

**GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO
Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper on IDN ccTLDs
January 29, 2008 at 22:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper on IDNccTLDs on January 29, 2008 .

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/gnsoidn-rework-20070129.mp3>

<http://gnsoidn-rework-20070129.mp3>

Agenda:

<http://www.gnsoidn-rework-20070129.mp3>

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency group co-ordinator

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee

Olga Cavalli - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Adrian Kinderis - Registrar c.

Absent apologies

Bilal Beiram - CBUC

Absent

Stefanie Lai - NCUC

Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager Policy Development

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor - GNSO

Tina Dam - IDN Director

Marilyn Vernon - EA

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the coordinator. I'd like to inform parties today's conference is being recorded. If anyone has any objections please disconnect at this time. Now I would like to turn the call over to Mr. Chuck Gomes. Sir, you may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. Okay welcome everybody and let me start off again for thanking everybody for all the hard work on this over the last month and a half or so and we made some really good process. Hopefully we can wrap it all up today because we really have to. Any changes to the agenda? Okay then here's our schedule for today and tomorrow and then on the 31st.

So first of all our goal today is to finish our work in deciding on any final edits, and then Liz if at all possible it would help us if you could make sure that those were all incorporated in the document as soon after this meeting as possible and then let everyone on the list know when that's been done so that then everybody has until close of business tomorrow on Wednesday, everybody's time except for Adrian to (unintelligible) content edits that need to be reconsidered.

And please communicate those on the list. If it's change in substance I think at this stage it's better not to make the change in the Google document. If it's just a minor edit go ahead and make it in the main document and just use whatever color you've been using to make your edits. I did a few of those today in fact on mine, but I did it in color so everybody could see what I did so that in case I make any mistake you can catch me.

So again, minor edits after our meeting today and once Liz notifies us that the documents, all the latest edits have been put in then please take a look at that, and you're only going to have the 24 hour period until close of business tomorrow, basically end of your day tomorrow is what I'm basically saying. So that first thing on Thursday morning then between Liz and I, if Liz needs my help we can make decisions on any final edits that need to be made and finalize the document and send it off to the council before the council meeting on Thursday.

It's not as if we're expecting the council to have read it by then. Obviously it's too big a document for that, but I really want to make sure we have it in their hands before that meeting, and then we can at least talk about briefly in the meeting on Thursday letting them know it's there and so forth and encourage them to review it in detail. More detailed time will be spent in New Delhi on that...

Avri Doria: Yeah Chuck I thought I had you down for a little bit more of a talk through during the meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah I am more than willing to do that. I just know that we're obviously not going to be able to go through a great deal. We probably could go through the executive summary depending on how much time you give me, and I forget what we allocated for that.

Avri Doria: Yeah me too. I have to go check.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'll be flexible on that Avri. If there is time to go through the executive summary I think that would be good, not for discussion purposes because I think if we start veering off into discussion it'll take

too much time. But at least maybe whet people's appetite and get them to read the whole document.

Avri Doria: Right. Basically what we've normally been doing on these things is someone does a walkthrough and then we some clarifying questions if people have it, but try to save the discussion for future time.

Chuck Gomes: That's great, and I'll be ready for that. I mean of course you're welcome and anybody else that's on the council is welcome to jump right in on that to contribute. So any questions on that? So that's our schedule today, tomorrow, and then Thursday.

Now as important as it is for everybody to do this in the next 24 to 48 hours, keep in mind that until the council actually approves the document there is still opportunity for additional changes. In fact some councilors that aren't on this group may have some, so it's not as if this is a do or die deadline but certainly we would like to have what we present to be as complete and thorough as possible.

And I've asked those that couldn't be on the call to make sure that they try and review what we do today, tomorrow as well so that we can – they have the opportunity for input as well and (Edmund) assured me that he had gone through the remaining part of the document today and has taken a look at it and put any comments that he had. Okay and questions?

Woman: Only one thing I want to add to that. When Liz sends it out to the (unintelligible) list I think we should also put it in the (draft) directory.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Good point, and Liz are you able to do that directly or (Marilyn) do you need to help us on that?

Woman: I could work with Glen to do it.

Chuck Gomes: Glen is just not available...

Woman: That's right. She had other...

Chuck Gomes: That's right, yeah. I remember now.

Woman: She had a better offer tonight.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah well I'm deeply offended by that.

Woman: I think it was just an earlier (arrangement).

Chuck Gomes: Okay so Liz is going to be our editor again today and we're going to go back to the document. Now keep in mind that I will be using a document that I cut and pasted a couple of hours ago and will not be looking at the live document so that I don't get bounced all over the place and lose my place. But you're welcome to either do that for yourself or look at the live document.

Where I want us to start – I'm actually going to backtrack a couple of places just to call your attention to some things and make sure they're okay. I want you to first of all look at section A in the first big paragraph where there is a list of I think six items or so, and in item number five if you look at what's up there now you'll see some of the – I don't know, but it's blue green text...

Woman: It's a lovely teal.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah teal, there we go teal. It's teal. I couldn't think of the name. The teal text, I think that's a nonmaterial change, but I thought that because we really haven't talked about the objection process and as it relates to the new (TLB) and I probably should have set the context a little bit better. So please take a look at what I did there and see if that's okay.

Woman: The only thing is something to sort of say that the only one that – the benefits process. In other words putting among others or give the (unintelligible) and ccNSO, and others standing as objectors, so that countries don't go, "Oh but I'm not member of the (unintelligible). Can I object on my own?" So just that it's not exclusive.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, very good. So in other words you're suggesting after ccNSO just to add and others.

Woman: Right. If it was a diplomatic document we'd say (unintelligible), but in this case among others.

Chuck Gomes: Sounds good to me. Okay. That's okay. Alright, then adjusting down in the document to just almost to where we left off last week and you'll see – it's going to be, we're in section B now. And if you go back to where the main item should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful, and then under B Edmon had suggested a change that we didn't get in our meeting so you'll see there again in the (TL) text that I suggested that we consider putting what Edmon suggested in there, which is the (IDNTLD) string introduced should be for the sole purpose, etcetera.

Thoughts or discussion on that? Do you think we should have that or no?

Woman: I think it's a good sentence.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody disagree with that? Okay then Liz is that clear what needs to be done there?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And then I think that brings us up to an item that we were right in the middle of when we ended last time, which was number of characters in the string. So if you go to there and – I'm just going down to – okay. We have then – hold on one second. I just need to look back over.

Oh okay. So we're under B then. I'm sorry. We're now under number of characters in the string as I previously said, sorry about confusing myself. And A is should all IDN ccTLD strings be on the fixed link, etcetera on that one, and are there any additional – and what we're doing in this part of the document, in fact people don't object what I'd like to do is go through this part of the document fairly rapidly because I had asked each of you to kind of review it and be ready to identify anything.

So rather than going through item by item, to save time if no one objects I'd just like you call attention to any changes you noted. And what I did earlier today when I went through this there were a couple of places that I noted some things in the (TL) text. So if you just kind of scroll down you'll see the things I caught and one of them I highlighted

in yellow because I think it's a sentence that we can delete because of the fact that we covered it in the main paragraph I think.

So those are the things I found. Did anybody else find any others that need to be adjusted? If not, then I think the first thing I noted was just a formatting thing that I'll let Liz hassle with. I couldn't figure out how to do it in the Google document.

Woman: I think there are a couple of things that are harder to edit in the Google document and some of that indentation that I noted.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah I couldn't get this one indented.

Woman: I wouldn't try to do that in the Google. I'd say that once we get to the end of this editing to put out the clean copies. Feel free to pull it into your favorite Word editor.

Woman: Yeah I won't say my favorite Word editor on this call, but I will do that and then the one...

Woman: That's why I put it the way I did.

Woman: I thought that was very diplomatic. And then the other thing I noticed was for example we have a footnote early on and there doesn't appear to be a way to do footnotes. There may be but I couldn't discern it, so thanks I will do that at the end. But I will wait until the very end so that we have (unintelligible) doing that formatting work.

Chuck Gomes: In fact you can go ahead. I think once people – as soon as end of the day tomorrow comes and people have had time to provide anything via

the list or any edits directly in the Google document at that point, then I think you could go ahead and convert so that we're ready to go then.

Woman: I would actually suggest that at the end of this meeting would be a fine time for Liz to take – Liz and/or you to take control of the document and (unintelligible) changing it on the fly and send the list – I suggest we change these words to those words, but since we won't be doing another meeting where we talk through it, it might be time to have a tighter control of the pen.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm okay with that if nobody else objects. Then instead of doing any even minor edits that you might find on the document after this meeting once Liz gives us the go ahead, then communicate all changes even minor edits via the list.

Woman: Is that okay with you Liz as a way to do it?

Liz Gasster: That's fine with me. Let me just ask the group though if I do push this over to a word processing program does track changes work or does that not work for everyone's compatibility?

Chuck Gomes: Personally I think it makes it much easier for people to see what's done without being as time consuming if you use track changes, but one approach to doing that too is if people don't like track changes you can give them a clean copy too if they'd rather not have the track changes.

Woman: But I would expect that edits would be pretty minimal at that point. So like you'd produce it in a word program and then hopefully...

Chuck Gomes: And we're probably not going to have time – in fact I would say it's quite definite we will not have time on Thursday morning to go back and have the group check it and see. We'll communicate to them a red line that shows the changes that were made, but you and I are going to have to make a command decision, here's what we're sending forward.

And if we miss something or the group disagrees we can always come back and deal with that through the council process.

Tina Dam: Hey Chuck. This is Tina. A quick question for you. What would you like to do in terms of – like for example, right now I'm just like staring at it on the screen. It says a single character in a non-ASCII script. I know we all know what that means, but terminology wise that's incorrect. Do you want me to take a look at the document for that, and if so – and make changes for stuff like that? Or do you have a different plan?

Chuck Gomes: Feel free to do that Tina. One of the struggles is just like the term IDN ccTLDs. It's really not a precisely accurate term.

Tina Dam: Right. I remember that.

Chuck Gomes: What we needed to do is to decide whether it's better to use the less precise term or to try and be precise, and I'm comfortable with your judgment in that in terms of the broad audience that's going to look at this. If we could state it more accurately and you think it's going to be clear to the average reader, no problem. Or if you think that we can state it precisely with maybe a footnote that's okay too.

Tina Dam: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So I welcome what you're doing and just send those via the list, okay?

