

GNSO IDN Working Group (WG1) Teleconference

23 January 2007

14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO IDN Working Group (WG1) teleconference on 23 January 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

<http://gnso-audio.icann.org/IDN-wg1-20070123.mp3>

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

Participants on the call:

Ram Mohan - Working Group Chair

Paul Diaz - Registrar constituency

Werner Staub - Registrar constituency

William Tan - Registry constituency

Caroline Greer - Registry constituency

Charles Sha'ban - IP constituency

Marilyn Cade - CBUC council

Will Rodger - CBUC

Avri Doria - Appointee to GNSO Council

Andrea Pasztor - standing in for Jonathan Cohen wg member, IPC

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Glen de Saint Gery - GNSO Secretariat

Tan Tin Wee – absent - apologies

The Power point presentation and agenda that was used may be found at :

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

Man: Hi.

Glen Desaintgery: Excuse me. Ram Mohan now joins.

Hi, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Hi, Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Good. You're clear as a bell.

Ram Mohan: That's a good thing.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. (Unintelligible) of (Etheron). (Unintelligible) that we can go on from here.

Ram Mohan: You got it.

Glen Desaintgery: Are you good enough (unintelligible) and all that?

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I think so, yes, I'm leaving tomorrow.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Yes, I think so. I mean, I - at least I had enough to (laugh me) until I get to my room.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. Fine.

Man: Okay.

Coordinator: Excuse me. (Marilyn Cade) has now joins.

Man: Good morning, Marilyn. Welcome.

Marilyn Cade: Good morning.

Man: It's you, me and Glen and Paul so far.

Marilyn Cade: Oh. Well let's make some big decisions.

Which looking at my calendar, (yours) and Glen are going to ask to be tightly scheduled.

Actually, I'm surprised.

Man: Excuse me?

Marilyn Cade: When I'm surprised, you're able to keep all these calls (right). There are so many of them.

Glen Desaintgery: Hello, Marilyn and Paul.

Paul: Good morning, Glen. Hi, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Hi, Paul.

Glen Desaintgery: And hi, Avri.

Man: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Ram, are you on?

(Will Roger): Hello, it's (Will Rodger).

Glen Desaintgery: Hello, (Will).

(Will Roger): Hi. Who's this?

Glen Desaintgery: It's Glen Desaintgery. I'm the GNSO secretariat.

(Will Roger): Oh yeah?

Marilyn Cade: Hi, (Will). It's Marilyn.

(Will Roger): Hey, Marilyn. How are you?

Marilyn Cade: Good. Welcome.

Ram Mohan: Welcome everyone. This is Ram.

We'll get the call started in just a minute or so because we're waiting for people to gather.

Man: Okay.

Coordinator: Excuse me. Charles Sha'ban now joins.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, Charles. This is Ram.

We're just waiting for...

Charles Sha'ban: Good (evening).

Ram Mohan: ...a couple more minutes (for others) to join. We'll get started here just shortly.

Charles Sha'ban: Thank you. Nice to hear your voice again, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Same here, Charles.

Charles Sha'ban: Thanks.

Coordinator: Excuse me. (Andrea) Pastor now joins.

Ram Mohan: Welcome. This is Ram. Welcome to the call. We'll get started in just another minute...

(Andrea) Pastor: Okay.

Ram Mohan: ...or two.

Coordinator: Excuse me. (Caroline Greer) now joins.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, (Caroline). This is Ram.

(Caroline Grey): Hi, Ram.

Ram Mohan: We're going to get started (unintelligible).

Man: Hi. We're going to get started just shortly.

(Caroline Grey): (Unintelligible).

Glen Desaintgery: (Andrea), can I just check your name please? Is it P-A-S-T-O-R?

(Andrea) Pastor: PASZT-O-R.

Glen Desaintgery: P-A-S, ZT-O-R.

Which constituency are you in?

(Andrea) Pastor: I'm just calling on behalf of (Jonathan Cohen). He's not available for this meeting and he asked me to call in. I'm his (article student).

Glen Desaintgery: Oh.

Is (Jonathan) member of the intellectual property constituency?

(Andrea) Pastor: Yes. Well I'm not quite sure. He just left the message for me to call in, at this time, a number and take note.

Man: Glen, would you be able to check if (Jonathan) is a member of the IP constituency.

And (Andrea), you work for the same organization as (Jonathan)?

(Andrea) Pastor: Yes. I'm his (article student) in his law firm.

Charles Sha'ban: Hi, this is (Shan).

Mr. (Jonathan) is the member of IPC, you know, that he's representing 15 IPC (staff)?

Marilyn Cade: Charles, I'm sorry. It's Marilyn.

Will you (just) confirming that (Jonathan) is a member of the IPC?

Charles Sha'ban: Yes, he's the member.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Thanks.

Charles Sha'ban: Welcome. Thank you.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, (Jonathan Cohen) is a member of the IDN Group.

Charles Sha'ban: (Yeah), I remember he sent - the IPC sent a message. If any one wants to volunteer, I remember (receiving) an email from him that he would like to volunteer here. but I'm not sure if they send (unintelligible).

Man: (So folks), we are at the - five minutes past the appointed time, and I (suggest) it's time for us to get going.

First off, and we welcome you all to this call, and I'm going to ask Glen if we could do a roll call.

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: Certainly, Ram.

On the call, we have yourself, Ram Mohan, Marilyn Cade, Paul Diaz, Avri Doria, (Will Rodger), Charles Sha'ban, (Andrea) Pasztor, (Caroline Greer), William Tantem - William Tan -- sorry.

Have I missed anybody out?

Hello?

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Well I hope all of you had a chance to go through the bullet's agenda for today's call.

Before we actually get into the call itself, I'm wondering if anyone has any agenda item that they'd like to add.

All right. So, that's good, no new agenda item.

I'm going to go by the PDF that was sent to all of you - at least a link was sent to all of you. Excuse me.

The plan here is to spend about 90 minutes today talking about what are the major issues that this working group is going to be looking into and getting a little bit of plan of action together. Excuse me, a second.

Okay. First off is on the PDF. It will be Slide 3 which is to briefly reiterate what the purpose of our working group is, which is to identify and specify any policy issues that the GNSO opt to consider via PDP that may not already has been considered within the December 2005 PDP.

Now, specifically, what we have been asked to do in this working group is to review the new gTLD draft recommendation that's coming out to the GNSO, the lab test outcomes some of which have already been published and others that are due to be published shortly, the ICANN staff issue (support) an IDN, and also the IAB document which is (RXC4690).

In addition, we are also expected to research what the policy - and discuss really what the policy implication for IDN gTLDs are and might be and (review) a report -- which is due on March 21 -- on policy matters that may or be - that (maybe shared on) or might conflict the ccNSO and also policy issues that merit a new PDP.

