

GNSO IDN Working Group (WG2) Teleconference

23 January 2007

21:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO IDN Working Group (WG2) teleconference on 23 January 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 recording may be found at:

<http://gns0-audio.icann.org/IDN-wg2-20070123.mp3>

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

agenda:

<http://gns0.icann.org/meetings/agenda-idn-IDN-topics-23jan07.pdf>

Participants on the call:

Ram Mohan - Working Group Chair

Mark McFadden - ISPC

Maggie Mansourkia - ISPC

Cary Karp - GNSO Council gTLD Constituency

June Seo - gTLD Constituency

Alistair Dixon - GNSO Council CBUC

Marilyn Cade - GNSO Council CBUC (joined late)

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Yoav Keren - Registrar Constituency

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to GNSO Council

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to GNSO Council

Hong Xue - ALAC liaison

Dan Dougherty - IPC observer

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Glen de Saint Gery - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: This is the conference coordinator. I just wanted to remind all parties today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Otherwise, Mr. Ram Mohan, you may begin.

Ram Mohan: Thank you very much.

Welcome everyone to the GNSO IDN Working Group, the paired call. This is the second call of this Tuesday. Glen, could you do the roll call please.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, I will do that.

We have on the call (Olop Nordling) from the staff, (Mark MacFadden), ISP, Alistair Dixon, Business Constituency, Cary Karp, Registry Constituency, and Sophia Bekele is the Nominating Committee Appointee to the council.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Welcome, Sophia, I didn't realize you'd come on.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, I did. I supposed I missed the - this morning. Hello everyone and happy New Year. I didn't talk to anyone since the New Year.

Ram Mohan: Happy New Year to you as well.

Man: Happy New Year to you too, Sophia.

Ram Mohan: Well, folks, we have a pretty full-on agenda for today. And actually a pretty full-on agenda between here and Lisbon and we're going to be the working group that kind of emphasizes the word working work.

Let me start off with just a quick reiteration of the purpose of our working group, the GNSO IDN Working Group, just to identify and specify any policy issues that should be considered by the GNSO via a policy development process that has already not been considered within the PDP December 2005.

What this translates to is our job here is review at least four sets of documents, new gTLD draft recommendations, (unintelligible) ICANN staff issues report, and the IAB document, the RFC4690, to discuss research and debate any policy implications that exist for IDN gTLD, and to prepare a report that needs to be submitted by March 21, 2007, a week prior to the GNSO council meeting in Lisbon, Portugal that has a focus on policy matters that maybe shared or maybe in conflict with the ccNSO, as well as policy issues that may merit the creation of a new PDP process.

The plan of operation is pretty clear, we have 18 meetings scheduled, this is meeting number two and we meet every Tuesday at - our set time for 90 minutes. Each pair of meetings will be focused on specific agenda topics.

One of the questions that have been asked was how we plan to make sure that this coordination and update between - and continuity between the pair of calls and our plan is that (Olop) and I will be sending not only a summary of the call but also a summary of the major areas of convergence and divergence between each of the paired calls.

Given that each of the calls will - is both being recorded and transcripts being made available, it provides members the ability to look at the summaries and look at the areas where they may have a desire to listen in more or hear a little bit more of what is going on and be able to jump directly to that part of the recording or on the transcripts.

We have a really significant calendar in terms of work that has to be done. I would like for us to complete the review process of these four sets of documents by February 6th, two weeks from now. And create a draft outcome document that kind of starts to talk about what are the policy issues that we think - or at least what are the outcomes of our review from these four documents.

and begin literally from this week onwards begin our discussion and research into the policy implication and have a draft conclusion - set of draft conclusions around the marketed timeframe so that the working group can review a draft report, March 13th, and finalize it a week from there and actually issue it for the council and public comment on the 21st.

(June Say): Mr. Mohan, this is (June Say) also in the call. I apologize for being late.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (June), for joining.

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: Can I interrupt for a moment because we have more people on the call. We've got (Maggi Nunsuckia), we've got (York Cane), (Mike Rosenbaum), (June Say), and (Hung Yu).

Ram Mohan: Wonderful. Welcome everybody and thank you for being on the call. If you would like to follow along, we're on Slide Number 5 of the agenda which is in the PDF on the GNSO Web site and also in the email that was sent to you - the link is in the email that was sent to you.

Let's talk for a moment about a few administrative details which is merely a reminder as to whom it joined the GNSO IDN Working Group but restricted to constituency members or GNSO council members and to ICANN advisory group liaisons, we don't have any as of yet but I'm certain that we will have some appointed before our work is done.

I wanted to just take a minute and communicate my expectations of members of this IDN Working Group, the GNSO IDN Working Group. The expectation is not that you be an IDN expert or that you have a completely comprehensive idea of all things IDN. However, my expectation is that you're in the working group because you have a strong interest in IDN and that you will spend the time and the efforts to read the summary documents, to do the necessary research that is required to make meaningful contributions into the working group, to come to decisions on which issues you or your constituency cared most about, to certainly inform and consult with a constituency so that you'd bring the discussions of what we are doing in the working group back to your constituencies and come back into the working group with informed advice, opinions that your constituency may have on the various policy topics, and, you know, really come prepared to our meetings.

We will send out summary documents, we will send out agendas in general, we will send them out more than a few days ahead of time, similar to what we did to this week's meeting. And I certainly expect that when we get into detailed work, that we will be able to delve directly into it rather than begin discussing it for the very first time for each of you on the call.

I had on the administrative side I had I guess one more item which is as you have seen last week, Bruce Tonkin sent a note about the GNSO IDN Working Group appointing an observer to the CCNSO and the GAC Joint Working Group.

So one of the questions that has come to me quite frequently as a result of that has been asking what, if any, are the qualifications for such as individual and what I expect the job to entail.

And just, I guess, quite clearly my expectation is that this is an observer and reporting back role. There is not a larger degree of authority or influence, et cetera, that goes with it. And, in fact, I anticipate that this role is going to require a significant time commitment from whoever is going to be doing it primarily because in this role, I anticipate that the individual will have to listen in to both of the GNSO IDN Working Group calls to have a good idea of the full range of the discussion and also be able to listen in to the entirety of the ccNSO GAC joint working hall. But the primary role here is to listen attentively and to report back on both sides accurately and with fidelity on what is going on.

I'm pleased to report to you that we have a good number of folks who have written in to be appointed to this role and I'm going through - discussing with each of these individuals in a short amount of time we'll be able to make the announcements as to who will be our liaison.

I'm going to pause here for a second because this kind of gets us to the end of the administrative section and ask if there are any questions before we jump into the meet of the call.

Sophia Bekele: Ram Mohan, this is Sophia.

I have a question.

Ram Mohan: Hi, Sophia. Go ahead.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. Just on the administrative stuff, I was just listening to the prior call's recording earlier and I know a lot of these materials or the stuff that you are talking about has been covered on there. Just to understand moving forward, we have two paired session as you said and I'm thinking or you can clarify for me if one is a continuation like the second one so jump in the morning call, you have an agenda and then the second call would be a continuation of the first. Or are we sort of like expected to perhaps listen to the calls that we didn't listen to on?

