

GNSO IDN Development Group
December 14 , 2007 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO IDN Development Group on December 14 , 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-20071214.mp3>
<http://gnsoidn.icann.org/calendar/#dec>**

Participants on the call:

**Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency
Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee**

Apologies:

Olga Cavalli - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Tim Ruiz - Registrars Constituency

ICANN Staff:

Tina Dam - IDN Director

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Officer

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

(Tina): Okay, thanks. Okay so unless anybody objects, let's just get it started. And as I said, we'll need to schedule another call since not everybody's here.

Just for the purpose of the recording, let me mention that we have Edmon on the call, (Aubrey's) on the call, (Liz) is on the call and (Glen) and myself – and this is (Tina).

So is there any of you on the call who did not get my email as of a couple of days ago that gave, like, the three overviews of what should be in this working paper that we're scheduled to submit to the GNSO Council?

Woman: I got it.

(Tina): Okay great. So I thought we would use that as an agenda to discuss some of these issues. But – and I'm going to, like, try to direct us through that, but I thought first up, if there's anything that anybody wanted to add, any additional points but the three that are listed.

And then also I was going to ask, and I realize we don't really have many people, so not many choices, but if there's anybody who wanted to volunteer to draft a precision paper that we then can send out to the email list and then have another call to discuss before we submit it on to the GNSO Council.

So Avri and Edmon, I don't know of any of the two of you would be available to take the task on for drafting it.

Avri: Yes, I'd probably be. I sort of put myself down to help draft it.

(Tina): Yes? You know, I'm happy to help you with it, you know, especially with...

Avri: Yes, I know. Right, right. But I know it needs to come from us.

(Tina): Okay so let's try to do that. And then we'll set up a call next week before – well, before the 20th of December because that's when we

need to submit some, you know, that's the latest to submit something for the GNSO Council. Is that right, Avri? That's the next council call?

Avri: That's the next council and, yes, I'd like to have something then. I wasn't sure from just looking at how we were getting started that we would necessarily have something by then. But, yes, it would be good to have something by then.

((Crosstalk))

(Tina): You know, I – it might be really hard to get agreement on this topic because I think it's quite a difficult and broad topic but, you know what? At least we can try to see if we can get some sort of draft to the council that they then can discuss on that call.

Okay so, topic number one that we should include is the basis for allocating (GLDs) to the (GTLD) and (CCGLD) names faces.

And I listed some bullet points on that to – of things that could be included in that like, you know, history, you know, currently using ISO3166 for (CCGLDs) and then, you know, I wanted us to talk a little bit about how IDNs are expanding or changing or not changing this perception.

And this is just taken directly from the last GNSO Council call, where I think the specific example was, if we include something like dot China in Chinese characters then would that be a (GTLD) or a (CCGLD) and there's diverse opinion on that as far as I could hear.

And then I listed timing compared to the introduction to new GTLDs. I don't know if there's – is there anybody who wants to add anything to that or have any comments on whether those elements should be in that topic?

Edmon: This is Edmon. I was wondering, the statement from, I guess, from GNSO is intended to somewhat what cede into the IDNC discussion or is it completely independent of that?

Avri: Yes, that's sort of what I was trying to understand because also I was wondering – and I believe it's part of assuming that the GNSO decides that they'll do it, is background on our appeal to the board for greater participation.

But it's also a background to help the GNSO members participating in the IDNC. But I thought the ex – and this is one of the things that I haven't been totally clear on my understanding of – is I thought part of the exercise we're involved in is in forming this appeal.

(Tina): So Avri, this is (Tina). I – that is – that was how I understood the task so we're stepping back and we're talking overall what is this volunteer supposed to do?

And I understood it as a – the position paper that will be used to submit to the ICANN board together with a GNSO letter asking for potentially more representatives in that IDNC working group who support that.

Avri: Yes.

(Tina): Who support the GNSO's point of view in term's of, you know, how do you divide the (GTLD) and the (CCTLD) name space up – as you move into implementation of IDNs at the top level.

Avri: Right and for course it helps. You know both representatives that we have in the group also sort of have some background also. And it just makes sure that as the GNSO, we understand what we're talking about.

(Tina): Right.

