

**GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO
Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper on IDN ccTLDs
January 22, 2008 at 22:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper on IDNccTLDs on January 22, 2008 .

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/gnso-idn-rework-20080122.mp3>

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

Meeting notes from Chuck Gomes are at:

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-cc-idn-tld-rg/msg00068.html>

Agenda:

<http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/agenda-idnrw-22jan08.shtml>

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency group co-ordinator

Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee

Olga Cavalli - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Stefanie Lai - NCUC

Adrian Kinderis - Registrar c.

Absent apologies

Bilal Beiram - CBUC

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager Policy Development

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor - GNSO

Glen de Saint G ery - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: Excuse me I would like to let all parties know today that the call is being recorded. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you! Okay welcome to everyone. Let me first of all compliment those of you who had auction items, as far I can tell everyone followed through on their auction items and that is much appreciated. Our plan is to pick up where we left off last week with first going over the things that we covered last week to make sure that we can confirm those as finished and as a few cases where there is some decisions to made -- to be made in that regard. So, any comments on the agenda?

Now, with regard to meeting schedule, we can obviously revisit this at the end of the day's meeting but I don't see that there is anyway we can get this done today and may have trouble getting it done on the 29th. So let's plan for a meeting next Tuesday on the 29th, as I have been suggesting to keep it open anyway. And at bare minimum we probably need to finalize the executive summary after we finish the whole document but I think that we'll opt to even do some of the finishing of the document and maybe we'll talk about some techniques to speed that up between now and next week.

So please plan on that meeting next week as well, and hopefully in that meeting we'll be able to discuss any final revisions we've make. Make those and then distribute the document as planned to the counsel before the January 31st counsel call.

Liz you are set to be our editor again correct?

Liz Yes, I'm all set.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, and then we -- let's pick up on the same things we talked about last week starting with -- under items number one regarding general issues regarding IDN ccTLDs and the question which territories are eligible for an IDN ccTLDs. The existence of IDNs as we got to question D which was, should anything be done about ccTLDs already being used as gTLDs?

And if you look at the Google doc, and again I am not going to be looking at the live website, I am going to be looking at a cut and paste idea. The questions -- Avri asked if we'd like to add something like the following: If as discussed below contractual conditions are introduced for new --what's DTN?

Avri Doria: IDN sorry, I'm mistook... (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: But it wasn't too close, so I was curious.

Avri Doria: I'm doing research in delay tolerant networks so those letters are in my mind.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: DTN is something I write constantly.

Chuck Gomes: If as discussed below, contractual conditions for new IDN ccTLD, I suppose that's supposed to be ccTLDs that function as GTLDs, ICANN may wish to review its options regarding the ccTLDs already being used as GTLDs.

So Aubrey is asking the question: do we want to add something like that? And so are response without that is just that there seems to be an issue of primary concern from the communities associated within individual ccTLDs. My concern with regard to adding that is that it adds a total new dimension to its response. It goes beyond the IDN ccTLD issue, and I think our response is going to have enough -- plenty of issues already that generate some discussion, considerable discussions in the CC community. So I would lean against that but please feel free to just disagree with me.

And again like we've been doing, I think our group is small enough so you can just jump in. If we get to a point where I need to create a queue, I will but so far everybody has been really good about that so, there's no need to ask permission to say anything just if you have a thought jump in. If that becomes a problem I will deal with it.

Avri Doria: One thing I'd point out is they ask they asked the question. Not like we are bringing up out of the blue. They do ask.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and that's true that's a very valid point, but I think its also true that, that's an issue primarily associated with the communities that have those because they you know, in some cases that I'm familiar with that

are very much relying on revenue from those TLDs, in some cases for basic infrastructure and stuff in those communities. Other thoughts, do we want to add something, do we want to leave as is?

Man: (Unintelligible). I don't know that, well I see where Avri Doria is coming from, I think its more about, I wasn't on Aubrey at all until she asked a question, now that I've asked the question I am thinking that we do need to address it, but I'm not sure that the answer to mean in practical sense, I don't think there is anything you can do.

Not many of these guys are bound contractually with ICANN there is not contract and ICANN has no jurisdiction if you like over their ccTLD so really it's up to them to try and fill it out for themselves.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and that was kind of the sense of the response that you saw there already.

Man: Yes that's right. So I guess I'm saying is, well instead of being offensive, I'll say lets stick with what had originally.

Man: Because I, I'm (unintelligible). When we take into account what they've conceived as terms of reference for the gTLD PDP this falls. If it is another question, I would say that it would enlarge the scope to involve the PDP in probably not a very productive direction.

Avri Doria: But its not -- these are a set of questions, they're not necessarily about the -- I mean you know if people don't want it there, its basically you know, its kind of like ICANN and the root servers, you know, that can negotiate for ten years and maybe get somewhere so it doesn't really matter. But all these questions aren't necessarily pertinent to the PDP.

They are basically a set of questions that they have asked us to give answers to, now if we don't want to give that answer, you know I am not going to argue for it, but I don't see the problem.

Chuck Gomes: I think its -- and my concern is that this is going to raise some concern by certain members of the community that wont necessarily help in our more -- o more important issues that we want to address which like the allocation of IDN TLDs and some of the competition issues and things like that.

This gets off on a -- and they did ask it you are absolutely right. This...

Avri Doria: And it is a competition issue. I mean when you get right down to it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, the one I was talking about is the...

Avri Doria: The new competition...

Chuck Gomes: I understand.

Avri Doria: If people don't want it I'll back off, it just...

Chuck Gomes: Back as opposed to not adding that there? Try and keep us moving because we are really going to have to try and keep moving.

Avri Doria: The last thing I want to say is it's consistent with the way we try to behave on our stuff.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. No I agree. Okay, let's not put that in there, it's not sharing anyone and again we do need to keep moving. So going then to

should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful? We have got response there that to me looked pretty good except there is the one bracketed word local, and there is . I am not sure what that is. So it's kind of in the middle both of those, do we want the word local there? Local ccTLD language in the four line there?

It's in brackets right now, any discussion on that? I am not sure that it -
- I think there are cases that we talk about later that well it may not be a local language in the sense of any official capacity or anything like that but it could be a language that is used. So does local add anything here? And as far as...

Avri Doria: Just so you know I guess the purple brackets mean I was suggesting we take it out.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Yes I, not sure what that was.

Avri Doria: And the word is already in there and by bracketing it and not coloring the word, I'm not trying to put the word in, I'm trying to take the word out.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for clarifying that, I didn't go back and check which way it was, I just got (unintelligible). I think I would delete it because it don think we loose anything, by deleting it, but it does make it more restrictive I think if we say local.

Okay? So then lets delete that and then the -- can we just delete that ? I'm not sure what that -- and the semi-colon I suppose? Okay? Alright? Any other comments on that?

Avri Doria: Oh yes the is just a formatting, that's a XML character that didn't translate correctly.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you.

Avri Doria: And it's a non-breakable space if you care.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks.

Avri Doria: I know (Pete's) got show up every once in a while.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, going to be. If so how is meaningful determined and by whom? Hopefully everybody had a chance to look at these before the meeting, so I'm not going to read that, any comments or suggestions on that one? If not we we'll accept it as is. Okay?

Then going on to how many IDN ccTLDs per script per territory and you can see that in A issues there is simply be only a single IDN ccTLD etcetera I'll let you read it all. The proposed GNS response is yes, the GNS sublease says that there should be one string per ISO3166-1 string, dash one entry per relevant script.

Any problems with that, can we accept that as is, anybody opposed to accepting that as is? Going then to B: could there be several IDN strings per territory in a script; if so who would determine the number and what are the criteria? And you can see that Liz has an alternative wording there and Tina was going to check on the meaning of the question, Tina you haven't joined us have you?

Tina Dam: Why don't we have any alternatives, wouldn't that be a no? And then the rest of it as it says? There should be several IDN strings for a territory in a script. No. They believe there should be one string per script.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I think you are right. Now do you want to go with the alternative wording, rather than what's there? If multiple scripts are used in a territory introduced (unintelligible) and the community should make the choice of which scripts and what number of scripts will be in use. I am ok by the way with the alternative, I am just asking.

Avri Doria: I think the first option we weren't really answering our question.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, so the second one is more direct. Anyone opposed to the alternative wording? Okay going on to C. If an IDN ccTLD string is not applied for, for whatever reason should an IDN ccTLD string that could be associated with the particular territory be reserved or protected in some way. Now we had our response there and then Olof added some draft text that I personally thought looked pretty good. What do other people think? Any opposition to just adding that second paragraph to the response?

Then it's done! Going on to how many scripts per territory, can a territory apply for more than one IDN ccTLD string in different scripts and so on?

Here we have some choices, so this will probably take a little more time to finalize this one. And again I'll let you look at them, we had our

original response there and then there is several bracketed ones. I had, in my own little version here had added a comment that if on the second -- I guess they are all bracketed including the originals, in the second one in those case of territories or a community with the special need for IDN ccTLDs etcetera. You know, I commented there to myself that, you know you probably want to qualify that cover security stability, but that's done. Down below in a separate bracketed one and in looking at the choices here, my thinking was that the last two bracketed items in and of themselves might make, including the one that Avri did there, might make a good answer here.

So what I am suggesting and please feel free to disagree that we should start with using multiple scripts in the case of Avri's added text there that'd be the first part of our response and the second be in all cases, care must be given to the stability and security of the internet and we would include then that last paragraph that was there previously, with regard to the limit confusion and collisions due to variants.

So there would be three paragraphs, if you think that what I'm suggesting is a good way to answer this question, and let me pause and let people comment or look at it, or both.

Anybody need more time?

