck: I'm not supporting that position, but I was.

Man: I want to say even something further on that, I also don't support it and I don't think it should be automatic. They can have an involvement just like any other party in this thing and when I was looking at reading these questions and answers and I read the (Tin Wee's) notes about the (Cato) committee, I don't know who, if all of you are aware of the (Cato) committee.

It's an icon committee that did a very thorough word on IDNs a few years ago. And I think that what they put out as, as their some of their conclusions, they also, they're not only relevant to the first question, and they're also relevant for this, this question and we should mark it over here too, because what they, and I think it's very important that we will at least note out this committee because, you know, if ICANN wants to be at least seen as a serious organization it's important that things that have been done in the past will be, you know considered, and I'm not sure, I don't know how much this thing is known to other people (unintelligible) and so I think that just to note out what they were saying is that nothing should be automatically given to incumbent registries regarding the ccTLDs, so it's relevant to this third questions and to the fourth questions, question, and so I think this should be noted here also. That there report of (Castle).

Man: So I think if I'm reading the question, yea I agree on the point that you have made. I was just re-looking at the question and if its (unintelligible) from the delegation and in particular (unintelligible) reasons and then there's consent involvement and knowledge, it basically is a different level of stricture here. Consent is really you must get the consent of X being incumbent or government.

If not then a weaker level of it would be involvement. And then a further weaker level would be just simply knowledge. So they're basically asking us, okay well if you say who's deciding delegation, do you really need consent of government?

Well, if there's not consent that you need, well okay how about involvement? If it's not involvement will knowledge of the government be sufficient? So it's a level of gradation and it's asking us, will (GNS) or which level should come in?

So we've just concluded that the government consent is a bit too much and involvement of government is suddenly important therefore with involvement knowledge.

The question here for ccTLD incumbent is that consent is absolutely not supportable by, as Chuck clearly stated out, he is not absolutely not supporting consent at all. And here we are saying, well, knowledge will be fine and possibly even involvement might be.

So definitely, as Olof was saying, just like everybody else, well an incumbent ccTLD like everybody else should be in the know, because

as Chuck was saying, well they have the experience, right, and they're a legitimate player, so they should know.

And okay, if they know, should they be involved? So the question now is how much of the involvement should incumbent ccTLDs have given that we are quite clear that at least amongst two of you guys that consent of the incumbent ccTLD should not be there. It's just too much, very much like consent of government is absolutely necessary.

So the ccNSO's position incumbent ccTLD's in order to level the playing field should not have any additional preference or any priority status of being, of having the power to consent yes or no of the total, the whole thing or not. In the same way that the government should not have the veto power as we just agreed earlier.

Chuck: Yea, good and that's well said. So is it correct that we're in agreement, anybody in disagreement that we, we're supportive of involvement and knowledge of the ccTLD manager but not consent?

(Tin Wee): Not I now think the consent.

Chuck: And anybody disagree with that? Okay good. That's helpful to clarify. One other thought in the wording that you proposed (Tin Wee) at the very end you say setting aside the need for the incumbent's consent and to me that kind of assumes that there is a need somewhere established that there should be incumbent's consent and I don't think that's, that there is.

So I don't want, I don't think we want to make that assumption that there is then a need for incumbent's consent and so, but I think the

suggested changing in the language is, you know, addresses that okay.

So, how should we word this one? I made a, I put a proposal on the table basically saying whatever the role incumbent ccTLD manager plays in this process. It would seem desirable to encourage involvement by the local ccTLD manager because of the experiences they could bring to the table.

Now we could also shorten that and just say, it would seem desirable to encourage involvement by the local ccTLD manager because of the experience they can bring to the table.

(Sophia): That's what you say (unintelligible).

Chuck: What I did (Sophia) is I deleted that whatever role the incumbent ccTLD manager plays in this process. That kind of sets a different tone for it.

(Sophia): Okay.

Chuck: And instead of having that there, just directly say, it would seem desirable to encourage involvement by the local ccTLD manager, etc.

(Sophia): That's fine. I just have one comment, Chuck, because we are trying to, we're struggling with two things now, one is to identify the level of involvement of the ccTLD manager in this question and the next coming, and the second is courting or referring to the (Cato) committee.

Now, so the level of involvement, I agree with the sentence you are eliminating and what you were just saying, but if we say it would seem desirable to encourage involvement, for me involvement and knowledge are two separate things when you make someone know or when you get them involved, right?

