

GNSO IDN Working Group Teleconference

20 February 2007

11:00 UTC

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

<http://gnso-audio.icann.org/idn-wg-20070220.mp3>

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

Participants on the call:

Ram Mohan - Working Group Chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Charles Shaban - IPC

Paul Diaz - Registrar c.

Cary Karp - gTLD Registry constituency

Apologies:

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Steve Crocker - Security and Stability Advisory Committee Liaison

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Maria Farrell - GNSO Policy Officer

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Ram Mohan: Okay, folks. We're about five minutes after the hour and it's time to get going on this call.

Thank you for joining us and Glen, you may start the recording for the transcripts right now.

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible), yes?

Ram Mohan: You may start the recording.

The goal of today's call is the - quite simple as it's quite clear that's what (entered) in the call that we had last week where we were focused on last week on speaking about and discussing new gTLD strings.

We're continuing to go forward from the prioritization that all of you as members had suggested. And from my brief polling of you - of members on the call last week, what I heard was that you had kind of had enough of speaking specifically about the introduction of new gTLDs and that you wanted to move on to speaking about both geopolitical details and existing gTLD strings as we had defined them before.

So in my goal in today's meeting is to help facilitate a discussion more around the area of geopolitical details and also existing gTLD strings.

And other than that, really the rest of the couple of hours that we have scheduled here in front of us, the only thing I have other than that to really speak about is to ask for your opinion on two specific matters.

The first issue ahead of us is whether the prioritization that we have right now in terms of allocation of time, which currently has new gTLDs, geopolitical details, existing gTLD strings, existing domain name holders and techno policy rights as the primary areas where we devote our attention.

I'd like outstanding ask you if you believe that the other three areas that we prioritize is lower on the time allocation scale, which is privacy and Whois legal details and other (style) issued. But do you believe that any of those ought to get a higher amount of time ahead of us?

Before you answer that question, I just wanted to briefly go over our plan of operation that I set out for us almost a month ago now where the plan was to complete the review process early this month of the four major documents we were supposed to go through. And we've done that perhaps not as exhaustively as we would have all liked, but we certainly spent the time to go through each of those four documents.

In addition to that, you know, we were - our task is to arrive a draft conclusion by March 6, which is then in two weeks' time so that we can have a draft report ready by March 13.

So we have perhaps another five meetings before we get to listen and we really have only, I would say, two meetings in front of us where we can talk about issues and add an issue from the very start. And after that, we will have to start going through conclusion documents and work through details.

In fact, Olof has already started working on a draft document, and I'm working my way through it, and I'm a little bit behind on having the document draft review document up in front of you.

I had planned to have it in front of you before today's meeting, but I will ask your indulgence for this meeting and promise that I'll get you that document for you to review, including this meeting's discussion before the - either before the day's done today or sometime tomorrow.

Maria's going to help draft some of today's discussion, conclusions into the - into this new - into the revised document.

The second kind of administrative point, if you will, is I have been requested by a few members of our working group to both ask from the liaisons from other advisory committees that ICANN has setup, and in addition, to also ask for perhaps a liaison from our committee to be placed on the PDP 05 working group and in return, ask for a liaison from the PDP 05 task force.

So I'd like to open up that topic for your opinion and ask you what your thoughts are, whether we should - so let me frame the question a little better.

Do you think - what is your opinion on, number one, inviting liaisons from other ICANN advisory committees and number two, what is your opinion on (unintelligible) liaison exchange with PDP 05?

And I'll open that topic up for your thoughts.

Marilyn Cade: Ram, it's Marilyn. I have a question before you - before we go through this, if I may?

Ram Mohan: Welcome, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: PDP 05 is the council working as a task force of the whole and I'm - I think there's a lot of overlap between PDP 05 and your - where there's a good deal of - there are several counselors that are not on your working group?

Ram Mohan: Uh-huh. (Either of), there certainly are.

Marilyn Cade: What were the purposes of a specific liaison be in addition to that dual membership?

Ram Mohan: Well, oh the dual membership. Well, I - let me be clear. This is not a proposal I'm putting forward that something we should do. It's a proposal that's been put to me as Chair of the working group, and what I'm doing is bringing that proposals forward for your opinion.

If you ask me, my personal opinion is that as similar to what you're saying, Marilyn, which is that the IDN working group has, in my opinion, sufficient representation by existing sitting GNSO council members and therefore, does not require a special liaison being appointed from the working group to the IDN - to the PDP05.

But this is - that's my personal opinion.

Marilyn Cade: I'll just go ahead and express my opinion on both since I seem to be - I've left them to the queue.

My view would be that there is a lot of liaison activity already and the fact that there is strong representation from counselors on this working group, and PDP 05 is somewhat unique and that it is composed entirely of counselors.

So, I would suggest that that may just be an unnecessary duplication of work and time.

On the issue of liaison from other advisory groups, I think that would be advisable if it can happen quickly, and if it can't happen quickly, then perhaps that special session would need to be set up to fulfill a dialogue in liaison functions.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Alistair Dixon: Well, Ram, can I join the queue?

Ram Mohan: Absolutely. And, Alistair, before I get you into the queue, I'm going to request Glen, I should have done this as the normal practice, I should have requested Glen to have done a roll call but I will ask her now to do a roll call so that everybody knows who else is on the call.

And then Alistair, you're on the queue.

Alistair Dixon: Sure. Thanks.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you, Ram. Can you hear me?

Ram Mohan: Very well.

Glen Desaintgery: I'll start with you, Ram Mohan.

Marilyn Cade from the Business Constituency, Alistair Dixon from the Business Constituency, Charles Shaban from the Intellectual Property Constituency, Paul Diaz from the Registrar Constituency, Cary Karp from the Registry Constituency.

Apologies from (Mark Rotenberg) of the Business Constituency and Steve Crocker, the liaison to the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

For staff, we Olof Nordling, Maria Farrell and myself.

Did I miss anybody?

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Glen.

Alistair, you have the floor.

Alistair Dixon: Ram, I mean, I would agree with both you and Marilyn but I don't think it's necessary to have a liaison with the members of our PDP 05 task force because I think there is quite - I (unintelligible) agree of overlap.

I do have a rather have a question in relation to advisory committees. I'm - it's just not clear to me what advisory committee you're suggesting who should be liaison for. I understood that we do certainly have - I understood that we have liaison for certainly the ccSO but I presume there are others as well that you have in mind.

I guess, (Patrick). Yeah, sorry.

Ram Mohan: Perhaps I was thinking of other ICANN appointed committees, for example the Root Server Committee Advisory Committee, the RSAC is one, which is similar in its structure to the SSAC, and there are - I believe a few other advisory committees. I don't have the comprehensive list in front of me here, Alistair.

But these - so these are -- oh, there we go, ICANN committees - advisory committees, there is a, well, we already have a liaison from ALAC. RSAC is one Root Server System Advisory Committee, and the third committee would be the GAC.

Charles Shaban: Ram, this Charles. Can you place me in the queue?

Ram Mohan: Absolutely, Charles. You're in the queue now and you have the floor.

But actually before you have the floor, Alistair, does that answer your question?

Alistair Dixon: (They) - thank you. I mean, certainly, it would seem to me given the issues, I think that actually it does make (sense) for at least probably at least somebody from the GAC and possibly RSAC, at least on a - yeah. I think we would make sense in my mind or at least to offer the opportunity for them.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Alistair.

Charles, you have the floor.

Charles Shaban: Thank you, Ram.

I wanted to say that I think it's good to check the different advisory groups, as you said and not only even maybe the Root Server and these advisory groups. Maybe you can check the other supporting organizations, and then we see for example who will add value to us and we will add value to them.

So maybe we can choose - it's important to have a liaison in the Root Server for example, and the ccSO and maybe as you said, the Security of course. And that should be enough maybe or we need from other advisory committees or other supporting organizations.

Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Charles, I'm wondering what's your part. I mean, I see what you're saying. I guess I don't understand if I had to go, you're suggesting that perhaps I ask Glen to speak to the different groups - to other organizations like ALAC? Is that you - I'm not sure what the - if we said let's go do it, what actually we would do?

((Crosstalk))

Charles Shaban: I was trying to find maybe something in between. Not to say yes, we need to have from all or no need for them. Maybe before asking the others, maybe we can just have a list for all the advisory committees as you said, just to have a look maybe when we have them in front of us.

As we say for example, we think that it is important to have someone from this group or not so we can - it will make the decision for us maybe easier than just saying yes, we need liaison or we don't need liaison. I was just making the suggestions of course, if the other colleagues is it's important.

Marilyn Cade: Ram, it's Marilyn. I'd like to go back in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Sure. And was that Paul or Alistair?

((Crosstalk))

Cary Karp: Cary, okay.