Man: (Unintelligible) for the rest of our lives?

Avri Doria: Yeah but we don't get that until we're pretty sure.

Man: Yeah, exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Now (Edmond) had said it seems like there's a fundamental question to be asked, do we allow applicants whether they be government issued to apply for an IDN ccTLD string that represents a designated territory in the list. Or do we find, develop and -- I think that's going to come up later whether we you know, advocate for a list or not. I don't think it's our place to start talking about, I mean us allowing applicants, it's not going to be us that allows applicants, so ultimately once the name space is defined, we see applicants will follow up processes that's designed by the ccNSO.

Man: That's a question that comes up later.

Chuck Gomes: That's what I was trying to say, yes. So, anybody opposed to using those three paragraphs, and Liz did you follow...

Liz: I didn't actually I need to have you stick me through this again.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz: So we are starting with all three (unintelligible) may be reasonable?

Chuck Gomes: May be reasonable? I'm sorry where are you at? Starting with the paragraph that says using multiple scripts.

Liz: Right.

Chuck Gomes: That's the first part of the restructure.

Liz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So would delete the previous two paragraphs.

Liz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And then the next paragraph starts out, in all cases.

Liz: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And then the third paragraph, with this in mind.

Liz: Right

Chuck Gomes: And that's the response. Anybody opposed to that? Okay. Going on to B...

Man: There's a small typo. The bridge is audibly confusing, ccTLDs from plural, sorry for speaking in unexpected.

Chuck Gomes: Not a problem.

Liz: Say it again please.

Man: The second sentence, however care must be taken to not produce audibly confusing ccTLD.

Liz: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Liz: Got it, got it.

Avri Doria: Its my goal to give the nitpickers plenty of stuff to find.

Chuck Gomes: She does a good job at that. Sorry about that Avri.

Avri Doria: Its quite alright I know I typo all over the place.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay, you actually, as I was looking ahead in the document I was impressed how many places you actually really helped us. Its going to help us moving forward with all of the work you did on this. Hopefully...

Avri Doria: And I even went back to try to fix my typos so I didn't find you know, and I could even see them.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, going to B

Man: And, basically the next time it comes TLD in the following sentence, it also needs an s at the very end. Sorry Avri.

Avri Doria: That's quite alright I'm sorry, I really do try.

Chuck Gomes: She handles herself very well. Okay?

Avri Doria: Sometimes I have to send out apologies I get it so wrong.

Chuck Gomes: And that'll help quite a lot we'll have a cleaner document, so thanks (unintelligible) appreciate that. C and what circumstances would it be appropriate to introduce a limit on the number of scripts a territory may

choose, introduced to a particular TLD or any TLD with a national connection. Our proposed response there is there. No comments were added to that does anybody have any now? If not we'll accept it as is.

C; can a territory apply for an IDN ccTLD string even if the script is not used? And of course we talk about that some last week and Avri say added there is some bracketed language there I'm not sure why part of it is in purple and part of its not, I suspect, I don't think there is anything significant about that is there Avri?

Avri Doria: I don t think so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so anyway the whole bracketed response there was added by Avri and then another bracketed sentence that (Edmond) added as he had promised to do down there, it probably needs some fixing dramatically but it basically says it depends on the process required of r granting an IDN, it should be an IDN ccTLD and then it gives an example, if a process similar to that develops for a gTLD (unintelligible) then it may be.

Now when I looks t both what Avri did and what (Edmond) did the fact that hit me and I don't know if it's right or not, was to put (Edmonds) response first because it does kind of directly answer the question, and then put the paragraph that Avri put. Any thoughts on that?

Avri Doria: (Edmond's) response is not complete though is it?

Chuck Gomes: Well, lets see...

Avri Doria: Because I remember I typed it and was going to put in more.

Chuck Gomes: Oh so he still hasn't added it, I thought the stuff in front there was what he added and that other was just left there. That's my mistake I didn't go back and check that, so alright we still need...

Avri Doria: And I tried to include some of that notion, I think in that second line.

Chuck Gomes: So the question then is, has Avri adequately covered that in what she has written? What do you think? Now you don't I don't think talk about the gTLD process which I assume...hello?

Avri Doria: No I guess that there should be some process, you know, but I didn't...

Chuck Gomes: Maybe that's sufficient, what do people think? We just go with what Avri has? And then if Edmond still wants to contribute something there he still can, but I guess I was wrong he hadn't does his action out on here so, he can still do that if he's not satisfied but anybody not ok with just going with Avri's response there?

And (Adrian) you had a comment there are you okay with what we have done there?

(Adrian): I'm just reviewing my comment with a lot of the above paragraph.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

(Adrian): No I think its supports is well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, okay good. Any opposition then to that? So Liz you with us on that one?

Liz: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Good thanks. D; if official status is required who will define it and who will determine in each case? And our proposed response was pretty short there, the questioned should be answer by the two (unintelligible) and related communities that currently involve our ccTLDs.

Any problems with that?

Avri Doria: I just got a message from (Edmond). He is sending is apologies he is in a hotel room where the phone doesn't work and he's waiting for them to come and fix the phone.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: I got a Skype Message from him.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, well tell him we hope he able to get it fixed, and join us and I don't know if you want to mention to ask him to take a look at that section we just did or not that might be easier...

Avri Doria: Yes, yes yes, I will do that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, alright so D is okay then? With that thank you Avri for letting us know that. And that's where we ended last week so now we head into new territory as far as this group is concerned. And we get into number of characters in the string.

And we go down to A; should all IND ccTLD strings be of six lengths?
And we had a fairly lengthy response there, and then I think Avri proposed a much shorter one and Avri were you, was your intention the shorter one totally replace the lengthy one?

Avri Doria: Okay sorry I was typing to (Edmond),

Chuck Gomes: That is a possibility.

Avri Doria: That was a possibility yes.

Chuck Gomes: I thought that some of the stuff in the longer response was, in effect, your response might be the better response to lead with. Some of the stuff we say there from the reserve, and its working group and stuff, might be useful information but maybe not as the lead in to the response, yours is more direct so I like it that sense. The only problem...

Avri Doria: Yeah I guess that was it I didn't feel it was -- -it instantly answered it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah so I definitely like yours better as the lead in. Now with regard to what's there I flagged a couple of things in the last, I think its just the two sentences. The word sovereign, we were kind of shying away from sovereign nation's choice, and then the last sentence the last question regarding variable string length for ask (unintelligible) is one best dealt with by the CC and I'll fill in the gap. It seems to me that maybe the last sentence maybe we want to delete it if we keep that longer response after Avri's.

What do you think, or is it okay? I am not opposed to it its just that I think it is helpful to say finally the genus owner stands in a single character in a non-ASCII script. Of a -- matter of fact maybe we can just delete of a sovereign nation in a non ASCII script will represented by more than one character in the DNS itself.

Man: In all of here I think it's a very end. I mean what proceeds Avri's comment I should think now, its not really consistent with what Avri's stating.

Chuck Gomes: Let me look at that again, the last sentence, the finally sentence? That what you are saying?

Man: That's not necessarily follow that there should be valuable lines asking ccTLDs. (Unintelligible) ccTLDs are allowed, yeah well its consistent, the earlier statement is much stronger.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, so are you agreeing that the last sentence starting with the last question should be deleted?

Man: Yes but I mean, from some sort of just the logical perspective.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and I think you're right on that, that's kind of why I highlighted it, but I wanted to give the group a chance to comment on that. Any other comments on that?

Avri Doria: Okay we are deleting the last question sentence?

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And then at a minimum I am thinking that the sentence previous to that we may want to delete a sovereign nation's choice. And just say, that a single character in non-ASCII script will be represented by more than one character in the DNS itself.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: that okay? Any problems -- thanks Avri for your contribution there. Then we'll move on to B. you okay, you with us Liz?

Liz: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Good. B; does moving outside the current two symbol limitation...

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Avri Doria: On that previous one? So I know they ask that question again later about the ASCII ccTLDs, but should we add a answer to that one that says no?

Chuck Gomes: That's to this one here?

Avri Doria: To the previous one. If a valuable string is introduced, should it also be introduced for ASCII ccTLDs, and I believe our answer is no it shouldn't be.

Chuck Gomes: You know think you are right I think we should add that as a separate paragraph?

Avri Doria: As a separate sentence yeah. And basically if a variable string order is introduced for IDN ccTLDs it should not also be introduced for ASCII ccTLDs period.

Chuck Gomes: I think that says it pretty directly, any problems with that?

Avri Doria: As long as we make sure that not is in there.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, then not is critical though.

Liz: Can you please repeat that Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes that sentence should say, if a variable string is -- just cut that last sentence.

Chuck Gomes: that last question.

Avri Doria: Right the last question, cut it in as a sentence.

Liz: Oh Okay. So the IDN ccTLDs...

Avri Doria: Right.

Liz: yeah it should also be introduced...

Avri Doria: It should not.

Liz: It should not also.

Chuck Gomes: Copy and add in the work not.

Liz: Got it.

Chuck Gomes: and of course...

Avri Doria: Underline in bold, and italics....

Chuck Gomes: Screaming.

Avri Doria: By the way (Edmond) says that he did add something about that one but it seemed to be missing, so he will try to re-add it. The one way back when you said I should ask him a question.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah ok, alright good. Yeah and that...

Avri Doria: So we can o back to that later. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah so if he wants to sent that via email...

Avri Doria: Well no he's got internet connection, his Skype though is too. Okay he says his entrance was in revision 1608. But we can go capture that later.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, alright. Alright then going on to B; does moving outside the current two symbol limitation create any security stability or integrity issues? The -- this question seems best answered by IDN technical experts, anybody have a problem with that?

