

**GNSO – ICANN Sydney Meeting
GNSO Open Working session
IDN Group
Date: 21 June at 09:30 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing at the IDN Group Meeting held in Sydney on Sunday 21 June 2009 at 09:30 Local time. 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.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Good morning. I think we're supposed to have printouts of the latest version of the draft charter. Glen went out to grab them but does anyone -- does everyone have the -- have it -- is everyone on the mailing list before and have the draft? No? Well, they should be coming and but what -- I've projected on the screen. I haven't really put together any specific agenda but the idea is to take a look at the new charter but I guess wheel start with a number of things to -- because there was quite a bit of discussion on the list in the last couple of weeks. I think we -- the group started out by looking at the issue of potentially grating an IDN gTLD fast track. I think it was based on the proposition that the GNSO has expressed a couple of -- you know, more than a couple of times the importance of having some parity between especially time frame whereby IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs are introduced into the root, and the IDN gTLD fast track discussion came out of that basis.

After some discussion since Mexico, some discussion about whether a fast track process would work, I think we came to a conclusion, or somewhat of a conclusion the last few weeks, that perhaps what we're really talking about is looking into a method or measures to somehow harmonize between the introduction of new IDN ccTLDs and new IDN gTLDs, and fast track may be one possible way, and there may be other possible ways of dealing with it.

And so the latest draft sort of took a fairly significant turn and that's why we've sort of taken the motion out of the agenda for this week. And basically I think we're back to -- I don't want to say we're back to square one, actually I think we have progressed. But we're back to discussing whether we can create a group with the revised purpose of looking into really possible methods to harmonize the introduction of the new IDN ccTLDs and gTLDs. We have expressed a couple of times formally that if IDN TLDs, whether it's cc or g, would be introduced into the root before the other -- before the other, then some sort of measure should be taken to avoid conflicts but we have never actually put together, or put forward any suggestion to do that. So I think the group now is -- I'd like to see if the group now could take the direction towards producing something that would satisfy what, you know, the issue that we address -- we identified. So that's -- that's, I think, where we are. I'll see if anyone wants to jump in.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Adrian Kinderis. Can I ask a clarifying question, Edmon, do you mind? Could you, please define for me what your interpretation of harmonizing is? And I know that given we're in Australia you could probably spell it with an S, but that's a joke and albeit an early morning one, thank you.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Really, it's the -- I sort of chose the word when -- as addressing conflict 'cause we have repeatedly said that if one -- you know, if cc or g is introduced before the other, measures should be taken to avoid conflict. That is directly taken out of our statements. So "harmonize" is to address conflict.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Would you use a different word, Adrian?

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Yes. I guess what I'm trying to stay away from here is -- I know I speak on behalf of the registrar constituency when we talk about harmonizing to the point of -- I have to be careful how I choose my words -- we don't want to see a splintering of the process and I think we've been fairly vocal on this point, at least Stephane has in representing us and if that's -- if harmonizing meant must be released at the same time or in advance of, you know, if that's what you meant by "harmonizing," then that could be sort of poison news to our support of this process. You know, assuming that eventually it's going to end up as a motion or something before the council.

So for those that don't know, the registrar constituency sees that potentially allowing for a fast track, and you already know all this Edmon, but allowing for a fast track in IDNs in the g space may take momentum away from the overall process and that is allowing for a partial release, potentially seen by some groups as a beta release which could be at the expense of getting the overall process under way so we just want to be very, very careful here.

>>EDMON CHUNG: That's very well taken. I think that's a very strong argument. And I think it was taken through at the mailing list as well. And that's hence put forward this new revised direction. And right now the point is we know that -- well, at least it seems like that the IDN ccTLD fast track is moving along and it is potentially going to be in the root much earlier than IDN gTLDs potentially, or may not. If there -- if it is not the case, then, you know, I think we're all happy about it.

Right now the work -- I guess, what I hope for the work of this group to do is to address the case where if, in the case that new gTLD process is further delayed, and we know that it may be a possibility, you know, I don't think anybody wants that, there are some who want that, but a lot of people in the GNSO community does not want to see that. But there's still that possibility. And this -- and if we keep hoping and not do anything, we'll see that gap potentially widening, so this is what the group was hopefully formed for. And how, we haven't

really talked about how. We can talk about it here and get it started on how we address the Harmonization issue or if you want to choose a different word. But yeah, this -- there's no particular presumption.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: If I might reply. You've put a lot of thought into this and I thank you, and I thank you for your effort so far. Do you have intuitively a feel for what would be an appropriate time frame, sorry, maybe the question is: What would be an inappropriate time frame between launches, between cc's and g's, when would it get to a point question you would think that -- that harmony is out of synch?