Ram Mohan: Cary, you have the floor.

Cary Karp: There's a significant difference I believe between liaison among the various advisory bodies in the GNSO and liaison between the GNSO and other supporting organizations. And I'm not entirely certain that it's appropriate to this group to establish any such (cross) SO liaison without going at least by the GNSO Council.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary. Any discussion on Cary's perspective?

Marilyn Cade: I - if - I think I would like to speak next because my comments are sort of relative to that.

Ram Mohan: Go for it, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Sure. I think they're spending a huge amount of time on process in a working group that is duty and shortly and that has still a fair amount of work ahead of it.

The - my suggestion would be that the Chair of the working group issue an invitation to these other groups to appoint an observer slash liaison and give them the schedule and explain what the purpose of the liaison would be, which I think has already been laid out earlier, and that we try to move ahead with the work.

I think actually, I was under the impression that the issue of observer from (CT) had already been resolved.

Ram Mohan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: So, you know, I think that takes care of the points that Cary raised because that's already been resolved and my suggestion would be that the Chair, that would be you, Ram, of course, just issue an invitation to the other groups with our schedule.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Marilyn. I appreciate it.

And certainly I'm eager, eager to move forward on discussing what we really are constituted for, which is IDN areas. And therefore, we shall move mostly on to exactly those areas.

Today's focus is really going to be on geopolitical detail and also existing domain - existing gTLD strings.

What we had defined, so to speak, under geopolitical details in previous discussion, we had actually kind of tucked in a few topics under it. We had said what are countries roles in IDN gTLDs, what is the working group opinion on countries asserting “sovereign right” over strips slash languages.

The third area we had tucked in under geopolitical details is what are ccTLDs’ roles in IDN gTLDs, and the last item we had put in was what about geopolitically name in IDN gTLDs.

Rather than asking you to pick one or the other, I would like to open the floor here to the working group and ask that, you know, you bring forth your opinion. I would certainly like to get your opinion on these four subtopics, but certainly, other subtopics are welcome as well.

So I’ll just repeat again.

What are countries’ roles in IDN gTLD? What is the working group opinion on countries asserting “sovereign right” over strips slash languages? What are ccTLDs roles in IDN gTLDs? And what about geopolitical name in IDN gTLD?

The floor is open.

Marilyn Cade: Ram, it’s Marilyn. I’m going to, again, ask a question of clarification to make sure I understand.

I know what a geographic name is. Do we need to have an understanding of what a geopolitical name is?

Ram Mohan: Probably, Marilyn, we begun using that kind of terminology geopolitical because in some cases, what we had been - what has been told that in a number of cases, especially in local language representation, the name of a particular geographic land mass or a particular location transcends geography and may - and actually gets into the political area. So it's not merely a well-established, say, UN-established geographic name of a nation or a region. But in some cases, it's what a nation or a region or a sovereign country decides is a label that in some cases might be enshrined in the constitution, for instance.

So that's my interpretation of geopolitical name.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I think it's probably -- it's Marilyn again. I think it probably goes a little bit...

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: ...beyond that, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Marilyn, did you mute yourself?

Cary Karp: Cary has to put in the queue while this get sorted out anyway.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Cary. Why don't you get on the queue and, you know...

Marilyn Cade: One of the interesting experiences I have with the service is when someone on it goes into mute, they often put me on mute. I'm trying not to think of that as an additional feature but...

Cary Karp: Let me test this just a second here, (Marilyn).

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry, Cary.

Cary Karp: Marilyn, you were saying that you paused (unintelligible) beyond my description so I'm keen to hear where you think, you know, what's your opinion is on the...

Marilyn Cade Sure. And I think that probably at some point it's going to be belong in our definition, you know, just sort of an agreed definition. I'm not suggesting my definition. It's going to be the agreed one.

But one of the things that I've seen is concerned about the political names that a country may think are identified with itself or even religious leaders. And so, I would use perhaps as an example the word pope which is I think probably going to be viewed by many people as a geopolitical name or geopolitical word.

In addition to that, words that we might use as an example might be Amazon, et cetera. But I think it probably goes beyond just geographic or land mass or other physical attributes that have been named something and have taken on a characteristic or bridge multiple country boundaries.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Marilyn.

Alistair Dixon: Ram, can I join the queue?

Ram Mohan: Sure thing, Alistair. So we have Cary and Alistair in the queue. And Cary you have the floor. And I'm going to add my part of the queue after you, Alistair.

Cary?

Cary Karp: I'm going to say what I want to say is some going to clarify anything but at least it will call some attention to the complexity of all of it. And that is that names of languages are very frequently the asset title of form of names of countries and I want this sometimes this is extreme focus that countries are facing on right to the language. It may not be purely linguistic that there maybe some component of Russia - and Russian actually are the same what's called (unintelligible) conceptual done in the word. And that sort of thing may make our discussion even more difficult than it already is.

Marilyn Cade: I thought you were going to help, Cary.

Cary Karp: I'm helping by calling attention to the fact that there's a degree of complexity that we're going to need to address.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Cary Karp: Yes.

I'm trying to help by doing that.

Ram Mohan: I know.

Cary Karp: Yes.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary.

Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: Ram, I guess I have a question because it seems to me - I mean, I guess - the fifth comment I would make is I'm not sure it's really ICANN's role to (unintelligible) who has responsible of their particular language. Who has authority of a particular language or uses a particular country name. But I guess the question in my mind is what does international law say about this? And I know Cary - I do recall Cary actually talking about this in the past. I mean, I understand that (unintelligible) addition and claim in relation to international organization name. But I'm wondering if it's something in the UN system that also - authority of the particular name input the language and do we know anything about this stuff that having implication for us.

Cary Karp: Can I speak directly to that point, Ram?

Ram Mohan: Yeah. That's a direct question to you, Cary, so please.

Cary Karp: Okay.

Again, this is going to be the same kind of non helpful attempt that's being helpful simply by noting that the issue - the concept of ownership of language is one of the most perpetually debated and almost infected aspect of all of it. So in all of the discussions that I've ever taken part of, discussing issues of language right and sovereignty, notion of language ownership invariably really - is a very ugly and the best of my knowledge unregulated head.

Marilyn Cade: (Norman) will be back in the queue after you, please. It's Marilyn.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Thank you.

Man: So my part was that we are - in defining geopolitical name, I think Marilyn definition certainly heads in the right direction in defining what a geopolitical mean is. But I must say that this is an issue that is not unique to IDN. This is an issue that is in fact much broader and perhaps belong far better in the reserve names working group. And my own recommendation is that specific to geopolitical names as there is an IDN component associated with it, our job perhaps should be to define what are the IDN ramification with multiple languages and strips involved, define those and then provide that as expert commentary into the reserve name working group. So that's really where my heads at in terms of what perhaps to be ought to do in this area but I'm certainly open to your suggestion on this.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. It's appropriate that I'm following you Mr. Chair because that what's going to be my recommendation but we work the issue once and define and - but if maybe that we - one of the things that may emerge out of reserve name is the category that I'm calling. It's very, very difficult to make an absolute decision at this time, but we might be able to solve if we have more time. We need a better heading in that.

But if you were to liaison with Chuck, I think you would find support for the idea that we, Mr. Chair, there that we work this issue just one time, making sure we have the relevant expertise and to that group at the time that we're considering this issue.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Marilyn.

I'm curious since I've, you know, made a proposal that Marilyn has - second it. I'm curious to hear whether the working group member there on the call supports that concept, because it does two things in one sales group. It narrows the scope of our responsibility of this topic instead of this working group and it allows us to participate in the other working group in a very specific and perhaps positive role in that working group. I am on that working group as well as the few other members from this working group. And I'm quite desirous of moving that direction but I would certainly like for you all to think about this and just let me know either on the call or certainly via email.

Glen, if you could take this, and Maria if you could take this as an action item to post this suggestion to the working group membership and to ask for their opinion, I think we ought to do that.

Alistair Dixon: Ram, I'm going to express my opinion now if that would help.

Ram Mohan: Please, thank you.

Alistair Dixon: I mean, I will certainly support that proposal but I would note that in terms of country names at least, I understood this is an issue that also being considered by PDP '05 and the - principle address that particular issue.

Marilyn Cade: But Alistair -- it's Marilyn. PDP '05 will have - beside their subtext to its three groups, IDN, reserve names, and protecting the rights of others coming forward with a specific recommendation that as a whole then it would consider.

Alistair Dixon: Okay. So thank you, Marilyn.

Well, in that case, I think your proposal is a good one.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Alistair.

Maria Farrell: And Ram, its Maria here.

Ram Mohan: Hi, Maria.

Maria Farrell: Hi. Can I just make sure it captures properly to the group. So the proposal is - this working group would provide targeted input to the reserve names working group on geopolitical and terms.

