

**GNSO IDN Development Group  
December 18 , 2007 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO IDN Development Group on December 18, 2007.

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

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

<http://gnsoidn.icann.org/calendar/#dec>

**Participants on the call:**

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee

Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency

Olga Cavalli - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

**ICANN Staff:**

Denise Michel - Vice President Policy

Tina Dam - IDN Director

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Officer

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

**Reference Document: Draft Statement**

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnsoidn-dg/msg00005.html>

Woman: Okay great. So, I uses this is a start and as a benefit for those who weren't on the last call is that we had quite a discussion about what is our area of work in terms of comparing it to the previous (unintelligible) call that just took place on the (CCNSO) issues paper.

So, that group is working on answering questions to those detailed questions. Whereas our group is looking more forward and is more process oriented. And needs to take a position on making sure that the

(GNSO) and the (CCNSO) and other groups are equally and fairly represented when we talk about divided (name) space and allocating (IND) and (TLD) in general looking forward.

I think that was sort of like our conclusion last time. And then Avri volunteered to do a first draft on that position. And Edmon made some comments to that. And I thought for this call we should go over that paper with Edmon's redlines in it and just go through and see what people any additional comments or agreements to his comments.

Does that work for everybody? Or I should say, is there anybody that that doesn't work for?

All right does everybody, is there anybody who doesn't have the paper that Edmon made comments to on Avri's first draft?

Olga                    This is Olga

Woman:                Uh-huh.

Olga                    I can't see the versions of everything, but I can (unintelligible) when (unintelligible).

Woman:                I had trouble hearing you, did others?

Woman:                Yes I couldn't hear that.

(Alda):                I cannot see the version sent by Edmon I see the one sent by avri).

Woman:                (Unintelligible) to the list.

Olga Yes, I know, but I cannot open it.

Woman: Oh, okay. Well, I can quickly send you a PDF of it that perhaps you can open. So, if you give me a second I will do that.

Olga): Or just resend it again, if you have it.

Woman: Okay, sure.

Woman: Hey, Avri would you mind sending that to (unintelligible)?

Avri: I'm sending it to?

Woman: My gmail account.

Avri: Oh, okay sure. Let me (unintelligible) a message out.

Woman: Can you do that to everyone otherwise I'll do it quickly for you?

Avri: Yes, can you. You want the, let through a PFD of it too though. Just in case people have a trouble opening it.

Man: Yes, about it. I've heard some complaints about my outlook on this actually as well with the (unintelligible) parts scrambling after I sent an attachment. So, (unintelligible).

Woman: I was able to open it fine in open.

Man: Yes apparently some clients say that, I know clients seems to have proper (unintelligible) time.

Woman: Okay, I'm just about to send it out and I'm sending out both the PDF and the (Doc) version. And I'm sending to (denise.michelle@gmail.com) and to Olga

Olga Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: And then copying just in case I don't get any of it right I am copying (unintelligible). Okay, it's sent. Okay, I guess I'll give it a couple of seconds. First correction I can mention because it doesn't involve reading it is all the way through I made a mistake and refer to it (unintelligible) it refers to (fast track) and Edmon caught those and corrected them through out. And obviously that's a good change.

So, thanks for that correction. Okay, where am I. Okay, do we want to have like an overall, I was thinking maybe we could have like an overall conversation about the different headings that you have.

Woman: Okay, certainly. I'll just do an overall talk while we're waiting.

Okay, so the first thing, I just had a brief introduction about what this not this about and that refers to 789. Then, the next thing I do is go in for question of interpretation. In other words the first thing we had talked about was a sort of contradiction that some of us felt between the Board's resolution and the way that the, as the charter was written.

So, basically the first section in this is (unintelligible) getting into what any of our specific concerns might be was to ask them is this really what you meant to do? You know because in one place it looks like your doing what? In some ways because to do the right thing of asking the community to figure out a methodology for doing this as for the (unintelligible) group to together and figure out how to do it.

And then you go to the charter and it's much more limited, you know that looks disproportionate and the questions for the Board involve the contradiction, what did you want? You know were you looking for something that was community wide working group with balance participation or were you looking for something that was (unintelligible) oriented with other participation? So, basically asking the Board to clarify the resolution, and that's the first part.

The second part goes into a number of concerns that we have. And it starts off by saying, while we're still working n finalizing, you know what's being called (IB1) basically the response to the ccNSO GAC issues paper. Based on Board resolution 756, you know we still have concerns in relation to this particular working group that we want to pass on.

And the first one of those is the basis for allocating (TLD), the (GTLD) (unintelligible), and by the way I tried to largely use the outline that (Tina) had given last time, but I modified it somewhat in writing. But I think it hit the points that were in that outline.

So, the first thing, you know talks about slight historical for what ccTLDs are, how the length the two character code. And (unintelligible) remit, you know was recognized by the (GNSO) in trying to explain

what we did and the new (GTLD) the (PDP) policy in terms of sort of saying, we realize that this is a big area, the whole, you know geographical, geopolitical, whatever names, we weren't comfortable building a reserve nameless on our own.

