

GNSO IDN Working Group Teleconference**13 March 2007****21:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO IDN Working Group teleconference on 13 March 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.

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

<http://gnso-audio.icann.org/idn-wg-20070313.mp3>

Participants on the call:

Ram Mohan - Working Group Chair

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Will Rodger - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Steve Crocker - Security and Stability Advisory Committee Liaison

Werner Staub - Registrar c.

William Tan- Registrar c.

Yoav Keren - Registrar c.

Paul Diaz - Registrar c.

Cary Karp - gTLD Registry constituency

Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency

June Seo - gTLD Registry constituency

Mark McFadden - ISPCP

Tin Wee Tan - NCUC

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Sergei Sharikov - observer

S. Manian - observer

Shahram Soboutipour - observer

S. Subbiah - observer

Alexei Sozonov - observer

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Tina Dam - IDN Program Director

Maria Farrell - Policy officer

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies

Charles Shaban - IPC

Coordinator: Maria Farrell joined.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, Maria.

Maria Farrell: Hi. Thanks, Ram.

Ram Mohan: For those who just joined, we'll get started in just a few minutes.

Cary, welcome.

Cary Carp: Thank you. Hi, Ram, how are you?

Ram Mohan: Very good.

Coordinator: Avri Doria joins.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, Avri. We'll get started in just a few minutes.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Ram Mohan: Thank you for joining us.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Coordinator: (Fergie Cherikoff) has joined.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, (Fergie). This is Ram, we'll get started in a very short while.

Man: Hello.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung joins.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Hello.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Hello, (Sharam).

Ram Mohan: And welcome, (Sharam).

(Sharam): Hello.

Edmon Chung: How are you?

Ram Mohan: Doing very well. It gets harder (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Coordinator: Alistair Dixon joins.

Ram Mohan: Alistair, welcome.

Alistair Dixon: Hello, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Hi there. We have a motley crew onboard and we'll get started in just another minute's time.

Alistair Dixon: Okay, great.

Coordinator: (Subaya) joins.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, (Subaya).

(Subaya): Hello, thank you.

Coordinator: Mark McFadden joins.

Ram Mohan: Mark, welcome.

Mark McFadden: Thank you.

Ram Mohan: All right, I'm just about to start the recording for this call and then we'll get started.

Coordinator: The recording has begun, you may begin.

Ram Mohan: Thank you very much.

Folks, welcome to the IDN Working Group call on March 13, 2007. We have a motley crew onboard. We have a good set of people already in attendance. Let me hand the mic over to Glen -- and ask if you do a roll call, Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Certainly, Ram.

We have (Manion), an observer. Help yourself with a chair.

Paul Diaz from the Registrar Constituency.

Yoav Keren from the Registrar Constituency.

Sophia Bekele from the Nominating Committee.

Werner Straub from the Registrar Constituency.

Jun Seo from the Registry Constituency.

Will Rogers from the Business Constituency.

Cary Karp from the Registry Constituency.

Avri Doria from the Nominating Committee, appointed to the GNSO Council.

(Fergie Cherikoff), observer.

Edmon Chung from the Registry Constituency.

(Sharam Subitchuku) from - an observer.

Alistair Dixon from the Business Constituency.

(Subaya) from - an observer.

And Mark McFadden from the ISP.

Ram Mohan: Thank you very much, and thank you for joining us on this penultimate call of the GNSO IDN Working Group.

Tina Dam: Ram, I'm sorry, this is Tina. Steve and I have joined.

William Tan: William Tan also.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, Tina Dam; welcome, Steve Crocker; and welcome, William Tan.

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry, and (Alex) of the staff people, Olof Nordling, and Maria Farrell.

Ram Mohan: Thank you very much. We're just getting started, Tina, William, and Steve Crocker.

I wanted to say a couple of things. First this is our last but one call before we finish our formal conference call and submit a final report to the GNSO Council. It's been a good session - set of sessions so far and we have a draft outcomes document to go through today and to work through between here and the middle of next week.