Now, I said March 21, 2007 primarily because that's about exactly a week before the GNSO council meeting scheduled in Lisbon which provides the council members and other members of the public an opportunity to actually lead our report and ask them a questions or post any comments.

Moving quickly on to our plan of operation, my plan is to set a vigorous schedule and to work pretty hard on understanding what the policy issues might be on OPoC on IDN TLD.

Between here and March 21, the plan is to hold 18 meetings in 9 pairs, one every Tuesday - each pair of meeting is going to be focused on agenda topic and we'll continue to plan as we have done for this meeting by setting an agenda ahead of time and also...

(Olof): Hello?

Ram Mohan: ...sending some preparatory - hi.

(Olof): This is (Olof). Sorry for (late) - you know, for being late.

Ram Mohan: No problem, (Olof). We are on Slide 4...

(Olof): Okay.

Ram Mohan: ...of the PDF.

(Olof): Okay.

Ram Mohan: Now, each pair of meeting is going to be focused on specific agenda topics and I - we will give the agenda out ahead of time as well as any preparatory material that will be acquired.

Now, the calendar that I proposed for us to work through is to complete our review process by February 6 which is in two weeks time, and that would be reviewing the new gTLD draft recommendation, the lab test outcome, ICANN staff issue support and the IAB document.

And once we've done with that, I would - what I would like for us to do is to draft an outcome out of the - out of what - whatever we have reviewed and we'd like to have a document that starts to point out and drive at what areas there might be consensus on and what other areas we think for the study is warranted.

Now, our job from February 13 through March 6, what I proposed that we do is to discuss research, analyze the policy implication and to have a draft conclusion document ready for the membership of the working group to review on March of - by on March 6, and to actually have that work pretty vigorously on the mailing list, to have questions and answers.

And I suspected, we will have some drafting teams and potentially smaller group that will split of to go more deeply look into certain areas that they can - and come back to the meeting, say, we have talked to the following individuals or we have looked to the following areas and here is - here are our findings.

The intent is that our working group will have a draft (unintelligible) report ready for us to look through by March 13. And I would very much like to finalize this report by March 20, have our working group go to and basically sign up on this report and to issue the report on march 21 a week before the GNSO council meeting.

It's an aggressive schedule and it's a vigorous schedule that requires all of us on the working group to actually go and do our homework and to continue to pay attention to the topics.

Now, one of the questions that had come up to me, both privately by more than one or two people, was a question of how will paired meetings work? So it's a question about, you know, concerns raised that might be extra work for members to keep track of what happened from the first call on a Tuesday to what happened on a second call on a Tuesday, and then to achieve continuity into the week going forward.

My (thought) is a following to ensure coordination and update and to maintain continuity, what we planned to do on the staff is I have asked (Olof) and he graciously agreed, but (Olof) and myself planned to - in addition to the transcripts and the MP3 recordings that are going to be put out, we planned to look at identify what were the commonalities and commonaries of agreement

between each of the pair of the call as well as point out to the membership areas that - where there were significant or even small differences.

And the intent there is to provide all of you in the working group a (base) where you can look at and say, "Here is an area that I'm more interested in. Now, let me go to the transcript and look at what was actually said or let me look at more detail," rather than have to go and listen to 90 minutes of another call.

The reason for having these paired meetings, as we had said earlier, the reason is to make sure that the global membership of our working group can meet at - from reasonable hours.

I know that even though we have these two set of times, there are still some set of people who will be in (community meetings), who will be up late at night or who will be up early in the morning, but that is kind of the nature of working in a global setup.

There are couple of other details in - that I wanted to go to -- this is on Slide 5 now -- and this is just administrative stuff.

The first is who may join the GNSO IDN working group and that's also a quite clearly defined in our original charter, constituency members or GNSO council members as well as ICANN advisory group liaison.

At this point - Glen, correct me if I'm wrong. But at this point, I do not think we have any ICANN advisory group liaison as of yet, but I fully expect that the advisory groups will be appointing liaisons shortly.

Glen Desaintgery: Absolutely, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Great. Thank you, Glen.

Now, I have certain expectations of myself as well as - of the other working group members in the - in this IDN working group. I suddenly do not expect that, you know, you'll be technically completely up to speed on IDN or actually even the experts on IDN.

But I certainly do have an expectation that our working group members will read the summary documents and will consult with your constituency to think about what issues you or your constituency care about and that, you know, do your homework and come prepare to meetings.

In general, my intent is that we will do only a little bit of status on these calls and really try pretty hard to have these calls dig pretty deep into the mid of issue rather than just go over status details.

Now, the other thing that I also intent to do and plan on doing is when we reach topics that are deserving of discussion or required discussion, what I would very much ask of you and would like is to ask to be placed in a queue and ask questions or make your comments in a queue.

I find some time on conference call, especially global ones, when we have more than one person speaking, you sometimes cannot comprehend what anybody is saying, so that's my humble request to you to just place yourself in a queue and we'll make sure that we - there is an opportunity for your opinion and your voice to be heard.

So that kind of takes care of all the administrative and kind of set up start up details of this call.

I'm going to just pause for a minute here and ask if any of you have any thoughts, questions, opinions before we actually jump into work -- the real work that we have to do.

(Warner): This is (Warner).

Just a question of how we are organized as team (GNIS) or ICANN org issues, IDN TLDs Web page so to speak where we have the central depository for documents for the working group or is there something as well?

Ram Mohan: That will be the central depository, (Warner) and the idea is that, as new documents come out and as well as agendas come out, we will end up publishing them on that working group Web page.

(Warner): Okay, that's great, thanks.

Ram Mohan: Any other questions? Any other thoughts?

Okay. There is one other item, author of business that I should mention and talk about which is the request that Bruce Tomkin sent out to our group about a week ago to have an observer from the GNSO or working group, be appointed the ccNSO GAC Joint Working Group.

A number of members have - (as I said) in my email, a number of members have actually come forward and suggested themselves as liaison's aid to be in the liaison role, and I'm still in the process of speaking with the number of them and I'm trying to evaluate where we go with this.

Now, one of the questions that Marilyn had asked on the list was qualifications and what really are the expectations of the role -- Bruce (to lead an answer). I'll just reiterate it for those of you who didn't follow that exchange.

The idea of this role is really somebody who will listen keenly and who will make sure that messages are passed accurately and appropriately between the different working groups.

There is not a - an expectation of extra prominence or importance associated with this observer role. And in fact, I wanted to point out that, when I spoke to folks on the - to the chairs of the ccNSO and GAC working group, it seemed likely that there would be, again, quite a few calls.

They plan on having calls that might go as long as two hours and they might - they have not yet decided whether the calls are going to be once a week or once every other week or perhaps even more frequently than that.

