

**GNSO IDN Group  
May 18, 2009 at 14:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IDN Group on Monday 18 May at 14:00 UTC.

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/gns0/gns0-idn-20090518.mp3>

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#may>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

Edmon Chung - Registries c. Group leader

Chuck Gomes - Registries c.

Stéphane van Gelder - Registrar C.

Glen de Saint Géry  
GNSO Secretariat

(Ricardo): We're now recording.

Edmon: Okay, so I guess we can start. It is really just myself Edmund here and Chuck is on the call and Stéphane (you've been on the phone). So I guess, I mean you can just jump in and discuss (unintelligible). There is no need to (take queue) or anything. And I guess the real (unintelligible).

Stéphane: Edmund, we can't hear you at the moment. I mean it's - I can hear one word out of two. Okay.

Edmon: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, you're breaking up a lot.

Edmon: I will try to call back with another phone then.

Chuck Gomes: Okay we'll hang loose here.

Edmon: The idea is really just to go through the draft part. Okay.

Stéphane: Chuck do you know when the last version of the (Drop) Charter was sent?

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I'd have to go back and check. Let me see if I can find that while we're waiting for Edmon here.

Stéphane: I'm looking to but...

Chuck Gomes: Oh let's see, I probably have it in a folder. Okay I'm going to forward it to you. Okay?

Stéphane: That's great thanks.

Chuck Gomes: I just sent it so hopefully that won't take too long.

Stéphane: Okay great.

Chuck Gomes: You know what, I'm going to forward to you a different one because I sent some edits, I think after that.

Stéphane: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So let me just send that one. I should have had that pulled up but I'll just pull it up right now. So I just forwarded it to you again the...

Glen DeSaintgery: Is that the one on the 24 of April?

Chuck Gomes: Let me go back and look. Yeah, he sent it on the 24th and then I did a few edits on the 24th later that day for me.

Stéphane: So you just sent me the edited one?

Chuck Gomes: I sent you both but look at the second thing I sent you which was my edited version that will be...

Edmon: Hello, hello?

Chuck Gomes: Hi Edmon.

Edmon: Hi, rejoining. Is this better?

Stéphane: Much.

Edmon: Okay, that's great. I don't know whether you guys were started the discussion?

Chuck Gomes: No.

Stéphane: No we were just...I was just asking for that draft again and Chuck has just emailed it to me.

Edmon: Okay, so I guess we could follow some edited version of additions. So I guess ultimately, you know, the idea is whether the - to adopt the sending this to the Board and see if the Board is interested in creating a Working Group.

Stéphane: Do you mean the Council?

Edmon: Well first through the Council, floating Council and if there is interest whether to send it to the Board (unintelligible).

Stéphane: But the Board won't be making a decision on whether we create a Working Group, will they or will they?

Edmon: Well the idea is to follow sort of the previous approach of IDNC which the ccNSO Council made a resolution to ask the Board to create the Working Group.

Stéphane: Okay.

Edmon: Which is a - as such it wasn't a ccPDP.

Stéphane: Okay.

Edmon: And that was the construct of the IDNC work. So I guess the - at least the idea is to follow that path and of course this is the first step and then bringing this to the Council and then the Council eventually resolving on sending this to the Board and the Board creating a Working Group. That is based in concept the idea.

So and that also explains the - some of the structure of the Working Group and in fact the whole layout was pretty much modeled after the IDNC Working Group Charter. I think all of the main headings are - remain the same. I actually followed from it.

So I guess the first few items the purpose so - the process and the membership we sort of discussed on the mailing list. We just want to bring it back up and see if the draft as it stands right now looks like it incorporated some of the discussions at the mailing list. And whether there are additional concerns or issues that Stéphane or Chuck you want to raise.

Chuck Gomes: One of the things that would be helpful for me Edmon because Stéphane and I have not really talked about this, I'd like to see where his head is on this and then if he knows where the Registrar Constituency might come out on something like this.

Stéphane: Okay.

Edmon: Sure.

Stéphane: Yeah, sorry.

Edmon: Yeah, that's good.

Stéphane: Okay, I'm still waiting for your draft actually Chuck so let me address your second point first. I haven't confirmed with the Registrar Constituency (Xcom) yet, more than just sending them the draft, and so I won't be able to give you too much of an idea.

I think after today's discussion, I will go back and see what the idea is - what the ideas are and try to get you possible feedback at our next conversation on this.