Ram Mohan: On geopolitical terms with a specific focus on the IDN component and the multiple language is a drift component of this.

Cary Karp: May I make a suggestion in wording and that's from this group deferred to the other group. We can't present anything that they might regard themselves as having primary responsibility for.

So rather than risk parallel effort, we will offer our services if it were or an expression of interest to the other guys. I also a wholeheartedly support Marilyn's notion of this being an issue that is work through singularly in all the various committees that exist.

Marilyn Cade: And Ram, it's Marilyn. I'll ask Alistair another to comment on this.

I think that the way the work is broken out since we're dealing with an existing reserve list. I think that actually we break the phrase in half and call it geographic and geopolitical in the other - in the reserve name working group.

Alistair Dixon: There's a fancy word for geographic name, it's called (unintelligible). It's probably an equivalent one to political name.

Marilyn Cade: But I think that is our - I just want to verify this that is the intent we basically are deferring to the reserve name group for both geographic and geopolitical in specific to - but we'll provide advice and input as those names relate to IDN.

Ram Mohan: That is exactly right.

And we will have, you know, a fully worded proposal. Maria and let you and I work on this and we'll have a full worded suggestion/proposal out to their working group membership on the mailing list here shortly.

Maria Farrell: Okay. Thanks.

Ram Mohan: Having dispatched at least that component, let's now drill down on what we do want to work on which has to do with IDN themselves in the geographic and geopolitical area.

What do you think our (CCP) on this rule in defining or providing direction in (IDN GTLD) moving forward? Do they have their own role?

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. Ram, you could actually decode that a little bit for me. Could you explain that again please? Sorry.

Ram Mohan: So the example of that one could use here is the following, that is a (CCTLD) operator on, you know, which may or may not be associated with a national sovereign government. But a (CCTLD) operator may decide to reserve or implement a certain type of reservation or at least classification of what kind of geographic and geopolitical names and what would those name themselves are for their (CCTLD).

And in some cases, I have heard (CCTLD) expressed a perspective that because represent more closely what that geographical or geopolitical region is that (GTLD) perhaps are to follow and emulate the example that they have set.

And I'm wondering, you know, whether our working group has an opinion.

So that's -I offer that merely as an example of a case where a (CCTLD) set quasi-policy execution methodologies for reserving names, geographical and geopolitical name, and what the (GTLD) role ought to be especially when it comes to (IDN GTLD).

Marilyn Cade: And recognizing that at this point, we are speaking only about the second level. Is that right?

Ram Mohan: I was actually thinking about both the second level and at some point in time about the top level. To me, that issue would not be as far different second level or top level.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. With what exception? I'm only going to capture what the idea that - well maybe two exceptions. One is that even though the

(CCTLD) may not have a direct relationship with its sovereign government, it often has a very close relationship with the sovereign government and a country I may feel comfortable about treatment of names that it has agreed to within its geographic borders and uncomfortable with a lighter landscape outside of that. So that would just be one observation I would make that's drawn some interaction with some government and brief discussion with them.

The second point I would make is that actually country code manager are not empowered to any string that is not a (to another) country code as far as I recall from my days on the council in PDP '05 and others can correct me. I believe the termination was that all of the strings will have to be applied for to a process that ICANN in order to be agreed to be put into the single authorized group.

So let's say a country code manager wanted to - and I think there's been a fair amount of discussion on this that the 3-letter version of a country code automatically get allocated to the present incumbent country code manager does a IDN version of the 2-letter or the 3-letter automatically get allocated.

Those I think are different questions and I don't want to tie us up on that but the question of should we follow a preceded, a practice that is working and is instantiated and it's expected?

I certainly think we ought to look positively toward the leadership that may have already been offered by country codes to see what we can learn from that.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Marilyn. Any other opinions, any other points of view on this topic?

Alistair Dixon: It's Alistair.

Am I - I mean, certainly the first thing I would say from my understanding is the same as Marilyn's is that I understood that country code dealt with basically country codes and all other proposals for (TLVs) where to go through to the (GTLV) process.

But having said that, I can see some complications here. One, IDN I could imagine in New Zealand and (unintelligible) which...

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's not an IDN.

Alistair Dixon: It is actually, if you put the particular character over the...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay. Fine then.

Alistair Dixon: And that's the appropriate spelling.

Now, I could imagine that there would be (unintelligible) and - but the mails desire for just at top level domain called (unintelligible). And it strikes me that the - at least the like - and the (unintelligible) community in New Zealand would want to have a say in awarding the top level domain (unintelligible).

Now, the way that is dealt with through new (GTLD) is at this any contention mean the question is there a sponsoring community behind that proposal. So perhaps that would deal with any concerns about someone from another country or who didn't have in particular right whatever those rights might be asserting ownership over that label here.

Yeah, I guess - So I'm not sure if that helps but it didn't - it seems to me - my mind explains the complication that might arrive.

Marilyn Cade: And Alistair, it's Marilyn again. The (unintelligible) has a number of words that they feel to have significant religious significant.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: And...

Alistair Dixon: But not all of them are IDN words, of course, Marilyn. And (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Exactly. Which is why I think that maybe a good example for us to, you know, there I think it is complicated, but if you think about the string of potentially being a sponsored string, I think it becomes easier since the rules for a second level registration would be heavily influenced by the sponsoring entity whether it's an IDN or ask for character strength.

Alistair Dixon: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: I'm just thinking out loud as Alistair has given that example and from my limited reading though I wasn't (unintelligible) got some of the history of (unintelligible), the concept of sponsoring that we have used in GTLD is did you have a view on whether that approach to a language cluster has any feasibility?

Alistair Dixon: I think it has quite a bit of sensibility. I'm just recovering from my own insensitivity and in my most recent comments here so as taken. But note that (unintelligible) for example which is a specifically targeted on the language/cultural component of (unintelligible) is identity. It's very, very carefully said that this is not a piece of territory within a government entity.

They said that this is for (Catholic) culture where they manifest itself and that means that is language which is the basis for the community identity that's being sponsored. So we're already there. I think it's pretty darn good idea.

Marilyn Cade: I would like them and just to make sure that Maria and (unintelligible). It's premature to say if anything other than the examples, but it seems that it deserves more (unintelligible) if you will.

Alistair Dixon: Marilyn, unfortunately, I heard that deserves more and then I missed that on the actual word you were suggesting.

Marilyn Cade: I was just saying that I think this concept might be examined a little further. It seems to have some merit, but it never hurts to kind of like find a couple other examples and test it and for the maybe other - maybe Cary might contribute to more discussion on the list and we might explore this a little bit further.

Cary Karp: I can give you immediately another example which I'm pretty certain I'm - is going to be figured in the discussion and that's (Daphne) which is a name for the people in the nation if you will that spans Northern Scandinavia, (unintelligible), Finland, and Russia which some, if spelled correctly also is an IDN label.

So there are any number of non-stated nations which span geopolitical boundaries, the (occurrence) of political map and every single one of these I think could easily make a case even if that case might vary from the one to the other about what is the primary cohesive force and I suppose that will be a (TLD) application actually.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Sorry. Was that, Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Yes, sorry. I should have stopped (unintelligible). I'm just wondering with the -- and this was a wise idea with the sort of at least a possible wise deal with the language issue over who had authority over a particular language.

I mean I can imagine it would be very complicated with the language like Chinese. I would say Mandarin or, you know, Chinese characters or...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Or say, Urdu which is spoken in three different nations.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, but I mean it may be at least one possible option for addressing that particular issue.

Cary Karp: It's certainly a tenable way to proceed. I think as the largest number of cases, a language is spoken in several countries and each of them may have its own (Diaspora).

There are, however very significant situations whether it's a good degree of correlation between government and the language used in the country that is governed.

So although there's not going to be any general principles that we can find that's going to make this easy, what you've just described, Alistair certainly has to be in our repertoire.

Ram Mohan: I wonder if I could explicitly ask (Charles) if he could comment on the situation in terms of Arabic version, you know - how things are handled in the Middle East, but not just the Middle East, but you know, Arabic particularly is spoken in many, many places and whether you perhaps have a perspective on it.

(Charles): Yes. Thank you, Ram. I was just going to comment on this. For example, Arabic is spoken in 22 official Arabic countries. So these 22 countries, their official language is Arabic. What Cary said is correct sometimes. You can see that the Arabic in Jordan, they know better than for example Egypt or any other countries.

But I think, for example, we can find something that we can take the reference from. For example, for the Arabic countries, there is what you call the League of Arab States which is the members, all the Arab

countries are members in this organization you can say or something of this league and there is an official there. There is a secretary general, et cetera, et cetera.

So maybe for example, we can go through this league and this is usually, the members of course, it's country, so government.