Avri: Because I think we're coming from a few different places and while I think at an abstract level we all agree, I think when you start getting down to details, we find that we're not quite agreeing on what it is we agree on.

(Tina): Right and that's where bullet point number two comes in, right? (Unintelligible) clarification of the limited scope of the IDNC and I – the way that I listened to the council call where this was discussed was that I'm not entirely sure that all, you know, all the information around what the scope is for the IDNC and what it is that they're trying to accomplish is well understood.

So, you know, potentially number two for me – bullet point number two for me could be, you know, explanations and then it could be, like, questions requesting, you know, more information that could be used to be sent to (Chris Hispanus) to see if she needs OTR to ask for more information back into the GNSO.

Avri: I actually – yes, that I’m not so sure of, although it – there may be a possibility of more information. I think that number two also includes understanding of the implications of the activity.

I think that there is – what the group is chartered to do and there is what, in effect, the group will be doing and the implications of its work. And I think this is one where I sort of argued that it’s all well and good to say you have this limited scope but the implications of the way you’re going about it are problematic.

(Tina): Okay.

Avri: And that they – and that those implications about that make it effectively have a wider scope.

Edmon: Just one more comment – just adding to that, really currently the charter seems to vaguely say that it’s a fairly targeted scope but in effect it really doesn’t say it has so much because the scope is still very much open in terms of how broad it is going to be except that they want a test.

Avri: Yes, that’s true too.

(Tina): So what I – if I understand you right, what I hear- so you’re adding to those bullet points that I already had in number two. You were adding, you know, implications of, you know, future work such as setting a precedence for the PDP that also is on the way under the PCNSO. Is that right? I mean, you were...

Avri: Yes, I guess to some extent, yes, that's what I'm saying. And then I guess what – if I just understood what was just said, it's also that limited numb – the limited scope. You know, so the question is, what keeps it so limited?

And I know that maybe – that that certainly could (unintelligible) intention but I think what Edmon was just saying is that there's nothing in the charter that really limits – it's really limited by people's intentions but not by the charter.

(Tina): So in other words, you know, the GNSO may have a position that says we want to keep this limited scope. You know, with some of the items I listed, you know, limited number of IDNTLDs is to cover special needs. You know, and items such as that – insure no delegations of PCTLDs that will be considered as GTLDs or used as GTLDs.

But, so if that is some of the elements in the limited scope, then how do we keep it limited? And a GNSO may have a position where they say we want to insured but this can be kept at that limited and narrow path. And how is that done? And that has to be clarified.

Edmon: Right, I think that's one of the key basis of why we want more representation in the group. It is, at least in my point of view, I think the – it is – actually I think it's correctly chartered to be without some of those very explicit limitations at this point, however, we need the representation there so that we want to make sure.

In the case where it's starts to edge over our border into issues that we think are out of the scope and should, you know, it's outside of the somewhat limited scope then we should be able to bring it, you know,

bring it to attention of the large community or stop the group from proceeding in that direction.

(Tina): Now this may be a silly question but, when you – when on a GNSO council, when you discussed the number of representatives, did you discuss a number of what you thought was adequate?

I mean, so you were like offered two seats, right? Was there like a number that you thought was – a specific number that you thought was better or did the specific number not come up yet in the discussion?

Avri: I don't think the specif- I don't think it was a notion of a specific number. I think that, you know, we wanted to make sure that the scope of opinion was represented also.

I think that if the – and this is just me guessing – if the GNSO had had an open scope, there would've been similar to, you know – it probably would've been the number of people that were put forward, so it may have been fixed.

(Tina): You said it may have been fixed?

Avri: It may have been fixed because we had six people from the GNSO that, while this was being talked about, had sort of indicated an interest in participating, you know, and so that may have been the right number.

And as we weren't looking for, oh they've got eight. We must have eight. I was, you know, they've got a spread of their particular interests.

We need to make sure that the GNSO has the proper representation of its interests and go with it like that.

(Tina): Right. So just – so you may have seen on...

Avri: So it wasn't a numbers game. In other words, when I was talking to (Chris), at some point I had told him that he'll understand that it wasn't a – we were not voting. It's not necessarily a numbers game but we need to have a sufficient representation to make sure that we've got the various viewpoints adequately represented.