>>EDMON CHUNG: Well, I think that's a very good question. I think Tina mentioned numerous times about the -- there's always going to be time difference, whether it's a day, a week, a month. It's a tough question. And actually, this is one of the things, further down, I would have said that the minimal -- or the reasonable acceptable time difference between the introduction of the first new IDN ccTLDs and new IDN gTLDs to the root is one of the, you know, one -- actually, the first topic to be discussed.

Personally, I feel that probably three months is a very long time. I don't know whether others would be interested to speak to that.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Of course, we have to define what we're talking too. If we're talking about three months between the starts of the process, in other words, when applications are assembled, that's very different than talking about three months of getting names in the root. It's quite likely to expect that the ccTLD fast track process for approving applications could be much shorter than the gTLD process for accepting applications. I don't know that for a fact. But our process is certainly much more complex than the -- than I think the IDN ccTLD fast track. So if you're talking about the start of the processes you're probably talking about an even -- if there was three months separation of the starts of both when applications -- application period's open you're probably really, in reality, talking a much larger gap than that, between actually getting names and the root. If you're talking about names in the root, then, you know, if we're talking about three months separate there, you know, it's still a pretty big gap because if there's some good marketing going on there's going to be a competitive advantage to whoever gets out the door first. Assuming we're all right, that there's this huge pent-up demand for these names and I suspect in certain regions of the world that's very true.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Just one comment and then I'll -- in -- at least in the proposed draft, I'm talking about the anticipated time into the root. So after the validation, after the process and into the root, of course, that's very difficult to anticipate given the very different processes that the two tracks are on. But at least, you know, I think everyone's end goal is when it gets into the root. That's the idea. And we should talk about that sort of time difference with that basis 'cause I think that would be more meaningful.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Steve Delbianco with net choice and also a member of the business constituency.

I'd like to just try to bring back to the perspective of registrants and users to supplement your discussion of this perspective of registries and registrars, and in particular, registrants and users who currently are using certain TLDs and have a desire, express desire, to have those TLDs in IDN.

When you look at this perspective, it isn't really "conflict" is the right word, it's really "dilemma." Let me see if I can explain.

So we heard about it in Paris and Cairo. One of my members is bluebridge.net. Arabic, target audience, 30 or 40 employees in Cairo, and they serve the Arab world through IT solutions.

He wants bluebridge.net in all Arabic, he wants that IDN.

The dilemma he would face is if the fast track put into the root 15 or 20 Arabic IDN ccTLDs and he thinks it could be six months or 12 months until he gets something like a dot net in Arabic, his dilemma is wait or jump, and what does "jump" mean for him? It would mean visiting a dozen to 20 Arabic ccTLDs and IDN and launching his own domain name in those ccTLDs. That isn't at all what he wants to do. And he said as much at the public forum in Cairo and also in Paris. So the dilemma is what do I do? Do I just bypass the IDN customer base and wait until I can get what I want or do I take the jump? And when they do, it would mean him figuring out whether he has to register to do business in up to 20 different Arab countries or waiting. And from the standpoint of his business, he has said loud and clear -- and others have as well in the BC -- we want to be able to move as quickly as possible to an IDN target, but we want to do so with our current domain name and some IDN equivalent of their current TLD. I realize you can't transliterate dot net to Arabic or dot com to Arabic. I'm netchoice.org and I might want an Arabic, but I don't know how we're going to work that out, but keep in mind that registrars and users have a different perspective if they're incumbents, and what they want to do is move quickly and not have to vulcanize and fragment their brand across as many as 20 different Arabic. And think about -- it's not just the domain name of bluebridge.net but it's all of the e-mail addresses within his employee base as well, and notifying all of the different customer sets that if you happen to be in Egypt, you're going to be using the Egypt IDN ccTLD, and Jordan or his other customer base, are they use supposed to use the Egypt or are they supposed to use Jordan? What he really wants is a single bluebridge.net in all Arabic.

>>EDMON CHUNG: I think that's definitely well understood.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Yeah, I guess the ccTLD providers would like him to protect his trademark in all regions, but that's a different story.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: (Speaker off microphone).

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: I was being facetious about potentially registering a number of domains. I think you have an issue where the council -- the GNSO Council and the ccNSO Council have sort of come together and said, well, one -- as far as IDNs are concerned -- new gTLD process and IDNs is that one might retard the other, you know. And I think that so long as you have that, then you're also looking at time to get things into the root seems to be a moving target.

So unless -- the only way I think you can sort of get around that issue is to draw a line in the sand and say one won't go without the other because then, you know, then you can have a moving target and that's acceptable. Which, you know, I don't see any other way around it because if you -- you don't know the two end results, you don't know when either is going to go. Yet you have a rule that says one can go instead of the other. That may by definition indicate there's a huge lag in the process.