And as a Chair, how are you trying to manage that in terms of not to repeat what you have said in the morning or spend minutes on capping up or summarizing.

Ram Mohan: Given that with the exception of (Olop), Glen, and myself, most of the other members on each call are actually quite unique and are new to the topic. I don't anticipate that we're merely going to continue where the previous call left off. I don't think that works quite well. The idea is to have the full discussion in this call.

The advantage of the second call is that there is ability to inform members of the second call as to opinions that have been received on the first call. But in any case, the intent is that once both calls are done, that on the staff side, (Olop) and I, we will end up putting together a summary for the entire group

to be able to go through and understand where the convergences and where the divergences were.

So certainly while there is some level of repetition, mostly the repetition is at the cost myself and (Olop) and Glen and we're certainly fine at doing it because it means that each call - the members of each call are dealt with the same hand rather than the members of the second call to some extent having to devote an extra 90 minutes in prior prep.

It is wonderful if members of the second call actually listen in to the first call because it provides a little better level of continuity. But it is no requirement.

Sophia Bekele: Okay. So we're saying the agenda is the same on both calks?

Ram Mohan: The agenda is the same on each call, yes, on each pair.

Sophia Bekele: All right, thank you.

Ram Mohan: You're welcome.

Any other questions?

Man: Well, it's (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Go ahead.

Man: On the mailing list, there has been a discussion about possibly having two liaisons to the ccNSO GAC working group as well. Have you thought about that and here does that stand?

Ram Mohan: I think, unfortunately, in that area, we just have to go with what we have been requested, which is to appoint to single liaison. My part is also that while two liaisons means that there is a possibility of some back-up, I also worry about discontinuity of communication between one and the other.

I also need to consult with the Chairs of the different councils. So far, the preliminary reaction that I have heard about is one saying just stick to the rules and get going.

Man: Thanks.

Ram Mohan: You're welcome.

Okay, let's get into the meat of the discussion today. Our goal here is to obviously talk about IDN and specifically IDN as they may occur at the top level of the domain main system.

Now, for those of you who listened to the first call, you probably heard us spend a little bit of time on Slide Number 6, which is definitions that we need to understand.

Let me quickly summarize some of the discussion that happened there because I suspect that many of the points from there you may have concurrence with.

In summary, the fundamental reason for working on important definitions is to really understand so that as we go forward and have a dialog on IDN, we have - then we - when somebody says, you know, I'm talking about a variant or I'm talking about (translation) that everybody has at least a place to go to to say, "f I didn't understand what that meant, here is what it really means."

To aid that what we are planning to do is to open up a wiki that allows for some level of both collaborative writing, as well as it's an open model that as we discover new terms that we think requires to be noted somewhere will have a place to go and add that new term.

Another point that did come up was that we probably will add terms as we go along and as we discuss. And my request is once we have the wiki started, we will provide the links to it and my request is as each of you works together on looking at various documents or various discussions, if you find terms that you think are important for the working group to either already - to know about, you know, existing definitions, or new definitions that you think we should propose definitions for terms that we should propose definitions for that you place those in the wiki that we will be creating here shortly.

Moving on to Slide Number 7, which is really the heart of our job here. What I've done here, (Olop) and I, what we've done on this set of slides is to summarize and get some high level headlines of the major areas and issues that have been discussed to-date most recently in Sao Paulo and to really summarize them into seven major headlines.

And the idea here on today's call is to really go through each of these topics, spark a discussion on each of these major headlines. And the goal in today's call is to initiate early talks and opinions on each of these areas to see what your thoughts are on policy matters that should be discussed and directions that you think we should be going on.

So, as we hit each topic, you will hear me coming to you and saying, "Do you think what's here is appropriate and do you have any items to add?" And that's really my way of asking you, "Are the policy matters as briefly encapsulated

in the bullet point here appropriate? And, B, are there other policy matters in these headlines, in these headings that should be added?"

So, that takes us to Slide Number 8. The order, by the way, of these topics is pretty much random. There is no intended prioritization of these topics. And, in fact, my hope is that in our call next week, we will get to prioritize these seven major topics and get to decide which are the areas that we think are deserving of a larger amount of our time and attention as compared to others.

So the first topic is introduction of new gTLD. And some of questions that have been raised so far for discussion in our working group have been, what, if any, is a policy impact on new gTLD introduction by IDN gTLD and whether the introduction of new gTLD ought to wait for the completion of IDN gTLD issue. And also, what, if any, are reserved name policies that should be adapted in new gTLD with respect to IDN TLD.

Before we launch into the discussion, let me give you a very brief summary of some of the main points that I had noted down, you know, prior call.

One of the points that was - one of the suggestions that came through was perhaps that new gTLD should not be delayed by the introduction of IDN gTLD and, in fact, that as long as applications in the new gTLD round allow IDN gTLD, evaluation of IDN gTLD could be done on a phase manner where certain criteria could be set out to determine which IDN gTLD ought to be rolled out first.

Mention was made of sample criteria such as the population of the language users or the ease of development. So for example Arabic or Chinese were mentioned as possible examples.

There was also a little bit of discussion on variance and whether variance of a IDN gTLD, but they should be bundled exposed, so to speak, or whether restrictions should be placed on any other variance at the top level of the - applied for IDN gTLD whether there should restrictions.

So that's been the discussion so far and the topic so far. And I'll open it up for discussion here.

In terms of protocol, what I would like for you to do is to please place yourselves in a queue because I find it pretty hard to listen to more than one person at the same time and actually make some sense of it.

Are there any comments, does anyone have comments or discussion on this topic?

Alistair Dixon: Mr. Mohan, can I join the queue please?

Ram Mohan: You're on and you have the floor.

Alistair Dixon: Okay. I guess my comment on this particular topic is in a policy scene, is there anything about IDN gTLD that would affix the policy for new gTLD introduction? Because I guess if there aren't any policy implications on flowing from IDN gTLD that would in anyway affix new gTLD introduction, then I would agree that there is no need to wait for IDN gTLD, you know, for IDN gTLD policy before going to hit with new gTLD introduction.

It seems to me that if anything flows from policy around IDN then that would in some way affix the introduction of new gTLD, then it may make sense to hold off the introduction of new gTLD. But if there isn't anything, I mean, in other words, I guess, if the group doesn't identify anything and then I can't

see why from a policy point of view, there might be policy reasons, but from a policy point of view, why would hold off on the introduction of new gTLDs.

(Mike Rosenbaum): This is (Mike Rosenbaum), can I join the queue?

Ram Mohan: You got it, (Mike), and you have the floor.

(Mike Rosenbaum): Great. I mean, just, you know, following up on Alistair, I think he makes a very good point although I do think that we already have identified issues in IDN TLDs that do apply for new gTLD policy. You know, obviously, just the similarity between IDN strengths that might be applied for in the next round in new gTLDs.

I also just think that as a practical matter that IDN ought to be prioritized over non-IDN new gTLDs so that - I don't see much need for new gTLDs, to be frank, and I see a much greater need for IDN for a lot of different reasons.

