

**GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO
Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper on IDN ccTLDs
December 18 , 2007 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper on IDNccTLDs on December 18, 2007.

Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnsoidn-rework-20071218.mp3>

<http://gnsoidn-rework-20071218.mp3>

Agenda:

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnsoidn-rework-20071218.html>

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnsoidn-rework-20071218.html>

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency group co-ordinator

Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee

Olga Cavalli - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Stefanie Lai - NCUC

Adrian Kinderis - Registrar c.

Absent apologies

Bilal Beiram - CBUC

ICANN Staff:

Denise Michel - Vice President, Policy Development

Tina Dam - IDN Director

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor - GNSO

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: Thank you, sir. The call is now being recorded

Chuck: I appreciate that.

Thank you very much.

Okay, so no questions on the - or changes to the agenda, so we'll move right ahead to Item 3 to finalize revisions to the document using Google Docs.

The - is anybody not up on Google Docs?

(Denise): Yeah, I'm not just yet. But go ahead.

Chuck: Okay, all right. Thanks, (Denise). So hopefully you can get up shortly.

(Edmon): I'm also on transit.

Chuck: I'm sorry. Who was that?

(Edmon): This is (Edmon). I'm also on transit, so I'm not in front of the computer.

Chuck: Oh, okay. All right. So thanks for joining us, (Edmon).

All right. So we now we have everyone here except (Belal) and Olof. And so we'll move ahead to the first thing.

I'd like to suggest that Liz be our editor in Google Docs for this meeting. Are there any objections to that?

Okay.

Liz Gasster: So we'll wait until you see me try.

Chuck: Yeah. Well - yeah, at first you can keep in mind that you can go back after the meeting. So if you have a little notepad...

Liz Gasster: Okay. Sounds good.

Chuck: ...(unintelligible) yourself a note that...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: Obviously, we'll be able to see what you do, so that's nice. But we also understand that we're putting you in an awkward situation since you're...

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Chuck: ...participating in the first time on this particular topic. So, but we do thank you very much for...

Liz Gasster: My pleasure.

Chuck: ...joining us and taking Olof's place.

All right. So the plan of attack then is just to go through the Google Document in order and try to reach consensus in terms of what we want to do. Please feel free to express positions that you may not have communicated on the - in your comments.

And for those that are new as we go forward, please try and pick a different color that's distinguishable if you add comments to Google Docs. And...

Man: If nothing else, Chuck, it's a very pretty document.

Chuck: Yeah, it is. It is. It's very colorful. And use your initials too just in case it's not obvious in terms of the color. So you can just follow the example that others have done.

So now, going to Google Docs, let me flip over there.

Why is it not up for me? I had it up.

Oh, there it is. Okay, I just didn't recognize the URL that was showing up on my laptop.

All right, so we're just going to scroll down to the very first set of comments following the sentence that says "The comments are intended to provide the ICANN Board and the community as a whole with input," et cetera. And Avri indicated that she likes the paragraph. We could even abbreviate it further.

The two ccTLDs - and then I know that we probably should decide what we want to use here. Now based on some very technical-oriented feedback from Cary Karp and a little side group that was formed in LA, I made a suggestion and I did it globally throughout here to use these - to use - to avoid the term IDN ccTLD or anything like it. The reason being, ccTLDs are officially just the two-country ASCII code in

ISO3166, so that's all that support - those are the only ccTLDs that exist today.

So what I suggested, and we can decide this right now, that we use the term like "IDN Territory TLDs," so to avoid the CC reference until such time as allocation of names into the ccNSO space is decided.

Now, I made that change globally through - or suggested the change globally. Does anybody want to use it -- suggest using a different term than that or even debate whether we want to change it at all?

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, it's Adrian. I'll jump in the queue (here).

Chuck: Go ahead, Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Look, I think reading (Edmon)'s comments there, I think he's got a fairly succinct way of putting it. I agree that we should certainly make the change. I do like the differentiation; it does make it clear. And I think that putting it differently in (Edmon)'s terms there and maybe adding a footnote is the way to go forward.

Chuck: Okay. Let me just jump ahead to - unfortunately I did not ready (Edmon)'s comments yet.

Adrian Kinderis: He says I think it is probably - or I mean - yeah, he's not in front of his document. So, (Edmon), I know you're listening, but I'll try and summarize where I think it's probably a good idea to add a footnote, but perhaps a footnote would suffice. And also I think the description of IDN Territory TLD is appropriate. I also think that the term IDN Labeled TLDs associated with countries or territory designated in the ISO 3166-

1 list should be replaced with IDN TLDs representing a territory designated in the ISO 3166 list.

He goes on to say critical part being representing rather than associated because generic term could be at least argued to be associated with a territory rather than representing them, and I think that's a good point.

Chuck: Yeah, yeah.

Anybody disagree with that?

Now, (Edmon), are you suggesting that we not change the term "IDN ccTLD" or just when we change it, put the footnote the first time?

(Edmon): Sorry, this is - while they're noisy. But I guess the main thing is I think IDN ccTLD, I agree with Cary that IDN ccTLD is probably not the appropriate phrase to use. But my worry about IDN Territory TLD is that territory is a little bit too broad. For example, you know, even if you take into consideration .cat and .asia territory TLD, you might unfortunately fall into sort of that criteria.

So I try to avoid that particular description with a different type of description that avoids the ccTLD definition but still maintains a description that is appropriate I guess.

Chuck: Now are you suggesting then IDN Labeled TLDs?

(Edmon): I'll tell you, the part label is not that much of a signification in my point. But the term "ccTLD" or the term "territory" is, I think "represents" is the keyword there.

Chuck: Okay. Let me try - that I all - I agree with. What I was trying to do is come up with a brief term that we can use throughout the document. If every time we have to say IDN Labeled TLDs associated with countries or territories, it's an awfully long term. Can somebody suggest the term that you're more comfortable with that's brief, that's why I did the territory one. I fully understand your point there.

It'd be nice if we had a briefer term rather than having to use that lengthy term every time we make reference, and there are many, many references.

Adrian Kinderis: You know, Chuck, it's Adrian. I think it's - if I get (where) (Edmon)'s going on this is that he wants a footnote at least initially to further explain that. But your use of IDN Territory TLD is okay to use through the documents, but just footnote the first time you use it to go on and do that further explanation.

Chuck: Is that okay - is that correct, (Edmon)?

(Edmon): Actually, is that the short term that we end up with? I am generally okay, but I, you know, I think actually the word just "IDN Territory TLD," I sort of try to mention, in that case, we don't know whether .cat or .asia might fall into Territory TLD.

But with the footnote, I'm generally okay if we do that. If we don't come up with a better short term, I'm okay with that. But if we can come up

with a short term, actually I just put little bit of thoughts of it, but I really didn't come up with the better term. But if we could, it's better. But if we couldn't, then I'm fine with it.

Chuck: Would it be better to say IDN Country TLD?

Liz Gasster: No, because country - territory goes beyond country.

Chuck: Oh that's why I used "territory." So - but I'm just trying to see if - does anybody have a different suggestion?

Liz Gasster: I have one idea and I don't know - I mean, if we define, if we continue to use IDN ccTLD but have defined it in a footnote that what we mean when we use this term is that. Is that problematic because that is the term that everyone else is using? Now we redefine it as a - in a broader context with open question. But does that work at all?

Chuck: Comments?

Man: I think Cary really hated it.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Man: I personally - I actually feel that IDN ccTLD is actually better than IDN Territory TLD because of the reasons that I just mentioned.

Chuck: So the approach that Avri is suggesting is to, the first time we use IDN ccTLD is to footnote it and clarify distinction that we think should be made there, but to go ahead and use the term "IDN ccTLD" which the

GAC and the ccNSO obviously use. Are there any objections to that approach?

Liz Gasster: Even if it's only an interim approach until we come up with a better name.

Chuck: Right. I can live with that. Anybody can't live with that?

And let me suggest that, Liz, you control the movement of the document. Otherwise if each of us are moving it around, I assume that affects everybody.

Liz Gasster: I don't think so.

Chuck: No? So I can move it independently. So when I move it right now, it doesn't affect - It keeps moving back on mine, so I was...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: Chuck, I don't see yours moving, you know.

Woman: And I didn't see you're moving either, so I don't know why yours keeps moving back.

Chuck: Okay, all right. Well let's that okay as long as I can control it.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: So, Liz, question for you. Are you okay on what we're doing here? This is...

Liz Gasster: So, we're going to leave the term "IDN ccTLD" but in the first instance define it as you've defined it or...

Chuck: Right. And I had added a footnote already along with line - (Edmon) is suggesting some additional information there. So you don't have to do it on the fly right now, but I...

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: ... - as long as you - the key thing is to understand and then hopefully you can in the next few days come back with, you know, revise the document and then let us know so that we can all see the change - see the revision.

Liz Gasster: Okay. By the way...

Chuck: And you can - now Avri and Liz and I talked about this earlier in the week. But the assumption is, is that Liz could delete the comments as they are taken care of. And then all we have left then is the latest version of the wording.

Does anybody...

Avri Doria: And I'll point out...

Chuck: ... - go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: ...to people that if you go to the Revisions tab, you'll see that there's multiple revisions. So those comments won't be lost and that you'll always be able to go back and see the comments. They just won't be in the active text.

Chuck: Okay. Any...

Avri Doria: In that way we would leave any comments that hadn't been resolved yet.

Chuck: Right, exactly. Does that make sense? Anybody oppose to that?