I think that's a true statement, okay. T; who determines the appropriate label use to represent a new IDN ccTLD string and how are the set of characters used to represent the label selected?

Now here in our draft response, we pulled quite a bit text out of the IDN working group because it seemed to be quite relevant here. Which is reference three at the top, and so most of that is just a cut and paste from the IDN working group and then we get -- and that's our total response, I didn't see any comments on that, so and I assume from that that that was okay?

Anybody opposed to that? Okay. Looking at my scroll bar on the right, I would guess that we are about half way through this document but lets not be intimidated by that I think the latter half is easier than the first half. Are there any rights attached to a given script?

And then we get to question A, and Avri put some text in brackets there, I personally liked what she did there, and the one question that I ask is should it replace the following text or precede it?

Avri Doria: I was thinking that it did replace it but I'm not sure that I captured everything that people wanted captured. I followed my normal tendency for short direct answers.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Except when I'm talking.

Chuck Gomes: And I like the short and direct but in a few cases because of some extensive work that we did, I think it provides some information, I think the short direct answer should be first, but like we make some references to the Paris convention and some other things here that give them some specific references that they could refer to that they may or may not find helpful, but that's their choice.

As long as we are direct and upfront at the beginning, I kind of like having the added detail but I am not locked in on that either, so if...

Avri Doria: It seems somewhat problematic.

Chuck Gomes: What's that?

Avri Doria: The last two sentences certainly all of the informational doesn't hurt but the last two sentences, to the extent that this approach is feasible for ccTLDs IDN it is recommended, which sounds like we are recommending that there may be some special rights. (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Actually those two sentences kind of -- I kind of flagged in my mind but I didn't do it otherwise so should we just delete those last two sentences? To the extent and forward? Anybody opposed to that? You guys are easy today.

(Adrian): Back in , as I drew in the paragraph before we talked about sovereign (unintelligible) again is that some of the terminology we are trying to stay away from do we want to introduce it there? I know its more relevant in this one because...

Chuck Gomes: The paragraph before where are you (Adrian)?

(Adrian): In the last, its almost the last, like seventh or eighth last word of the paragraph. It says reaffirm the principal over such matters and the rule of international law.

Chuck Gomes: Are you in the previous question? Or are you on question A?

(Adrian): I'm in A.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Adrian): I think I'm reading the right -- is the IDN call I'm on now?

Chuck Gomes: Are there any rights attached to a given script?

(Adrian): Right and until answer A right at the end of the first paragraph, it says it is worth noting that UNESCO Paris convention at the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expression reaffirms the principal of sovereign rights over such matters and the rule of international law.

Chuck Gomes: You are in the second paragraph, okay, now I'm with you. Avri's...

Liz: Yeah I took, I moved Avri's to the front so I think (Adrian) is probably looking in real time, and I had moved...

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, that's why...

Liz: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Then my problem okay.

Man: I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: So now that I am with you say it again please. (Adrian) I'm sorry about that.

(Adrian): I get a chuckle out of that thank you. It is worth noting that UNESCO Paris convention at the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expression reaffirms the principal of sovereign rights over such matters, sovereign was a word that was mentioned throughout and you just mentioned previously chuck is a word we are trying to stay away from, I understand that its probably more relevant to you that directly relates to conventions, but I'm just wondering if that is still a word we want to steer clear of.

Avri Doria: I would take out that whole sentence.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, is anybody opposed to that?

Avri Doria: And just to give you my reason is because the UNESCO Paris convention is not international law, and its an advisory so putting that in that position we seem to be granting it the position of international law.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I am okay with that, anybody opposed? So we are deleting that sentence as well. You with us Liz?

Liz: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, going on to B; now lets look at (Edmond's) comments back in A...

Liz: Did we address, I guess we addressed the, okay

(Olga): No that's okay.

Chuck Gomes: You okay (Olga)?

(Olga): Yes, yes. That's okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now lets see about (Edmond) and see if he is able to comment, agree in general to the note part but should be specific to say that ICANN should not grant such special rights. The question was general in whether there should be special rights. Now do you think we have covered that well enough? In Avri's statement?

Avri Doria: I think it would be stronger if we did add a little sentence right after, should not be restricted by ICANN actions. Period, ICANN should not grant special right period. So we could just stick that sentence in after my entry.

Chuck Gomes: Any problems with that? Okay lets do it. Go ahead Liz.

Liz: Yeah that's done.

Chuck Gomes: Done? Okay thank you, going on to B; can anyone get acceptance of a script under the IDNA protocol or are there restrictions and so on, I wont read the whole thing there, we have a propose response, let me scroll down just to see what's ahead. Avri had a much shorter and

more direct response. No, unless required by international law no territorial approval should be required for gT...

Avri Doria: Yes for gTLDs.

Chuck Gomes: So for gTLDs or a gTLD. ICANN should not become an enforcement point for national interest so the objections is available to any territorial authority and needs to use it. Now the objection process you are referring to there is...

Avri Doria: Is a gTLD.

Chuck Gomes: The gTLD objection process. Now and so yours in this case part of your seems to fall form the language that was there before especially the first paragraph. Is that right or am I wrong on that?

Avri Doria: Yeah kind of but it was just...

Chuck Gomes: The no though...

Avri Doria: That thought was sort of ambiguous and left it open and so you know there may be a law here, are there any recognized laws, well we are not sure, maybe there is this law maybe there is that law, and I was just saying, what is required by international law?

Chuck Gomes: What if we were to take the no and the last sentence and put it at the first part of our response. And then follow with that next paragraph maybe deleting the last sentence that say whether that consultation or voluntary seems like a good discussion for the GAC and the CC, so I am not sure if that's all that useful.

And then putting what you said, at the end of that what I guess would be the second paragraph now, ICANN should not become an enforcement point for national interest though the objection process is available to any territorial authority that need to use it.

Does that work? I'm kind of thinking out loud here so.

Avri Doria: Not really, because one we are talking about gTLDs here and gTLDs uses script and we have a lot of talk in that about ccTLDs and you know, with restrictions based on specific countries laws and such, and I think that we are mixing up topics here.

Chuck Gomes: So maybe we just should replace that first paragraph with what you said. It think you are right. That what you are suggesting?

Just replace the first paragraph and the original response with what you said. And I need to relook at the second paragraph to see whether there's value in still having it or not.

Avri Doria: Yeah okay that one is sort of good sense.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah it is so maybe we just leave that, the second paragraph there but its the second paragraph, the first one is more direct answer. Is that okay?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: We would take out from are there any recognized to CCNSL.

Chuck Gomes: Where was that?

Avri Doria: In other words we would take out the first paragraph.

Chuck Gomes: Oh right, oh yeah take out the first paragraph, replace it with Avri's starting with the no...

Liz: Yeah I think I have done that.

Chuck Gomes: And then the second paragraph stays.

Liz: Right, and check your notes also go.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, for sure. In fact that's true of most of these, most of these notes are going to go away.

Avri Doria: Yeah started deleting all my notes whenever I put in a recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any problems going on to C? Okay should it be possible to adopt two or more versions of a script with only minor difference under the IDNA protocol and are there issue or concerns should this occur?

Our proposed response and I suggest just a minor addition there, if we understand this question correctly, we think that the following recommendations from the GNSO IDN workgroup apply and I just suggested that we put in parenthesis there see reference three at the beginning at the beginning of this document.

We did that in other cases but it wasn't sure. And then here again we quoted directly from the IDN working group paper. And there were no comment on that, did anybody have any now?

Okay, introduction of IDN ccTLDs were now at two we finally finished one. Should a list of IDN ccTLD strings be mandated, and this is where the whole idea of a list is going to come into place. It's here I think we have been kind of trending toward a list if it's possible but lets see how this discussion goes. So we have A, is such a list necessary? And Avri has necessary no but if such a list did exist it might a useful reference. And that's a much more direct response after rereading it today I really like it in place of the above paragraph. Any body think differently and I assume that's what you intended Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, it is. Lets say I like short answers. Except when I am talking.

Liz: And that would be in lieu of the other right?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. With a very short one sentence answer necessary no but if such a list did exist it might be a useful reference.

Avri Doria: Got. And then just so you note, the answers that I tried to put in from this point on always left that ambivalent and try to answer it as a conditional -- if such a list exist, then. And I don't know don't know if that works but that's how I tried it.

Chuck Gomes: I know and I saw that as I was going through it. Any comments by anybody at this point? Okay, going on to B; who would develop such a list and again Avri has a shorter more direct response, such a list is

required should be mandated by some outside authority with the saying or similar stature to ISO. UNESCO might produce such a list.

This one I have some problem with and I think we need to spend a little bit of time talking about this. Because I agree, that would be great, but I just don't see it happening. I'm sure that ISO is not going to do it, at least not in the next five or ten years. Is it really realistic that UNESCO would produce such a list and could they even do it in a timely enough manner to be useful?

I've come to the opinion I think and this is where I would like the rest of you to chime in please that if such is going to exist, it's probably going to be created in ICANN processes. At least in a timely manner.

(Adrian): I agree.

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

Chuck Gomes: Please (unintelligible).

(Olga): I agree with you. The only thing that I would say is that not all the countries are present in ICANN processes. And not many countries are participating in the (Ark) and also not all the (PC TOD's) are actively participating at the ccNSO meeting.

So I would suggest such a joint paragraph in between what Avri said and also mentioning that the ICANN process could be considered, like adding what Avri wrote with the 16 or so on the (unintelligible) would also develop or participate in developing such a list.

I would consider both an international organization and also the ICANN process because both are two universes that are not the same.

Chuck Gomes: So you're suggesting that both avenues be pursued to see if an international organization would produce the list and at the same time, within ICANN processes including outreach to nations that aren't participating right now - a list...