So I recommend IDN do be reserved in this next application round and that we make them available as soon as they're technically possible to be made available, but that certainly new gTLD should wait until IDN policy issues are resolved.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Terrific.

Any other comments?

Cary Karp: Cary here.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Cary, you have the floor.

Cary Karp: It maybe worth noting that although there's some still considerable uncertainty about the modifications that are likely to be made to the IDNA protocol. The constraints that apply to the top level implementation, the top level application of IDN are probably so clear at this point that they're reasonably unlikely not to be disrupted.

So I mean just - we don't anticipate being digits for example in gTLD strength regardless of what character repertoires is otherwise available and we don't expect to see decorated - well, we do see decorated, I'm sorry, I'm going to get myself in a little corner in about two minutes to keep this up.

Nonetheless, it's possible to proceed in the discussion of IDN on the top level with some rated degree of freedom than we currently discussed at the implementation of IDN on the second level despite the fact that authority being applied there.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary.

Any other comments on this topic?

What do you feel - what does the group feel about some of the discussions earlier of even among IDN gTLD applications that might come in the next round to arrive at some sort of criteria to determine which TLD should be rolled out, which IDN TLD should be evaluated first and rolled out? Do you have any thoughts or opinions on that?

Man: The applied force should probably be evaluated first.

Alistair Dixon: Could I join the queue round, it's Alistair.

Ram Mohan: Alistair, you're on and you have the floor.

Alistair Dixon: I guess, my take on it would be the criteria for determining which IDN gTLD should be rolled out first. I guess, again, I'd comment from the standpoint is why would it be different to new gTLD, I mean, if there are reasons, why they should be - the criteria should be any different in new gTLDs. The new gTLD wasn't, excuse me, discussed this extensively and I haven't heard anything around the IDN issue, which would say that's any different.

I mean, I think for me, the new gTLD approach is system preserved and I guess, I mean, it's a question of what you then do if this (unintelligible) applications and that still I think to be fully resolved. But I guess my take would be - oh, I guess my first position would be to say adapted approach taken for new gTLDs for IDN.

Ram Mohan: Got it.

And perhaps, I can see a little bit of light on why there wasn't a discussion or even a request to create criteria. It was - the example that was quoted was for example, if there is a request for an IDN gTLD in, say, Arabic, which has a large population that is actually not necessarily completely conversant or uses English regularly as compared to an IDN gTLD application in, say, French, that perhaps Arabic should be given a higher priority simply because there is a greater perceived need.

Cary Karp: Cary to speak please.

Ram Mohan: Okay. You're on, Cary, you have the floor.

Cary Karp: We can probably generalize on that. If we have some notion of insufficiency of the act repertoire as of - on a scale that the English language cannot be fully represented using ASCII, but it doesn't really bother anybody.

The languages that you script that are written right to left are about as different - alphabetic language - alphabetic script written right to left are as distant from ASCII as you can get and non-alphabetic languages are more distant still.

So the things that are really missing would be the logical things to wait more heavily if there's an unexpected situation. If nobody asked something, we don't need to worry about how we prioritize this compared to other things that have been asked before.

So there's a certain notion of this distance from ASCII and an insufficiency that could be weighed into any abstract discussion of this.

(Mike Rosenbaum): This is (Mike Rosenbaum).

I would just add on that it seems that there's, again, places where there are similarities between the new gTLD policy work going on and the IDN policy work going on like - that to seem to me to be an equal itself and should be therefore be considered together.

(Gio Al): Ram, this is (Gio Al) here.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead (Gio), you have the floor.

(Gio Al): Thank you.

I just wanted to note something about what you said to consider maybe IDN gTLD coming from a large population. I'm not sure if this should be the criteria, the number of language speakers. I think that, you know, if we - let's say tomorrow we'll - ICANN will get an application from, I don't know, some distant language, African language where there are some script. I don't - nothing comes to my mind now. I think that would be something that should be considered also in a high priority because these are usually those parts of the world that less use the Internet right now, and IDN is needed for those that less - use the Internet view to constraint of using only the English language.

So I think that the number of known speakers shouldn't be the criteria, but more what Cary said, the distance from the English script would be more important in the criteria if we decide them on criteria.

And I would like also to support what was said before, I also think that we need IDN gTLD, the inter-community needs IDN gTLD much before any other new English script gTLD because we still have a few gTLDs that no one uses really. So before we have a few more, let's have some IDN that have some - that will help the Internet develop in some part of the world that is not developed.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Folks, would I be correct in paraphrasing then that there is - that some level of rough consensus exists among us on the call that IDN gTLD should definitely be a part of the next round, barring any significant, you know, policy implications and that there is rough consensus that in the evaluation of IDN gTLD where it is appropriate to apply specific criteria for defining which IDN TLD to consider that perhaps application of criteria is allowable or is okay and not really get into what those criteria might be.

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

Ram Mohan: Yes, please.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah. I was going to ask you to get before you had a rough consensus call, you may have roughly - but certainly don't have consensus, I was going to comment before that I think it's probably inappropriate to link the new gTLD, the resolution of the IDN. I certainly think we have to move on the IDN as quickly as possible. I think there's a pent-up demand for new gTLDs (unintelligible) is for new IDN and while we have to be careful in using TLD not to do things that make it difficult for future IDN if for policy or technical reasons IDN are not ready to go when new gTLDs are ready to go, the new gTLD should not be held hostage.

So I would argue that at least on one voice that you might still have rough consensus on the only voice. But I do not think that new gTLD could be postponed into IDN.

Ram Mohan: So let me clarify what - I guess what I was trying to paraphrase perhaps that is in perfectly, I was not trying to paraphrase that there is rough consensus that new gTLDs should wait for IDN gTLD, but rather that when new gTLD rounds go through that application for IDN gTLD should suddenly be a part of the group that comes in.

And in evaluating that group of IDN gTLDs, there seems to be at least to my listening to everybody here that there is some rough consensus that criteria for determining which ones ought to be prioritized perhaps might not be a bad approach.

Avri Doria: Only if, I guess, I would agree except as long as we use Cary's definition that the priority is those who have been applied for.

Ram Mohan: Agreed.

(Mark McFatten): Ram, it's (Mark McFatten), I'd like to get in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Okay, (Mark), and you have the floor.

Was there somebody else who wanted to get in?

Sophia Bekele: Yes. Sophia from (unintelligible).

Cary Karp: And Cary...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Okay.

(Mark), Sophia, Cary.

(Mark McFatten): Okay. A problem I have with this formulation is that it would seem that the policy issues have been dealt with prior to the applications for the new gTLD, and I think that when you're building your consensus formulation, what's important to me there is that the policy issues need to be identified prior to development of criteria for either preferential treatment or the setting of criteria for deciding on what new TLDs are approved. It wasn't in your initial formulation but I think those policy issues not only have to be identified but in some meaningful way resolved.

Ram Mohan: Understand. I guess my very quick response to that is I don't think my formulation intends to rush forward without the policy issues being identified. But somewhere along the way, I guess we will have to arrive at some level of can they be - can all the policy issues identified be resolved before IDN gTLDs can be evaluated. And, you know, it's hard to predict the future.