(Tina): Right, and to build on that, that I think is what may be hard with this precision paper is to actually write something that everybody agrees on because it can be, you know, quite broad or diverse depending on what constituency within the GNSO you're asking, right?

So is that another argument since we're having more representatives because you have to make sure that those representatives can argue on behalf of all of the constituencies.

Avri: Yes.

(Tina): Is that a way of – I'm just – I'm trying to find a way to, like, describe what is adequate GNSO representation. And is it because the GNSO constituency has diverse opinions on this and you need that cross representation?

Avri: That is definitely part of it, yes. Yes that is definitely part of it, at least part of my understanding.

(Tina): Okay.

Avri: I don't know. Edmon, does that...?

Edmon: I think that that is – that makes sense. I mean, that was exactly how it is felt.

Woman: The other thing that you might want to address is why observers aren't adequate, like are there limitations to observer status where, you know, you can listen but you can't participate or, you know, the arrangement that – or the most recent arrangement why that's not, you know, sufficient – helpful but not sufficient.

Avri: Right, yes. Yes, in fact, I'm not even sure what a (worker) can and cannot do to be quite honest. I'm assuming because – and it's interesting that just looking today at, you know, the represent- I mean, the list, it's sort of interesting to understand, you know, we have two alternates listed who are not participants, I think, except for when the principles can't be there. And then I'm listed as an observer.

I'm not assuming that the alternates to the observer are able to participate but we'll see what happens.

Woman: And so you're thinking about participating in calls because everybody's on the email list.

Avri: Everyone's on the email list and I'm not even sure to what extent – and this is just a question that I'm going to have to deal with later – to what extent, even on the email list, are the three extra people participants or are we just reading the list?

Woman: Now so – I’m just wondering, if the three extra people are, you know, participants. I mean, yes, I mean, you can say either they can – I mean, we’re all on the same email lists. I mean, they can send messages to the email list, you know, I’m pretty sure it’s just set up generically right now.

Avri: Oh, I’m sure that physically they can. Are they supposed to participate in the discussion fully on this list?

Woman: That was my question as well.

Avri: And I don’t know the answer to that, but to anticipate your question, if these observers are as if full participants and it’s just that they’re being called as observers for some political reasons, as I said, that’s where then we fall into the implications of how this is being set up.

And if at some point that you could say, “Well, you wanted six voices, you got five, you know, yes we’re calling them alternatives, but you know, they get to participate completely so what’s your beef?”

You know, that’s where the implication of the issue really being a CCNSO GAC issue and not being a GNSO issue still remains relevant.

Woman: Right and Avri, that was pretty much exactly where I was going to go next because I was going to say, if these five people, you know, no matter what they’re called, if these five people are, you know, active participants, then does that mean that the GNSO feels that they’re adequately defended and doesn’t want to do anymore about this?

You know, we don't want to write to the board for requesting more, you know, information and adequate representation and not, you know – and maybe not even in writing this position paper.

Is that a possible outcome or, you know what do you – you know I'm not – and I realize you can't talk on behalf of the entire council but, like, what do you think?

Avri: As I just tried to explain, and hopefully Edmon can give another viewpoint on it, I don't think so because I think the main issue – I think there are two main issues. I think one is the issue of the presumption that it's up to the CCNSO and the GAC to decide what part of TGLD space they're going to cut out and that the GNSO is not really part – an equal part of that decision.

That is a presumption that I'm at least questioning and I believe some of the GNSO is questioning.

And so having two representatives and then three workers does not respond to that particular issue.

If they participate fully, it does seem to respond to the voice, although still when it comes down to the end of the day and we're counting consensus that you could be certain that those extra three voices don't count as part of the consensus call. But Edmon, I don't know.

Edmon: And to that, it's just broadcasting (unintelligible).

Woman: I'm sorry, Edmon, can you try that again? Can anybody hear me?

Avri: I can hear you.

Woman: Yes I can hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: We may have lost Edmon, yes.

Woman: Operator at this time to reconnect him.

Woman: I see that's just – okay. Oh, reconnect Edmon, right?