(Olga): I am more confident that the ICANN process can generate something quicker, but not all the countries are present in the ICANN process.

(Adrian): I...

Chuck Gomes: So what if we say something like it's in - we would strongly encourage in - within ICANN processes that an outreach effort be made to those countries who are not active in the (GAC) or not active in ICANN processes in some other way?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Adrian): I disagree, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Go ahead.

(Adrian): I think - I don't think it's the responsibility of ICANN to necessarily outreach these things. If these - and I agree that not all countries are representing in ICANN or the (GAC). That's, I think, factual.

But I believe it's the country's responsibility if they want an IDN to pursue, you know, the appropriate avenue in which to get one. So that

would make them, you know, make the in putters reliant upon the country to go out and seek ICANN to get that.

I don't think it's necessarily ICANN to go and tap every country on the shoulder and say do you want an IDN. I also believe that if things go the way that I see them going -- and this is my point of view whereby everyone must sign an agreement with ICANN in order to get an IDN -- the, you know, ICANN seems the logical body of choice to do this.

And I don't think putting the expectation upon another or international organization to get all this together is reasonable or more practical. So I think, unfortunately for better or worse, ICANN is going to be given the job to put the list together.

But outside of that, you know, it'll put together the list of the countries that want one rather than all countries.

Chuck Gomes: Two thoughts in that regard, (Adrian). Number one, in the new GTLD process we certainly have encouraged ICANN, at the beginning of the process, to reach out in ways that might not normally be done.

So the concept of outreach is - I don't think is inconsistent. But also, I think the ccNSO is probably as good as any organization to reach out to countries because...

Woman: I mean, there's - yeah. I'm sorry. I thought you were done.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. No, jump in.

Woman: I was going to say, there's the same countries in all of these IGO's with a standing that if they really wanted to do it, they could do it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I think so. Yeah.

Woman: I mean, they're the countries. They are the IGO's.

(Adrian): (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I guess I (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

(Adrian): I'm not sure I understand the point.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: If we (unintelligible) just need one specialist...

Chuck Gomes: I'm partially agreeing with you (Adrian) in that ICANN reaching out to these countries in and of - I mean, ICANN -- the staff or something -- would be kind of hard.

But through the ccNSO organization, it might be fairly realistic.

(Adrian): So it's - not all countries have to be a member of the ccNSO. And in fact, a lot of countries don't want to be a member of the ccNSO.

Chuck Gomes: I understand. But that wouldn't prevent the ccNSO from reaching out to them because - I mean, most of the people that participate in the

ccNSO aren't members of the ccNSO as far as I understand, unless that's changed drastically.

(Adrian): But isn't that then still within the ICANN framework as such?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Adrian): So aren't we then pretty much saying that it's still up to ICANN?

Chuck Gomes: Well - but we could clarify it probably. I think...

(Adrian): Right. I mean, I'm talking...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Adrian): ...big umbrella ICANN rather than specific ICANN staff.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. But the problem is so often when you just say ICANN without any clarification, people think ICANN staff or ICANN board or (unintelligible)...

(Adrian): Right. So maybe the ICANN community then?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right.

Olof: I'd...

Chuck Gomes: So where are we - go ahead, Olof.

Olof: Could I just add something because I think we're talking about a list like it's produced once and then we have a well mandated list which people then -- as they become ready -- can pick and choose from.

But it's not like that because it will always call for maintenance on the list, much like the ISO is doing and well all lists of that nature - cause for (unintelligible)...

(Adrian): Exactly. It's going to be dynamic.

Olof: ...every job for maintaining it. And I think it's more like this that ICANN can certainly be - well facilitator in the very beginning for it, establishing the first list. But the maintenance of it, when - for example, Mongolia deciding then when they are at odds with China that now we switch to (really script).

And in order to distance ourselves from China and get closer to Russia - I mean, things like that will happen. So we'll have to update the list and - well maybe not with - at a very high frequency.

But it's still a job that you need some kind of permanent organization to do. And that's not the ccNSO and maybe well you need a new structure. I don't know. But it seems like this is - well it's cause for a particular organization.

Chuck Gomes: Well...

Avri Doria: Yeah, I see this - I mean, and this is why I suggested as I did. But I will back off after I say this. I see this one as a big time, scary international

politics snake pit. And it's something that I really don't believe that ICANN either can do adequately or should let itself in to doing.

I've dealt with the ISO process of trying to get a new country added to the list, trying to get a new entry. And it's just monstrous. It's really some of the worst of international politics. Having said that, though, I will, you know, go along with whatever.

Chuck Gomes: Well yeah. I don't think we know what we want to go along with yet. You know, on the one hand if you look at a lot of our comments that we're talking about now, and ahead - where we're headed, there's kind of this trending I think by our group that a list would be nice.

But is it realistic? And let me back up a second. Olof, the fact that the list is dynamic, does that -- in your opinion -- eliminate the idea of a list being a good idea?

Olof: No, it's just the fact...

Chuck Gomes: Okay because that's what I thought too. I wanted to make sure.

Olof: That's the facts of like. It's like - but something of the (unintelligible) that the - sort of a special organization is responsible for - where all the political turmoil can be played out in an orderly fashion.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Sorry I was on mute while the other line was ringing here. Now - so okay. So where do we go on this then, okay? Anybody have any bright ideas here? A list might be good. It's going to be dynamic. We need...

(Adrian): I - Chuck, I don't see it as being this -- and call me naïve, Avri -- but I don't see it as being this big, scary beast. Ultimately each country is deciding what they want on the list.

I see it as being a dynamic list in the way that, you know, who wants an IDN? Okay, come to us and tell us, you know, which CC you're going for and we're locking that in.

And then as time goes by, if you don't go by my outreach method and you say build it and they will come, then you'll get a knock on the shoulder from (unintelligible). And then - and also they want to be added to the list. So on and away we go.

And, you know, their name wants to be added to the list. And then, you know, in another year's time someone else will start stirring and the - we'll (run) other Pacific Islands. Then it's okay - now we're ready to have our name added to the list.

What's - I don't understand what's scary about that. If they're in control of their name on their list, why is it a big problem?

Chuck Gomes: Avri, you want to respond?

Avri Doria: The first time Taiwan wants to add its name to a list and China happens to object, or the first time Taiwan - I mean, it's just when we talk about - oh, what is the place that's Macedonia, but it's not Greek Macedonia - so we can't call it Macedonia. Things like that. So...

(Adrian): But I thought we were using the basis of the list as the 3166. So if you take that as the basis, now Avri when - if you're on this list, you're entitled to come forward and put forward, you know, a reservation.

Chuck Gomes: And there can still be an objection process.

Avri Doria: So what does Taiwan call itself and who cares? Does it call itself (Fermosa)? Does it call itself Taiwan? So...

(Adrian): It's up to itself to call what it wants to call, but they've got one shot at it. And if, you know, if we turn around and say okay the governments are all responsible for what gets entered into this list. Right or wrong, that's what we're choosing.

So the government - so the Taiwan government comes forward and says we want to be called lollipop. Well great, you could have lollipop. That's good and away you go. But you've got one. If you want to change that in the future, fine. We just update and change that dynamically.

Avri Doria: And when Macedonia gets its independence and ISO puts it in the list - or maybe it already has, I can't keep track.

Olof: Yeah, it's there.

Avri Doria: It has. And the Greeks say no, you can't use Macedonia.

(Adrian): Well that would - if ISO put it in the list, then obviously the Greeks have put it forward before that and the Greeks didn't stop it from getting put on the ISO list. Why would they stop now?

Avri Doria: Because (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

(Adrian): What right do they have - if they can't stop it from being the 3166 list, what right do they have to stop it on our ICANN 3166 reference list?

Avri Doria: No, there's a difference.

Olof: That is not the name.

Avri Doria: There's a difference between stopping it from being a country and stopping it from using a particular name.

Chuck Gomes: The...

(Adrian): I really - unfortunately, I mean, maybe I'm a little bit more (unintelligible). I do understand. I don't mean to be insensitive to the issues. But I don't think you can be guided by the, you know, the 2% peripherals here.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I don't envy the ccNSO on this particular issue because I think, Avri, the complexities are there. But should we be trying to solve their

problem? Now obviously we're going to have to deal with it in some way so that there's not intrusion into the G space.

But that aside, I don't think we're going to solve this for the ccNSO. I think the big part of their two year effort on the PDP, if not longer, is going to - they're going to have to deal with this.

The question is, what would - they're asking here, who would develop such a list? We can say no response or we can say that we believe that within the - that the quickest way to get it done -- not easy -- would be through ICANN processes, including the ccTLDs in the ICANN environment and the (GAC), and so forth.

But because we don't believe that international organizations are going to be able to do that in a timely manner. Now is it better to say something like that or just a punt and say no response?

Avri Doria: Well as (Ken) indicated last time, UNESCO actually does have a list already. Now - not that anybody wants to use that one. I think you might as well punt on it if you don't want to get involved or just sort of say, you know, I'd almost recommend leaving mine in - you know, could be mandated.

Change it from should to could be mandated by some outside authority and then add a second line. And if practical, you know, to do it in-house, well god bless you and good luck.

Chuck Gomes: That's not - in my opinion, that's not a bad response. (Adrian), what do you think of that?

(Adrian): With the exception of the god bless you because that offends me - I'm joking.

Avri Doria: I meant something (unintelligible)...

(Adrian): I'm joking. Yes, I think that that's....

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So...

Olof: Could we just add - should be - could be mandated - maintained just to show a little bit of the dynamics in it?

Avri Doria: Yes. Right.