So for example, if there is anything related to the language , the Arab language itself, we can go to something like this and we should look maybe the same thing for other countries and language as we said, the Urdu for countries and so on.

I have one more issue regarding the language itself. The Arabic form of the language, it's the same usually wherever in order the 22 countries or in the minorities even in some other countries, but the dialects and the accent, sometimes there is a big difference.

So for us, we would depend on the scripts which I don't think this will make any problem or the official language, but sometimes, you can say these are exceptions. You may find the same words that in one Arabic country is used for a different (unintelligible) in other countries, but again, this would be that the usual used language, but not the official.

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

Ram Mohan: Sure, and I'm, going to actually - I have a question to or clarification of (Charles). You were suggesting perhaps, you know, that an organization such us the League of Arab Nations might be an appropriate organization to ask for opinions.

I wonder what your thought is for nations and language communities that actually do use the language but whose nation itself perhaps is not part of this league. I wonder if it's kind of focusing exclusively on such an organization whether you think there is sufficient representation of other groups or communities that, you know, whose nations may not be part of the league itself, but nevertheless have significant language or presentation in their borders.

Marilyn Cade: Ram, it's Marilyn. I'd like to be in the queue after (Charles) please.

Ram Mohan: Okay. We have Cary and then after that, yourself, Marilyn?

(Charles): Okay. Ram, I still have a question. I think maybe I was misunderstood a little bit. When the Arab countries are represented there, so officially, when you have any political decision, you can go to the League of Arab States or Arab Nations, but if I want to go back, I don't think we should depend on of course the League of Arab States for standards, we can say because we should go maybe with a local group who will do work on the internet and have logistics or something to work on this and to maybe just to take the results of course after approving maybe from the different groups.

So our part of ICANN, for example and I remember now, there's a (meeting place) specifically for anything related to ICANN for the Arabic (CCTLD) managers. It's started by the way back here from ICANN and the chairman of the Sudanese (CCTLD) as (Muhammad and Fasier).

So I think we can find this forum where we can contact and know exactly what we want and by the end to be sure that we will help fix any problem maybe with any government of any Arab country. We can go to the league just to approve maybe what we have already.

One more example, sorry, maybe it will help my colleagues to know that three years ago, we were part in something started by the UN (unintelligible) in Lebanon to find standards for the Arabic domain names and we did this and there were representatives from government, from private sectors and even from non-profit organizations. And this was submitted to the (IETS) and it is under by the way a list I think (office standards).

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Charles). I have Cary and then I have Marilyn. Cary?

Cary Karp: It is something that (Charles) said about the variation in the orthographic requirements of the various Arabics that the (unintelligible) dialect is precisely the reason of why there's critical (boundary) between what the IDN protocols are capable of doing and what is relegated to policy and that boundary is between script.

The Unicode support for Arabic is capable of addressing all of the requirements of all of the dialects of that at least have been called to the attachment of Unicode that's already up.

I'm pretty sure that's comprehensive, but the extent to which some aspect that is relevant to one of the dialects or one of the Arabic languages is mapped into this. This is beyond the ability to perform mathematical operations on big tables filled with characters.

So this is the key issue is not so much the Arabic, but given that Arabic is a group of languages with many countries involved and also the countries in which there are Arabic speaking immigrant communities (unintelligible). In fact, it's not an IDN issue either in English with (unintelligible) similar situation in any number of languages (unintelligible) with the large influential languages I believe which (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I'm thinking, Ram, of what we're going to be able to accomplish and one thing that is coming across to me is something that has been discussed already in PDP '05 a couple of times, but a bit to go back in the Amsterdam meeting and a relatively high level and that is I'm going to call it an exceptions process.

So let's say that we could set a framework of guidance about what were generally would be approvable and again, I think we may need to carefully distinguish between second level and top level and test whether there will be strong differences of opinion about top level string by government, but let's say we set a framework of guidance, but we have an exception process which says that we really can't easily tell that this word, whether this particular word is controversial or we know this word is likely to be controversial. And then we have a referral process to try to determine what is the controversy? Can it be resolved quickly?

The question I would have then is to whom do we turn for guidance? Do we publish it to the GAAC and ask the GAAC to advise us? Do we

think there has to be some other public outreach process to someone that we think is the expert or the expert group?

Ram Mohan: I'm going to prove myself in the queue here and ask if others would like to be in the queue also. Just please speak up.

I guess I have two thoughts here. The first is that I worry about the lack of a process for ICANN (GTLD) allocation system and methodology that there is really no good process of that whether a requested name has a geopolitical or geographic and geopolitical impact.

Number one, so to the first problem that I see for ICANN is it doesn't really have a good process to evaluate. (Unintelligible) will give name actually has a geographic and geopolitical impact.

Complicating that is the lack of formally established groups or organizations that evens should such a process existed ICANN, the lack of place where ICANN can actually go and say please have render opinion on this set of questions and once such opinion is rendered, the topic is generally free of controversy and I worry about that I have had some nations that are not represented in the GAAC.

Some representatives from those nations speak up in private and also in some UN fora about the fact that, you know, just asking the GAAC is perhaps not sufficient.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Ram Mohan: However, I think that ICANN doesn't really have any many other mechanisms to do something real here. So I post to you that ICANN

has two complications in front of it particularly as refers to the (GTLD IDN GTLD) roll out.

Marilyn Cade: And this is Marilyn. Just to comment on what was said, I think I too have heard these complaints that many of the complaints I've heard are from -- one of the challenges that many people in the GAAC says is the participation in ICANN is not yet well substantiated into the multiple agencies in some countries and so, I think that we're sort of been in a situation where by now, there's probably does need to be a documented outreach process in addition to the complication with the GAAC.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Marilyn. I think that makes a lot of sense. Now I mean the question is what do we actually recommend to the council because that is really at the end of the day, that the task of our working group is to really come back and say are there items that require a PDP process or are there items that are not adequately covered today and to me, this area certainly seems to be the one that we should bring up to the genus or council as an area that is worthy of further study and perhaps even some part of an outreach or a policy development process because it seems to me that ICANN is thoroughly lacking in this area in the (GTLD) evaluations and that this lack of consistency is going to hurt the community in general and ICANN in specific.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Alistair Dixon: Ram, I guess the question in my mind is sponsorship (unintelligible) approach wouldn't deal these issues. In my, for example, (unintelligible) civil proposals for and (unintelligible) top level domain name and I guess - I mean the result would be well and sponsorship

could be used to determine which - who would be the successful applicant.

I guess the difficulty is determining which of the sponsoring organizations has this sort of the authenticity and authority (unintelligible). That's the case with any (GTLD).

So I mean again, I guess the question in my mind is that a unique IDN issue was a more generic (GTLD) issue.

Cary Karp: Ram, can you put me in the queue, please?

Ram Mohan: You got it and then I'll jump in the queue after you, Cary.

Cary Karp: The comment I made earlier about the (unintelligible) that any discussion of language ownership, I'm afraid extends exactly into the potential solutions of problem that we're now discussing that given the multiplicity of, how should we say it, (unintelligible) for claiming some form of representativity of a language. It's very difficult to have something - to identify a group that is surely, globally representative. That was the thing we had to do back in 2001 with the first (STLD), and it was just the matter of being able to claim representativity of a community.

You have to claim global representativity of that community and that just doesn't extend easily into the discussion of language. We just keep circling back on this one very, very awkward fact without any of us, least of all, me having any brilliant notion about how we're actually going to work our way through it.

In the NGO context in which such things as museums and libraries appear, the only thing that's done is some - display respect for these kinds of issues and to the extent that the UN has guidelines and directives that are applicable that than they are just applied (gladly) and to the extent that not even the UN has figured out how to do this.

Well, one doesn't want to be the fool that steps in where an angel fears to tread. I'm not describing the UN as angelic in this content. It's probably poor analogy.

But nonetheless, we are looking at a problem that has (unintelligible) that's beside solutions, it's far more daunting context than what we are addressing.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I agree with that.

Ram Mohan: This is, Ram. Alistair, I guess my concern - I think in some areas or in some cases, sponsorship approach might solve the problem but let's even take the approach for instance that (Charles) was suggesting for Arabic. I think that in some - it's just an example here merely for illustration.

But I know that the Arabic as an example, Arabic is spoken by a minority of the population in India. It's a small minority. It's only a couple of million people speaking it, but I suspect that population or if the government of India were to be asked to defer to the League of Arab Nations, there might be some reluctance to do so and I worry that lacking -- especially when it comes to language community which really are in a (Diaspora) spread across the world.

Unless it's a relatively well-defined community that puts within, you know, reasonably good borders and boundaries, I think the task is quite - is almost impossible and that's why I guess I'm proposing that perhaps it's a kind of thing that should be recommended to the councils for further study.

Alistair Dixon: Ram, can I respond?