Tina Dam: Alright.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Tina. Now if you take a look at under number of characters in the string item A there is a long response that we have there, and of course Liz for the sake of finalizing this document for the council we will leave the lead in to all of our responses as proposed GNSO response because until the council approves it it won't be a GNSO response. Ultimately that proposed will be deleted.

Now if you look at the very bottom of that long paragraph you'll see that there is a sentence there, "If a variable string length is introduced for IDN ccTLDs it should not also be introduced for ASCII ccTLDs." I think we covered that if you look up at the first few sentences of the main response, so I don't think that's needed anymore but please correct me if you think I'm wrong.

Woman: I don't think it's a bad thing to repeat, but you're right it is redundant. Sometimes redundancy is good.

Chuck Gomes: Well if we do repeat it there probably should be – it should be probably separated from the main paragraph just because it doesn't flow very well at that point either. What's the inclination of the group?

Woman: I mean you could always say as stated earlier if you really want to say it twice.

Woman: Well in one place – yeah it doesn't matter. I like the idea of being very emphatic about it. We repeat just in case you missed it the first time.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody opposed to repeating it?

Woman: No, no.

Chuck Gomes: Okay then why don't we – and then just add a line space there so it becomes a new paragraph by itself and just say as stated earlier if a variable string and so on. Is that okay?

Woman: Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Now I think – I believe that other than minor edits if you look real closely you can find a minor edit or two in that teal text, but they were very minor. Like I think I added an S in one place to (CLDs).

Woman: And I'll pick those up.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so then that means we're okay on the changes that we made last week unless somebody identifies any others right now. Okay. Alright now we ended our meeting last week right in the middle under section two of their issues paper, introduction of IDN ccTLDs. The question what precedence should be given to ccTLDs in the IDN implementation process, so if you want to go to there in the document that's where we will pick up for today and move from there.

So we're right in the middle of that one now. If you look at the document you'll see that I made a minor I think nonmaterial edit in that first paragraph where I said the GNSO worked diligently and openly for over a year and a half. It was previously worded like a year and a half

just ended and obviously we actually ended that some time ago. That's the only reason I did that.

So what we need to decide now, and we worked on this a little bit last week but we didn't finish. So we need to look at our total response here including the voidance of ASCII (squading), which I think we may have briefly talked about last week from the IDN working group and see if there are any other changes in our total response there. And I'll be quiet for a minute and let you take a look at all of that because it's a fairly length response.

Tina Dam: Chuck this is Tina. I'm sorry, but you actually kind of lost me. I don't know what section we're looking at.

Chuck Gomes: Okay are you in the Google document Tina?

Tina Dam: Yes.

Woman: Search it for 4.1.1.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah if you find 4.1.1 we're in that response right there.

Tina Dam: Okay great. I was actually – I was right there. I just wasn't sure then. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I know. By the way, this is kind of a digression, but in the GNSO the more we can (unintelligible) integrate documents to create easily referable numbering systems the better because this issues paper is a classic example where it's very awkward to refer to parts of the document and make comments or suggestions and things like that.

Woman: And to fax that, because I know that you can put out something at least in the draft version where lines are numbered. We can't introduce section numbers because they didn't, but we could put it out with numbered lines so that when we're talking about it it's easy.

Chuck Gomes: Good point, though it's probably a little late in the process for us to take advantage of that now. But that's a good idea for the future.

Woman: Well it might be good for the next version that comes out, once Liz takes control of the document when we're talking about it in council and such to have a line numbered version.

Chuck Gomes: Ah, that's a good point.

Woman: I'm happy to do that. I think it's an easy thing as I recall. If it's not an easy thing I don't want to do it.

Woman: Right. If it becomes a not easy thing then ignore it. I think it is easy.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so let's take this response here to what precedent should be given to ccTLDs in the IDN implementation process. Any suggestions on the first paragraph, the one where I made the minor edit? Okay. Then going to the next paragraph, the GNSO IDN working group...

Woman: Can I ask one – I'm slow. On the last sentence I'm not sure if that's ambiguous or not. "The process should not be put on hold for IDN gTLDs." Now what you mean to say is that IDN gTLDs should not be put on hold because of a ccTLD correct?

Chuck Gomes: Correct, and I'm okay with that change.

Man: Or maybe we could change it just to say the process should not be put on hold for IDN TLDs.

Woman: I was thinking – right. In general, right. Unless there's a technical reason.

Chuck Gomes: Although there are...

Woman: Yeah, yeah. It follows from your previous sentence.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah it should fall under the previous sentence. I know that if we talk about IDN ccTLDs separately (unintelligible). The idea there was to be very explicit in both cases rather than just making – we kind of start off with the general sentence I think.

Woman: Right. So anyhow, if I was going to make the sentence unambiguous I would say, "The IDN gTLD process should not be put on hold unless there are technical reasons for doing so."

Chuck Gomes: I like that.

Woman: And that sentence gets rid of the ambiguity of (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: And so just a very minor edit, but the preceding sentence, "The GNSO has worked diligently and openly the last year and a half," I mean time

has passed since we did the first draft of this. So for a year and a half I would suggest instead of the last year and a half.

Chuck Gomes: That's the part that I changed. I think you're looking at an older version.

Man: Oh yeah, okay sorry.

Woman: Now for over a year and a half.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and you're welcome to change it further, but I had the same concern. Okay. Alright then the next paragraph, the one that contains the 411 from the IDN working group, any comments on that? Hearing none, and then we'll go the – and then tied into that paragraph 411 is what looks like a separate paragraph below it. "If there are technical reasons for delaying introduction of IDN gTLDs," etcetera.

And go ahead and take a look at the very last paragraph that's not indented there. "Both ccTLDs and gTLD users have needs for IDN TLDs," and so on. Now that one we haven't talked about in quite awhile so take a look carefully at that and make sure that we're all comfortable with what it says. I think I still am.

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck it's Adrian.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Adrian Kinderis: We had this discussion yesterday actually. Is man hours still an appropriate term?

Chuck Gomes: You mean from a...

Adrian Kinderis: Politically correct point of view.

Chuck Gomes: Gender point of view?

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: We certainly don't need to have man there do we?

Adrian Kinderis: I'm just being careful because I got called out yesterday in a similar circumstance.

Chuck Gomes: Not a bad point. I would delete man and say many hours and financial resources.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah I think it works better.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Adrian Kinderis: Once bit and twice shy.

Woman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Anything else in that paragraph or anywhere (unintelligible)? Okay. Let's go on then to who selects the IDN ccTLD string in the absence of a mandated list? And question A there is, "What are the criteria and policies that determine who can submit a request for the designation of an IDN ccTLD?"

Now there is some good suggestions here, and I think we're probably going to change what the original response is, and in fact Avri proposes a response that might replace what we have there. What's the thinking? Should we just use Avri's proposed response and replace what's there in the black text?

Woman: Well there is – I mean I'm in favor of it but there is the comment about not all ccTLDs being members of the ccNSO. Now of course that may be covered in the prior rules approved by the board based on, but that would be only – is how do we take into account? I mean obviously I like my suggestion, but how do we take into account Adrian's comment?

Chuck Gomes: And I guess we can ask the question is that something we really can adequately take into account? Obviously it's an issue and in fact on the center list right now there is some discussion going on about what the value is of being a member of the ccNSO and so forth.

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck? Yeah just in response to that, I think that we tend of have covered that because I did bang on about that throughout the entire document and I think we covered it very well by referring to the (GAC) and ccTLD managers and things. I think that in our proposed response this seems like a (unintelligible) activity (CC) and associated activities in (GAC).

We were wording it better to cover it before. I'm just not sure my points are still relevant anymore.

Woman: Well of course we could just bring that down.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah exactly.

Woman: Yeah replace ccNSO for ccNSO, the ccTLDs and the (GAC) should be able to make that selection, blah blah, subject to the variables.

Adrian Kinderis: I think that covers. I'm just having a quick look back though the document to see where we refer to it because I know I mentioned it a couple of other times very early on. So for the time being I think that more than covers it, but I just wanted to I guess expand the community wider than the ccNSO because I realized that that wasn't all encompassing.

Chuck Gomes: That's good.

Woman: Okay just saying in the absence of a mandated list or rule that the ccNSO, ccTLD and the (GAC) should be able to. And the delete the other entry.

Chuck Gomes: And are you okay – (Olga) you had a comment there...

(Olga): Yes, but it's an old comment and I agree with the new writing.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks okay. Anything else on A?

(Olga): Which is the final wording?

Liz Gasster: "In the absence of a mandated list or a rule by which an intrinsic list is determined, the ccNSO, the ccTLD, and the (GAC) should be able to make the selection subject to prior rules approved by the board based on the recommendations of the (unintelligible)."

(Olga): Perfect. I like it.

Adrian Kinderis: And can I just make one more suggestion? I'm not sure mandated is also politically correct. Can we have a look at another word? I'm joking. I'm joking. Keep moving, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Don't make me laugh Adrian. It hurts my throat, okay?

Adrian Kinderis: You do sound a little worse for the way there.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah well my old age. I seem to get colds more often. Anyway B, who will develop the...

Tina Dam: Hold on. This is Tina. I'm sorry. So you guys went beyond the members of the ccNSO, but do you also want to go beyond the members of the (GAC)?

Man: That's a good point.

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, I just found the word I want. It's ICANN community is what we've been using instead of – I just want to see whether it works here though. Just hang on one second.

Chuck Gomes: I think you need to be more specific here that it's the – now if you were to say the ccTLD community, then does that automatically involve the (GAC)?

Woman: So in other words Tina would you like to add a ccNSO, the ccTLD, and the (GAC) in cooperation with the territorial partners, or some such

thing? Is that what you're saying? So if the territorial partner is a nonmember...

Tina Dam: No. I was just mostly thinking that there are governments that are not members of the (GAC).

Woman: Right, and they would be the territorial partner in the case of their ccTLD.

Tina Dam: Well but there was countries too, not just territories that have...

Woman: Yeah, but we're staying away from the word country all the way through, and we've used territorial authority.

Chuck Gomes: We're using territory as a broad grouping.

Woman: That includes country.

Tina Dam: Okay.

Woman: It's not for us to decide who is a legitimate country or not.

Chuck Gomes: So you think that that's a good addition Tina?

Tina Dam: You know what? Since you went beyond the ccNSO, which I think is a really good addition I just thought maybe you needed to expand on the (GAC) as well.

Woman: Well maybe you'd say in cooperation with the relevant territory authorities?

Woman: I think that's good.