Chuck Gomes: That's probably good.

Avri Doria: Okay. If, however - I mean, (unintelligible), you know (unintelligible). ICANN.

Liz: I just put to be mandated and maintained for the moment.

Chuck Gomes: The mandate - mandation -- I don't know if that's a word -- and the maintenance wouldn't necessarily have to happen by the same organization.

Avri Doria: That's true.

Olof: No, that's right.

Chuck Gomes: It may be desirable that it does, but it wouldn't have to be.

Olof: Developed and maintained, perhaps.

Chuck Gomes: I'm assuming you're working on some language, Avri. Is that a correct assumption?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I taped it badly, but if it's - if however (GAC) and the ccNSO wish to create such a list themselves, that should be within their prerogative.

Chuck Gomes: With input from the full ICANN community. Do we want to add that?

Avri Doria: All right, sure.

Chuck Gomes: I'm trying to be consistent with (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria: No, no, no. You're absolutely right.

Chuck Gomes: So...

Avri Doria: And I'll leave it to Liz to make it look reasonable.

Chuck Gomes: Are you okay on it, Liz?

Liz: Yeah, I finished it.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Liz: It's after the purple and the green...

Avri Doria: Right.

Liz: And it needs editing, obviously. Prerogative is...

Avri Doria: Right, yeah.

Liz: ...totally mangled.

Chuck Gomes: And we'll come back to this.

Liz: So that would replace the original proposed...

Avri Doria: But we're keeping such a list if required, right?

Liz: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Liz: Could be mandated and maintained by some (outside) authority.

Chuck Gomes: And everything else that we had here before, including the comments, would go by the wayside. Is that right?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Liz: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And we'll come back and revisit that this next week so you'll have a chance to think about it further. Any other comments on this? Okay. Should such a - we're on C.

Should such a list be (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria: Do we have (Edmond)'s issues taken care of?

Liz: (Edmond)'s issue?

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. What's that?

Avri Doria: (Edmond) had an issue...

Chuck Gomes: Oh yeah. Well he's - I think he's going further than we've been able to agree on so far.

Liz: Right. He's getting into details of what would be - I think having said that - I mean, he wasn't accepting the notion of currency. Good idea, but not good enough. And, you know, it should be all the languages, but we're not getting into that.

If we say that, you know, they're going to make the list they're going to make the list.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I think if we try to solve the ccNSO's probably here, it's a tough one. I don't envy him at all on it, like I said.

Avri Doria: So we're going to delete (Edmond)'s comments?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I think so.

Liz: Well...

(Edmond): Yeah I just joined (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: You can leave his comment in there if you want.

Liz: Okay, yeah. I was going to say we should leave (Edmond)'s comment until (Edmond) gets to say take it out. But if (Edmond) is here, he could say that.

(Edmond): Yeah, I just joined about five minutes ago.

Chuck Gomes: Oh.

(Edmond): And yeah, I think the issue was pretty much dealt with. My only comment really was that even with currency, I didn't think it was personally a good...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right. Now a - before we go - in fact, let me just see if there's a better (unintelligible)...

Liz: We're taking out the previous (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: Before we go on to C, should we go back up to the point where we were hoping (Edmond) was on the call where he was going to - he provided some text?

Avri Doria: Might as well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So let's do that. I've put a little marker here - a little flag).

Avri Doria: Well before we leave here, though...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, go ahead.

Avri Doria: The first paragraph - the individual countries, territories could start the process by working with - that all comes out or that stays in?

Chuck Gomes: I thought it all comes out but I, you know, what else?

Avri Doria: Me, too.

Chuck Gomes: What do others think? Yeah.

Avri Doria: If it stays in, then it would move to after what we just put in.

Chuck Gomes: So what do you think? Is...

(Olga): No, we should take it out.

Avri Doria: That's what I think.

(Olga): Because...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's what I thought - all we have then is...

Liz: Right, but we didn't yet so that's why I was asking.

Chuck Gomes: ...your suggested language.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. No, I didn't get it the first time. So we've replaced it. Got it.

Liz: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Good - good thing you brought that up. Okay. Now I'm scrolling up to the - where - let me - probably a search might be my quickest way to our find here for (Edmond). And let's see where that is. Keep going. Okay.

So I think we're back...

Avri Doria: It was the question about...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it's...

(Edmond): Official status (for the) languages.

Chuck Gomes: In what circumstances would it be appropriate to seek - oh I'm sorry, wrong one. Can a territory apply for an IDN CCLD string even if the script is not used? Is that the one?

(Edmond): Right. That was the one that we had a discussion last time and I had said that I really didn't feel comfortable, as we just said, you know...

Avri Doria: Is what's there now okay, or do we need to add...

Chuck Gomes: Take a look at what we put in there from Avri - what's in there now from Avri, and then let's see if we also need to add your statement, (Edmond).

(Edmond): Okay, I'm trying to get there. Where...

Chuck Gomes: Oh...

(Edmond): Okay, yeah. I found it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Edmond): Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay?

(Edmond): Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Now do you...

(Edmond): I think the only big issue I had before was there was a suggestion to just saying no.

Avri Doria: Right. Now I took that into account in terms of writing that and dealt with the fact that, you know, the only language that's not formal in

Sweden is Swedish. You know, the US doesn't have an official language either. So - and then I added my favorite cases about minority indigenous populations while I was at it.

Chuck Gomes: So you're okay with what Avri - what we put in there from Avri, without adding anything else, (Edmond)?

(Edmond): Yeah. I'm actually fine with it. I mean...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Edmond): ...as long as we're not saying no. So yeah, I was pretty comfortable.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, very good. Now let me go down and find my little marker here. Here we go. So we're down - back to C. Should such a list be mandated? And the response we had in there before was only if there were not other means to avoid security stability and upper end user provision issues.

And I don't think that applies anymore based on the direction we've been going. Avri noted that if such an authoritative list can be found, then yes. And then (Edmond), you said I can see that for the fast track at this point. However, I have reservations simply saying that for overall.

So here's one where I - anybody have a suggestion of what we say to this?

Avri Doria: Is it the same answer as the previous one, you know, that if an authoritative list can be found, then yes. Otherwise, if (GAC) and the

CCNO wish to create such a list - wish to mandate such a list and create it, then in that case should it mandated?

Olof: I think it's slightly different because - well if it be mandated, and I think that's the question that's raised before under B. By whom then? And I would say that that - we - well, that task is certainly ICANN's. Like in the same way as the mandating the use of the ISO 3166 list for CCT ND's (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Olof: So if we decide to - that it should be mandated, well does the role to mandate it - is ICANN?

Chuck Gomes: Is this one where we should punt? I like - the first sentence you said from the previous response works pretty well. If there is an authoritative list, then it - I guess you still have the question even if there is, should it be the ICANN community -- ICANN in cooperation with the community?

Because if it's not mandated, what happens? Is it a free for all?

Olof: Or is it like the RFC 1591 where the ISO 3166 list is mandated as a basis?

(Edmond): Well I guess the comment that I put in was really, you know, the - somewhat sprung from the question before. But if we do not have such a list, then, you know, what can we do?

I mean, right now we're anticipating there will be some sort of an application process, right, meaning ccTLDs would sort of apply and there will be a process to, you know, vet the application and ultimately decide on whether delegation is made.

So that's sort of the concept right now that we're hearing from ccNSO. But because in lack of such a list, I guess, how could the list be mandated?

Chuck Gomes: Well ICANN just won't put anything in the (ruth) that's not on the list.

(Edmond): Yeah. But if we don't have a list...

Olof: And we don't at this point in time, really. So it has to be (bid). And I guess the past (unintelligible) hopefully the way of stopping (venting) the list.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Now note here - let's not get off track on this question. The question assumes that there will be a list at some point. Okay? And if there is, it doesn't say all this but I think it's fair to assume it in there - if there is, should it be mandated?

Avri Doria: I don't think you can mandate a list before it exists.

(Adrian): I think you're right.

Avri Doria: So perhaps the one I wrote to be expanded if such a list - authoritative list can be found or created, then yes.

Chuck Gomes: Not a bad response.

(Olga): I like it.

Chuck Gomes: Any objections?

(Adrian): I'm fine with it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Let's go for it. That's good.

Avri Doria: (Edmond), will you object?

(Edmond): (Unintelligible).

Liz: That's basically - that is Avri's response then.

Avri Doria: Well with an addition of can be found or adding what we said before - or created.

Chuck Gomes: So it's a one sentence response. Okay. Moving on...

Avri Doria: I mean, it's kind of like punting. It's a conditional.

(Edmond): Yeah, actually it's...

Avri Doria: If the ifs don't exist then the yes doesn't either.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And then we have if yes - in other words, if it should be mandated by whom - the...

Avri Doria: We'd have to add the same clause about creating it in-house. And then I had also added -- and this is something that we may want to drop -- this is where I resurrected and made slightly wider the notion of currency.

You know, so this is a third possibility. We need to stick in the second possibility. In the case that a list is mandated, it should be produced by ISO or another IGO with the stature of ISO. Alternatively, it could be produced by an ICANN process.

And then whether you want to leave this one in or not, is up to you all. It might also be possible to create a rule-based intrinsic list that is defined by a role such as the name of a territory as it appears in its official documents or currency.

Chuck Gomes: Now does that all relate to this question Liz?

(Adrian): Yeah. I don't think that - that's getting into the specifics of how the list is generated rather than by whom.

Avri Doria: You're right.

Chuck Gomes: And this is - the by whom relates to who should mandate it, right?

(Adrian): Right.

Avri Doria: Not who should (unintelligible)...

(Adrian): So I think the inclusion of ICANN is consistent with our previous answers. But I don't think you need the rest, although it's a good point, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think you're right.