>>CHUCK GOMES: What if we fail in that? My understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, Edmon, but my understanding is the purpose of this working group was to come up with some alternatives in case we're unsuccessful there. And we might not be successful there. We have been -- the council's been saying for a long time they should, you know, start at the same time. But the bottom line, as you know, very well and are concerned about, that we keep getting more delays on the gTLD process and it's not really fair to the ccTLD side that they -- they are impacted by our delays. Now, I think all of us here probably, and if somebody differs, they should speak up, I think all of us here would like that approach, if we could succeed at it. And we should keep trying, I think, to do that. But if we wait until we know we failed, it's too late to do anything else and I think that's what this is all about.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah, I think that without that -- Avri Doria -- without that getting into the root at the same time, we're basically allowing ourselves into the gaming situation because we can interfere with each other's processes to get one in front of the other. One group can make demands about what happens with geo names at various levels that forces things to take longer. One can force issues on how long it takes to do IDNA BIS. And so if we're not actually locked coming out at the root at the same time we actually have the risk of competing to come -- who comes out first. And that's one of the things that's always worried me. Not so much that one did come out before the other, but if it was possible, we can trip each other while we're running for the finish line.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks Edmon, I do understand what Chuck Gomes was saying about coming up with a plan B if you're unable to obtain the parity. Plan B from the standpoint of registrants and users you want

to minimize the dilemma or delay but keeping in mind you have to get something out there for IDN users and it would be seen from the standpoint of an IDN demand that delaying the cc's is going to be seen as undermining the needs of the registrant community so how do you find a way to split the baby? It may well be that a small subset, not the entire beauty contest of all new gTLDs but some subset, call it the equivalence of the current or come up with another short list, 20 or 30, categories that could be launched so that you can do some IDN g's on a fast track. Not necessarily be slowed down in the giant round of new gTLDs that include the ASCII gTLDs. So that may be one thing to consider as a plan B which is to fast transparency and accountability the current or IDN equivalents of the current set of TLDs.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: For discussion purposes, Edmon, can you elaborate on why, you know, there are a certain set of circumstances that are retarding the new gTLD process, you know, the overarching issues. Why don't -- why, in a fast track g -- fast track IDN gTLD world don't those same overarching conditions apply, what would permit them to fast track.

>>EDMON CHUNG: I'll answer that first and then I'll come back to the question. The way to go about it is really if we do a fast track we can put together certain elements of it such that it would address if not all, some of the overarching issues. And how we do that, there is one possibility, you know, let's say certain TLD, let's say dot Asia, for example. Okay. We've always (inaudible) this but any case we would, for example, run the same zone between dot Asia and dot yazhou which is Asia in Chinese. In that sense, then at least the IPR issue is being dealt with because we're talking about one TLD essentially, one zone, shared between two TLDs. And, you know, certain other issues. There are, of course -- as I mentioned in the earlier versions of the draft, there are certain issues, for example, if there's contention, if there is other issues that come up, yes, it is possible that, you know -- and it is -- it may be correct that if there's an application that came into the fast track and bumped into those issues they would, then, have to be punted to the full IDN -- full gTLD process. But we can build that in so that for ones that are - - do address the issues, they could go ahead with the fast track. That, conceptually I think is a possibility.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: It seems to me that potentially it can take unfair advantage by trying to get into this. For example, ICANN is embarking on a full-month communications campaign, that four-month communication campaign time may vary is not just about trying to get applicants to join the process, it's for those who want to understand the process and on potentially if something happens. You get an IDN gTLD fast track, people may not have had the opportunity nor visibility to respond or react and won't just have seen what's happening. So if I wanted to get something through -- I guess I'm saying I could have an unfair advantage in going in an IDN gTLD now, in a fast-track sense, because the momentum and the public profile hasn't occurred and all of

a sudden they're -- and someone turns around afterward and says, well, man, I didn't see that coming. This name got through and I didn't have a chance to object because I -- I only found out about it -- and that's why ICANN has been so steadfast in having this communications campaign. So it seems to me you're circumventing this communication campaign as well and the purpose of it.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes again. Of course, the communication campaign could start earlier. To accomplish your problem. I don't think there's anything to prevent that. As far as the overarching issues, I would predict that by the time we would be ready to do an IDN gTLD fast track, if we went that route, we would know the solutions to all of the overarching issues so those requirements would be very easy to put in. It's probably unrealistic anything like an IDN gTLD fast track could happen before the December time frame anyway. And by then hopefully, if there are not more delays, as you know, we will know -- you know, it would be about the time that the board would approve them. So that could be incorporated. And you raised the one issue, the communications issue, but there's no reason why that couldn't start earlier to cover that 'cause that's a legitimate concern.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Thanks, Chuck. Adrian Kinderis, I'll just announce myself every third time I speak. The -- that's actually helpful because that's the first time I've sort of got a sense of when you think that the IDN gTLD fast track would come into play, you know, and it's not something you're talking about starting tomorrow. And, you know, so I think it's been helpful, at least for me, and I'll certainly take it back to my constituency that, guys, this is, you know, a worst case scenario here is that new gTLDs blow out for another year, we could still get something off the ground. Am I picking up the sense here, is this the purpose that the court -- Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: I'm confused because what would blow out new gTLDs for another year other than overarching issues? So -- and now, one way to go about it -- sorry, this is Avri -- one way to go about it -- I'm sorry, I'm just not used to it.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: (Speaker off microphone).