Chuck Gomes: Is that alright Tina?

Tina Dam: It works for me, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. So okay, are you with us Liz?

Liz Gasster: Yes. It's done.

Chuck Gomes: We can move ahead to B. "Who will develop the criteria and policies for determining the designation of an IDN ccTLD," and I suggested a couple of changes in there and there is some comments. Maybe before we talk too much about the comments, Avri will you explain the one, one, one formula for us?

Woman: Okay. I think we moved beyond that. Yeah but it's one...

Man: One script.

Woman: One name, one script, per entry in the (ISO) list.

Chuck Gomes: Right, right. I was having trouble remembering what it was too because we did move on. But anyway I thought that would be helpful to see the context. Now I think we want to include the GNSO in this response as I suggested. It depends what we actually say I guess, and then I did suggest a change. I think before – that the word delegating is more appropriate for (unintelligible) rather than issuing or whatever was there before because the (unintelligible) doesn't make any decisions in

and of itself as to what the ccTLD string is, but they make decisions with regard to the delegation of the string after that decision is already made.

That's the distinction I was trying to make. Now Avri why don't you talk about your comment there and how it might be incorporated or replaced or whatever.

Avri Doria: Yeah I guess – I think I was just trying to rephrase it, not make a comment.

Chuck Gomes: Well I mean – and so go ahead and suggest how you – are you suggesting that what you have there replaces the text there?

Avri Doria: I think that's what I was suggesting at the time, but the other one has developed beyond there now. In other words, yeah I was basically putting it in the same language. First of all, technical protocol, that's out. That's the (IETF) and in its processes and procedures in terms of other policies, and (unintelligible) not technical in terms of policies related to designation. But then again, I had the ccNSO there and I don't know if we want to extend that one again.

Chuck Gomes: Well with regard to policy making the...

Avri Doria: Yeah that would be the ccNSO.

Chuck Gomes: That would be the ccNSO. Now we go on to say with input from stakeholders. We say sovereign government. Do we want to say territories instead of sovereign government?

Woman: Territory authorities?

Chuck Gomes: Local communities and language communities, and do we want the GNSO in there? Does it even go there then?

Woman: See that's why I was basically going back to our standard formula of they get to do it subject to the rules made by the board. Now those rules can and should include consultation with everyone, etcetera, but not getting into that specificity of it is what I was trying to do.

Chuck Gomes: What do others think here? One of the problems we get into here is we're mixing – there is two things that come into play. In other places we've been more explicit maybe in separating them than we are right here, and I think that's part of what Avri is trying to do. The actual decision of what becomes of (CC) or (G) is one thing.

Once that decision is decided the policy then is defined for whichever (SO) it applies to. Now so we come back to what's the question really asking. "Who will develop the criteria and policy for determining the designation of an IDN ccTLD?" I personally don't think they they're necessarily asking whether or not – what a (CC) is, but rather once you define that through the broader ICANN community then obviously they're not making that assumption.

Then it's who is going to develop the criteria at that point then for what they actually do allow as an IDN ccTLD?

Man: Yeah this stretches further than selecting the ccTLD strings. I mean this is appointing the actual manager, so it also stretches into the (unintelligible) and such.

Chuck Gomes: Well not this question in particular, but the whole line of questions.

Man: Well the designation of an IDN ccTLD, well it reaches further than the ccTLD string.

Chuck Gomes: Do you think so?

Man: I think so.

Chuck Gomes: Why do you think that?

Man: Designation of an IDN ccTLD, isn't that more than just selection of the string?

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure they really meant more than that.

Man: I don't know.

Chuck Gomes: What do some of the rest of you think? But it's okay if we cover our bases. I think that's what Avri is trying to do.

Woman: Yeah that's what I think we need to do. I think that sometimes there is some ambiguities about words and if we just cover it and sort of say we think that for this it's them, for this it's them, for this it's them. And so perhaps taking what I've done and adding your last sentence, "currently the process for delegating is coordinated," and add that sentence to what I put and then you've covered all the bases.

Tina Dam: Hey Chuck. This is Tina. I don't necessarily think that they meant anything beyond the string, and the reason for it is that countries historically haven't really wanted to have anyone else make any decisions around how they deal with their registrations under the ccTLD. So I don't necessarily think that they want to go beyond that here as well.

But I don't think that Avri's addition is really going so much further that that would be a problem for the response from the team itself.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Tina. As you can tell I think the same thing, but I'm okay with covering our bases here and so Avri I think what I heard your suggestion to be is take yours and add the last sentence that starts with currently up above and that becomes the response. Any problems with that by anyone?

Woman: So were we leaving the first sentence?

Chuck Gomes: No you don't need it. I think it's covered in her – there is not very much difference between...

Woman: The first sentence is the same, so I was going to leave...

Woman: Yeah you could leave it, right. It's only the second sentence that changes.

Woman: Right and then the third sentence stays with the addition of the (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yep. Okay. Moving onto C. "How will such issues as competing requests, both domestic and international be dealt with?" There weren't any comments on that one. It looks like – I don't know if that's – Avri added territorial authorities right?

Avri Doria: I think I was just doing the substitution of language. Or no maybe I wasn't. Let me look at it.

Adrian Kinderis: I think it's the substitution of language.

Avri Doria: Yeah no. I was just substituting local sovereign governments for territorial authorities. I put in brackets, so that meant pick one.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so we can eliminate local sovereign government and just use territorial authority.

Avri Doria: That's what I was suggesting.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody have a problem with that? That's consistent with what we've been doing. I'm okay with that.

Woman: Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Going on to D, that's pretty straightforward and I think that it applies. Any disagreement with that? Now we go then to who are the appropriate actors? Adrian you said delegates. I didn't know what you meant by delegates.

Adrian Kinderis: Because the delegate is not always in the ccNSO.

Man: ccTLD managers, that's what you mean?

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. Sorry it shouldn't be a comma between delegates. It's more like you can use...

Chuck Gomes: So are you saying ccTLD managers or delegates?

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, yeah. ccTLD managers or delegates meaning the same thing.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay.

Woman: So should I put both?

Adrian Kinderis: I would put one. So depending on which wording. It could be ccTLD delegate or ccTLD manager. Maybe there is a better response.

Man: Maybe we could use individual ccTLD.

Woman: Adrian, I think either one of your suggestions are fine. ccTLD managers may be the more normal terminology for that. I don't know.

Woman: It just gets added to the string anywhere?

Adrian Kinderis: I would put it before registrants and potential registrants.

Woman: Got it.

Chuck Gomes: And do we want to eliminate the word sovereign?

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I was looking at that too Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Just put governments, or maybe governments and/or territories?

Adrian Kinderis: Well in every (unintelligible) territorial authorities, maybe that's more appropriate.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. So go with territorial authorities instead of sovereign governments. So Liz, you want to read that one back to us?

Liz Gasster: Sure. "Proposed ccNSO GNSO, (SSAC), (GAC), (unintelligible), (SSAT), (IANA), ccTLD managers, registrants and potential registrants, (IETF), (ISO), territorial authorities, the community (unintelligible) and organized language communities."

Man: The full alphabet soup.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I think it works. It's good.

Chuck Gomes: Anything else on that? What are their roles? There are some good edits that have been made there that I think were okay, in a few cases some brackets. We need to make some decisions I guess on the bracketed items. I highlighted in yellow at least a couple of areas where also I think we need to decide what to do.

But let's start off with the first brackets there that Avri put in subject to prior rules. So that's not a replacement...

Avri Doria: That's an addition, right year.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah it's a qualifier.

Woman: So ccNSO policy making for IDN ccTLD subject to prior rules, blah, blah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah okay. Alright that's consistent.

Woman: And then the one for GNSO was GNSO for everything else.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I caught that. I thought that was okay.

Man: Just wondering about allocated. IDN (VTLD) that are not within the remit of the ccNSO or something.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, that's okay. Yeah I mean that may be better than allocated. Any disagreement with that?

Adrian Kinderis: I like that better.

Chuck Gomes: We want to really even get into that next question you asked there Avri. At this point does it complicate it a little bit too much?

Avri Doria: That's right. I hadn't meant allocated there. I had meant apportioned. But anyway, you mean the whole thing about should all...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Well we're talking about what are roles, so the role of those guys is to participate in the original recommendations considering apportionment and then continuing as a source of input and comment on the (SOs) and the policy making function. And (unintelligible) we're asking for the

role of (SSAC), (GAC), (ALAC), (RSAC). Those guys should all participate.

So basically I was putting that in as what their role is. Their role is to participate in the first act of apportionment and then later as continuing source of input and comment.

Chuck Gomes: Isn't that true of everyone on this list? Why would we single it out for them?

Woman: I think because of the previous one we had who are the appropriate actors, and then what are their roles. You're right. You could just sort of say – I don't know. It looked like we had started on sort of a laundry list for each actor or class of actor what was their role.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and I suspect we're maybe getting to a point where we're giving them so much detail that it becomes less useful. So either we just list – well we could make a couple of general statements. We could start off with, "the role of all of the following bodies includes," – let's see. That may not work.

Woman: Basically I guess what I was doing is I was taking what was there previously and I didn't indicate it correctly, but as opposed to just saying their advisory committees I was opening up what it means to be an advisory committee. We could just go back to sort of say those guys' function as advisories committees, though we are trying to give them slightly more standing in this original apportionment discussion.

Chuck Gomes: And maybe we need to kind of take this and restructure it completely and maybe start off by we believe that all of the following should be

involved in the role of supporting organization designations for IDN TLDs. I'm having trouble with my wording.

And then we could go on and say beyond that then it narrows. Once those apportionment decisions are made then the roles of a lot of these bodies become smaller. Is that true?

Woman: They're different. (Unintelligible) put in comments smaller, I don't know. It's different.

Woman: One way I thought of it was to say we believe that all of the following should be involved as follows. Then it would enable you to specify how each one should be involved if you want to distinguish.

Woman: You could even make it a bulleted list so it was clear.

Woman: That too, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah that would be a much better format for this because it has grown considerably.

Woman: It's an awkward run on multitude of (unintelligible) sentence.

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck it's Adrian. I think you're right. I think everybody needs to be involved in the apportionment as Avri is saying, but then once that's taken care of you're going to turn to bodies like – and I noticed that the ccTLD managers aren't in that at the moment because we added it in the last question so that would need to be added in, or whatever terminology we used.