Liz: Okay. We're going to leave Avri's answer and add ICANN.

Chuck Gomes: Read it back when you're ready, please.

Liz: In the case that the list is mandated, it should produce - be produced by ISO or another IGO with the stature of ISO. It's a - including ICANN...

Avri Doria: I think that what he was saying was irrelevant.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Adrian): Yeah.

Avri Doria: If I understood correctly...

Chuck Gomes: I think you did.

Avri Doria: I think that's what...

(Adrian): I mean now...

Avri Doria: (Adrian) said was irrelevant.

(Adrian): ...if the situation is such we have a list one way - divest in - found or created, and all right should be mandated. And I guess mandating is the decision by ICANN...

Avri Doria: Right.

(Adrian): ...to one wave on to - now let's henceforth only accept what's on this list.

Chuck Gomes: What if we said just simply ICANN...

(Adrian): Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...through its bottom up processes...

Avri Doria: You can't - yeah - no I can't...

Chuck Gomes: But I think we need to say a little bit more than just ICANN, although I kind of like that. But the problem is so many people interpret ICANN to be staff or something like that. So ICANN, through its bottom up processes or through its policy development...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible)...

(Adrian): Or ICANN community or something.

Liz: Policy development process.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Or we can use the phrase that I started slipping in many times in coming up - in questions coming up. You know, the ICANN board based upon the recommendation of the ICANN community.

Chuck Gomes: Not bad. What do you think?

Liz: See I almost turned that into a mantra on the last question.

Chuck Gomes: Is Avri's last suggestion okay with everybody? Anybody oppose?

(Adrian): I'm okay with it.

Chuck Gomes: (Olga)?

(Olga): I'm a little bit lost. Which is the last wording?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Avri, can you - or maybe Liz, you captured it?

Liz: The last wording is - if yes, by whom? The ICANN board based on the recommendation of the ICANN community...

(Olga): That's okay.

Liz: ...through the bottom up policy.

Chuck Gomes: Cool.

Liz: And then could be through a bottom up - through its bottom up policy development process - is a nice coda.

(Olga): Yeah, I like that with the last part. I like it better.

Liz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: (Edmond), are you okay with that?

(Edmond): Yeah.

Avri Doria: Great.

Chuck Gomes: Olof, you got anything to add there?

Olof: No, that's fine.

Avri Doria: Can I bicker about one word?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: I'm - through its bottom up or through a bottom up policy development process?

Chuck Gomes: A what?

Avri Doria: I'm not sure that we necessarily have the bottom up development process in place.

(Adrian): That would cover that. No, you're right.

Avri Doria: It would cover that. Therefore, if we replace its with a, we're safe.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, got you. Okay.

Liz: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Olof, did you have anything else to add?

Olof: No, it's fine.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody else? Okay. Going to E.

Liz: Excuse me, it should be - this is my kind of type. It should be bottom ups, not bottoms up.

Avri Doria: Bottoms up, looks great.

Chuck Gomes: By the way, do you have your...

Liz: I got confused, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Do you have your generator now, Liz?

Liz: I don't. It's really expensive, so I'm going to have to get one (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry for the...

Liz: Fortunately it's sunny here at the moment. So...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well we got quite a bit of rain in the last 24 hours.

Liz: It has. It's really - yesterday, last night it rained very hard. But things are good here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, E - who would develop the criteria and relevant policies for identifying IDN ccTLDs? And we have quite a few comments there. The previous response was the ccNSO, as a policymaking body for ccTLDs, it seems like the appropriate party for this task and with appropriate input from the broader community within ICANN and with input from the above-mentioned non-ICANN entities to -- we not have mention those again -- to establish the legitimacy of the process and the outcome.

And I suggested adding input from the GNSO is especially relevant because of possible impact on GTLD name space. Now Avri has something - a little bit different approach on this, which is consistent with - throughout, as we'll see here.

Once the rules for IDN ccTLD apportionment have been determined by the ICANN community, the ccNSO should be responsible for developing the relevant policies that govern IDN ccTLDs.

Now on that one, trying to look ahead and anticipate - we know that at least for some in the ccNSO, that's a very sensitive topic. They think that that - this should be decided during their PDP, not before. And that they think it's impossible to do it the other way around.

We take a different position. How can we put it here so that it's constructive without raising too many red flags, or can we or should we?

Woman: I don't think we can, I don't think we should. I think we should just say it.

Chuck Gomes: Other thoughts?. One change I would suggest making that maybe helps a little bit, I don't know, is once rules - I would eliminate the word, "the" with saying, Avri's statements. Once "the" rules and just say, "Once rules for IDN ccTLD apportionment have been determined by the ICANN community. The ccNSO could be responsible for developing the relevant policies."

And we could even say, "Should be responsible for developing the relevant policies that govern IDN ccTLDs." Now, that may not seem very significant but what I'm getting at is that I do think that it's possible that we may need to have some interim rules to deal with fast track ccTLDs and the introduction of new TTLDs.

(Adrian): Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: And that the final complete rules for apportionment may come a little bit later. Now, that's my own opinion, okay? As kind of a compromise where we can kind of respect the fact that the ccNSO and their process is going to take them a long time. At the same time we need something now because the question needs to be answered at least for what we're doing now.

(Adrian): Yeah, Chuck, it's (Adrian).

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

(Adrian): The - I think the key word here in the question is “identifying” IDN ccTLD. And, for example, the ccNSO is the policy body for ccTLD. As our response that’s somewhat irrelevant and because they - the ccNSO does not identify ccTLD. Okay? In a sense.

So being more - hello?

Woman: Go ahead.

(Adrian): Oh, I thought someone was interrupting. The - so I think that the question, or the answer, lies solely in the apportionment part rather than, you know, the other part. So where I guess I’m heading is who developed (unintelligible) for identity? So isn’t that just once again the ICANN community?

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible)...

(Adrian): Isn’t the answer simply the ICANN community again?

Chuck Gomes: Actually I think (unintelligible)...

Woman: (Unintelligible) recommendation of the ICANN community.

Chuck Gomes: ...is solved then you know what’s going to the ccNSO and then it’s their round.

(Adrian): That’s right but isn’t this talking about that apportionment parts? We don’t need the rest of the - “the ccNSO should be responsible developing relevant policies that govern” because I don’t necessarily

agree with that but we can leave that out because we don't even need to address that.

The question asked for more about IDN identification and therefore I guess the apportionment. So just leave it at that.

Chuck Gomes: Well, then it doesn't answer the question.

(Adrian): Yes, it does. Who would develop the criteria...

Chuck Gomes: And relevant policy.

(Adrian): ...and relevant policies for identifying. Only for identifying, not for engaging, not for governing, not for anything else, only purely for identifying.

Chuck Gomes: But the - solving the apportionment problem doesn't get you the identification.

Woman: What does identifying TLDs mean? I'm getting confused.

(Adrian): That's...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it is kind of vague.

(Adrian): That's right. And I guess that's what - if you relate identification to apportionment, but if you read it as, "Who would develop the criteria and other policies for apportioning the IDN's" if that's what that means.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and I don't think it is based on what we've seen...

Woman: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...from the ccNSO. I don't think they had any...

Woman: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...thought about this idea of apportionment.

(Adrian): Well, can you define what...

Woman: I think (unintelligible)...

(Adrian): ...what you believe the word "identifying" means in this question?

Chuck Gomes: I don't know.

Woman: Okay, to me I...

Chuck Gomes: I guess I'll try.

Woman: Okay, I'll let you go first.

Chuck Gomes: No, I haven't got anything yet.

Woman: Basically I was seeing "identifying" and that's why I (unintelligible) the answer kind of like I did, was I see "identifying" as including both the apportionment and the next step in the - not quite the allocation but the work leading up to allocations. So I viewed "identifying" as somehow spanning both of those. Perhaps not completely but in some sense

dealing with both of those. And that's why I kind of like tried to answer it with both.

(Adrian): But is it the apportionment and definition of the ccT - of the IDN?

Woman: That (unintelligible).

(Adrian): What I mean by definition of, you know, what are the parameters by which that IDN is defined? Is that as well?

Woman: I think...

Chuck Gomes: Now, I don't think they're asking about apportionment at all based on what we've seen in recent weeks. And here's what I think "identifying IDN ccTLD" means and that is deciding what Taiwan gets, deciding what Mainland China gets, etcetera. That's identifying IDN ccTLDs.

(Adrian): Aren't we talking about going the other way?

Chuck Gomes: What do you mean?

(Adrian): Aren't we talking about that response backwards?

Chuck Gomes: I don't follow you.

(Adrian): Letting Taiwan tell us what they get rather than dictating to them what they get?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I think we punted on that. We're not trying to answer that question. That's a problem that the ccNSO has to solve once they know what their name space is for IDN.

(Adrian): But I guess I'd like to - I mean, I like the first part of (Aubrey's) response. What I don't like is, "the ccNSO should be responsible for developing the relevant policies that govern and IDN." I don't know that that's appropriate.

Chuck Gomes: Well, and it seems to me - I'm missing something here, (Adrian), because that seems one of the easiest questions to answer. Just like if we were talking about who's going to develop criteria and relevant policies for IDNgTLDs, the gNSO. That's all it...

(Adrian): But they're not the - well, I guess I'm stuck on the identification part of it. That's because...

(Edmond): I agree with (Adrian) on that particular part because this is distinct from the question about the list earlier on. This is a slightly separate question with actually identifying it from, you know, if you will, general IDNTLDs or IDNTLDs without risk.

Did I get you correctly, (Adrian) that...

