

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

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO IDNcctlds group teleconference on 14 August 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at::

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/idn-cctld-ah-20070814.mp3>

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

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency group co-ordinator

Tin Tan Wee - NCUC

Bilal Beiram - CBUC

Absent apologies

Mark McFadden - ISPCP

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO
Council

Yoav Keren - Registrar c.

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

ICANN

**Moderator: Glen Desaintgery
August 14, 2007
02:00 pm CT**

Chuck: ...same as before. I guess if this works, this is great. Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: Can we get this work on Mac as well?

Tin Wee: It's the Web page, anybody can see.

Glen de Saint Géry: Any body can see. Okay. Great.

Chuck: No, I don't see - where are the comments?

Tin Wee: Yeah. The comments disappear and therefore it is important for you to keep two windows open.

Man: Yup.

Tin Wee: In that way, you edit and see what everybody else wrote. And your secret document that you have all your comments and whatever things you want to change yourself.

Man: Yeah. Okay.

Man: Okay.

Man: I'm going to...

Man: So that's the MO - that's the MO for the editing process.

Chuck: Uh-huh. Okay. I'll open up - I have one open up. I'll open up the one right next to this stuff. It makes it a little easier to toggle back and forth.

Chuck: Oh that will - let's see, 14. Here we go.

All right. So I've got two open. Now I need to just remember which one I'm in.

Let's see. Let me look back to at our proof here. So we are missing - oh, maybe we're all on. That's it. Okay. Let's get going.

Everybody else says they sent their regrets. So they're...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah. Right. Everybody else did.

Chuck: Sophia, Olof and Mark aren't going to join us. So let's get going guys. I'm hoping that we can, with just one more meeting after this, wrap this up at least far enough so that the council can take it from there. And so let's get going here.

So if we - what happened here?

Okay. Let me - I thought I opened that up but I don't see it.

Okay. Let's try again.

Okay. There we go. All right.

Now - oh it's not going to let me do that; all right.

Okay. The first now there was - can we - Olof had said that he had worked with you on some comments that you were - a writing task that you had. But I never did see anything on that. Did you send something that didn't get around?

Tin Wee: Well, I haven't been reading those set of email because I've been stuck with running an international conference for the...

Man: Yeah. Okay.

Man: I keep the - I'm catching up on lost time.

Chuck: Okay. When we get to that I'll bring it up again. And so I just was - okay. So let's get going.

Now, I'm going to back, just a little backtrack, a little bit to the beginning of the document because you'll see that - and just before the paragraph before Section A in this document, Mark McFadden was supposed to write a paragraph to go after that paragraph, he still hasn't done that. I will keep bugging him on that. But we don't - I don't think we need to send any - spend any time on that now.

The next thing then is on Page 3, I have highlighted in green there and you should be able to see it on that document extending this

relationship to the newly introduced IDN ccTLDs operated as a non-territory link commercial de facto IDN ccTLD should be definitely avoided. This is to preempt more unnecessary controversy, et cetera.

And the - I'm trying to find the comment here; hold on. This thing isn't scrolling right for me. Okay. All right.

Now that Sophia was going to draft some language and she sent an email. Did she send that to everybody? I didn't pay attention.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes.

Man: Yeah. She did. Okay.

And so if you are online and can look at that, I'm not sure why she repeated what I added in blue and email in red. But she did seem to add a sentence at the end which doesn't go here but I think goes in the other spot.

And as such she said, "And a fast restriction is or cannot be specifically prohibited upon deployment of new IDN ccTLDs and this issue of unfair competition must be addressed by means of ensuring that the technical financial and operational criteria required for deployment. Application for an IDN ccTLD must be same or similar to that for a new IDN gTLD."

So in other words, I think she is saying that if it's possible -- and correct me if anybody reads this differently than me -- if it's possible that IDN ccTLDs could be used as generic ccTLDs, then the financial

operational and technical criteria for them should be the same or similar to that - this is going to be for IDN gTLDs.

Am I reading that correctly according to what others read that? She unfortunately cannot be on the call.

Man: I'd agree with the organization of that.

Man: Okay.

Man: Yeah, me too. I agree.

Man: Okay. So I think then that - let me find where that goes. Okay.

So what I will do then is - oh, now how do I - in this document...

Man: It actually was - well, since she was supposed to do something about A and about B which comes a little further down where you have your - well, you already agreed - comments marked in green here on the document further down. So this is (slots) in more under D actually.

Man: Yeah. The problem with this - now I'm not saying how to add that text into this. Can we - it's not let me - do I need to do something to...

Man: Well, Glen - it says here that Glen and (Belao) editing it right this moment. All you have to do is click in the window and start typing away.

Man: Oh, so somebody else is doing it. Is that a way I can?

Man: No.

Man: No. No. You can just click where you want to add the edits and just start editing. Shoot away.

Man: Okay. And Olof where - okay. So that was in D.

Man: That was in D.

Man: If official status is required or am I in the wrong place?

Man: No, no, no, no, no, no, no.

Man: I don't see any page numbers on this shared document and...

Man: Neither do I. But the button - in the printout version with comments, it would be under Page 3. Just above that should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful?

Man: Oh there we go. Okay. Good. That's helpful. Oh this is where we - okay.

Man: A little bit at loss here because I've noted it in the printout I got, it's marked as deleted.

Man: Right.

Man: One of - the very last sentence here in the preceding paragraph, for those governments who don't have control, so this - I don't know. I have mismatch between the documents actually.

Man: Okay. I have no idea why but this thing is not letting me do any edits.
So I'm clicking. I can kind of select text. Let me check something here.

Man: Did you click the edit tab?

Are you on the edit tab?

Man: Where is the edit tab? Oh, up above - you mean up above on the top?

Man: Right. Yup.

Man: So - okay.

Man: Yeah, it's something like log in if you want to start editing. So we need
to do something. I haven't done that.

Man: Log in. Where do I log in?

((Crosstalk))

Man: You can see your name at the top right, can't you?

Man: My name at the top?

Man: Yup. It's in Google (Document) Spreadsheet followed by (cgomz@)...

Man: No, I don't see my name.

Man: I think we need to log in.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...spreadsheets GSO. Now is there a log-in?

Man: Yeah. On...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sign in. Okay. Sign in.

Man: On the far right.

Man: Okay. I got it. Okay. There we go. Sorry about that. I went straight to the document.

And do I create a new password?

Man: No. Just use your - do you have a Google account?

Man: No.

Man: Okay. I think you need to have a Google account now.

Man: Right. Rather than waste time on that...

Man: Right.

Man: ...I didn't understand that before hand.

So who has a Google account that can do the editing for us?

Man: All of us.

Man: Okay. Olof, do you want to the editing?

Olof Nordling: I'm not one game leader. Let's see if I can.

Man: Oh you're not. Okay. Well, you hold on. Let's get somebody that's on there.

Man: Glen is in.

Man: Glen, do you have a Google account?

Glen de Saint Géry: I'm in but I don't have a Google account.

Man: Okay.

Man: Do you need to have the Google account to edit? I'm not sure if you do.

Man: Are you able to edit?

Man: I can edit but I'm a very slow typer. So you're going to have to bear with me. So we might be wasting time that way.

Man: Okay. (Ken), can you do the editing?

(Ken We): Yes, sir.

Man: Okay. Good. All right. So if you'll do that now.

What I was trying to do is add Sophia's language to the spot in the document where it's supposed to go which would be...

Man: The second question from the top I think, "Should IDN ccTLD string be meaningful," and that's D or - is that where you are?

Olof Nordling: I think it's at the very end of the green section under D.

Man: Yup, I got it.

Man: So those governments who do not have control.

Olof Nordling: Oh, yeah. Well, that's where I'm lost because that's marked as deleted in my printed out - printed document.

Man: Yeah. Yes. Okay. Tell you what, let's - because Sophia is not on and I'm a little bit confused because of where she placed it in her email message, and rather than waste too much time on that, let me try and figure that one out after we go through this. And let's go to another point and let somebody quickly...

Olof Nordling: Well, you go to another point.

Man: Okay.

Olof Nordling: I'd tried to type it in the meantime because I think I'm in this now.

Man: Yeah. So I thought her comment was supposed to go under A. We had said that it was going to be a draft there; in other words, which territories are eligible for an IDN ccTLD should this relationship - the existence of IDN at ccTLD assumes a direct relationship between an IDN TLD string in the territories and ask ccTLD. And then it says, "Should this relationship be maintained?" And so that's where I thought it was going to go.

But anyway...

Olof Nordling: But she had actually - I think she had two places to put it. And why don't I try to put it on both and then we can...

Man: Yeah. And then we can - okay, if you can do that, yeah, that's fine. So, (Ken We), do you want to cut and paste her language in both places?

(Ken We): I'm trying to type it now.

((Crosstalk))

(Ken We): We have to continue. I'd do my best to get it in there.

Man: Okay.

Man: Olof is doing it now, yeah.

Man: Olof, are you doing - so you're going to try and do it?

Olof Nordling: Yes.

Man: Okay. Good.

Olof Nordling: I'm basically doing it right now.

Man: Okay. And so I should be able to see it? Is that right?

Olof Nordling: I believe so. Or maybe you have to refresh or whatever.

Man: I think I'm getting the idea that you have to be logged on to see it too.
Is that true?

Woman: No.

Man: No? Because I'm not seeing anything.

Man: Neither am I.

Olof Nordling: Well, that's tough. I do see it.

Man: Good. You're seeing what you're doing?

Olof Nordling: Yeah, I see what I'm doing. I'm happy with that.

Man: Okay. Well, good.

Olof Nordling: Let's see what happens if I - when I'm finished.

Man: To initiate the changes, you have to click Save.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Man: Not every 5 - every 30 seconds or something, you will detect that you made some changes and you will save. And then everybody else would - if you want to see the changes immediately, you will click Refresh and it will go and set the changes.

Olof Nordling: Okay, I'll try to type it first.

Man: And you're on - where at in the document? Which one are you starting with?

Man: Yup, I see changes. I just refreshed. And these are first your changes in (mid slide).