On the actual idea of a Working Group, let me just take some very general points which I think I'll try to make by email and which we had a few email discussions on. One of the things that I wanted to address first was the very idea of having Fast-Tracks for certain types of TLDs.

As you know we had this discussion on whether IDN gTLDs are a certain class of TLDs like city TLDs would be or if they're more generic than that and in such, preserving of a different kind of treatment or a different kind of Fast-Track system.

My initial take was that actually we were talking about types of TLDs and IDN gTLDs are one type, city TLDs might be another, corporate TLDs might be another and how are we going to justify asking for a Fast-Track for one and not the other?

Then I think either you or Edmon came back mentioning that the fact that they are actually a wider class of TLD which I think is a valid point. I think it's one that we need to make clear in the (chopper) that this is actually, you know, whatever the type of TLD. Whether it's a corporate, a city whatever the other types of TLDs are, we're just talking about trying to get this off the ground. Why do IDN gTLD justify a faster introduction system than normal gTLDs?

Chuck Gomes: Well there's really only one reason for that. And that's if the IDN ccTLD Fast-Track process gets going before the gTLD process starts. That's the only reason and that's the only reason why that particular category was singled out. Because one of the recommendations in the new gTLD process was that neither IDN ccTLDs nor IDN gTLDs should perceive the other. So that's the sole reason why it was singled out.

Not because it's a special category in and of itself but because if there are some distinct competitive issues if either the ccns or the gs go ahead of the other with regarding to IDN.

Stéphane: Okay, why are we going on to this now -- I'm just trying to be the devil's advocate here - if, I mean, it's been - we have known that there's a ccTLD Fast-Track for IDNs for a good few months and we have already voiced, I mean, when I say we, the GNSO Council has already asked for no priority to given to one over the other.

Are we just throwing this in just to make sure that, you know, there's an added level of security for us to make sure that there is really no priority, if you know what I mean?

Chuck Gomes: Well it's - we've never had a great deal of confidence that our recommendation would be honored because of the pressure of some government with regard to the IDN gTLD and then probably the more important factor is that as the gTLD process continues, it has looked more and more like there might be significant delays in the gTLD process as a whole. And so the possible need to close that gap seemed more prevalent. Does that make sense?

Stéphane: Yeah and I've just found your Charter which still hasn't come through my email but I've got your previous mail.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I'm having connectivity problems.

Glen DeSaintgery: I sent you a copy Stéphane too.

Stéphane: Okay thanks Glen. I've actually found Chuck's previous email so I'm on that now.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah I'm having some connectivity problems myself here. Not on the phone but on my email.

Stéphane: Okay, so does that answer your initial question Chuck as to...?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah so with that not exactly because with that understanding what is your reaction? I understand that you, you know, and I read all your emails and responded to them with regard to other types besides IDN TLDs, but let's focus on the IDN gTLD Fast-Track concept. What's your thinking, just your personal thinking on that, I understand you haven't gone back to the Registrar Constituency (Xcom) yet?

Stéphane: I think there's much less for the need for much less demand. Sorry let me rephrase that for IDN gTLDs in general. And I'd really love to have (Edmund's) input on this because I may be looking at this from a very European point of view.

But my personal feeling is that while there's justification for an IDN CcTLD Fast-Track just simply on the basis that so many countries are actually, you know, looking at the - you know, the whole demand is there and the system, the process is complex so that they just needed to get something out there pretty quickly.

I'm not sure there's that much demand for IDN gTLDs. I have not seen any request through the rumor mill for an IDN gTLD. So I'm not - I'm in agreement with the idea that you've just stated Chuck that we have a process in place to ensure that we get what we ask for which is equal

treatment for ccTLDs and gTLDs. I'm fine with doing that through a IDN gTLD Fast-Track. I'm just not sure there's that much demand for it.

Edmon: I guess that was all the two distinct items.

First of all, it's good to hear that you feel comfortable with a (Visa) concept and the way we're approaching it. In terms of demand, I really disagree because I guess it really depends on the community that you're coming from.

I'm hearing a lot of projects being put together about IDN gTLDs and in fact speaking from my own experience, every time I speak in public about Asia, it's almost inevitable that somebody would ask about whether, you know, there would be DOT-Asia in IDN version and it's almost a standard question that I receive every single time.