>>AVRI DORIA: One way to go about it is to say that, you know, in this sort of noncontroversial aspect of the fast track IDN gTLDs you go into it accepting the maximalist point of view on the overarching issues solutions, so you take the whole IRT package, you take the whole, you know, geographic names issue package, and thank you don't try to discuss it or change it.

But if it wasn't for the overarching issues I'm not sure what would slow us down anymore in the full gTLD program.

>>EDMON CHUNG: I -- I think that's, you know, that's -- that's a good summary. I think most people agree to that. It's always the

question whether there will be delays on those issues. And I think we're still on the same page somewhat in that if that happens do we have a plan B and that's I think -- you pointed exactly sort of at least the sentiment or the crux of the issue and why at least I did he do indicated time and effort to look into this -- this group.

I think, it seems to me, you know, a lot has been discussed and it seems to me that yes, I did change this -- actually, I want to go back to Avri's point but I did change the direction of the group in talking about a method to -- to sort of address the conflict issue that we brought up. And it seems to me that the two most obvious possibilities is, one, is to somewhat go back on what we say that one should not retard the other and based on I think Avri's argument, that it may be to the benefit of both because we won't be trying to trip each other over or ourselves over trying to get to the finish line first.

And so it seems like the two most obvious possibilities would be, one, to have some sort of agreement that they will go together into the root. And the other part is the other option may be a sort of an IDN fast track, again, we're always based on the potential that the full gTLD process is for the delayed. And that's -- that's a basic assumption on a lot of discussion and without that assumption a lot of - - this might not be useful but again, we come back to the issue of if we don't do it now then we'll be much late when we know that it happens. So -- Adrian and then Stephane.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: I'm going to move to a different topic so if you want to pick up.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: I wanted to ask Avri a clarifying question about this statement. Steve Delbianco.

Avri, did understand -- I know you're brainstorming as well. But you talked about a plan B for these IDNGs. You said perhaps they might have to embrace the maximum sort of IRT protection or embrace the maximum restrictions that the GAC might be seeking on geo names and that, out of embracing the most restrictive, the most protective sort of regime, that you sort of make a case for why you can proceed more quickly or the broader new gTLD and ASCII, new gTLD in Latin works out which portion of the IRT makes its way into the final agreements or what compromises are worked out with the GAC on geo names. But, Avri, did I catch that correctly? You're thinking that the people who move the fastest would have to embrace the most restrictive regime?

>>AVRI DORIA: In a sort of logical brainstorming way, yes. Because it's -- there may be other places that the delays come from other than working out these overarching issues. For the most part. But, for the most part, I think the delays are going to come in solving the hard issues. Okay, I know geographical names isn't strictly one of the overarching. It's overarching plus one. But that's where most of the delays are going to come out. They're not going to happen in areas

that aren't conflict areas. And so, if you're going to have something that can go faster than the other, you basically have to sort of say listen, we have no conflict. We're noncontroversial. Our noncontroversial perhaps means something different than my government agrees. It means that we have no argument with anything that anybody has mentioned wanting to impose on it. I'm just speculating. I'm not, you know, trying to state something as fact. Merely logically. That seems to me to be the case.

>>STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you. One follow-up to that. Earlier I was stating sort of the perspective from the registrant and user group community. And I would say that, if our plan B included IDN equivalents of certain Gs on their own fast track, then one litmus test is to ask, if they embrace the most restrictive and protective elements of the IRT, you'd have to ask would it prevent a lot of incumbent registrants, members of mine who happen to have IDN.net or IDN.com or dot org, anything that would prevent them from getting the same thing in the IDN equivalent ends up frustrating the whole purpose of the fast track. Because, remember, their goal is to quickly -- I gave that example of bluebridge.net. Their goal is get that whole thing in Arabic and not have to go to 20 different countries.

So, whenever we embrace the most restrictive elements, let's just check that to make sure it wouldn't prevent the actual goal here, which is letting registrants quickly address the entire IDN community. So the restrictiveness aspect should be tested rather than just assumed that we can embrace the worst of all.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Can I -- sorry. I think that's a very good point. And -- and, if we are going down the track of talking about a fast track, then this should be one of the discussions. And I do think that there are ways to handle it. I mean, if -- take, for example, the one that I just proposed for dot Asia. Then we would grandfather -- well, our proposal would be to grandfather anything that's in the zone. Right now we don't offer IDN, so we don't have that problem at -- we don't -- when we -- what I mean is that --

>>STEVE DEL BIANCO: (Off microphone.)