Or perhaps at all, but certainly not on our own. And basically so our way of dealing with it was to recommend an objection process and to give the (GAC) and (unintelligible) standing to object and in asking the ICANN staff to make sure that they always do it when they're with something they might to object to. If that was the approach we had taken.

That we recognize that this was not a path that the (GNSO) could take on by itself. However in doing that we (wont) think that that has nothing it has nothing to do with us. That basically the allocation of (IDN) and name space between (GNSO) and (CCNSO) remit is still an open question. And we're certainly not advocating our role in participating fully in that discussion.

Then there's basically a discussion about what is the remit of the (GNSO) and ccNSO in relation to these names? And the fact that there are still open questions there.

That basically we don't think that making the decision about these allocations is a (CCNSO) or (CPNSO)/ (GAC) job to do, but it's an ICANN means community wide job to do.

Now, we assume that this process of figuring out how this allocation should be properly done is a long and involved discussion. We don't necessarily think it's properly the object of a (GNSO) (PDP) or

(CCNSO) (PDP) again it's to be determined community wide process that should do it.

Now understanding that this will take a while, you know we certainly support the notion that (unintelligible) non controversial (unintelligible) (IDN) territory country, (CCLD) names could be, should be, may be allocated before that whole process is done, but given that that other process wont be done yet, we believe therefore doing that, coming up with a methodology for doing that is against something that (GNSO) (unintelligible).

The there were questions, the next sessions was questions and concerns over the scope of the (IDNC) and sort of recognizing that there's a charter and then there's also things people say. And its all well and good to say non controversial. And I think I say things in more diplomatically in writing then I may necessarily say in the quick.

And then Edmon's script made it even cleaner. You know, how are defining non controversial? You know this whole issue of associating (ISMC) to (unintelligible) with language and cultural (unintelligible) communities is an issue or these critical national resources that come under some form of national administration.

People speak of the scope as limited, but you know limited in what way? It doesn't seem that it's either, you know it's certainly not limited in that one name, one script per 3166-1. Even though some people say that that's the limitation, but there's recognition that some countries issues wouldn't allow that to be a good solution. So, that's an open question.

There's the question of imposing no preempt position or precedence on future (NSO) (PDP), but the notion that the very fact that this is being done obviously (unintelligible) (GAC) initiative was (unintelligible) the primary responsibility doesn't indeed set some foot of precedence and some (unintelligible) a portion (unintelligible) allocation is done.

Now the charter talks about satisfying a special need. Yet that need is not explicitly defined. (Unintelligible) large question that the group members will need to, the group is what is the special need that (unintelligible) has to fulfill?

And then the charter is intended to ensure no (CCDO) record (unintelligible) allegation will for be a (TLD) that could be considered a (GLD). But it's unclear how that could be done.

Then there's the section that basically talks briefly about the need for adequate (GNSO) representation, sort of goes into the fact that, you know there's a lot of issues here, all the stakeholders in the (GNSO) have not come to an agreement on all the detailed issues.

We still have a lot of discussion. So, why we may have some top level agreements, on, you know the need for (GNSO) inclusion for example, we don't have a community wide of all stakeholder position. If some people could just go and represent our viewpoint.

And so we're saying we need to have a range of the stakeholders able to participate in this (unintelligible) can be counted in while the consensus of this (IBNC) group is being made. And then finally it closes with a specific request.



That the Bard revisit the resolution 789, carefully consider the need for a balanced representation of all stakeholders, and urgently requesting that the Board clarify and if necessary reconsider its decision with regards to the (IDNC) charter as its earliest possible convenience.

So, that's basically a quick walk through of the sections and what's in them.

Woman: Okay, so, well I guess everybody should speak up sort of like in general and then we can go through like some of the more specifics. But, I'm just wondering overall if there's a way of maybe of flipping the paper around so you don't start right off the bat questioning whether the Board really wanted to say what they said.

I think it might be hard to, if you want to be successful in something like this to go to the Board and ask them to reconsider one of the resolutions. I'm just thinking if there's a different way of doing this? And getting the same results.

Woman: One reason I put it that way is because I talk to (various), I think about five of them at the moment, and I've gotten from several that while they did very careful consideration of their resolutions, they don't actually remember any really detailed analysis of the proposed charter. And so that's one reason why I personally though it was reasonable to bring out the sort of the apparent contradictions.

And if they say yes, that's what we meant. I mean there's a quite easy answer that some of them will read it and say, oh my God we didn't realize that we were doing that. Yes, yes, you know what we really meant was something (unintelligible) considered.

And then that's an easy solution. You're right. I do believe that that's what we're asking for is a reconsideration or at least I believe that's what the counsel wants to do. Obviously the counsel is the one that needs to make that decision.

Man: Well actually on (Tina)'s note I think when I was reading the whole thing I had a similar feeling that (unintelligible) fairly aggressively. I think we've probably, it's probably my own (unintelligible) feeling that that's probably one (unintelligible) affirming that that we want, you know that we're very supportive of a (fast track) and (unintelligible) approach.