(Adrian): Yeah, well you're definitely in the right ballpark and I decided that because I'm not exactly sure what I mean either. But I just know that there is - yeah. Let me think about it some more.

Chuck Gomes: Well, if we take out the last part of what Avri said then we don't answer the question.

(Adrian): Yes, we do, the ICANN community.

Chuck Gomes: Oh.

(Adrian): “Who would develop the criteria and relevant policies for identifying IDN’s?” And this is why I’m going back to this word identifying, should be determined by the ICANN community.

Man: Right, and I think this is...

Woman: You putting in the same answer for (unintelligible) as we did for D.

(Edmond): It’s sort of a little bit different through. I mean, D is the really the list itself but E is...

Woman: I understand.

(Edmond): ...is talking about completely, you know, let’s say there wasn’t a list at all. Who would develop the criteria and policies for identifying the IDN ccTLDs? So I think that was actually what - this E is actually the most crucial question that we have the biggest problem with when we sent the note to the ICANN board and that is when we have to identify an IDN ccTLD from the general IDNTLDs (unintelligible)...

(Adrian): Right, right, right.

(Edmond): ...that action must be an ICANN-wide decision.

(Adrian): Yeah, so if I can just sort of twirl that around, (Edmond), if I think I'm in the right sort of thinking is that if you imagined during the new TLD process if someone was to put in a TLD, a new TLD that could be taken as an IDN ccTLD who would be coming up with the policies that would identify that as being one of those? Is that what you're saying?

(Edmond): That is part of it, too, but I think the, yeah. I mean, I think we're sort of on the same page and it's the identifying word, the word "identifying" that's an issue. If it says "delegating," you know, then of course, the delegation of it should be the ccNSO stuff but identifying them...

Man: Wait a second. The ccNSO doesn't do any delegating.

(Edmond): Wait, okay, sorry. The...

(Adrian): Bad example, Edmond.

(Edmond): Okay. I should use a different word. The - I can't - okay. But I guess what I really meant was that, you know, if identifying means, you know, any word in the world, any IDN string in the world, somebody identifying that as an IDN ccTLD. So in the case where there is not a list...

(Adrian): Yes.

(Edmond): ...then, you know, then we need to be involved in the identification process.

(Adrian): Yes.

(Edmond): I mean, you know, whether it's through an objection process or whatever, we want to be involved.

(Adrian): Yeah, so I...

Chuck Gomes: I think I understand where you guys are coming from in terms - you're looking at identifying in a much broader sense than I was. Like I said as an example...

(Adrian): But, Chuck, the easy way to look at this is if there was no list then how would you identify? How would you understand that a TLD was either a cc or a g? Wouldn't we want to be involved in that process?

Chuck Gomes: Well, that has to do with the apportionment part of the question and the answer is yes. But when - once we agree on the rules for apportionment then I think it's perfectly okay for the ccNSO, following those rules of apportionment, to identifying specific IDN ccTLDs for territory.

Woman: For example, if the rules that are established in apportionment say, you know, it has to be some variant of the country's name. Now, it's the ccNSO that would get to decide what variant...

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Woman: ...whether the country's name would be the proper one.

(Adrian): Right, so I think the question is asking who comes up with that rule that you just said then where it needs to be a country's variant.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Adrian): Because isn't that what's doing the identification?

Woman: Right, and that's why the thing once the rules for apportionment have been determined by the (unintelligible).

(Adrian): But this is asking who's doing those rules of apportionments. Who would develop the criteria for relevant policies for identifying? Who's coming up with the rules of apportionment for IDN ccTLD?

Chuck Gomes: I understand that...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: ...that's what you think it says, (Adrian), but I don't think there's any evidence at all that the ccNSO was thinking about apportionment. They just assumed...

Woman: But we don't have to worry about what - if they were thinking about apportionment.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm just saying their question is, it's highly unlikely that that's what they're asking in this question because of that fact.

(Adrian): Can we once again do what Tina said last time and go away and ask them what they meant by this question?

Woman: Not if we want to be done before we meet with them.

(Adrian): Well, I could get this answered pretty quickly. I mean, we could easily just ask (Chris) (unintelligible), right?

Chuck Gomes: Well, yeah and in fact if you want to do that, that's fine. Another way to approach it in the interim is to actually provide two responses here. One of them (unintelligible)...

(Adrian): Yeah, that's right. You...

Chuck Gomes: ...another one (unintelligible)...

(Adrian): Yeah, I agree.

Chuck Gomes: ...about apportionment. Okay? And one of them that talks about the more specific identification that Avri and I were talking about. Does that...

(Adrian): Yeah, I think that's okay. You can say, you know, "If the question is where such, then such. If not, then this is the answer."

Woman: I mean, "If (unintelligible) wants the rules for IDN ccTLD apportionment have been determined by the board based on recommendation of the ICANN community at large." Does that cover it?

(Adrian): Now what don't use "wants rules." Just say, "Rules for IDN ccTLD apportionment should be determined by as" whatever you just said then. And then you can add your next paragraph no problem, your next part.

Woman: Okay, that (unintelligible).

(Adrian): Does that help?

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I think that works.

Woman: Okay. So rule -

(Adrian): But I just want to make sure that Edmond is cool with that.

(Edmond): Yeah, and I think you're right. I mean, that would ease the worry there, you know, where we start off the (unintelligible) with, you know, what we want to tell them.

Woman: Right. So, "rules for IDN ccTLD apportionment must be determined..."

(Adrian): Yes.

Woman: "...by the board upon the recommendation of the ICANN community at large." Stop. Okay, full stop, period.

Olof: Perhaps the wider ICANN community and now I just was thinking about "at large" has...

Woman: You're right. At large, people might understand (unintelligible).

Olof: Yes.

Woman: "By the full ICANN community" or...

Chuck Gomes: That's okay.

Woman: ...”by the full ICANN names community” or people will say, “Why? You want the addressing people in here, too?”

Chuck Gomes: That's not a bad addition, the names or naming.

Woman: Right.

Woman: The full ICANN naming community.

Woman: Both for IDN...

Woman: Right. “Once these rules have been established then relevant policies,” you know, or perhaps we don't even need that?

(Adrian): I'm happy to take it off because I don't agree with it anyway.

Woman: Right. You don't agree with it and you think it's irrelevant and I'm not going to argue for it.

Chuck Gomes: So...

Woman: We say enough other times that, you know, making policies on these things is their business.

Chuck Gomes: So what did we say then? In answer it says, “Who would develop the criteria and relevant policies for identifying IDN ccTLDs?” Read me the response.

Woman: IDN ccTLD apportionment must be determined by the ICANN board upon the recommendation of full ICANN naming community.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And my opinion is we didn't answer their question but we could argue this indefinitely.

Woman: So you think we need the sentence that was there before?

Chuck Gomes: Well, or in addition to that, I mean, like I said, one...

Woman: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...way of handling this to deal with our differences is to give both responses dealing with different interpretations of "identifying."

(Adrian): But, Chuck, what...

Woman: So you would (unintelligible).

(Adrian): ...sorry, what did you want there? Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: That...

Woman: "Once these rules for apportionment have been determined the process divulges to the ccNSO."

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Adrian): Okay, that's fine.

(Edmond): It is (unintelligible) question G. That seems to be more relevant to that particular answer.

(Adrian): Yes, good pickup.

Woman: It's your call, Chuck, since you're the...

Chuck Gomes: But I'm comfortable either way. Absolutely. I mean, if you add it in there I think it's fine. Well, it seems like it's relevant both place.

(Adrian): Yes. I think Chuck wants it and I'm not - I'm okay with it.

Chuck Gomes: Keep in mind that there - and by the way, guys, please, regardless of what I think, when this gets at the council level please feel free to argue your point. Don't be...

(Adrian): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...hesitant at all because of my opinion here because it is that, an opinion.

(Adrian): No, no.

Man: We weren't. That's what we...

Woman: But we've been...

Chuck Gomes: But I mean at the council level when we revisit this...

Woman: ...(unintelligible) group.

Chuck Gomes: ...is that I'm saying is. Okay?

(Adrian): Hey, Chuck, I thought you said the second half of the document was the easy half.

Chuck Gomes: It is. You know how much progress we've made today compared to what we were doing at the first?

Woman: Let me be sure I catch this though. You want to - is it suggesting adding your sentence that you had before at the end?

Woman: Well, slightly different.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: Because it was basically, "Once the rules for apportionment have been determined, the process must -" used the word "divulges." I'm not sure that that's the right word.

Woman: Diverges?

Woman: Divulges. And as the process becomes the ccNSO's. "Once the rules for apportionment have been determined."

Woman: I have "Once apportionment rules are established..."

Woman: Okay.

Woman: "...the ccNSO's..."

Chuck Gomes: "Would be responsible for..."

Woman: "Would be responsible for the process." Is that okay?

Chuck Gomes: "...for developing the relevant policies that govern those (unintelligible)."

Woman: Okay. But once we get the word "govern" I think we start moving into an area that (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, that just...

Woman: ...and that just (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Right. That "of identifying specific IDN ccTLDs."

Woman: For identifying?

Chuck Gomes: I think the word...

Woman: ccNSO would be responsible for identifying...

Chuck Gomes: ...specific IDN ccTLDs. And that's that process I was talking about. Okay, now that we know the apportionment rules, so now, okay, what should be given to Taiwan? That's their problem as long as it follows the apportionment rules which will narrow the scope of what can be a ccTLD.

(Adrian): But, Chuck, what happens in the circumstance whereby Taiwan turns around and says, "We're dot television"?

Chuck Gomes: The rules for apportionment would deal with that. It has to be related to the 3166-1 list of countries.

(Adrian): But you're saying that our interests...

Chuck Gomes: Represented in, you know, in a strip that, you know, whatever. You know?

