

**GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO
Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper on IDN ccTLDs
January 8, 2008 at 13:00 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 8, 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/idn-rework-group-20080108.mp3>

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/idn-rework-group-20080108.mp3>

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

Agenda:

<http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/agenda-08jan08.htm>

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

Tina Dam - IDN Director

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor - GNSO

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: Connect at this time. Thank you. You may begin.

(Chuck): Thanks. That's fine. I don't think that will cause any problems. We're being recorded now even though we haven't officially started.

Woman: (Olga) joined.

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

(Chuck): Hi (Olga).

Woman: Hi (Olga).

(Olga): I'm so sorry. We have changes in time in Argentina. It used to be minus two and I got confused and that's why I was late. I'm so sorry.

(Chuck): Oh okay. I'm glad you rejoined us. The operator told me that there was some confusion. (Balou), are you on too? It looks like you came back on.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Hello?

Woman: Hello?

(Chuck): I'm showing (Balou) on, but I'm not hearing him.

Woman: They told me that they called out to him, but I'll get my cell phone and I'll ask them to call out to him.

(Chuck): Well he's showing connected right now on the meeting, so he's just not responding so I'm not sure what that means. Glen, I'll be able to see the number of people on this just fine because there aren't so many that'll go beyond the view that I see.

Woman: Okay good. Thanks.

(Chuck): So it'll be fine. It's just the council meetings have so many people that it goes beyond my screen limitation on my laptop. So probably if I had a desktop with a bigger screen it might work fine, but it doesn't seem to allow me to scroll.

Woman: I'll re-inquire about that (Chuck).

(Chuck): It's always interesting to see what they do with your name. I'm sure you'll enjoy that too.

Woman: Yes hi. Sorry for the delay.

(Chuck): A very important question for you both. We haven't started yet so you're okay. Do you have connectivity?

Woman: I do, as of about 20 minutes ago.

Man: Hello?

(Olav): Hello. (Olav) here.

Woman: Hi (Olav) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Edmond Chung) joined.

(Chuck): Oh excellent. Okay and (Balou) is showing not connected now, so it looks like he's the only one we're missing.

Woman: Do you want me to call the operator to check?

(Chuck): Yeah, it's probably not a bad – and (Stephanie) just joined.
(Stephanie), welcome.

(Stephanie): Thank you.

(Chuck): Okay. I'm going to go ahead and start the meeting while Glen's checking on (Balou) because as you know my time is limited to no later than just about an hour and a half from now because I've got to head to the doctor's office for an appointment that was scheduled many months ago, so my annual physical that I haven't had for three years.

Woman: You can only put those off for so long.

(Chuck): Yeah. Well there's no real problems, but (unintelligible). I didn't want to reschedule it because it takes so long. Okay well the agenda everybody should have received quite some time ago, and we're going

to – it looks like everybody's here right now except (Balou), so I'm hoping he'll join us any moment.

So let's just move ahead. Now any problems with the agenda I mapped out? Let me, before I give you a chance to respond let me point out that I kind of mapped out an agenda that mostly takes us to the end. That's not because I think that we need to – that we're going to get even close to that today. We're not, but that way we can just kind of pick it up each time and continue.

And I tried to include some references to the document so it makes it easier to follow. So any comments or concerns with the agenda? And for those who weren't on a little bit ago, they are recording. They started recording before we officially started so it is being recorded.

Now, the first thing I wanted to do because I'll probably have to rush at the end is confirm our meeting schedule in the future. You can see we have meetings scheduled for Tuesday the 15th, two hours later than this. Okay? The (2,200 UTC), and on the agenda you can see that the times – hopefully those times should be accurate. (Olga), with the change in time for you if that's not accurate let us know so that we fix that, and the same thing on the 22nd.

Now what I would like to request to the extent that we can is that all of us keep the 29th open if we need it. I don't know whether we will or not. We've got some fairly heavy issues and if we make some good progress on those I think that'll make the rest fairly easy. But until we know if everyone can keep the 29th open at the same time as the next two meetings, the (2,200 UTC), that would be appreciated.

Any questions or comments? Okay. The first thing then we'll do today is just confirm the progress we made last week, and I'm very glad that (Liz) has connectivity. She has been without it for quite a few days because of storms here in California, and (Liz) are you still able then to serve as editor like we did last time?

(Liz): Yes, with everyone's (unintelligible). I'm online and I'm (unintelligible), so yes.

(Chuck): Okay, thanks a lot. And the same thing as last time (Liz), in terms of the fact that you don't have to capture everything live. If there's some things that it's easier to defer until after the meeting and then just send a notice that it's been updated, that is fine. You don't want to hold off just while you're having to do a lot of things. So however you want to do the notes, that's fine.

Okay good. Now everybody, if you read the agenda you saw just like last time that (Adrian) I think was the one that made the original suggestion and it sure helped me, and that was to cut and paste the latest document in advance of the meeting for reference during the call as needed. If you haven't done that you might want to do that because then it doesn't bounce around and you can kind of stay in one place unless you like the bouncing around, and then you're welcome to have it that way.

So again, thanks for that tip (Adrian). That has been very useful for me. Alright, now then the first thing we'll do is talk about the edits that we made on our December call. The first thing I wanted to call attention to – (Balou)? I thought, I guess not. Okay, let me go back and look at the meeting thing. No, he's not showing on yet. Okay, alright.

The first thing I want to do then is take a look at in the introduction to the document there is a footnote that was added in the introduction, and that's within like the third paragraph of the introduction, third paragraph of the document itself.

And it reads, "As used in the document the term (IDNCCTLD) is defined as (IDNTLD), representing a territory designated in the (ISO 3166-1) list. The (unintelligible) makes this clarification to the definition to reflect the fact that (CCTLDs) are by definition two letter (TLDs) associated with the (ISO 3166-1) list. Because there is no corresponding (ISO) list for (IDNTLD) for countries or territories, and because it is highly unlikely that there will ever be such a list, we think that the term should be redefined accordingly."

Now, when I reviewed that again I thought maybe we shouldn't say that it's highly unlikely that there would ever be such a list. I personally think it's highly unlikely that (ISO) will do one in the near term, but I think what I'm starting to see us gravitate to as a group is that there be some sort of a list. So I think we have to be careful how we word this here. Does somebody else want to comment on that?

Woman: Yeah. I know that at one point (unintelligible) came to me and said, "You know, I think sooner or later we'll create a list." So that would be another reason why I would leave out the highly unlikely. It's just it doesn't exist now nor do we expect it in the near future.

(Chuck): So would it be okay if we change that last sentence to, "Because there are no corresponding (ISO) – there is no corresponding (ISO) list for

(IDNTLDs) for countries or territories, we think that the term should be redefined accordingly.” Just delete that and because clause.

(Olav): Or alternatively, because it is unclear when such a list may emerge.

(Chuck): That’s fine with me.

(Liz): What I added actually was because there currently is no corresponding (ISO) list for (IDNTLDs), for countries or territories. I think (Olav’s) point was a good one in that as far as we know, and I think that’s what (Olav’s) point said, no one is actually actively working on one at the moment either.

Now I’m not saying we should say that, but I think (Olav’s) addition there sort of also puts that uncertainty that it’s not like somebody is working on it and it’ll be done in two years.

(Chuck): Anybody opposed to (Olav’s) suggestion?

(Liz): Yeah, why don’t you say it again (Olav) please?

(Olav): And because it is unclear when such a list may emerge, something of that nature.

(Chuck): Is that okay (Liz)?

(Liz): Yep.