All right. So...

Avri Doria: So for this right now, this particular one I'm going to just leave it and go back since it's a macro correction...

Chuck: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...for the footnote. I'm not going to do it here...

Chuck: No.

Avri Doria: ...people are looking for my changes. But I do have it in the future.

Chuck: All right. And in fact, if you go into the Executive Summary then, the first paragraph there, my comments there are related to the same thing. So I don't - unless anybody wants to talk about that further. And we'll just skip over every time I suggest that change throughout because I did a global when I did this.

So, all right, so I think we're to - in the Executive Summary here are what we believe to be the most important points. And again, I suggested a change in the Number 1, changing both "CC" and "G" and parenthesis there with whether considered gTLDs or ccTLDs.

Any problems with that suggested change?

Okay. And, Liz, you can - you know, you may not be able to keep up with this doing live changes. And that's okay. I just want to give you the freedom as long as you have - know what was agreed to so that you can make the after the fact. That's okay.

Liz Gasster: Yup. Is the parenthetical still there?

Chuck: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: So CC and G. Okay.

Chuck: It would still be in parenthesis.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck: Just worded a little bit differently.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Can you all see my changes now, so that this one I'm capturing on the screen?

Chuck: No, I don't.

Woman: I think we have to hit refresher.

Liz Gasster: Oh I see. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: It may have its own regular refresh rate. I haven't figured that out yet.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck: So we just hit "Edit Refresh?"

Woman: There's a refresh down at the bottom, yeah.

Chuck: Oh, at the bottom. A refresh at the bottom.

Okay.

Woman: That's where you see - also Editing Now along with the names, and then there's a refresher underlined.

Chuck: Okay, I don't see that. So that's...

Woman: Did you see the also Editing Now?

Chuck: No, I do not.

Woman: Yes, I - oh you don't see that.

Chuck: I see down at the bottom - oh, also Editing Now - oh, there's Refresh in orange - that orange color threw me off...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah, that orange one. I'm sorry, I should have said colors.

Chuck: Okay, no, not a problem. I hit Refresh, so - and so there would just be - you can delete the both CC and G in parenthesis. That's going to be replaced within parenthesis...

Woman: Got it.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: ...that are considered gTLDs or cc - or TLDs associated with countries or territories.

Woman: Got it.

Chuck: Okay?

Going to Number 2, again, I suggested rewording. That's to say "Advantage or Disadvantage due to actions by either supporting organization."

And then I even suggested an example there. In other words, the introduction of IDN gTLD should not be delayed because of delays in finalizing the ccNSO policy or vice versa.

And Number 2, their efforts to fast track IDNs by either SO should be equally available to the other SO.

Any discussion on that or any objection or suggested changes to my suggested rewording? That was the result of some earlier discussions we have.

Okay? So that...

Woman: That's accepted.

Chuck: No objections, yes that's accepted.

I'm going to move fairly quickly because we have a lot of ground to cover. So please stop me even if it means to say, hold on and while you think it through when we do this because - so that Liz has the direction that she needs.

Woman: I also figure that this is only the first time we'll be through the test, but we'll go through again...

Chuck: Yeah.

Woman: ...in a following meeting.

Chuck: Yeah. Right.

So, okay, then going to Item 3, again, ignore the first change that I suggested because that's that broader issue we talked about at the

beginning. But I think the second one still applies. So change IDN Labeled ccTLDs to ID - oh no, I guess either one of those apply.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck: I'm sorry. My screen keeps moving back and forth.

Woman: It jumps - okay, it jumps when there's a refresh. And it does seem to have an automatic refreshing.

Chuck: Oh.

Woman: So I was making changes there.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Right. So as you're making changes and then we get an automatic refresh, that's when it seems to bring us back to where you are...

Chuck: Okay.

Woman: ...which is appropriate.

Chuck: Yeah. I just have to keep moving back and forth. Okay.

Woman: Cool.

Chuck: So now - so looks like - all right, so now we're on Number 4. Is that right?

Woman: Right.

Chuck: And I suggested a change there provided that no IDN TLDs associated with territories - I suppose we should say "countries" or "territories" introduced earlier than "IDN gTLDs."

Any problems with that?

Woman: So it should be countries or territory?

Chuck: Yeah. We're not - since that's not abbreviated there anyway, I would say that the more accurate term is "countries" or "territories," which I did not obviously have them in my note there, my comment.

Woman: I have a question.

Chuck: Go ahead.

Woman: And does - and maybe I'm just seeing this morning. But does 4 contradict 2? And as we're saying that neither (unintelligible) should be finalized. And then we're saying that none of these should be introduced before any of those. Now granted I don't personally want to see the IDN ccTLDs associated, I mean introduced earlier since we're already standing in the queue, but the statement seems contradictory between 4 and 2, unless I'm misreading something.

Chuck: Well - and maybe we need to reword it. But I don't - in my view it doesn't. The idea is, is that - and obviously these are all picked up from more detailed comments down below on the document. But Number 2 is basically saying that if - I mean either SO could decide - could make the decision to let the other one go ahead and proceed. If that happens, then, you know, probably some steps need to be taken to deal with possible conflicts down the road.

If this - if one of the SOs - neither one should be able to go ahead of the other without concurrence of the other SO. Does that make sense?

So Number 4 then, we're supporting interim solution; now maybe we need to add some wording to cover what I just said. Does that make sense, Avri?

Avri Doria: I guess. I'm...

Chuck: Maybe we need to - you know, and in Number 4 there in my comments, suggest adding - provided that no IDN TLDs associated with countries or territories introduced earlier, then IDD gTLDs without - maybe we need to add without the gNSO's approval or concurrence or whatever we want.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck: Does that help? Because I see your point and that it probably is contradictory unless we add something like I just said. That makes sense? Does it solve the problem?

- (Tina): Chuck, this is Tina. I think that makes sense. I - because it is contradicting as it is today, and I think that is what that other gNSO IDN group was tasked to discuss and provide some more, you know, information around how the CC fast-track is supported. But - and that is what you're saying here -- we're supporting the interim solution.
- Chuck: Uh-huh.
- (Tina): But it shouldn't set our precedence for anything at a longer term.
- Woman: Right.
- Chuck: Is that okay, Avri?
- Avri Doria: I think in the general idea, but I'm not sure if it's not putting it slightly strong to say without gNSO concurrence. But what we're saying is without full community, ICANN community participation. And that it's not that we per se gNSO has to approve it. It's that the full community together needs to - if we're going to accelerate something, then we need to do it as a community. And there's a slight nuance difference.
- Chuck: Yeah. Now one question - and I think you're going in a good direction. But I'm wondering if we say full - without full community participation...
- Avri Doria: That's too wide.
- Chuck: Yeah, that's really too wide because just as long as they get comments for full community, they can go ahead and proceed it.

Woman: Right. And is it's too ambiguous to just say appropriate community participation?

Woman: That's certainly a good start to have. Appropriate is always a good word to use.

And I provided another - I'll introduce - and it's not really earlier than IDN gTLDs; it's before the entire issue is resolved.

Chuck: Yeah. But we have to be careful here. If we're too vague, they're going to miss our point.

Woman: Right.

Chuck: Don't we really want them to understand that we don't want either going before or the other if at all possible? Yeah...

Woman: Well that we don't really mean what we say in 2 - and we may want to come back to this later and leave us time to think about how to put that. I think having that still marked in green is (unintelligible) or whatever color, is good, but it's really a careful balance between the two, you know. If we mean it in 2 and we're saying no one should be delayed because of the other issues that need to be resolved, and we need that and I think we do and I think we mean it reciprocally...

Woman: So then maybe you want to pick up the language that you have in 2 that neither category is advantage or disadvantage.

Chuck: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Well we're making a specific point in 4 saying that in general we support the near-term fast-track solution. However, because of the broader issues, it needs to be fast-tracked before all of the broader issues are resolved; means it needs wider concurrence.

And so I agree with the - in principle, without gNSO concurrence, but I think that that's to say that we have to concur, us specifically is - perhaps it's the right bluntness and we should leave it.

Woman: Or we could say participation.

Chuck: Well again - yeah, I almost think that your last statement, Avri, is correct that if we're not fairly blunt on this one...

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck: ...like a lot of people are going to miss the point.

Avri Doria: Right. So let's leave it blunt and perhaps later when we've got the whole thing down, a way of, you know, fine-tuning it will occur.

Chuck: Yeah. That's a good idea.

Man: Yeah.

Chuck: Anybody...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: ...with that?

Adrian Kinderis: Look, Chuck, it's Adrian. I think we're best to circle back to the Executive Summary when we've gone through the meat of the document. Because there certainly few of these points we're going to be arguing about later which may substantially...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: Well let's go ahead and do what we're doing right now. But you're right, we're probably going to have to come back. This will - that'll actually also help us when we get down to the meat of the document. So I think it'll work both ways.

On Number 2, we may have to come back to that later, but I still believe and I'm open to people disagreeing with me on this, but that there is still the possibility that one could end up being introduced before the other. And, you know, for example, we for some strange reason, you know, support a plan by the ccNSO to start a couple of months before (us) or something, or vice versa, in those cases, what we're dealing with here really - let me get very specific.

If gTLD IDNs happen before ccTLD IDNs, and that could happen, okay? And obviously, we would involve the ccNSO here. I think we would need to do something like reserve IDN scrip versions of country names and territory names at least temporarily until the ccNSO was ready to go.

Woman: I thought that's what we have the objection procedure for.