(Olop Nordling): Ram, this is (Olop).

Maybe - since I hear some echoes from what was in-depth - pretty much in-depth discussed at the very last day at the Amsterdam meeting in new TLD committees, maybe I could just recap that because I think there was - it's not consensus, at least strong support for the notion of being able to go as far as for reserved IDN TLD in the first new TLD round.

So perhaps having to wait then until all necessary issues have been resolved, but just for clarification of the previous discussion that occurred in the new TLD committee on this.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Olop). That is helpful.

Sophia, I have you next on the queue.

Sophia Bekele: Yes, thank you, Ram.

The only comment I wanted to say is basically really the purpose of this working group - I should really to make this particular decision on the gTLDs and the IDN gTLDs and the policy around it, it's not necessarily the technical issues and any other issues that we used to worry about.

And so, I think it's very important to grab the consensus like Ram is doing and get early into funding of what the group is thinking in terms of the prioritization. And I think you can add me in that consensus, Ram. I think this has been a very big issue and the priority should focus on the IDN gTLDs.

And I recall when we were putting the policy together earlier this year for the gTLDs, contrary to what Avri has mentioned, you know, one of the issues I had was that the gTLD policy actually could hold the IDN as gTLD releases the hostage versus the other way around.

So I think it's very important, yes, to identify the policy issues now before the detailed criteria, but I think one of the most significant parts of that why this working group is put together, and I think we should press upon that.

Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Sophia.

Cary, I have you next.

Cary Karp: Yeah, I think there are two separate reasons for why the one category might be prioritized over the other.

The one is simply the slow paced of the small numbers at which new TLDs are created. So that having another round of non-IDN TLDs would put the availability of IDN TLDs on such a distant horizon that there might be some reasons to be concerned about that. And that's one kind of problem.

The other kind of problem is actually more amenable to analysis and them being weighed into whatever applications are ultimately solicited in the next

round. And that's seeing too that nobody is permitted to submit a pure ASCII strength that some has deceptively exploitable masking abilities non-ASCII string, the one that we've talked about when we were in Amsterdam was what would look like the sequence Z-A-X-A-T of Latin letters, which is a Cyrillic word (unintelligible) meaning sugar.

So there is a certain amount of our spec to be applied to the crafting of an ASCII strength that would make a potentially valuable IDN strength non-available or turn it into a commercial situation external to the actual TLD allocation process.

So I think we should have to be kind of careful about things. But one shouldn't be held hostage for the other without having first analyze all of the factors that might cause genuine concern if only IDN or only ASCII were to be the substance of the next round.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary.

Alistair Dixon: Ram, can I join the queue? It's Alistair.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead, Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: I think I would agree with your characterization of the consensus. But I think I also, I mean, I think (Mark) and Cary say that - excuse me, I think what I would also agree with in a slightly - but mostly the same thing, slight different way. And that, basically, if there are policy issues, and for example, around the confusingly similar issues. I think it is important that they are clearly identified and as possible resolved before there is any implications.

So I think it's important that applicants are aware of basically the rules around which the applications would be ceased. And so I think it's important that we do have clarity on what those rules are.

So I think just mere identification of the policy issues, I don't think really is sufficient from the point of ensuring certainty for applications. But I would certainly agree with what (unintelligible) that the variability of IDN is very important, and there - and you know, so I certainly wouldn't wish as ever possible for making those - making IDNs available to be held up, I think it's important that it is expedited as much as possible.

Ram Mohan: Great. I have - yes?

Man: Can I just make a quick comment? I think to - well, talking about resolving the issues, if we can find the issues that - in that sense has been resolved. For example, taking the Russian case of Zaxat in which you could put preempt by applying for Zaxat in ASCII or España which you could preempt by writing Espana without the (unintelligible) for the N.

Well, those cases would probably be clearly identified as confusing the similar, and partly I have a solution to that provided there is a possibility that they can apply concurrently. So maybe there are solutions already in the new elite recommendations which can apply and can help to resolve issues which we identify here.

Ram Mohan: Okay. It sounds to me that we have some convergence around the following areas. A, that policy implications in IDN TLDs and so far as they apply it to - in the new TTLD round that they need to be identified and in areas where there are of immediate and urgent relevance prior to being added to the zone - to the root zone that they - these policy issues actually be resolved as well.

I also hear that IDNs should have a very high priority and that there should not be - neither new gTLDs nor IDN gTLDs considering IDN gTLDs are a subset but one shouldn't be held hostage to the completion of issues in the other.

And that there was a general agreement that criteria for determining which IDN gTLDs ought to get evaluated earlier than the other, that there is some general agreement that the creation of criteria is a generally good approach in making such determination.

Cary Karp: Can you put Cary in the queue?

Ram Mohan: Cary, you're on the queue and you have the floor.

Cary Karp: This suggests something that we probably haven't thought about quite as clearly as we need to. And that is given that we need to see what's ripped or requested in - for IDN TLD use, it's very difficult to know what we actually need to prioritize up against anything else. So there's going to be a need for some period subsequent to the submission of request for IDN string.

And the actual processing of those some requests during which the use of weighing criteria need to be clearly established when I think of it, and we can be preempted about it. We can articulate numbers of general principles that might be invoked if it were applicable in light of the actual application.

But it's probably going to take longer to process a batch of IDN applications and this is going to take the process a batch of ASCII applications even if - so the consequences even if there's one single call where both will be permitted.

So somehow the IDN stuffs those that comes up on the short end of the stick probably for no other reasons, it's just do - we haven't done it before and therefore, it is going to take longer.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary.

We'll do is when get the summary out of this call, we'll get this - the sense of convergence quite clearly written out and that provides an opportunity for all to go through it and to modify and tweak it so that we actually get it to the point where we do have a convergence and consensus.

Sophia Bekele: Ram, can I just jump in on this? Sophia here.

Ram Mohan: Sure.

Sophia Bekele: Yes. I just want to say I think that we spend almost a couple of hours on this, during the Sao Paulo meeting actually, on discussing some of the criteria on how to, you know, how to do the gTLDs and so forth. I think it's worth it to look at that paperwork; that was the one that Bruce was sharing. I think there was a lot to draw from that. I don't recall specifically, but I think we had discussed a lot of criteria on what the criteria should be actually.

So I think all of you might remember that even presented it there in various meetings. So that's something to look or incorporate in the next.

(Olop Nordling): I think we have - this is (Olop).

I think that - I've tried to summarized that to - but at least coming from the key points in those criteria, in the little summary, and that I think 14 issues

which I sent out to you earlier just before Christmas. So it's maybe worth right to have a look at that and...

Sophia Bekele: We can start from there, I mean...

(Olop Nordling): Yes.

Sophia Bekele: ...so we don't have to deliberate from the same issues over again.

(Olop Nordling): No, I mean, basically that was all for the basis for this compilation which - where Ram has put it up on a more topical level to - in order to get the structure on the work.