So, if we're defining the level of his involvement of the ccTLD manager and not encouraging consent, I suppose there is a wide gap between, you know, just letting them know and letting them get involved, so, I do not know if this group wants to make a comment or have a consensus versus knowledge.

Chuck: How about both (Sophia), what if we said involvement and knowledge?

(Sophia): I would rather not give them involvement, just have them know, knowledge only, but.

Man: No I would prefer, by the way, that the wording would be a little different, not encourage involvement because encourage involvement can be interpreted as much more than what we mean at this point, I think it should be something like it would, something like they should be allowed to be involved, okay, just like any other party in the process. Okay.

(Sophia): So how about if we notify?

Man: Okay, we're not, we're not any other, you know, with no preferences and I would add here. What?

Olof: Level playing field.

Man: Exactly, and I would add here.

Olof: The next question was just the presumptive right you see, because it leads to the next question, well how about presumptive rights, you know?

Man: Okay, okay, yea exactly, yea. Yea, and I would add here and also in the answer to the next question, the sentence that I think, you (Tin Wee) that added there about the originally recommended by the (Caso) idea and committee.

I would also add it here at the end. I think it's very important that we point it out, this thing, especially if we all think, just like you said Chuck that you don't support, that they should they have a.

(Tin Wee): The way I read the whole series of four questions, actually leading questions, leading up to the final one, which is all rhetorical, you know, shouldn't there be presumptive right of the ccTLD manager over corresponding idea of ccTLD.

Now either an emphatic no or because this has been reported on by (Cato) IDN committee before, you know, setting (unintelligible) right and then the preceding question was well, consent needed? No consent, well yea, absolutely no consent is necessary because of the level paying field thing, right.

And then government knowledge, well yea, involvement, no need consent because we don't want the veto thing with the governments

which especially when they're not quite engaged with the Internet thing, deployment of IDNs right.

So because it's worded in such a way in a escalatory manner to the last questions were sort of, is there any therefore, any presumptive right, is there any presumptive right of ASCII ccTLD manager over corresponding IDN (unintelligible). So the answer could be escalating to an emphatic no.

Chuck: Okay, now I think we have two issues on the third sub-question, okay, and we're going to get to the fourth one next. Okay, the first issue is is, you know, getting our wording right on the sentence, and the second is whether or not we refer to the (Coto) report, so let's put the latter one aside for a second and make sure we're in agreement in terms of the wording of the first part.

And in listening to what people were saying earlier, both (Yolov) and (Sophia) I think, this equal plan, and (Tin Wee) as well, should we say encourage involvement by local ccTLD manager along with other stakeholders?

I was trying to address, what's the way, how do we want to word that so that we're not showing any preference to them but they should be involved just like others. Somebody have another suggested?

Man: Maybe allow, allow something like that, allow involvement just like any other party or something like that.

(Sophia): We already said encourage.

Chuck: Yea. So...

Man: Yea, I would, I would delete the word encourage and say allow, I think it's better, in my opinion.

Chuck: Allow involvement?

Man: Yea.

Chuck: So allow involvement by local ccTLD managers along with other stakeholders.

Man: Yea.

Chuck: Is that okay? Okay now let's talk about.

Man: It shouldn't be banned from me, that's for sure, but you know.

Chuck: I'm sorry I didn't get that.

Man: I said that they shouldn't be banned from being involved. That's clear, but I don't think they also shouldn't get any preferences.

Man: They shouldn't get any presumptive rights, right?

Chuck: Okay, we'll get to that one, that's the next question, okay?

Man: Okay.

Chuck: Okay now, with regard to the third sub-question, you have suggested that we make reference to the (Cato) report here in addition to the last question on presumptive right. The, so, let's talk about that. What would, if we refer to the (Cato) report here, what would we say?

And by the way, just for everyone's awareness, I am very aware of the (Cato) report because I was monitoring that and watching it from the sidelines when that was developed and finished.

Man: Okay so, Chuck, so you must be the one to draft the words right.

Chuck: No not necessarily.

Man: So this question now. Since you are so familiar with the case, (Cato) report.

(Sophia): As recommended just like we mention that the number four can we say as recommended by the original (Cato) IDN committee report?

Man: Yea.

Chuck: And what specific recommendation are you referring to?

(Sophia): The recommendation that the ccTLD managers, they should not be given consent or presumptive right.

Chuck: Oh, okay so, maybe we say something like, it's useful to note that the (Cato) report recommended that ccTLD manager consent not be required, is that what you're saying?

(Sophia): Not be required.

Chuck: Anybody opposed to that.