But there certainly is a time commitment that is required both on the GNSO IDN working group and - as well as on the joint working group site.

So in the next few days, you know, I'll be able to make a determination in terms of, you know, who we have to be on the working group, but in a meanwhile, that's kind of the information I have gotten from the ccNSO and the GAC side.

Okay, before we actually get into the policy areas that have been identified so far and to open up for discussion, I thought that perhaps there are a number of important definition that we need to understand as a working group and that we actually need to, to some extent, agree upon. They don't have to be

necessarily definitions that the whole world has, and in some cases, they will not be such definition.

But as we write our documents and as we create our report, I anticipate that we will have a glossary and a definition section.

Now, (Olof) is -- has a draft document that will come out to the list shortly. But what I thought was for this call to call your attention to Slide Number 6 which is the definition slide, and to ask the following question a few, what is missing in - from among all the definitions that are here, what is missing?

Because we could have a long discussion about what each of these terms are, but my part is let's have (Olof) - let's have a draft document that we can read and review before we - you know, we comeback and say, "I believe this is what a definition of the gTLD is et cetera." I think we have some - (Olof) will have some basis to pull certain definitions from contracts, certain other definitions from RFC, et cetera.

But my question to you is what's missing? Because we'll need to make sure that the terms we use are consistent and stay that some level of referential integrity throughout our conversation.

So what do you folks think? What's missing here in terms of definition?

(Warner): Just a question, Ram. This is (Warner) again.

Are you talking about definitions that where there easy definition or where we would have to provide one? I mean, if I see IDN ccTLD, I quite frankly think that this is one area where (unintelligible) will have to be a definition.

Ram Mohan: And - you're right. I think - sorry, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I just want to get in the queue. It's Marilyn.

Ram Mohan: I got it, Marilyn, you're in the queue.

(Warner), my thought is both. In some cases, I think we will have preexisting definition. In other cases, we may have to create a definition, but nevertheless, I think what I'm interested in is to get the list of terms that we might use that may mean different things to different people and then we can go figure out, you know, who to get it from or what the right source is.

Does it answer your question, (Warner)?

(Warner): Yes, I actually think that way also.

There's a couple of terms (unintelligible) set ourselves the target to providing or proposing a definition, and there will be a couple more where I suggest that's really important.

Man: What definitions to you think - what are those couple of definitions that we should...

(Warner): I think we might need definitions as to what is it, a translation of a gTLD and what are the transliterations or - of a gTLD? Do these things are probably going to be needed at some point?

Ram Mohan: Great. Anything else?

(Warner): Well, this is just the one that came to my mind.

Man: What I...

((Crosstalk))

Man: This is (Olof).

Could I just attend to that because they should search idiom in that context to that's transcription.

So if you talk about translations and transliteration, there is sort of a phonetic transliteration which is actually a transcription. There are things would need to be included in that as well.

Man: (Unintelligible) (Paul Roger).

Man: Can I...

Man: (Paul), you're in the queue, Marilyn is in the queue before you, and then (Paul).

Man: Okay.

Man: And then (unintelligible).

Man: Okay, Marilyn, the floor is yours.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

I though it was (Will Roger) that have to be in the queue, but that's not the...

Man: Yeah, but...

Marilyn Cade: ...that might be in the queue.

Well, I agree with (Warner) on the suggestions he made.

Ram, I just want to point out, that actually, I don't think if this working group's job to create a definition for gTLD that - if there is - and I say that because we have this discussion in the previous meeting that (Olof) will remember.

I think that the council believe - let me get to that call, sorry.

I think that the council believes it has a definition of gTLD. I'm not saying this group couldn't put a definition forward but I think we ought to try to use the existing definition and see if that can work for us because we would need to have alignment of definitions at the council level.

Man: Marilyn, I couldn't agree more with you. I think our job here is to (coop) definitions that already exist, and then those that do not exist, to perhaps propose some.

And really again the intent is to have consistency across the board rather...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: ...than invent new ones.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: So I'm on the same page with you.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So I just say that, for instance, you know, what we might want to propose is a existing TLD is a term that becomes outdated every time we - or becomes updated I should say, every time a new round of TLDs is added.

And so maybe we could just take gTLD, existing gTLD, new gTLD, and see if we can (coop) definitions and have that standardization which then would be adopted at the council level across future work of the council that the two valid related to - is it a IDN gTLD and IDN ccTLD, I definitely think definitions are needed from this group and there - I don't really think there's anything to (coop) although (Olof) would be that expert on that.

Man: I got it.

Anything else, Marilyn?

Marilyn: None.

Man: Or could I get in to the queue please with (Olof)?

Man: Okay, (Olof), you're in the queue.

Who is next in the queue after Marilyn, (Will) I think. Yeah, that...

Man: This sort of echoing some of Marilyn's thought. It wasn't - it's still not entirely clear to me what's really we're talking about in terms of (art) and

what we were talking about terms that can be disagreed upon, but looking at the list, I think it might be well worth putting in PUNICODE as much as that sort of a key piece of this whole puzzle.

Man: I got it.

Anything else, (Will)?

(Will): No, that's it.

Man: Okay. I have (Olof). Did I hear somebody else get in and asked to be on the queue before - or after (Will)?

Woman: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry. Avri (unintelligible).

Man: Avri. Okay.

Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

Just a quick comment. One is I think there will be (a lot of) terms and I don't have them at my finger tips now.

But as we're talking through some of the technical documents, we'll see that various times are either used unclearly or they use slightly differently at

different points in time. And I think that we're going to have to put those in the dictionary as we move along.

And I think the other point out I want to make is I don't think we're going to be able to achieve a close list of terms that need to be defined. I think, as we're going through the conversation and as soon as we hit something where we notice that there is not quite a full understanding in this group that we'll need to have someone whether it's (Olof) or someone else (in the group), you know, stop and get the definition written that everyone can buy in.

So I think that this is actually going to be an ongoing effort throughout this, you know, 26 meetings, whatever it is.

Charles Sha'ban: Yes. Ram, this is Charles (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Go ahead please.

Charles Sha'ban: Thank you.

I just wanted to add maybe one thing, maybe understandable for us all but to just to confirm that we are now, when you say IDN gTLD, this, this means)in a sub-level domain) (unintelligible).

When we use to talk about IDN, we use to talk about second level keeping the top level domain name as .com or .net. We are talking now IDN.IDN for sure.

Ram Mohan: It sounds like - since you raised it, it sounds like IDN gTLD is not clear enough or perhaps IDN gTLD have to be defined to say we're talking about, you know, .IDN or IDN - you know, IDN - yeah we're talking about IDN.IDN rather than IDN.ASCII.

Charles Sha'ban: Yeah thanks. It is - since I'm just trying (unintelligible) because what I heard this is comment from someone that's why (I don't changed it).