Olof Nordling: Okay. Real-time.

Man: Where did you make them? I am not seeing anything.

Olof Nordling: I'm doing it on the D to start with. Then I got to copy-paste over to...

Man: D?

Olof Nordling: Uh-huh.

Man: Okay. Are these - IDN ccTLD?

Glen de Saint Géry: Oh, yes. Yes, yes, yes. They're coming through quite clearly.

Man: For everyone except for me.

(Belao), are you seeing it?

(Belao): No.

Glen de Saint Géry: Aren't you seeing it?

((Crosstalk))

Man: I am not.

(Belao): Maybe I'm at the wrong section. I'm on the question that says, "Which characters are eligible for IDN ccTLDs?" Am I at the right place?

Olof Nordling: Nope. Why don't you save? I hope that's the right thing to do.

Man: And you should be looking at the huge block of green thing, the (Island X) thing.

Glen de Saint Géry: (Unintelligible) should anything be done here?

Man: Should be done about ccTLD already being...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: That's it, yes.

Man: I see it; except that it's green. Is that right?

Olof Nordling: Correct.

Man: Well then, I see it.

Glen de Saint Géry: Not in my - it's gone - it was in white.

Olof Nordling: It's turning white at the end. Yeah. Well I guess I skipped the - just move one...

Man: Okay.

Olof Nordling: ...one step further. But anyway, there it is.

Man: Okay. So we got it there. And you put it up above as well?

Olof Nordling: Yes, I did; adjusted that.

Man: Okay.

All right. Well then let's - oh I see. There's the - an operation criteria; okay. All right, so that's there so we can - now is everybody okay with the language - I'll spend more time to tweak it in terms of flowing everything later. But is everybody okay with the concept that Sophia is communicating there? Don't worry about the minor edits; I'll take care of those later.

So the concepts - anybody opposed to that concept?

Okay. It seems to make sense to me. And I'll figure out where the best place if we want it both places or one or whatever, we can - that's not too hard to fix I think and we can check that later.

Okay. So that's taken care of.

Now while we're at that point, that's in D, the language that I put there, is that okay? I mean, I had a writing assignment like a couple of other people. And so that's what I wrote. Any problems with that, any suggested changes that's where - that's about what was highlighted in green there is what I added.

Man: Yup. We can do nothing about gTLDs being used. So, I mean, that's it.

Man: So that's okay? All right. So that language is okay. All right.

Olof Nordling: I think it's back to the Treasure Island or something. The imaginary island, isn't it?

Man: Right, right. Well maybe I should call it Treasure Island instead of (Island X). So I've tried to use this at ccTLD that there was not a country code for. I specifically looked to make sure there was no (XI) and just didn't - for example. So - but no problems with that.

Okay.

Well then let's pick up unless I've skipped something else. Let's pick up with where we left off last time which is we were working on how many IDN ccTLDs per script per territory. And (Ken We), you haven't - I take it that you haven't had a chance to draft additional text although Olof thought you had.

(Ken We): No, I did.

Man: Oh, you did.

(Ken We): Yeah. But he had something to say about this and then - so...

Man: He communicated to me that he was okay with what you did.

(Ken We): I didn't read the top that says he is okay. So I thought of (unintelligible).
So I'm going to cut and paste the stuff...

Man: Okay.

(Ken We): ...if it's okay with you.

Man: Okay. So, I...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay.

(Ken We): Okay, I have to paste it in right now. That was - where was I supposed to put it in?

Man: That was in - right under how many IDN ccTLDs per script per territory and then question the - in the GNSO response there. I think after the first sentence of the GNSO response, if there are multiple official scripts using a territory, the best user experience would be to provide IND TLDs to all of those scripts where feasible and then that's where at least I inserted a note that you would - you and Olof were going to draft additional text. So we can worry about placing it later if you can get it in there.

(Ken We): Okay.

Man: So it's in A. It's under Part A of that.

(Ken We): Okay.

Okay, I see it in green. I don't have white but green.

Man: Oh, okay I see it.

Man: Okay.

Man: So it says, "And an order to act as a check and balance against government to adopt the highly defensive registration posture and exhaustively try to get justification for every single known language in unit code and develop linguistically meaningful strings and each of these languages that might conceivably denote their country and language and cause a major problem for brands that need now to buy up all IDNs in this language, prevent domain names squatting or abuse or fishing or other measures yet to be embedded. We propose that every government that wishes to implement IDN should adopt a formal input mechanism for local language communities, appropriate language communities external to their country."

"This check and balance means that it will become extremely onerous for a government in a defensive posture as described above to be able to construct process as involving an exhaustive list of language groups.

Let's see, so what does it meant to be a - what's a defensive posture of a government, (Ken We)?

(Ken We): Meaning that's the - wants to take the opportunity to state their claim on everything under the sun that could conceivably come under their jurisdiction.

Man: Is this the language ownership issue?

(Ken We): Yup. For the simple reason that they don't want - even though they don't - may not have a language that - with community that would conceivably use that thing, use that IDN, and they're going to do it anyway because they're afraid that another country will step in and do that thing and state a claim.

So it's like, you know, if nobody is going to do it, I'm going to send my staff to the North Pole and plant my flag there. Even though nobody is going to live there for the next 50 years I'm going to plant my flag there anyway.

Man: Okay. And so your solution to that is what, I'm not sure I totally follow it?

(Ken We): And in order to check - act as a check and balance within such government, we exhaustedly tried to get justification for every known language blah, blah, blah, right? We are suggesting that they should propose for each government that we should do this to adopt a formal input mechanism for each language, meaning each language that they want by linking up with their local community involved.

This means that if they want to plant a flag in every IDN that they can conceivably think about, well, they have to think again because it means that they have to start the process engaging 50 or 100 language simultaneously and that costs money.

So the reason why spam is so prevalent is because it's free. So the reason why nobody plants a flag up in the North Pole is because it's costly to stand a flag up there, you need a stuff for status, you know. And therefore by implementing or adopting this kind of mechanism which we already have language for anyway in other paragraphs, we actually provide this a little bit more onerous procedure so that these governments might tend to adopt a defensive posture, would find a little but more onerous to implement few languages at the same time.

So because of the lack of resources, they have to prioritize. They'll say, "Okay, we'll only focus on those things that we can conceivably find a local language community that we can talk to and receive input from." And if this local community language - of language speakers also have a similar language speakers in other places, maybe I better put in - the requirement might be for us to at least inform members we are doing such a thing as using their language for our country.

Man: So let me see if I can paraphrase. So to make sure that it's clear in my mind and others can do the same.

So if cc - a country wants an IDN ccTLD in a particular script, they would be required to go through a process that involves the local language community associated with that script in their country or outside their country and - before they could do that.

(Ken We): Yes.

Man: So that would be kind of a prerequisite to adding a script - adding their cc - IDN ccTLD in a particular script would require this process beforehand. Okay.

(Ken We): Yup.

Man: Okay. Any other questions on that? Does everybody understand the gist of what he's suggesting here?

Man: Yeah. I understand. I would suggest that we perhaps try to simplify it a little.

Man: Yeah. And I agree with that but let's not try and simplify it on the phone call just for time sake but I think we can - if we understand it, I think that can be done.

Now, is there anything in the concept that anybody disagrees with?

Man: Can I ask a question?

Man: Yes, absolutely.

Man: I'm not sure if there is a language authority in any other country but I'm not aware of one where I live in that you can go to get an authorization to use the language.

(Ken We), maybe just educate us a little bit on that.

(Ken We): Well, they are authority; I'd say the language community itself. So for example if you are in Israel to use (unintelligible) example and if you wanted to implement Israel in Arabic, then you go talk to the Palestinians and the Arabic Community, the Arabic-Christian Community, the Arabic-Muslim Community and tell them, "Look, I would like to put this, do you have any input?" And put on the notice and anybody can put up a block and you can get your feedback.

Man: Uh-huh.

(Ken We): And then, because it's also a big language, well, we're going to send a friendly message to the rest of the Arabic Community by putting it on - putting a message out on Al Jazeera where block side and tell everybody, "You know, please give us the feedback to this mechanism and we welcome your feedback on our implementation of dot Israel in Arabic."

Man: But would ICANN be - is ICANN ready to go into such - it doesn't seem robust enough that ICANN wants to be involved in; I mean that's what I'm trying to say.

(Ken We): ICANN doesn't do that. ICANN just simply mandates - well the idea here is that ICANN simply says, "Well, right, Mr. so and so from Israel, thank you very much, you want to have dot Israel in Arabic, very good. Where are your supplementary documents indicating the date, time, and process of your formal input."

"Oh, yes, here you are, here is the block side. Very good. Well done. How long was the - your input timeframe or the - five week, okay fine. I think that's enough. Okay. And here was your feedback. Everybody

seems to be okay except one or two persons with objection and the objections within the - not frivolous objections and therefore we proceeded to apply."

And if ICANN feels that these frivolous objections being frivolous by the Israeli government do not look frivolous, they will feedback and say, "Well, could you please address this point?" And the Israeli government goes back and says, "Oh, well, okay, I'll go address those points."

Man: I see. Okay.

(Ken We): And then come back again.

Man: So, (Belao), what do you think of that?

(Belao): I just don't see the feasibility of that happening, it just seems to be too complicated and we'll take such a really long time to - for something like that to be implemented. He does have a point, I just don't see it. I'll just leave it at that.

Man: And I think you're right in the sense that - I don't think this is a path that ICANN is going to be really excited - ICANN staff is going to be really excited about going down. I should let Olof speak in that regard.

But we could possibly word it in such a way that we strongly encourage that for any script that a country wants to use for its IDN ccTLD that it - that this kind of consultation with the appropriate language communities is done.

Man: Right.

Man: Keep in mind that ccTLDs right now have very, very (unintelligible) agreements with ICANN; those that do anyway even have agreements. And so this - probably in terms of enforcement, this one - I think (Belao) is right that this is probably a ways off as it could ever happen. But there's no reason why we couldn't word it in a way that is more of a, "Yeah, we strongly suggest this and da, da, da." I'm not sure it could ever be firmly enforced.