Sophia Bekele: If I understand, I think, what Ram has put his way, you know, with the subject matter again, and I think we have already discussed many of the issues. So it's a matter of, I guess, matching those two again and then starting other discussion points from there. Because I think we're brainstorming fresh again on this, and I think we've already brainstormed pretty well is all I'm trying to say.

Thanks.

Ram Mohan: Fair enough. And my takeaway on this is that for the next time we actually get into these details is perhaps to have the high level headline come through, and then for (Olop) to quickly go through what's already been discussed so that we don't repeat ourselves.

I'd like to move our attention now to the second topic that is here in front of us which is the technical policy details. And there are a number of topics that are kind of written under red.

My question to you is, do you think that there are other areas of policy that are impinged by technology or vice versa that this working group needs to consider? And if so, what are they?

(Unintelligible) at once.

Man: Okay, I can speak.

The first point - we're on Slide 8, I presume. Those...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Yes, Slide 8.

Man: Okay. (Unintelligible) at all TLD levels be a requirement, what mechanism exists that allows homogeneity of scripts to override the delegation principles that are fundamental to the DNS?

I mean, it's clear that if ICANN which controls the top level name space, permits a Cyrillic strength to be entered into the route, and the operator of that TLD imposes requirement that any registrant in its TLD needs to register as a real strength, how can the operator of the TLD be certain on that down the second level name holder will impose the obligation on the third level and onwards - down onwards to the three. And there's no - is there any mechanism whereby that could be believed that one knows it's true?

Alistair Dixon: Could I join the queue, Ram, please? It's Alistair.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Alistair, you are in the queue. And you have the floor.

Alistair Dixon: I guess my take on this question would be I don't think there need be a requirement unless there are implications or security in stability of the entity. And so, I mean, I think for particular issues that I think we have discussed several times is the confusingly similar issue. If there's a problem there I think might need to be restrictions, but otherwise, I'm not aware of any reasons why there should be restrictions.

A few technical reasons why they need to be restrictions, well, that's another matter, but from a policy point of view, so long as there aren't implications for security and stability, I'm not - I (unintelligible) at this stage of any reasons why there should be a restriction such single script adherence.

Cary Karp: My question was if there is a technical basis for restriction at all. And I regard that as a normally - enormously effective idea and my question is simply is there a mechanism for supporting it?

Man: It's enforceability that you are worried about, Cary.

Cary Karp: Yeah.

Man: Because you can enforce it as a top level, but you can't enforce it easily. At least technically, you cannot enforce it at level further below.

Cary Karp: Unless (unintelligible) with no delegation. And if a single agency except registration for multi-label names and delegates none of them that is doable but that is counted to the entire notion of the DNS.

Woman: Ram, may I ask question? Could someone give us an example of exactly what Cary is saying, for example, what script and how it's implemented and the issue of multiple...

Ram Mohan: Well, I guess - sure. Let me take a whack at it. So let's say that there is an IDN top level domain that has been allocated in Chinese, now there is - as far as we know, as far as I know, there is no effective technical way just to make sure that at the third level, in other words, if it is (dot-dot-China) or if it is say (dot) I don't know (dot) example in Chinese at the top level, there is no really good way to make sure that at the third level or the second level, somebody doesn't go and register a second level domain name or a third level piece that is now written in say Arabic.

Woman: And why should that be an issue?

Ram Mohan: Well, based on the entire confusability issue. We have decided that it's not a good idea to allow Cyrillic letters and Latin letters to appear in a single domain name label because they can so easily generate deliberate confusion at a view.

Woman: Another question.

Ram Mohan: Yeah. And if we allow Cyrillic to appear in a label and then a (dot) and then a Latin label, the potential for confusion is right back again.

Man: Could I join the queue?

Ram Mohan: (Maggi)?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Okay. Someone had a point of clarification. Was it (Maggi)?

Woman: No, that was (Maggi)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Oh, I'm sorry, (unintelligible).

Woman: No, no, it wasn't me.

Ram Mohan: Okay?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I had thought and this is perhaps expanding the discussion, I have thought that the purity of script - as a single script was only per label. When did it move to per second layer or third layer and for multiple labels?

Ram Mohan: From the notes I've seen, it seemed like this was discussed in Sao Paulo.

Avri Doria: I had thought we were limited to once script per label, but I did not know like I don't have a response (unintelligible) where we were (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn; just joining.

Ram Mohan: Hi, Marilyn, welcome.

Marilyn Cade: I must say, I'm coming in late to the conversation, but I think I'd share Avri's recollection or perception, maybe that's the better word.

(Olop Nordling): This is (Olop). May I (unintelligible) from that?

I think we in Sao Paulo the subject matter. I mean, we do have the IDN guidelines and those are the new version that they talk about single script and single language treated for a particular strength or labeling that we need to define what we mean by that.

But the discussion in Sao Paulo was rather exactly what we're having right now whether if we have an IDN top level domain with a strength and that should adhere to the IDN guideline, because that seems to be general consensus about that. So it should be in a single script and you see a mixture of scripts. Should it then be so that the second level at least, because I think that the discussion in Sao Paulo ended with a slight concern that while beyond the second level it could be unenforceable anyway, and - but this was something considered for the working group.

Avri Doria: Are you saying that the second level must be in a single script or you're saying that the second level must be in the script as the first level?

(Olop Nordling): I think what exactly...

((Crosstalk))

(Olop Nordling): ...the second level would be a single script. I think that's already in the IDN guideline.

Avri Doria: Right.

Woman: Right, right.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I think what was intended here was that the second level be in the same script as the top level.

(Olop Nordling): Yes.

Man: Right, which was...

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: It's Alistair. Can I join the queue please?

Ram Mohan: You got it. Alistair, and you've been waiting patiently. So why don't you take the floor.

Alistair Dixon: It seems to me that this issue, well, I think (unintelligible) we've now come on two issues rather than one. So firstly in terms of the questions that's on this document and the example of Cyrillic versus ASCII; that is only an issue if it's a problem of confusing similarity.

If we're talking about ASCII in Chinese, I can't see why there would be a problem of confusing similarity. So it seems to me that the confusingly similar requirement is what should be the requirements here and that would apply in the case of some Cyrillic with this as ASCII would, as perhaps Greek words but then would not apply in the case of some other scripts.

In terms of our labels, I guess from (unintelligible), again, only becomes an issue when you have this problem of confusing similarity. I mean, if you had a mixture of, say, ASCII and Chinese, again, I can't see that there's a policy

issue within a label on this because there's no problem of confusing similarity unless I'm not understanding something here.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Alistair.

Let me quickly interject and just say that when the IDN guidelines group got together, one of the reasons why the single script admonition went out was because rather than the manufacturers were unmasked, simply rejecting any domain names that had mixed scripts in them.

So that's just something to consider while there may not be practical policy issues, but they might actually be a practical you want to consider if browser manufacturers have it coded it into their systems to treat domain names that have more than one script in it suspiciously or perhaps to block it all together.

Alistair Dixon: Right. I mean, if I could just respond to this. I mean, if they were practical and/or technical reasons why this is a, you know, that is a bad idea to have two scripts and one label, then I think it would be appropriate to continue with that requirement.