>>EDMON CHUNG: We currently do not because we have been warned not to because people don't want to say IDN dot asia. They feel it's confusing, and they feel it's -- it creates the dilemma that you mentioned. Whether they want to register now or wait until there's a full IDN solution to register. And they don't want to pay now and only be able to use it when we do have the IDN TLD. So we've been warned not to. And we've been holding back. But so, yeah. Adrian?

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Adrian Kinderis.

I think a peripheral issue here -- I was listening to Avri when she spoke before about our goal is to somewhat leap together and to try to

get together. One thing that bothers me is we now, after Kurt Pritz's presentation yesterday, we've got a timeline that doesn't seem to have slipped since last time when, potentially, there's a little bit more confidence in the gTLD process. What we don't have is certainty over when the IDNA protocol, when the work around that is going to be finalized. And that's a concern. Because that's seems to be taking some time. And I'm not too much of a technical person. And maybe someone in the room could speak to where that is currently. But our attention, I think, will quickly flick across to we're all ready to go in a policy process of new gTLDs and we've covered all the overarching issues. All of a sudden we're not ready to go because we have to launch IDNs at the same time in the G space. So now we have a clock ticking. And, you know, I think, although it's a periphery concern at this point in time, potentially it may impact what we're talking about here. Absolutely. In fact -- let me jump in and then Chuck. That's exactly why I slipped in the second part of the purpose. Which is there are commonalities between IDNs ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs that we want to get resolved. And the standards issue and how we deal with it on an implementation level is one of them. And there are others, too. I mean, Tina is in the other room. But there are three or four items that we have created policies around. But, when it comes to implementation, you know, they have repeatedly come back with, well, at least one of the issues repeatedly come back with something -- I personally don't like, which is the number of characters thing. And then there's the issue of variant management at the root. There's no -- we -- the GNSO provided the policy. And also the IDNC also provided policy to say that you should follow the IDN guidelines and the IDN tables. But how exactly is it implemented into the root is something that is -- you know, is a common interest between IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs.

There's the issue of the IANA WHOIS, how the IANA WHOIS will be managed for IDN TLDs, whether it's CC or G. Those are that's also a common, you know, interest between the two. And so --

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: And I also think that that common interest then extends to the gTLD community full stop because they're tied into the IDN gTLD, right? One can't go without the other. At least that's my understanding. So that common interest is about to get a bigger audience, right?

>>EDMON CHUNG: Well, I don't quite understand.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Okay. So dot eco is out there. And they're only concerned. And all they're doing is looking at Kurt's timeline. But all of a sudden, if IDNs aren't ready by that time, dot eco is going to be very concerned about what's happening with the IDN protocol, even though they're not an IDN name. Do you understand?

>>EDMON CHUNG: Yes, exactly. That's exactly the case. Chuck?

>>CHUCK GOMES: I can't predict what the IETF is going to do. None of us can. They can't either. But, with regard to the IDNA standard, they are having a meeting in Stockholm this summer. So we may get an idea then. But I did want to remind people that in the past several times it's been pointed out that ideally it would be good to have that protocol in place, but it doesn't necessarily have to be a gating factor.

So, whether that's really true and whether they -- people will believe that, when we get down to the end, I don't know. But, in other words, in other words, the revision of the IDNA protocol may not necessarily have to be a prerequisite to starting a new IDN gTLDs or ccTLDs for that matter.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Starting, yes. But I thought we were talking about here the conclusion was entering into the root.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I'm including both. The question was put bluntly to Tina in times past. And, correct me if I'm wrong on this, Edmon. But -- and Avri, too. And, you know, I think the goal is that it would be good to have it in place.

But I have heard several people say that it doesn't necessarily have to be an absolute prerequisite to be finished, that if somebody thinks differently on that, please speak up.

>>AVRI DORIA: Avri speaking. I -- it used to be -- and I think we've gotten into revisionist history because things are taking a long time in the IETF. It used to be absolutely required. Now that things have been delayed within the IETF because people are trying to work things out, I think there's a wiggling and there's a bunch of revisionism. I would still say that I think it's totally inadvisable not to wait. That, basically, IDN -- to have to change over to have to do that will be problematic. We don't exactly know how problematic. And I know I'm probably disagreeing with Tina here. I believe Tina won where she said it had to be IDNA BIS. And I have disagreements with, Tina, too, saying it's not necessary.

>>CHUCK GOMES: And, actually, if it is necessary, then it's necessary for ccTLDs and gTLDs. And that could be a solution to our problem of going out at the same time. So I'm not personally opposed to it being a prerequisite as long as they don't take forever. But -- but that could be a solution that's out of our hands that would help what we're talking about.

>>AVRI DORIA: Avri again. Actually, slowing it down is in our hands. Slowing down the IETF process is trivial.