And then go onto the, that's just my feeling here. Just (unintelligible) that to start off that whole thing is great, you know we're supportive of it, however there are a number of fairly critical items that we think that you might have missed as part of the details.

Woman: So, would that be possible like just adding a second sentence? That basically says what you just said? (Unintelligible) we are in general supportive to the (unintelligible) I had earlier, of (fast track) for this. We have some fairly serious questions.

Woman: Well, the thing is that I don't think that the intent with the (fast Track) is anything different then what we want it to be. So, I'm not necessarily certain that it's because the Board missed something. (Unintelligible) can it be said as clarifications?

Or detailing what is the scope? Or like, I'm like thinking about going completely different direction, not asking them to revisit something that I think (unintelligible).

Woman: I believe that we want to ask them to reconsider. To either reinterpret or reconsider and I'm fairly (unintelligible) in wanting that to be, certainly what the counsel decides, now if the counsel decides that they don't want the Board to reconsider it, but my impression is that the counsel is interested in having a reinterpretation and if necessary a reconsideration.

So, I don't know that I want to back off of that at this point.

Woman: Okay, so I think we want the same results, but we're just thinking about two different ways of obtaining that then.

Man: I think in this particular point I agree with Avri because the reason being that the charter itself makes a couple of points fairly clear in terms of the membership and that's one of the (unintelligible) of the issue. And that cannot be explained away. It can only be reconsidered away.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Does that, I mean Avri does that?

Avri: Yes, you know I believe that's a good way of putting it. I mean I do agree with you that I should put something in the first paragraph that, you know is sort of yes, of course, and I do have it in the writing, I just don't have it up front.

Woman: Ye, you have it further down below and that's why in the document, which is why I said, you know maybe we can flip it around and (unintelligible).

Woman: I certainly pull off or you know just copy where is, you know basically where we say, we support in general. Basically, so what I'm suggesting, I can't find it at the moment, is adding a sentence that says it, you know.

Woman: (GNSO) is supportive of the (unintelligible).

Woman: While the (GNSL) is in general supportive of the need or support, is supportive of, well basically (unintelligible). That the (GNSL) in general agrees that there is a need for a (fast track) to allocate (unintelligible) for those (unintelligible) special need.

(Unintelligible) counsel has several questions and concerns. So, basically making the first paragraph be (unintelligible) the Board (passed). Okay, you know that its (unintelligible) with questions and concerns.

Actually, I'd take out part there. And basically same thing its meeting, (unintelligible) support (unintelligible) resolution relating to a (fast track) for (IMCC) (PLD), period.

While the (GNSO) in general agrees there is a need for a (fast track) allocation of new (IDNCC) (PLD) for those with a special need. The (GNSO) counsel has several questions and concerns. And then go to the next thing. (Unintelligible) contains the questions for the Board in

terms of interpretation and it contains an explanation of concerns regarding the subject, etcetera.

So, that soften it enough? And it basically says up front that, yes we agree in principle with what you're doing, we just have.

Woman: Any specifics that we have considered (unintelligible)?

Woman: We have (unintelligible) questions. One question is, you know because the easiest thing would be for them to say, oh, no, no, no, you know we meant for it be a, you know about participation and we just didn't pay attention to unlimited (CTNSO) unlimited (unintelligible) and just two of you guys, sure, sure. You know talk among yourselves and figure out how to make about (unintelligible). And that would be the end of it.

You know, and as I say from several conversations I've had, I've gotten the impression that they agreed with the (unintelligible) of the (CTNSO) charter, but didn't get into details like balance representation even though in their proposal they wrote it as if they wanted (unintelligible), its just (unintelligible).

Woman: Right.

Woman: And the easiest solution for the Board, and that was one of the reasons for putting it first. The easiest solution for the Board is to say, oh, yes, yes we really want balanced representation and sure, you know work it out.

And that's done. They don't have to get into all of our issues because they defer them all to the balance representative of the (IDNC) working group.

Woman: So, what does everyone else think? I mean for me that helps in terms of how this is going to be approached and read. If you start out with like a supportive statement. I was mostly concerned reading it that it goes, you know so directly into, here is something that has to be changed that you've already resolved.

Woman: Yes. And that's why, and in fact I had intended that because, you know in the first place I was sort of saying, you know perhaps it's just a question of interpretation.

Woman: Right. Is there anyone else who has any thoughts on that?

Man: I think its (unintelligible) right now not at this point, but after, I guess after we (unintelligible) we read it from start and see if its (unintelligible) more softer then it ids right now.

Woman: yes, I mean yes there's always room to add, you know I know what I'm writing in my job as a writer for (unintelligible) stuff. I basically write the core off the argument and then I add all the (UNish) words that soften it and make it acceptable to governments reading it, you know.

And add the (unintelligible) and all the, you know, I guess words that diplomatically would be called the diplomatic language. Or when in an irritated mood, I call the weasel words. But, and as I said I think with your changes Edmon you already basically made it much more diplomatic.