Woman: Yes, reconnect Edmon. And (unintelligible) cannot...

Edmon: I'm reconnected actually. So yes, I was just going to say, I think – I actually think there – what Avri said is definitely a worry but I don't think I completely agree that the presumption is that widespread at this point or really a fear.

I guess the – my point of view is that we need to make sure that the presumption – that I guess what Avri has mentioned is really not the presumption then and I agree on that.

And that – and hence, so I think the – that we should still have a statement out and have it passed to the board so that they understand the position.

Given – however, I think looking at the list right now, this morning and that was (unintelligible) interesting is there isn't much participation in the GACor at least not yet.

I don't see a list of GACmembers looking to (unintelligible) so I want to – I wonder how it would be perceived if we, you know, very explicitly asked for more (“seats”) at this particular juncture. So that's sort of how I see it right now.

But I guess the key point is that we – the whole representation and the statement and all the discussion points to one area that I think is very important to the GNSO and all, you know, it doesn't matter what their viewpoints are at this point, but that is, we feel that this (INC) probably shouldn't – this scope should be limited to – in a point – in a way that it does not tie to create a precedence or a process by which the GTLE space is being called out by the GACand the CCNSO as sort of a first (unintelligible) when it comes to IDN.

Woman: Right, so that is definitely something we want to have in under that heading number two, right? It's the implications and to make sure that it doesn't set that precedence.

And the GNSO – based on what I hear both of you say, the GNSO is, you know, requesting some way of being insured that the IDNC is kept limited and it will not be used to set that precedence.

I mean, that's sort of like what the paper is going to – that's what the draft is going to say, right? And then we'll discuss it with the rest of the members and the council as well and see if that is a thought consensus in that point of view.

- (Tina): Now do you guys want to talk a little bit more about this – what is a GTLD and what is a CCGLD and what is the basis for allocating, you know, new GTLDs into those two categories, if we can call it that?
- Avri: Yes, that one I don't know how much there is to – I mean, that's largely, I think the topic of the other longer paper. I think it's probably worth mentioning especially since we're, and I'm not quite sure I always understand this differentiation when we say we want them to be ccTLDs but we don't want them to be (re-gTLDs) and I think what we're saying is that in their scope they need to apply to just the country and not like just that (unintelligible) example. Or they need to apply to just the linguistic community and not, but when we start talking about applied or just the linguistic community are we saying how does that compare to a ID in gTLD that applies to a linguistic community. So it's something that we have to try and make a distinguishing on but it's not an easily made one.
- Woman: Right. As soon as you go in and you talk about how domains or TLDs are used it becomes really hard right. But I, you know I have to look on the charter again, but I, you know at least my, you know, my understanding and how I had viewed the IDNC was that you know, those TLDs that are allocated through that process. If it's possible for the IDNC to develop that that those TLDs will be, you know, closely connected to the countries and territories that already have ccTLDs allocated per the ISO 3166 list, and that you know, the strings that they're going to have assigned is going to have to be in the country or territory names. And not, and they can't just, you know, some country can't just come and say, you know, we have an express need for this and here we want this generic strength. I mean I'm sure it's possible

for us to draft some language that talks about how it needs to be country and territory specific and they cannot be generic terms.

Avri: Right, right. Certainly. And I think that I actually don't think that that is much of a problem, I mean it's a good thing to say but I'd be really surprised if these TLDs that people were arguing for in the IDN, and the ccTLDs or things that were other than a country's name or some representation of that name.

Woman: Yeah exactly. What concerns me much more is that on the counsel call when Chuck said does anybody believe that China and Chinese characters is a, should be a gTLD, that I don't remember who it was, but at least there were some who said, yes that's a gTLD, that's not a ccTLD.

Avri: Well that's a different question.

Woman: Does that come down to the whole contractual relationship and the financial relationship as opposed to, you know if you just look at a gTLD is a generic term and a ccTLD is a country name or a country code?

Avri: Well, a ccTLD at the moment is a country code and now we're talking about how one matched to that. And yeah there was some opinion in the GNSO as far as I understood, that those shouldn't be full blown names but those should be some kind of meaningful code or some kind of code comparison. I don't think that that's necessarily a consensus view or even necessarily that widespread but it certainly was a view (unintelligible).