So for me, the gTLD mean...

Ram Mohan: Yeah, I think our charter...

Charles Sha'ban: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: I think our charter clearly calls for us to discuss IDN.IDN rather than IDN at the second level so - but that's a good point and we need to make sure that that's - that comes across quite clearly.

You know, perhaps what we could do, Charles, is, say, IDN gTLD and have, you know, what many dictionary would do also know as IDN.IDN or something like that.

Charles Sha'ban: Okay. That will be I think - we can make sure now everybody knows exactly what this meant of the IDN gTLD.

Thank you.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I get back to the (queue)? (Unintelligible) follow-up comments (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: This is Avri, right?

Avri Doria: Yup. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: We got it Avri.

(Olof), you're next.

(Olof): Thank you.

Well, first of all, to respond backwards here. (John) mentioned that IDN.IDN, and most certainly, it's - well, the definition or the common understanding which I almost would prefer to call it definition is rather presumptuous.

But a gTLD with a label or string that contains at least one character, not a pairing (unintelligible), specifically not in the subset of the LDH subset in the top level string.

So, well, yes, that's exactly what we're aiming at, and well, maybe we can use this - I call it glossary or working definitions or common understandings of terms to get us all on the same page that we really mean that.

I think that Avri made very good point when it comes to that this is a matter where sometimes the definitions aren't necessarily stringent in the existing ones.

And what we may need is really a common understanding that we all can agree to. Maybe it won't to make qualify as the ultimate definition but at least that we have an agreement about what we're speaking about.

And, well, we certainly should use what we have got. And I would like to - we do need to add a few things like will management PUNICODE of - that's perfectly clear.

Perhaps we also need to be able to talk about the presentation layer and the source code string compared to the PUNICODE string or sometimes in order to be able to distinguish between what the user will see normally and what actually appears in - within the core of the Internet.

And also, Marilyn, I think you mentioned that we should use what we've got, yes, we certainly should. And I - you also made an excellent point which I had made a little draft definition of existing gTLD which rhymes very well with what you've said -- gTLD that has been approved to be added to the root.

Marilyn Cade: Fabulous. Yes.

(Olof): So (a router) that has been added to a root or rather (it means) operational because I believe that the policy consequences appear the moment that it has been approved.

So just a few comments to all of you. Thank you very much for the comments.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Olof).

Avri, you're back in queue.

Avri Doria: Yes, just a quick follow-up.

As we were talking, for example, somewhat as .ASCII and all of a sudden there we were again in the definition of thing, are we talking about (at aid) of some level are all ASCII.

So clarifying that whole bit of conversation of, you know, at what level are we speaking, and I think that been - (Olof) alluded to it, you know, .ASCII and what is that mean, they're all .ASCII at a certain point.

So making sure that we've got that bit of language clear to us, I think, would be effective.

Man: You know I must confess that all of these makes me wonder whether we should - we're not have enough time for here but it might be something that you might be able to put into the recommendations that we start off some sort of, say, a Wiki for this kind of thing because that -it lends itself quite nicely to the type of exercise we're talking about here.

Avri Doria: ICANN (unintelligible).

Man: I'm sorry, I missed that?

Avri Doria: I'm sorry. (Unintelligible) but I'm not sure ICANN (unintelligible).

Man: Hello?

Hello?

Avri Doria: Hello?

Man: Yeah, are we all back?

Man: Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes?

Man: Are you in contact with the operator?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, I will contact.

Man: Okay, thanks.

Woman: Are you sure that wasn't just a foghorn?

Avri Doria: We're talking about the definitions with you.

Man: Or maybe Ram, it's background noise from Bhutan.

Woman: I thought maybe Ram was introducing a new form of approval. We no longer hum or boo but we had (four) kinds of horns.

(Olof): A big (horn).

The question - by the way, can we run it on weekly? This is (Olof). I think it's - it is a good idea. I think maybe this is something that can develop into some kind of long term effort because I find that in many discussions about IDN that this initially tend to almost block progress. So there's suddenly some join efforts that should be made and maybe, well, this could be - well, at least the starting point for getting better common understanding on what we actually mean with various terms.

I know we have definitions in many RFCs and such, but frequently, the - that some kind of university-accepted glossaries, well, doesn't seem to exist and that's a very, very ambitious thing to even start upon.

So, hence, my ambition would be to have a common understanding on what we're talking about and something that we can refer to at least in the documents so that people would understand what we mean. Whether that's the ultimate truth to the matter is probably a much harder and not to correct.

Ram Mohan: And this Ram. I'm back and I'm sorry I got (dropped of) in the beautiful mountains, kingdom of Bhutan. And it seems like international call center automatic time out. (Unintelligible).

Man: This is (Warner). Could I get to the queue unless (there's) one or...

Man: Please, go ahead.

(Warner): It was just - Wiki was mentioned. I think it would be very good idea - of course, it also a very good idea to have the central and repository, but the can easily be solved if you just have a link from the central repository to the Wiki.

And if use a Wiki, wouldn't it be good just to go ahead and use an existing one such as, you know, if maybe (unintelligible) use the ICANN Wiki, ask them to, you know, make available some space (rush) and that's we can somehow use as a group, and I mean, we work to (staff) directly on the Wiki. It's much easier to work, (to get it).

Man: Yeah, I agree with you, and, you know, I commend without a specific - you know, we decided it must be on, you know, one type Wiki or the other. I'm kind of much more focused on "lets get this going," and I'm very struck up by Avri's comment on, you know, we're uncover of more and more terms as we engage in this course.

And I worry about, you know, all of us spending, you know, “Hey, this is a term, let me send it off to (Olof),” I mean, you have to remember it, but its probably more likely that you may, you know, put it down somewhere and then at sometime just to go (add stub) into a Wiki and then, you know, the (community can) (unintelligible).

But that's a good point.

Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Are there any other thoughts on this slide before we've move on to the next one?

Marilyn Cade: Its Marilyn.

I just want to ask (Olof) not to respond today, but there is a separate conversation going on at the council level, as you know, (Olof), about ongoing tolls that can be used and applied for all of the policy work. And Denise Michel had indicated that she had assigned the examination of tools to someone.

If there are going to be tools made available anytime soon that are consistent across the policy process, I would say we should use those, but if - and that would - that probably unlikely, so given that this is a short term project working on an accelerated pay probably whatever we do will be completed before there would be any best choice or selection of other resources. Is that a good assumption?

(Olof): This is (Olof).

Yes, I think that's a good assumption, but we will certainly follow up and see where we - where exactly this stands for - at this point in time. I mean, what we have used, as you know, for some time in other dealings within the GNSO, and many of you know, we have used the Shinkuro online cooperation too. But (what lends itself) exactly to this, I'm not sure (to rather) to have support online for - during meetings but...