You know and changed it a lot and that's why I'm really of a mind to basically accept all of your changes. But I just wanted to talk about one particular sentence.

Man: Sure and before we go into, I'm sorry, I was just going to say, before we go into the details. There's one particular underlying theme that I, when I make some (unintelligible), just wanted to make sure we're on the same page.

One particular concept that I think, I feel more comfortable with is rather than the concept of redistribution of the name space into (GTL) (DNCC) (PLD) the current situation is as such that a portion is sort of proportion as (CCTLB) and everything else is (GTLB).

In a sort of sense and before the larger discussion I don't want to relinquish that particular position. So, all the discussion I've been focusing on be (unintelligible) of the (IDNCC) (PLD) and then those become (CCNSO) and not touched on whether anything else is considered by the (NCTOD) or not.

So, that was one of the intentions of some of the edits.

Woman: I see that there and definitely support the change.

Woman: All right, if there's no one else then let's go into the specific content, yes?

Woman: Okay. I think we're should just take it like heading for heading, right?

Woman: Okay. Oh, actually paragraph by paragraph at this point going through the changes?

Woman: Yes, we can do that.

Woman: Okay. So, the paragraph that had a lot of changes it starts out, as originally interpreted by the (GNSO). I had written work together as equals. Edmon had suggested without participation which I think is a good. Again, he corrected the (fast track), added a changed few to limited number of, and (INDLD) representing territories designated by the (I3166) (lib) as opposed to just (IDCLD).

I though it was a good change. Again changed few to limited number of, corrected spelling on (TLD). (GMSO) counsel continues to support the goal of the (fast track) in principle, especially done in such a way that facilitates balance participation from the entire ICANN (unintelligible) community.

So, basically took that paragraph made a number of wording changes that I think improves the paragraph.

Woman: This there any comment for that paragraph?

Woman: And the next bit was just quoting on the (unintelligible) working group, not much to say there. Then comes the final paragraph in that section. The (GNSO) questions the Board involved this contradiction. Is this working group supposed to be a community wide? I put community, community wide is an improvement.



Working group that allows for balance participation. I had full and equal participation, balanced participation. They all involve stakeholders. Or is it suppose to be a joint (CTNSO) and (AC) working group that allows for some lesser degree of participation by other in the community.

Then there's a sentence added by Edmon. If it is the former, how can the conditions remedied? If it's the later, how will the scope of the working group be better defined, litigating and for action taking or proposed by the working group that should have involved the broader process with more balance participation in the ICANN named community as a whole?

And then back to what I had written, this question is of critical importance to the (GNSO) as will be discussed below.

So, I'm fine, I mean there a slight (unintelligible) difference between full and equal and balance. I accept the change. There's always this little part at the back of my mind that someone may look at balance and say, what you got (unintelligible).

You know its one of the phrases that also shows up in a lot of government writing, which is each participating in the appropriate roles and responsibilities. So, if someone takes the appropriate roles and responsibilities mentality (unintelligible) one could say we thing the two (GNSO) is balanced. But that's a nuance that I'm too worried about, but it is a possibility.

Man: So, I guess that's the diplomatic part to try to?

Woman: Right. And so I decided to go along with it even though from the diplomatic perspective I know that that's a very big hole for someone to drive through.

Woman: Okay is there, I thought it was good additions from, that Edmon made. Is there anyone else that has any comments on that part?

So, I just wonder if we should agree right now whether this is like final or if we're going to do another run through of it. Since there doesn't seem to be a lot of comments, I just want to have a quick check on how comfortable are people?

Do they want to read this again or once we're done going through it today on today's call then we consider it done and we sent it to the counsel?

Man: I'm sure (unintelligible) send it to counsel there will be much more comments.

Woman: Yes, I think that it...

Man: I don't know.

Woman: I'm sorry I thought you were done.

Man: I'm done.

Woman: I think that if we make it through the rest of the talk through without there being any, you know large conflict that requires that we (unintelligible) further review then we should just send it. I think if while

we're going through this we hit something where we can't come to closure on it immediately then we'll have to take another pass.

Woman: Okay. And that's how I view it too. Because the thing is that, yes the (GNSO) counsel is going to discuss it further in detail any ways. So, if we just have a rough consensus that this is sort of like a good position statement, then I think its something that we can send on to them.

So, lets just, Avrido you just want to go ahead to the next.

Avri Okay, the next is a single paragraph statement understatement of concern. While it be (unintelligible) still working on finalizing, was a word added, our position (unintelligible) regarding the allocation. I think I just had we're still working on.

And I think that's a good addition form general (IDNPL) (unintelligible) space and the n the (unintelligible) added not categorized as a (GTLD) or (CPTLD).

Based on the Board's resolution 756. The counsel thought it was important to submit these concerns to the Board as opposed to send these concerns (unintelligible) the change, without further delay. Then I have in brackets, this statement has (unintelligible) approval in the (GNSO) counsel.