Woman: Yeah. So I'm at this Prague regional gathering for (unintelligible) and (unintelligible).

Avri: Yeah.

Woman: And we talked about IDN on yesterday and so obviously this is not in any way a representation of the (ready streets) or the (ready straws) constituency but there was a lot of people here. We're about 60 people signed up and present and I think it was about 20, across 20 (ready straws) and from Europe and, what was there like maybe five (ready streets), detailed (ready streets) represented and so I ask the question, you know, had their hands raised, you know, who believes that .China and Chinese characters is a gTLD and should have a gTLD contract and should be a member of the gTLD constituency?

And nobody raised their hand. Everybody thought that that was the ccTLD, and believed that it should belong, you know, in that category. And I totally accept that that is not, I'm not trying to say you know, that that is a representation, a formal representation of anything. I'm just saying, you know, I asked the group and that was what they said.

So you know, I don't know if it's because we're not going deep enough into the details of it or if it's because there is a misunderstanding of how ISO 3166 cannot be translated or if it's something else and I actually don't know how we are in this group are going to figure out what the broader view of that is, you know, without going and asking the counsel again.

Man: And I think even if we talk about that at this point and (unintelligible) very long discussions in terms of how we eventually define ccTLD and

dTLD especially in the IDN space and really that's excessive I feel at this point no one is willing to really make that particular distinction, at least I'm not prepared to do that and but, so that comes back to your original question of whether we want to have that in (unintelligible) and my team knows that is definitely, I don't feel we're prepared to make that statement yet except that this is something that really I feel is not to be decided at this point and if the IDNC is trying to just make that decision or is trying to make duplications that would have made that decision I think that's, that would have, that is actually something I feel needs to be taken, you know, to take a look at and somewhat avoid because that seems to be the discussion that definitely heavy involvement from different decisions between GNSO would like to be involved in I think.

Avri: Yeah, I think that's probably a good way, and that may be indeed the way to put it is that there are all kinds of open issues as to what constitutes a gTLD and a ccTLD and some of it has to do with the way it behaves and some of it perhaps has to do with a selection of a name. I mean one could very easily see China as an abbreviation for, you know, or China and Chinese as abbreviation for the Peoples Republic of China in Chinese, you know, and so one could even say well that is an abbreviation, that's about as short as you can get their name. Now one could also be from, you know, the one could also see China as a generic word referring to, you know, the types of plates and work that are made in places like (Mison) in (Dresden) and elsewhere.

And if .China is so constructed as to only be for the people of China well then, there'll be some people in the linguistic community say wait a second, you know, that that's a problem. If it spread to all people that speak and can handle Chinese then you have a different set of

opinions and it's not only that it's also available to (Mison.China) to be able to sell their wares in China, then you know or whatever, then it becomes yet another issue and I know I'm stretching this one, but those are the kinds of issues that haven't been resolved, haven't been completely understood in terms of how you distinguish, and it has to do partly with the name. It has to do with the multiplicity of names and it has to do with youth. And so what we're saying is, this is a hard question and this is not a question that they get to decide on their own, but it's an ICANN-wide question of what's a ccTLD in this new IDN space and that that's the issue not that it's easy to understand and everyone could say, yep a dot Peoples Republic of China written in Chinese is definitely a ccTLD. We don't think it's a gTLD, but then you start asking them other questions and you know, you might find that in the way you ask the question you start to get some head scratching and I think that's where the issue lies, it's complicated and we haven't figured it out yet.

Woman: So in other words the position paper is not going to stage the (gene) as those of viewpoint of what is a ccTLD and what is a gTLD, it is more of, it's going to say this is an open discussion and it is a discussion that hasn't taken place and it is potential that we need some new definitions and those definitions have to be dealt with across the, at least across the two SO's because (unintelligible) both of them.

Avri: I think essentially that's what we're talking about. At the moment ccTLD is narrowly defined as 3166-1, that's a ccTLD. Everyone accepts that we have to go beyond that, but how we move beyond that is a difficult question and it is not a question that the ccNSO or the ccNSO and GAC get to decide because it's complicated...

Man: Let me...

Avri: Yeah, hey.