So it - I myself at least feel the demand from the end customer point of view and also from my community side. So I somewhat disagree and also if, you know, if you look at the request from there is this IDN gTLD constituency that's probably another data point to look at.

And there are also from many of the public sessions throughout the last few years in the ICANN discussion there's been a consistent demand, I guess, from different parts of the world about IDN gTLDs so I kind of disagree. But I do understand it's really - it could really come from a matter of perspective from where you're coming from.

Chuck Gomes: And Stéphane I would agree with you that in - from a European point of view the demand is not there. But so it is certainly originally based from

in the Asia region there's huge demand for it. And in areas like the Arab world or Hebrew and so forth where...

Stéphane: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...there's also in fact there has been very little uptake of IDNs in the Arab world because of the fact that it's not a full IDN experience and of course there's the right to left issue too. So yeah, it's definitely an original issue but that's where the problem becomes acute if in China and Korea the - and to a lesser extent Japan if IDN and ccTLDs make, you know are...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...well before IDN gTLDs that pent-up demand that's been there for years has been, you know, going to gravitate to the cc world and gTLD users will be at, you know, at a disadvantage certainly our customers since we offered second level IDNs for a long time. You know, what they wanted all along was a full IDN experience not just the half experience.

Stéphane: Okay, so those - you both make some very compelling points which my advice would be to include them somewhere in maybe in the initial report that's planned in the draft Charter. Because I think we - to some extent, you know, a problem we make have here is simply one of advertising, you know, making people aware there is actually demand for this.

The - you know, for this initiative to gain some traction you are going to have to ensure that people are aware that there are many, already

many proposals or many projects including projects from the Middle East, projects from Asia, you know, the places that you mentioned for IDN gTLD.

Because on - once again, you know, I'm not aware of any and I keep my head to the ground on such matters. I'm aware of one or two. I mean I'm aware of the DOT-Korea or sorry, Seoul or DOT-Seoul in Korean script or something like that. But it's only been vaguely mentioned somewhere. I'm certainly not aware of a vast number of gTLD projects. So, you know, we make need to set the scene as it were.

Edmon: Okay, I think we can probably include some write up sort of like a summary of what myself and Chuck just mentioned and perhaps a couple of links aw well into the background section which is right at the bottom of the back of the draft Charter. You think that would work?

Stéphane: Yeah, yeah that's good idea. I think, I don't know. I mean it seems good to me.

Edmon: Chuck you...

Chuck Gomes: That sounds good. That sounds like a good idea.

Edmon: Okay, okay.

Stéphane: And another thing that if I could just - another thing that has me - another point that may be is worth addressing is how many people actually (wither) from this? Is it just us three?

Edmon: On this call, yes, but I have had the chance to speak to different people and I think there are two general groups. I think one of which are sort of like yourself and Stéphane in a sense where they feel where this is something that is good to do and if somebody is willing to take up the work it's a good thing but whether there will be enough people to put - to make this work might be a concern. But if there is, it's a good thing.

The other group of people feel that, you know, this is definitely something that I tend to prioritize. So far the only issues that have been raised has usually been in two things. One is on the actual process. Would it take away - would it draw too much resources from ICANN. The other one is whether it might essentially the same thing, whether it might delay the general gTLDs.

So a lot of - from those concerned, people tend to say wait and see. But what I've seen in the last few months is that the more you wait and see the more you can see that the new gTLD processors is being delayed. Of course that's not something people want that to happen.

But that seems to be a reality and what myself, I guess, is try to put some time into is to make this, you know, sort of get this chugging along as we move along and if in case - in deed that the new gTLD process is further delayed that we do have this in place of that so that it does address the issue of the IDN gTLDs and IDN gTLD coming into being at about the same time.

Stéphane: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And one thing I would add to that is that another issue that has been brought up is okay what if we did do an IDN gTLD Fast-Track? And the

only reason we would do that is because the full gTLD process is not ready to go. How then do we implement the idea in IDN gTLDs if the gTLD process is not ready to go? Now I think that's workable but it is an issue that would have to be dealt with.

Edmon: Right and I think that is - that particular part we need to deal with in the initial and final report from the IDN g work exhibit as it's formed. Because, you know, then in that Working Group, that Working Group needs to answer this particular question and in fact the addition that Chuck you added to the list of issues that need to be addressed, I think it's a good one is if we do go ahead with the Fast-Track, how to then position it back into the new gTLD requirements once those are ready?