Ram Mohan: Absolutely, please.

Alistair Dixon: I mean - I think yeah, I mean that's probably a good example. I mean the Chinese community (unintelligible) around the world. I'm not sure of them what (unintelligible) determining, you know, the (unintelligible) Chinese language, but I wouldn't know.

So I mean - I think this is something that we - it's going to be difficult to provide a definitive answer given the time frame and (see it for those) this working group.

So I think - I guess my initial (unintelligible), it would be I think sponsorship does offer potential way forward. It's probably (not) going to be the perfect solution, but I do think that the study would be valuable.

Cary Karp: Ram, could you put Cary on the queue? I like to (unintelligible) specifically on this.

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

Cary Karp: Okay. I think we're going to find that there are situations in which there is a readily identifiable sponsoring entity. In indigenous language situation, in non-stated language situation where there is no government that uses the language, there is no government that has ever used the language that tends to be a far stronger sense of community identity if nothing else because languages in that situation are often under threat.

I'm not sure there's a price to that cap, but there's certainly some responsibility from the notion - from the cohesive force that is entirely applicable to of the (Catalan) situation and to these other things.

So I think that we might comfort ourselves in the knowledge that the sponsorship notion is in fact readily applicable in some cases just not in all cases that take some discomfort in the recognition of the fact that some of the cases where it's not readily applicable or where we're going to be discussing this with - this against governmental force with forces of significant government. Sorry (unintelligible) how that should be twisted.

Man: I think (unintelligible) are applicable.

Cary Karp: Yes.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Still, I guess the way I am where to paraphrase some of the discussions we've had here, you know, I guess the way I would paraphrase, it is that in the case of (CC TLDs) as well as language authorities that our working group at least as a presenter on this call.

We have at least two specific things to offer. Number one is that consultation to (GTLD) should find some ways of consultation with sponsorship organization or sponsorship approach to where it is appropriate and applicable and be that the issue of a good process for consultation using ICANN and also identification of appropriate body is a larger topic that is worthy of study and should be offered to the genus of council as an area that needs to be discussed further in the council.

Okay. Thank you for that. Now, there are a couple of other topics that...

Marilyn Cade: Ram, sorry.

Ram Mohan: Yes?

Marilyn Cade: Is it for the council or is it for PDP '05 the task force as a whole?

Ram Mohan: I guess since our charter doesn't really allow us to suggest topics for other task forces...

Marilyn Cade: Got it. Okay, thank you.

Ram Mohan: The other area that we had originally left in the geopolitical details topic was explicitly written as what is the working group's opinion on countries asserting "sovereign rights" over scripts/languages. And we had a little bit of discussion in our early meetings on January 23 and January 30, and I will try to paraphrase that here before we open up some level of discussion.

On the 30th of January, there was a bit of discussion about, you know, that the statement made by Korea regarding IDN and also there was some discussion on the report that China in the IGF that there was representation from China. There was effectively an assertion that Chinese - the Chinese (unintelligible) representation and I'm doing a poor job of paraphrasing it and one should look at the actual record from the IGF.

But what I understood was that there was representation from China that stated that the Chinese language and its representation of the Indian system was considered a manner of sovereign right of that nation.

And I'm wondering if again, I offered that as an example, but I'm wondering if our working group has an opinion on countries or such bodies asserting sovereign rights over scripts/languages.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I must say that the issue of sovereignty was debated and discussed to great length throughout the entirety of the four-year world summit on the information society. My view is that government agreed to recognize the sovereign rights of other countries and there's even a particular phrase in the (unintelligible) document that make reference to the fact that, you know, no country should not be interfering with each other when it comes to their country code for instance.

There is also I believe in the GAAC policy principles of recognition as well of the sovereignty of the member state - of the individual state.

(Unintelligible) in front of a country as saying that they don't have sovereign rights over certain issues. I think there's it's a no win for ICANN.

The issue, you've already identified, I think comes down to when a language is shared across multiple country, not just when a people speak that language in other country, but when the language is shared and there are multiple governments who believe that they have legitimate role in influencing the language. I take Cary's comment about the difference between (unintelligible) language part.

But when many governments speak about it, they do not make that distinction.

Ram Mohan: And Marilyn, I will also point out, in the case of - specifically in the case of India as an example, the constitution of the country defines a set of languages, not scripts, but languages that are constitutionally approved and our official languages -- there are 22 official languages in the country.

And as a result of that, by law, each one of those languages needs a presentation. I have been in contact with various members of the information technology ministry in India who have a clear mandate, that they shall establish the country's right. And I speak these words not lightly, but they had a mandate to establish the country's right in so far as that language is used in the representation of a domain name.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, yeah. And I'm not surprised and I would have supposed from the experience that we've had with South Africa that there are certain

countries, China is one of them that determines how the word China can be used, not only how the language can be used.

South Africa has similar requirements for the use of the country name. The variations, of course, are myriad.

In the United States, I could name my consulting company, the United States Associates and would not have to ask the government.

But if I were to do so in China or in South Africa, I will have to get permission to use the name of the country, let alone any variation on the language that I might started wanting - if I have started trying to make decisions about the use of the language -- the official language.

Ram Mohan: Right.

I mean, in India, for instance, the use of the word India, Indian or national in any conjunctive way is prohibited by...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Ram Mohan: ...in all the language. And I don't know what the examples are, for instance, in Arabic, you know, by the use of the word or the name of the country is.

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

Ram Mohan: Sure, Cary.

Cary Karp: My turn?

Ram Mohan: Your turn.

Cary Karp: Okay. Here again, I think we're likely to run into easy cases and hard cases. (Benefit to them) that there are three governments, which provide clear support in all legislation for the same language, and there are variations from country to country in which these languages are written and these variations are also relevant in the IDN space.

Okay. If we adapt the policy that supports all three and each government that - that's fine. Our concern is that, the way we use this language has to be supported and we do that, then there is no problem.

If one of those governments say, "No. We insist that IDN support to provide this with language." only as we use it even if it means that the other two governments maybe unhappy about the result, then we got a problem.

Marilyn Cade: Do we, Cary, or are there some instances, which are too hard to deal with right now? And...

Cary Karp: If there - this is obviously has been discussed quite a bit. If there are then probably the only thing that ICANN can do is they - well, please resolve these issues among yourselves...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Cary Karp: ...while you are doing that, IDN support will not be available for this language simply because we're not capable of providing it on the basis that is satisfactory to you.

And the moment you can provide us with the shared description of what needs to be done, we will then put that forward in the process.

And I'm not sure that that would be invariably accepted by in any conceivable situation either, but I'm not sure of this in additional alternative.

Marilyn Cade: But, Cary, maybe - let's just take your - let's call that the interim step.

Let's say, we have five examples that have to go into this interim step program. And we communicate with the government nature of the problem we have. We try to work with them -- we being ICANN try to work with them on a fast track process to resolve it, noting that there will be an interim period. But maybe that those are the exceptions and we have a limited number of exceptions.

Cary Karp: Yeah. The things that I see here is that they maybe a limited number of very strong exceptions.

Marilyn Cade: I hear you.

Ram Mohan: I have two kind of directed questions here. This is not the norm, but I'm quite curious and I want to hear, I guess, two specific sets of opinions, as well.

One is a question directed at (Paul), (Paul Diaz). I'm wondering, you know, given that your employer or your organization operates across the world and also your own personal experience with Latin America, whether, you know, you've find something of relevance in this particular area about sovereign rights because I would expect in Latin America, there is certain languages that are shared across multiple nations.

However, there is perhaps not a single coordinating organization in that country and the original, the language itself might originate from - say, perhaps somewhere in Europe.

So that's a question kind of directed at (Paul). I'm going to have a separate question also about Arabic, which I was going to direct it at (Charles). But perhaps (Paul) you could, you know, or if you have an opinion, if you could offer it.

(Paul Diaz): Okay. (Unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: I can hear you.

(Paul Diaz): Okay. I'm sorry. When I unmute it, it takes like five seconds to come back.

You know, in experience, Ram, the - you're question about - unless you've Spanish language in system is widely use for Latin America and, you know, I would only echo some of the things that were said earlier when we were speaking about Arabic and that there's a lot of different uses and a particular word in one language and they come out differently elsewhere.

But I am unaware of anybody or any organization trying to assert any particularized and forces them to take a stand, et cetera.

Professionally, we've not had any experience like this where we've bumped up against any sort of standard setting body or such group.

So, you know, my experience is, I've not come across at least in the Spanish language realm.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Paul).

And I wonder, you know, would there be - what do you think (Paul) would be the reaction say among both registrants in those regions, as well as perhaps as other organizations, if say, there was a request that said that, the Spanish language representation of a particular word must get, you know, approved by say, the Spanish Language Institute in Spain because it's (unintelligible), you know, (unintelligible).