Man: (Olof), I don't think...

(Olof): (Unintelligible).

Man: Shinkuro - I just briefly watching Shinkuro. I think Shinkuro is very good for document sharing.

Woman: But that's all?

Man: But I don't think it's really good for the kind of work we're looking to do here which is to have definitions or this term be put up somewhere and then continue from there.

I mean, in my own line in a Wiki is definitely a tool that is going to be required in ICANN future and working group's future.

Woman: So (Mike), I don't want to - (unintelligible) with this. I would totally support your analysis. Shinkuro is not the right tool. I just wanted to be sure working on a fast track.

I think the Wiki probably is the most immediately available resource for us within the time frame that we have available. But I just want to be sure there wasn't anything else coming down the (path), it doesn't sound (like it is).

Man: I would have to check that, but let me get to you and I and Glen will get to (agreed) with this particular issue and (rework) to you and say what we can do, in addition to the existing web page, of course.

Ram Mohan: Marilyn, good point.

Thank you.

Any other thoughts or questions on Slide 6 before we move on to the next slide?

Going once, going twice, okay.

The next slide really is an attempt to summarize, (Olof), set of issues -- the ICANN staff issues -- before that was - that is published awhile ago, almost a month ago now.

What we've done is to (group) them into seven major topics, and the topics are right in front of you and - well that sort of a review.

My thought is we would now spend the remaining 45 minutes or 40 minutes or so of our time reviewing the major areas inside of these seven topics, and I'm hoping that while we do that, we will uncover perhaps (in one to) - inside of these areas or we make even uncover a major area that has been left open and that opt to be considered by us in the working group.

So, going straight on to the new gTLD area, what has been discussed so far and what's been published in the prior stat report under new gTLD is where

that the GNSO working group should consider or could consider the policy impact on new gTLD introduction by IDN gTLD.

And really the - I guess the question that was being asked for us to discuss and think about, it was should new gTLDs or the allocation of new gTLDs wait from the completion of the IDN gTLD issue.

The second area that was in the issues report was what reserve means policy opt to be adapted in new gTLD with respect to IDN top-level domain or IDN gTLD.

So those were kind of a two highlight of items that were listed there.

I want to stop here and open this topic up for our group and ask you to have comments on this area and if you have additions or modification to suggest.

I'll start the queue now.

(Wynard): This is (Wynard). I would like to be in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Okay. (Wynard), you're in the queue.

Anyone else?

Okay, (Wynard), you got to talk.

(Wynard): Okay. Of course, we're not be able to feel the impact that the IDN gTLD (unintelligible), but, you know, the ones that we can see and certainly the first one that had become visible is the question of whether there is an influence or,

so to speak, disadvantage for IDN and gTLD project is in IDN policies were not ready and (still) gTLD cycle would start.

There was some provisional consensus that I felt existed in Amsterdam to the effect that, as long as they allow applications in the first new gTLD round to include IDN and gTLDs pending resolution of respective policies, that wouldn't be a problem.

So the work (weight) for is - should have to be, so to speak, qualified. It is not necessarily that they would have to be waiting for but - so to speak, the IDN would actually be allowed to be in the gTLD process anyway even if all the policy issues are not cleared.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Are there comments on this or any other comments on this topic?

Okay. Let me go to the issues and (thoughts) follow - that (Olof) had originally sent out.

One was that - there was a note there. There was a community expectation that IDN gTLD should be launched soon preferably within a year.

And there was also something that said IDN gTLD timing depends on the outcome as well technical and policy works.

So, did you - as a group, do you feel that there is some sort of pressure to get an IDN gTLD out within a year?

Marilyn: Ram, its Marilyn. I'll just get in the queue.

((Crosstalk))

(Roger): I also going (into the queue).

Ram Mohan: Okay. (Unintelligible).

(Warner): (Warner). I'm also in the queue after Marilyn.

Ram Mohan: Marilyn, (Warner), okay.

Marilyn, you have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

I'm going to (reference) the concerns that I hear politically from governments about the importance of having a roadmap to IDN and showing progress. And in some cases, there is a strong sense of urgency than others, but I do think that geopolitically, that there is a – it's very important for ICANN to be able to address this topic and to do it in a timely manner.

If that means a year as long as there are, you know, assurances that we have addressed the technical issues and the user impact, then I think -- that's one question.

If we are using the date of a year as hard of fast rule and have it yet addressed some of those other issues, I think the geopolitical pressure could turn on us and that is "Yes, you delivered IDN but you didn't take the necessary additional in two or three months to make sure that they were not a number of failures or harms."

So I think it's a difficult answer to say it's definitely a year, but I do think it got to be foreseeable time frame. I just - well, I'm saying this, I just want to say that the awareness of - and recognition that IDNs are being introduced, actually, I think, we probably needs to start now and run in parallel more visibly with the conclusion of the technical work or we will have a different kind of backlash at the time of the introduction.

Ram Mohan: Marilyn what you're saying, that is helpful.

(Warner), you're on the queue now.

(Warner): Yup.

Yes, I want to address that topic also in the same step. The answer must be so somehow qualified. The question is slightly modified because it is not the same situation for all kinds of IDNs and gTLDs. There is some extremely urgent cases, and they concern the large population with (unintelligible) different.

Where the nonexistence of IDN TLD causes a move to -- but many people refer to it as keywords -- all kinds of fairly disorganized methods of identifying which now go into the habits of people and people get to use increasingly to not having in their IDN gTLDs, therefore, they believe we do not exist and will never exist.

As these behaviors have been, so to speak, developed, they will not be able to be taken back, they're just going to be there and so we're going to be stuck in many countries with keyword systems that are going to be (virtually) monopolies by a couple of companies rather and - where nobody understand what is going on and that people we'll be able to test the domain of the

registry in ICANN, you know, show you things for - in registration in keywords in China and where the brand holder don't even know what they have to register, they don't know what it is, they will never be able to see what they do because they only test their own keyword just (unintelligible) save expenses and this, of course, subject to quite of (views).

This is not because it's a bad system as such. (If you're able to use) keywords in the context (and what the) keywords in the context (would look) automatic (can be sorted out) is early enough there is a IDN TLD affirmative, but if there isn't, then the keyword system is going to be developed more strongly and there's never going to be a reliable solution.

So I think, in those cases, there is urgency, and this should be addressed without having to look at border line issues for other cases.

So basically, the metaphor would be, if you do need trucks, let people (have eyes) in - and advise those trucks, you know, and then think about what kind of transport for blind people we need to have later.

But - say - don't say that you shouldn't have trucks because some people are blind. These are issues further down but, you know, let's address to ones that we have right now.

Man: I mean, in terms of...

Man: That was interesting, (Warner).