Olof, do you want to comment on that from an ICANN staff person's point of view?

Olof Nordling: Well, I think you already made a few of those comments. But let's put it like this. It's very, very difficult to get anything of the sort be judged in an objective way...

Man: Yeah.

Olof Nordling: ...as well.

So I think from that's perspective rather than make it sort of a mandatory - well, prerequisite for launching it because that caused for vesting of the whole process and that's a major task in itself.

I think if we put it forward like strong suggestions that such consultations be undertaken, I think also that's the ccTLD community and government would never subscribe to that kind of (vetting) really. So I would rather go with the idea that we strongly recommend such consultation that takes place.

Man: Okay. So...

Man: That means sensitive languages for example dot Iraq would like to adapt dot Iraq in a - or dot Syria in Israeli characters, you know.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. And that may happen.

Man: Yeah. So the idea here, Olof, you know, we're going to do this thing, okay so you may not want to participate in the process but we have a formal input mechanism for you to provide feedback and if you choose not to provide feedback as far as ICANN is concerned, ICANN can go back and tell to Israel, "You know, these guys gave you time for feedback. This is the Web site, you could easily key it in in a block page and then send in your comments strongly objecting blah, blah, blah, but you didn't, you know. Take that."

Olof Nordling: If you're talking about - if you look into the new gTLD process where we do have this objection handling or objection resolution process, I would say, where the governments have the opportunity to object to use of their - as a country name for example that they're being used for gTLD.

I wonder if - and I think we're in a largely similar position here that somewhere down the line there will be a need for an objection resolution process and I think that's actually coming under C if we continue.

Man: That's interesting. So that another way to approach this would be a challenge process similar to what the new gTLD introduction PDP is

suggesting in several areas including geographic could come under that. And so it's not unlike this and that would be a different way of approaching this problem.

So that for example if the Iraqis wanted to or say the Iranians wanted to have a Hebrew version of dot Iran in IDN, they could then file a protest in that regard and there would have to be some objective panel that would evaluate whether there's, you know, significant impact to that community that would be undesirable.

That gets - this is an area like Recommendation 20 in the new TLD that is thought to be objective which is a point Olof made and - but that would be another way of approaching this.

So thoughts on that, (Ken We)?

(Ken We): Yup. Yeah, I understand.

Man: (Unintelligible), is that another way to approach this?

Man: Well, this is also the effect, right? So I'm saying we can do it preemptively or you can do it reactively.

Man: It could be either way I think. In the new TLD process for gTLD, it's preemptively, it's before it ever goes into the group. So it would be preemptive in that sense but - okay, let's do this on this one. This is one that - this is a challenging one. We could probably spend our whole call on this one and let's all give this some more thought.

Olof, can you maybe rework the language on this one, maybe with a couple alternatives, the approach that (Ken We) suggested and the alternative would be more of a challenge process?

Olof Nordling: Oh, yeah, actually, I can have a go with this.

Man: Yeah.

Olof Nordling: Right now or after the call?

Man: No, no, after, after. No, no. If we try to rewrite everything during the call, it'll take us 20 more calls.

Olof Nordling: Yes.

Man: Okay. So we don't want to do that.

Now, let's go on and let's try and make some progress through some other places here. If we go to - all right, so now going down to the next place where we have a comment which was - it's on the top of Page 4, I believe. I had a comment there - oh, there was a comment from (Belao) that he agreed with what I - with my comment and let me find my comments here. I have to switch over to the document. Oh, that's all, okay. So that's all. And so let me go back up.

So the question was, "Could there be several IDN strings for a territory in the script? If so, who would determine a number and what are the criteria?"

And our response was, "If multiple scripts are using a territory and if it's judged that those scripts will add value to the user experience, then the sovereign government should make the choice of which scripts and what number of scripts will be in use for IDN ccTLDs."

Now, any - is that response okay? Any disagreement with that?

It'll relate to this other issue we're trying to resolve that in a previous one, in A, that Olof is going to work on a language and that (Ken We) and Olof worked on so.

Okay, so that's okay.

Then under C, going on to C, "If an IDN ccTLD string is not applied for whatever reason, should an IDN ccTLD string that could be associated with a sector already - be reserved or protected in some way?"

And the response that we have there, it say's, "The GNSO formed a special working group to deal with the topic of reserve name and that group recommend that a reserve name category for geographic name not be created but rather than any dispute."

And here's where the dispute process comes in that Olof just mentioned and there was a slight typo that was corrected by Avri; that was no big deal. Is that response in C okay with everyone?

Olof Nordling: I'm just little at a lost whether we - about the - well, what expression we use. Do we use the expression - thinking back to the gTLD recommendations objection resolution process or some...

Man: Well, you know, I don't know that we've been consistent, Olof. It's sometimes it's been called to a challenge process; it's sometimes been called a dispute process.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, anyway, well, we know what we mean, so...

Man: Yeah. Yeah. I don't know that we need to resolve that. But you raised a very interesting point. I find myself using different terms all the time as well and I hear others do the same thing. So I don't think we ever really agreed on what the right term is if there is one.

So now - so no problems with the rest of the response, the GNSO response to C? So we note that ccTLDs are different. One of the key differences is they're clearly under the laws of one specific jurisdiction so it might be much easier to establish reserve name categories to provide other means of protection for a given ccTLD.

So basically what we're saying is that for - we didn't do it got gTLDs suggest reserve geographic names but in the case of ccTLD IDN, it could be much more appropriate and kind of left it at that. So we're not making any real strong statements.

Is that okay?

All right. Then going on then to - I don't - I think they - the next one is how many scripts per territory and Question A. Mark McFadden had just suggested that I move a sentence up to the front and that's what I did.

Any discussion on that? Is that okay?

I won't spend a lot of time on this unless somebody raises an issue.

Then going down to B, the GNSO response. Mark McFadden said - made the comment is there a policy possibility here? Could it be that one of the languages was more official than others and that the introduction of multiple scripts there might be confusion about the location of official government information for instance under the (unintelligible) of dot RU but not under the ASCII version of dot RU.

So I don't know. Our - you can see our response there just - do you think that - is that an issue we should try to address, this idea of one language being more or one scripting more official than another?

Man: It's terribly complex.

Man: Yeah.

Man: Because it varies from country to country and sometimes it's like my own have - doesn't even have - is most official language Swedish as an official language.

We got them four or five other official languages but it's taken for granted that Swedish is of course official language but it's never been denoted as such.

Man: Now, what I did in response to what Mark - the question he raised, look at the last sentence in that GNSO response, it says, "In that regard could it be that one language is more official than others," and that with the introduction of multiple scripts, there might be confusion above the

location of official government information and I use this example of dot RU. But I just put it as a question; I didn't make any statement or claim and just threw it out for consideration by the ccTLD.

Man: Yeah. Well, whether it's helpful to them or not, I'm not sure. But well, no objections to having it there, not at all.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Should we have it there or should we not?

Man: Sorry?

Man: I'm just asking kind of surveying goes on the call, is it okay to do it the way I did it and raise that question if they find it helpful, they can use it, if they don't, they then move right on or should we just not even raise that issue.

Man: I think we should raise that issue and I think the place for it is here and now and we'll leave it up for them to remove it or keep it, so whatever they do with it.

Man: Okay. So that's okay? All right.

Man: Yup.

Man: All right. Going on then to C and I highlighted the - I think if I remember correct, well, I better be careful.

Okay, who did this text come from? I'm just trying to see why is it not telling me.

Okay. Anyway, so now, going on to C the GNSO response there, I think, (Ken), that this was language that you submitted on this one but let's look at that the GNSO response then said they stated twice already, if the goals to provide the best user experience is possible, why impose restrictions that may limit fulfillment of that goal.

In our very diverse world today, most nations have people from other countries to speak none official languages. The key goal should be to try to meet the user names as best as possible.

That said, it would also be at the other end balance with some regulation with the light touch against the natural and well-known (unintelligible) such as more upper news for homographic spoofing, TLDs with little demand except for defensive registration and (net) use of TLDs for political ends, (EG Warring) groups that have little need for each other's language. Now, provided with the opportunity to abuse each other's languages.

Now, I highlighted that because I thought of something that we needed to discuss further. I think, again we're heading down a direction that it's almost impossible for ICANN to play in an objective way. At the same time, the real issues that (Ken We) way is raising here.

So how do we deal with kind of those - the fact that they are real issues but it maybe very tough to handle them in an objective way?

Any suggestions there?

Olof Nordling: Well, if we - Olof here. I think that - well, what we do or what GNSO does is actually to provide, well, some advice which is actually up to the ccNSO to deal with or the GAC.

Man: So should we approach this one like we did the one just before where it was kind of the issues are raised in a question. How do you deal with, you know...

Olof Nordling: Yeah, I mean, sort of these are potential issues and just, well, highlight them as such.

Man: Okay. All right. Good.

All right. Well, then let one of us take the action item to just reword to address the issues and kind of as a question type format where a - how do you deal with this or the - some considerations to balance this out or things like these and I can do that or if somebody else wants to volunteer.

(Ken We), does that sound okay?

(Ken We): That's okay with me.

Man: Okay.

(Ken We): Well, the point also I want to make is that, you know, we have to be generous about the number of languages that we use but there has to be a limit for some kind of particular number if somebody wants to, you know, go in.

Man: Okay.

Man: So...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Unless somebody else wants to volunteer, why don't you assign that rewording to me?

(Ken We): Okay.

Man: And I'll take a crack at that.

(Ken We): Thank you.

Man: Okay. And then, so - okay.

Going on then, I think, we get down to the next one is the number of characters in the string is the main question and under A, our response and which is a length they response there, the latter half of it is highlighted and I see Mark McFadden has something he felt we should have a stronger statement here.

And I'm just looking - he said that GNSO is not aware of any technical reason not to use variable link - string link variety in ccTLDs, GNSO is not aware of policy issues that would argue against the use of any length of strength variety in ccTLDs that you see GNSO is also aware that a single character and a script of a sovereign nation's choice will be represented by more than one character in the DNS itself.