(Sophia): Hold on a second.

Man: I think one of the points is also that since you are well involved in the (Cato) committee that the ICANN processes should be actually learning from previous experience and building up, you know? So that it grows and acquires is kind of inherited with them as it goes along.

And for subsequent generations of policy making not invoking or even recalling that previous committees have extensively dealt with this issue and debated it at hand, extensively, would be something of which is not quite ideal, right?

It's just like, five years from now if we didn't have IDNs deployed yet and then yet another committee by folks five years our junior debating going over the same ground as we have been going now, and then totally ignoring what we have stated because they simply haven't gone back to look at history. Or simply we haven't learned from the lessons learned in the past.

Chuck: Let me suggest some wording for this an additional sentence here on the third question. It may be useful to note that the (Cato) report recommended that consent of incumbent ccTLD managers not be required.

(Sophia): Okay.

Man: Sounds good.

Chuck: Is that good?

Man: Sounds good.

Chuck: Okay, let's go on then to the last sub-question, which is – Is there any presumptive right of the ASCII ccTLD manager over a corresponding IDN ccTLD.

And, (Tin Wee's) response was, again deleting the stuff in the front, an aspect that could possibly be considered for example in cases where local legitimacy is in question, is setting aside such a presumptive right.

As originally recommended by the original ICANN-wide gTLD and ccTLD (Cato) idea and committee report of a few years ago on the eventual deployment of IDN ccTLDs.

Man: So I really think the point that Chuck was trying to make that, well, we are assuming that there is presumptive right,

Chuck: Yea, right.

Man: Chuck is basically, well the problem now days is that so why are you pretending that there is, so I take your point Chuck maybe you'd like to reword this.

Chuck: Yea, and I'm glad you said that yourself because that was one of my first concerns here, I don't think there's any presumptive right. Okay, the question is should there be? Okay.

And so I had suggested a GNSO, let's see, you know, whatever is decided regarding the involvement of ASCII ccTLD manager we would probably want to delete that like we did before, so it would seem wise to consider the issues of local legitimacy and a good experience for those who will directly benefit from the script used for IDN ccTLDs and then make a reference, and then we could make a reference similar to the (Cato) report just like we did in the previous one.

Man: Saying that there are no presumptive rights.

Chuck: Yea.

Man: That a (Cato) report, this is one of the main issues that they said that there are no presumptive rights.

Chuck: Yea.

(Sophia): So we can make reference to that, Chuck the way you wrote it exactly before but with the reference of a presumptive...

Chuck: Exactly. Yea.

Man: Exactly, yea, that's the best way.

Chuck: Okay.

Man: So it's not us saying it, it be just reminding them that it's not us saying it, it's actually the (Cato) committee, right.

(Sophia): No it's (unintelligible) I mean, we (unintelligible) responsible to disclose, to disclose the report, that's what I've been saying all along GNSO before, because it's not something we should ignore, its work done by legitimate people that were appointed by the board, so.

Man: So you, it's not GNSOs position, it may not be appropriate for us to answer this question, but you know, don't you guys remember, you know, a few years back, you know, there was this (Cato) committee thing.

Chuck: And we're going to delete that language about the appropriateness of the GNSO response.

Man: Yea, just kidding, yea.

Chuck: Okay thanks, okay. All right so now, now let me get clarification on one more thing. I have suggested that we say something like, it would seem wise to consider the issues of local legitimacy and a good experience for those who will be directly benefiting from the scripts used for IDN ccTLDs and then we add on a statement about presumptive rights, and the recommendations by the (Cato) committee. Is everybody in agreement with that?

(Sophia): Right.

Man: Yea.

Chuck: Okay, good. And rather than taking everybody's time to try and reword those, I think we've got just a vet, Olof you have, you have any questions in that regard? You and I will draft language after the call.

Olof: Yea let's do that because I don't have your proposal.

Chuck: I understand. I'm not going to take the time to word it right now. All four of these things, I think I have the gist of it and I'll work with you to finalize some language and then let me see if this plan of attack works because everybody doesn't have the language in front of them.

Within a couple hours and I'll get on it right after this call, to send to Olof and then once Olof and I have agreed on some language we'll send it to the list, and can everybody commit to reviewing it within 24 hours?

(Sophia): Okay.

Man: Okay.

Chuck: Because I need to get this thing wrapped up because I have, so that I can move on to other things that I have responsibilities for and get it to the counsel. So, everyone will have 24 hours after we send it out the final language on this, to comment and make any final edits, is that okay?