(Chuck): Okay, and no objections to that. So we’re okay with that footnote then with the change we just made.

(Olav): Hold it. Hold it. Hold it. Hold it. That's really a minor thing and I'm not sure – it's not my mother tongue, but nevertheless the term (IDNTLD) is defined as I would say a or an (IDNTLD) representing a territory designated rather than having the plural.

Woman: Oh yeah.

(Olav): It's nitpicking, but anyway.

Woman: That's a good nitpick. That's good. I got it.

(Chuck): Anything else? Alright, then the next item there, 5B – excuse me. Yeah anything else on the introduction that anybody wants to comment on, otherwise we'll assume we're done with the introduction.

Woman: Introduction, that's not the executive summary. Okay. Nope.

(Chuck): No. Anybody else? With regard to the executive summary I made a suggestion in the agenda and I want us to talk about that now. We don't have to go that direction, but my suggestion is that we defer the executive summary until we do the body of the document and then come back and do the executive summary.

Because the executive summary was created by pulling things out of the main body of the document, and if we – I think it's a more straightforward way to do it that direction, but I'm open to discussion on that.

Woman: It works for me. I just did a note in it.

(Chuck): Yeah. There's a lot of work that's going to have to be done on the executive summary, but I think it'll flow better if we go through the main part of the document and then as our last action item, which I will add to the bottom of this ongoing agenda – in fact I already have on my draft here to go back to the executive summary and then correlate it to the changes we've made in the body.

Anybody object to that? Thanks, okay. Then the next part that we covered last meeting was Section A, responses to issues, paper, questions, interim, and overall approach to (IDNCCTLDS). And does anybody – recommendations one and two we got past. Any additional comments on those?

Okay, then recommendation three. Let's take a look at the parenthetical insert there. Is everybody with me in terms of where we're at? And it's the one that says, "The (CCNO) should be primarily responsible for (IDNCCTLD) policies." And I won't read the whole thing because you can do that, and in parenthesis it says, "The apportionment of the named space between (GTLDS) and (CCTLDS) should be determined prior to allocation of any (CCTLDS), and this should be done jointly by the (GNSO) and the (CCNSO).

(Olav): Allocation of any (CCTLDS)? They're all to be allocated?

(Chuck): Yeah, it's a good point.

(Olav): (IDNCCTLDS) for want of a better expression?

- (Chuck): Yeah and I think we decided last time that we will use the term (IDNCCTLDs). That footnote that we just spent some time on was designed to deal with the concern there.
- Woman: So we're substituting (IDN) for any?
- (Chuck): No. I think we're adding, "allocation of any (IDNCCTLDs)." We're adding, or we can say – yeah, (IDNCCTLDs). Just add (IDN). Is that okay (Olav)?
- (Olav): Oh yes.
- (Chuck): Good catch. Any other comments on number three? Okay. Then we go to recommendation four. Note that there's a – I think I added that because it's the color I used. I added the word gave into the sentence there, so it ends, "which gave the (unintelligible) and (CCNSO) objector standing."
- Woman: (Unintelligible).
- (Chuck): So that should be in the document already.
- Woman: Yeah, I'll change it to black.
- (Chuck): Yeah that's fine. Yeah, that's good. No comments? Okay then I think that brings us...
- (Audrey): I have one, and it's I think a mild ambiguity. "Should be delayed because of readiness of one category," and I think I know what we

mean. And we kind of mean a readiness specific to one or the other category, or readiness specific to just one category.

Because in some sense we're saying until allocation of (IDNCCTLD) in the prior one, and we say that needs to be done together. Now could one be said, well the (IDNCCTLD) is a category and until we've gone through all of that we shouldn't be doing – so I think it's basically readiness specific to one category. Or something, I don't know.

(Chuck): That's okay with me. Anybody object to that or have an alternative suggestion?

(Audrey): I mean be pedantically.

(Chuck): I think it's okay (Audrey). Anyone else think differently? (Liz), do you have that?

(Liz): No.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Audrey): Instead of readiness of one category, readiness specific to one category.

(Liz): Okay.

(Chuck): Okay, that brings us to recommendation five in this section, which is where we left off last week and we're going to take that one in paragraphs because there are several paragraphs. And there were lots of comments on the list. Now I hope that everybody had a chance to

kind of re-review the comments. That's a good practice leading up to our meetings.

I know I try to do it at least as far down as I thought we might get together. Hopefully a little further so that it kind of gets my mind back in gear so that we don't have to go through and re-discuss the comments. But what I'd like to do is read that paragraph and then if you need to look at the many comments under that first paragraph under five, please do so.

So it says, "If the assumption is that (IDNCCTLDs) will have the opportunity to become de facto (IDNGTLDs), as has happened with some (ASCII) (CCTLDs) historically, then the selection deployment criteria, for example technical, financial, operational, etcetera, for (IDNCCTLD) policies for an (IDNCCTLD) should be similar to those for an (IDNGTLD) to ensure that there is no unfair advantage. In addition, in the absence of a contract there is no way to enforce the criteria."

(Liz): (Chuck), I'm sorry to interrupt. It's (Liz). I'm going to lose my battery and have to dial in on a different phone, so I'm going to drop off for a second. (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Alright. Just for those that don't know, (Liz) – power wasn't supposed to be restored at (Liz's) house in the mountains near Santa Cruz, California on the central coast (unintelligible), until tomorrow. So she is using alternative power sources and they have not yet installed a backup generator.

Alright, now on that – a lot of good discussion on this, okay? Very quickly let me just try and encapsulate some of it. One of the things is,

is that whatever names, (IDN) names, (TLDs) are allocated to the (CCNSO) policy space. My personal feeling is that I think we got to be fairly realistic that to the extent that governments are involved, and I think (Adrian) even made a comment to this effect.

He mentioned it with regard to Saudi Arabia. Are they going to be willing to enter into agreements with ICANN to the extent that the government's involved in the (TLD)? I think that's highly unlikely, so I think we need to balance some idealism here with some practical reality and come up with a statement that maybe finds that balance if we can do that.

I think we're all in agreement that we don't want the (CCNFO) just to be able to introduce (IDNTLDs) that are essentially (GTLDs), and therefore compete in the (GNSO) space without the same requirements.

At the same time, the chances of many of them if not all of them signing the same kind of agreements the (GTLD) registries sign is very slim. And so what's the best way to approach this thing? I think all of us have kind of the same objective, but let's maximize our chances of being effective here.

(Liz): I'm back, sorry.

(Chuck): Welcome back. I was just kind of doing a little – while you were out (Liz), just kind of setting the stage for talking about this and just opened it up for discussion.

(Liz): By the way, that could happen again. I'm going from one phone to another because none of them have had a chance to recharge. So I will try to let you know if that happens again.

(Chuck): Do you not have – do you have power now?

(Liz): I do, but nothing's really recharged like the cordless phone.

(Chuck): Oh okay, so you did get power back a little bit sooner than they predicted.

(Liz): Yes I did. It bodes well for this call.

(Olav): We'll have you on a petroleum phone next week.

(Chuck): I was prepared to get another editor if you didn't have power.

(Liz): So far so good. We'll keep our fingers crossed collectively.

(Chuck): Okay now let me open it up for discussion here.

(Adrian): (Back on). It's (Adrian). Can I make a comment?

(Chuck): Sure. And by the way, unless we get a long queue or something I think our group is close to being small enough that it's okay to jump in. If I see that that becomes a problem I'll do a formal queue, but otherwise if there's a space feel free to jump in.