But them and the ccNSO for example, their direct experience in managing domain names may be a rule while providing knowledge around and experience around their current role as managers, direct managers. So I think that they sort of differentiate themselves as opposed to all those other groups, as they're directly related in managing or administering the name space.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah okay. So what we've got then is – Liz, read that lead in sentence again.

Liz Gasster: So the lead in is, "We believe that all of the following should be involved as follows," and then I am bulleting the list. I'm mid bullet here.

Man: Wasn't there an overarching comment that would be that all of the following should be involved in the apportionment. I thought I heard that.

Chuck Gomes: And maybe more specifically then involved in...

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I think that works much better. Maybe if you take every sentence there because I'm pretty sure that applies to the ccNSO and GNSO, the purple ones, should participate in the original recommendations concerning the apportionment of IDN TLDs and then continuing as a source of input. So I think that up to there, that's your general statement right there isn't it?

Woman: I think so.

Adrian Kinderis: Why is that specific just to those four groups? I think that's all encompassing.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah that was my point earlier, and I think that we came up with a way to resolve that so that that starts off and applies to all of these because the whole community should be involved in that decision.

Woman: And should they also be a continuing source of input and comment, the whole community, or no?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. That's okay.

Woman: So why don't we put that we believe that all of the following should be involved in the apportionment and continue to be involved as a source of input?

Chuck Gomes: Well for each one of the entities or categories of entities like advisory committees we're going to have a little bit of a description of what their role is beyond the apportionment. So it's okay to I think leave that there.

Woman: You want to leave the source of input under the advisory committees continuing?

Chuck Gomes: I think so. Otherwise you might not have anything there for them.

Woman: And that is specifically what they are there to do.

Woman: Okay so I will say will continue as a source of input and comment, or should continue?

Chuck Gomes: Let's make them parallel, parallel consistency there. In other words we're referring to the ccNSO as a policy making body, the GNSO as a policy making body, advisory committees as providers of ongoing input or whatever, just so that they all follow the same pattern whether it be a noun or a very or whatever. In the first two we use nouns right, the policy making body. Does that make sense?

Woman: Yep.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Alright and now what is (MA) for (ISO3166)?

Man: Managing authority I think.

Woman: I thought it was the maintenance agency.

Man: Maintenance agency, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Why don't we spell that out so it's clear if it needs to be there? Also for sovereign governments we're going to take territorial authorities when appropriate like Avri suggested right?

Tina Dam: Chuck this is Tina. I just had a question for you guys on that last sentence. For the non-ICANN entities and so forth, first of all I'm not quite sure what the non-ICANN entities are and secondly the role between – I don't know what the role is between IDNs and the Unicode Consortium for example. So I don't think providing that example makes that clear.

Chuck Gomes: Well the IDN protocol relies on the Unicode Consortium to work, right?

Woman: Well it's based on Unicode, but that does not clarify what is the role of the Unicode Consortium members and IDNs, does it?

Chuck Gomes: So that may not be a very good analogy.

Woman: It wasn't clear to me what that means.

Chuck Gomes: Maybe the whole sentence is a problem.

Woman: Well maybe you could start with what are the non-ICANN entities, because to me that's also not clear. Is that ISO? How far up the list do you go?

Chuck Gomes: And in fact what really is a non-ICANN entity because ICANN is open to the whole world right?

Woman: Right?

Chuck Gomes: Good point.

Woman: I know what you're trying to do. You're trying to specify some of the latter list of entities roles, but I don't think it's helping.

Chuck Gomes: Does that last sentence, both parts of it, really accomplish anything here?

Man: It's probably worthwhile mentioning the four other entities like – since we have a list here, like (ISO3166), (MA), and Unicode Consortium will

have important roles to play. Something like that just to mention them rather than trying to draw analogies.

Woman: Well the Unicode Consortium's role, and it has to do with IDNs, is included in the work that the (ITS) is doing, so I would be very careful about adding them as a separate entity.

Woman: I think you define the character separately.

Chuck Gomes: I suggest we delete from four of the non-ICANN entities.

Woman: I agree.

Woman: I agree. It's a good idea because we're talking about the Internet community, so everybody's there.

Woman: So we're saying the whole sentence...

Man: And besides we haven't mentioned them in the answer to A either, so – well just to stay consistent with our response in A.

Woman: When in doubt cut.

Woman: So it's the whole sentence, so not just that first phrase right? It's the whole sentence?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, the whole sentence. Four lines there just about. Also did you add ccTLD managers or whichever term we used up in A?

Woman: A separate board for ccTLD managers?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Woman: I did not.

Chuck Gomes: And what do we want to say about their role?

Man: I think Adrian had something.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah I was going to sort of put them with – well yeah actually you want them separate. So give them – I think anyway, give them a separate point and then just put their experience to – let me think. Let me world smith this a little. Their role would be to convey their experience in managing the name space or managing ccTLD members, something like that. I don't know. Someone will do better than me.

Woman: Right. Provided by based on experience managing domain names.

Adrian Kinderis: Yep, and you can put direct experience.

Chuck Gomes: So that we don't dwell on this one too long because we still got a long ways to go, especially when you consider we got to do the executive summary. Let's make sure everybody between now and 24 hours from now takes a good look at this paragraph so that we can all catch things because if we try and be too fine here we're not going to meet our goal of finishing.

Woman: And if you could just restate what should follow ccTLD managers because I had to switch phones real quick.

Adrian Kinderis: Avri do you want to take a shot?

Avri Doria: Right, yes. Provide advice based upon their direct experience as managers of.

Adrian Kinderis: The name names for domain space.

Avri Doria: Right.

Woman: The domain space?

Avri: Yes.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah either one.

Woman: I think domain names is better because it's larger than the single name that any of them make.

Chuck Gomes: Anything else on this before we go on? Liz, do you have what you need? Are you comfortable?

Liz Gasster: Yep.

Chuck Gomes: Okay let's go on then to C. I think C is pretty straightforward and there weren't any comments. Anybody disagree with that? That takes us then to section three, delegation of IDN ccTLDs, and the first question is do existing ccTLD delegation policies apply to the delegation of IDN ccTLDs?

Notice that Edmon thinks that our basic answer should be no to start this off.

Woman: I agree with that. I like it.

Chuck Gomes: And so I wanted to call attention to that first of all.

Adrian Kinderis: I agree with that as well. The existing ccTLD delegation was done in such an ad hoc and organic manner that you don't want to follow that precedent whatsoever. So the short answer is no.

Chuck Gomes: We start off by saying no, and then would be follow then with Avri's sentence? And then what was there before becomes a third sentence if you count no as one sentence. So in other words it would say, "No. After apportionment of IDN TLDs and the establishment of principals for such delegation by the board based on the (unintelligible) of the ICANN community – "let's see that's not a – oh okay. Well then that's supposed to be a comma. This becomes primarily a decision for ICANN so with consultation with other...

Adrian Kinderis: See I don't like when...

Woman: Do you think we can say no?

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah I think just say no because you're opening a can of worms Chuck when you get to this primarily is a decision for ICANN (unintelligible) ccNSO because you got to go back to the (GAC) as well. They've got to be in there, and you're going to start to interweave a few of the other – we've got to go back to the ICANN community wording if you want to do that.

Chuck Gomes: So is no sufficient?

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Sure, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: The more I look at it the more I think we're complicating it, and Edmon had the right idea.

Woman: Yeah. I mean I had originally thought that they had to be consulted, but I'm willing to go along with no.

Chuck Gomes: Now Avri I do have a question for you. Would that response meet your brevity criteria?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Good, okay. Alright thanks. That's a nice brief one isn't it? Okay and then if not who can apply to have the IDN ccTLD delegated, etcetera, and we have a proposed response there with some edits by Avri.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah this is much more where the content of Avri's last response becomes applicable I think. Although I'd like to use, "This is a decision for the ICANN community," rather than, "ICANN, ccNSO with other supporting organizations and advisory committees."

Chuck Gomes: Well we are – I think we’ve already conceded the fact that once the allocation decision or apportionment decision is made then it does become a ccNSO responsibility with input from the rest of the community.

Adrian Kinderis: We have? Because I don’t agree with that.

Chuck Gomes: You don’t agree with that?

Adrian Kinderis: No because as I mentioned before there are a number of organizations that – a number of countries that aren’t in the ccNSO – territories, excuse me, that aren’t in the ccNSO. So why should the ccNSO have that power?

Chuck Gomes: Well Adrian then you’re disagreeing with something we have already agreed to.

Adrian Kinderis: I didn’t realize we had.

Chuck Gomes: If you go back to section A, all the way up to section A, you’ll find that point number three says, “The ccNSO should be primarily responsible for IDN ccTLD policies.”

Adrian Kinderis: Right, right, right. Yeah that’s the nervous side on my behalf. I don’t want to drag everyone down. I’ll bite the bullet and bring it up at an appropriate time.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well I mean do you disagree with number three, that they should be responsible for – I mean in the ICANN world that’s the way it’s divided right now. Granted there are people that have elected not to be

members, although they are not prevented from participating in the policy development process.

I understand the issue you're raising, but I don't know where else we'd go. Do you let – are we going to end up with some subset of ccTLDs out there who decide not to recognize policies set by ICANN and the ccNSO, and therefore do their own thing?

Adrian Kinderis: See this is where I wanted to have the backing of a – where I thought we were relying upon an agreement, as in a contract with ICANN that would rope all that in. So I figured potentially it was going to be government entities that did the bidding on behalf of – the government and the ccNSO, or the (GAC) and the ccNSO potentially work together to apportion. But look, that's as aside. We got a lot to get through Chuck. I'm happy to bide my time and bring it up another time, but I think that there is a fundamental problem with that.

Chuck Gomes: How do you solve that problem?

Adrian Kinderis: This is why I'm trying to buy some time here Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Maybe I should just let you. Yeah obviously we don't have any more time in this group to do that, so what's our decision right now with regard to that? So if not who can apply, so Adrian do you have a problem with the response as modified by Avri including replacing sovereign government with territorial authorities?

Adrian Kinderis: No I do not. That's fine.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay?

Adrian Kinderis: Yes.

Man: Does it help to make it clear that this is a policy decision for the GNSO or something like that, rather than just say this is a decision even if that may be clear enough?

Chuck Gomes: I can go either way on that. The answer to the question is a decision they have to make. You could also call it a policy decision. Any inclination by anybody?

Adrian Kinderis: This whole thing gets solved is if they turn around Chuck and they say, "If ICANN says in order for you to have your own IDN ccTLD you must sign a contract with ICANN and you must be a member of the ccNSO." And then if people turn around and say, "We don't want to do that," then they just go, "Bad luck. You're not getting your IDN."