So if I paraphrase what I heard you say, I'm hearing you suggest that both evaluation and perhaps even approval of IDN gTLD, one approach could be to satisfy based on certain characteristics and do not hold back on the application

- or the evaluation of application but to identify a set of qualifying characteristics that would merit an IDN gTLD application to be looked at sooner than later. I mean, that's what I heard you say. Do I get it right?

(Warner): Yes. I mean, based on the priorities, look if Arabic and Chinese and Korean, I mean, they're pretty important and its pretty high priority.

And when you talk about questions where do you would need to have a - an IDN for, you know, French word with an accent on it, you know, quite frankly, it does not important, you know, this can wait.

Marilyn Cade: So, Ram), can I get back in the queue and ask a question?

Ram Mohan: Go ahead, please.

Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

I must say, (Warner), that really mirrors some of my concerns and is - could be a fast-forward to addressing them.

I think that one of the geopolitical questions, again, might be, ahh, that can we get a commitment that this - we're viewing this as a base roll out or, you know, we're do - were' going to do a triage approach perhaps.

And so were going to address some of the largest population of language users first. But we are committed to continuing to exam on how to address other groups of language -- script of language users.

(Warner): I agree, I mean - but you could say it's the combined criterion of less or - you know, few issues because, in the case of Chinese, you know, these issues are clear that, you know, we know how to go about them.

And so we know that there's no significant issues - no significant unexpected issues, and there is high priority.

If you talk about the case of, you know, the French word with an accent on it, there are significant issues, many of them social not technical because confusability and so on, and - is not high priority. So basically, it's both the priority and - you know, develop this (ease) policy lines that we should look at for a specific strength.

William Tan: This is William Tan. I like to get into queue.

Ram Mohan: William, you're on.

William Tan: This is in response to - with (Warner) who is just speaking before me.

Ram Mohan: Yes.

William Tan: Yeah, I was...

Man: (Unintelligible).

William Tan: I just like to respond to your - that - I thought that you said that Chinese - for Chinese, there's not much of an issue with Chinese IDN at the top level. I thought we would have some sort of traditional simplified variants issue if we were to issue, you know, a - approve a TLD in the Chinese language, wouldn't you agree?

Ram Mohan: You would have that but it's a strange dare such as the ones that China is using already internally.

There is no issue because these TLDs as TLD are pretty clear to going to be understood as being used in that context, they mean word "company," for instance, in Chinese, "mainland" (unintelligible), and they are in simplified (unintelligible) matches.

Now, if somebody want us do the same thing somewhere else, one could be doing the same thing in which traditional scripts independently then, of course, is a very easy response that is not, I mean, it's just like the (usability) of TLDs.

William Tan: Right, right.

((Crosstalk))

Man: It sounds to me that what you're talking about is also an item that - you know, they cannot take this into the technical policy detailed part of the discussion because your - you know, what you're saying is what if they are variants...

Man: Exactly.

Man: ...is what you do in an IDN TLD and - you know, it seems clear to me that we have to think about it and then propose or at least recommend that a policy to be created.

Now, one of the side effects of this could be that, given some string, it's possible that there are - there's a multitude of variants that the correct experts

say, "Yes, these are appropriate variants." And as a result, in a IDN TLD situation, the application into ICANN would - on (unintelligible) for single IDN TLD, but in reality, it might result in the creation of multiple entries into the (root zone file).

William Tan: Right. It sounds like a bundling at the root level.

(Olof): This is...

William Tan: One thing at the root level maybe what we (really) have to do.

(Olof): This is (Olof).

I think what if you have - well, we have two solutions and one is to have a (unintelligible) and say that - all right, if anybody tries to launch and propose a TLD with a variant -- a variant character to something that already existing - -- well, then it falls under the same rules which I (unintelligible) gTLDs on confusing the similar, or you can have an (ex onset) rule saying that, well, at the moment you reserve a particular - you get a particular string, you also would be able to, let's call, it block all the variants that go with it which is I believe something you do in the in (unintelligible) for Chinese or...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, that that is common practice in the - in the second level today in many locales, that is common practice where, if you ask for a second level IDN (domain) name, the variant (software) tend to get bundled and made available to the registrant in general with no extra cost.

Man: And that's - well, it's interesting. Now the - it begs the question whether they would be ALIASES or just the prohibited.

Man: Excuse me (unintelligible). Are we talking about second level or top level (unintelligible) of aliases?

Man: On top level.

Man: Uh-huh.

Man: We talk about top level because the - well, you could end up in - of course, have (unintelligible) alias situation or - well, there is only one correct way (of accessing) the top-level domain, but it's closely connected to aliases as well as the (computing dissimilar).

William Tan: This is William. I agree.

One thing I like to mention is that every time I hear about people talking about aliases versus normal delegation, it seems like it has to be an either alias only or normal delegation. Can we sort of allow the applicant to sort to choose on a per application basis on what they want to...

Man: Uh-huh.

Man: Uh-huh.

Man: Uh-huh.

William Tan: On how they want it to be delegated?

Ram Mohan: This is Ram.

I'm going to quickly have a comment and then, you know, have William's question again open up to the group.

William, I've heard Professor (Chan), when he was on the ICANN board. I heard him advocate something a little different. I've heard him advocate that we can't - it is not an "either/or" but in fact, in many cases, it is an "and" and need to have both alias and normal delegation.

Marilyn Cade: Ram, this is Marilyn. Can I be in the queue?

Ram Mohan: You're in the queue, Marilyn, and you're on (deck).

(Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Oh, thanks.

I'm going to have to drop off, but before I drop off, I'll pick the rest of this discussion up this afternoon discussion.

Aliasing is something that I think is an incredibly important conversation for us to understand in relation to the pros and cons of giving rights to existing holders of string, and I'm just going to use an example.

I'm not expressing a business constituency position because we are still going to have to study and report on that, but I'm just going to give an example of the complexity that I see in this topic.

Take att.com and mk.net as an example. ATT registers and protects its trademark in 120 countries and is a famous well known brand -- the 10th most well known brand in the world. MK -- and I'm using myself as the guinea pig here -- hasn't even bothered to try to service mark - a trademark her name.

The consideration of complexity between those two simple examples are pretty profound to me, and so I think that actually this whole issue of if prior rights exist and is aliasing an appropriate and only solution, I think we actually probably need to examine this in a - perhaps in even a sort of a more complicated unfortunately passion, taking into account the fact that there will be political concerns in many countries if priority rights are given to existing registrants of ASCII string and IDN.

Ram Mohan: Got it.

Any comments or thoughts in Marilyn's comment?

(Warner): And this is (Warner).

Just a little reminder, I mean, there is one issue of prior rights, the other is, of course, the non-confusability requirement and I think that would definitely (have) quite a number of things.

Man: Okay.

(Warner): Just by analogy.