Because its (unintelligible) actually have that and that's not a true statement, but I figure I'd put it in there and then I should correct f not (unintelligible) covers, uncovers the concerns the counsel has of currently approved charter for the working group.

Okay, in the next section, the first two paragraphs have no (unintelligible) edited it except for one in the second paragraph. Okay, I and that wasn't a (unintelligible) it was just a restructuring of the sentence.

Man: But I guess the substance of it is (unintelligible) whether (unintelligible) appropriate for (CCU).

Woman: Yes, I understand.

Man: The whole concept was that it's inappropriate for (unintelligible).

Woman: For (GTLB), yes no I think that was good change and again, it changes the balance. And so I think that was a good comment.

Man: Did you want to delete the more there?

Woman: Huh?

Man: Did you want to delete the more?

Woman: More?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Oh, yes, yes, yes delete the more would be part of that edit. Thank you. Glad your reading. Okay, then the third paragraph there were some changes.

Decision by the (GNSO) was recognition of the fact that the finding of certain names available for (IBNCCDL) allocation was not a task the (GNSO) could take on by itself. It was however not an abdication of responsibility for participation and decisions regarding the redistribution of the general (ITNELD) name space. (Unintelligible) or the categorization of the portion there was such name space to become the (unintelligible) (CCNSO) and should not be taken as such abdication. And I think those were two good edits from Edmon. The only thing I'd want to ask is as part of that edit would you also want to remove the re from redistribution?

Because we're just talking about the general (IDNCLD) and the more neutral positions even though my personal position is this is (unintelligible) redistributions. The more neutral position is that this is distribution of the (IBN) name space.

Man: Yes, I think taken re would be okay.

Woman: Taken out re would be what you would want to do.

Woman: And more consistent with the proceeding (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, and I agree with that. We're really talking about, you know some thing new and not redistributing what is existing.

Woman: Yes, and as I said, personally I disagree with that. I believe that it was all name sake and just because we're now figuring out to do (IDN) doesn't change that its redistribution, but I understand that it is much more (unintelligible) and neutral (unintelligible) distribution. Although I

believe that that change in nuance really does make some of our positions slightly more difficult to argue.

But, I see the consistency and I a accepting it.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: But, I do record my discomfort with some of it.

Man: I understand the, I guess the discomfort, but that's the reason why I tried to balance it by not talking about it slipping into (GNSO) and (CCNSO) but focusing on part of it being allocated to (CCNSO) and then implying the remainder should be and should remain as (GNSO) which I think is what you had in mind to start with.

Woman: Yes, right. Okay, any problem with accepting that change? I have none.

Okay, then the next paragraph, a grammar change from understood to understandable. That there be a portion of part of the (IDN) name space for (unintelligible) for designation of (IDNC) (unintelligible). So, it's more rewording to be consistent with previous wording and I think it's a good change.

It is assumed that such an (unintelligible) is an ICANN wide decision that needs to be made in an open process that includes balance participation from all supporting organizations in making a recommendation for how the (IDN) name space may be partitioned.

The conclusion for such a process could also be a lot and this is a final sentence. The conclusions of such a process should also be allowed to and they also require a redefinition of the (CCNSO) remix as are counting defined or go beyond the structural confines of the current supporting organization.

That sentence is one that I certainly have questions and discussions with. I think it opens a Pandora's Box of other possible issues. Including the whole notion of the (GOTLD) (unintelligible) that it needs a new structural supporting organization issue which people have brought up.

I think it brings that into this discussion and while I think in principle I agree that once we have several of these (GOTLD) we will look back and say, you know I think its time to re-segment these off into a separate organization. I think it's a prioritized thing to do, it's just not time for that discussion yet. But, that's my view on that sentence.

Man: I (unintelligible) comfortable in not including it. I just though it would round it up more a better (unintelligible) stating that we are aware that these things could happen and this is also why you shouldn't make the particular decision right now.

And I guess it was brought up, in my mind it was brought up to support the notion that (CCNSO) or (CNNSO) (unintelligible) alone should not be making this decision. That was the intention of the bringing it up, but if you think it opens up too much of a Pandora's Box, I'm, you know. Take it out.

Woman: Or perhaps just take out that last phrase. Or go beyond, I think it's quite possible in the five years to take figure this out. We will be ready for (GTLD) or whatever notions of supporting organizations. I just think bringing it into this one, so perhaps if we just took out that last (unintelligible)/

Man: Sure.

Woman: That opens up the lets build new supporting organizations (unintelligible).

Man: That explicitly says, (unintelligible), okay.

Woman: Excuse, how would be the last (unintelligible)?

Woman: I can't, you have to speak up.

Woman: (Alda) I think what was agreed was that that last sentence that Edmon had added is just being taken out.

Woman: Not the last sentence, just the last clause of that sentence.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: So, it would read the conclusions of such a process should also be allowed to and may also require a redefinition of theccNSO and (GNSO) as they are currently defined. I added a couple of words when I read it.