(Adrian): Okay. So our interests are covered in the apportionment part. After that we don't really care what you do.

Chuck Gomes: I think so, yeah.

(Adrian): Okay. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense?

(Adrian): Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. Well, so long as you can rely on the apportionment part, for sure.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, yeah, that's like a critical piece, (Adrian). I'm not trying to minimize that.

(Adrian): Yeah, no, I've got you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? Liz? Where you at? Are you okay?

Liz: Yeah, so what I've got is, "Rules for IDN ccTLD apportionment must be determined by the ICANN board upon the recommendation of the full ICANN naming community. Once apportionment rules are established the gNSO would be responsible for identifying specific IDN's, ccTLD."

Olof: The ccNSO.

Woman: The ccNSO, yes.

Woman: Right.

Chuck Gomes: That would really irritate somebody.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, boy, talk about a war. Okay?

Woman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Going to F. "Under what policy or authority would the list be created?" There isn't one, is there? Unless you - and there isn't a communitywide - see, again, we're coming back now. If we're talking about allocation rules or if we're talking about that more narrow scope of identification of specific IDNTLDs, it's handled under different processes.

Woman: Right, that's why I...

Chuck Gomes: Do we need to address both?

Woman: ...put the answer I put.

Chuck Gomes: Let me see.

(Adrian): Why does this question go back to the list again after their previous one?

Olof: (Unintelligible) exactly.

Woman: But we can't change the question.

Man: No.

(Adrian): No, we can still moan about them.

Woman: Yeah, that's why I put the same answer again. "Once the IDN ccTLDs have been apportioned by the board based on the recommendation of the ICANN -" we should probably put in the naming community again, "- the ccNSO policy development process should be used."

(Adrian): Yeah, I'm okay with that.

Woman: One more time, please.

Man: It's in there.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: It's what I have there except I added naming after - between ICANN and community.

Woman: Got it. (Unintelligible) okay. Oh, I see, okay.

(Adrian): And Edmond, that covers your point, too, right?

(Edmond): Yeah. I think the next (unintelligible) is (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: So what we're really saying is the allocation rules need to be created under the - by the whole ICANN community and so we really are saying the same thing we said in the previous one.

(Adrian): Yes.

Woman: Yeah.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right.

(Adrian): Because we have the authority, I guess. "We" being the ICANN community, has the authority to make those rules.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay, Liz?

Liz: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible).

(Adrian): These are stupid questions.

Chuck Gomes: Well, they - yeah, and (unintelligible).

Woman: So (Adrian) says, "These are stupid..."

Chuck Gomes: Put (Adrian Kenderest) just so that there's...

(Adrian): Yeah, yeah, yeah, just get the spelling right, please.

Woman: Yeah, yeah, got it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Tell where he's from, give his email address.

(Adrian): All right, lay off.

Chuck Gomes: G, "If additional criteria on our policies are required, who is responsible for formulating that policy?" Boy these things duplicate so much.

(Adrian): That's what I'm saying.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Woman: That's why I said, "See above."

Chuck Gomes: We could put, "See above."

Woman: Or we can repeat the sentence again.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, why don't we just repeat it, yeah.

Woman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now, (Edmond), in your comment you - if I'm interpreting it correctly there, you're suggesting that the whole community should create the actual list of names?

(Edmond): I don't remember what I said.

Chuck Gomes: And then it's passed to the ccNSO?

Woman: Oh, I just assumed he was making the same point about the (unintelligible) or ICANN naming community.

(Edmond): Yeah, I think it's just - I think F and G is repeat of what is already...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, but you say, "the list." That's what throws me.

(Edmond): I forgot what I put there and...

Chuck Gomes: It says the - "actually, once the list is to be developed - is developed, I think it should then be passed to the ccNSO." And what I'm suggesting is we create the allocation rules and then the ccNSO creates the list. Two very different approaches. I think the ccNSO is going to have a tough time doing it themselves. You open it up to the whole community it becomes probably a near impossible task.

(Edmond): And I think in my point of view it was - when I wrote the comment it was G really reads to me as the criteria and policies of, you know, within this IDN ccTLDs. And so, you know, I guess my response really

just that if the list was created or how the list is to be formulated that apportionment has been created. Thereupon whatever criteria, whatever policies is really up to the ccNSO. And I think we did cover the full discussion earlier.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So you're okay then?

(Edmond): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I wasn't going in the wrong direction there.

All right, "What precedent should be given to ccTLDs in the IDN implementation process?"

Woman: And I offered one of my longer short responses.

Chuck Gomes: And let's see what is it? I write myself - I didn't last time (unintelligible). I like your response. Now, we add the - now it doesn't say anything about, you know, emphasizing technical and security issues being dealt with first like it says up above.

Woman: Well, we already had that as a concern in other questions. But...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. There's part of that big paragraph above though that I still want us to talk about...

Woman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...and that's the last couple sentences, two or three sentences. "The gNSO has worked diligently over the last year and a half to develop procedures" and so on there. "Why should the process be put on hold? There are over 1 million second level (unintelligible)." I think those are pretty significant things for the gNSO that adds some. And I'm not saying that should be the first part of the response, yours is more direct and should be first. But do we want to also include at least the latter part of that above response?

Woman: I'm fine with it. I would not put a question, "Why should the process be put on hold?"

Chuck Gomes: Just say the process should not...

Woman: I would turn it into a definitive...

Chuck Gomes: ...be put on hold.

Woman: ...statement that says, "That process should not be put on hold unless there are technical reasons for doing it."

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olof: Otherwise the (unintelligible) sounds too...

Woman: I would not invite somebody to answer that question of why they should put it on hold.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, got you. No, that's a good point. Olof, what were you going to say?

Olof: I just said that the question puts it in a very defensive mode and...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah, okay.

Olof: ...I think that (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I like the suggestion and it applies to both questions. Right?

Woman: Yeah, I wouldn't put any questions in our answers...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Woman: ...if we can avoid it.

Chuck Gomes: So when we start with (Aubrey's) and then skip the first part of that big paragraph and go straight to, "The gNSO has worked diligently" and convert the questions into affirmative statements. Is that correct?

Woman: I think I'd done that (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I'll let those of you looking at the live document tell me whether she's done that or not.

Woman: I'm - would it be worth saying, "diligently and openly"?

Chuck Gomes: I like it.

Woman: Come on, folks, we've been prattling about this stuff for two years now.

Olof: I think we may want to say over a year and a half from the last year and a half because...

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Olof: ...time has paused.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's fine.

(Adrian): Do you need that last sentence, "There are over a million second level (unintelligible) IDN registrations and operations"? Just - it sounds kind of throw-away to me.

Chuck Gomes: Well, think about it. If you're a (unintelligible) IDN registrant who really wanted a full IDN name, it's pretty significant.

(Adrian): Yeah, but my response to that's going to be, "You know what? You put out those registrations so you could make a buck at the time and rode the wave of popularity. You did it when you wanted to do it. So (unintelligible)." You know, you could be kind of cynical about it.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I'm sure people would be. I don't think that lessens the fact that we weren't technically ready for that. It's still a real need for those people. They shouldn't be ignored. I...

(Adrian): But I don't think anyone's arguing over the need, I mean, as you said at the start of this call today, we all agree that, you know, IDN's are needed.

Chuck Gomes: By the way, I'm not hard and fast on this one. If other's think that we should delete that, I'm okay with that.

Woman: Well, I just changed it from a question to say, "And there needs to not (unintelligible) longer than necessary."

Chuck Gomes: I didn't hear all that.

Woman: I just changed the form to take it - to eliminate the question and said, "And there needs to not be delayed longer than necessary."

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, but I think (Adrian)'s suggesting that we totally eliminate that.

Woman: Right, yeah, that's right.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody opposed to (Adrian)'s suggestion? Okay.

Woman: So that's my sentence.

Chuck Gomes: Well, we've reached the two hour point. I think we're sitting in a reasonable position to pick it up next week. I need to write myself a note here so I can get my fingers on the right - okay.

What I'd like to ask people to do is to make sure you look ahead to the rest of the document and if nobody is opposed, and if somebody is I don't have any problem with that either, I'll be glad to give the responsibility to somebody else, very glad as a matter of fact, I could take a crack at redoing the Executive Summary based on what the changes we have made so far. And I don't think the last part affects

Executive Summary too much anyway and I could kind of probably anticipate where we're going based on what we've done so far.

So then next week what we would do is confirm what we did today, finish the document, which I think is not too hard to finish without taking up the whole - in fact, it really doesn't look that hard to finish, okay? And then what I will try to do is send out the Executive - I will make a commitment to send out the Executive Summary by the end of this week so that everybody can look at it before the meeting next Tuesday.

And the goal will be to decide on any final edits, other than format and things like that, in the meeting next Tuesday and then hopefully that'll give Wednesday or so to clean it up and then present it - send it to the council for consideration in New Delhi and hopefully review before then.

We're going to have to really encourage people to take a look at this thing in detail before they get there because in New Delhi even working on the weekend, if we have to go through this item by item there's no way we're going to get through it.

The Executive Summary's probably going to be the guide that we'll use and then hopefully people will have read the detail that follows.

Now, is that an okay approach? Anybody...

(Adrian): That all sounds good. Can you just ping everybody once you've done your part of the...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. Yeah, I intend to do that. Thanks for bringing that up. So any questions?

Woman: No.

Chuck Gomes: All right, thanks, guys. Hey, we really did make a lot of progress. And see, (Adrian), it really is easier in the second half.

(Adrian): Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Woman: Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Have a good rest of the day. Okay, bye.

Man: See you.

Man: Bye.

Man: Take care.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

END