Marilyn Cade: (Warner), I think that's a really good clarification.

I would just say one other thing. I don't act - you know, this is very challenging for all of us, but I'm not sure that ICANN is actual able to declare prior rights.

In the past, we have made it very clear that we turn to existing law upon which to rely, for instance, in the UDRP - in the establishment of the UDRP, et cetera.

And I'm not, you know - I don't know whether within the larger community of ICANN, we've actually - and the legal group of ICANN, Ram and (Olof), we've actually had a conversation about whether it is feasible to create a definition of prior rights and then to look at what those are.

(Warner's) suggestion that we need to look at confuse at - is confusability the right word, (Warner)?

(Warner): Yes, it is just the criterion we already have in the gTLD.

Woman: Right, right.

Man: Hello?

Marilyn Cade: So - maybe I would just say that, you know, this particular topic, are we establishing prior rights for the purpose of limiting confusion and collision? Because one of the topics that we dealt with and thinking about - it isn't that trademarks are recognized in domain - in domain names, it is that we have tried to avoid the kinds of collisions that prevent the ability of the name to be used.

And maybe there's more work to be thought about Ram around this topic as one of the topics that we - you know, that we - as we go to the topics that we have to drill down into.

Ram Mohan: Yes, I agree. It sounds like - suddenly, a significant topic and not one that is going to allow itself to be dissected very - in a very short amount of time, I don't think.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

(Olof): (Olof) here. Just quickly, I think these are the core mission we're trying to be with now when (bidding) with variants and such in particular scripts because it's not something that appears everywhere.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

(Olof): That's really to what you mentioned, to limit confusion and avoid collision, and that at the same time - well, it implies once you have been awarded a particular string, it sort of implies certain rights that's, well, you wouldn't be exposed to confusion and collision, but for the rest, it's the far stretch to go all the way to say that this means such - what intellectual property rights that stretch into something that can be dealt with in other domains and other territories and other contexts.

I think that's the other big stream where it's been pretty clear that's just because one has a particular domain name or a top-level domain, that (unintelligible) for intellectual property rights.

But it's more like an (undisputable) right of use which you have the right to use it and you have the right to extend that use and you have also the right to

transfer that use for money but not anything, it's not ownership further than that.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

(Olof): But amateur lawyer as I'm not (Steven), so I should stop there.

Marilyn Cade: So, Ram, is it appropriate then to add a subpoint to - you know, is the question also then should there be a policy recommendation that addresses - and I'm having trouble formulating the question so I need to think more about it but, you know, like, for instance, one of the things we're trying to examine is the negative impact on the introduction of IDNs that are only - or that are primarily engaged in collision with other names and creates confusion may become a stability and security issue. It isn't that they can't co-exist, but if all users are confused, you know, they're really worthless, so to speak.

Ram Mohan: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: There may also be a role for the use of a reserve name process to go back to (Warner's) point earlier, maybe we can't answer all questions when we launch IDN on day one, we answer as many questions as we can in order to be able to release some IDN names and then we work on addressing and unreserving names where there went some easy answers.

Man: It sounds to me like the - particularly, the collision and confusion discussion that we've have, it could fit under either existing domain name holders or technopolicy details.

I'm actually more inclined to add that as point either under existing domain name holders or make it a separate point altogether, and I can go either way.

but it seems to me that since existing domain holders really is focusing on due priority right exists and does aliasing provide sufficient protection, it seems like both of those topics are congruent with the collision and confusion discussion as well.

Marilyn Cade: But let me just add a question to you. I think that the treatment -- the treatment of - you know, do some kind of prior rights exist for registrants has to be treated differently than - I'm confused about why there would be prior rights for registrars frankly.

But both registrars and registries are given a limited scope of responsibility from ICANN. They basically are receiving a - in the case of the registry, they're given a specific license, I might call it if you - we translate that into other world, I'm unsure. You know, I think actually, (Olof), in new gTLDs, in our discussion on IDN so far, we've already begun to address that question.

(Olof): Yes, indeed. I mean, the - well, there were a number of examples discussed in particular in Amsterdam where the question was whether -- I can't recall it -- whether (we suppose) to travel and it's - well, it's French...

Woman: Voyage, that travel in that - voyage, I think.

(Olof): German (doctor) of (unintelligible) or anything else. But - well, there were substantial agreement that the one run doesn't - didn't exclude the other due to for (unintelligible) confusability or anything, and that there was no concept of prior right in (trans) getting the language system in that respect.

But - so I - that's what I recall and there we could certainly bring back the transcripts from the (AMFLA) meeting to...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I think that be good. We addressed that .com and .info as well. I think it would be good maybe to look back at the transcripts, Ram, and maybe just have it a report from (Olof) on the existing discussion that took place for this group?

Ram Mohan: We'll do.

Glen, could you make another - that as an action item for (Olof)?

Glen Desaintgery: I'll do that, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Folks, we are about - just about 15 minutes away from the end of the scheduled time on this call. I wanted to - while you were speaking, I was looking through the topics that we have not discussed so far.

Among the major topics that were listed the - it seems to me we've had some conversation about new gTLD, a little bit about the technopolicy details and a little bit about existing domain name holder.

We have not much of a conversation about existing gTLD string in terms of allocation or representation or (backlash) comparability or geopolitical detail privacy (WIS) in this legal detail.

So let me suggest this, given that time is running short. For those of you who are on the call, are there - do you have comments on any of these topics that have yet to be discussed, in other words, if the topic that exists on Slide 9, 10 and 11 of the PDF in front of you.

I'm assuming that the silence is because you're reading through those and not because that you've all dropped off the call.

Man: ... (indeed).

Ram Mohan: So while you're reading, let me try and structure this certainly. I'm going to through each of these major topics and ask if you - if all - you know, all of you on the call, if you have any comments to contribute.

The first one I will go to is existing gTLDs string. Do you have any comment?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. May I ask a question?

Ram Mohan: Please.

Avri Doria: Are we going to be coming back to this (unintelligible)? I think we stop to talk about and - on all of these, and I wasn't exactly whether we were trying to sort of get all that conversation (then set).

Ram Mohan: No, I don't think that that was a plan today. My plan today was to introduce these topics and then make sure we start to think about them and start to get some level of familiarity.

And really my goal is that, in our next week's meeting, I'm going to ask our members to prioritize these topics and we'll have to figure out, you know, what's the best way to prioritize them, and then to embark into a much deeper discussion because it seems clear to me that each of these topics could take large amount of time.

Avri Doria: Okay, good.

I just want to make sure that it wasn't like a first and last call for discussion on these things because definitely thinking about them and - so more looking as we're heading (here), doesn't essentially capture the discussion we need to have. Is more the question you're asking?