Chuck: Well, my own opinion, I don't think that's sufficient if we go ahead of that. I think once they're ready to go that that's absolutely the way it should be handled. But if we go first, it's going to create a huge stink. And I can understand it from their point of view if we don't specifically reserve the names on a temporary basis until their policy is established.

Now, let me hear from others on this.

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, it's Adrian. Can I jump in the queue please?

Chuck: Yes. Go ahead, Adrian.

And by the way, let me suggest that unless - feel free for the sake of time. We're I think a small enough group that just jump in. Now in case - as soon as I detect that there are (multiple) people wanting in, I will automatically take a queue. So just feel free to jump in.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay, great.

I think we talked about - I just want to note that we do discuss this later in the document to some, you know, with some further data. But while we're talking about it now, I certainly agree with you, Chuck, because if you don't - if you rely merely on the objection procedure, that means people have gone through the trouble of putting together application. And they've gone through the trouble of raising funding to put in their application. And then they're going to wait for - you know, and then they're going to vetoed the minute they hand in .india.

So yeah, you're going to get a lot of angry and disgruntled folks once they do that. They're going to say, "Well, why didn't I know this in the first place?" So yeah, and without a, you know, without a precise list of blocking at least initially in this circumstance, I think you're on a hiding to nothing.

Chuck: Anyone else want to comment?

(Tina): Chuck, this is (Tina).

Chuck: Go ahead.

(Tina): I think one of the things that would be difficult from a staff perspective to implement that is how do you actually get that list translated. And I think that was what the reserve names working group was talking about. And they decided that it wasn't possible to make that kind of translated list. Or at least that list doesn't exist then - and it could be hard to get it translated.

And so I'm, you know, I'm wondering if we can do maybe a list then put some general language around it and say, you know, all countries and territories' names in all languages - you know, something generic around how these are reserves and you cannot apply for any of those, and here's a list of what that could be, but it could go beyond that list.

Is that too vague or...

Man: Yeah. You know, I think that's an excellent solution to the problem because if that's written into the RFP somewhere that says, by the way, you know, don't do this yet, at least, you know, that you may be

able to get this later on. But from the time being, until such time as the country code works out what they're doing, this is what we're doing. We're blocking the entire reference.

Then yeah, I think that's a great idea.

Woman: I...

Woman: Great. I just don't want to limit it to a list that may not be complete. That's all.

Avri Doria: I'm sort of uncomfortable with that long a statement because that's sort of aviating the processes that the PDP group as a whole went into.

What I think is close to that that might work is to just warn people that if you do apply for a country name, and I would put "in any of its national scripts" as opposed to "in any script." But if you actually do apply for that, please be warned, that is an objection procedure; you most likely to be caught in that objection procedure. And so we recommend that you don't do it.

But to actually prohibit it is going one step further than the reserve name groups or the PDP was willing to actually go. And we're basically trying to warn people that...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...this is a dangerous place to go, but if you want to apply for it, be warned, this is what you're asking for.

Man: And then you're asking...

Avri Doria: And that's why we had the mechanisms in that said, you know, and the staff will notify, you know, the GAC anytime one of these happens, when these applications happen. So the objection is almost automatic.

Chuck: Did I hear Liz and Adrian?

Liz Gasster: You did not hear me.

Chuck: Okay. I thought I heard somebody else.

Okay. Is there somebody else besides Adrian that wanted in?

Okay, Adrian, go ahead.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I understand where Avri is going. I don't know that you're prohibiting it as such. Maybe you're saying for the time being, you're just blocking it. There's a difference between prohibit and block. So you are entitled to apply; it's just not yet right until the CC even works. And maybe that language is a little softer.

Chuck: Now that's interesting variation of what you're suggesting, Avri. By the way, I was kind of thinking the same thing, some sort of a warning. But what about the variation that Adrian is suggesting there?

Avri Doria: I still think that that implicit list is still too big and too broad. And whether that list would then be seen as capturing things like, you know, (.usadeal) is an ambiguity we get defined as sort of saying, well, you

can include the name of the country, but it can't be just the name of the country.

And so as we try to define well what is it you're saying you can't build the block that you think it really becomes way too difficult to pin down. And especially when we go to...

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: Avri, I think you are misguiding it, Avri?

Avri Doria: Huh.

Adrian Kinderis: I don't know that it's that complicated, Avri. I think you are misguiding it. I think quite simply you just say any TLD that is represented here - you know, we can go back to some of the language we've used here before, are the territory or the country - or a territory -- I think we just left it at that -- you know, will be blocked at this point in time. And that's it that is representative. Yeah, but we've used this language before.

So that means they can put in US (deal) and they can put in Australian (shoes) or whatever it is, but, you know, I think it covers it up. I think it's fairly clean.

Chuck: Do we have to then have some sort of a process that decides whether or not a name does in fact represent a country or territory?

Avri Doria: Well, yeah, I mean first of all...

Chuck: If we don't a list.

Avri Doria: Right. First of all, say territory...

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: Well that's (how you fall) back on your objection.

Avri Doria: Right. First off, you say territory, you obviously have to restrict it to as defined in 3166-1.

Adrian Kinderis: Yup.

Avri Doria: So that you're not - somebody isn't saying, well, you know Berlin is really a territory, you know. It's a set of territory.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes. That's her point.

Avri Doria: Right. So you definitely want to restrict it to 3166.

I still think a warning is better than an outright blocking but, you know - and I would leave those two as, you know, options at the moment whether we're blocking or whether we're just warning. But I think doing something is good, and perhaps it needs a broader discussion. I'm still more comfortable with warning that the objection procedure will be used against you if you do this, which is the same as blocking but it's not telling staff to block.

Chuck: No.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, but it's...

Chuck: We're going to probably end up with some situations where we'll have a couple of alternatives. And I'm okay with that. What I would like to do right now is give opportunity for others to at least jump into this particular discussion to get a general sense of where people are leaning. The idea of a warning without a list or the general statement of blocking territory and country names associated with 3166 list, or even some sort of a list -- I think there's kind of three things we've talked about -- that is non-inclusive.

Where are the others that haven't spoken up on this? Where...

(Olga): Chuck, this is (Olga).

Chuck: Go ahead.

(Olga): Yes, I agree with Avri having a warning. And, Adrian, could you clarify to me what's the difference for you in between block and prohibit? I really don't see very much difference.

Adrian Kinderis: I think what you're trying to do is minimize your - you're trying to filter them before they have to get to utilizing the mechanism - utilizing the dispute resolution mechanism or arbitration or whatever you want to say. And by saying initially that anything that is clearly a name will be blocked because what you don't want is also to have to get, you know, the GAC, because you're starting a big procedure. Once it enters arbitration or dispute, you're starting a big process. And it - then you've got to get government involved and get people moving to, to put forward their arguments and their cases.

But I guess what I'm trying to do is make the process a little more efficient. If it's cut and dry, if you're putting in .india (I-N-D-I-A) in script or whatever, they're not cut and dry. Now if it's something that's potentially contentious, there's obviously a room for that. Then you can put forth and activate the mechanism.

But what I'm trying to is filtered in the amount, so rather than having (unintelligible) and saying okay, everybody can, you know, you can go for it. But by the way, if you do go for it, you're going to go - you're going to have to go because then that's just going to, as I say, fast track and create - get a lot of people involved in the process for just a simple blocking mechanism.

Am I making sense? I'm a little...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: Yeah. Let me add something to that, Adrian.

One of the things we need to keep in mind as far as the gNSO objection process is that there will be cost associated with filing an objection. Now, I'm fully supportive of that in the long term even if it involves the government or territory or inter-governmental organization or whatever. But, in the short term, asking governments and their interested parties to go to the (expense) of filing for an objection just because they have not yet finished the ccNSO process may be going a little too far.

Avri Doria: Can I add something?

Chuck: Sure.

Avri Doria: I think that the point about the objection process and warning people that an application that looks like this is going to get stuck in that process is essentially a way of - in other words, being warned that this will happen to you if you do this, there's sort of an expectation that people will go, "Oh, I won't do that then."

Now, if someone does intentionally decide to do that, it's sort of leading it open to the individuals to sort of say, "Yes, I know I'm not going to get this through. Now is this something that is still worth it to us to bring up the issue and to call and process all these mechanisms?" Then yes, they still get to spend their dime and put us through it.

For the most part, a warning will be, you know, it's like when I'm ice skating. I see a warning that says "Thin Ice." There's no fence there blocking me from skating into the thin ice, but I know it's stupid.

Chuck: Yeah. Now, Avri, we still have a situation though. And by the way, I agree with most of what you said there. The - I think a warning in most cases will work. In cases where it doesn't, if I'm a government or a territory, an existing ccTLD or whatever, and I see - you're telling me that I've got to file an objection and pay a fee to do that ahead of when the ccNSO has finished its work. I think I have a problem with that from their point of view.

Man: Exactly.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: That's what I'm trying to see if we can - I think...

Avri Doria: But the objection process did not start with paying a fee. It started with filing an objection. And then as I understood it there were all these time to talk, time to cool off, time to resolve. And it's only when you couldn't get pass that point that you were in the objection process now.

Chuck: I fully understand that. But, still, I think it's going to be an issue with governments and ccNSO members if they have to do that in a case where the real problem is if they haven't finished their work yet because keep in mind it's going to be several years before the ccNSO finished its full work in this regard. And...

Avri Doria: So it's not just the first round we're saying it won't be ready; we're saying for the next five years.