Chuck Gomes: And just to give an example of like for example one of the big issues is Right Protection Mechanisms.

What if that wasn't in place when we started the IND gTLD Fast-Track? How would that be handled? You know, obviously those who are participating in the IDN gTLD Fast-Track could commit to strong Right Protection Mechanisms right up front.

Edmon: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And to migrate to any things that are ultimately approved for Right to Protection Mechanisms as a final (unintelligible). But I think they're things that can be done but that is certainly an issue that needs to be dealt with.

Edmon: Right. And that's also included in the list of issues that the workers need to deal with.

Stéphane: Maybe we can add to that list of issues a date basically. You know what are we asking for. Are we asking for Chuck you explained that we are asking for this to happen at the same time as the idea in IDN ccTLD Fast-Track? Which itself has no set date.

So, you know, I can understand some of the questions that you've just noted. People saying, you know, you're going to put in some work and resources on this but really it's an open-ended process coming into another open-ended process which is actually the new gTLD process itself.

Which now seems to be, you know, more - well ICANN seems to be saying that it's hopeful that it will come out in Q1 2010. So we're getting some more precise dates but more precise doesn't yet mean very precise.

Perhaps we need to say rather than the thick state which we cannot obviously say, we need to say something like the Fast-Track would be for example, I mean this is just off the top of my head, six months before new gTLDs are actually launched. Which if you think about it means very soon. So once again, you know, what are we working towards here? If gTLDs are launched in Q1 2010, when do you hope this Fast-Track to be launched?

Edmon: Well I think that's the issue and, you know, if we don't start the work at - we'll never reach a point where we'll be ahead that much because from the last year and one half every single time, you know, every three months the target for the new gTLDs seems to extend for three to four months.

Can, you know, that has been a consistent pattern. Nothing that we hope that will continue to happen but what I'm saying is that if we start the work now, I'm hoping that this could - we could come to a some sort of recommendation in about 60 to 90 days and then thereupon there could be the implementation plan which ultimately would - could end up being half a year before the new gTLD round is being launched.

But if we don't do the work now and wait until say September and then, you know, it's realize that it will take another few more months, then we come back to this particular art, you know, issue that we're talking about right now.

Stéphane: I fully agree the work needs to be done.

But once again, what state are we - what timeline - what agenda - what timeframe are we setting ourselves? You know, once again if it's - I mean the only way a IDN gTLD Fast Track would be worthwhile is if it happens at least six months before the new gTLDs launch, don't you think?

Chuck Gomes: Well it depends. I think the idea is to minimize any gap between the - that's the problem you've noted very well that we're looking at two moving targets and one of them the cc, one of them g process and the problem is, is if we wait until we know one of those stops moving and we have definite dates, it may be too late to prepare, you know, and to minimize the gap between the start of the two.

And that's why we're trying to do some more (Edmund's) trying to do some work right now and get this thing going so that if in fact we do get

to a point where there's going to be a significant gap and I think you're right, if the gap is minimal, a month or two may not be near as critical as if it's six months. So but we won't know.

Edmon: Yeah, I think I agree in terms of that - there should be a significant time difference but whether we say six months or you know, have a description of that, I don't think we're really at that point yet. I think it's okay to add in that as one of the discussion items definitely and we could add one more bullet point about it.

But probably you know, the start time - at least the anticipated start time of the Fast-Track should be comfortably ahead of the anticipated timeline of the new gTLD process and that could be determined when we come to the communication time.

Stéphane: Yeah that's a good way of saying it.

Carrying on with my list of questions can you contained or been in contact with any - I'm looking at the list of participants. Have you been in contact with anyone from the GAC. I think it's crucially important that we have these conversations with someone from the GAC and someone from the ccNSO on this just because obviously, you know, if we just spring this out of the blue, they might feel that we're just threading on their turf a little bit with the IDN cc (unintelligible). I mean.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon: Yeah, I do understand.

I think, I believe Avri has contacted (Chris) on this issue. I'm not sure how far it went. But I believe they do know. But my - sort of what I'm looking at is that once we are able to, as a drafting team say, you know, post this to the Council in general, then I would also - I'm more than happy to bring it to the attention of the ccNSO people and the GAC people and get their early feedback before the Council makes the decision on it.