Avri Doria: It's Avri. Can I get in the queue?

Ram Mohan: Correct.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Okay, and you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Ram Mohan: And who was the second person who wanted to be in the queue?

Cary Karp: Cary.

Ram Mohan: Cary, okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah. I think first of all, I think the application artifact is an artifact (that now). But I think if there was a reasonable policy that's been out to discuss in terms of language and not jumping complete, you know, strengths or domain names than, you know, application artifacts can change.

The other thing is as looking at the reverse side and will end up with unless we're going to put limits on new, you know, regular ASCII gTLDs is that we don't have that limitation at the moment that says only one scripts per label on those. So the existing, you know, and I guess (surge) on while I understand is putting a restriction on confused - or policies based on confusability that really becomes quite a subjective decision to be made on when it is excusable and when is it not in terms of second and third level domains that we get into enforceability.

So I'm very uneasy about this.

Marilyn Cade: I just - may I ask to be in the queue after Cary? It's Marilyn.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Marilyn, you're in the queue after Cary.

Thank you, Avri.

And, Cary, you're on.

Cary Karp: A little technical detail that you may not realized that it's probably relevant to all of these, and that's the current protocols, the current IDNA protocol does look at labels, it looks at individual characters and labels, and simply makes a decision, is this a permissible character, is it a permissible character, is it a permissible character.

But actually only one situation where it looks at some attribute of an entire label. And it does this character by character separately for each label in a name.

Now, the current protocol revision is considering the necessity for changing that where there are certain things about a label that has to be considered. So that's the next version of the IDNA protocol will look at a label not just the individual characters of a label. But there's absolutely no discussion about looking across the (dot) between two labels.

And the people who are involved in this discussion regard the notion of one name, one script as simply not reconcilable with the DNS as it's currently structured and deployed.

So I started this line of discussion by wondering if there is a technical basis for anything that resembles one script, one name. And I haven't really heard an answer to the question, so I'm kind of answering it myself simply noting on the basis of the discussion about the protocol revisions, which I am (party) that nobody believes that this is currently viable and nobody believes that this can become viable.

So if there is going to be any such restrictions, it's going to have to be implemented on a policy level and a policy level only. There will be no technical support for it.

At the same will not remain true about the one label, one script requirements; there will be protocol level enforcement of that. And so there's nothing much we need to say about on the policy front with that thing.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Cary, thanks. That was helpful.

I want to just reinforce concerns that I see in the exchange of infrastructure base, and that is how long it can take for browser developers and ISPs and others to catch up with changes like the introduction of IDN. It may move very rapidly at the larger end and very, very slowly in the middle end and smaller end.

So I guess I'm, Ram, particularly cognizant of the need to -- and I think we've had this conversation in some of the workshops -- particularly cognizant of the need to take into account the rest of the infrastructure provider to have to also make changes in order to support IDN.

And I recall there was efforts that outreached to the browser, but the browser suppliers, but it seems to me that it may still be a vulnerability that is, you know, broaden of outreach across the broad population of the buyers.

Cary Karp: Marilyn, I agree. It totally seems that that's going to continue to remain a requirement. So I recall from the last time around where there was a browser issue with multi-scripts, the manufacturers that we spoke to were quite arbitrary in making the decision. They begun with all mixed script TLDs or all

mixed script domains are blocked, and then began unblocking domain names or TLDs even one at a time.

I believe at this point even now, a number of authorized top level domains are not yet even activated in IDN in Mozilla.

Marilyn Cade: Right, right.

Cary Karp: Dotcom, dotnet, (name) two smaller ones.

Marilyn Cade: I didn't understand the question, sorry.

Ram Mohan: Cary was really saying that while I was saying, you know, certain - some TLDs have not yet been activated in Mozilla or FireFox. Cary was merely adding to it that two small TLDs that are in that category or dotcom and dotnet.

Okay, is there more to discuss in the techno policy area or are you ready to move to existing domain name holders?

Okay. Let's move on to existing domain name holders. Now, just very briefly bringing a few points that were made in the prior call forward into here. One of the points that was made was that prior rights for registrants or perhaps not only very important but separate from prior rights such as (IAB) for registrars and registry and that those very clear desire to ensure that they understood in this working group aliasing because that might - as a concept, that might be very important to have clear comprehension and to also determine what if any is the impact it has on giving rights to existing users of domain names.

There was also a brief mention of making sure that confusion and collision requirement, the lack of collision and confusion that that has a - that there is a common ground between the non-confusability and prior rights. And there was a point also made that ICANN may not be able to declare prior rights in any known way.

So those are some of the points that were made in the prior call and I now open this topic for your thoughts and opinions.

(Mike Rosenbaum): It's (Mike Rosenbaum) and I would start by suggesting that we have to continue to look at Sunrise periods for these sorts of things; that proved to be very valuable for our brand owners who want to protect their brand defensively, they should have that opportunity.

Obviously, a lot of harm can be done to a lot of businesses by introduction new TLDs with domain names that are very similar to domain names that we've spent, you know, billion of dollars to market to the public. So, I just feel like fundamentally Sunrise periods need to be built into the process for IDNs just as they need to be built into process for all new gTLDs.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can you put me in queue?

Woman: Hi, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Avri, you're in the queue.

Yes, was that Glen?

(Hung Yu): No, this is (Hung), liaison from (unintelligible), can I be in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Okay.

You're on (Hung), you're on the queue as well.

(Hung Yu): Thanks.

Ram Mohan: Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay, (unintelligible) I think one of the things that we're talking about at the council at the moment is the whole idea of this sort of preparedness to all and protection of all of which say mark holders or brand holders at but one category. So the whole notion of Sunset and whether there is applicable tool or reasonable tool, or necessary tool is completely an open discussion and I think it's one that while it may have IDN bearing, I actually don't know if that has specific IDN bearing other than the complexity brought in by the fact that there are so many global jurisdictions under which one can claim some sort of to trademark our brand that is even more confusing than what we've got now.

So, I guess the complexity of it arises but I do think we need to pay attention to that fact that the whole issue of whether much protections are reasonable and necessary and if necessary, whether Sunrise is the right method, it's totally an open subject.

Ram Mohan: Okay, thank you.

(Hung), you're next.

(Hung Yu): Okay. Thank you very much.

I noticed that you lift the priority rights in confusion as two issues, I totally agree with this approach. They are separate issues. With respect to confusion as previous colleague mentioned that some interesting domain names may have this problem more (unintelligible) but it is a script that's quite similar to letting script, this problem could occur. But for some other scripts, it is so different from Latin's group and this - it is impossible to have any confusion say this adult China - adult - commercial company in Chinese but this is so different from the Latin's group so there's no way to confuse when you use it.

And if we look at the priority use - priority rights, this in another issue that I believe if any such rights would be prompted, it will be quite dangerously open ineffective door so the problem, we don't know what kind of rights, what kind of faces would these rights be fronted and especially as you're currently pointed out that ICANN has no rights to create these kind of rights for those existing domain name registry or registrar.