Chuck: Well, it's the same issue, isn't it?

Avri Doria: And...

Chuck: Yeah, let me tell you a philosophy of mine. And people may disagree with this and that's okay. But I think it would be really good if this doesn't become or - and it may be unavoidable, but to the extent that we can avoid it, I think we ought to avoid an us versus them -- a ccNSO versus gNSO on this -- as much as possible and try to - and that was the intent of Number 2 there, to try and look out for some of their concerns in addition to ours, so that we're cooperating together in the overall community to make sure that we've covered the basis as best as we can.

Avri Doria: And that's what I said the objection process was.

Chuck: Well, again, I don't think that especially in the case where we would go before them that that's going to be well received. Maybe I'm wrong because I certainly know - I haven't got any inside intelligence on the ccNSO or the GAC. But again, let me open it up to others. (Olga) spoke; let me hear from some of the rest of you.

(Denise): This is (Denise). A concern that we have heard from ccTLD operators and investment representatives that concern particularly for those smaller train-to-work, smaller operators, there's a concern that they may not have the wherewithal to track the - for example, the full gTLD process and be aware of and file in its - in manner objections that they feel may impinge on their countries right.

So, there's also a concern for less developed countries and all our ccTLD operators that may not have the resources to fully engage in the dispute process that's laid out in the new gTLD report envisioned in that process.

But - so we're also hearing comments like that. And I know that's an ongoing concern particularly for the GAC.

Avri Doria: All right. That was one of the reasons why there was a discussion of ICANN notifying. And then obviously ICANN is going to see - ICANN is going to know when one of these has been submitted, and for ICANN to notify GAC of any such instances, so they didn't have to track it that carefully.

Now the whole notion of, you know, objectors having to pay to object is a staff position. That is not one that was actually written in by the PDP committee. That yes, it was written in by a PDP committee that the objection process would be separately (feed), but there wasn't a notion that one had to pay a fee in order to object within the policy recommendation that's sort of an implementation option.

But there certainly was a policy recommendation that the staff would raise the flag, would notify GAC. And that's why GAC and ccNSO were empowered as objectors withstanding to sort of take problems there and...

Adrian Kinderis: And Avri...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Sorry.

Chuck: Hold on a second. Adrian, just a minute, let me put you on hold for second. I'd like to give opportunity for some others to speak up that haven't voiced their opinion on it, if they will.

Woman: I'm sorry, I was - sorry, I still don't know anything.

And will she finish...

Chuck: No one else does anything to say?

Woman: If somebody was speaking, (was) speaking very faintly.

Chuck: Yeah, I couldn't tell.

Okay. All right, then, Adrian, go ahead.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, Avri, two things. Number 1, when we talked about earlier about getting ICANN staff interpreting the list and blocking them, you said that, you know, you're then putting the issues back on ICANN staff and that's why we're against the blocking.

You're now saying that when the ICANN staff gets an application in, they then got to send it to the GAC. Isn't that the exact same prices? Don't they have to do that exact same interpretation then to see whether one of these is or isn't? Not necessarily a block, but the same result. They're still making a judgment call as to whether this is pertinent to a territory or not.

Chuck: No, it doesn't.

Adrian Kinderis: Secondly...

Chuck: They're just going to be communicated to, Adrian. All that is a communication itself.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: That's right, but they're making a decision to communicate though. That's what I'm saying.

So when an application comes in, in some script, they're going to have to go and get that script translate and understand what that is.

Otherwise, why would they notify the GAC?

So this is my point. So before - now, you know, so you're still letting ICANN staff make a judgment call.

Chuck: No, I don't think there's any judgment at all. They're supposed to communicate all of them.

Adrian Kinderis: All of them to the GAC. So they're going to give the GAC the complete list of every new TLD.

Woman: No, but the assumption is that yes, the ICANN staff does need to understand that it is a country name and that is...

Adrian Kinderis: Right, a GAC.

Woman: ...going to - and yes, they'll have to do that discrimination in any case whether they're blocking it...

Adrian Kinderis: (Right).

Woman: ...or whether they're notifying.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay. So I just wanted to highlight that point because that was the...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Right. Now, the point was that the staff wasn't being brought into the adjudication role. The staff is certainly being brought in to the you've-got-to-understand-what's-happening role.

Adrian Kinderis: Right. The acknowledgment role or the...

Woman: The acknowledgment role. It's whether then it's the staff decision to say, "Yup, this is one of the ones we're blocking" or it's the staff position to say, "Oops, this is one of the ones that may engender an objection; we have to notify those who might want to object."

Adrian Kinderis: Right. And...

Woman: And there's different levels of decision, that's all.

Chuck: Now, so that we can move.

Adrian Kinderis: My second point - yeah, I agree with that.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: And my second point is simply please don't view the objection mechanism as a fee base that the cost is at the fee. Don't forget for the small countries the resources are at - getting together a lawyer to respond and doing all that. So, there's more than just the fees at the, you know, at the ICANN level.

Woman: Right. And that is a problem for everyone in the objection process whether if we're talking about small countries or whether we're talking about with the other objections processes. You know, a small group

that happens to not be a country or territory who believes they need to use the objection process. So there's a general problem with the objection process of how it doesn't end up an instrument just for the rich and not for the poor.

Chuck: Okay. What I'd like to do now so that we can move on past this one is see if we can narrow down the alternatives that we've talked about. I think there are basically three -- one of them being the warning; one of them being what Adrian is suggesting in terms of blocking but not containing a list, okay?

Adrian Kinderis: I thought that was (Tina)'s suggestion just for the record.

Chuck: Oh, thanks. I appreciate it.

And then the third one that I think was the first one...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: ...was talking about having a non-inclusive list of names that would be temporarily reserved. Now, on that last one, is anybody supportive of that approach?

Woman: Which - Chuck, which one of them?

Chuck: The approach of actually having a list of country and territory names in scripts, various scripts associated with 3166 country codes.

Woman: I think the GAC, yeah.

Chuck: Well, I'm not - I'm the less concerned about the GAC on this one because this is going to be the gNSO position.

Woman: Yes. No, I understand.

Chuck: Yeah. So I mean I don't minimize a GAC, but the bottom line is does anybody want us to pursue that idea any further?

I'm not hearing anyone. So we basically have two alternatives -- and it doesn't mean we can't come up with the new one as we work on this -- on the table right now. One of them being the general warning, and then the second one being blocking based on some generally-defined criteria for country and territory names.

Okay Liz, are you okay on that in terms of where we're at on...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: Oh, I have no idea where we are.

Chuck: You have no idea where we are.

Liz Gasster: No. I mean we went back to Number 2 from Number 4 and then - but in terms of the text specifically.

Chuck: Okay. Let's see if I can help there.

Liz Gasster: Thanks.

Chuck: Okay. The...

Liz Gasster: Yeah, this would be an extra one. This is really an extra one.

Chuck: So we would leave 2 and 4 the same and add a new one?

Liz Gasster: If we're going to add, yeah. Or maybe it would be an addition to 4.

Chuck: Yeah, I think it's an addition to 4.

Liz Gasster: Are we - the clause we first added which "provided that no IDN TLDs associated with countries or territories introduced earlier," blah, blah, blah, "without the gNSO's concurrence," is that what's going to change?

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck: Well, I think that's still there, is it not?

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck: I think that's still there, but we're probably going to have to add some more there and that's where we're getting into...

Liz Gasster: Right. This is the corresponding statement to that...

Woman: Okay.

Liz Gasster: ...that sort of says they wont get to add one with us and we are saying and no gTLD will - and either A, people will be warned not submit a

gTLD application that would be a ccTLD or there will be some sort of blocking list.

Those are the two alternatives. And what they are - that's a reflective statement too, they won't do 1 before we have a participatory (unintelligible), and we won't let anyone do 1 before they're ready.

Chuck: Now I'm going to change my position. I actually think the two options that are on the table right now relate to 2.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck: Because that's talking about if for some reason one does end up going first, how is that going to be handled in the interim and there are...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: You're right, it's not a fast-track issue.

Chuck: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: And 4 is a fast-track statement and 2 was general statement.

Chuck: Yeah. So really the two options, Liz, are relating to 2.

Liz Gasster: Okay. I think we need to, sorry, restate the two options again.

Chuck: Okay.

The - let me let Avri and (Tina) do the restating because I think you're the authors.

Avri, would you restate your option on the warning?

Avri Doria: That's it. Yes.

In creating - you know, we recommend so that in creating - I couldn't even type it in. The - what is it? The request for the application process, applicants will be warned that any application for a territory - a 3166-1 territory name in any script is subject to the objection process.

Chuck: And, (Tina), do you want to communicate the other option?

(Tina): The only thing I actually said was that if you guys decided to have a list, then I would propose some general language around that list to say that, you know, the list is not complete and it's any name of any country, territory in that definition that we agreed on earlier that would be reserved, because...

Chuck: Now that's the option that I think we eliminated.

Avri Doria: Yeah, well if - she was saying if there was a list.

(Tina): Because - well, because you eliminated the list. So I just said if you have the list...

Chuck: Yeah.

(Tina): ...then you have some language around it because it's from an operational standpoint it's going to be hard to make a...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: Right, right. No, no, I understand. Okay.

Avri Doria: I think - Liz, I think that the other option to the one I said was a replacement. I basically bracketed text for where I say, you know, will be warned that the objection - you know, will be subject to the objection process will be informed that those names will be blocked until such time as policy works on IDN ccTLD is complete.