So he wanted stronger than that but I don't know, let me see what - how the people - I mean, should we be stronger than what's worded there? Does anybody think so?

Man: Well...

Man: So should we just come out and say, "Yeah, it seems to us that variable length IDN ccTLDs are okay."

Man: Right. It's also (unintelligible). It also will be more functional and more - and makes more sense to the - to that particular community to be different then too. I don't think it's going to make a lot of sense and - for an IDN ccTLD to be in two characters just like in ASCII.

Man: Right.

Man: To be more functional, I think it should be - and we shouldn't have any restrictions on the links of the string.

Man: So is there agreement then that maybe we should follow Mark's advice and make a stronger statement here. Basically, something to the extent that we see no reason why against variable - we think that it's fine that there will be variable link IDN ccTLDs.

Man: Which is what I've got in - if I look at the print version here, 14 August, well, it's already included in the - that's exactly word by word.

Man: Oh, so I probably already addressed this concern way back when, when I first did this and I forgot. So it maybe okay the way it is.

Man: Yeah. I got - slightly, a very, very change as I would like to make. A single character in the scripts of a sovereign nation's choice, I would say, just to be very clear, a single character in a non-ASCII scripts of a sovereign nation's choice because, well, that's what we're meaning actually.

Man: That's okay with me. Why don't you go ahead and make that change.

Man: Yeah.

Man: Well, so well, then - so then with that change, that one should be okay.

Okay? Moving right along and I think we now moved - skipped quite a bit because there were no comments on quite if few sections. If somebody is aware of one, stop me. But I'm scrolling down on my other document, my Word document to - I'm all the way down to Page 9 which is - let me get the main questions for you.

On Page 8, is - are there any right attached to a given script and then the next time there's a comment and a document is with question B under that and that's on Page 9, that's probably not helpful to you. They are not - you're looking at the Word document. The...

Man: That's it.

Man: Okay. The question was, "Can anyone get acceptance of a script under the IDNA protocol or are there restrictions?" For example, can a gTLD registry get the Kanji script accepted under the IDNA protocol?

Should that use be data approve by Japan if you ask with the same requirement if a script is used in more than one country.

And Mark McFadden - and then the GNSO responses there, you can look at it yourself but Mark McFadden made this statement.

"This is the second time I think the draft has strayed. I think that a gTLD clearly has the option to get the Kanji script accepted under IDNA protocol. I don't see a way for an individual government to influence which scripts are use in a particular gTLD."

"How would we see Russia have an influence on whether (unintelligible) is supported in dot ORG? Am I missing something here I'm not even sure an individual country gets to consult on the choices made by gTLD operate. Have I missed the memo?"

Okay. Now, let me also read my comments in regard to that, comment 13 on there. You know, personally, this is me personally speaking, please understand that. You know, I agree with Mark's comment and some of you may not but I do. But I don't think that his approaches is the smart way to approach this issue.

Certainly, there are countries that think they own their language and so forth and some governments have taken that position. And so what I did in trying to word this was to be able to - I hope considerably more tactful in the way we approach this issue rather than coming right on and saying countries don't have any right to tell the gTLD what they can do. So I don't think that's an effective way to interact with the ccNSO, ccTLDs, and the GAC and so forth.

Let me open that up for discussion, what do you guys think? Am I correct or is Mark correct or is there some other position?

I basically took approach somewhat similar the way the new gTLD committee took for gTLDs and that is if there are international principles of law that could be applied so that we could make it objective, then those should be applied.

Then, if not, then, it's kind of part to expand the law of one individual country on a global basis and then I used the Australian ccTLD as an example.

Is that okay? Is that what we want to put forward to the council? Do we want to take a different approach? Do we want to be more direct like Mark is suggesting?

Man: Yeah, I would like to highlight at this point maybe (intentionally) that for example the UNESCO in so-called Bill of Rights Nations that each nation has a sovereign right to their language whatever that mean. So, you know, so we have to be careful about this at this point. It's been signed internationally with the exception of two countries including US.

Man: Uh-huh. And this is the way - is the GNSO response contrary to that, the way it's worded right now do you think or is it okay? Because I don't think there's anything here that counters that.

Man: Yeah. So the idea is within the country you got to follow the rules, right? And if you're in the country, you might want to get the consensus, all the opinion of the Japan for instance so that I'm going to - you have your citizens in my country or you have your language-

speaking people in my country, well some of them residents or even Australian citizens. But they want to speak in Japanese.

Okay. And this is what we are going to do, is this okay with you. That's the proposal and see what happen. (Unintelligible) to be thinking that, you know, he wants us to - he has objections about approving whether say their needs to seek approval so it's the (unintelligible) business between (unintelligible) review proposal by Australia as opposed to getting Australia sovereign confirmation of getting approval from other countries to deploy something in their own territory.

Man: Yeah. And the way I approach here, I basically ask questions again, the last question, the first paragraph of the responses whether that consultation is required or voluntarily seems like a good discussion for the GAC and the ccNSO.

Man: Yup.

Man: And which is - I think that's correct, you know, and it's similar to what we are talking about on another complicated issue that we started with today and that is that, you know, whether that could really be made required is up for debate but certainly it should - you know, encouraging it might be a good thing to do.

Like for example, it seems like in my opinion it seems like it would be wise for the Australian whoever is doing the Australian ccTLD to consult with Japanese government with regard to what term they might use for Australia. Now, that maybe fairly straightforward in that case but that still would be - seem like a good thing to do.

So, back to this, is the language the way it is in that first paragraph okay or should we make any changes to it? That's the responses; are there any recognized international principles, et cetera? Any suggestive changes?

Okay. Then the next paragraph for the response and I highlighted some things in yellow in there and I had a comment there that I already read; that paragraph says, "And since there's nothing that can be done to prevent a country from (unintelligible) stopping by legal or other means the use of any script or TLD and that script within its jurisdiction, it would seem prudent and sensible for ICANN and a perspective IDN TLD registry wishing to deploy their TLD in a given country, say, Japan and a given script, say, Kanji, to approach that country and/or local language community in question to (vet) or approve their intent particularly from the point of view of commercial viability and market acceptability."

Now, I think, (Ken We) that this was your language and let me stop there for a minute. I like it personal - on myself and I want to get people opinion except that, I don't think we can have or approve, that's why I highlighted that one.

(Ken We): I would agree to that I mean, even suggesting that you're encroaching upon the sovereignty of nations and such. Well, they'll probably reject the cashier.

Man: Yeah. If you give every country an approval right, you're basically giving them a veto right for anything. And so those who think that they do own languages would have - you're giving them a veto right, I don't think that that's a good thing to suggest.

My understand and I think I mentioned this on our earlier call is that I've heard at least indirectly that the GAC is moving away from the concept of countries owning languages and that's probably - they're probably not going to support that either. But I would just suggest removing or approve in that language. I think it's fine so (vet) their intent but I would delete the language - the words "Or Approve."

Man: I have some concerns about the phrasing a bit earlier on.

Man: Okay. Let us come back to that, can we - anybody opposed to deleting or approve?

Man: Yeah. I have no problem go ahead.

Man: Okay. All right. Go ahead and delete that, Olof, in that.

Now - and before we get here, let me just go ahead and read, (Belao), you had submitted a comment on this so maybe we should discuss that. You asked the question, "Do you mean for example that if an organization located in the US wants to apply for an Arabic ccTLD, you must have approval from all Arabic-speaking countries or a subset thereof and it's just..."

(Belao): Right.

Man: Is what we just did - does that answer the concern that you had?

(Belao): Exactly, exactly. I just don't see anybody on in a certain language.

Man: Yeah. Okay.

(Belao): I can write in English; my (unintelligible) language is Arabic, nobody is going to present me - England is definitely - not going to prevent me from writing anything I want to do in English.

Man: Yeah. Okay.

(Belao): So ownership of a language is something is not clear to me so...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...or approve we've addressed that; okay. Very good.

Now, Olof, you have some other suggested changes.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Or rather a little concern. When we say and a prospective IDN TLD registry wishing to deploy their TLD in a given country, say, Japan, well that sounds very much like a gTLD, not so much of relevance for the ccTLD audience we're talking to here.

Man: Yeah. I see what you're saying, yeah and that's a good point. And, well, first of all, TLDs really aren't deployed in countries, even ccTLDs aren't deployed in countries, they are deployed in the DNS and so, I think we should clean up that language.

Maybe we just leave out - maybe we just delete in a given country, say, Japan just cross that out and so that it was read, "In a perspective IDN TLD registry wishing to deploy their TLD in a given script," would that deal with the concern or is there more to do it than that?

Olof Nordling: I think that's it.

Man: So in other words, delete in a given country, say, Japan; that whole phrase there is deleted.

Man: I'm ready to do that if...

Man: Any objections to that? That was a good catch.

Man: No, problem.

Man: Okay. Very good.

All right. Then, all right let's move on. We're moving on to Page 10 and we've covered (Belao's) comment there.

Going to Number 2 then, introduction of IDN ccTLDs and Mark had a comment there just saying that he agreed with this everything in this section and then, in - and the response to A, is such a list necessary; Sophia had a comment and she asked us to add something and I think that the additions were taken cared of.

So - is - let's look at that, the response is such a list necessary, our response is, "Probably not with such a list result in an earlier ability to meet the needs of non-English users, if so, would seem to be a good idea. If not, then it seems like the higher priority should be to meet user needs and if that can be done without a list that might be the better approach. If the list avoided conflicts and confusion, it might be needed."

For example, in situations where there are reports of complex and confusions among ccTLD member themselves or where there are reports of such conflicts and confusion from traditional standards bodies like the ISO.

Now, let's look at - what Sophia said in that light. She said, "Please add," but as it stands, there are reports of complex confusions within both minority of ccTLD members who have actually been known to have thus far participated in a debate and who are not necessary representing their sovereign government as well as amongst other more traditional standard setting bodies like ISO and PSO. Therefore, while a list is not necessary ideal, a list may avoid delayed or unnecessary conflict confusion.