(Adrian): I appreciate the power to be rude. Thank you. I've been thinking about this and racking my brain on how we can overcome this, and I'm

looking forward to hearing suggestions. But I think (Chuck), you've almost got to just state exactly what you just said to introduce it. I don't think there is a better way to state it other than to simply state the (unintelligible) and the issues that are around.

On one hand I want them to have the ability, but on the other hand you want a contract. So exactly what you just said to introduce this little (unintelligible) I think is probably the best way to go about it, although I look forward to hearing other responses.

(Chuck): And I'm pausing so that others can jump in.

(Edmond): I guess (unintelligible) exactly what he is suggesting in terms of – you're suggesting rewording the...

(Chuck): Are you talking about me or (Adrian)?

(Edmond): Yeah both. Actually I probably...

(Chuck): I didn't so much make a suggestion as I was trying to describe what I believe is reality. Now how we deal with that reality, and I think (Adrian) was taking it a step further and suggesting saying something like I said. Is that correct (Adrian)?

(Adrian): Yeah that's right. Because I don't think there is – and as I said, once again waiting for other responses. But in my understanding I don't know that there is an answer to this, so if there isn't an answer it's best just to pose the issue. Which is exactly what you just did (Chuck) when you were explaining the question to us all.

(Edmond): So I think I generally agree. So I think we should try to keep this shorter, rather than state out all our observations. I think we should just say what we want and just leave it at that, rather than trying to explain okay we don't think agreements (unintelligible) (IDNCCTLDS) are likely. But to say it would be good to have (unintelligible) that. And rather than saying it's a requirement, saying that's a good thing and just stop there.

(Chuck): Other thoughts?

(Adrian): I disagree (Edmond), with all due respect. I think that you have to show that you've thought about the other angle, and to say – just to say what you want doesn't imply that you thought about the issue.

And I think that the major issue here is that the reality is that we believe that some of these new (IDN) managers won't sign contracts, and if they don't sign contracts we're kind of at the mercy of them number one, to run the idea in any way to wish, or to choose their idea or whatever it is. So I think you need to show an understanding of the issue, and that's why I believe just pointing out the issue is just a better way to go.

I mean you could do it succinctly. I certainly agree to do it succinctly, and I don't think (Chuck) was too far away. But I think you need to (unintelligible). In our paragraph here we say as a last point, "In addition in the absence of a contract there's no way to enforce the criteria." I think that's a pretty major point...

(Edmond): Actually I agree with you. I was just saying the point that most of these (CTLDs) won't sign it. You probably don't have to go into detail about that particular observation. The importance of it, yes definitely.

(Chuck): Yeah and I don't think either that we should state that particular point, that we don't think they would sign it. But approach it the way I think I hear both of you saying. "Hey, here's what we think would be the best way to go," and kind of leave it there without getting too explicit and say they have to have a contract.

That would be nice, and I think (Olga) made a good point that – I don't know if it was in this one or in one of the later paragraphs in section five, that even if they have a contract doesn't mean they have to be in the (GNSO), which is an important point.

(Olga): I have a concern. This is (Olga).

(Chuck): Go ahead.

(Olga): My concern is that if they don't get a contract, or somehow they (unintelligible) with this new ideas and technical issues. And this will be totally unfair for new (GTLDs) and for new (IDNTLDs). So I think that if we do not enforce the idea of having a commitment – maybe it's not possible, but we shouldn't (unintelligible) not talking about it.

We should mention that it's important to have a contract because it's totally unfair in my view for the rest of the registries that we'll be having.

(Chuck): And in fact (Olga), that point exists in the environment today.

(Olga): I know.

(Chuck): In the (ASCII) world as well. So I think we're all in agreement with that. The question is how should we state it, and what you're suggesting if I'm hearing you correctly is that we should be fairly direct that we think the best way to go is for there to be a contract.

(Olga): Well somehow mention in it, not leading – not clearly best.

(Chuck): Okay, other thoughts?

(Olav): (Olav) here. Just quickly, I think that there is, well maybe some kind of straightforward statement, straightforward. We don't mention contracts until the very, very last sentence, and perhaps it becomes a bit awkward. I mean it would be preferable to have a contract in order to enforce the action or something of the sort.

(Chuck): So that last sentence could actually be changed to be a more direct statement. Is that what you're suggesting?

(Olav): Yeah. I think that's what we mean and maybe it's good to be straightforward about it.

(Chuck): Did I hear someone else trying to jump in about the same time as (Olav)?

(Edmond): It was (Edmond), and actually the issue I think seems to be talking about two particular things, which are related. I mean on number five.

One is the issue about (IDNCCTLDs) becoming – or sort of become de facto (IDNTLDs), and that relating to then they should have – if that's the case then it would be better to have a contract or have a more specific arrangement with them.

And I guess I was just looking at the comments again - my own. And I was suggesting that perhaps, you know, we should start off by saying - just stating that it should be avoided to - when introducing IDNCCTLDs essentially, CCTLD becoming a (unintelligible) defacto (unintelligible) should be avoided.

Because in the current thinking at least, it is not based on a particular list published by some third party. I mean, at this point that is not the envisioned way in general.

So there has to be (unintelligible) some process of creating that list, or proposing certain things.

So in that process, there is a possibility to at least try to avoid some of the situations where the string itself is somewhat generic.

So starting by that, you know, that is really what we are - I think, that is at least one of the things we are after is, if the string itself is actually - can very well be a generic term, that's the start or the root of some of the problems.

Glen Desaintgery: So, (Edmond), what you are suggesting is as a first sentence in this paragraph, we say something like this: The situation of IDNCCTLDs becoming defacto IDNGTLD should be avoided.

(Audrey): Must be avoided.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

(Audrey): In other words, I think it is quite fine for us to say that they must not do it. Now that doesn't mean they, you know, they might not go against what it is we say they mustn't do. And that we will need to protest it in the future. And we will have to find - or people will have to find ways to force those to be withdrawn, because they have gone against something.

The point is, I think we want to set it must not happen. We have no way to stop it, but I don't know why we wouldn't say it mustn't.

Glen Desaintgery: Anybody disagree with (Audrey) - that it should be must?

(Edmond): I kind of - well, I am not sure whether I want to completely disagree yet. But I would pose a question of, you know, there are situations - there could be situations where, you know, (unintelligible) is always used. But let's say (unintelligible). There could be situations where, in some views it is - you know, it could be used as an IDNGTLD. But in essence it, you know, these (unintelligible) in a way that it is an IDNGTLD (unintelligible) be a particular (unintelligible).

So I am not sure whether we want to just start off by using must.

(Audrey): Well I think you are not saying they mustn't used a word that could be misconstrued as a GTLD. What you are saying is they mustn't create one that is used.

Now one of the ways it becomes ambiguous when the word would allow for it. But I thought the statement you were making was, they mustn't create defacto GTLDs. Not that it mustn't use words that could be construed as to GTLDs.

(Edmond): Yes, actually I agree with that. But I was just thinking, you know, if we talk about a broader based terms of, I guess (unintelligible) defacto GTLD, it sort of comes across as, I guess somewhat (unintelligible) if it comes with must.

Because the defacto GTLD as somewhat vague in my mind.

Glen Desaintgery: Anybody else want to comment on that?

(Tina): Yeah it is (Tina). I just - I am a little bit concerned about this rewording of it. Because if you are saying that something must not happen and we have no way of enforcing it, then I don't really know what the purpose is.

When you talk about usage of TLDs and usage of specific registrations, on TLD, it is something that at least in that past has been really difficult to do anything about - even though it was thought it was a bad way of using a registration.

So I am just wondering, if it can't be enforced, then why do we want to put a requirement for it?