Chuck: But there won't be a list associated with that. It will just be a....

(Tina): Right. And basically any name associated with 3166-1 in any script will be blocked until such time as policy works on IDN ccTLD is complete.

Chuck: Now, Adrian, isn't that what you were advocating? Is that a good description on that?

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, it is. But rather than one of us pointed back to the 3166 list, why can't we just say any script that is representative of a territory?

Chuck: I think that's actually very important that we tie it to the 3166 list. Otherwise, we start getting broader.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, and that's...

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: ...exclusively.

Chuck: Huh?

Adrian Kinderis: Well, as the basis of your list, but I just want - no, I'll retract my comment.

Chuck: Okay. That makes sense.

Adrian Kinderis: I agree.

Chuck: All right. Liz, are you okay?

Liz Gasster: I think so. Yeah.

Chuck: Okay, thanks.

Liz Gasster: You won't see it in the document but...

Chuck: Yeah. And by the way, I know we're spending a lot of time and this happens to be one that's probably really critical and it'll help us down the road, so I appreciate all the contribution on that.

Let's go on and then there are some comments under Number 5, the user experiences, one of the fundamental motivations for deployment of IDNs and should therefore be a guiding principle in implementation decision.

You can see the comments there. Obviously this is a point of disagreement among us. The - so let's just open it up for discussion on that.

Woman: Yeah.

And as I said, my comment basically because of the relativism of that statement and, you know, since it's funny thing for me to argue against because I do consider myself an absolute relativist. But, by saying that we basically make anything an issue of user experience, which is always culturally variant and such. And so I believe it opens it up to all kinds of really complicated issues if we say that that is a fundamental motivation.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: And obviously I disagree with that because I don't think it's really all that complicated. The bottom line is that don't we want whether it'd be gTLDs or ccTLDs in their space, don't we - isn't that a primary motivation to make sure users have a good experience?

Liz Gasster: But I won't have a good experience of the network if there's a gTLD that says .atheism is bad. If I see that one, that will be a very bad experience for me. And I'm using that as an example as opposed to dot, you know, your favorite God is a demon, (unintelligible).

Those are things that go against my user experience. If I see the name of my country listed in .your-country-is-evil, that will be a bad user experience for me to see that on the network.

Chuck: So maybe what we need to do on this is to be more specific in the areas of user experience that we're talking about. For example, I think we want to minimize confusion to the extent that's possible and reasonable for users.

Liz Gasster: Yeah. And I think we were very careful in, you know, the things we defined in the PDP on the particular aspects of user experience that were relevant to the TLD discussion. And yet we went further than some people wanted. But that's where we defined it. The state user experience broadens it so much and that's my issue.

Chuck: So what are the issues of user experience that do apply here? I mentioned one -- attempt to minimize confusion as is reasonable.

Liz Gasster: Right. I think what - if we're making a positive statement, what we're trying to say is the ability of a user to use the network in their script and language of choice is the fundamental motivation.

Chuck: Well actually, I think 5 says something different than that. But I'm okay with that statement.

Liz Gasster: And if that's the user experience, to be able to use the network in the language that is your first language. That is the particular thing that IDNs are meant to give.

Chuck: Now let me give a very specific example of where I'm coming from on that. Let's take IDN versions of .china in different scripts not just Chinese, because in China they have other - there are people from other - using other first languages.

If the .china is operated in different script - every different script by a different registry operator, then I strongly believe that that's a very bad user experience. And in case of dispute resolution like for trademarks or whatever, if the trademark holders have to file a dispute in every - with the different registry involved for every use of their trademark in the various scripts all involving a different registry, the cost in the application of the dispute resolution process is greatly complicated.

That is not a good user experience and it has nothing to do with them being able to use their - we can implement the opportunity for them to use their - use the Internet with a domain name, a top level domain name in their script without going down a path that creates a very complicated situation for dispute resolution, and so that it's readily available. If they see a .china regardless of the script, they know that there's a registry associated with .china that handles those sorts of things regardless of script.

Total silence.

Woman: Well I know for me, that's further than I would think we would need to go in this one, but...

Chuck: So you don't think that that would be a bad user experience.

Woman: No, not necessarily.

Chuck: Okay. Well we're...

Woman: And I think that, you know, certainly - but beyond that, whether it would or wouldn't be a bad user experience, I'm not sure that that's

something that we need to take a position on in this, but obviously you do, in terms of, you know, the whole - does that mean we're taking a position on issue that ccTLDs are the ones that need to run - whoever is running the current ccTLD is the one that needs to run the new one because otherwise, there'll be a confusion between the current .ccTLD and the IDN ccTLD in the various script.

So, are we making in our response here that that particular recommendation of who the ccNSO once we've done the redistribution or re - not allocation, but once we've done that, we're saying that and therefore then it's done because the current ccTLD holder is the one that has to get it all because of user experience?

Chuck: Well, I actually think that that is the better user experience, but I also believe that that's a ccNSO-GAC issue to decide that. What we're just saying is, is that in making that decision, you know, let's not create something that's very confusing and complicated for users. And...

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. Chuck, can I comment?

Chuck: Yes.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I think to pick up on the point, unfortunately, sometimes you're going to have to broaden the user's knowledge on the topic. And if that means that there's little bit of confusion, then you overcome that confusion with education. Most specifically talking about the fact that the delegates, the current delegates, you know, in the database might not indeed be the person that receives the IDN territory domain or top-level domain. Because from my understanding of what the price is going to be and from what I've heard at least from the ccNSO and the

GAC is that the GAC strongly wants government involved. And as you would well know that government is - does not always and is not always involved as the delegate of ccTLD.

Chuck: Yeah. And I respect that. But, Adrian, for .australia and various scripts, okay...

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah.

Chuck: ...as you know, certainly lots of people using languages other than English, you're okay with the fact that .australia and simplified Chinese would be operated by different registry than .australia in Korean or whatever? Is that okay? Is that a good user experience for those who are...

Adrian Kinderis: No, that's - so that's squashing one step further than what my consideration was. So yes, I would agree that that is a bad user experience. But to say that it's a different registry to the current .au registry is quite acceptable.

Chuck: Oh, okay. So what you're saying is, is that, you know - all right. So it doesn't sound like we're too different in terms of what we're concerned about.

Again, I respect the fact that governments, in some cases at least, need to - they're going to need to make a decision whether they're involved and how they're involved in this. I'm not - that's why I'm cautious about just saying that we think that the existing ccTLD operators should be the ones that do the IDN TLDs. That's really their decision. I think that that's another reason why the group that I led

before wanted this emphasis on the user experience. So that when you're making this kind of decision, let's try and not overcomplicate things if we can avoid it.

Adrian Kinderis: Absolutely. I agree with you on that level certainly.

Woman: I guess that I still believe that user experience is too broad. I think if we want to say that and it's not something that I personally want to say, I think that as a group, the gNSO wants to say that, then we should say that explicitly, but that we shouldn't hide it under - now, if we do want to use the word "user experience," then I think we have to define it in a restrictive way, so that by user experience we mean that the registry controlling all of the, you know, different scripts for name are the same or however it is we want to put that.

Chuck: All we're saying in Number 5 is that the user experience -- and maybe we need to say a good minimally confusing user experience -- is a guiding principle.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, I agree. It can be a general term. I don't know why it needs to be specific because there are certainly a lot of other areas and parameters by which you could refer to user experience as part of really who's running the registry.

Avri Doria: Yeah. But I would say that brings in then everything from, you know, remembering that everything that applies here in terms of ccTLDs applies everywhere. If we're saying that user experience is a guiding principle, then we're saying those things that users might find offensive and would ruin their user experience are also problematic.

Adrian Kinderis: And what about you put at the front of it, "where appropriate and practical, user experience should be used as a guiding line or whatever Chuck, say.

Chuck: That might be a way of doing it.

Now keep in mind though that with regards to names like .acs or something like that that you used earlier, Avri, that's not an issue in this document.

Avri Doria: Well, I think it actually is.

Chuck: This is with regard to TLDs associated with 3166 country codes.

Avri Doria: Right. But once we say that - are we saying that user experience therefore is not relevant to ccTLDs - IDN gTLD?

Chuck: No, I think we want good experience there too. But...

Avri Doria: Right. So basically...

Chuck: ...this document is not dealing with that. This document is dealing with IDN names associated with 3166 country codes. And the...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: ...and maybe we need to just qualify this to say in developing policy for IDN TLD associated with territories and countries, a guiding principle - the user experience should be a guiding principle. A good user experience should be a guiding principle.

Avri Doria: I'm still uncomfortable with it, but if I'm the only one I'll desist. But I think it's dangerous.

Man: Does this putting some wording in like "when appropriate" or "where practical?"

Avri Doria: Yeah, "when appropriate," you know, is fine because, you know, because it may never be appropriate. And in fact "when appropriate" is one of those words that shows up in a UN document. It means it ain't never going to happen.

Woman: What about, Avri, your initial suggestion in terms of limiting the use - you know, we're talking about it in terms of user experience to be able to use the Internet in your first language?

In other words saying in "developing policy for IDN ccTLD is a good user experience on us," meaning, "to be able to use the Internet in your first language,..."

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: Yeah, I don't even think that addition fits here.

Woman: Okay.

Chuck: We've already said earlier that we support the - we're supportive of the introduction of IDN TLDs, and that is basically to be able to use a network in your fist language. We're really saying something different

here. We're saying in the process of introducing those, let's make sure that we maximize a good user experience as much as we can.