And I - but I do want to at least get some feel from GNSO first about where we're headed before sort of broaching the subject with GAC and ccNSO and definitely I think (unintelligible) you're definitely right that we shouldn't, you know, just throw this onto the Board without discussing it with the intended members of the group.

Stéphane: Yeah because you are - I mean in the draft it does say, you know, the IDN Working Group with have GAC and ccNSO members in it. So yeah we had a discussion on who should be on it. I think during one of our email exchanges and we - in this draft are we setting our sights too high maybe?

Chuck Gomes: Keep in mind that all Edmon did there was just kind of pattern it exactly after the IDN ccTLD Fast-Track.

Stéphane: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And that's all that is. Isn't it Edmon?

Edmon: That's correct basically it was...

Chuck Gomes: It was as close to that as is absolutely possible.

Edmon: And the reason for doing that is to make the job of the Board more easy in terms of being more comfortable to accept this proposal because they have already accepted the ccNSO one. If it's, you know, within the same structure and for the same goal, I figure it would be easier for the Board to adopt it.

Stéphane: Okay and Chuck I (unintelligible) by the way.

Chuck Gomes: And in terms of the...

Edmon: In terms of the GAC and ccNSO as you mentioned whether we are setting our sights too high. I think, you know, the membership is open and I hope they would - and I think they would but you know in terms of the GAC, I think how they would participate I can't speak for them of course but I think they would be interested in what would happen here and at the same time (unintelligible) as well.

(Female): Oh, you're on a conference call (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: So what's the next step Edmon, you going to add some stuff to that Charter, is that what's going to happen next? Am I still on the call?

Stéphane: I think we've lost Edmon.

Chuck Gomes: Edmon?

Stéphane: I'm hearing some background noise but I can't...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah are you going to meet for breakfast on Wednesday?

Stéphane: No I'm not.

Chuck Gomes: Did you hear that?

Stéphane: Yes I did.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry I had to throw that in.

Stéphane: But who - it depends who's inviting.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and how far we're going to travel just for...

Stéphane: Yeah, if it's in Paris, then possibly.

Chuck Gomes: Oh that would be nice yeah except I don't have time for travel right now. I usually have a little breather between ICANN meetings but it's not happening this time. It's just crazy (unintelligible).

Stéphane: Good it means you're busy. It means things are happening. That's good generally.

Chuck Gomes: That's true.

Stéphane: So Glen do you know if we've lost Edmon or not?

Glen DeSaintgery:: I think we might have lost him because we can't get him. Yes, yes, he's disconnected. He must have been lost.

Chuck Gomes: Well let's hang loose.

Glen DeSaintgery:: You think he'll call back in again? Oh Edmon yes, yes, my cell battery ran dry, we'll call back in now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so he's going to give us a call back.

Stéphane: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery:: Sorry I didn't have my phone on mute.

Chuck Gomes: I need to jump off to another meeting here shortly.

Stéphane: Yeah, same here Chuck. I think the way you - what you're suggesting was right though. Let's while he's not on the call let's get Edmon to do the work.

Chuck Gomes: Well I think he was willing to do that. I kind of got that impression from him. But the - anyway, but Glen can you because I'll going to have to jump off on another call. Is that him? No?

Glen DeSaintgery:: No, no that's not him Chuck that's another...

Chuck Gomes: Just let him know that it's our understanding he would - he's going to add some stuff to the Charter and I think he said at the end or something and then he'll send it to us and we can discuss it on the list and possibly arrange another call if that's the best way to do it. So is that okay?

Stéphane: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay Chuck I'll get that message to him.

Stéphane: And once he sends that new draft then I'll send it back to my constituents in case there's any input there.

Chuck Gomes: Excellent.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Hey thanks Stéphane

Stéphane: Thank you Chuck, thank you Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

Stéphane: Bye.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Ricardo) (unintelligible)? (Ricardo)?

(Ricardo): Yes?

Glen DeSaintgery: (Ricardo)?

(Ricardo): Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

(Ricardo): We're still recording.

Glen DeSaintgery: Oh, is Edmon back?

(Ricardo): Yes he called back yes. I think he just hung up again.

Glen DeSaintgery: Oh because okay. Can he read the - can he still read the screen if I send him a message?

(Ricardo): Yes, he should see it on the (unintelligible).

Glen: Okay I'll send him a message on the screen thank you.

(Ricardo): Okay. I (unintelligible) the recording now yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yeah please thank you.

END