Chuck Gomes: And then you have a revolution.

Adrian Kinderis: I'm just talking utopia. It's called Adrian's utopia, granted, but it's utopia nonetheless.

Chuck Gomes: That would be nice if they had to have contracts.

Adrian Kinderis: Because then we can rely upon the whole one to one to one ratio working well and theory wise that's kind of (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and I think we do have to balance a little bit with some reality here if we want to be effective.

Adrian Kinderis: That's right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay Liz, are you okay with A?

Liz Gasster: I'm not sure where we are.

Chuck Gomes: Okay we're going to basically incorporate the edits minus her spelling errors that Avri communicated there. So you're going to insert the first bracketed thing that she suggests, and then as applicable, and then instead of sovereign government you're going to have territorial authority. Makes sense?

Liz Gasster: Yep.

Chuck Gomes: And then we get to who decides on the delegation, and in particular are there specific reasons for deviating from the standard practice (unintelligible). Now this one, our original response I don't think is very good here. Avri may be a better direction. What do people think there, and Avri do you want to talk about yours? Avri are you still on?

Avri Doria: Sorry. I was talking with mute. I'm in an area with other people occasionally so I've been muted, sorry. Basically what I was trying to say is some of these large communities (unintelligible) large significant (unintelligible) and I'm not saying they get to decide by any means, but I am saying that they should be included and this is sort of a different way of saying the language community.

But the language community always gets confusing because people say, "What? Because I studied five years of French I have something to say," and of course that's not what you're talking about. You're

talking about the gigantic national associating – the (ASPRA). The (ASPRA) is the best word to apply to it. So that's what I was trying to say.

We should sort of say they should be – those communities should have standing in the discussion.

Chuck Gomes: Now how do we word that in such a way that we're actually responding to the question though? Because they're asking...

Avri Doria: Is there a specific reason for deviating. Yes, in cases of a significant (unintelligible) there should be consideration of including them in the (unintelligible) process. So I was specifically answering that question.

Chuck Gomes: Very good. No, I'm with you now. I missed that.

Avri Doria: Now there may be other reasons, but mine was an attempt to specifically answer at least one case in which there is a reason to deviate. There may be others.

Chuck Gomes: And so we could actually take what you say and replace it with what's there and I think it's a better response. What do others think? Any disagreement in that?

Woman: And then you could say, yes for example in the cases of, if you wanted to leave open the possibility that there could be other rationale.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody disagree with that approach?

Woman: And if you liked what you had there before you could go on to another sentence saying another aspect to be considered would be the local legitimacy or something like that, if you wanted to keep that content in.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and there were members of a little group that I headed up on writing the first draft that thought that was pretty important. I'm not sure...

Man: Well it comes in the next bullet point.

Chuck Gomes: Actually it fits better in the next one, doesn't it?

Man: Yeah. It is (unintelligible) cover that.

Woman: Let me just ask you in the sentence that we confirmed, is there a better word for them? There should be considerations including them in the decision process. Are we talking about the local Internet community? Are we talking about...

Man: That population.

Woman: That population, that common...

Woman: That community and that population.

Woman: That community, okay. I like that, okay.

Chuck Gomes: So anybody opposed to just taking the just modified sentence and replacing with what was there – replacing what was there. Okay. You've got that Liz?

Liz Gasster: Yeah. We've moved on then to...

Chuck Gomes: "Is consent, involvement, knowledge of government required," we're moving there right now.

Liz Gasster: Yeah I got the previous then. We deleted the...

Chuck Gomes: And then that – and then Avri I think you were...

Avri Doria: You could drop my note because I think it's covered in the one above.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And so you're okay with the responses there?

Avri Doria: I'm not sure. It may be useful to clarify legitimacy by encouraging. I think the wording choice is difficult. I guess I don't really understand it. What does the government have to do with local legitimacy? Are we saying in cases where you don't have a legitimate government, in cases where the person applying may or may not be legitimate?

Chuck Gomes: I think they were actually probably all of the above were in different scenarios, but this wasn't something that was a big issue to me but there were those who thought it was important.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) legitimacy. I don't understand clarify legitimacy.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not pushing for what's there myself. Should we just say what you say there and kind of repeat what's being said above?

Avri Doria: Well it's not quite the same answer.

Chuck Gomes: No it's not. You're right.

Man: Do we mean substantiate legitimacy?

Avri Doria: Determine? Determine is strong.

Man: Substantiate is less strong.

Avri Doria: How about support legitimacy? Many things would go to supporting the legitimacy of an application. So it may be useful to support the legitimacy of an IDN ccTLD.

Man: I like that.

Avri Doria: Now I think though it says is consent, and as we're saying involvement and knowledge, yes. Are we saying consent yes or do we want to add a specific sentence that says we do not believe that government's consent should be required?

Chuck Gomes: That's probably going to be a local government issue whether it's required or not.

Avri Doria: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And they're basically asking her any one of those things required and you could also include are all three required or are just one of them required. So maybe if we just go with what you previously said it might work.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Would you read that back Liz?

Liz Gasster: What was originally there?

Chuck Gomes: No, what Avri suggested change.

Liz Gasster: I didn't get it.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Woman: Well the only change we had so far was to support legitimacy.

Liz Gasster: Yeah that I've got. It may be useful to support legitimacy of an IDN ccTLD by encouraging government involvement and knowledge, particularly (unintelligible) local legitimacy...

Avri Doria: I don't understand how that final phrase helps.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah I don't think it does and I didn't think we were trying...

Tina Dam: Hey Chuck, this is Tina. I think if I remember right, a couple of other times in the document you guys have referred to (GAC) making such a decision when they talk about whether a government needs to be involved or not. So I'm just wondering if you're now trying to provide some added information from the GNSO where in fact really previously you've said this is what the (GAC) should be talking about.

Chuck Gomes: Thoughts on that from others? Now this is a question. I'm comfortable with the one response we have right now, but another option is to just put a no response.

Avri Yes, at other places we do say a lot of things belong to our decisions that happen in the (GAC). But I would think that we don't want to come down as tacitly approving that there must in all cases be government consent of a delegation or an allocation. So perhaps we do want to add a sentence that says it should not be necessary or it is not necessary in all cases or something.

Because as it stands now we're saying that it's worth considering, but we really leave open the question of whether governments should have a right of consent for all IDN ccTLD delegations.

Woman: I think that's interesting Avri. How would the (unintelligible)? I like the idea. Only if needed or something like that.

Adrian Kinderis: Why can't we say whilst we potentially advise the government's involved, it might not be necessary. Why not do it in that order? I think that then sort of we do get that theme going through the document.

Avri Doria: Right so you're saying we start out while government advice should be considered, it should not be necessary to obtain government's consent. How's that work?

Chuck Gomes: Sounds pretty good.

Adrian Kinderis: Instead of should say may, it may not be necessary.

Chuck Gomes: So what do we got? What's it say now?

Avri Doria: While government advice – what did I say?

Woman: To be considered but not necessary.

Avri Doria: To obtain government consent. It may not be necessary to obtain government consent.

Woman: And that is to follow...

Avri Doria: That's just it. I'm wondering if it follows or does it precede? What were you indicating Adrian?

Adrian Kinderis: I think precede.

Avri Doria: Yeah. In some sense, the second sentence follows nicely from it. Afterwards, the following may be considered in this regard. What regard? The one we just said. It may be useful to support legitimacy of an idea by encouraging...

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah I think it works.

Avri Doria: Yeah I think it's much better to have the sentence we just did first.

Woman: Okay. (Unintelligible) response. While government advice should be considered, it may not be necessary to obtain government consent. The following may be worth considering in this regard. It may be useful to support legitimacy of an idea in ccTLD by encouraging government involvement and knowledge. Do you want the last phrase?

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah keep the last – I'm sorry, go on.

Woman: Particularly in case of where local legitimacy is in question.

Adrian Kinderis: Maybe we don't need to say that.

Avri Doria: Yeah I think that's worth dropping.

Chuck Gomes: The lead in to that second sentence though, read that again to me?

Woman: The following may be worth considering in this regard.

Chuck Gomes: Do we really need that or could we just jump right into it may be useful to clarify legitimacy of an idea of an IDN ccTLD by encouraging government involvement and knowledge?

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah that works for me Chuck.

Avri Doria: Yeah I'm fine on the principle of less is more.

Woman: Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Alright. Let's go onto is consent involvement knowledge of incumbent (CCLD) manager required and as a response there, there's a reference in the response to the (Catto) report. (Ostineau Catto) was the former ICANN board member who chaired that committee and I asked the question whether we would want to refer to that. And Avri asked why not.

My reasoning for why not is that that particular report I'm concerned, it's got a certain level of legitimacy already because it was done within ICANN board committee, board led committee. And it was heavily dominated by ccTLDs and really for the most part ended up ignoring most gTLD input into it because of the domination by the ccTLDs.

Now I'm not saying that the particular point being referenced here is a problem, but I'm just giving you the background of why I asked the question whether we want to reference that here or not. I'm comfortable with what people want to do.

Avri Doria: I guess a telltale question would be do we bring in elements that we prefer not to legitimize by bringing it in? I don't know the report well enough to answer, so I'll go on your answer. Is there stuff there? Is there stuff there that by having given it a mark of legitimacy we all of a sudden are stuck with all kinds of stuff we hate?

Chuck Gomes: Well as I recall, and help me Tina if you can remember, but as I recall it certainly came out in a sense that gave the advantage to (CC) community. Gs we afterthought. It was more important that IDNs be implemented in the ccTLD community first, and that was easier to do etcetera, etcetera. So that's where I'm leaning. So Tina, and I wrong on that perception or do you remember the call? Because you were in a different role then.

Tina Dam: Yeah you know Chuck, and I haven't read the report for some time, but it would be worth it to go back and look at it. The one thing that I remember from it coming out of it was that an (IDNTLD) was an (IDNTLD) regardless of whether if it's a CC or a G or what it is, and

that introduction of it should follow whatever the standard process is for introduction of new (TLDs).

So I don't know. It is sort of like – right today, the GNSO and the ccNSO have divided, or at least are trying to do that division, and this report specifically does not make that division or categorization between those two types.

Chuck Gomes: We're at a point where we don't have time to go back and look at the report, we can obviously after we finalize this document, but I don't feel really strongly on this. I'm okay leaving it as is.

Woman: I think you answered the why it might not be helpful to reference, so I'm fine with dropping it.