Woman: But it is the user experience for those using the network in their first language.

Chuck: Yeah, but that's not what's being stated.

Woman: But I - and maybe a good modifier. Do you object to that as a modifier?

Chuck: Yeah, I think so.

Woman: Oh, okay.

Chuck: Because I think that it detracts from a point that was intended by the group that developed this.

Woman: Yeah. And I think - and I guess it's one of the points in this document that I found problematic. So I think that the issue remains open.

Chuck: Okay. Yeah, that's fine.

Woman: I don't know where other stand on it.

Chuck: Obviously, the Council is going to have to make a decision when we get there.

Any other comments with other people?

Woman: So, just to summarize what I've got at the moment is in developing policy for IDN ccTLD is a good user experience. That's one of the fundamental motivations, et cetera. Do we want to note that this is...

Chuck: Sure.

Woman: I just leave it like that or...

Chuck: It's okay to put a note in there that there's some disagreements here.

Woman: If you put brackets around "good user experience," you indicate that that's a controversial timing, so now just square brackets around it.

Woman: Yeah.

Woman: We know that it's still an open discussion.

Chuck: Okay. Any other...

Woman: And perhaps we can find a place at some point between us that, you know, satisfies...

Chuck: Okay.

Woman: ...or satisfies this.

Chuck: All right. Then going on in the Executive Summary to Number 7 we've already covered. But there's - we've got a comment there from (Edmon). (Edmon), do you want to talk to your comment there on Number 7? Do you want me to read it?

Woman: And so, we were at Number 6, okay.

Chuck: Oh, I'm sorry. I missed the comment there on Number 6. Suggest combining with 7 below with some adjustments for the suggested edits below. Okay, let's see. So, 6 is any added IDN label for a territory design in the 3166, that should be for this sole purpose of benefiting the language community or communities designated by the new label. And 7 then is IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful to the local community and should represent in scripts of the sovereign - okay, and so on.

What do people think? Should those be combined?

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, it's Adrian. I don't think they should. One speaks about purpose and another one speaks about design. So one's talking about how it should be use for the sole purpose of benefiting the language committee. And that's used - and the other one should - that it's representative of script. So I think they're covering two different things.

Chuck: (Edmon), are you still on?

I guess I could look at my...

Woman: (Chung) could be on the line.

Chuck: Okay.

Now, first of all, does everybody understand the - what the intended objectives were for these two? We're trying to narrow, you know, what

can happen in ccNSO space in terms of this. There shouldn't be an opportunity for just introducing some gTLDs that are in the ccNSO space. This really should be related to the - and that's in response to similar questions later on in their document.

So, this is intended to make sure there's a limitation in terms of what IDN TLD is going to be introduced in a ccNSO world.

Anybody not clear on that, in the intentions of 6 and 7?

(Tina): And Chuck, this is (Tina). With that added explanation, I think you should keep it separate because when you try to do something about limiting use, it often seems to be a very difficult thing to do. So if you want to try to get those things - those two points put forward, I would keep them separate.

Chuck: Okay.

Now, can somebody help me? I guess I'm not fully getting (Edmon)'s suggestion here and he's apparently not available at the moment to help us out on that regard. Can maybe somebody on the call can - what is he suggesting besides the combining which so far I've heard people think it's better to keep them separate, what exactly is he suggesting in the added under 7 then?

Nobody is getting that I think.

((Crosstalk))

(Tina): I'm reading it at the moment. Give me a second.

Chuck: Okay. So go ahead. I'll be quiet.

(Tina): Okay.

So, there is one thing in his comment that I would be concerned about because he's talking about the sole purpose of benefiting the corresponding language community in the territory. And it's - when you look at, you know, a language community, I don't think that that can be limited to be within the border of one territory. I mean language communities spread globally around the world...

Chuck: Yeah.

(Tina): ...and it has beneficial for all of them, not just to those who live in the country that the string may be a translation of 4.

Chuck: Yeah.

(Tina): You know, however you want to say that.

Chuck: And I think that - (Tina), what you said is consistent with what the group that I led in developing the first draft of this was trying to get at. We recognized that it wasn't limited to just the country or territory - within the country or territory.

(Tina): Good. So that's what I think it should be.

Chuck: Okay. So for now, until that we can get further explanation from (Edmon), should we just - (Edmon), should we just leave 7 alone?

Okay. And, Liz, you can just put a comment there that wasn't clear. We need additional comments from (Edmon) in terms of what he wants until such time then we'll leave 7 alone. So you might want to leave his comment in there and just add a comment to it that the group did not - wasn't clear on what (Edmon) was suggesting here.

Woman: And also in reading it, I think there's a wider discussion that we have to have when (Edmon) is here, is that he's right that a language community outside the country shouldn't be able to hijack it, but in the same sense, you know, can the language community within a country in some sense prevent the language community outside the country from access. And I'm not quite sure and I think there's again nuances in that discussion that we should have when he's around.

Chuck: Okay. All right. Good.

I think the next comment then is under 12 having to do with variable string links. And (Edmon) suggested we support the notion that variable string links is the appropriate approach or - I'm sorry, the screen scrolled on me, so - is the appropriate approach for IDN TLDs representing territories that - okay. So I thought that's what we're doing. What is it saying...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible) adding that we support the notion as opposed to the blank statement that says "variable with string is the appropriate." We support that notion. I think it was just...

Chuck: Oh, okay.

Woman: I think it was just a wording difference.

Chuck: Yeah, which looks fine to me than what he's saying, yeah. It looked like he was saying the same thing, but he may have said it better so that...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And also he did IDN TLDs as opposed to IDN level. So, it was the wording. I don't see a substantive change there; just the wording.

Chuck: Well except that - yeah, okay, all right. Yeah, so it doesn't look like this changes as they look fine, don't they?

So, Liz, I think if you want to just do what he suggested there, that's okay. Anybody object to that?

Liz Gasster: Got it.

Chuck: Okay. And then under 15, operators of top-level domain registries with IDN TLDs representing territories they can provide their ISO 3166 that should be required to follow up the ICANN IDN guideline.

Woman: I think he's just making a flat statement as opposed to making that a comparative statement. The period, they should support them. You know, yeah, we should support them too, but...

Chuck: Well, that's a lot of different than should be required.

Woman: Should be required? Should be required, no he's saying - I'm sorry. He's saying that should be required just like we're required. But he's not saying that just like we're required part.

Woman: He's also changing the nomenclature from IDN labels?

Chuck: To the TLD, yeah.

Woman: Yeah.

Woman: Because labels are wider than TLDs.

Chuck: And then his, it should be countries then territories (unintelligible) one that we have. Although or is everybody comfortable with just using territories in that thing?

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck: Okay. All right that's fine.

Woman: I think territory has been taken to include countries and go beyond.

Chuck: And then TLD is okay instead of labels. That's a little more explicit and that's really what we're talking about.

So is his statement - his wording okay?

Woman: Works for me.

Chuck: Yeah, looks okay to me too.

Anybody opposed?

Okay. And moving along into a - specific questions in the document. We go then to Number 1, our response to - sorry, I - it'd be nice if there are some way of dealing with that refresh situation so that we could - I don't have to keep scrolling back and forth.

Man: Just lose your Interconnection, Chuck.

Chuck: What's that?

Man: Just lose your interconnection.

Chuck: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

So then it'd be nice if there was a fixed version that we can look at and not change when we're going through this.

Anyway...

Man: Chuck, I can copy a version into an email to send to (Tina) before. So that was easy and you can just scroll through that.

Chuck: Oh, okay. All right...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah. And we'll certainly don't have any problems with it going back and forth.

Chuck: Okay, all right. So does that maintain the coloring and everything?

Man: Yeah, it did. In Outlook it did anyway.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck: Okay. Well that's good. So I'm not going to take the time to do that now, but that's...

((Crosstalk))

Man: You know what, Chuck, I'm going to forward you my - this copy just to keep you going.

Chuck: Okay. Great.

Man: So you can just keep working in here. There'll be something in your inbox (shop).

Chuck: Okay. Because I keep getting bounced around and can't focus on Number 1 actually - wait a second. I don't know; it's a wrong place.

Woman: It may be partly my fault as I edit.

Chuck: Yeah.

Woman: You know...

Chuck: No, no, and I want you to do that.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck: So that's an issue now. Sorry. Just, yeah I'm going to have to get that thing because this is - it just bounced to me all over the place.

Woman: It's strange that it's bouncing you. I keep seeing the edit that she makes, but I stay on the same screen. So I'm not sure why it's working differently for you.

Chuck: Mine keeps scrolling to difference places in the document.

Woman: Oh, okay. I thought you were still focusing on the one we were talking about which is the one that's always in the middle of the screen.

Man: Chuck, I've emailed it. You should have it any second.

Chuck: Okay, thanks. I'll pull that up as soon as I can here.

So now, on Number 1, the - I guess there was no comments there. We go down to Number 3, ccNSO should be primarily responsible for that. And this is - Adrian had a good comment here I think on Number 3 that the reinforcement of the name space between the gTLDs and ccTLD should be determined prior to the allocation of any ccTLDs.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think that was me.

Chuck: Yeah, yeah I know it says you. So and I - oh, did I say Adrian? I'm sorry Avri. Thank you.

Avri Doria: I didn't want him to be accused of this.

Chuck: Yeah, yeah. Sorry about that.

Okay. I've been looking at it and thinking of you and saying Adrian. Sorry. Let me look to my email a second here and see if I got that. Yeah, yeah.