Woman: And because what has been discussed before this group was set up was, you now where do these things belong? Under (CCNSO) or (GNSO) and that needs to be figured out. So, we want to keep that part right?

Woman: Right.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: Yes, and the only thing, by taking out that last clause (unintelligible) acknowledge the truth of the concern and actually I'm supportive of it in the long run. I just didn't want to bundle that into this particular discussion. The structural confines of current supporting organizations.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: And thank you Edmon. Okay as mentioned above the (GNSO) recognizes, this is added, in the development of (GPLD) policies. That there could be names that may be inappropriate to be defined as (GPLD).

Man: The assumption was that (unintelligible).

Woman: Right. And I think the sentence just (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, probably want to edit (unintelligible).

Woman: (Hence) recommended. No, I think it's actually fine. As mentioned above the (GNSO) recognized in the development of new (GTLD) policy that there could be names that may be inappropriate to be

defined as (GPLD) and hence recommended the objection process, no it's okay. I tripped over the edit.

So, in further in dividing the name space requires a ICANN community wide decision and how the name space should be categorized. And that's changing divided per categorizing, I think it's a good change.

Just as it would have been inappropriate for the (GNSO) to define which names would be a portioned into the remit of the (CCNSO), it would be equally inappropriate for the (CCNSO) alone or even for the (CCNSO) and (GAC) together to decide on the apportionment of such names away from the general name space. And designated as being within the (CCNSO) remits.

Woman: So, is this a little bit similar to the previous call that we just on where we need to specify that that has to do with policy and not allocation of such or delegation? In the (unintelligible) of (CCNSO) to do the policy and development, but not the delegation or allocation of the (TLD).

Man: Yes, I think I specifically tried to stir away from delegation.

Woman: Right and it kept talking about apportionment. I think it covers that. You know and I think it's a good change. The only question I have and this is purely sentence structure and redundancy, is doing (unintelligible) and designated as being within the (CCNSO) remit.

In other words that sort of goes without saying. But should it be said? It makes the sentence slightly awkward but other then that it's okay.

Woman: Now say that one more time.

Woman: In other words, if the sentence was just as it would have been inappropriate for the (GNSO) to define which names would apportioned into the remit of the (CCNSO), it would be equally inappropriate for the (CCNSO) alone or even for the (CCNSO) and (GAC) together to decide on the apportionment of such name away from the general name sake.

And drop the, and designated as being within the (CCNSO) remits. Because that goes, that's implied.

Woman: Yes, I think that's pretty (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, that's fine.

Woman: (Unintelligible) that last clause there became a mouth full. And this is not a decision for the (GAC) or either the (GNSO) (PDP) or a (CCNSO) (PDP) alone, but is a decision for wider, yet to be defined community process. I think that's good.

Next paragraph has some (unintelligible) I think there's (unintelligible) maybe sentence structure. It is assumed that the process mentioned above will be lengthy and involved given the many interests that need to be balanced. This is the reason why a (fast track) for interim delegation of limited number of (IDN CLD) representing the territories as stated by the (ISO 3166-1) (unintelligible) allocation makes good sense. I think that's a good correction.

Man: I guess the (unintelligible) part is, I added an into delegation rather then, and maybe we should not use the word delegation here as well.

But, the whole point is for it to be (unintelligible) so that its consistent with our (unintelligible) that says, you know we have made the decision that it's an (IDN CCLD) and its with this (CCNSO) completely yet.

Woman: You may want to replace an interim delegation with, why a (fast track) for allocation of. Or a method of allocation of.

Woman: Yes, I think you want to add method in this because that, I think, I'm pretty sure that is what is in the charter. That group.

Woman: So, how about replacing an interim delegation with, for a method of allocating (unintelligible) limited number of (IDNCLD) representing?

Woman: Well then I would like delegation better because it's not an allocation, it's a delegation. If your talking about something that's truly (unintelligible) it's a (unintelligible) delegation.

Man: (Unintelligible) probably just used to the word we keep using, apportionment.

Woman: Yes, how's that (Tina)?

(Tina): Yes.

Woman: Apportioning. This is the reason why (fast track) for a method of apportioning a limited number of (unintelligible) representing the territories designated by (ISO 31666-1) lists for (CCNSO) allocation makes good sense. (Unintelligible) allocation, yes that works.

Woman: Well, then the (GNSO) allocation or (GNSO) delegation? I'm sorry.

Woman: Well, (GNSO) doesn't delegate. It does delegation policy.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: So it's (GSNO) policy.

Woman: (Unintelligible) policy development?

Woman: Policy development. Does that work?

Woman: I think it does. I think I need to read that sentence again, now.

Woman: Read it again.

Man: Yes, it probably needs to read it again. Policy development might imply like if (PDP) concept, so you might want to (unintelligible).

Woman: Policy method.

Man: Or just for (CCNSO). Without anything (unintelligible).

Woman: Punctuation, yes.

Woman: Okay, it wouldn't be for (CSO) it'd be to the (CCNSO). While apportioning to the (CNSO) without saying what they do with them. Let me read that.

Man: I think that's fits nice, yes.