Chuck Gomes: So just deleting that sentence?

Woman: You gave me sufficient reason to believe that it may not be helpful.

Chuck Gomes: Now another thing too, not too many people are going to be familiar with that report because it's quite old now.

Woman: Yeah but it could drive us all back to read it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Woman: Which we probably should before the meeting anyway.

Man: (Unintelligible) base the question on whether consent of the (SS) ccTLD manager not be required, and as a statement on its own? Without reference to the (unintelligible) report.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So is anyone in favor of leaving the reference to the (Catto) report? Okay and nobody's opposed to deleting that I assume? So we'll delete that second sentence.

Woman: Done.

Avri Doria: And we should probably delete it in the next one too.

Chuck Gomes: Exactly. The same thing comes up...

Avri Doria: Yeah and I think it's the same answer.

Chuck Gomes: And by the way, there was one person in the working group that really pushed strong to have that reference in there, and leading the group I tried to base relatively neutral, and I raise the same questions. Well I couldn't raise the questions in the same sense because it's a different audience. Okay so then takes care of both of those.

Woman: Well there was still issues.

Chuck Gomes: More comments. So let's look at the other comments. Let's see, I would suggest that they do...

Avri Doria: Okay I deleted my last comment, or one of them, and you would basically ask is it our place. So my original is that yes, going along with what had been said here, if they had been doing a good job then they certainly had a right, but then several people argued that I was wrong about that, and that boasts from the (Catto) report and from Adrian and from your comment that nope, those guys don't have a right I don't find myself in a position where I feel I ought to argue for that right so I'm backing off.

Adrian Kinderis: Avri if I can share some experience in monitoring ccTLD land, it seems that the Internet communities in some of these territories have been hand strung by the current ccTLD managers that were as I said previously, delegated the name in an ad hoc manner because they were in the right place at the right time and it's been a struggle to try to call that back.

So I think in giving them necessarily a say puts them in a position of power that they may once again hold the Internet community to ransom with.

Woman: Right, but I guess the question I have in places where someone has done a good job and has built a brand and has been responsible, do they have a right to consideration?

Adrian Kinderis: Sure they do, but if they're doing a good job then surely the authority, and we're talking about who that is, whether it's the government and we talked about that before, the ccNSO, whomever, surely that will be recognized and they can put their hand up then.

Chuck Gomes: That's the essence of what we were trying to say in the first sentence of the original response. We were pretty vague about it because this gets in a fairly political area in that arena. If there is some local legitimacy of the current provider and the user experience has been good for them, then those are considerations that would be worthy to look at.

Adrian Kinderis: For sure, and I think Avri in practice you're right. But I don't think you can make a rule around exactly what you're saying just because there are times when it won't apply and now they're try to get some sort of legitimacy. So I think that the proposed response at the moment probably covers it well enough because it does talk about only consideration rather than anything else.

Woman: Yeah I think it's fine.

Chuck Gomes: So we'll just go with that one sentence response. Anybody opposed to that? Okay jumping down to C...

Tina Dam: Hey Chuck this is Tina. I'm sorry, but I'm going to have to drop off the call to go to another meeting. But I'm going to read through all the rest of the stuff and provide any terminology and comments that I have.

Chuck Gomes: Great, and Liz will be letting us know on the list in the next few hours, and I suspect it will be fairly soon. Liz, is that true after we get done here?

Liz Gasster: Yeah. In fact I was thinking I would turn around and put it into a Word document and just send it.

Tina Dam: Actually I'm just told that I have 15 minutes more and then I'm going to drop off.

Chuck Gomes: Okay well good. You won't miss too much then if we're able to keep plugging away here, depending on how long it takes on the executive summary.

Woman: So Tina if you want to make your corrections in this document before I do it just email me when you're done and then I'll take it and convert it.

Tina Dam: Okay.

Woman: You'll be the only one. No one else will do that.

Chuck Gomes: Alright that's fine. And then C is, "who will formulate the policy for these responses," and I think that Avri provided some good edits there. Again, the territorial authorities replaces sovereign government. Anybody opposed to the changes that Avri suggested there?

D was just a reference to a previous response up above. I had checked that earlier. It seemed like it still fit. E, let's talk about the wording there. Avri you were suggesting other contractual conditions. What are you thinking of that's not included in technical, operational, or financial? Policy?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I mean it basically just...

Chuck Gomes: Policy is somewhat – I guess it really could be thought of as operational.

Woman: It's true.

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck if I may, I tend – sorry. Yeah sorry. I think Edmon is on the right track. I think effectively we just say yes. Why do we need any more than that. It doesn't matter in what way, but they should be...

Woman: I agree with Adrian.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. We were trying to be politically astute in this response.

Adrian Kinderis: Are you calling me non-politically astute Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I think so. You're making me laugh again. That's hard on my throat. That makes me cough as you can tell. Yeah, I mean I'm not opposed to that if that's what the group wants to do here. I'm not going to fight that. If we're that blunt is our response going to be mostly ignored?

Woman: I don't think so. I think we've done a pretty good job at making sure that we just ignored. We'll have to keep working on it, but I think that if we as the GNSO believe that there should be contracts between ICANN and all IDN ccTLD then we should say so.

Chuck Gomes: And understanding that the (GAC) nor the ccNSO or most ccTLDs for that matter, probably all ccTLDs, are going to strongly disagree with that.

Woman: Yeah.

Adrian Kinderis: I don't know that they are.

Chuck Gomes: Who do you know that would agree to that? Keep in mind the differences Adrian in the contracts that gTLD registries sign up to, and even the contracts that Japan and Australia and a few of the ones that were willing to assume some relationship there early on, they are huge differences. Now you look at the letter agreements and the – and by the way, I'm on your side on this issue

I hope everybody understands that. I'm just trying to be realistic in what's the best way forward.

Woman: Well what Edmon wrote wasn't quite as blunt as what Adrian said. What Edmon wrote was if ICANN has a contract or some other form of agreement, and I would take it further and sort of say has some other form of agreement that covers technical, operational, and financial requirements. Leave out contractual conditions (unintelligible).

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I like the way where that's going. I think so just say...

Woman: Yes, ICANN should have a contract or some other form of agreement which includes technical, operational, and financial requirements.

Adrian Kinderis: That may include.

Woman: May is pretty weak, but okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Well I just say that because it may be that it's only one of those rather than all of those.

Chuck Gomes: Well as soon as you start eliminating any of them you're starting to water it down and you lose your point.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, I'm getting – I'm heading to what I didn't like about at a minimum from the start. You're right. I probably am diluting it.

Woman: Right. We're not saying must, only should.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay. The should at the start does that, okay.

Chuck Gomes: So can you read that back Liz? Do you have that?

Liz Gasster: "ICANN should have a contract or some other form of agreement that includes technical, operational, and financial requirements."

Chuck Gomes: Now that's a should. Now what I would suggest after that is the at minimum sentence, except changing it to a must.

Woman: "At a minimum IDN ccTLDs (unintelligible) must be required to follow the ICANN IDN technical guidelines."

Chuck Gomes: I think they're more than technical, or are they just technical? Are they just technical Tina? Avri, they're called the IDN guidelines.

Woman: Right. Okay sure, yeah.

Woman: Yeah, the guidelines are sort of like in between the technical and the policy.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah so let's just (unintelligible).

Woman: Use the proper term, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now do we want – we still come back to this issue of the de facto ccTLDs. If there are any of those, I mean keeping in mind that probably they're not going to buy in very quickly to our suggestion of contracts. Maybe they'll buy into the IDN guidelines.

Woman: (Unintelligible) will probably sign a contract if we managed to build them a country.

Adrian Kinderis: Can I make a point of clarification here please? I think it's pretty fundamental. Isn't there no such thing as an IDN ccTLD running essentially as a gTLD? There will be no such thing. We've already dictated that and go on quite a bit about it in this paper. Why are we stating it here? There is no such thing.

Chuck Gomes: Well if you believe they're going to implement everything we say that's true.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah so we don't want to put that in there.

Chuck Gomes: Being some de facto gTLDs it seems like it's really important then that there be very similar contracts.

Adrian Kinderis: Well I don't think that – I think even the ccNSO we're talking about the word meaningful being in there, and I think that that's a very key element of this document in our response. I think to now turn at the last gasp here in the second to last sentence and now we're saying that we're going to concede that they may not be meaningful. I don't think you need to cover your base on that one Chuck. I really think that that's...

Chuck Gomes: Adrian, they could have a meaningful gTLD that's operated like a generic (TLD).

Woman: Hey Chuck. Would it help in the first sentence that we just did, the ICANN should have a contract or some other form of agreement that includes appropriate technical, operational, and financial. So if at some point it drops through to them being gTLD like then one can insist that the appropriate operational and financial constraints are (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: That's a good suggestion. By the way this is less for me guys than it is for what I'm wondering what we're going to encounter on the council, seeing some of the responses from (Tim), (Ruiz), and others. This whole competitive landscape is going to be one that is a bigger issue, but I'm okay with that.

Have you got all of that so that I can – in other words, delete the last paragraph on de facto gTLDs right?

Woman: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Well Chuck on that point without meaning to take up too much time, could someone explain to me when something is gTLD like? Does that mean in its policy, in the fact that it's open for registration, or is it by definition that its name itself, it's string is able to be utilized for a greater purpose?

Chuck Gomes: Totally open and marketed generically so that no restrictions. It's basically in direct competition with gTLDs that are open like that,

except they don't have the contractual requirements unless they impose those.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah I'm still having trouble there Chuck because for example you can open up at the moment dot AU globally and you can market it globally, but it doesn't lose any of its Australian flavor. It simply has no policy around the fact that you have to be Australian to have it. So that's one way to do it.

Now to then turn around and say – well let's take (ME) for example. So before affiliates came along with (ME) that's just been re-jigged and got a new registry, you could have said that that was exclusively for (unintelligible). And then they opened it up. Now they're turning around and they're going to promote it as a love.ME, health.ME, whatever. So it's now being promoted like a gTLD. But it's still the same string, so the point I'm trying to make is in IDN world there won't be any strings that are allowed to be like another word that can be promoted as such.

However, the policy behind it may be that it can be marketed to a global market. Did I make any sense?

Chuck Gomes: No. I'm following you. I guess I'm not sure that that's not a possibility.

Adrian Kinderis: But did that - if I can circle back to that's what we were talking about before about the word meaningful. That's what I've been relying upon in this whole document that the guitar or let's say Tonga.