Now, does anyone think that we should add a statement like she's talking about? Unfortunately, she's not here to comment.

Nobody does?

Okay. So for now we will leave that one alone. And then, under who would develop such a list, she also had a comment there add a language community of local government input if any.

So it reach right now individual countries, territories could start the process by working with language experts in their country and/or trans-boundary language communities with the local government input to develop and propose names and their official scripts for their ccTLD.

Now, I think she is suggesting - oh, so she's adding language - so in addition to language experts in their country, apparently she's suggesting adding any language communities and with the local government input.

Man: Isn't that...

Man: Oh, it's been added, hasn't it?

Man: More or less.

Man: Yeah. So okay, so that's been addressed. Okay. Any problems with that then? The way that was covered, is that okay, any suggested changes?

Man: I'm fine.

Man: Okay. Good. Moving right along.

Olof Nordling: Just a quick comment on the proceeding one, on - under A. It's not altogether comfortable to make such a statement that there are reports of conflicts and confusion; that to me is hearsay. And then Sophia's comment there, maybe this so about it's - well, I couldn't state that and well maybe she can but...

Man: Should we say evidence of conflicts and confusion?

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Well, if there is. But...

Man: But that would be a lot different in saying reports.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. I mean, well we would need also to have that substantiated by Sophia in order to introduce it I think.

Man: Where it needs to be substantiated is in the actual case involved; whether Sophia could substantiate or whether ICANN could substantiate it or anybody else for that matter when it really comes down to it in a specific case. What you're saying is just somebody's report that there's conflicts and confusion would not be enough.

Now, so the question is, I mean, should we remove that...

Olof Nordling: No. Actually I mean, you left it on the side and I'd say one of the reasons why we should for the time being leave it to one side is revisit - is the GNSO can state something like that. I mean, well then we would like to - probably the GNSO would like to see report - the reports and actually cases so that we noted this is a fact, they're not - well, not only hearsay.

Man: Right. No, no I agree with you. How would you change the wording here?

Olof Nordling: Well, I don't want to change any wording. I mean, I just want to keep it on one side for the time being; I'm not very comfortable with introducing it.

Man: So would it be better to leave that example out of the (EG) and it's (parent) there, it looks like we're missing other side of the (parent).

Olof Nordling: Well, well, well, well I mean, back again under A.

Man: Yeah. That's where I am.

Olof Nordling: And, well...

Man: I mean, what I'm saying, Olof, is we could just say if the list of avoided conflicts and confusion, it might be needed, period.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Something would show off.

Man: And not have in situations as the example, in situations where there are reports of conflicts. So what do others think, it's better to just leave it as it was and not add what Sophia suggested there?

Man: Yeah. But I supposed - most people would know what these reports are, right? I mean, haven't you encountered some of these yourself? It's not quite (unintelligible), right?

Olof Nordling: Well, all right. Well, I actually not - perhaps, I'm scratching it a bit. The way it's captured under (EG) is probably okay on second reading of it.

Man: Okay. Well then, why don't we just add a close parenthesis at the end of the - just before the period? I think that's the only thing that's missing.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. I can see that.

Man: Yeah. Okay. All right. So we're okay on that.

All right. Back to B because there were some things I highlighted at the end of B. The last sentence of the response under B says the ccNSO and the GAC could then develop the list in conjunction with traditional bodies such as the ISO or UN-related entities particular when the issue was not just technical operability but also linguistic suitability and when they're may be perceived legitimacy of such a list.

Now, that was an addition. I think suggested by Sophia, and I think (Ken We) is actually the one that suggested that.

The one thing I highlighted there is when they're maybe perceived legitimacy of such a list. And the reason I highlighted that was because that becomes terribly subjective.

Any thoughts on that?

Man: Much on that but do we say technical operability? Is it interoperability we want to say?

Man: That's fine. Yeah. That's better.

Man: Okay.

Man: Yeah.

Man: Thanks.

Man: Yeah. Good chat.

So is everybody okay with the - when they're maybe perceived legitimacy of such a list?

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...you have with the perceived legitimacy, the legitimacy or the perceived or both?

Man: The perceived. No, legitimacy is fine. I noticed I didn't highlight that; the perceived part. I mean, who perceived, how is that done and it may be okay the way it's used here. I just flagged it so that we could talk about it.

Is everybody okay - if everybody is okay with that, I don't have strong objections; I just wanted us to spin a moment to talk about it.

Man: Yeah. You can drop perceived if you don't feel comfortable with that.

Man: What do people think? Should we delete perceived?

Hello.

Man: I have no problem. I mean, it's perceived that there's agreement when there's really no comment. So I'm just - I just have no comment.

Man: Okay. So let - then I suggest we just leave it alone. There's no strong objection to that. That's okay.

Going on to C, the - should such a list be mandated? GNSO responses only if there were not other means to avoid security stability,

interoperability and user confusion issues. And Sophia said - suggested adding or satisfy the primary motivation of such a thought-out list, widespread legitimacy.

Now, I'm not really clear what she's trying to accomplish here. Somebody help.

Olof Nordling: I think what she wants to say that only if it was generally agreed among all parties the need of such a list isn't that so - widespread legitimacy.

Man: Yeah, maybe so. With what Olof just suggested, would that wording work for those on the call?

Man: Yeah. I'm fine with it.

Man: Why don't you go ahead and add that and - similar to what you just said, Olof.

Olof Nordling: I'll try to regulate something out because I try to avoid double negations here.

Man: Yeah. Agreed.

Olof Nordling: Okay. I'm working on that. Don't wait for me.

Man: Okay. So I can go ahead. Help yourself. I'll go ahead. Good.

And of course, one - some time after this call, we'll - you can distribute the revised document.

So, okay. Then going on to D, yes, by whom? This should be answered by the ccNSO and the GAC with applicable input from sovereign governments transnational across boundary language communities and other standards bodies. That I think was the input from Sophia that I think (Ken We) may have actually put it into the text. Let me just look at Sophia's comment there.

Yeah. She had also suggested ISO, UN and other standard bodies, but any problems with the way that's worded now? Let me the full response again. This should be answered by the ccNSO and the GAC with applicable input from sovereign governments, transnational cross boundary language communities and other standard bodies. And maybe we don't need other because we don't mention any standard bodies, do we? I would say delete other.

Any...

Man: Did we actually mention ISO and the - at the previous...

Man: We don't in there right now. We could put and standard bodies such as ISO. Do you want to do that? I mean, is that...

Man: It's up to you. But we since we mentioned it already, we want to keep a trend.

Man: Yeah. Just put it in.

Man: So - and standard bodies such as ISO?

Man: Yup.

Man: Yeah.

Man: Okay.

Olof, are you with us, since your managing the changes.

Olof Nordling: I'm lagging behind.

Man: Okay. So we'll loosen here a little bit because we're making a couple fairly minor changes to the response to D.

Olof Nordling: Yes, okay. I'm with you. I'm catching up. I've done something on C.

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Maybe we should look - refresh C and take a look at it, huh?

Olof Nordling: Or if consensus develops that such at list be mandated.

Man: Okay.

Olof Nordling: Widespread legitimacy. Well, let's call it consensus then.

Man: Yeah. That's - I'm okay with that. Everybody see that? It certainly showed up on my screen here, okay?

All right. Now, then going on to D, the changes that we suggested and your - please comment on this to make sure you agree with us, Olof. Delete other at the end there where it says other standard bodies and add - and so, it will end up with - and standards bodies such as ISO.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Man: And that's the only change we made, okay?

Olof Nordling: It's done.

Man: Okay, going to E. Sophia had a comment there as well.

So let's see. The questions is who would develop a criteria and relevant policies for identifying IDN ccTLDs that GNSO responses so ccNSO is the policy-making body for ccTLD. It seems like the appropriate body for the staff with appropriate input from the broader community within ICANN and with input from the above mentioned non-ICANN and to establish the legitimacy of the process and the outcome. And I think that pretty much covers what Sophia was getting at.

Any disagreement with that, any other changes somebody would make?

Man: I'm fine.

Man: Okay.

Going on - skipping now then to G and again, Sophia had a comment there. The question is that additional criteria and her policies acquired, who is responsible for formulating that policy. The GNSO response now reads the ccNSO would input from the above mentioned non-ICANN entities. And I think that covers Sophia's concern.

Any discussion on that? Rather than repeating all those, I just kind of - the above mentioning non-ICANN entities. Okay.

The next question is what precedent should be given to ccTLDs and the IDN implementation process and Mark McFadden had a comment on that. He basically said none which I think is what the response says. The IDN implementation process involves technical security and policy issue identification and resolution.

This work is independent of whether the top level IDN represents ccTLD or gTLD. Once the technical and security issues have been identified and resolved, a moment will come where top level IDNs are technically ready to be put in the root. At that time, the GNSO and the ccNSO communities will be able to assess for themselves whether the policy issues has been resolved to their satisfaction. If they have and process for the introduction of IDN ccTLD is in place, the GNSO the ccNSO should move ahead at their own pace to introduce top level IDN. One should not have precedence over the other at that time.

And so that's the GNSO response. Their - any - you know, other than Mark's comment - and I think that what is stated there...

Man: That's included in the...

Man: It's included, right?

Man: That's right.

Man: Yeah. Okay. So that's okay. So, any questions or discussion on the response to that one?

And then I'll go to the - and then what we did there - and I think I was the one that did this. There's a paragraph that says the GNSO IDN working group made the following recommendations that has some applications here and that's the idea of avoidance of ASCII-squatting which is kind of related to this.

And then went on if there are technical reasons for delaying introduction of IDN gTLD when new ASCII gTLD introduced, steps should be taking to avoid ASCII-squatting and so on. I won't read it all unless somebody wants me to as you can see it on the document there.

The next paragraph goes on both ccTLD and gTLD uses have needs for IDN TLD and meeting those needs as quickly as possible for both groups should be a priority.

Going down to the third sentence there in the case of the GNSO, gTLD registrants fund well over 90% of ICANN's budget. It would be very unfair if the gTLD registrants funded activity that work against their own needs.