(Audrey): Perhaps if necessary to find a way to enforce it at some point. And basically, for us to say we don't think it should be, and therefore it must not be.

Because, I mean, everything we say here is just (unintelligible) we think it. We are not making rules, we are just giving our opinion. And perhaps there needs to be something that can be done about it.

You know, whoever allocates the name can deallocate a name. So to say that something, you know, that we don't know how to enforce a rule yet, it is not necessarily....

I guess also the place I am coming from, whenever somebody says should, then you are immediately saying, well if you only said should, then there are some cases in which it is okay not to. And you actually have to delineate those. Because otherwise, if you don't say should with what are the exceptions, then should is really even more empty than an unenforceable must.

Glen Desaintgery: Let me make a suggestion for dealing with this, and maybe we can do this kind of thing if it works in other areas where we are not in unanimous agreement. And that is that we put in the sentence like I stated, with two choices there - one should/one must.

And that can remain there for our final document that we give to the council. Because the council is ultimately going to have to approve the wording.

And unless we - unless people think that we can come to agreement on whether it should be, should or must, then rather than spending huge amounts of time debating it amongst ourselves, handling it that way. Any thoughts on that?

I want to try to keep us moving, because there are so many - there are several really key issues in this whole thing that we could spend a whole meeting on. And if we do that we are going to be going into March.

So my goal is to keep us moving. And in cases where it is not clear that we can reach consensus, then give a couple of choices that - in our draft document.

(Edmond): (Unintelligible). With that, (unintelligible) now, I think that we can - I think (Tina) is saying should is OK. But the practical sense is you might not be able to do anything about it.

You can say what you like, but at the end of the day, I think if I am understanding (Tina) correctly is that, you know, you can't necessarily - as history has shown, you can't necessarily know that you are going to do anything about it.

I think it is okay for us to put must in there, because at the end of the day, it is an opinion from the GNSO. And therefore, we are letting you know that as far as we are concerned, it is unacceptable for someone to act in this behavior.

We may have no control over that and (unintelligible) as (Audrey) said, (unintelligible) and scratched to try to (unintelligible). But at the end of the day this is our opinion. And I don't see any reason why should, should not be used. I'm sorry, must should not be used.

Glen Desaintgery: And, (Tina), I would like you to respond to that. Because I understood you to be arguing for should instead of must. But let me let you state it.

(Tina): Okay, so I guess I was mostly just saying, if you want to put must in there (unintelligible) put it as a requirement, then I would, you know, if that comes to me as staff, then I would go back to the GNSO and put to you that, you know, right now there is no mechanism of enforcing that. So that needs to be a part of the work as well.

So if you want to put must, that's fine, but that puts some additional work on you. Because you need to probably put some statements around how that should be enforced.

Man: Well, I think that's great. That is exactly what we want. Because then we want to be able to come back and say well, here are some answers and how are you going to enforce it? Because that's the crux of the issue here.

(Tina): But that takes you back to the contract discussion then.

(Audrey): Alright, and that basically makes that an issue in the GTNSO, PDP efforts. That, you know, that is one of the constraints that they need to look at now. They don't necessarily need to solve it. Then that becomes a post issue for approval. But that does become one of their issues that, you know, that is one of the things they need to look at.

And the other thing I want to say is, I actually won't protest that much against should. But any time we use should, I feel that we must include examples of why it is a should and not a must.

And what we have see as the things that make it more a should than a must. Then if we can do that then, you know, I am comfortable with should.

I am just not comfortable with shoulds that don't explain exceptions.

Glen Desaintgery: So how many people are opposed to using must?

(Edmond): (Unintelligible) I just want to add one little thing before you take the little poll.

What are we really talking about, in terms of should and must? You know, is it must we avoid CCTLD as a potential GTLD? Or, you know, the reason I (unintelligible) should is because we, you know, in the cases where they cannot avoid it, there should be - there must be a contract is sort of what we want to say. But if we start out with must, then we can't say, in the cases where it cannot be, you should have a contract in place.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, that is an interesting - that is helpful I think, (Edmond).

And what you are saying is that we say that should be avoided. But then we continue and say, if it is not avoided, then any such IDNGLDs must have a contract. Is that - did I express that correctly?

(Edmond): Well actually, it was my question. Whether it - where the must should be (unintelligible) with all these musts and shoulds.

Glen Desaintgery: Does what I say it make sense? I mean....

(Edmond): Yeah. I mean, that is what I sort of wFant to ask. Is that were the must was suppose to be? I guess in terms of what (Audrey) you are thinking about?

Or are we really wanted to say, you know, must be avoided. But how...

(Audrey): I think that is a fine alternative. I think it is different. It is basically saying that it should not, but we see an exception then it might. And (here's) already offering and solution that you think it is good enough that they have a contract if they do it. And if they don't, need to be stopped from doing it.

And those are really two real possibilities. It satisfies my need that a should includes it's exceptions.

I prefer that they don't to it. And I - but I think that if they do it and they have a contract that parallels a GTLD contract, you've got a good thing.

Now of course then you are right back in what (Tina) said before. (Unintelligible) how do you enforce that? And you are right back where we were with the simple statement is, yeah, somebody has got to come up with a way of enforcing it.

Glen Desaintgery: Yeah, now that sounds like we have what could be a reasonable compromise here - granted that wherever we put the must, there is the issue of enforcement. But like (Adrian) pointed out - and I think, (Audrey) you address it too, you know, then that is a challenge down the road.

But is this a reasonable compromise? And what I am understanding it to be, we say that the situation of an IDNCCTLD being - becoming a defacto IDNGTLD should be avoided.

But if it is not avoided, then any such instances should require a contract with comparable terms to GTLD.

(Audrey): Except that second should was a must (unintelligible).

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you. I appreciate that. That is what I meant. Yes.

Is that a reasonable compromise?

(Liz): It works for me. And I find it interesting, because it actually adds the content about contractual conditions, (unintelligible).

Glen Desaintgery: And we should make sure, (Liz), in rewording it. A I will give other people a chance to talk here before we move on. That we include the specifics that is in there now, like the technical and financial operational criteria and stuff like that.

So I think that is good to clarify, you know, what (unintelligible) concerns are.

(Liz): So could you just repeat them how it would... I think I am losing my battery. Yeah, I am losing the battery on my (unintelligible) phone. Could somebody else capture that, and I will try to dial back in? So sorry. Technical difficulties.

Glen Desaintgery: Can somebody go....

(Audrey): (Unintelligible).

Glen Desaintgery: So, can you try to capture that, (Audrey).

(Audrey): Ok so it should be avoided.

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible) later as long as you get them main idea.

(Audrey): Yes, I will add something and then it can be fixed, Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Is anybody opposed to that approach on this?

Okay, thanks, (Edmond). That is very helpful.

Then we will go down to the next paragraph. So if you go down to the black text and get past all of the comments - (Edmond)'s was the last on that.

The next paragraph reads, the GNSO Counsel is aware of a proposal for introduction of IDNCCTLD presented by the Asian Pacific Top-Level Domain Association, whereby each CCTLD would be granted one IDNCCTLD in the interim to get the process started faster.

If this results in meeting more user needs sooner, we support it. But we would also support a broader implementation that meets more user's needs sooner if that is possible.

Now here is, I think again where we have a difference of opinion in our group with regard to this. Because I am thinking I am hearing quite a few of you say that no. No more than one. And then I hear others saying, like I have said, that yes, some exceptions might be OK. So where are we at on this?

Feel free to repeat your concerns too so that we can come up to speed on this paragraph.