Man: Yeah, I think the important, in terms of the statement, and the important part is to make sure that the IDNC is definitely not equipped to answer that question.

(Audrey): Right. And I'd argue that even a ccNSO PDP alone is not necessarily a qualified to answer that one. They're qualified (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah I agree to that.

Avri: And that's what I don't want to do anything in the presupposition of performing of IDNC that implicitly accepts that well maybe the IDNC can't do it but the ccNSO is fine doing it. And it's bigger PDP and I'm still saying, no, that that initial question of definition and allocation is broader than any SO, it was broader than the gNSO and that's why we didn't do it, we just said there's dragons there, there's a big open space, we have yet to discuss how that space goes, it's objection territory, nor do we think they can unilaterally decide it.

Woman: And then you actually just circled right back to the implications and not setting a precedence for the future again, so that, you know.

Avri: Yeah, and that's the point that I've been trying to make and I think it's one that in general without getting too deep into detail the counsel's in agreement. As soon as we drop down into detail then, you know, then we have a multiplicity of the appointed agreement.

Woman: All right. And that is the soonest you're trying to have a clear definition of how to divide this name space up, then it becomes a hard discussion and something that probably is going to take a longer time but as of now you just want to say, this has not been defined and decided yet and we need to have a broad community discussion about it.

Avri: Right, and I think it's that we're trying to say in parallel that we in principle do support the fast track, we do support satisfying the immediate needs of the few that are ready. We just want to make sure that we haven't made any implicit decisions up front and that during the course of the working group we don't transgress on this yet to be defined decision space.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri: And so we want to say it in a way that says, but we do support fast-track, we just feel that we have to be there.

Woman: Right. Well and I think it's going to be very positive to say that fast-track is supported and I think that is important for the gTLDs as well because this is going to be, you know, when you move into implementation at the top level that is going to be a shared interest for both groups because you are going to learn from each others experience and expertise, so it's, you know, you can't get around the fact that things have to sort of like work together on that right.

Avri: Yeah.

Woman: Well, so we kind of got...

Avri: So anyhow it looks like I should do a first draft over the weekend.

Woman: Yeah I was going to say we kind of got at least a little bit around all three areas and I'm guessing we're going to draw the (admin) sometime soon anyways. I'm just looking at the calendar so, if you do a draft that we then can, you know, send to the group and discuss on the list and then we have another call early next week.

Avri: Right, yeah. At the moment, yeah, at the moment I did not put it on the agenda for next week. But if we're ready, because I just did not feel that we would necessarily be ready, but if we're ready you know, then I'll definitely get it into the agenda for next week, but at the moment it's not in the agenda for next week, it's in the agenda for the January 3rd.

Woman: Well on this discussion, on this call though, I mean I think we have a pretty good sense of what should be in it so some sort, I think, I'm thinking some sort of draft can definitely go to the counsel and then whether or not it just goes to the list for e-mails or if it goes for the call that's, you know, two different things.

Now, on Tuesday next week there is the GNSO call to discuss further revisions of the issues paper right?

Avri: Yep, yep that's at 11, it's yep, that's what (unintelligible) UTC, what time UTC, it's at 13 UTC.

Woman: Yeah it's 1300 UTC, so it's same time as we are on this call. I'm just, I'm just going to throw this out there, I'm just wondering, and I don't know if this is going to be too tough to have those two calls like right

after each other, but I'm wondering if we should have this call again immediately following that?

Avri: I think it's fine with me, we need to check with (Chuck) whether that's, it's a two-hour call?

Woman: It's a two-hour call.

Avri: It's a two-hour call. So yeah, I can certainly deal with the other call, I would say give us 15 minutes but yeah.

Woman: Yeah, I would, I would you know, break for sure. (Edmond), do you know where you are on Tuesday next week, because it might be you who will be in a?

(Edmond): Let's see, what's the time again, what time is it?

Avri: It's at 1 UTC.

(Edmond): 1 UTC.

Avri: So it's...

(Edmond): In that case I'm good.

Avri: Well that's when the other (unintelligible).

(Edmond): I'm going to be in Hong Kong at that time.

Avri: Right, this would be at 13, at 15 UTC, so you'd be at 11:00 if it's right after the other meeting.