There was a comment there by Mark McFadden agreeing with the text and maybe making the linkage stronger, and I think I tried to do that.

Sophia also had a comment there in this context of making the level playing field for all. It is worth noting that the technical operational (unintelligible) for the selection award of IDN ccTLD. This should be similar or consistent and I don't think that's addressed in here.

Yeah, it is. Yeah. That is there, so that was added. Is that okay, the way it's worded?

Man: It's worth the try.

Man: Okay. All right. Any suggestion for changes? That's a long answer. Any suggested changes?

All right, moving on. Going on to the next major question which is who selects the IDN ccTLD string in the absence of a mandated list.

And going down to question - and there's a general question and then question A says what are the criteria and policies determine who can submit a request for the designation of an DIN ccTLD. And the GNSO response, the first sentence is this seems like an appropriate activity for the ccNSO to ccTLD and the GAC. And Sophia's comment - I don't know, it seems to be missing something. It says just as while it.

Olof Nordling: I think she refers to the following sentence, while it does not seem appropriate for GNSO to comment on this and then she would like to add it would be ideal. That's how I read her suggestion.

Man: Okay. That seems pretty simple. Why you just go ahead and make that change. I didn't understand what she was...

Olof Nordling: If we agree to it.

Man: Is it okay? I mean, do we agree to it?

Olof Nordling: Well, I can...

Man: Is there anybody opposed to that change she's suggesting?

So what she's suggesting is while it does not seem appropriate for the GNSO to comment on this.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Man: And then 26 - her next comment is please add the idea of such requests were to be from parties that fill into at least one other fall-in categories, the local sovereign government, local Internet business user community and language community. And I think that that's kind of addressed then in the next sentence, is that correct? Again, I'm sorry she's not on the call.

Olof Nordling: I think so.

Man: Okay.

Olof Nordling: So, actually - right. I put the changes that I'm about to make in (unintelligible).

Man: Okay.

Olof Nordling: So we keep it as is, huh?

Man: Okay, any objections to that? Is that okay?

Man: Yeah. Okay to me.

Man: Going on to B and let me know if I'm moving too quickly or too slowly. But B, who will develop the criteria and policies? And the first sentence response, Mark McFadden had a comment. Is this a typo? Currently, the process for the selection of ccTLD is supported by (IANA) and as well as the staff to the ICANN board of directors. The process is already in place, and I assume that designation of IDN ccTLD would be done by the designated ccTLD operator of that country.

So, and let me - let's just look at the responses. So the technical protocol criteria we determined by the (ITF) and the revised IDN protocol, the non-technical policies for selecting ccTLD string should be determined by the ccNSO as the policy-making body for the ccTLD with input from local stakeholder sovereign government, local and language communities.

And so, there was also a comment by Sophia there that I think is addressed now in the wording there because she said, "Please add a process of local government, et cetera."

Is that okay?

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Well, do we keep the very last sentence? Delegations of the selected string will be determined by (IANA).

Man: Well, that's the point that I think Mark was getting at and where he saw some confusion. So if we remove that, I think his concern is still there. Would you change that wording?

Olof Nordling: I think it sounds like (IANA) is ruling sovereign in...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah. Maybe it should say delegation of selective strings will be performed by (IANA).

Olof Nordling: Okay. I think it's the word delegation.

Man: Yeah. You're right, you're right.

Man: carried out.

Man: What was that?

Man: Carried out by (IANA).

Man: Yeah. That could be or should - maybe we should just delete the sentence. What if - I'm not sure it's too relevant to talk about (IANA) here.

Man: I'm not entirely sure either. I mean, it's something like processing of the selected things will be handled by (IANA), but I mean, when it comes to the delegation, it's - well, it's a multi-step process.

Man: Or we could say putting selective strings into the root will be done by (IANA). I'm not sure that it adds anything to this question.

Man: Not exactly. I think basically, well, who does putting in the root. I mean...

Man: We all know that. Yeah.

Man: ...it's you.

Man: Yeah. Right.

What do people think, (Belao) and (Ken We), do you think we ought to just delete that last sentence? Does that add anything to that question?

Man: I'm not - I'm sorry. I was just looking at something else, but I'm not really sure. I think leaving it will not - is not going to make really big difference.

Man: You're okay with leaving it, although we probably ought to change the word delegation to something else.

Man: Right.

Olof Nordling: Actually, we could use Mark's comment. The first sentence of that I think would fit in better. Currently, the process for selection of a ccTLD is coordinated by the (IANA) in its role as stocks to the ICANN board of directors coordinated this. Well, that's closer to the truth at least.

Man: So, what you're suggesting is just replace that last sentence with that one.

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Man: I'm okay with that. Anybody else? Is that okay?

Man: Yeah. I'm okay.

Man: Okay.

Man: Okay. All right. Go ahead, do that, Olof.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Man: Good suggestion.

Man: While Olof is doing those changes, Chuck, do you want to talk about those 576 homeruns?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: For Barry Bonds.

Man: Barry Bonds. That was a good one.

Chuck Gomez: My son and I are trying to get tickets for a game in September there at AT&T Park there in San Francisco and see the Dodgers and Giants play then.

Man: I've seen that in your backyard.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. I'm not a Giant's fan, but I am a Dodger's fan. So we'll be in enemy territory if we are able to get these.

((Crosstalk))

Man: What do they call it? Unanimous.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. Okay.

How are you doing, Olof?

Olof Nordling: I'm doing fine. It's done.

Chuck Gomez: Okay, going on to C then. I don't think there's anything we need to do about C unless somebody wants to suggest something different.

Mark McFadden had suggested that we do - let me scroll up here because I see I'm missing - I'm sorry. Or is it - yeah, comment. I had over there after all. He had suggested that there needs to be a richer answer there. The answer right now basically refers to what the new TLD committee did for gTLDs with regard to where there's contention for strings as something to consider not necessarily saying it should be the same but just thoughts.

And he thought there should be a richer answer but he is yet to provide any text for that. So I'll give him until our next meeting to do that, and if he doesn't, unless people object, we'll just leave it as is. Are there any comments on that response?

The only reason I highlighted such (unintelligible) was I was trying to make sure I - we could find places where we need to discuss things so there's no significance other than and it wouldn't highlight the blue part as string.

Okay, nothing there?

Okay, scrolling down and then we're going to the question. What coordination should exist between the different actors? And question A is who are the appropriate actors and right now we have the GNSO responses, the ccNSO, GNSO, (SSAC), GAC, ALAC, (ARSAC), registrants and potential registrants, (ITF), which I think was suggested by - and he had suggested (IANA).

But I don't think (IANA) is really an actor on this other than the actual putting it in the root but - and then we added ISO. I think per Sophia's suggestion, sovereign government, the community most directly served and organized language communities. Is that okay for the appropriate actors?

Olof Nordling: I agree with a little question mark about (IANA) because, well, what I do have - I do have a vast experience of former delegations and would know some of the pitfalls. So perhaps, it's not a bad idea to just list them as well.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. Go ahead, add them. Add (IANA) unless anybody objects.

Man: Nope.

Chuck Gomez: Okay, anything else on that?

All right, going to B then. What are the roles? And so, then what we need to do is add a role for (IANA) after (ITF). So if you want to do that, Olof, that would be good.

Olof Nordling: I guess...

Chuck Gomez: You can do that after the call if you want.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. I'll try to add something actually exactly what I said. I mean...

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. Right.

Olof Nordling: ...going on their experience.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. Okay. Do you want us to wait or you'll take care of that later?

Olof Nordling: I'll take time that's why you...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: ...while I'm gabbing here.

Okay. C, do the GAC ccTLD principles need to be revised in the light of the introduction of IDN ccTLDs? And the first sentence says this is the decision for the GAC, and Mark McFadden said this is clearly is new lessons are learned via the deployment of IDN ccTLD. The GAC principles may be revised several times in the future to reflect new

knowledge that all stakeholders to learn and that was added. So what he had suggested being added was added.

Any questions on that, any concern?

Okay, going to three then, delegation of IDN ccTLD. The question is do existing ccTLD delegation policies apply to the delegation of IDN ccTLDs? And the response is this is primary decision for ICANN and the ccNSO with consultation with other ICANN supporting organization and advisory committee as applicable.

Sophia had suggested adding it is also worth noting that one of the few recommendations of the previous (Kato) IDN committee that spent over a year and composed of most the members of the non-ASCII or non-Latin script country made was to - in the future avoid the pitfall of delegating future IDN ccTLDs to the incumbent ASCII ccTLD folder automatically.

Likely, this clear recommendation was in response to the many cases of the lack of local legitimacy of the ASCII ccTLD incumbent then and a warning best kept in mind as a ccNSO and ICANN formulate a go easy policy that transcends question of legitimacy.

Now, I personally, have concerns about it stating what Sophia says there, but let me, before I comment on that, let others comment.

I think we're trying to step on the - we're stepping on the toes of the current ccTLD operators, and I'm not sure we gain any value by doing that. So I think from a GNSO broader perspective, I think we're better

off not going down that path of suggesting one way or another whether the incumbent ASCII ccTLD operator should be the ones or not.

Actually from a user experience point of view, I personally suspects that it's probably a better user experience if that happens, but the (Kato) committee that she's referring to, (Masinavo Kato) that most of you are probably familiar with was on the ICANN board from Japan. They did make a recommendation like that, but my suggestion would not be to address that here.

(Ken We): So are you saying that we should take out the key operator incumbency?

Chuck Gomez: No. I'm not - it's not in there right now, (Ken We). Sophia was suggesting that we add what I read in her comment, and I'm suggesting that I think it's not politically very smart to add that.

(Ken We): Okay. Then, we should take out in the - in doing paragraph which is eight, just to be consistent.

Chuck Gomez: And that follows that? If - so, who can apply to have that; I don't see it there. Where are you seeing it?

(Ken We): Who can apply to that IDN ccTLD delegation - the delegate for the ccTLD...

Chuck Gomez: Right.

(Ken We): ...anyone can apply and get IDN TLD. And it's not that TLD should not be able to have the right to agree someone else having it to be -

anyone can apply and anyone on the level playing field can actually apply for that IDN ccTLD delegated.