(Olga): (Unintelligible) (Olga).

Glen Desaintgery: Go ahead, (Olga).

(Olga): Yeah, I suggest one for the (unintelligible) period. But I have heard from some countries that only one (unintelligible) few. And (unintelligible) there needs. And there are some countries that have (unintelligible) about 25, which I think is a lot for a preliminary period.

So that is why I commented that perhaps some exception to this one per IDNCCTLD would be allowed (unintelligible) someone else advises that. But I am not sure how can that be presented.

Glen Desaintgery: Right. Yeah. No, I think it is a concern that you have expressed well. Others?

(Edmond): This is (Edmond). (Unintelligible) talk about in the comment, couldn't we just simply offer support for the fast track approach and not spell out one I do not (unintelligible) - one script per CCTLD?

As we are speaking right now, the fast track discussion is going on anyway. And there's no - I don't think it creates a whole lot by just saying, you know, by saying one (unintelligible), one script vs. supporting a fast track.

And as (Olga) mentioned, there are cases - yeah, of course there are extreme cases which may not fit into the fast track by limitations that should be set by fast track.

But situations where is, you know, two and it is well - or let's say (unintelligible) where maybe, I am just saying that it is more than one script. But (unintelligible) those cases may - should be , you know, allowed. And by saying - by specifying one, you know, I just think it is not necessary (unintelligible) supporting the fast track.

Glen Desaintgery: Go-ahead, (Audrey).

(Audrey): Yeah, I think I am looking at another should statement in here. I think that it might be OK to again say that they should be restricted to one.

However, in those exceptional cases where national policy requires the use of more than one script, that's OK. But what we want to avoid is the circumstance that happens that, well, they get three. I get three, and making that extra jump.

And so I think it is good to put in the thing about the one. And it is good also to acknowledge that there are some exceptional cases where national policy prohibits the use of just one.

Glen Desaintgery: To me that sounds like a pretty reasonable approach to dealing with this. What do others think?

(Tina): I, this is (Tina). I think it is reasonable too, but I also agree with (Edmond) that we could refer to the fast track instead.

One of the things is that the APTLD proposal proposes each existing CCTLD to be granted one (unintelligible), you know, one IDNCCTLD.

But the fast track actually does not specify that it has that one CCTLD - IDNCCTLD has to be run by the current operator.

And so that's - I think there are some competition issues around that. And some governments would want another entity to run the IDNCCTLD, compared to the CCTLD.

So, I mean of fast track is building on the APTLD proposal, but is not exactly the same.

So you know, I see the fast track as an extension, the APTLD. It could be a general idea of doing something quickly. But change the parameters around a little bit.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, and I am just going to interrupt a minute. (Liz), you are back on, Right?

(Liz): Yes, I am.

Glen Desaintgery: I saw you on (unintelligible) here.

(Liz): (Unintelligible).

Glen Desaintgery: And, (Liz), what we did, (Audrey) inserted in the Google documents some wording on that...

(Audrey): I put it in yellow. I put it in yellow and I put it in brackets.

(Liz): Yeah, I see.

Glen Desaintgery: And feel free to work - wordsmith when you do your thing on it. But she just captured the main ideas.

(Liz): Right.

Glen Desaintgery: If you have any questions, you can ask (unintelligible).

(Audrey): Did you want to keep the - in additions, in the absence of the (unintelligible) ability to enforce?

Glen Desaintgery: Oh, good question. I don't know that we need that anymore. What do you think? Do you want to leave that last sentence that is in there - in the absence of a contract, there's no way of enforcing? Any thoughts on that? Leave it?

Woman: Let's leave it for now.

Man: It doesn't make much sense anymore.

Glen Desaintgery: Well, I think it still makes sense.

Woman: It should be noted in the absence of a contract, there is no way to enforce the criteria. It is not a bad thing to end the paragraph on.

Glen Desaintgery: So maybe adding that little (unintelligible).

Woman: Right, it should be noted - instead of, in addition.

Glen Desaintgery: I am ok with that. Anybody opposed to that?

Woman: Done.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay and then now of course, we are on the next paragraph in the document there.

(Liz): So do you want to delete all these comments, that (unintelligible)?

Glen Desaintgery: Yeah, once we have gotten past that....

(Liz): That is what I have been doing, but I did want to make sure because there is so much on here that we have covered.

Glen Desaintgery: And by the way, another global edit you can make. All of the comments I added to change the term IDNCCTLDs to another statement, you can delete all those comments.

(Liz): I think I did already. If I missed any....

Glen Desaintgery: Yeah, well if you do encounter any more (unintelligible).

(Liz): I tried to go through with the global changes.

Glen Desaintgery: I did not go through an attack. But I just wanted to make that (unintelligible).

(Liz): Okay I think they are all gone.

Glen Desaintgery: So, now, do we want to refer to..? I think some people - at least from comments I have seen and heard, really do want to try and restrict the number of fast track names to one per CCTLD as much as possible.

Is that the case? Or is what (Edmond) suggested and (Tina) chimed in on the way to go, and not even refer to whether it is one or not. And maybe make a general statement that the number of fast track TLDs should be limited until the full policy is developed?

Thoughts? Anybody opposed to not making a reference - sorry for the double negative. Not making a reference to one TLD - IDNTLD per CCTLD in the fast-track approach?

(Audrey): I prefer a should for that, with an exception (unintelligible) for those cases where it is absolutely necessarily, to not mentioning it at all.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. And I think I heard - and (Tina) and (Edmond), you lean towards a little bit different approach. Do you want to talk about that?

(Tina): The only other thing that I was going to say about it is that, the initial proposal of one IDNCCTLD per existing CCTLD came from (CNNick). So if you want to go through that road, you may want to mention that it came from them and the APTLD later on as well.

Yeah, I don't know I - but again, I see - those were two proposals out there. (CNNick) came out, you know, I think a long time before the APTLD did. But both of those proposals is sort of like what the (unintelligible) got built on in developing the fast track.

So I don't think those two proposals are going to move forward, whereas the fast track will move forward. So it might be more appropriate to talk about that.

Woman: I have absolutely no problem with dropping the references. I am more concerned about the content than the references.

Glen Desaintgery: So....

(Olaf): So if I have well, so if I can just make a comment. We have been chewing on this text for quite a while. And I think this is (an old stereotype) from the early days when we only had that. We didn't really have the fast track, completely conceived yet.

So I would concur with (Tina) that rather refer to the fast track. And then - I mean, it doesn't prevent us from expressing preferences for one, or a limited number, or exceptional cases only when justified when we talk about the numbers of IDNCCTLDs.

(Tina): That works for me.

Glen Desaintgery: (Audrey), you had done a pretty good job of expressing possible wording on this paragraph.

In light of your previous comment, and what (Olaf) just said and what Tina said, can you kind of try and restate this paragraph as you had done previously?

(Audrey): Sure. Let me find it again. Now that I am reading it - I am working with the live version.

Glen Desaintgery: Yeah, okay. That's fine. That is tougher. I don't even try the live version when I am (unintelligible) a meeting.

(Audrey): Yeah, okay. So where was it? It was No. - okay. OK this it. The GNSO is aware.

Obviously we would want - and if we are talking about deleting the - OK, I see what we are doing. I mean, because - I mean, one thing we could say is dropping the references to the GNSO Council is aware of proposals whereby each (unintelligible) GTLD would be granted one IDNCCTLD through the fast track to get the process started faster.

But that is not good. I am not that great at wordsmithing on the fly.