>>EDMON CHUNG: I think that is exactly what Avri mentioned earlier on when we're saying that we could -- you know, we could trip each other or trip ourselves over if we are trying to race to the, you know,

finishing line first. And that that is one of the obvious ways that do that. And I think Avri mentioned the geographic names as the other trump card from the other side. One of the things that I wanted to mention is that exactly. Because, currently, in terms of the standards, currently, both the GNSO recommendations and the IDNC, which is the IDN ccTLDs fast track recommendations both point to saying that to wait for the finalized version of the IDN standards.

And I would find it very interesting if that implementation time that those policies be violated unless there is another implementation recommendation group kind of thing, which is exactly what we're talking about here, that recommends otherwise. So this might be one of the issues that this group needs to take on -- you know, take into consideration. And, again, coming back to why this group originally was formed -- or currently thinking about forming it with the participation from ccNSO as well this might be a good particular topic that's -- again, it's a common interest to address this particular issue of IDNA standards. And in the group we can probably address the issue and the issue of what -- you know, how do we deal with the conflict of one going first or not. And the end result, again, there are two obvious options that we're seeing right now. But we might end up with more options. But currently two options, maybe one, is yes, we're now going to say that both would go in at the same time to the root. We would change our position somewhat and make that assertion. And both sides needs to agree to it.

The other option is that, you know, we continue with this no retard. But we have the plan B in place which everyone agrees to. So that's -- that's sort of, at least in my mind, why we want to create this group and why we want to involve others. And I think Chuck earlier mentioned why don't we just create a GNSO group to talk about this. And I think this -- there might become interests -- enough common interests to bring together a board-created work group so that we can address the issue head on. The biggest issue for us is the timing between the cc and the G IDN. And then there are common interests that affect that particular timing.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Um, can I just pose the question just so I get an understanding? I'd love to hear from Chuck and Avri and anyone else. So would -- are we -- is our opinion changing on when we would -- how do you say this? Should we tie ourselves back where in the past we've made ourselves to say one way retard the other. Is this something where eventually we should be going back saying we must jump together, "we" being CCs and Gs.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Can I answer this? That is exactly what Avri's suggestion was is to consider that option. And it may be a good option looking at, you know, the two -- you know, one side may be retarding the standards. The other side may be retarding the full gTLD process. And we each may be tripping ourselves up to get to the root. And maybe a way to harmonize the situation is, in fact, to say that, you know,

let's just agree that we'll go in together.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah, this is Avri.

I think one of the possibilities was that the processes don't need to retard each other. In other words, all the prework, all the amount of time it takes to get the contractual stuff and the allocations, that that doesn't need to -- one doesn't need to stop the other. It's the -- it's the entry into the root. The fastest of the fast track and the easiest of the gTLD. And, as the noncontroversial gTLD, the first entries of each get rooted at the same time. And -- but how the processes go, they don't mess with each other. In other words, you know, one could take six months to approve. One could take three months to approve. You then have your marketing organizations going. You have your starts. You have your, you know, everything else. It's just that the start date is the same.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Is that still revisionist?

>>AVRI DORIA: Is that revisionist? It could be.

>>CHUCK GOMES: The -- this has been great dialogue, but there's only five of us participating. I would love to hear what some of the rest of you think about this. Disagree or agree or some new ideas? Sorry to put you on the spot. But I really -- it would really be helpful to get a broader perspective of what people are thinking about this and what your needs are, what your concerns are, et cetera.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Does anyone want to speak up?

>>WANG LIYING: Yes, I'm trying to keep up with everyone's discussion. I just wonder how could you -- how could the GNSO to guarantee when the IDN gTLD get to the fast track and the other -- the third party could put enough information and type to object to the new gTLD so that would be included into the guideline?

>>EDMON CHUNG: If we do go down the path of discussing a gTLD fast track, then we would have to address that issue which Adrian brought up as well.

>>WANG LIYING: Everyone could have enough time to now who gets into the fast track and get enough time to put into the objection. Thank you.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Right. The problem right now is we're not even starting to talk about the fast track. There -- there isn't even enough agreement to start that discussion. But we're thinking about options, whether fast track is one option. There may be other options to deal with it. And, if we talk about fast track, yeah, absolutely, that's definitely one important point.

>>Liau speaking from Konac. We're wondering whether the fast track is providing for implementation we have any time schedule or deadline for the final submitting of the application?

>>EDMON CHUNG: That's a very good point. We -- in the group that was convened earlier, we addressed that issue a little bit. It is -- at what point do we think a fast track is meaningful after all? Because the -- if the full gTLD -- full gTLD process is ready -- and we're talking about, I don't know, like two weeks before that, there's a fast track, then maybe it's not useful. Rather than talking about the timeline from now, the -- if we are going down the discussion of fast track, I think the best way to approach it is to figure out what time difference between the full gTLD process and the gTLD fast track could be put in place, you know, what's the meaningful time lag between that? And, in terms of how fast a fast track could be put together, it's anybody's guess. But, at the very aggressive timeline that I try to put together earlier, have -- put it together in four to five months.