Man: Okay, I'll go to sleep and come back on this tomorrow.

Chuck: That's right, that's why I said 24 hours, I do want you to get your sleep.

Man: Thank you.

Chuck: Okay. I need a little bit more myself. But, I'll work on that tonight.

Man: Wonderful thank you.

Chuck: Now, let's go back, let me go back to the, the Word document so I can see if there are any other changes we need to go over. If you go down to E, scrolling down a little bit there, okay.

Oh and in fact let's look at, at D, the question was – Do existing U.S. ASCII ccTLD delegation policies for dealing with multiple applications, objections to applications or disputes apply to the same issues in the delegation of IDN ccTLDs, if not, who will formulate the policies for these issues?

You know, the only thing we had there as a response was a GNSO response to this question is, probably inappropriate and we kind of shied away from that based on (Aubrey's) suggestion, which would mean we would have no response there. Is that what we want to recommend?

Man: On which point are you asking?

Chuck: D, Item D, just go down a little bit from where we were, we were on D remember?

Man: Yea.

Chuck: Okay, go down to D and it says, do existing U.S. ASCII ccTLD delegation policies for dealing with multiple applications objections to applications or disputes apply to the same issues in the delegation of IDN ccTLDs. If not, who will formulate policies for these issues? What should we say there? Should we say nothing? And that's okay, I think, I mean I'm not advocating one way or another, but I'd like to get the sense of the group.

(Sophia): (Tin Wee) did we talk about language community at some point on this?

(Tin Wee): Yea. So decision for, you mean decision for ICANN and the ccNSO and others reporting organization advisory committees supported by (unintelligible) government, blah, blah, blah, language community, the same language that we used in A?

(Sophia): No this is D, (Tin Wee).

(Tin Wee): Yea, so could we use the same language that's in A here?

Chuck: Or we could just refer back to A if that's what people think, see response for A above.

(Sophia): Okay let's see.

Chuck: And that may be appropriate here. And that does get into the language community etc.

Man: Yea.

(Sophia): Yea, that is (unintelligible).

Chuck: So we can either repeat it or we could just say see the response for A above.

(Sophia): Anyone other than the language community in the mentioned government and Internet business users that we want to see, (Tin Wee) or Olof on there? Otherwise we can just say refer to A for not excluding any other authority.

Chuck: That okay?

Man: Yea, I'm okay.

Man: Yea.

Man: Yea, not actually any other regimen party.

Chuck: So, please see the response for A above. Okay. Going on then to E, there were some changes made in the response for that. And the second paragraph of the response was changed a lot.

It now reads for IDN ccTLDs running essentially as commercial gTLDs with little or no connection to the territory it would seem appropriate that a level playing field is established with similar technical, operational and financial requirements as for any IDN gTLD counterparts, at least in the same language script country. Any questions or comments on that?

Okay, let's go on then and that covers all of the edits, so the next question I have is, does anyone have any other areas of the document that you want to discuss on this call?

While you're thinking, so Olof and I will, and I'll take the first stab, Olof, of sending something out to capture the discussion we had on the four sub-questions and I'll get that to you hopefully within the next 30 to 45 minutes.

Olof: That's perfect.

Chuck: And then if you can, just, you know, give me your feedback and then shortly after that we'll get something out to the whole list and everybody will have 24 hours for final comments on that and then hopefully by then tomorrow we can wrap this thing up and not later than Wednesday get it to the counsel for their consideration.

And please keep in mind that all of you have input to the GNSO counsel through your representatives and some of you directly like (Sophia's) on the counsel and I'm on the counsel, but, and then, but and (Bilau's) on the counsel, okay.

But those that aren't on the counsel, you still have input through your representatives and the constituencies that you're a part of, so please use that avenue. Anything else?

(Sophia): Thank you Chuck. This was a very good group.

Chuck: Yes.

(Sophia): It was very efficient.

Chuck: It was and I really sincerely appreciate and thank each of you for all the time you spent on it and, you know, that really made my job much easier, so thank you very, very much.

I didn't talk about (Mark McFadden's) second comment where he was going to provide some text, but since he didn't provide it, I'm just going to not do anything with that if everybody's okay with that.

Okay? All right, well good job everybody, and remember to take, to watch the list and look at what Olof and I send around in a little bit and then we'll wrap this thing up and again I'll try and keep you informed of what's going, especially for those who aren't in the counsel, via this list in the next few weeks.

Man: Thank you Chuck. Thank you very much.

Chuck: Good-bye.

END