Chuck Gomez: I'm not sure I agree with that. But we can talk about that. But that response doesn't say that. The GNSO response says, as in the previous response, this is a decision for ICANN and ccNSO with other supporting organization or advisory committees.

Nevertheless, the approved applicant should at least be from or be supported by the local sovereign government, local Internet business, and user community, the organized language community in the present ASCII ccTLD operated.

Oh, I see what you're saying.

And that's what I had highlighted. Yeah, you're right. So we should remove it there as well. I got you. Okay.

(Ken We): So that fits with the point you made above?

Chuck Gomez: Yup. No, no. I miss that. Okay. So what you're saying then is, we should say, we should end it with and the organized language community.

(Ken We): Yeah, that's fine with me. Okay.

Chuck Gomez: And put a period. You got that, Olof?

Olof Nordling: I'm doing it as we speak. Use of community and the organized language community.

Chuck Gomez: Yup.

Olof Nordling: And then what would the outcome would be then?

Chuck Gomez: Who decides on the delegation of - and in particular, are there specific reasons for deviating from the standard practice guidelines that are - that a zone should only be delegating with the support of the local Internet community which includes the government.

And our response on that which is the next thing is GNSO response to this question is probably inappropriate. However, to avoid issues of local legitimacy being questioned as previously mentioned, there maybe a necessity for this.

And I think that was the comment - related to the comments that Sophia said that the withstanding was - she suggested not withstanding that the GNSO response to this question was probably inappropriate.

And then she changes in deviations needed in order to avoid the issues of local legitimacy should be considered for adoption. I think that's covered in that second sentence there. I don't know if we need to change it to not withstanding.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Were there any changes lie - I was typing along on the previous section?

Chuck Gomez: No, we haven't changed this one in B yet.

Olof Nordling: And we haven't. Okay.

Chuck Gomez: No, no. We're looking at right now.

So, I think what Sophia is suggesting in the GNSO response is to say something like this, "Notwithstanding that a GNSO response to this question is probably inappropriate, to avoid issues of local legitimacy being questioned as previously mentioned there, maybe a necessity for that." I don't know, that seems awkward to me. But somebody have an idea here?

I do think that this isn't a very good thing for the GNSO to be jumping in on. And Sophia is suggesting that the local legitimacy issue should be addressed. What do others think? Should we include that legitimacy sentence that's there?

Man: Make the theme a little bit more explicit?

Chuck Gomez: How would you do that?

Man: I'm thinking...

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. No, no, no. I just - you maybe right, I just don't want to - figure out how.

Olof Nordling: In the meantime, if - since there are number of bullet points, I see two small flaws in the phrasing just like that. However, whether there is a known legitimacy situation, I guess, what we mean in that in their subsequent bullet point where it creates exactly the same is, legitimacy issue rather than situation, isn't it.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. Yeah.

Olof Nordling: In order to keep in line with the word first. I'll change that in the meantime.

Chuck Gomez: Okay.

Olof Nordling: And also you would allow before we advance too far ahead. I mean, way back in under the what B, what are their roles? And the very last line that for areas outside of ICANN's jurisdiction, I think we shouldn't call ICANN a jurisdiction, but ICANN - outside of ICANN's mission.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. That's good. Good catch.

Olof Nordling: Well, I do that for the same flight.

Man: Do we want to get into the legitimacy issue in these responses. I'm not sure it's a GNSO's place to be talking about what's legitimate for ccTLDs.

(Ken We): Yeah. I think a little - (unintelligible) the GNSO is basically the (unintelligible), you know, this...

Chuck Gomez: Well, say that again please, (Ken We)?

(Ken We): Well, I suppose our response here would be mainly to focus on our advice with ccTLD, right, rather than talk about the...

Chuck Gomez: Yeah.

(Ken We): ...the thing about...

Chuck Gomez: And maybe not even advice maybe, I mean, give them things to think about and consider, but...

Man: I mean, they should be aware of the fact - you see, that's one I'm grappling with - on the one hand, if you want to (glute) the legitimacy thing because we want them to think about it.

You know, on the other hand, you know, this maybe inappropriate to us to tell them what to do, so how do we construct and response and highlight the point that legitimacy is something that we ought to be thinking about, and yet, it's something that we'd want to (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomez: Well, maybe we do it like we did earlier in the document in our call today where we approach it on a question, maybe we just say a question and this may not be the best wording, but I'll throw it out just so you know where I'm going.

However, that the issue of local legitimacy is one that maybe worth considering or maybe we can say, "Should local legitimacy be an issue that should be considered here?"

Man: Yeah, given the fact that you have to think about local legitimacy and, you know, it's the only thing that you should be thinking about local legitimacy, right?

We haven't thought about it already. I post it as a question which is fine.

Chuck Gomez: Can you put something like that there, Olof?

Olof Nordling: Yeah, I'm thinking about this.

Chuck Gomez: You seem to be pretty good at wording. So...

Man: Yup. He's our (unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: Well, thank you. That's - well, then I'm glued to the keys here.

Chuck Gomez: I hope it's not super glue.

Man: Well - yeah, I think I know why.

Olof Nordling: So go to...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: ...be an issue to address.

Chuck Gomez: Say that again?

Olof Nordling: Will the local legitimacy be an issue to address or...

Chuck Gomez: That maybe okay.

Man: Okay.

Olof Nordling: And then we keep it like that for the remaining bullet points.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah.

Olof Nordling: For the two...

Chuck Gomez: Except for the last bullet point.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Well - exactly. Not till...

Chuck Gomez: I think the last bullet point, we take that sentence out to be consistent with that we've talked about before -- the yellow sentence.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. That on the involvement knowledge of incumbency to TLD manager.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Well, which is not the last but next to last; okay.

Chuck Gomez: I'm looking at the question, is there any presumptive right?

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Chuck Gomez: And that looks like the last bullet under B.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Yeah. Oh, is that the one? What do exactly - okay.

Chuck Gomez: The other three all have to do with a legitimacy issue. I guess, we could put the legitimacy...

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Chuck Gomez: ...issue in - under that last bullet too. Then we might even be...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: ...better on that whole set up question is giving one answer for all, then
- but whatever works out is okay.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Okay. Well...

Chuck Gomez: Now I know we're at our two hours, but we're just about done if you
guys can bear with me just for a little bit. Let's see...

Man: I actually - I'm sorry - I actually have to hang up right now. So - sorry.
Okay. So...

Chuck Gomez: Okay. Well - if - (Ken We) and Olof, can you stay on a little bit longer?

(Ken We): I can; I'll hang on.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. So we'll try and at least between the three of us go through the
rest of the document. We're on - we're already on Page 15 and 16. So
- and then we'll have a document - oh, (Belao)...

(Belao): Yes?

Chuck Gomez: ...what's your schedule like? Are you available this coming Thursday
for a meeting at the same time?

(Belao): This coming Thursday? Yeah, yeah. Yeah, I can...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: (Ken We) and Olof?

(Belao): Is it going to be also two hours?

Chuck Gomez: If we need it.

Olof Nordling: On Thursday, 16?

Chuck Gomez: Yes.

Olof Nordling: Okay. That's fine.

Chuck Gomez: (Ken We)?

(Ken We): Yes, sorry?

Chuck Gomez: Would this - two days from now meeting at the same time work for you?

(Ken We): Let me check - I was just looking at the changes that - but let me see my schedule. That you are referring to Thursday, the 16th?

Chuck Gomez: Yes.

(Ken We): I have a dinner appointment at 7:00 pm with my former head of departments.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. So that does not work for you. Okay. Then what about...

(Ken We): Later?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: Yeah, I what about next Monday, the 20th?

Man: Monday is actually better for me also.

Chuck Gomez: Olof, does Monday, the 20th work for you?

Olof Nordling: Yeah, as long as we don't stretch beyond five.

Chuck Gomez: I'm sorry. If got the right...

Olof Nordling: The domain take thing press con.

Chuck Gomez: Let's see. So...

Olof Nordling: Well, 5:00 pm my time. Well, forget about the (UPC 15).

Chuck Gomez: On Monday?

Olof Nordling: On Monday, yes.

Chuck Gomez: Oh, okay. So - but the time - the same time we have now works okay on the 20th?

Olof Nordling: That's fine.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. All right. Let's shoot for that then. Monday, the 20th this same time.

Man: Okay.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. So - okay, (Belao), thank you very much.

(Belao): Okay. Take care. Bye-bye everybody.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. And we'll try to wrap this up as exactly, Olof and (Ken We) so that we can - can we go on to C now?

(Ken We): No. Hold on a sec. What was the time again on Monday?

Chuck Gomez: On Monday, the same time as today, so that...

(Ken We): Which is?

Chuck Gomez: ...that's 1200 (UTC).

(Ken We): Okay. I've sent out that I will be in Hanoi.

Chuck Gomez: That's - oh, okay. So that does not work for you.

(Ken We): No, no. I will be in Hanoi then, and if you have a phone number in Vietnam, I could call in or I could (Skype) in.

Chuck Gomez: Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: No. Give me your number, (Ken We), and we'll call up to you.

(Ken We): Yeah - when I - I'm not sure which hotel I'll be in.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay. When you arrived send me your number and we'll call you.

(Ken We): Okay. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Good.

Chuck Gomez: Good. Thanks, Glen. I appreciate that. And I realized that, but I forgot to press star-0 to get this thing recorded. My apologies guys.

So a little bit late now, huh?

(Ken We): Okay, before you get to E, I was looking at - I was just saying before (Belao) went off the air that we were looking at this thing that Olof just updated and you went to change all four bullet points into the question, should local legitimacy be a topic to address.

Chuck Gomez: Yes. Now do you disagree with that? You have another suggestion?

(Ken We): Yeah. Well - the thing was that the final bullet doesn't address the consent it used specifically (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomez: So you think maybe it does not fit there.

Olof Nordling: Oh, you're right.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. Yeah. I think you're right. Yeah.

(Ken We): Right.

Olof Nordling: Right.