Ram Mohan: And - that's a good point Avri. I think the idea here on this call really the say, you know, here are some parts, here are some things to spark thinking, and we're suddenly going to come back to these and get into them in much more detail.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks.

Ram Mohan: Back in my earlier question, existing gTLD strings, any comments?

Okay...

Man: I'm sorry, I don't understand the question. I just say...

Ram Mohan: Okay. Sorry.

The question is, under existing gTLD strings, we have a few areas, and really the question I have for the group is do you have any other areas that, you know, under the existing gTLD strings topic that we have to consider or research or discuss? And I'll be asking that question of each the other major headlines or headings that we have.

Did I answer your question?

Man: The - not quite because we should say there's a topic in this existing gTLD strings which is not in the (per view) of our working group, as far as I understand, unless we really say what kind of aspect this would be. A location, don't think is what we're talking about here (unintelligible) representation of existing gTLD string.

So (unintelligible) what is the context of why we have existing gTLD string allocation representation of strings in the specific context.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sure.

Let me- how quick response to that. In Sao Paulo, one of the questions that I came up was in the issues support which is should transliteration to the existing gTLD string be addressed.

There were no other...

Man: Okay, yeah, yeah.

Man: ...other topics that have to do with the gTLD string.

Man: Okay.

Man: And that's the reasons...

Man: Yeah. Then I think.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry. Then, I mean, (unintelligible), if you could actually probably enhance the wording here so we know what it's, you know, like transliteration, transcription within the translation as one of the...

Man: Absolutely.

In fact, if you go to Slide 15 through 18, there is much further detail in there. You know, the slides that you're seeing are merely a poor attempt at trying to get some brevity.

Avri, you had a follow-on comment?

Avri Doria: I was basically, I think, sort of coming up with the same thing you (unintelligible) that is - it should be allocation of IDN equivalent or what have you, IDN representation of existing string, you know, et cetera. It's just the slight wording modification, that's all (unintelligible)..

Man: Got it.

(Olof): I think, the - it's also the reverse. I mean, the existing strings, well, there was certainly an issue that was brought up in Sao Paulo and that was relating to actually the existing second level IDN registration.

And the necessity or perhaps the eventuality of - foresee or take care of some kind of grandfathering and back towards compatibility for these guys -- that was one -- but also there is, of course, there is the least aspect.

And whether there would be any extension of the rights, so its very closely partly connected to the (three) as well of right for reasons of prior rights or

confusability or collision when new IDN strings are launched and whether - so there is - I think the heading covers a lot of different ground really.

Ram Mohan: And it sounds to me that perhaps the heading is so broad as to not convey the meaning that is really was intended to convey. So we'll correct that going forward, but thanks for pointing it out.

Still keeping an eye on the watch here, I'm going to move on and come back on my earlier question which is, in the other areas that are there, geopolitical privacy and who is legal as general high-level headlines, do you feel that there are areas -- policy areas -- that are missing or that are deserving of our review?

(Paul): Well, this is (Paul) from Network Solutions.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead please.

(Paul): Yes. Do you have any information for us what the ccTLD group may have done to-date with the geopolitical detail section? I'm curious to know what is they're thinking on (unintelligible) in IDN string (covering) rights and things like that?

Man: I don't have computer report as of yet on that front, but I do have a call with the chair of that group scheduled here shortly and I'll be able to report back on that to you. But at this point, I do not have something to give to you.

(Paul): No problem. Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Well, let me make a suggestion. If you do think about areas -- policy areas -- that we have to look in - look at that we did not discuss today on the call,

please post it to the list and we'll make sure that to add it in and we'll make sure to carry it forward, post once we get pass the prioritization.

I'm now going to move to Slide Number 12 which is really our final slide here and in our meeting which is to walk you through a little bit of my thinking on what - I think we ought to be doing next week.

I'd like for us to - you know, we've done a little bit of thinking today of what are some of major topics and what other areas need to be added. I would like - if were possible, I'd like for us work through some sort of prioritization of the major topics so that we can direct our attention and give a larger proportion of our time to the more pressing or more important or more urgent issues rather than allocating equal amounts of time to all the topics.

I - when I was looking through this topics, I certainly felt that, you know, there were probably four out of the seven that would have gotten higher rankings on priority from main versus the other three, and I'm certain that, you know, different members will have different points of view on that.

But I would like to go to a little bit of a prioritization of these major topics next week.

I like to get you a feedback though on whether you think this is a good approach to take in our work because our charter doesn't actually say that we should spend more time on one topic or less time in another topic, but I think just from being practical, we have to take the liberty and say, you know, the group decided that these topics have a higher validity or higher importance or urgency. That's my perspective, but I'm very eager to hear what you're thoughts are.

If one of you or more of you think this is not a good idea, could you speak up?

Okay. Thank you. I appreciate you're saying that this is not a bad idea.

So what I'd like to do next week is prioritizing major topics, review the new gTLD recommendations, and we'll have that again in attempt to have that in a PowerPoint bullet format but there will also be links to the (full on) document. In a similar way, there'll be a bullet format, output for the ICANN staff issues report, but in the similar way, a link to the main document.

To go though those - and then the idea is the meeting two weeks later - two weeks from now, we'll review the other two documents that our charter require us to go through which IAB document and lab test.

And for the lab test, we'll probably have (Tina) come in because she has been charged with coordinating the lab test and have results. She understands these things. I'm thinking of having (Tina) come in and be available for both briefing us as well as being able to answer some questions for us.

That's a plan, and I look forward to having all of you on the call next week or later in the second call later today, you're welcome to all of these calls, and I appreciate your time.

Are there any last words before we close this call?

Man: Just a question, sir. It's from me.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead.

Man: How are we going to keep so as we can proceed with our meetings? Is this going to be summary sent by you or isn't going to be (Avri) is going to take minutes or have somebody take the minutes or something?

Ram Mohan: Glen has the answer to that.

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible).

Man: Uh-huh.

Glen Desaintgery: There's going to be a high level summary from all of - on them after every meeting.

Man: Uh-huh.

Glen Desaintgery: And then there will be a transcript and a recording available of each meeting.

Man: Okay.

Ram Mohan: And, (Warner), the other thing that I was mentioning earlier is in an attempt to bridge the two calls -- the paired calls -- the extra work that we're going to be doing, (Olof) and myself, is to provide a briefing to the entire working group of what areas we saw similarities and what areas we saw some diversions which would then give you the ability to go to that transcript and then jump straight to those areas rather than have to wait through the entire, you know, hour-and-half worth of transcript or listen to the entire call.

Does it answer your question, (Warner)?

(Warner): Yes, thank you.

Ram Mohan: Okay, any other thoughts, questions? Hearing none.

Thank you all for your time. I appreciate you're making your time available, and I look forward to you reviewing the documents and coming ready for our meeting next week.

Thank you very much.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you.

END