Marilyn Cade: Would you put in the queue as well. It's Marilyn.

Ram Mohan: You got it and you have the floor. And who is the second person?

Marilyn Cade: I thought there was someone before me; it's Marilyn.

Ram Mohan: Well, I had (Hung), I had the queue ending at (Hung) before.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, okay.

Then I gave an example on the earlier call that I'm not going to over in detail here but I'm just going to mention a clarification, I think I probably was the person who's address to that ICANN cannot created new forms of

(unintelligible) but ICANN does refer to existing law that has impact on things that it does.

So for instance in the UDRP, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Procedure, there was a recognition that there is existing law on both on national basis and in some cases more broadly that affects decisions or policies that ICANN develops and let's take this adjacent line to account.

So then we use that to just address a concern that I have about a failure to be pragmatic on our part about recognizing that many companies do both translate their famous and well-known brand and trademark protect their famous and well-known brand in a number of languages and may use them for commerce within the appropriate company - country, sorry, to fail to understand that famous and well-known brand companies whether it's NTT from Japan or it's a company that is building strong recognition and it bases in South Korea or China or the United States and that brand has recognition globally, I think we have to think about what the process is to deal with that kind of conflict.

Otherwise, we will find ourselves, I afraid, allocating names but the winner of the allocated name is totally tied up in court and not even to use the name dealing with trademark disputes or other kinds of pursuits.

Alistair Dixon: It's Alistair; can I join the queue, please.

Ram Mohan: And you have the floor.

Alistair Dixon: I think just following on from (Mark's) comment and just addressing the second question, the question of whether aliasing provides such protection, I think the answer is aliasing may provide protection but it isn't - since they

may - I guess it depends on whether aliasing is possible or not but I think the there is also need for additional protection in the events that IDNs are not - only available, you know, or made unavailable on aliasing basis.

And so I think it's important that there is additional protection to the extent of that that is - well, I mean I think having provisions likes Sunrise I think would be a useful additional protection.

So, I guess my comment is basically I don't think aliasing by itself is sufficient.

Man: And could you...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Understood. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...clarification - could you go and just talk a little bit about what exactly is meant by aliasing?

Man: Do you want me to provide that clarification or?

Man: Anybody just - I mean I think I understand it but I want to make absolutely clear I'm understanding it perfectly.

Marilyn Cade: And I think we should all remember ourselves when speak so it's Marilyn; I'd like to go back in the queue after maybe Ram explains that.

Man: Yeah, I think it's clear....

Ram Mohan: Okay, Marilyn...

Man: ...around...

Man: Yup.

Ram Mohan: Okay, the idea behind aliasing it's - we're using a word in a somewhat non-technical way but the non-technical - the general idea is given a label to have another label be associated with that and tied to it, in such a way that if you attempted to get to the one label, you would always consistently get to the other.

(Olop): I think that matched - this is (Olop). I think that's (unintelligible) for following from Wikipedia, an alias, it's a pseudonym and may refer to multiple names for the same data location.

Man: So that sounds...

Ram Mohan: Well, I think though we are talking here specifically about aliasing in the (GNSO) context where it's not necessarily a pseudonym, it could be something else that is not a pseudonym but that is explicitly tied one to the other. So that when you ask for one, you will get to the other.

Woman: May I just kind ask, is (Sunbec) the same as the DNAME and we just don't want to call it DNAME.

Man: No, it is not.

Man: No, it's not.

Cary Karp: DNAME is a mechanism for achieving the result that outside of the (unintelligible) from my word but there are other ways to do it. If we have - the concept to the (unintelligible), there's a bunch of names that reside in (dotTLD), okay, there's a top level domain TLD.

And there's a bunch of names that are registered in (dotTLD). And now we - the operator of TLD, wishes to have an all then in designation, they wishes to have the Arabic equivalent to TLD translator or transcribed, whatever, some equivalent. There is an argument made that we are - we use the right colored strips, we are not capable of mixing Arabic second level labels with some Roman top level label.

So we want (dotTLD) to be represented in Arabic. But we will use the exact same database filled with second level names in it. So anything that resolves in the Latin TLD, will also resolve in the arabic TLD and nothing that resolves in one where that also (unintelligible) in the other.

That's alias.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Cary, and that's why I was in my definition of aliasing was really speaking about, you know, two labels, if you will, that are tied on one to other so that then you look for one you always get to the other. Yes, DNAME has been in the past used as the only solution but there are other solutions do exist.

I'm mindful of time and I'm also mindful of the queue, Marilyn ask to be in the queue.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I was just going to say...

Ram Mohan: Marilyn, you're breaking up.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry.

My understanding of the use of aliasing is that that would provide us with flexibility; policy guidelines could determine that certain names had certain requirements and others did not while some other approaches are a one size fits all if you apply DNAME for instance to an existing registries.

Can I just verify, Ram, or (Terry) that my understanding is correct?

Ram Mohan: It is.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I thought that was - I think that's important. And one thing I would just think of, you asked about definitions earlier. Maybe some of the attributes for the definitions as we develop them are to even include some examples so they're clear to lay people.

Man: And, Marilyn, could you impute the notion that you have just said what exactly you meant in it?

Marilyn Cade: Me?

(Phil Oscar): Yeah, could you repeat...

Marilyn Cade: Sure. Can I ask who's speaking?

(Phil Oscar): It's (Phil Oscar).

Marilyn Cade: Oh hi. And I was just suggesting and I'll use an example, I was suggesting that (unintelligible) and my understanding is - and I'll take att.com and nk.net as an example.

So for instance, aliasing might provide the famous and well-known brand holder like AT&T different level of recognition then it provided nk.net, which is neither a trademark at - NK does not trademark nor is it used in - you know, its got a very different identity than a famous and well-known brand holder has. So aliasing would allow the different treatment of those two registered names.

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Woman: Ram, may I be in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Sure.

Woman: Okay.

Ram Mohan: And you have the floor.

Woman: Oh right now, oh, great, okay.

I think I want to get clarification on this aliasing thing. May I ask for example, if we're looking at TLD it could be (dotcom), (dotbiz). And so for example if you take that, if you use that in aliasing, I would - to implementation for example in (IDN) for Arabic, it could be Hebrew, it could be another African language and so forth. This...

Ram Mohan: I'm sorry, was the question complete?

Woman: No, it's not. Let me - I just kind a expand it, sorry about that.

If (unintelligible) wants to register is TLD in all the different languages. And does the aliasing give them the protection to do so under all the different languages, is that aliasing? Is that what we're saying aliasing or recommending aliasing to be?

Ram Mohan: I actually don't think we have a full-on definition of what it is or what it opt to be. We certainly know that, you know, multiple mechanism exists and one such mechanism could achieve the goal that you're talking about. But there are other mechanisms, which could achieve the goals that Marilyn is talking about that provide differentiation between various "classes" of registrants.

So I - in general I think though, the area that I'd like for us to look at is - while we had to understand what aliasing might mean, I would like to stir us away from actually trying to determine what - the various ways to do aliasing and, in fact, to place that as a charge to the technical community to comeback with various ways and to help us understand what those ways might be.