Okay. Oh, good. That will keep me on the track here. That's a very good idea.

Avri Doria: Now there's one issue with this which is the allocation word. And this comes from the other group where I kept talking about allegation - allocation but - and then have been wondering whether it was a portion then or, you know, a different word. So it's certainly not allocation because allocation is what the ccNSO does and then who they allocate it to. It's certainly what they do and what I'm talking about here is the distribution or the definition or the - the (reapportionment).

So, you know, the division of the name space between should be determined if we don't use the reapportionment word.

Reapportionment maybe - it's certainly the one that I use personally, but if we're being more neutral in our language, you know, we may want to say the distribution of the name space between should be determined prior. And it leaves out that notion of reapportionment which gets us into discussion of prior apportionment versus new name space.

Chuck: I'm curious as to comment you made at the beginning there, Avri. You said the ccNSO is responsible for allocation?

Avri Doria: In other words, once names have been determined as being in ccNSO space and ccTLD space, and then let's say we've gone through this whole long process of determining that - and at the end of the day we've decided that any country name, any proper country name, you know, my favorite definition. Let's say we get to - my favorite definition is any country name as it's been used on their currency in the script which you find on their currency is defined as (unintelligible).

How they allocate those to various registries is totally up to that.

Chuck: Oh, okay I got you. Yeah. Yeah.

Avri Doria: And so they're trying to discriminate between the distribution or apportionment of the name space.

Chuck: The apportionment really may be the best word there.

Avri Doria: Right, the apportionment without the "re" part.

Chuck: Uh-huh.

Adrian Kinderis: Now, Chuck, I got - can I ask a question to Avri there?

Chuck: Sure.

Adrian Kinderis: Avri, just to get a better understanding, are you - I agree with the fact that the ccNSO should back the policy, but it's not the ccNSO just going to decide who gets denied from my understanding. Surely that's ICANN (unintelligible) job. Because you can have - you can be the

delegate of the domain name at the moment and has nothing it all do with ccNSO.

Avri Doria: Of course, yes.

Chuck: Yeah. And that's why - that's was kind of addressed my question too, Adrian.

Avri Doria: Okay. You're right it's the allocation policy and not the allocation per se.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes, yeah.

Chuck: Yeah. That's what through me.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay, sorry. Yeah.

Chuck: That's a good clarification.

Thanks, Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Thanks. Thank you.

Chuck: Did you follow all that, Liz?

Liz Gasster: I'm sorry I didn't catch the last part. So we are going to leave the apportionment. We are going to - of the name...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah. Leave apportionment and add allocation policy.

Liz Gasster: Allocation policy?

Avri Doria: And that should be some prior to - oh, no it doesn't matter. It's not saying that the ccNSO is doing it.

Right, so no, that was just side conversation of the comment you made.

Chuck: Yeah, that was your comment that I wanted clarity on...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck: ...so - and that Adrian was just commenting on, so...

Avri Doria: Right. The allocation is something...

Liz Gasster: So is it a parenthetical to the preceding - is this whole phrase (unintelligible) explanation of the preceding?

Avri Doria: Right. You're right. It could be a parenthetical before. Following the apportionment of the name space between gTLDs and ccTLD, the ccNSO should be primary responsible for IDN ccTLD policies, et cetera. It could be a way of doing it.

Liz Gasster: So I thought it was just leaving it the way it was and then - and saying parenthesis, the apportion of the name space should be determined, et cetera.

Avri Doria: Yeah. That's another way of doing it.

Liz Gasster: I don't - however you want, but I don't want to...

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: So I think there are two different ways. I think the way that Avri just said then is the correct one, because if you say as it is at the moment, the apportionment name space, blah, blah, blah, should be done jointly by the gNSO and ccNSO, that's not right.

So the way it's been, if you did following the apportionment of the name space, and that's all you derive to what is existing there at the moment.

Chuck: Yeah. But isn't Avri saying is saying something different that the decisions regarding some apportionment of names, IDN TLDs, into the name spaces of the ccNSO and gNSO needs to happen...

Avri Doria: Right. So yeah, I'm saying both things. I'm saying that the allocation policies get determined following the apportionment and that the apportionment needs to be done jointly.

Chuck: Does that make sense, Adrian? Does that work?

Adrian Kinderis: Can you define apportionment for me please?

Avri Doria: In other words, that's where we're going through this whole process now of saying which part of IDN name space is gTLDs - IDN gTLD space and which part is IDN ccTLD space.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay.

Avri Doria: That particular discussion is one that we haven't had yet. And so that's the long-side view one.

Adrian Kinderis: I just want it to be well clear of any inference of provisioning.

Avri Doria: Yup. That's the third aspect following allocation.

Adrian Kinderis: Yup.

Avri Doria: Correct.

Liz William: Okay. So just to bring us back for Number 3 now, I simply have the parenthetical at the end. Is that right? Or should I also add the apportionment?

Avri Doria: I'm fine with leaving the parenthetical at the moment. We may decide later to...

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...to do a rewording for, you know, legibility. But I'm fine with it as a parenthetical.

Liz Gasster: Great.

Chuck: Okay. All right. Now what did (Edmon) have to say there? Are we consistent what he's suggesting? (Edmon), are you back on?

Avri Doria: Well I thought we had addressed this.

Chuck: Okay. I think we have. I just wanted to confirm that before we move on.

Then Number 4 there, I think I had fixed the numberings so...

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck: ...we're okay on that.

Now, Adrian, you had said there that we'll need some further highlighting and perhaps included there. Do you want to talk about that a little bit?

Adrian Kinderis: That's Avri again, Chuck.

Chuck: I see (A-K) in...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah. No, I said that and then you said it too.

Adrian Kinderis: I'm sorry. Right. Yeah, now all I'm doing is agreeing and sorry, Chuck.
Yeah, I think Avri's point, this is...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: Oh. So you're not saying adding some words; you're just supporting it.
Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah.

Chuck: When you said it needs to be further highlighted, I thought you wanted to say more about that it. Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: No, no, just I guess strengthened. So I believe this is why the gNSO put a new objection process, blah, blah, blah, depending on how we give (unintelligible) of what we've discussed today may impact it. I think that the point could be that - well, I guess I'm just saying it's a strong point and you may want to elaborate on. But I'm not so sure now given what we said today whether it's still a bit right.

Chuck: So should we add the sentence then that says this is why the gNSO put in the objection process that made the GAC and ccNSO objectors withstanding?

Avri Doria: Right. We could modify that slightly and saying, you know, one...

Adrian Kinderis: Mechanism.

Avri Doria: ... - one mechanism for ensuring this is the gNSO objection process...

Chuck: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...that made the GAC and ccNSO objectors withstanding.

Chuck: Sounds okay to me.

Anybody object to that?

Were you able to capture that, Liz?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Chuck: Good. You're a lot better than I am.

Liz Gasster: Well, we'll see if you think so (unintelligible). That's right.

Woman: Actually, I think this is working out quite nicely watching the live document here.

Avri Doria: So you guys can check this on....

Woman: That's right, we can see it and immediately (piped up).

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck: Okay. Now, there's a question there, Adrian, that you asked, does this include your (unintelligible) where the same contractual conditions as gTLDs. And I just commented that that was the intent of it there - of the group that developed this. A whole bunch of comments there. Why don't I just open it up for - rather than reading them or something. Why don't I open it up for discussion on this.

Avri Doria: Yeah. This is a really large issue and that's why I asked the question...

Chuck: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: ... is - I mean, there is no such (parse) opposition within the ccTLD world as far as I know it at the moment as the contractual condition. And there really is no limitation on how a nation or a ccTLD would use.

Now, my approach has always been and therefore we have to be very careful in limiting the number of these things.

And I think the other approach that I think is one you're taking is that the problem doesn't come in the limitation of how many they get it and then how many different (loci) of controls there are and a contractual condition under which they operate. That if they're going to look and quack like a duck, then they should have the same contractual condition as a duck, which is a fine thing, but I think I'm going to say that we have to explicitly work out that theme.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I think what I was saying there, Avri and Chuck, is that there's going to be no chance in hell that some of these countries are going contractually sign anything with ICANN to get their name. They're just going to be somewhat delegated. They're going to assume that just like their ccTLD, they're just going to be delegated this name space.

And so they're not, you know, bound by contract now; why would they be bound by a contract then?

Chuck: And what's the intent of the statement here was is that our position is whether they will do it or not, our position is that shouldn't be allowed to happen in this case because it's a way of the subverting - I mean giving a competitive advantage to a country or territory IDN TLDs at the disadvantage of gNSO IDN gTLD.

Adrian Kinderis: Absolutely. So may you need to answer the question by simply saying consideration needs to be given the fact that it may be hard to contractually (bound) - you know, because the realization is it's going to be very, very hard that contractually bound this guide. And consideration needs to be given that there - that the use of the name is not getting to impact or infringe a gNSO - I mean a top-level domain.

Chuck: So what's wrong with this statement as this worded right now?

Adrian Kinderis: (Unintelligible) explicitly is that - let me - sorry, Chuck. Let me just go back over again.

Chuck: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Well, okay, so why don't you just come out and say - my point is why don't you come out and say quite explicitly it's not - you're not going to be able to get contracts. So maybe you post the question rather than saying it how, you know, we see this is a major issue, is that IDN managers, IDN delegates or territory delegates will not be contractually (bound) had we, you know, how is it proposed, to protect the interest of gNSO registry.