(Paul Diaz): I'm sorry, Ram. I don't mean to laugh, but, you know, I'm sure it's similar elsewhere. But if ask an Argentinian to, you know, (unintelligible) group in another country - yeah, good luck. It's not going to happen.

I can't imagine any group trying to assert such rights or what have you - over anybody. And the other is probably just going to, you know, shake their heads and say, "We don't accept your authority and basically shove off, you know, I could not imagine that, either being applied or enforced.

Man: Thank you, (Paul).

And I had a similar directed question to (Charles), you know, in the case of the Arabic where - so, the Arab leagues say - or the league of Arab nations says, you know, here is what we suggest is a standard, you know, in your experience, do you think that that would - that would actually have sway over other areas or not?

(Charles), perhaps you're on mute. If you're speaking, we cannot hear you.

We may have lost (Charles).

Anyway, that was the other area that I was curious about.

Okay well, to me it sounds like perhaps at least among those of us who are on the call today, we're saying that if anything, you know, sovereign right over our scope of our language, it's not in the - this is my paraphrasing, but it's not in the scope of this working group to offer an opinion or suggest an alternative to the - nations asserting sovereign right over a scope of our language.

However, I think, we - it moves us to state that it is - there seems to be empirical evidence that points to the fact should some nations assert sovereign right, there might be a multitude of other organizations and other nations that might simply ignore it and request or require the ICANN to also similarly ignore or repudiate even in some cases such a right.

So that's my suggested approach to this problem which is that we don't actually state whether we acknowledge agree or not because we don't have the standing so to speak to kind of go up against any nation's assertions, but that they merely point out that such assertions might be equally repudiated or that ICANN (must) request to set aside such opinions.

There's something else that we might want to point out. If only to ourselves and - for once, I'm going to say something that might be some release.

You put me in the queue - do that please.

Man: Go ahead.

Man: Okay. And that is - I don't have - I'm not prepared to comment on any - on legitimacy with which any government might wish to assert its rights or the scope of rights that might be legitimately asserted.

But I do note that the likelihood of their being any genuine issue in the structure of the IDN space that results from any such a discussion is actually pretty low. And just that the basic orthographic requirements of a language are - even if subject to some political contention, probably not subject to anything that would be a genuine roadblock in getting this particular show moving forward.

The real issue would be, if some governmental agency says that we have no business even discussing it.

Man: Well, the horse is out of the barn and that's one, since we are actually discussing it.

Man: Yeah. Well, I mean, there is (the yack) if nothing else in the ICANN context which is the membership of which is designated by governance. So, I suppose we now have to start some - looking really (power field), are there any government that are interested in this discussion that are, for example, not represented in the GAC.

Man: I thought you were going to offer some release here Cary.

Cary Karp: I started out doing that. But the - again, I mean, if we back up to the release thing, as long as what we are doing is accepting from the Unicode guys via the protocol guys, a bunch of characters that reasonably and safely can appear in the identifier space.

The policy is that, we then attach to the use of those characters, probably can accommodate any new ones - that might be registered by a government.

We're looking at the identifier space is not some carefully, that are critically marked literary statement. And I think they're just (first) sequences of character that don't even have to make any language (sense). And in many cases, they specifically aren't supposed to.

So, in the real world, I suppose I'm having difficulties doing any real world likelihood of insurmountable problems actually arising despite the ease of which, we can take inventory of potential such problems.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary.

Folks, we have about half an hour left in our call here. And I would like to move our attention from the geopolitical details topic because I think, we have at least a couple of conclusions that we can draw and that has to get out in the document.

I'd like to move our attention to the area of existing gTLD string which was the next area that, you know, in the working group prioritization, there was a recommendation that we spend time on.

In our discussions in the past, we had under existing gTLD strings as a generic topic header, we had three sub-headers: We had allocation of existing gTLD string. We had representation of existing gTLD string. And thirdly, we had question of, should there be a policy recommendation regarding backwards compatibility of existing IDN, when IDN protocol change. Those were three areas that we had set ourselves up to discuss.

I would like to kind of quickly dispatch the first of this issue or - and then kind of ask for your opinion on the other two.

So, the first one I'd like to bring to your attention is, should there be a policy recommendations regarding backwards compatibility of existing IDN when the protocol has changed?

I open that question up for your responses.

Alistair Dixon: Can I start, Ram, with a question?

And that is under what basis our existing IDN is created, I mean, they don't...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I can offer two examples.

Alistair Dixon: Right. Okay. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: One example could be that, a particular strength is created using a Unicode table at a version - the current version is 5.0 and in two or three year stuff, it's certainly possible and it's likely that Unicode will evolve through a new version that includes new characters or - and Unicode actually never removes an already existing character, but includes new characters. Some of which may now be homographically similar to one that is already approved. That is one example.

The other example is, for instance, right now where you have some of the protocol that translate or that converts a Unicode string into ASCII string, the name (prep), string (prep) protocols are undergoing significant revision right now.

And one of the - as an example Alistair, one of the recommendations that is going in is that, perhaps the (hyphen) should be done made in legal going forward or perhaps that a particular - that the number of characters that are allowed should be as minimally -- sorry -- as maximally restrictive as possible.

In other words, eliminate everything that you today do not think is valid, even though the prior version of name (prep) and string (prep) was more liberal.

So, those are two specific examples.

Alistair Dixon: But my question really is, are there existing top and second level and possibly third level IDN now, or is that what we're talking about or are we talking about at some other label?

Ram Mohan: We are talking - in this case, we're talking about at the top level. I mean, that's the focus of our working group, in general.

Today, as, you know, if there are IDNs at the top level, they exist in proxy days or alternate group systems, not in the actual group. But in the - at the second level, for instance, there are IDN strings, that's the new version of unique - the new version of string (prep) and name (prep), for example. There are certainly a number of strings that would be rendered illegal.

Marilyn Cade: You mean, there's illegal grandfathered but nothing else allowed or...

Alistair Dixon: Illegal, as in impossible to use.

Marilyn Cade: Oh. That's what - that was just more helpful. So, when you say they are illegal, you mean that they will no longer resolve.

Man: Right. They will no longer be supported and therefore, if you own or have such a string, tough luck.

Man: Now, wait a second.

They will keep resolving because the "X" and "--" is just going to be an invalid Unicode string. But some - the D and Ss are going to care one way or the other.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Man: Application software probably will.

Ram Mohan: Application software will carry but also I suspect that if you're a registrar and you're implementing for the latest tool kit or standard or something like that, such (trial) versions might get automatically deprecated...

Man: Yeah, right.

Ram Mohan: ...and that might mean that if you're a registrant with an old legacy strings for example, you might get up to need it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: All right, Marilyn. So the question from (the first) is should we make a policy recommendation because the - there are two things.

One is technology moves forward and in some cases, technologies are going to explicitly say break from the (past), not just gracefully support the (past).

Marilyn Cade: Right. And, you know, there are times when that is the only realistic decision to make.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Alistair, you have the floor.

Alistair Dixon: (I wouldn't do it). It might actually be a different approach between first and second label. It would seem to me that there are, you know, legitimate right to an IDN at the first level at the moment.

But a decision label, I'm not sure whether that it's quite likely to have. And I have - I guess it would seem to me a similar issue to other second level strings where, I mean since we may have - have been basically and did a lot of resources in that string.

And so they may have some legitimate claim to that string. But I'm not - in the first level, that seems to me since it actually hasn't been in the allocation of the IDNs at the first level, then any assertion to right to an IDN string with this level would be illegitimate.

Man: Can I - there is a point of information here or a question, for provocation...

Man: Yeah, please, please.

Man: I thought that the purpose of this working group was to prepare for precisely the opening of the space (right in).

Ram Mohan: And I had something to add as well.

Alistair, let's take for instance a - let's take the case where there are IDN gTLDs applied for and approved, and a few years hence, the way those IDN gTLDs work is obsoleted by technology.

I would think that that is where our attention should be focused on, whether we ought to make a policy recommendation that speaks about that is compatible to the existing IDNs even at the top level, assuming that they will be approved at the top level.

Alistair Dixon: Sorry, Ram, I was thinking I have to - but were talking about certain visions (unintelligible) to particular IDNs now, that sort of existed now. But I think in that situation I would agree. Once we - once ICANN has decided that IDNs are at least, I would think it would be appropriate for - to have that with compatibility.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. Let me ask a question.

Within the scope of what ICANN can influence, which will not necessarily extend to the application layer, ICANN might be able to convene meetings with application developers with standard bodies and encourage that backward compatibility. But some of this is going to be behind the scope of influence.

Alistair Dixon: If it's also going to be beyond the law of physics.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: It's the - there's an algorithm which makes it possible for certain sequences of Unicode characters to be encoded into certain sequences that would be used (X10--), it's Unicode thing.