Woman: Okay, this is the reason why a (fast track) or a method of apportioning a limited number of (IDN TOD) representing the territory designated by the (ISO 3166-1) (unintelligible) to the (CCNSO) makes good sense.

Woman: Oh, so it's not a two (unintelligible) or four (unintelligible)? (Unintelligible). So, it's led by the (CCNSO), I think. Isn't it?

Man: Well I think it is to (unintelligible) the whole plan of (fast track) is to move a few of the (unintelligible) to (CCNSO) and let them then give it out to the whoever. And (GNSO) point of view it is allocation, I mean apportioning a few names over to (CCNSO) and that's the extent of where we want to be involved.

Woman: You want to say something about that being a one time thing and not saying the precedence and so forth. Like we talked about last time? Or is that going to go in at a different time?

Woman: I don't know, is that necessarily relevant to this paragraph?

Woman: No, it probably isn't. Okay, I'm good with the change then.

Woman: Okay and we'll you know. Okay, however until such time as the apportionment of the (IDNCDL) name space for which the (CCNSO) remit has been decided the methods by which this will be done cannot be fairly decided by (CCNSO) and (GAC) led working group that does not recognize the (GNSO) as equal participants in the working group.

And the change there was the inclusion of apportionment of the (IDNTDL) name space. Then there's a more major change, I think it's at the end.

Woman: You might just want to say, recognize that (GNSO) is an equal participant, period.

Woman: I an equal participant (unintelligible). You've sort of got it. Yes, okay does that work?

Until such time as the ICANN community at large has decided on the proper apportioned of the (IDN TDL) name space or the (CCNSO) remit any (fast track) method must be developed with balance participation form the (GNSO) along with the (CCNSO) and (GAC).

I think that's a good change. Certainly cuts a lot of wordiness.

Woman: I agree.

Woman: Okay. Next there's questions and concerns. The first one there's a couple word changes. (Unintelligible). The stated intent of the (IDNC) charter is to define a method for by a limited number of non controversial (IDN CCTLD) to be identified and delegated. Cover special and several international applicants. Replacing could be defined and allocated.

I think that's a fine change. And then the next one was a capitulation correction. There were no edits in the first bullet, second bullet, the third bullet, fourth bullet had some changes.

While the charter states clearly that its intent (unintelligible) creates a method that imposes no presumptions or precedence on any future (CCNSO) (PDP) on (CCTLD). The very fact that the issue is being

define as primarily a (CTNSO) and (GAC) responsibility, constitutes a very significant presumption and precondition. There were no changes on that except for correction of the word vary to very and capitulation corrections

There is a concern in the (GNSO) counsel about any presumption that a part of the general name space can be apportioned as (CCTLD) space without full participation by the (GNSO).

This is not to be confused with the allocation of (IDNCC CLD) once the name space is defined and policies related to allocated (IDNCC TLD) which of course remains fully within the remit of the (CTNLS).

So the corrections here was to include general name space as opposed to just name space. And then to replace redefine with apportioned. Otherwise, and I think again that's consistent with the other changes that we talked about earlier.

Woman: Yes, I agree with that Avri

Avri Great, no changes on the last two bullets. Okay, then the paragraph, I mean then the section, the need for adequate (GNSO) representation. No changes in the first paragraph.

Then basically I think just some presentational changes where as I had, however the issues are still complex, (unintelligible) changed to however the issues as currently presented are still far too complex and varied.



I think that's good wording change. Adding (IDN TLD) name distribution as opposed to name distribution. Again to be consistent with other changes we've discussed.

And then in the final paragraph, finally at a time when the (GNSO) is being restructured to be more opened and to operate on a consensus basis, its hard to understand how such a water shed issue as the first delegation of an (IDNTLD) in (CCNSO) remit can be defined by a working group with a skewed and unbalanced participation matrix.

So, it's basically placing definition of new, definition of (GTLD) and (CCTLD) IBN) space to delegate to a more direct reference delegation of a (ITN TLD) into (CCPNSO) remit.

I accept that change. Other comments?

And then finally there where...

Man: I guess to be consistent should be using the word apportioned rather than delegation.

Woman: Yes, okay that makes sense. Okay. And then there was no changes on the (GNSO) request, but I'll read it out here. Well, there was one spelling correction.

Just to make sure that since that's the final paragraph here. The (GNSO) respectfully requests that the Board revisit resolution 789 and carefully consider the need for a balanced representation of all stakeholders in the decision of issues relating to the distribution of general name space for (IDN) (unintelligible).

In addition to recognition of the importance of balance and open representation in the long term discussion, we urgently request the Board clarify and if necessary reconsider its decision with regard to the (IBC) charter at it earliest possible convenience.

Any further discussions, you know (unintelligible) now that I walked through it.

(Tina): Yes, no I was just going to ask the same question issues, if there's anyone else who had any further discussions? I want to mention one more thing myself, but I wanted to see if anyone else wanted to talk about it.