>>CHUCK GOMES: A logistical suggestion, I suspect there are people here today that aren't on the list. We should welcome them to join that list.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. Everyone is welcome to join the sort of drafting team for the IDNG group. And we sort of sent around to that constituencies to name people to participate to.

>>STEVE DEL BIANCO: I'm aware that on the cc side, the way they generate pressure for the fast track was to show they're ready.

And I've looked at those lists that show that a certain particular government says, "We're ready. Our registry is ready to go. We're going to follow the protocols. We have demand. We have an install base of domains at the second level. We just want a IDN cc to go." So being ready, I think, really contributes to the appreciation that this could happen.

So I would invite some of the registries or applicants for new registries -- I would invite a few of you to assert the same readiness. That would mean articulate in writing we have an install base. We have thousands, or in some cases millions of IDNs at the second level. We have strong demand in our target market for IDN gTLDs. And we're ready to embrace whatever it the GAC is requiring on GO. We're ready to embrace whatever it is we have on IRT. And bring that forward would be the tip of the spear that starts to lead this thing along. It takes us out of an abstract discussion under what are the conditions and what are the processes into here we have demand, head-to-head demand. We're willing to go with almost any process that gets us there, including what you asked for. Would there be sufficient time, say, for objection? So whoever this applicant is who says I'm ready to go and I'm going to open the door for objections, make sure that I proactively solicit whether there's an objection from appropriate governments that use

those scripts.

In other words, that readiness, that display of readiness in an aggressive way could be what breaks the log jam that we have right now.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Adrian Kinderis.

So what I'm getting from today's discussion -- and I think, Chuck, you're exactly right. Some more input here would be great. But I think also to take some of this back to council, at least get them thinking, that potentially we may want to revise our position here with respect to one going before the other. That's fairly groundbreaking for me here today to sort of get that sense. Just see how that floats. Not necessarily in a formal sense to bring it up. But, in an informal sense, I'd like to talk to my colleagues about that. Because, to have an understanding that our first would be to say we all go together. And then, if not, plan B clicks into action. And a plan B is a fast track.

That -- you know, I think that's more palatable. I really do. Especially to my constituency, because you're getting something rather than nothing, right?

So, you know, I would value certainly some more council input on this.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I hesitate a little bit to bring this up. But it's a fact, so I'll say it.

One of the realities in the ICANN budget -- and you can see it in the proposed budget that's out there right now -- is that gTLD registrants through their fees are the ones who will pay for the IDN ccTLD process, certainly have so far. Because about 80- to 90% of the ccNSO budget is funded outside of the ccTLD fees. So one of the real contradictions in this is that if the ccTLDs go first, we're actually funding it. "We" meaning the gTLD side of the house. Because the fees from gTLDs cover over 93% of the total ICANN budget. So that's a real contradiction, especially if the ccTLDs get a competitive advantage over gTLDs.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Question then, Chuck, is why, as a council, do we -- were we that confident we were going to go first with Gs that we put forward this motion to say, you know, not let one retard the other? I mean, given what you said, it makes damn good sense to sit here and say, well, why should you get a competitive advantage, right?

>>CHUCK GOMES: I don't think we were overconfident or arrogant. I think that seemed like the right thing to do that neither should disadvantage the other if there are significant delays. Do we need -- I think you asked the question should we reconsider it? It's still the right thing to do. It's an ideal way to approach it. We're now getting down to the nitty-gritty. And so that's why we're here.

>>AVRI DORIA: I think another way to look at that statement is we shouldn't be doing anything to interfere with the other one's ability to get in. So, I mean, if you look at that statement that neither should do anything to impair the other, that is most definitely a thing I'm still willing to say is true. Neither of us should be interfering with the other one's ability.

However, that still doesn't mean that one should get there first.

>>EDMON CHUNG: About Chuck's comment, I think that's -- I was walking in and out of the IDN session at the GAC earlier today. I might have heard it wrong, but what I -- if I heard was right, there are GAC members who are putting forward, that yes, the gTLD will have to cross-subsidize the ccTLDs. And --

(Speaker off microphone.)

-- like we have all along that's at least put forward by some GAC members. But I might have heard it wrong. Because I was walking in and out.

>>AVRI DORIA: Would that be an entitlement?

>>EDMON CHUNG: Okay. So I guess -- did anyone else want to -- because we've been sort of somewhat dominating. We're almost closing this session, I think we're a little bit late, running out of time, too. Does anyone maybe from ICANN staff want to talk you know about what you think about -- Olof, maybe?