Tonga guitar came out with a script that they use and I don't know what script they may use that means tree and publicize that.

It must be meaningful to Tonga and be representative of Tonga. They then can't go out because they use the Chinese script in Tonga for the word tree. And promote that as a gTLD.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Let's not - I'm hearing you. Rather than dwell on this longer I'm okay with eliminating that last paragraph. What do we have now?

Liz Gasster: We should have a contract or some other form of agreement that includes appropriate technical, operational and financial requirements.

At a minimum IDN ccTLD operators must be required to follow the ICANN IDN guidelines just like gTLD registries that offer IDNs.

Chuck Gomes: Is everybody comfortable with that response?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I might question the phrasing.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: And just be required to follow the same - oh never mind. Just leave it as it is.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody opposed to the languager? I can support this. Okay.

One more, huh? And then the Executive Summary and the last one Edmon had a comment there - a couple of comments actually mentioning that should we mention the - as an example maybe publishing an IDN table?

Tina Dam: Well, if you're going to follow the guidelines then that is a requirement.

Olof Nording: Yeah.

Tina Dam: Sorry. This was Tina. You know?

Chuck Gomes: No. I got that. Yeah.

Let's see. We just add to that list of things in that second sentence that adheres to the IDN protocol, publishing an IDN table, et cetera.

Avri Doria: And if I understand the question, they're saying is there anything that's different than what's already being done.

Chuck Gomes: With regard to (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yeah, yeah. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's what...

Avri Doria: So why would the curb phishing activities be different? I guess, yeah.

And on the - aren't those things included in the IDN paragon?

Chuck Gomes: They're included in the registration processes and also the customer support processes and so forth too that went for registry that's offering IDNs.

So I think this is relevant and I think the IDN tables was a good thing to add.

Avri Doria: Right. An IDN Table. And so if we want to add Mike's, you know, web policies.

Chuck Gomes: That's a tougher one to add. How do we add Mike's here?

Avri Doria: With policies to curb phishing.

Chuck Gomes: Well, now we're getting beyond the IDN Guidelines and getting into policy that hasn't even been established at the GNSO level and also gets into what can be out of mission things that hasn't been decided yet with regard to where ICANN's mission is with regard to content.

So we're really not - I'm all for fighting phishing don't get me wrong, but we're getting into some areas that it's not as clear where a policy's going to go on that and where ICANN's mission going to fit into that.

I think we're going to make progress in that in coming months and maybe it'll be years, but we're not there yet and is this an area that we want to add to this particular topic right now?

Avri Doria: We could add...sorry. Go ahead.

Olof Nording: No. I think our response as it is is fine without Edmon's addition.

Chuck Gomes: You mean without Mike's point on phishing or without the IDN table?

Olof Nording: But it was put in there by Ed.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Right. He did - okay. But see we already added something from Edmon. I wanted to make sure you weren't saying that.

Olof Nording: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes. With respect to Mike's - yes. The phishing activities.

That's a can of worms you don't want to go in. Sorry Chuck. I'm looking at the version on the fly, so...

Chuck Gomes: That's okay. Yeah. I understand.

So does anybody think that we ought to try and focus on phishing?

Avri Doria: We'll have the same exact conversation when we bring it to the Council.

So we should look now at whether there's any way for example to add an extra sentence that says, you know, emerging issues, for example phishing activities specific to IDN need further investigation or something. So it's acknowledged but not any specific recommendation made.

Chuck Gomes: So maybe we could add a third sentence that says something like there are also emerging issues that may deserve attention - sorry for the wording. We'll have to - let me just give you the gist. Deserve attention when IDNs are introduced.

And it could be called policy issues or something and then just put e.g. phishing, you know, or something like that.

I see what you're getting at and I think that's a possible approach because you're probably right. At the same time, it's a tough one. It is a can of worms, so...

Avri Doria: It's a can of worms, but it's one that, you know, we and they are going to have to do some investigative work on in time. I mean...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. What do others...

Avri Doria: We're not going to avoid it.

Chuck Gomes: ...what do others think in that regard?

Liz Gasster: Well, I'm inclined to think that this is a - I mean I guess - a consumer protection issue that certainly is implicated but ,you know, along with a bunch of others.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right.

Liz Gasster: By, you know, informing and other means of ,you know, fraud using domain names, so I'm not...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I'm dropping off now and this time I'll really drop off. Sorry.

Avri Doria: That's all right. Thanks.

Woman: All right. Bye.

Male: Bye.

Avri Doria: What does the ICANN mandate with regard to those broader issues?

Chuck Gomes: Other thoughts?

Olof Nording: Just I think Avri is right. When we present this to Council it will pop in again. So some consideration of emerging issues should also be taken into account.

Avri Doria: I like the sentence that Liz put there from the things that Chuck and I had said. There are also emerging issues that may deserve attention when IDNs are introduced such as phishing.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. What do you think about that one, Adrian?

Adrian Kinderis: Yep. In the interest of moving this along, yeah. I'm happy with it.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Is anybody opposed to that? I think that's a way to deal with it and a good solution.

Okay. If they want to take it too much further I think we'd probably start getting into trouble, but like Avri said this may be enough to at least show that we listened.

Okay. Now, we reach the...

Adrian Kinderis: Executive Summary.

Chuck Gomes ...Executive Summary. Now, hopefully all of you looked at that so that we don't have to go through it in detail.

Obviously I tried to make very clear that I threw in something that we had not agreed to in there and I tried to highlight it very clearly and I obviously was trying to anticipate the discussions we're going to have in New Delhi.

So how shall we approach this Executive Summary?

Obviously we have to talk about Item 2, maybe to start with are there any other items in the Executive Summary that people would like to talk about? Maybe we can just identify those right now.

I think with exception of what I added in 2 that they all incorporate things that we said down below. And the idea being and this was suggested by Council in L.A. that we - or maybe even before L.A. I can't remember. That - I think it was a weekend meeting when we did that is to create an Executive Summary so that - cause a lot of people aren't going to read this whole document. So we tried to capture the main points.

So the kind of questions that I encourage you guys to ask and think about is have we got the main points in the Executive Summary or are there any that we left out that we think are main points that should be there.

Secondly, did we capture those points correctly and then I threw in another little curve in number 2.

Avri Doria: Okay. Well, 16 will probably...

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...need to be adjusted for the language that we just came up with.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. That's a good...

Avri Doria: Cause 16 is slightly different than what we now have.

Chuck Gomes: Um-hum.

Avri Doria: I just have been reading these right now.

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Avri Doria: I know I read them before, but...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. There may be other...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...there may be places where - well, especially in 2 if we do go with 2 like I suggested, we probably need to add a little language down in the main body. It's not there right now, so I don't know. We'll see.

Any others besides 16 and 2?

Well, let's take the easy one first, 16.

Adrian Kinderis: You reckon that's easy?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I mean just - we just worked on it so I mean I don't think it's - I think we're - now, by the way we don't - did we still want that statement actually...

Avri Doria: No. We want a contract statement here.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah.

Avri Doria: What we want is some version of the contract statement.

Chuck Gomes: Well, keep in mind that we do talk about the facto IDN ccTLDs other places in the document besides the one we're working on.

Liz Gasster: You want to just pull from that last - ICANN should have a contract or some other form of agreement that includes appropriate technical.

Avri Doria: I would be in favor of putting that in the Executive Summary, yes.

Adrian Kinderis: It's one of our key points I think.

Avri Doria: It is a rather key point, yes. And I think that by having, you know, by - I think we'll probably find - I don't know that we need to bring the very difficult question that behaves like a gTLD...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...up there. We've got that in the body. We cover it by saying there should be appropriate - I wouldn't elevate that one to Executive Review status whereas I would elevate Contractual Conditions.

Chuck Gomes: So what - how much of what we just did would be stated here in Executive Summary? Just the first sentence or a little bit more than that?

Keeping in mind that Executive Summary is just hitting the main points, not trying to give too much detail.

Liz Gasster: Well, what I pasted in just now is ICANN should have a contract or some other form of agreement that includes appropriate technical, operational or - so it's not probably specific enough.

Chuck Gomes: What do you mean?

Liz Gasster: It doesn't reference the question so...

Chuck Gomes: That's okay in this case, I think. The Executive Summary they're not going to be able to relate to the question anyway. But that's...

Liz Gasster: Right. But it's an agreement specifically between ICANN and the IDN if you kill B.

Avri Doria: Oh, I see. I see. There is a B. Contacts between whom?

Liz Gasster: Right.

Avri Doria: Right. We need to give a little bit more detail.

Chuck Gomes: Did anybody drop off? I'm sure you can't tell me if you did, so...

Liz Gasster: I'm still here.

Avri Doria: I'm still here.

Adrian Kinderis: I'm still here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: It might be Olga.

Olof Nording: It might be Olga.

Chuck Gomes: What was that?

Avri Doria: That's right. It was at two hours. It might have dropped her automatically if they called her.

Liz Gasster: So now I have ICANN should have a contact or some other form of agreement with the ccTLD operator that includes the technical?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: (Marilyn), are you still on with us?

(Marilyn): Chuck, I'm here.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Could you see if the operator can call Olga back?

(Marilyn): Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay. Sorry about that. I wanted...

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the operator.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Thank you. Is it possible to call Olga Cavalli back in Argentina? I know we're past our two hours, but we're not done.

Coordinator: Okay. And she - I was looking to see who that was that was...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Coordinator: ...had that - all right. Let me give her a call back.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Bye. Okay. It sounds like we got that covered, (Marilyn).

Okay. Have we come up with some wording on 16?

Liz Gasster: So what it says now is ICANN should have a contract or some other form of agreement with the ccTLD operator that includes appropriate technical, operational and financial requirements.

Chuck Gomes: And for the Executive Summary would it be sufficient to say that they should have a contract with them without going into the operational, et cetera?

Or what do you think? Should we have the whole sentence? I'm not advocating one way or another. I'm just asking.

Olof Nording: Sorry Chuck. Can I just - don't we need the words IDN in there?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Olof Nording: And don't we use the word...

Coordinator: Ms. Cavalli joins.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome back.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Olof Nording: Yeah. A form of agreement with the IDN ccTLD operator. We're looking at the document on the fly.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. I think that's a good catch.

Avri Doria: I think it's fine to include what the contract is about up there in front so that people aren't looking for where you're talking about a contract. A contract of what?

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that. I think it's one of the key points I think the Council's going to be interested in that point being there as well.