And it's really just restating a little bit of what I said in the beginning. And I thought about it as we went through the document again. I think if we want a result out of this that it would be better to ask the Board to require that the (CC) (fast track) does not set up precedence for long term ways of dividing name space up and setting policies on a division of the name space.

And to ask them to make sure that that division of the name space is decided upon before long term policy is developed and that division definition will take place along equal groups of the community.

As opposed to going and saying, why don't pleas go revisit this resolution and potentially change it. But, if this is what you guys agree on this is what the group is and that's what we're sending on.

Woman: Well, I think there's two things in what you said. I think one, is very good and making an explicit request that they make sure that there's no policy implications in this position of the name space.

Which I think we make, but never quite as direct as your saying and perhaps that could be an additional sentence in the request at the end. And just reiterating that in a clear statement.

(Tina): Yes, I think that's something you easily can add to the request at the bottom.

Woman: Right. But, I don't think and but I don't think that that (unintelligible) the need for them to reconsider the decision that they made so far.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: In terms of the short term.

Woman: As I said, you know I was just restating what I said in the beginning of the call. So, that's obviously, it need to be on (unintelligible) wants it to be. I was just trying to think more practical on what would end up with, you know maybe an easier result. Well, in that case I think is there anybody who has anything against adding that clarification to the end of the document.

Woman: yes, I would have to restructure that. We can actually try to words method now or, which is probably good to present every if the people still have the time.

The (GNSO) counsel (unintelligible) requests the Board (unintelligible). So, we're basically adding a sentence? Or are we adding a sentence before the first one?

Basically saying, the (GNSO) counsel (unintelligible). And use that (unintelligible) phrase we've used.

Woman: Say that one more time.

Woman: Yes, no I'm sorry, I was typing while I was talking.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: What I've got so is, start that un paragraph with, the (GNSO) counsel respectfully requests that the Board ensure that all decisions made by the (IDNC) working group for (fast track) allocation of (IDN CCTLB) not set precedence or preconditions for any future allocation of, Edmon what's the phrase you've been using?

Edmon: (Unintelligible)

Woman: Apportionment, yes the future apportionment of general (PLD) or general name space to (IDN) (unintelligible). This that correct? Let me see, the (IDN) respectfully requests that the Board ensure that all decisions made by the (IDMC) working group for (fast track) allocation of (IDNC CDTLB) not set precedence or preconditions for any future apportions of general name space to (IDNCC TLD) as discussed above this needs to be done by the ICANN name space at large or in general. In a balanced and representative way.

So, and then basically I then added the sentence for the (GNSO) counsel respectfully requests that the Board ensure that all decisions made by the (IDNC) working group for (Fast track) allocation of (IDNCC TLD) not set precedence or preconditions of any future apportionments of general name space that (IDNC TLD) as discussed above this needs to be done by the ICANN names community in a balanced and representative way.

The (GNSO) counsel also respectfully requests that the Board revisit resolutions 789, I need to change the sentence now that idea has been brought up above into a more complete sentence.

So, it respectfully requests that the Board, (unintelligible) (GNSO) counsel also respectfully requests that the Board revisit resolution 789 and clarify and if necessary reconsider its decision with regards to the (IDNC) charter at its earliest possible convenience.

That's not quite good either.

Woman: Maybe I can make a suggestion. Not to this specific wording but I was going to suggest anyways that Avri that you take this revised version and circulate it and then give everybody a time until this same time tomorrow to make any comments. If there are no comments then send it onto the Board or to the counsel.

Avri: Right, no to the counsel, yes, I was going to make that same suggestion, but basically I do a clean copy, I send it to everyone and yes, I've almost gotten, if that first paragraph is generally okay, I can basically cut the second paragraph to basically be specifically about

789 and the (IDNC) charter. And then send it out to people as opposed to people suffering through my word (unintelligible).

Is that okay with everyone?

Woman: Yes.

Woman: That's good with me. And so if there's no comments by this time tomorrow then Avriis going to send it to the counsel and then...

Avri: And I don't have it on the counsel agenda for this week, so I'm just going to point it out and then I'm going to suggest that the counsel take basically two weeks discuss it on the list and then we'll decide on sending it at our next meeting. We're not making this month Board meeting with it, so it would be sent and be before the Board at a (unintelligible) meeting.

Woman: And the counsel might meet that time to discuss it anyways.

Woman: Oh, yes. So, I wanted it to be available to them before the meeting to point out that its there, you know to get any initial (unintelligible), but we're not going to do a discussion and decision on it this week.

Woman: Yes. Okay. Well great then lets see what happens on our list for next 24 hours and then all depending on what the counsel comes up with I guess we could even risk coming back into working in this group or we'll just consider our work done.

Woman: Yes, we'll consider, I think we should consider it done unless and until the counsel says, no you guys think about it some more. So, if we start

talking about it in the counsel and we still have a mess then we can come back to this team to fix what they (unintelligible).

Thank you (Tina). Thanks for helping doing this and thank everybody with their editing help especially Edmon.

Woman: Thank you guys. Have a good or good night.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

END