Now if the algorithm has changed so that the numbers of strings that can be into conversion in that manner reduces, anything that's reduced can't be selectively grandfathered into one or another level of the (DNS).

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: But what happens with just (ASCII code) where there's a sort of a change in coding approach. Presumably, there is - I think the grandfathering outstanding it doesn't - this simply doesn't happen.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry Cary, in support as in - if it's a regular ASCII code on, I mean of course all TLDs are ASCII at the end of the day. But if there are - if we're talking about a TLD that is not (processed) with say something like an "X" and "--" in its raw format (unintelligible), then there would be no real relevance.

However, let me also point out, if it stay the (hyphen) is rendered an illegal character, any potential TLD string that has the (hyphen) image would effectively stop working.

Marilyn Cade: Now - so let's take this just a bit further just to help those of us who are laymen here.

If the hyphen is, you know, is rendered an illegal character, doesn't that affect all existing IDNs?

Man: Absolutely.

Marilyn Cade: So...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Which is wrong. Taking a kind of an extreme...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, yeah. Because just like I mean, if we're talking about less than co-existing names that may be one question. If we're talking about impact on all existing IDNs at the second level, and that's what we're talking about or drag it and left behind in this...

Cary Karp: You're actually both right.

It would be possible to say that the only way hyphen may appear in a zone is that one of the two dashes in an "X" and "--" sequence. However, a hyphen will no longer be available on the display side of a decoded in such things.

So there are any number of ways by which this -- in fact, any number of changes that can continually introduce, which is the reason for my litany about perhaps cooling our heels with some aspects of the policy development until we know what the protocol if it is going to be.

But, nobody is seriously talking about removing the hyphen. It's being discussed as an example of the kinds of explaining things that could happen. But to my knowledge, nobody is seriously planning on doing it.

Ram Mohan: Yes, true Cary. And I will say that I'm almost intentionally using the hyphen because it is such a poor example that I'm trying to use it as an instrument to spark the discussion.

Marilyn Cade: Well I was just going to say, Ram that you did. But remember that there may be consequences. I may now live in terror of every possible consequence there.

Alistair Dixon: But I mean, when you think of the use experience, Ram, it would seem to me that from a user point of view (unintelligible) a change to coding. They want to get to, you know, with size. And if it involves an IDN; would that mean being changed in coding, you know, it seems to me I would still want to move to that IDN. I mean if there's a separate question of who would be operating the registry for that IDN, I mean it seems to me a safer question, which we had talked about in PDP06.

But as to - it seems I would have thought you would want sort of for compatibility, if possible.

Ram Mohan: Alistair, this is Ram, I completely agree with you and I think this is why I brought this topic up because while what you're saying is a self evident truth, there is actually no a single place that I have seen that states such a truth.

Alistair Dixon: I mean, is this - it's the more of a physics (prevented). We do indeed have a major problem.

Marilyn Cade: So when we think about principles, Ram, can Alistair - PDP05 has what I would call some principles inherent and this is a principle that this working group might recommend to PDP05?

Ram Mohan: Yes. That's exactly the direction I'm going as well that, you know, where - because in some cases, you know, one of the points that Cary is advocating is, you know, let's not build all the policies until we know what the protocols are.

However, we know that the protocols are subject to constant change. So, we do need to I think suggest to PDP05 at least, if not with the council, we need to suggest that this particular area is of intent importance and although the formulation of how to do it might be awkward, not focusing on it and not having any attention on it would result in, I think, an area of tremendous user confusion and actually would render much of the domain name system as we know it, you know, at least the processes as we know is impotent.

Marilyn Cade: I would just say that in the case of PDP05, you actually are communicating with the council, given that it works as a group as a whole. But I would just - I would certainly support a principle that is appropriately (couched), you know, because I think you're quite right if we have a situation where people build businesses and communications mechanisms on Web site and domain names and they are - they become unpredictable that you destabilize by such changes will be incensing those who want to create alternative routes as a form of dealing with IDNs and other issues.

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

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

Cary Karp: Okay. One thing that you may not realize and that's we've been here once before and an entire generation of proprietary; but not standards-based IDNs, massive numbers were invalidated.

However, that conversion to standard compliance of IDNs as far as the user is concerned was, I won't use the word reasonably painless matter, but it was a reasonably doable matter.

The kinds of things that are in jeopardy are not the kinds of things that have any business being in domain names but also a discussion we have generated - in the present form so I won't go there.

So what we're looking at is not an unprecedented situation and we do have some positive experience with the outcome the first time around, from which we I hope can - to take at least some (dollars).

Ram Mohan: Cary, your point is duly noted. I agree with you that the technical conversions from the (ACE) encoding from the (RACE) encoding, et cetera to the standard and methodology, they technology piece was quite painless. But as the technical, speaking in my personal role as a technology service provider for the .org toppled with domain, I can attest to the great amount of pain that would cause to a large number, almost 100,000 or so registrants who had names in the prior technology that suddenly got frozen, stopped working altogether and in some cases, still do not work.

So, I think Alistair's point on the user experience remains valid and I don't think you were actually negating that but I just want to point out that our recommendation as a principal, perhaps off the focus on insuring that the user experience and the user expectation that a name, once allocated as a label, should remain useful and usable regardless of the marks of technology that that, you know, that's useful to have (unintelligible).

Cary Karp: But the problem this time around compared to the last time around, despite the anguish that you're now describing, and to the best of my understanding, no name actually was on convertible. This time around, there will be on convertible names.

So we might want to call attention to the fact that the - disrupts the potential of the current protocol revision so as the lack of precedent and that there might be some reason for registration for patent to be correspondingly heightened.

Ram Mohan: I'm fine with that and I completely agree with that and that's why I'm bringing your, you know, your attention to this topic inside the working group because I have felt a little bit that this particular area is not - has not been well understood. And perhaps, there is some level of assumption that backwards compatibility shall exist, but in fact, such a principle has not been espoused anywhere that I can see.

Cary Karp: In fact, if it were to be espoused then we would be wasting our time with the protocol revision.

Ram Mohan: True.

Okay. It sounds like we are out of discussion on this particular sub-topic. Perhaps we should go to and I - and here I was thinking that was the easy one of the three.

Perhaps we should talk about allocation of existing gTLD strings, always a good topic to bring up to commence before policy goes to an end.

We're talking here about I think about two kinds of sub-areas. One is the allocation of existing gTLD strings as they are represented in the domain name systems. The allocation of those in an IDN world - IDN TLD world, and then in the past, we have had discussions in our working group about allocation of domain names of the second level in the existing gTLD string and a corresponding allocation in an IDN world.

So, I opened those for your thoughts and opinions.

Alistair Dixon: Ram, I will have it going at this level that is right for me that this is - this will be a very difficult one I think to complete in five minutes.

Ram Mohan: I don't think they'll complete it, Alistair, you know...

Alistair Dixon: No, I don't.

Ram Mohan: I think we'll open it up here and then we'll continue perhaps in our next call.

Alistair Dixon: I guess the sort of I would have is that - it strikes me that this is somewhat similar to the sort of the .biz and .com situation that - and I mean, you know, I mean sort of (trans license) equivalent, et cetera.

I mean it just strikes me that it's not - it need not necessarily be the case. I'm sure the registry operates with a decision that it shouldn't be the case. But it need not necessarily would be the case that the use of a particular string in ASCII would necessarily flow through to a (trans license) equivalent for IDN because by May it could not be the same thing.

Ram Mohan: So Alistair, if I were to pause what you're saying, you're saying that the use of a particular string in the non-IDN representation may now flow to the IDN representation.

Alistair Dixon: It - well, I don't think it automatically follows. And I don't - I mean, you might for - I mean if you're talking about two different languages, you may be talking about two completely different sets of users. And so I don't mean - I don't know why this should be, you know, I don't know why necessarily should follow that should flow through from ASCII to non-ASCII.

Ram Mohan: Okay, great.

(Paul), I'm wondering at the second level, what do you anticipate would be expectation group of registrants? I'm not talking about rights here, but you know, I'm curious to explore what expectations might be.

(Paul): Am I back online?

Ram Mohan: You're on.

(Paul): Okay. I'm sorry as I was -- I heard my name and I would try to do it quickly. I want to make sure. Can you just repeat your question for me?

Ram Mohan: We're talking about adaptation of existing gTLD strings at the top level as well as, you know, I'm curious about what expectations users might have for their domain names in an existing gTLD string to carry over so to speak in an IDN string.

Alistair had a point that he didn't see a reason why at the top level anyway why an existing gTLD strings ought to follow through into an IDN string.

My curiosity was at the second level, what user expectations might for users who has a domain name in an existing gTLD strings whether you think there might be an expectation or what expectation would be, you know, off say "an equivalent" IDN string?