I wanted to just to say a couple of things. There have been some comments posted on the list that have been the subject of a few off-list comments and I wondered if - just say a couple of words about this.

You know, our Working Group has a specific charter and we have real work to be done. And although policy inevitably invites politics, I'd like to keep our attention focused on the real policy issues involved in IDN and not worry too much about the politics. I'd like to encourage the Working Group members to stay focused on our agenda and to not allow ourselves to get too distracted by tangential commentary.

So having said that, I would like to get your attention to a proposed agenda for today's two-hour conference call. I have three items that I'd like to propose to you for discussion.

The first would be the status of root server test from Tina Dam -- the report got published last week; and perhaps we spend about 10 minutes on that topic.

And then another 10 minutes or so on reserve - the Reserve Names Working Group -- some recommendations have gone in specifically from the IDN angle.

And perhaps another 10 minutes devoted to any comment, merely comments on recommendations that have already gone in rather than the opening of brand new topics.

And then really spend the next 90 minutes of our conversation on reviewing the Draft Outcomes document that Olof has sent off.

Now my intent is to swiftly go to Section 4 of the Draft Outcomes document. If you do not have the document opened up on your computers or printed out, I'd suggest that you do that. We will start

going through that in about 20 to 25 minutes' time. And to go - you know, we'll start from Section 4 in the Outcomes documents.

And my intent today will be get us as far as we can with a goal that we cover all the major areas of agreement first and then we go to areas of support and then areas where the merely alternative views exist. And that's my intent, because our primary job going into the middle of next week is to submit a document to the - do a report to the GNSO Council that is focused on really areas where we have brought agreement and also areas where support exists for particular perspectives.

So that's really what I have planned for today.

Before we continue forward, I would like to ask if there are any comments on what I said so far and if there are any suggestions to add to the agenda.

Okay. Hearing none, let's get started.

Tina, would you please take the next 10 minutes or so and give us a little bit of the root server test and what we should as an IDN Working Group take away from the report that has come out?

Tina Dam: Sure. Thanks, Ram.

I think I can make this fairly short and then see if there's any questions around it.

But as you know, ICANN hired Autonomica to design and conduct an IDN test focused on the root server and resolver level of the DNS. And the design of the test was published in December.

And then we decided to have an open comment period on it to see if there's anything that particularly the technical community thought should be changed in that design before the test was conducted. There was no substantial feedback provided. In fact most of the comments that I received personally was that the design looked good and was in the way that it should be.

So Autonomica proceeded and conducted the test (proceedings). (As you just said), we just posted and announced the test results.

And all the test results were positive. Now what that means is that the software, in the laboratory setup, the software for the - that was chosen for the root servers and the resolvers, that was chosen for the test, is capable of handling the (punicode) strings.

So of course that's a very positive result. And what it makes us possible to do is to move forward and see towards application layers and whether there's any additional technical concerns that need to be addressed.

But this was like the first step. So the first phase of the technical tests were done with a successful result.

I don't - Ram, I don't know how much you want me to go into details about how the whole thing was setup. I mean it was a UNIX platform. And with the most popular software packages that are used.

You know, all of the details are available online, and if there are any questions to it, you know, I can take questions now or I can take questions later. If anybody needs more details than what has been provided online, you know, you can request that from me as well.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. And let's take questions.

Meanwhile if anybody new has come on the call since the last time we did the roll call, if you could announce yourself, please.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, this is Mike Rodenbaugh.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, Mike.

Alexei Sozonov: Excuse me, here is Alexei Sozonov Regtime.net.

Ram Mohan: Welcome, Alexei.

Alexei Sozonov: Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Okay, thank you.

I opened the floor for questions on the root server technical test that Tina just brought an update on.

Paul Diaz: Ram, it's Paul Diaz, can I ask a question?

Ram Mohan: Sure, Paul.

Paul Diaz: Tina, just begs the question, what are the next steps in terms of timeline? When do you hope to perhaps conduct in a live environment or any of the other perhaps technical application layers that you discussed?