(Ken We): So if you look back to the original stock, all right, it says that GNSO is probably - a response is probably inappropriate, however, you know, we do note that the ICANN (unintelligible) IDN committee that previously address both ccTLD and gTLDs recommend again a presumptive right.

The comment by Sophia was the...

Chuck Gomez: That was her comment that we add that.

(Ken We): Yeah.

Chuck Gomez: And the problem is that it's inconsistent with what we did previously when we've talked about the (Kato) committee, that was an area that we thought best left alone rather than stepping on the toes. In other words, not saying whether there should be a presumptive right or not, but as soon as we bring in the (Kato) recommendation, it will sound like a GNSO is recommending that, and I don't think that's the direction we want to go.

(Ken We): So - and also, so the - in the sense, it's the what? It's the consent of the government required? Is the consent of an incumbents gTLD manager requires that presumptive right that we basically say, "Okay, inappropriate thing..."

Chuck Gomez: For us to weigh in on.

(Ken We): But could we flip it over to say that at least in the form of a question, whether consent at least be something which - that they should be - it would be a prudent thing for them to take into consideration. Would that...

Chuck Gomez: To take what into consideration?

(Ken We): Wouldn't - use of legitimacy and consent be something which they might like to take into consideration.

Chuck Gomez: So - but I thought you were saying that the legitimacy issue didn't apply to this one; I'm confused.

(Ken We): Yeah. Well, I'm confused too. So I'm sorry. I'm not making myself clear. So - well, if consent is prior, then it's automatically incumbent, right? So the question he is asking, who decides on the delegation...

Chuck Gomez: No. The question here that we're talking, unless - maybe we're talking about different questions. The question is, is there any presumptive right of the ASCII ccTLD manager over a corresponding IDN ccTLD? And if we delete Sophia's sentence there, our response right now would just read a GNSO response to this question as probably inappropriate.

Olof Nordling: And I probably should delete the local legitimacy be a topic to address. I mean, that's probably inappropriate - well, beside the point here.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. And I thought that that's what (Ken We) previously suggested that we delete that there. Maybe I misunderstood. Or...

(Ken We), do you think we should add something more than just...

(Ken We): Can we get back to Sophia and ask her what exactly she means about this, you know?

Chuck Gomez: Well - yeah, unfortunately, she's not on the call. But it sounds like - by referring to the (Kato) report there, is that suggests that they're not be a presumptive right. Again, we're saying, we're raising something that I think will not be well appreciated by the CC community. And I'm not sure if the GNSO really wants to go there. It's something they're going to have to deal with, but what value is it of the GNSO saying that?

(Ken We): Yeah. So - well, maybe this whole bullet point should be taken as a whole, and then we really look at this thing because I'm getting - my brain is getting washed up now.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. All right. Okay. Yeah. Okay.

(Ken We): All right.

Chuck Gomez: And the responses are, that's...

(Ken We): Already 10 o'clock, and I'm really losing it, you know, I didn't quite sleep last night, so it's 10 already, so I'm really - 24 hours I'm awake already. Sorry about that. I'm not being clear here.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. And Olof, you may see if you can take a crack at maybe combining one response for all of those bullets, rather than repeating what almost ends up with the same thing for everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: All right. Very quickly. Who will formulate the policy for this processes? I'm in C. GNSO response is ccNSO with input from the above mentioned on ICANN entity such as local sovereign and government, et cetera. I think we've accommodated Sophia's concern there. Any comments on that?

(Ken We): Nope.

Chuck Gomez: Jumping down to E...

(Ken We): Yeah.

Chuck Gomez: ...we have at a minimum IDN ccTLD operator should be required to follow the ICANN IDN guidelines just like gTLD registries that offer IDN, if that requires an agreement between ICANN and the IDN ccTLD operator, then an agreement should be required.

Several comments there, Mark McFadden said, "Shouldn't our goal be a specific agreement of MOU between Caremark as the operation ICANN as a strategic thing for ICANN as a whole?"

I think, I basically went on and said, from a strictly GNSO perspective, I think that's - I would agree, but I'm not sure it's realistic. That whole issue is something very different.

And then Sophia's suggestion was added there where it says given so far it has been a historical fact that ASCII ccTLD have been running (in essence) as commercial gTLDs having little to do with the territory, it was meant for and run for the same root.

That comment to me seems, first of all, it's over generalized. I think we're getting in the troublesome territory if we say something like that.

(Ken We): So...

Chuck Gomez: So the - and id you start talking about what technical operational and financial criteria would apply to ccTLDs, we're totally going to inflame the ccTLD community.

(Ken We): Just obviously, what you mean is that, you know, historical segment - some gTLD had been running in essence the commercial but not all, right?

Chuck Gomez: Okay. That's true. But what does that have to do with this question?

(Ken We): Oh, I see.

Chuck Gomez: You know what I'm saying?

(Ken We): Yeah.

Chuck Gomez: This is really asking, should there be an agreement? And I think our first paragraph kind of beats around the portion, doesn't say one way or another. But, you know, but a minimum the IDN guideline should be

followed. And if that requires an agreement, then yes. If we go further than that, we're going to be stepping all over the toes of the CCs, and their local sovereignty of their government.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: But my suggestion would be just leave the first paragraph as it is, and to lead the second paragraph that Sophia added.

(Ken We): So I think what Sophia is trying to say - trying to read between the lines there, the comment lines and (unintelligible) it seems to me, she is trying to (unintelligible) for the fact that there should be some kind of level playing field because (unintelligible) at gTLD ccTLD you can run as commercial ccTLD competing with a commercial gTLD. So maybe what she's trying to say is underlying it all is - let me see...

Chuck Gomez: Now that I'm okay with. Maybe we could just - thanks, (Ken We). Now let me see if this is where you're going. So instead of the paragraph that's there, we could say something like, if an IDN ccTLD is operated as a commercial venture like a gTLD, then it should be required that they have similar technical operational and financial requirement.

(Ken We): Is that...

Chuck Gomez: Does that make sense?

(Ken We): Yes. So long as the concept of level playing field is established by this - of this paragraph, and I think it should be fine.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. So - Olof, did you get that?

Olof Nordling: Okay. I think I've got that.

Chuck Gomez: So we would delete those paragraphs and replace it with something like I just said.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, indeed. I mean...

Chuck Gomez: And by the way, I think that's the last item that we have to cover. Obviously, we'll need in our last meeting to kind of revisit a few of these things and see if we're in - and have rough consensus on the whole thing.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Man: Yahoo.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Not a little. It's more request, but it's just sort of - there's - the first sentence is a little bit awkward, does that requires an agreement between ICANN and the IDN ccTLD operated then an agreement should be required.

I suggest we change that to a call for an agreement between ICANN and so we just in order not to make it...

Chuck Gomez: That's good. I'm okay with that. (Ken We), is that all right?

(Ken We): Could you type it in and maybe I could take a quick look at it.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Is that call for adjustment in order to not become to overly repetitive.
And it becomes a little strange as a sentence.

Chuck Gomez: So the second sentence would say of that first crack of response would be, if that calls for an agreement between ICANN and the IDN CC to the operator, then an agreement should be required. So you don't have requires in both places.

Now, Olof, can you - once you - and I'll - I have a task to submit some language at one point and I'll do that trying to do that today. And then I think you had a - or you were going to take one thing and...

Olof Nordling: I've got one thing that...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. And I have one thing. I'll try and send that thing within a few hours, so that you have it early tomorrow - first of the day tomorrow for you. And then if you could send out once you get mine and get yours done, if you could send out...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: ...a new version of the documents that - and our purpose on our meeting Monday will be to go over that final document. And I realize there's one area where we really haven't finished, but we'll work on

that; that one we're talking about quite a bit at the beginning of today's call.

Olof Nordling: Could we swap that because tomorrow it happens to be a holiday in Belgium and I'm due for - we're painting our house.

Chuck Gomez: Uh-huh. So - okay, swap, let's see, what we're too is you want to do that then on Thursday?

Olof Nordling: Yeah. If I could shoot this off to you as soon as I've...

Chuck Gomez: Oh, that will work. And then I'll just add the change that I'm going to do. That works fine.

Olof Nordling: That's fine, because then I do try to wait. And then...

Chuck Gomez: That will work just fine for me...

Olof Nordling: Okay. Great.

Chuck Gomez: ...and then what I will do is distribute a final document is that we will go over - and I'll remove all the comments and everything that we've already addressed, so that we have a relatively clean document to go over in our last call on Monday.

Olof Nordling: And then I'd - what I would do is now download one way or another this document and send that out. I hope it will be sufficiently clear what we've been doing, that's a little bit of a problem, because I've been changing on the - well, on the screen document which...

Chuck Gomez: I'll try and do whatever I can to make sure it's clear...

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Chuck Gomez: ...even if I have to send out a couple of versions and people can compare to this version. But I'll try and work on that.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Chuck Gomez: Okay.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

(Ken We): Can we also look at the three bullet things - the bullet stuff that - but, you know, it's going to say something and we couldn't quite get what it was.

Chuck Gomez: You mean on the legitimacy?

(Ken We): Yeah, yeah.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah. Yeah. Well, we'll be able to look at any of these things again next week. We just won't go through every single thing we've done next week; we'll ask people to make sure that they reviewed the document in total that is sent out - that I'll send out hopefully by tomorrow. And then we will talk about those that we know we haven't finished, and then any others that people want to discuss for this.

Does that make sense?

(Ken We): Yeah.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. Hey thanks to both of you. I appreciate it very much.

Olof Nordling: Great. Thank you.

Chuck Gomez: Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: Can we use the same system next week too, (Ken We)?

(Ken We): Yeah, I will try to get my mobile (unintelligible) done and I will send email through my Blackberry.

Glen de Saint Géry: Oh, okay. Otherwise, what we should do is to - I will look for an (unintelligible) or I should try and get hooked on to this and we can send this out.

Chuck Gomez: Okay.

(Ken We): Yeah, yeah, please. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Chuck Gomez: All right, thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: So we will do that.

Olof Nordling: Bye.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thanks. Bye.

(Ken We): Bye.

END