But I think it's kind of important for us to look at the policy implications and to say, assuming aliasing is a viable approach, is it necessary and then is it sufficient to provide a sufficient protection and reduce confusion.

Man: Ram, this is (unintelligible) and I would like really to ask questions because I like to see - I don't really understand what's the - where are you going to because as much as I know, you can do aliasing very simply on a DNS level, so let's say tomorrow we have some Chinese TLD and there is some second level of Chinese domain name dot the Chinese TLD.

Then if it's a name, which is similar to some British trademarks and of some British Company, if they register that name for themselves, on the DNS level, they can alias it to their Web site or to the specific Chinese Web page they have.

So why do we need to deal with that in a policy level for the registry? I'm - or, you know, that the registration requirements, what exactly - why do we need to take care of that, this is something that's been - that is on daily - on a DNS level, so why do we need to do it in a registry level?

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Sure, Cary, in the queue and I'll hold my comments and hand the floor to you, Cary.

Carp Karp: And I was just going to - I think you're misunderstanding what we mean with the word alias.

Man: Yes..

Cary Karp: Aliasing is not directing of domain names to all our Web site. Aliasing is - I'm equating one name with another. The name - yeah, it's a.info is identical to the name (a.binfo).

Woman: In different language.

Man: Okay.

(Mike Rosenbaum): May I be added to the queue please, (Mike Rosenbaum).

Man: You know, that - I understand - no, I understand, Cary, that it's a different technical thing but the practical result is the same. So when you type A. - I don't know what you said the a.info or that (a.binfo), you'll get the same place, okay?

Man: I think the distinction here is that while I hear you speak of aliasing interchangeably with how it is done technically in the DNS, what I've been hearing is that there are other non-DNS ways to achieve the same end goal and therefore the policy issue is does such a mechanism where one label or one name is tied to another, does that provide sufficient protection. It's really not about the way the technology is implemented but it's much more about in such a method necessary and sufficient?

Man: Okay.

Ram Mohan: (Mike), you are in the queue.

(Mike Rosenbaum): Yeah, I would just say that all that sounds like very similar policy implications that we have with the Sunrise period is essentially here.

Ram Mohan: Yeah, exactly.

(Mike Rosenbaum): You're talking about how do you decide what domain should be alias? The same with how do you decide what domain should be projectable in the Sunrise period. You know, how exact do they have to be for example to register trademark. You know, because obviously, we're not going to have a registered trademarks for Yahoo! with an (unintelligible) over the A or the O, you know?

Ram Mohan: Understood.

(Mike Rosenbaum): Again, I would surely argue that that's equivalent on any other country's law to our registered trademark.

Man: At least confusing the similar.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Folks, I'm cognizant of the time, we're just a few minutes over the 90-minute mark, and I think we've had some good discussions here on - or at these three topics.

What I wanted to do was to encourage you for the topics that we did not get a chance to cover to get your thoughts on what other areas of policy might be required or what tweaking needs to be done to the general topics. And the intent isn't to close discussion on any of these topics at this call but, in fact, the opposite, to initiate discussion and to spark a vigorous investigation of the issues at hand.

So, suggest and recommend to you to look at the other topics that as well exist in gTLD strings as they apply to IDN, gTLD, geopolitical, privacy and Whois, as well as legal details.

And if you have - and I'm sure you will have thoughts to contribute. I suggest to you to place those thoughts on the working group list.

I'm going to step smartly to Slide Number 12, which is the concluding slide here and speak briefly about plans for the next meeting. One of the things that I'd like to do in our next meeting is to understand from our working group and get a sense of the seven broad topics that have been defined what relative priorities are to be because one of my concerns is that between here and our assigned time to listen that if you wanted to discuss each of the seven topics

and its entirety and to exhaustion that the number of meetings allocated -- there are 16 meetings left -- between here and Lisbon that we will have insufficient time.

And my own preference is to pick a few topics that the working group considers to be of higher priority and to dig as deeply as we can and to arrive at recommendations into that meeting.

Now, in the prior call, I had asked if anybody had objections to this approach and I heard none. So I will ask the same thing here. Is there any objection to this approach of prioritizing among the major topics and then directing our energies towards those that we consider to be of higher priority?

Avri Doria: I have one question. This is Avri.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Just in discussion over the next week, (unintelligible) look at all the (unintelligible) hypothetical at this point, we come up with another topic that isn't covered into the seven you've got. Can them also be considered in the prioritization?

Ram Mohan: Then we will have an eight, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. That's okay. So we're not limited to seven. It (unintelligible) that we have prioritized (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Right. You're right. We're not limited to the seven - the seven is really my attempt to try and, you know, bring these issues into something a little bit more manageable in our working group. But if there is an eight that is unique

and separate and deserving of a separate category, no problem. There is no magic number to the seven.

Okay, this is good because in both calls, I've heard really no objection to working through and prioritizing the topic at hand. And then, you know, devoting a significant amount of our energies on those topics. This is very good news because I think that'll allow us to have some real results in the report that we publish in Lisbon.

In addition to this prioritization, I'd like for us to review the new gTLD recommendation and the staff issues report. What we will do is, in the next couple of days, we will put out another document for your consideration that will attempt to summarize the new gTLD recommendations and the staff issues report, the main topics in there in a bullet-point format, so to speak, with clear links to the full text.

And I would request that you review both the full text, especially the full text, because some things might get lost in translation when we try to summarize it and come prepared for a discussion in our next meeting.

The plan also is two weeks from now to review the IAB document and lab test. And for the lab test, we - I have invited (Tina Dem) to come in and to provide us both a little bit of an update, as well as the available to field any questions you may have as we review the lab test results document.

Before we close the meeting, I wanted to ask one last time, are there any other topics or any other last thoughts before we close the call?

I'm hearing none. Thank you very much. And I look forward to interacting with you...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Sophia, okay. Go ahead.

Sophia Bekele: No, I would just kind of mention what I had - earlier mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, at Sao Paulo report that have of the working group summary. Is that something maybe all of us going to incorporate in the staff issues or recommendations or should we have a separate...

Man: The - I thought it was pretty clear but I'll do my best put those aspects into the summary.

Sophia Bekele: Okay, great. No, I wasn't sure because it was going to be incorporated because reports for next working group report, so I just want to now if either this is going to include that.

It'd be nice if you say Sao Paulo separate recommendation or something, so we would identify that's really what came out of it, you know, they're like, you know, they're repeating the same issues over and over again.

Ram Mohan: Sophia, I, unfortunately, was not on Sao Paulo. I must say that if I read the document that has been issued so far, what I see is a list of questions and not a list of recommendations. So, I think it'll be certainly helpful to take the issues list that (Olop) has written up and to provide for folks like me who are not there some sense of what the recommendations were.

Sophia Bekele: Okay. So, we could give that. Okay. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Any other last comments?

Hearing none, thank you very much. Have a wonderful rest of the day. And see you online and on the next call.

Thank you.

Sophia Bekele: Great. Thanks.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

END