(Edmond): Yeah so I'm fine.

Avri: So 15 UTC would be okay, okay.

Woman: Let's try to aim at that then because I'm, I was as you maybe saw on my e-mail I was just wondering if we could, we could potentially benefit from the content discussion in that call as well.

Avri: Oh of course, yeah.

Woman: Yeah. And then we'll have a call on the 18th and that could, you know, revise Avri your first draft and get it to the counsel, you know, before the 20th discussion if we wanted to do that.

Avri: Yep, and I'll get a first draft out. I'll work on it over the weekend and get it out on Monday.

Woman: I know that the issues report that's being worked on is much more, you know, detailed but many of the points are similar right? To, so could someone just clarify what the relationship is between this, is it like a short letter?

Avri: Yeah this is, I see this as a one or two-pager at maximum. We're not asking for, you know, a multi-page thing. The issues that the other (ccNID) and rework paper, that goes into the details.

Woman: But it also is it that this actually takes the form of a letter too?

Avri: No. This one is basically a draft document that will be submitted I guess to the board and they have a cover letter at some point but it will be submitted to the board in response to their request for us among others to respond to the questions that were posed for the, by the ccNSO and GAC together. I think that this one is much more pertinent to the long-term discussion because it gets into details and should they be gTLDs and what does the gTLD look like and how should they be allocated, how many should there be and you know, who controls the language and who controls the script, and all those nitty gritty questions.

Woman: Okay thanks.

Avri: So the two should have certainly the same top level intent, but one gets into dealing with every one of the dragons.

Woman: Right, right. I just wasn't sure if the target of the document was different.

Avri: The target of the document, the target audience is in some sense always going to be similar.

Woman: So the issues paper was the first call on Tuesday then, that is going into trying to make some decisions on these policy questions.

Avri: Yes.

Woman: Whereas the paper that we're talking about today is, you know, at a higher level and has to do with how does the community interact, you

know, in the short term and in the fast track that is supported, but that should not have implications and set a precedence for how all of these (unintelligible)...

Avri: Hi, you still there? You got cut off (unintelligible). Anyone else still there?

Woman: Yes.

Avri: Okay. You're not going to cut off, okay. But I think we knew what she was...

Woman: Right, right.

Avri: Yeah, and I agree that yeah, this one's more a (unintelligible) issues paper about how things are happening now, the other one is about the details of the various (unintelligible).

Woman: Right thanks.

Avri: And so yeah, and when I write this one up I'm not going to try and say the GNSO believes this about any particular issue.

Woman: Right.

Avri: By the way, I looked all through my e-mail and while I apologize for being late I don't find the announcement for this anywhere.

Woman: Oh for this call?

Avri: Yeah.

Woman: Oh, oh Avri.

Avri: So and with so many of us missing I'm wondering, but (Edmond) got it so.

Woman: (Edmond) got it yes, (Tina) got it.

Woman: I got it.

Woman: (Liz) got it.

Avri: So I was just, I've been checking through my e-mail looking for it feeling terribly, terribly guilty and I still feel bad but.

Woman: Actually, I'm sorry now I lost connection.

Avri: Yeah, we agreed with what you were saying that basically...

Woman: Okay great.

Avri: ...the one is just details of what the policies are and this one's more the overview of how we're approaching it at this point.

Woman: Exactly. Okay. Okay great. So I guess the only thing I said that you didn't hear was that I guess we could just finish this call then.

Avri: And we didn't want to say that because we knew you'd be right back to say it.

Woman: Yeah, exactly. Okay great. Well we'll, Avri you can call me anytime over the weekend. I'm in New York so if you want to chat anything over or if you need me to look at something still.

Avri: Okay sure.

Woman: Feel free to do that and...

Avri: I'm in the U.S. so if I were to call you I'd be much more likely to try to do it via Skype, if you've got a site account and are accessible let me know.

Woman: Yeah, I'll send you an e-mail on that.

Avri: Because I can't afford that many expensive phone calls on my own.

Woman: Right. I do have Skype, I'll send you the contact details.

Avri: Fantastic, thanks.

Woman: Okay great. Hey thank you guys.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

END