(Edmond): Actually, if we do that I just wanted to say, I actually agree with what (Olaf) said. And I think, you know, if we could start off the paragraph with, you know, stating that we support the fast track. And then go to, you know, for the fast track, one IDN per CCTLD seems to make sense, unless there are certain situations, within the territory that is really inappropriate.

And this - I think this general structure would work well for the paragraph.

Glen Desaintgery: And you also made a reference the first time around to national policy that I thought could be helpful.

(Audrey): Yeah. No I am not sure that we necessarily want to declare our support of fast track. I think we certainly are aware of it.

I think that we, you know, have accepted it to a certain extent. We have modified our protest of it in other extents. I don't know that I personally want to (unintelligible) so far as to declare our support of it. Because I do think we want to reserve the ability to, at the end, say its solutions are bogus.

So the GNSO Council certainly is aware of the fast-track process.

Glen Desaintgery: And part, I think....

(Audrey): To participating even in the fast-track process.

(Edmond): I guess there is some difference between supporting the fast track concept and supporting the structure for which the IDNC is now constituted and operating.

Glen Desaintgery: Could we say something - And by the way, for the same reason that I think you just stated, (Audrey). That's why in this paragraph as was originally developed, we focused on user needs.

Could we say something to the effect that we support meeting critical user needs in this area as soon as possible? Some general statement

like that, rather than specifically stating we support the fast-track approach?

Because that's what was intended, as you can see by the last couple of sentences in this paragraph is that, we think that is a laudable goal.

There are some user communities that would really benefit from this. And if those can be met sooner -- and of course we go on later and we make some qualifying statements with that in other paragraphs -- but that would be good.

(Avri): Okay. So the two - the (GNSO) council supports a fast track process that would be limited to one (IDNCCTLD) in the interim, except in those cases where national policy makes electing best one impossible -- or something like that. I typed it while I was saying it...

(Chuck): Yes.

Woman: ...but only because (unintelligible) supports -- and it wasn't quite right -
-Supports a fast track process to enable (unintelligible)...

(Chuck): While she's working on the wording on that, what do - other comments on that? Is this a reasonable approach?

Woman: I have a question.

(Chuck): Go ahead.

Woman: It's not (unintelligible) related to this form, but it's (unintelligible). What happens in those countries which the two letters are fined with their

language? Say for example Argentina -- they have A-R, which is perfect with our language. Are - is - countries like - are like mine or other (CCTLDs) are also receiving that one (IDN), which would be the language, which is the criteria?

(Chuck): Well my own understanding - I'm not expecting that countries like that would be accommodated in the fast track approach, because there's not the special need.

Woman: I agree. I agree, but I'm not sure that everyone thinks about that direction.

(Chuck): Yes. (Tina), what do you think about that? That's probably one that'd be good to hear from you on.

(Tina): Initially I would say yes I agree too. I mean there's - if there is an expressed - a certain need, then it wouldn't fall under the fast track. Now then comes the question well, can that then be divided up into languages and scripts?

So some are, you know, for example you could say those who use languages that are not based on Latin, they have a stronger need than those who languages are based on Latin, because those - in those you can just implement it at the second level and you would have those additional characters that you need to express yourself in your language.

But then it comes back to, you can't really limit regions into - I mean languages are a global resource, right? So who are to say that one language belong in one area only? And do you have immigrants that -

in the country that use other languages, and do you want to support those?

So Argentina - you have, you know, you have an additional few characters in the extended Latin character set. So you wouldn't necessarily have a as strong a need for (IDNTLDs) as other countries, such as, for example, China. But then do you have minority languages in the country that creates that need? You know, that - so that question comes up. And I don't know the answer to that. So I don't know how far it needs to go, but I think the fast track has to be, you know, quite limited in order for it to be a fast track.

Woman: I agree with you, but that question (unintelligible).

(Chuck): It's a good question.

(Tina): It's probably a question that the (IDNC) - that - the working group who's working on the fast track is going to be discussing as well. But yes. I mean I - it's - I can't speak on behalf of Argentina, right? You probably have a much better understanding of that than I do, but if the Argentinean government came and said, "Well, but we have these minority languages that are outside Latin and we need to have those supported as well. And in order to do that, we really need an (IDNTLD), because it can't just be implemented at the second level," then, you know, I guess that would constitute an equal expressed need as other countries and regions have as well.

(Chuck): I think we have to be careful here of trying to delve too deeply into this particular issue. I think we need to emphasize that it should be a limited fast track. And (Avri's) language I think it hitting that direction.

(Avri): Yes, I've got a possibility there typed and highlighted.

(Chuck): And that's in the live document?

(Avri): Right. I'll read it out.

(Chuck): Since I'm not - go ahead.

(Avri): The (GNSO) council supports the fast track - the (GNSO) council supports a fast track process to enable the assignment of a few non-controversial (IDNCCTLDs) in the interim. These should be limited to one idea in (CCTLD) per ISO 3166-1 (May), except in those cases where national policy makes selecting a single script impossible.

(Chuck): Any opposition to that statement or suggested changes?

(Olaf): Just minor thing, but perhaps change the name to territory.

(Avri): Yes, okay. That's good. I was uncomfortable with name, but that was what I thought of.

(Chuck): Thank you, (Olaf). Any other...

Man: I understand...

(Chuck): Go ahead.

Man: Yes, national policy is probably a good idea. I'm just trying to think through all the case scenarios of whether the word nation is (unintelligible) is the best word.

(Avri): All right, one thing. I mean one could say is that, "My country's national policy says that if somebody else gets 12 I get 12 too." Therefore, national policy also leaves pretty much the same loophole I'm afraid of, but at least it makes a tough one (unintelligible) specific.

Man: (Unintelligible) the definition of a nation is in question.

(Olaf): Yes.

(Avri): I see. So you're going for territory policy or...

(Chuck): Yes. Does it work to say governmental policy?

(Avri): Governmental policy could work. I have no...

Man: Yes. I think that would make it much easier. Yes.

(Chuck): And then would - it's - it appears that we would just reprise the paragraph that's there now with that statement. Is that correct? Any opposition to that? Okay, very good.

Woman: And that's the (unintelligible) the (GNO's) council's (lawyer).

(Chuck): Yes, yes. Yes. (Unintelligible).

Woman: So I take over the...

Coordinator: (Miss Elijah).

Woman: Yes. Yes, and that's why I put mine in purple and highlighted because you've got the (unintelligible)...

Woman: No, this is very good.

Woman: ...word smithing.

Woman: And by the way, I could have power problems again.

(Chuck): Yes. (Stephanie), did you want to jump in?

(Stephanie): No sir. I got cut off. Sorry.

(Chuck): Oh you're back in. Okay, good. Okay.

(Stephanie): Yes. Okay.

(Chuck): So now we're going to the third paragraph under number five, which says the (GNSO) -- and this is the last paragraph under five -- the (GNSO) is committed to working with the (CCNSO) however possible to expedite the introduction of (IDNTLDs) for both (CCTLDs) and (GTLDs), but we will not support any preferential treatments for (CCTLDs).

And you can see the comments there. So how do we - (Avri), you made a specific section suggestion there. I think you got an agreement

from several of us on that. Let's talk about some specific ways to improve that paragraph.

(Avri): Right. Because this point who statement that we just approved in the council that I still need to send out, kind of.

(Chuck): Yes. Are you suggesting that we include part of that statement here?

(Avri): Almost.

(Chuck): Okay. Now it's a little bit lengthy. Is it too long for here, or is that okay? I mean, our document's pretty long anyway, so I'm not really too concerned about length.