>>OLOF NORDLING: Olof Nordling, ICANN staff, yes. And we're happy to talk about just about anything. But primary concerns are -- well, like you say, we're -- I think my primary concern is what do the end customers really want. So more of the input of the -- kind of what Steve is saying, what are others saying from the customer's side? Because that's really what we're here to serve at the end of the day.

>>EDMON CHUNG: That's a very interesting observation. Perhaps we haven't -- at least on my part we -- I haven't emphasized that enough. But we certainly -- I'm sure Chuck can speak to that as well. Certainly there has been, we, at least at the registry, have heard significant demand. Every time I speak at any occasion, the first three questions would include when is IDN and we don't want IDN dot Asia. We want IDN dot IDN. When is it going to happen? Doesn't matter who I sort of speak to. That's sort of almost like the first few questions would have that now.

So I think that's a good point. Steve?

>>STEVE DEL BIANCO: And on what Olof said, the work, this term of reference -- I know it's just a draft. It turns out you do show the perspective of the target community, the customer base. But it's under

commonalities. And it's the third bullet in on commonalities. One has to dig deeply into this term of reference to get to what Olof and I are saying should be the primary driver. And that is the serving of the target community. So it's a matter of elevating it and making it clear.

The second is to avoid characterizing our concern as being about conflict. You see, conflict is two suppliers vying to get to someplace. It isn't a conflict. From the standpoint of the perspective of a customer is, as I called it earlier, it's either a dilemma or a delay or the inability for an IDN user -- taking registrants out of it for a second. Let's just say a user. Doesn't even register. Users are ICANN customers, too. And that IDN user is suddenly excited that they can have an all IDN. They actually don't have to do keyboard gymnastics to type in email addresses or type in URLs, except that they only have a tiny little group of TLDs that are available, the one or two that got launched in their own country code. What they really wanted is the full robust Internet experience in IDN. So we end up saying, from their perspective, it's not just registrant. It's end users who aren't going to have the full access to contents.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Just on that point. And your example you used with your Arabic domain name before is an interesting one, because I really think it's going to come down to those who have existing TLDs and where they have them as to -- so when we talk about what the user wants, do they want a G or do they want a CC, I think it's really what they have now that dictates that.

So I don't know that that's necessarily -- whilst I'm all for what the user or the registrant wants to see, I think it's a very fine line. Because, if you've got a dot ae domain name for the Arab Emirates and they're going to get their IDN ccTLD, that's fine for me. But, if I've got a dot com that I happen to be in the UAE, then I'm going to be hanging out for the gTLD. So, you know, I -- I don't know that that's necessarily helpful in that respect.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: May I respond to that? Adrian, great question. You said there's sort of a subtle distinction between the user and registrant with regard to it, because it's a function of what you have now. I think that is only true of the registrant. If a registrant has invested a lot of branding, like bluebridge.net, they're really focused on what they have now. And they want it in IDN. But a user doesn't sort of have anything. A user accesses the entire Internet. And she turns her fingers like this to access content from a variety of places, none of which she has but what of it she wants.

So I think the user and registrant perspectives should maintain a distinction and ought to make its way into the term of reference for this document.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: And for the scribes, acknowledged, thank you.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Edmon, make sure we left the people who would like to get on that list either leave their e-mail or give their name or their URL or something for that.

>>EDMON CHUNG: How do you propose we do it, perhaps --

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: The scribes will take it and then they can check the transcript of this, potentially, one way to do it, is that helpful?

>>EDMON CHUNG: The e-mail of the drafting team, I don't remember exactly. But for those who are not already on the list, who would be interested to be on the list and want to be added to the list?

>>EDMON CHUNG: Okay, yes.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: No, no, no.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I've got the drafting team e-mail address here, it's gnso-idng --

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Go slowly.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Am I speaking too fast? Sorry. Hello, everyone, sorry I'm late, this is Stephane Van Gelder. Is that good. So the e-mail is gnso-idng@icann.org.

>>EDMON CHUNG: And if anyone is interested to join that mailing list, you know, it's open for anyone to join. Talk to me or anyone to get join -- and check that mailing list on the ICANN Web site and the mailing list part. I think -- and --

>>CHUCK GOMES: Glen de Saint Gery is the GNSO Secretariat, and you can also send an e-mail to Glen to be added to that at glen@icann.org.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: And that's Glen with one N, G-L-E-N. And let the record show Stephane Van Gelder turned up only three minutes ago, thank you.

>>EDMON CHUNG: Okay. No, I think it's -- we ran over time now and I think we should wrap the session. But I think we had a really constructive discussion today. And it seem -- we will have further discussion at the council meeting as well later on in the week. And it seems to me that the approach is a little bit clearing more up in a way that people can agree to and move forward with and address the address a few of the concerns that we had all along. So thank you --

>>CHUCK GOMES: For those who don't know her, the person I just gave her e-mail out to all of you just came in, Glen is right over here.

[Applause]

>>EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, everyone, for joining.