Chuck: Why is that importance of the state that directly?

Adrian Kinderis: Because that's the explicit point is, because (squirting) around the issue because when all actually is saying here - my document just jumped. (Unintelligible), Chuck.

Chuck: Uh-huh.

Adrian Kinderis: Where - what number was it again, 5 right?

Chuck: Five, yeah. That's why I'm not even looking it and why it changes right now since to lead the meeting it makes it almost impossible.

Adrian Kinderis: If the assumption is that - because - again, because you're saying employment criteria, IDN should be similar to those. But how can you - there's no way of ensuring that. There's no way of ensuring the employment criteria.

Chuck: No, you mean it may be very hard to get through, but the bottom line is, is there anything wrong with us having that position?

Adrian Kinderis: Oh no, no, absolutely not. No, in fact I want to strengthen that position by being very, very explicit about it. I want to say do not allow them to infringe.

Chuck: But how do you do that I mean, because how do you do any of this? This is really a tough one.

Adrian Kinderis: That's right. And that's what I'm saying is that this might be the biggest issue we have, is that you're going to hand out these names to literally, entities that you will have now contract with . And that's a big issue to us.

And I don't know that you should even try to provide an answer here other than - and how you're going to deal with that.

Chuck: Well, I think it's important for us to get the point across, whether - I think the chances of having much success on this one are probably

fairly slim, but I still think it's a very valid point. Now, the question is how do we make the point.

Woman: Well could you say, in addition in the absence of a contract, there is no ability to enforce the criteria?

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I like that, Chuck, because that's great wording. Because what that does is because by just doing also, well there's no way you got a contract. And then you're done; they missed the point. Like Avri, by saying that in the absence of a contract, you need to think about another way to protect that.

But that's what I like about that.

Chuck: No, that's - I think that statement sounds okay to me.

Any other comments on that?

Okay. Liz, you have that?

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Chuck: Anybody else want to suggest anything there?

Woman: Can I see what does it look like?

(Tina): Chuck, this is (Tina). I don't know if you guys wanted me to link back up to where you guys are talking about making limits to what kind of strings can be applied for or can be provided as IDN ccTLDs. Because if you make that restrictions, you know, very strong in terms of like how

can you represent a country or territory, then you get - then you eliminate Number 5, right?

Chuck: Yeah. Did everybody - look at what (Edmon) says down below. He says, "The situation whereby ccTLD becomes a de facto gTLD should be avoided." (Unintelligible) "IDN TLDs representing a territory." And then he says, "Then putting what was said in the case where such avoidance is not possible." And then he talks about ICANN's exposure there too. But that first sentence is the one that caught my attention basically saying that that should be avoided when introducing them. That's pretty explicit and doesn't even get into the contractual issue.

Woman: Great. So if you...

(Edmon): Sorry. Actually, I just got back on. Yeah, that's the whole point in terms of - I guess my suggestion is to be explicit right off the bat and say, you know, try to avoid this situation. And then if you can avoid it then, you know, there are other things that you should take into consideration.

Chuck: Yeah. So then we could add some of those other comments there. We may not be able to finish this one. (Unintelligible) I want to leave the last 5 minutes for - we're talking about future work and our target dates, et cetera.

Woman: Is this concept linked to the contractual concept? I know there are several issues under Number 5.

Chuck: Yeah, we'll even - yeah, so I think we're going to have to - I think what we probably better do on this because this is really involved, I think

you're just going to have to say that we're going to have to finish Section A where we're at right now in our next meeting.

Now, so rather than trying to accomplish something that I think is unfeasible, why don't you just make a note, Liz, that this is where we ended on today's call?

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck: And this is what we're going to need more work on this.

Now, what I suggest, Liz is going to finish the revision. And what I'd like to request between now and our first meeting next year is that if people could go in and add comments to what we did today in the version of Liz's document that we have, so that we'll have those. We won't necessarily go back to those comments. We'll decide whether we want to go back to those and finish up what we did today or whether we want to just proceed. I'm not sure which way is the best approach, but we can talk about that.

Anybody have any ideas on that? In our next meeting, should we kind of try and deal with the comments of the ground we've already covered or should we continue proceeding and then come back and deal with the whole document again later? Any thoughts on that?

Liz Gasster: I think we should continue to walk through the document. I think all of us can perhaps take sometime in between and review some of our comments in the light of the discussions we've had. You know, I know that perhaps I can delete or modify some of the comments I have later for things that have been resolved or just make a point that says, you

know, we talked about this up there and so on. So perhaps we can do a little bit of pre-filtering ourselves in the documents before the next meeting. But then I think we should continue walking through.

Chuck: So in other words, add comments between now and our next meeting on the ground that we already covered. And - but we will - when we pick up next time, we will pick up where we left off and continue going through the document, so...

Liz Gasster: Yeah. I think that's okay. I think I want to step further and sort of saying that in the light of what we talked about and the bits and pieces of agreement we've come to, we may be able to go through some of our pending comments and sort of fix correct them in case that we're, you know, still arguing the same point later that we've already resolved, we can all go to our pending comments and see whether they still apply.

Chuck: Yeah. Okay.

Okay. Anybody uncomfortable with that?

All right, well now we need - let's talk. We just got about 4 minutes according to my clock here. As far as the meeting schedule we had set a target for rough draft today or no, later this week, the 20th. And we're obviously not going to achieve that because it didn't work out to have a meeting tomorrow and we wouldn't have achieved it anyway.

But this is - I think we're making - this is working pretty well. We're going to have a holiday break as far as teleconference meeting between the 20th and the 4th of January. So what I suggest that is that we have meetings on the - same time on Tuesdays, the 8th, 15th and

22nd -- 22nd if needed, but I think it probably will be based on the speed that we're going through this. Although I suspect once we grapple with some of these bigger issues that it will go a little bit faster if we get resolution on those.

So, is that okay as far as meetings after the break, the 8th, 15th and 22nd? They're all Tuesdays, same time as today.

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, it's Adrian. I'd like to suggest a different time. Can we change this around a little bit please?

Chuck: How would you suggest changing it?

Adrian Kinderis: Whatever is a little bit more convenient for me, at least on one or two of those meetings.

Liz Gasster: So for the Asian and Australian, basically we shift the time. So we can I ask Glen to suggest some time to us.

Chuck: Glen, can you take care of that?

Glen Desaintgery: I'll take care of that for you, Chuck, yeah.

Liz Gasster: As opposed to try and do it online now we get to choose...

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: Yeah, exactly.

Chuck: Yeah.

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible).

Chuck: Earlier for - earlier means...

Liz Gasster: You might end up at night.

Chuck: ...4:00 am, 3:00 am for me. So, Glen, if you'll do that then we - let's - it'd be helpful if we can...

Adrian Kinderis: I'm not talking LA, Chuck. I just thought we tend to get the gNSO (unintelligible), right? I can do them at 7:00 or 8:00 in the morning and they were fine, so.

Chuck: Oh, okay.

(Edmon): I think, this is (Edmon). I feel comfortable in the middle of the night. I have no problem at, you know, at 2:00 am or something like that.

Chuck: But Adrian doesn't. So let's have - we're going to have Glen give us some...

((Crosstalk))

(Edmon): ...later than this time would be fine with me. I just want to let Glen know, you know, if it ends up at 1:00, 2:00 or even 3:00 am I'm okay with it.

Chuck: Okay. Thanks, (Edmon).

Glen Desaintgery: Thanks to you, (Edmon).

Liz Gasster: Right. (Unintelligible).

Chuck: Okay. Now, we're going to - I think we're going have to extend our target dates. And I'm not even sure; we may have to shoot for the 22nd of January for our draft. I don't think we're going be any close - anywhere as near close to a final. What do you think? Am I wrong in that?

Liz Gasster: Probably.

Chuck: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Why don't we look at the schedule separately and then we can propose...

Chuck: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...something back to the team and to the council. You know, we need to do something before Thursday. And if we're going to be later than what we say we can address it.

Chuck: Yeah. Okay.

Avri Doria: And inform the council. I think that that's the least of our issues.

Chuck: Yup. And so, it's going to take us little longer than we had or that I had anticipated. But that's okay because I think it's really important work. And the target date of the 22nd anyway would have been after the

council meeting on the 17th, so extending it little bit probably isn't going to be that problematic.

Action items prior to next conference meeting, just take a look what we did today in the version that Liz is going to post later, because she still has a few things that she's going to do after our meeting. And feel free to answer comments like we've been doing. And then Glen will send some options for me. Please respond to the options that Glen will provide so that we can get our meeting schedule set up in the next week or so and people can get it on their calendars.

Okay?

Glen Desaintgery: And just a quick question for Avri as our Google Docs expert. I assume I can go back into this later today...

Avri Doria: Anytime.

Glen Desaintgery: ...and make macro changes. Great.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Anytime, you can edit it, we can edit it. It remains there. You know, and I suggest that except for you who have the editing pen, all the rest of us keep working in colors and initial bracketed text, and you would be editing pen or the one making the things in black that look real.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: And I'll go back and fix some of that.

Chuck: Good suggestion.

Avri Doria: Good.

Chuck: Okay.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Chuck: All right. Any questions?

Thanks. Thanks everybody. Have a wonderful next couple of weeks.

Woman: Thank you all of you.

Chuck: And we'll look forward to some meetings then after the first of the year.

Liz Gasster: Yup. For those of you, we'll be talking to several more times next week. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Merry Christmas.

Chuck: Yeah. Okay.

Woman: Bye.