(Avri): I don't know that we need to include the whole part about what we propose doing about it, but we should look at excerpting part where we explain the problem. And, you know, we don't need to get into done within 120 days and all that good stuff.

(Chuck): Right, right.

(Avri): Right. So I think we could excerpt it down, but I think that that captures the issue that we're talking about and covers the whole division of name spaces.

(Chuck): Now maybe a way forward on this is for you to take the statement, which I sent to you not too long before this meeting started -- the final statement...

(Avri): Yes.

(Chuck): ...and just...

(Avri): I saw it but I haven't done anything with it.

(Chuck): ...put it - yes, no. I didn't expect you to. Sorry to get it to you so late, but my morning's been really hectic. So...

(Avri): Okay.

(Chuck): The - so if you could just take as an action item to excerpt whatever portions you think are appropriate, then we can do final confirmation of it in our next meeting.

Now would - are you thinking that it would just add to the sentence we have there, or replace it? And I'm okay with just giving you the freedom to do whatever you want, and then we'll talk about it next time.

(Avri): Yes. I think I would - I think the first one is fine -- that, you know, we may not want to - we may want to take out the but clause, because we then get into the issue itself as opposed to having a, "We're willing to help you, but," you know. So...

(Chuck): Yes. Okay. All right. So is there anybody in here not comfortable with that approach? (Avri) will - and (Liz), before you make sure (Avri) does her edits on this before you finish yours, okay? Before...

(Liz): Right.

(Chuck): ...or - so that you're in sync. And (Avri), is that a reasonable approach in terms of can you get that done relatively shorter so that (Liz) can then do here thing?

(Avri): Yes. But she also, you know, since the statement is live, if she just stays away from the places that I've colored purple at the moment...

(Liz): Okay.

(Avri): ...then, you know, once I've got it - I'll leave it in purple once I've done it and I'll let you know.

(Chuck): That sounds great.

(Avri): ...that I've done it...

(Chuck): Okay.

(Avri): ...so that I'm not - I don't want to hold you up.

(Chuck): Is that okay?

Man: Yes, that's...

(Liz): Yes. And should we delete then the other statements that are above in color?

(Chuck): Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): (Unintelligible) above, yes. And then once this is done I think the ones below can be - well it's - what do people want? Do you want to leave the ones below the last paragraph...

(Avri): I think we should...

(Chuck): ...under five...

(Avri): ...until we've discussed it...

(Chuck): Okay.

(Avri): ...and people make sure that their concerns...

(Chuck): Okay.

(Avri): ...which they wrote here...

(Chuck): Oh yes.

(Avri): ...are reflected in what I put in there.

(Chuck): Yes. So leave the colored ones below the last paragraph there until after our next meeting when we confirm it.

(Liz): I'm sorry to say this but I think I lost my connectivity -- my internet connectivity. So...

(Avri): Okay.

(Chuck): All right.

(Liz): ...(Avri), if you could capture this.

(Avri): Yes. No.

(Liz): Thank you.

(Chuck): I appreciate you doing that.

(Avri): And I'll color everything...

(Liz): Thank you. I'm going to stay online to listen as much as I can, but I apologize that...

(Chuck): Okay. Well...

(Avri): I'll color everything I do in purple and from that point on so you can go back.

(Liz): And I'll buy a generator before our next call.

(Chuck): I'm sure that'll be a good (unintelligible) from several points of view.

(Liz): Probably.

(Chuck): Okay, anything else before we go on to Section B of the document, which is title comments regarding issues and questions in the (CCNSO gack) report?

And this is a section of a document where we're responding to the specific questions and issues that are discussed in the report. And what I did within the agenda, as I think all of you have seen, is I included the - in italics the portions from the issues paper that are related to the questions, and then in regular font our proposed response.

So hopefully that'll be easy to follow. And I thought that'll help us do a little bit less jumping around from document to document when we're going through this. Anything else before we go to Section B?

All right, so we're in number one then -- general issues regarding (IDNCCTLDs). The first question that's asked is, which - first general question is, which territories are eligible for an (IDNCCTLD). And then they have the statement, "The existence of (IDNs as CCTLDs) assumes a direct relationship between a (IDN) and the (TLD) string in a territory as an ask (CCTLDs).

And they asked the first question - first subquestion, "Should this relationship be maintained?" And you can see the proposed (GNSO) response, and there's quite a lot of dialogue on that. Who would like to start? Do you want me to read the proposed (GNSO) response or just open it up for discussion?

(Avri): I think we can all read.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Avri): Why do we say more than (unintelligible) (mapping) to the 3166-1 defined territories should be maintained? As - isn't it good that (ISO) and whoever is doing that, is still going through this incredibly messy process of defining who is a territory entitled to a two-letter code? And - because that process will continue.

In other words, every time something, you know, I know that I've been involved with the (Sammy) people for a while in trying to get an (ISO) 3166-1 code. And, you know, it's a known process and it's a gauntlet. It's a horrible process, but it's a known process. and if - I - if the (Sammy) managed to get one in 3166-1, then at that point they become entitled to the ICANN, you know, (CC - IDNCCTLD).

But why would we think that it should be someone other than that who's a territory and who's not? I certainly don't think it's something that we want to get into ourselves, so I'm looking for a much simpler answer.

(Chuck): And so in essence what you're suggesting is that we just answer yes.

(Avri): Yes, and be specific. Yes, that mapping to the (ISO) 3166-1, you know, must be maintained.

(Chuck): Any discussion on that? Anybody dislike that idea or want to modify it? Hearing no dissention, I think that's okay. And that's the first paragraph under that question. Okay, so would we just say yes, or would you qualify it a little bit?

(Avri): I would say yes, the mapping to (ISO) 3166-1 with...

- (Chuck): Should be maintained. Must be - or should be - I guess should be.
- (Avri): Must be maintained.
- (Chuck): Must be maintained. So a must there. Any - and here we're back to must and should. Is that okay?
- (Avri): Yes. Well I just don't see ICANN, whether it's in the person of (gack) or all of us together, getting into the politics of deciding who the territory and who's not.
- (Chuck): Yes.
- (Avri): I mean ISO has been doing this for a long time. As I say, it's messy, it's a gauntlet. I hate it, but it works. And everyone trusts it and accepts it to a large extent even though they hate it.
- (Chuck): Okay. Any objection to the first paragraph under that question? Okay, (Liz) you got that - or I - (Avri) you got that okay?
- (Avri): Yes, I got it.
- (Chuck): Okay.
- (Edwin): This is (Edwin). I forgot whether, you know, where we talked about in (unintelligible) later in the (unintelligible), but I think another concept is important under this -- at least this topic -- is that the (IDNCCTLD) -- it not only just maintained the relationship but that the (CC- TLD) itself is, you know, reflects the territory.

(Chuck): Yes, and that does come up later. You are correct. That'll come up later. Okay on that one. So then the colored text below that paragraph could be deleted. Is that - anybody disagree with that? Okay so (Avri), that colored text can go.

And then we go to the next paragraph, which says that it's also noted that a number of territory based (ask CCTLDs) are not operated as territory based (CCTLDs). Some of these are not even operated in agreement with the governments concerned. Now is that even relevant in - since we've simplified that response?

Woman: I don't know that it is relevant to this particular question.

(Chuck): Yes, as I read it now and what we just did, I'm thinking the same thing. What do others think? Anybody think that that paragraph is even relevant anymore? And you might want to look at the comments.

(Adrian): (Unintelligible) a bit redundant (unintelligible) under A.

(Avri): And it may apply to one of the other questions later. I don't remember. But I don't know that it...