(Paul): I think it's going to depend on the user, Ram. I would share out their view that does not necessarily going to be an expectation of carrying forward or carried over amongst some registrants.

However, others likely will, you know, start asserting or claiming certain rights in federal listing and discussing this whole - the work this particular working and where we intend to go with IDNs, you know?

We get internally a bunch of different views on this that I think will respect the views of the registrants and it's kind of a lame answer; but I

think it will depend on the end-user. Some will have particular expectations and now this one. For the more reason is the more extensively we touch on these issues within the working group and all of these is clearly articulated in ICANN for - so that folks are we're moving towards the rollout. Folks will have as much information as possible. We fully understand on where the things is going to come down, so much the better.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Paul).

You know, I have heard some in prior discussions I have heard some constituency members expressed a two-polar perspective carry red into the record I think I missed more two prior the assertion by the (barkava) registry that they believe that they opt to, you know, naturally have something like, say, (adage voyage) assigned to them because they are direct representation.

I also have heard on our working with (Paul) at that - a couple of calls ago, you said there is no way that the current dot com operators for instance would be the natural home of a .com equivalent in an IDN TLD.

And it seems to me that - there is, they seem to be coming together and certainly that no prior rights exist from existing gTLD strings to an IDN TLD string. There seems to be at least (report) for that position with some distinct opposing views.

But so far I have heard all those no opposition to the view that registrants in an existing gTLD strings do not have a right - a preexisting right in any - in an IDN field string and in fact that the place

for registrants to be directed to is the creation of some sort of a reserve period for intellectual property and all their rights...

So, I'm wondering whether we can whether I'm accurate in this interpretation and whether I can - you know, towards a position or about registry and...

Man: Can I ask a question Ram?

Ram Mohan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: And Ram, it's Marilyn. I want to be in the cue to speak about the views of registrants. I think there's some caution here that I thought that (Paul) was referencing. I think we have to be careful not assume that because someone registered in a nasty top level domain that they automatically granted a right at the registrant level. I think we need to examine what the characteristics are that might convey some sort of...

Ram Mohan: Marilyn, unfortunately you've broken up.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. There's a lot of background noise.

I'm saying that I think this is a very complicated issue and we're venting up for some more time on it. But I think we have to be very cautious.

Because I've registered in a nasty top level domain and I've used up an example within the consistency I'm in the contract. It's between (att.com) and the (mcade.net), where (att) registers and protects its trademark in 150 countries and (mcade) has not even sought to

trademark a (HER string) - (HER) at the second level or to trademark it as your business name.

That companies accept registrants are very, very different and I think we need to step back and examine that. That is at second level.

At the third level, I'm very cautious about assuming that because I was allocated to management of a string at the top level that ICANN was allocating all right in that string regardless of how the name appears.

On the other hand, I'm very sympathetic to the idea a sponsored community can be treated differently than an open as unpopular that maybe to some people.

If the sponsored name string manager has gone to the expense and trouble of identifying a sponsoring community that has global buy-in, I think we need to look at those three different examples one being should sponsored name be treated differently than open strings, should registrants be treated differently based on what steps they've taken to protect a name in different languages et cetera and devoted a fair amount time to it because it's going to be a very -- it'll generate a lot of heat and fire but not necessarily a lot of light.

Ram Mohan: Good. Thank you.

And I don't remember, but is Alistair or Paul who wanted to be in the cue.

Cary Karp: Cary wanted to be.

Ram Mohan: Cary wanted to be. Okay. Cary, you have the floor.

Cary Karp: Yes. I'm just wondering if there is any truly profound difference on all levels between those of us who own names in the root zone and those of us who own names in TLD zone?

Man: Was that a question to the working group, Cary?

Cary Karp: Yes, it is.

But I recognize the fact that all forms of -- how I put it rigor increase, the closer you get to the roots. But is there any - in principle between a registry withhold the name in the root zone and what's called otherwise the registrant holding the name in the TLD zone who are all the way down (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Cary, I would say it is because managing a string is allocated that scope of that management by ICANN.

A registrant is operating in a different role to the roots than the registry operator is.

Cary Karp: But within a sponsored TLD, I operate the sponsored TLD very, very rigorously (placed) in terms of eligibility requirements, entry level requirements and although that rigor doesn't approach very good that ICANN exerts in deciding who's entitled to hold the name and the - again, I'm curious about there being some difference in principles other than an expense.

Marilyn Cade: I don't understand the question.

Cary Karp: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I guess the way I look at Cary's question is the following: given that in names and names and labels of the labels, whether it is at the top level or whether it is at second level. And given that different individual organizations et cetera have an interest in or not interested in protecting such a label, I guess the way I interpret Cary's question is from a point of principle, there is no difference between a label at the top level or a label at the second level in terms of prior right that is if a - if there is protection accorded or taken by an organization at that level, then perhaps such protection ought to be considered in the carry over to an IDN TLD. Otherwise, it doesn't exist. That's the way I interpreted Cary's statement.

Alistair Dixon: I guess though, I mean, I would - my (sponsor) that would be just look at the direction with .biz, .com and even .travel which somewhat I used substitute to the other two.

And I mean, they - I actually might be to the right to the name but those zeroes actually (unintelligible) of those three and it's frightening that - I mean, and I guess the same applies - at the second level to take businesses operating in the same space.

But it just strikes me that if you move to an IDN situation, it isn't (unintelligible) .biz, isn't that in some ways add difference from .biz as - .business from .com.

Ram Mohan: In fact the Chinese is the same for both of them.

Marilyn Cade: Yup. But Alistair...

Alistair Dixon: Maybe that's a bad example.

Marilyn Cade: But let's take the word voyage as opposed to voyage, related to that travel.

And let's take .cat the animal and .cat the present sponsored TLD. Or maybe we'll take .feline.

Man: I'll take cat.

Man: I was going to propose that too. That's a really good one.

Man: That is a good one, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: So the sponsoring community has gathered itself together and gone through the process of defining who it is and what it represents and has brought its way through the process paid to see, put the registry together, advertise and withholding yourself out to provide registration to that community.

The community is marketed to by the registry, but those not in the community who look at the string .cat might in fact think it equates to .feline until they visit the Web site and see otherwise.

If we were to allow a second .cat or even a .feline, we would probably be confusing a number of users. We might not be confusing those who knew about the (unintelligible) language and (heritage) et cetera. But we could be confusing a large number of other users.

So now let's voyage versus travel.

I think there's an issue here of an entity has gone out and I'm - Cary, on - I'm - in the back of my mind trying to come up with an analogy for that - but I think there is an example here where a community has built itself into a sponsoring entity.

They are reaching out in marketing a concept of the community regardless of their language gathering into .travel. I haven't been on the .travel site recently but I've seen a number of the outreach at first including sponsorship of the (Rick Shaw) rates in India, lots of things to promote the idea that this is a even though it's written in Latin characters but this is a sponsoring TLD that is about to travel community.

If we don't have from rules at least initially, we're going to be confusing uses who also are going to be confusing the marketplace and why I'm a big proponent of competition, I think we also have to have some fair rules. And I also think we're putting ourselves in a situation where people might naturally just go after cloning the existing names and not spend their time on being creative and coming up with the additional names which will further expand the space in a logical way.

Cary Karp: Can I come up (unintelligible)?

Ram Mohan: Yes, please.

Cary Karp: This also brings us keeping close (unintelligible) smack up to the issue of people considering applying for IDN versions of existing TLDs, because of the value that the (Anglo Phone Association) has. The cache of .com is manifest.

And if we divide IDN policy that would allow a really separate from operation of some other representation of what is evocative of that brand of concept, then that's not really equitable either.

So I think this is again another one of those situations where we're going to have to come up with a couple of solutions that somehow different domains of applicability and ICANN have luxury of being wise enough to figure a single alternative as - and a provocative one as a context.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

I realize the danger of introducing an interesting topic a few minutes prior to the end of the discussion is that we will then exceed the time that they had originally reserved. And I apologize for taking another 15 minutes.

But I do feel like we had such a vigorous discussion going on in this area, and it's an area of significant important for us that it's right in our scope.

I'd like to continue this thread and this topic into our next call which will happen in a week's time. But I'd like to bring this call to a close now.

The next call just for your recollection, will move to - since we are moving to alternating time zones, the next call will be at the your local equivalent of 1500 Eastern Central time and that'll be in a week's time.

I thank you for your participation and you will see some of the actions that they promised out of this call come through on list here in the next day or two.

Marilyn Cade: And Ram, you're going to make a report in to this next meeting, is that right?

Ram Mohan: Yes, I am.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Man: Bye-Bye.

Man: Bye-Bye all.

Man: Thanks...

Man: Thank you very much.

END