Okay. Anything besides 2 for us to talk about in Executive Summary?

Okay. 2, the first sentence I think is - I assume that everybody's okay with the first sentence there. It's been a theme throughout many of our answers. Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah. I have a little quibble.

I don't know that we've bought into the notion that we have to have done the apportionment before there could be IDN gTLDs.

In other words, gTLDs to have absolutely nothing to do with county names. I don't know that we've agreed as a group that those need to wait for apportionment.

Chuck Gomes: So how do we know...

Adrian Kinderis: IDN ccTLDs status of any IDN TLD.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. What about a (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: What about it? (Unintelligible) isn't even an idea.

Adrian Kinderis: Well, with (unintelligible) in - Really?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Whatever.

Olof Nording: (Unintelligible) has no reference to the (unintelligible) of 3166-1 list at all.

Chuck Gomes: The reason I use (unintelligible) is I'm also talking about the ASCII world.

This whole decision of where names need to be fit in the policy development space needs to be answered before you can - basically we've been operating on a particular path.

We're now going down in directions where some things may be less clear. And I think what I hear you saying Avri is that the (unintelligible) on the gTLD side.

Avri Doria: I think with the objection process to basically pull out anything that isn't, you know, at all questionable, you know, I'm not sure that we have agreement on delaying IDN gTLDs that are unrelated to territorial names.

And so perhaps you're saying yes, that bullet might be seen as objectionable. And then it or, you know (unintelligible) - it makes me feel better - in Hebrew - might be unacceptable, might be challenged as a territorial and that's okay.

But that doesn't mean that, you know, (dot.teburon) which is, you know, the name of a company in Israel couldn't still proceed.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And by the way, I'm not - this statement shouldn't suggest that - I don't think and this is something we'll talk about with regard to our meeting with the CCNSO is that we're suggesting the delay of either one of them.

Let's make up our mind what fits in each one and let's move forward. And so the idea of suggesting that these broader decisions regarding name space need to be decided before actual implementation of these things. You know. I'm not ready to buy into the thing that that has to take three years.

Avri Doria: And especially because the IDN protocol isn't there yet anyway, so...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Right.

Avri Doria: We do have some time.

Chuck Gomes: So Avri what would be your suggested change in the first sentence?

Adrian Kinderis: What if you added ccTLD to that?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. Add where?

Adrian Kinderis: By the apportionment of the name space between gTLDs and ccTLDs should be determined prior to allocation of any IDN ccTLD and this should be done jointly by the GNSO and ccNSO with the involvement of other impacted stake holds?

Chuck Gomes: That may work. Now one concern that may come up there is how come - I'm trying to think from the C perspective. How come this decision has to be made before fast track IDN and ccTLDs can be introduced, but not before the IDN gTLD and new gTLDs including IDN

gTLDs don't be introduced? I was trying to make it look like a broader issue and less directed at the ccNSO.

Avri Doria: Cause we have an objection process that allows for the exclusion of anything that's problematic. And at the moment we no such mechanism else wise.

Chuck Gomes: Well we may have an objection process. I hope we do depending on what the board does with our recommendations. Yeah.

Avri Doria: That's true. And (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: And we've got to be careful because I'm getting a little bits of information that the board may have some trouble with some of our recommendation. So we'll just have to be careful how we handle that. But that's a side issue.

So is that what the group would like to do is to put cc in front of TLDs where IDN TLDs is?

To me that looks really blatantly like an us versus them issue where we're pointing the finger, hey you guys can't go forward until we help you decide this question. Can come across as arrogant on our parts, which I don't think facilitates a collaborative situation for us working together.

Adrian Kinderis: Problem you have, Chuck, is that on average point are completely unrelated IDN gTLD. Therefore would be held up in this process if the apportionment hadn't been worked out. So one that's not related to a

country, I mean. Or to the ISO list or anything. If it was just dot, you know, tree in Arabic.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And that's right. And I'm not advocating that. Don't get me wrong.

I was focusing more on the ability of us to go in constructively with the ccNSO and go from there.

Avri Doria: Yeah. And you may be - there is something in a negotiation that says if you're going to surrender on a point eventually maybe you should just give it up at the front.

And so you may be right, Chuck, in terms of political reality says that we should not put the ccs there. And I understand that decision.

And I think that perhaps your second sentence and if it's not possible to develop a complete policy for allocations, you know?

Chuck Gomes: Um-hum.

Avri Doria: And I would need to put in the short-term, I would put by the time that the technical and operational capabilities are set cause that's really the short-term.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Right. Sure.

Avri Doria: And if we don't have the policy by the time it's technically feasible to introduce these things then...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And...

Avri Doria: ...an interim policy.

Chuck Gomes: Olof, I think you suggested instead of saying an interim policy, an interim approach or...

Olof Nording: Yeah. Interim approach for such apportionment as to...

Chuck Gomes: To avoid the implication of a PDP and stuff.

Olof Nording: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I saw your comment.

Avri Doria: Right. And so those two sentences together kind of work. It basically says we don't want to stop their fast tracks anymore than they want to stop our non-national.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Avri Doria: So yeah.

Liz Gasster: So we're back to deleting the cc before the TLDs and then the following sentence...

Avri Doria: Well, I don't know if Adrian buys in yet.

Liz Gasster: Oh okay.

Avri Doria: Cause it was his cc, but yeah.

Liz Gasster: Okay. And then so we'll hold that. But then if it is not possible to develop a complete policy for allocation of IDN TLDs by the time the technical and operational capabilities are set then an interim approach for such apportionment should be developed that provides sufficient guidance to allow new IDN TLDs and fast track IDNs, ccTLDs should be introduced in a timely manner.

Olof Nording: I would like to actually replace complete policy for allocation of IDN TLDs to just develop a complete approach for such apportionment and the second one I would like to just replace policy by approach.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. So it's...

Olof Nording: Just in order to avoid the discussion that sprang up concerning the need for launching of PDP or whatever the description.

Avri Doria: Right.

Olof Nording: In order to (unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: So let me make sure I just have that. If it is not possible to develop a complete approach for such apportionment of IDN TLDs...

Olof Nording: No. Nothing about IDN TLDs.

Liz Gasster: Oh okay. Okay.

Olof Nording: In the short term.

Liz Gasster: Oh, I thought we took that out. At the time the technical and operational capabilities are set is how we replaced...

Avri Doria: Yeah. That is the short-term.

Chuck Gomes: So Olof, what were you suggesting? Can you give us the whole sentence?

Olof Nording: I think that Liz got it because there were some additions as well here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Go ahead Liz.

Liz Gasster: If it is not possible to develop a complete approach for such apportionment by the time the technical and operational capabilities are set, then an interim approach should be developed that provides sufficient guidance to allow new ideas and (unintelligible) using fast track IDN ccTLDs to be introduced in a timely manner.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, what do you think?

Olga Cavalli: I like it. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, do you want to know what I think?

Chuck Gomes: We're going to give you veto power right now.

Adrian Kinderis: I'm giving you the thumbs up here, Chuck. Thumbs up.

Chuck Gomes: Good guy. Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: I think with the second sentence it certainly lightens and it provides an opportunity for the first and I think it gives you the comfort you need. So I'm happy with the second sentence now. It helps with the first.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Well I think that helps us assuming that the Council agrees with us.

Going into the meeting in New Delhi with kind of a bone that we've thrown them, we recognized they see this as very difficult to get done and they think a full PDP's needed and therefore it's going to take two years plus dah, dah, dah.

This provides a way forward for both of us and hopefully grounds for working together whether how we do that they don't seem to like the idea of a joint working group. And maybe they can call it something different and we can live with that.

The point is that let's - and I actually in my comment to our notes here tried to suggest a way forward.

Now just for this group I'm curious as to what you thought about that. You know. I mean that approach to get going assuming that we can't do the approach for this - what was previously we called an interim approach. You know. I tried to lay the groundwork at least in our thinking as to what that might look like. You know, I think it's sort of...

Olof Nording: Very, very constructive. (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I mean I had no idea what people thought.

I'm sure the wording can be refined, but it provides something we could put on the table with them and what I've heard from them -- both in oral conversations and some email communication and looking at some of their documentations in the groups right now -- it seems like that's what they want to limit this to and if that's the case it shouldn't be too hard for us to do that.

Did that make any sense?

Woman: Um-hum.

Adrian Kinderis: Made sense.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now is there anything else in the Executive Summary?

Woman: Uh-uh.

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, can I be a stick in the mud? I'm actually late for a meeting. Are we near...

Chuck Gomes: I think this is it.

Avri Doria: I think we're done.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay. As far as next steps can we just quickly get over those cause I got to make a run unless you want to email them or something.

Chuck Gomes: Well I went through those at the beginning for the very reason of what's happening right now, but I'll...

Adrian Kinderis: That was all pre-coffee conversation. Chuck, I've had a coffee now. I'm ready to listen.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Remember Liz very shortly probably within an hour or so is going to send us all an email on the list saying the document's ready for your review. You have between then and 24 hours to review it and send any suggested edits to the list, not on the Google document -- to the list.

And then first thing on Thursday in U.S. time Liz and I - California time for Liz and I, we're going to - and if she even needs my help. I don't know if she needs my help or not, but I'm making myself available.

We're going to make sure we have a final document incorporating any edits as we think fit on things that you submit to us to the Council, the Thursday morning before the Council meeting. And then it'll be in the Council's hand.

Adrian Kinderis: Great.

Chuck Gomes: That's it. And thank you very, very much.

Again I hope - now how many of you will be in New Delhi? Let me ask that.

Olga Cavalli: I will be there.

Adrian Kinderis: Adrian will be.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good. So all of us on this call right now will be there?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Well good. And please feel free as the Council's working on this thing to jump in and help out and so forth. Don't think that it has to rely on me or Avri or Liz.

All of us hopefully can help contribute to the Council understanding all the deliberation that we did.

Liz Gasster: So Chuck just a clarifying question. The last set of brackets you have under the Executive Summary that gets deleted?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That was my...

Liz Gasster: That's your explanation?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Exactly.

Liz Gasster: Okay. That's coming out. And so yeah. I'll circulate this so hopefully in a couple of hours.

Avri Doria: Well done, Chuck.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. Chuck, if I can just say great job and great job everybody else and thank you for accommodating my time of day as well. It makes it easier for me. So thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And again it's been a great group to work with. All right.

Adrian Kinderis: Good job.

Chuck Gomes: So long.

Avri Doria: Okay now. Bye bye.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: See you tomorrow.

END