(Chuck): Yes. So anybody opposed to deleting that two-sentence paragraph there and the comments below it?

(Avri): I'm not done. As I say, anything we delete will still be available in an older revision. So...

(Chuck): Yes.

(Avri): ...we can always go back and recover stuff.

(Chuck): Hearing no comments or objections, looks like both the black paragraph and the comments below it can be deleted.

And that takes us to the next paragraph. And it says they tend to serve not just the local territory but also target a wider market competing with (GTLDs) while continued maintenance of the existing and historical (unintelligible) relationship (unintelligible) territorial - territoriality and (CCTLDS) for such cases as a matter of the (CC) (unintelligible) (gack) to decide. I think that was originally a continuation of the one we just deleted.

Woman: Yes.

(Chuck): And so is it correct to conclude that that would be deleted as well? And in fact you can see it is continued down below where it says in the next section -- these really aren't separate paragraphs; I think they're all in the same paragraph -- "extending this relationship to the new introduced (IDNCCTLDS) operated as non-(unintelligible) length (defacto) (IDNGTLDs) should best be avoided to preempt more unnecessary controversy regarding the blurred interface and so on. Is any of that still needed?"

(Avri): Certainly not here. I mean we set it in that...

(Chuck): Yes.

(Avri): ...what was that -- point five -- and it may be appropriate to some other answer later on, because they do ask specific questions like who controls these things and other, you know, so...

(Chuck): And in fact, as you go down and look at the comments after the last part of that paragraph there before you get to B, it looks like that we kind of already covered all that. So it looks like all we have under this is that one-sentence answer and everything else is deleted. Is everybody in agreement on that? Anybody disagree with that?

And again, like (Avri) said, we can come back and pull words out of what we had in there if we find they're useful somewhere else. So everything could be deleted up until (B) after the - just...

Woman: Right. I mean later we have questions, like should anything be done about (CCTLDS) already being used as (GTLDs). Then a lot of this...

(Chuck): Yes.

(Avri): ...content becomes relevant.

(Chuck): And in fact, as all of you will observe, there's some redundancy in the responses throughout anyway, so we'll probably see some of the language has...

(Avri): Yes.

(Chuck): ...already been repeated, so - that we just deleted. So, okay now looks like we have time to go to B. If so, should the territories which are potentially eligible for (IDNCCTLDS) be exactly the same as the

territories that are listed in the (ISO) 3166-1 list? The proposed response was this question (unintelligible) the (CCNSO) and the (gack) and the related governments are currently are involved in the (ask CCTLD). Several comments in that regard. Is this - now the 3166-1 list actually names the territories...

(Avri): Yes.

(Chuck): ...with the two characters/two letter codes. And so maybe - is this something that we really want to just leave to the (CCNSO) and the (gack) or...

(Avri): No.

(Chuck): ...I think we want to make a specific statement here, don't we?

(Avri): Yes. I think the answer is a simple one: yes.

(Olaf): Yes, because we already said so under...

(Avri): Right.

(Chuck): Yes. Yes.

(Olaf): ...(B1a).

(Avri): Right. And we're saying yes, let's keep ICANN out of that job. I mean we can get into the job of mapping words to that list that are in other scripts and all that other stuff, but defining who is a territory and who isn't is just - it's way - it's a - not a good job for ICANN to be into.

(Chuck): So the answer here is just yes.

(Avri): That's what I think.

(Chuck): Any disagreement with that? Okay. Not hearing any disagreement, that sounds okay to me. C...

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

(Chuck): Go ahead, (Adrian).

(Adrian): Just for the record, I'm still waiting to find something to disagree with for the last half hour, so - I'm still here, but I just happen to be agreeing with everything.

(Chuck): Thanks. I hope people don't mind me using the negative approach of asking if there's anybody that disagrees. It tends to flow a little bit faster. But...

(Adrian): No, I'm fine with this so long as you don't think I'm asleep.

(Chuck): Yes. We appreciate that. Now I guess I should ask a couple other people whether they're sleeping, huh? Okay I won't. C - and so does C become irrelevant now?

(Avri): Yes. I mean, you know, we should put an answer there that something like, you know, no.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Avri): I mean, you know, we should put an answer there that something like, you know, no.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Avri): I mean again, I don't think - we may want to go a little further and say this is not an ICANN issue. If the UN decides on another mechanism for defining territories, then ICANN should consider using it, but defining territories is not ICANN's work.

(Chuck): Oh. Is our answer here simply not applicable, because we have said (unintelligible) right? And...

(Avri): Right.

(Chuck): This starts off if not.

Woman: Yes, not applicable works. As I say, the only thing we could go further on is to say what other lists.. As I said, if someone - I think if someone were to all of a sudden show up and say, "Listen," you know, "(Unesco) has done a mean list of territories and it includes culture identities, "and, "maybe we should use that one instead," -- and I'm making this up because I don't know that (Unesco) has such a list...

(Tina): They still - (Avri)? This is (Tina). They actually do have a list, and it's different from the (ISO) 3166 list. But other than that, I just want to say I agree with you. I - this is none of ICANN's business, and I would prefer not to be in a situation where ICANN would have to make that

sort of like distinction. But there are other lists and they're not the same as - at the (unintelligible) (ISO) 3166.

(Adrian): What I'm saying - it's up to ICANN to come up with a list, but what we are - can you guys hear me?

Woman: Yes.

(Chuck): Yes.

(Adrian): Yes, sorry. But more so that it's up to ICANN to choose which list to use. And what we're saying -- if I'm rightly understanding the response -- what we're saying is that if ICANN's going to use a list, we prefer to use the 3166 list, right?

Woman: Right.

(Chuck): So - and I'm going to have to jump off, so it seems to me that we're going to say not applicable and maybe follow that up with one sentence that just clarifies that we think tying it to the 31 - repeating a little bit what we said up above, just to be really clear. Is that correct?

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) just a little bit. I think - and what (unintelligible) you mentioned is good, but I would be, you know, I wouldn't feel comfortable, you know, starting to talk about other lists and, you know, what ICANN...

(Chuck): Yes, I wasn't suggesting that. Yes, I agree.

(Avri): Yes, no. And I wasn't trying to indicate that we would. What I was only trying to say is that - yes I am.

(Chuck): Now since I'm going to have to jump off, would you guys - and the meeting can close after you do this, but would you guys just work on what we want to say besides not applicable here? And then that can be inserted in the document and the meeting can wrap up. I'm going to have to go.

But we made great progress today guys, and we'll pick up where we left off here, doing any confirmation of things that we did today next time, and then picking up on D in this same section in our meeting next week.

Remember the meeting's two hours later next week. I really appreciate the great work today, and we're moving along.

(Avri): Okay.

(Chuck): So...

(Avri): I have a quick suggestion before you jump off.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Avri): As far as (GNSO) response not applicable, the (GNSO) supports continued use of the ISO 3166-1 list.

(Chuck): That sounds good.

(Adrian): That's good.

(Chuck): And so maybe we're done.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Good luck with the physical, Chuck.

(Chuck): Okay, and (Avri) will do the next - we'll - has done live there, and then she has one more step to take. And then as soon as she gets that done, (Liz), you will do final touches on the document...

(Liz): Yes.

(Chuck): ...and notify us all so that we can all review it before the next meeting.

(Liz): Yes.

(Chuck): Remember to look ahead before the meeting at C on there so that you're kind of familiar with the comments. It makes it flow a little bit easier. Okay? Thanks, guys.

Man: Thanks, (Chuck).

Woman: Bye.

(Adrian): Goodbye to you.

Woman: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END