Tina Dam: Okay, a good question.

So the President's Advisory Committee on IDN had discussed Phase 2 testing and how broad that needs to go. So there are some recommendations from that group.

And right now I'm talking to the technical liaisons of the ICANN Board about their view on recommendations towards how broad should the Phase 2 testing go and what we need to include in it. You know, I hope we'll be able to get some information out about that as fast as possible.

One item that's going to be, you know, maybe not included on that but at least dependent on that is going to be the study that the SSAC is planning.

So we need to just spend a little time doing some coordinations and all of those activities and then we can come out with a massive plan with some timelines in it.

Now in terms of, when are we capable of doing any live root testing? I think, first of all, the one thing that stands clear is that the exact test that was conducted in the laboratory environment has to be done in the root zone as live in the root as well, as a live test. As far as I can tell, at this point in time, that will be the very last test to be completed, and if successful, we can then move into live production.

So, you know, I realize that I'm not giving you any good timelines, but I think that's as good as I can give an answer to that right now.

Paul Diaz: Could I just ask Tina, do you hope - I know Paul Twomey had originally said that we might have the (unintelligible) done the fall of this year. Is that general guideline still valid? Do you think that's possible?

Tina Dam: Well, I know that we're trying to do it as fast as possible, understanding the need in the community. So, you know, it's definitely something that we're trying to accomplish.

Paul Diaz: Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Paul.

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...other questions?

Ram Mohan: Who was that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's Mike Rodenbaugh.

Ram Mohan: Mike, sure. Go ahead.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure.

I just got off another call where we've talked about (unintelligible) this test did not involve any sort of aliasing situation at all. Is that correct?

Tina Dam: Yeah, that's right. There's no aliasing at all. The only resource record that was tested was NS record. And since the test did not go beyond the root server and the resolvers, we did not test NS records as an aliasing function.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. Are there plans to do so or to examine that in the next phases of testing?

Tina Dam: No, just - I think actually that aliasing is going to be something that the policy working groups, if - well, let me put it in a different way. If the policy working groups are advocating that aliasing needs to be an available mechanism, then that is something that we would want to take a look at -- what are the different technical options for allowing or for providing the functionality of aliasing.

And of course, as you know, DNAME is one of them and it can be done with NS records as well, and I believe there's other options as well. And, you know, it probably would be appropriate to do a comparison analysis of how these different ways of providing aliasing are working if aliasing is something that the community would want to have.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right. You know, I think it's certainly silly, and many in the community are considering -- I guess we don't have any real consensus on that at this point -- but I guess it's a little of the chicken and the egg situation too, it would kind of be nice to know what the options are in order to fully evaluate the policy implications.

Tina Dam: Yeah. So it certainly is a chicken and the egg discussion. You know, I'll pick down the action and make sure that as there's communication going on around Phase 2 testing, that that is being considered again.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thank you, Tina, I appreciate that.

Tina Dam: Sure.

Ram Mohan: Any other questions on the technical test?

Okay, hearing none, Tina, thank you very much for providing the review.

You know, one of the tasks of our Working Group was to review the technical test, the root server technical test. If there are comments that still come through that have not made it on to this conference call, I encourage you to place those comments on the mailing list and to move further discussion, if any, on the root server test results on to our mailing list.

I'd now like to move to a review of the Reserve Name recommendations that have been made from the, you know, from the IDN side.

There is a document that Sophia had provided to our IDN Working Group last week, asking for comments. And I'm wondering if any comments are there, and if there are, then I'd like to have that in schedule right now.

Sophia Bekele: Can I speak to that, Ram? This is Sophia.

Ram Mohan: Sure, please.

Sophia Bekele: Are you asking the group if they have any comments or are you asking if there is - that I submitted the last report I submitted consisted of comments of the group? Maybe I can clarify.

Ram Mohan: I guess what I'm looking at is whether the group, whether our group has any comments. You had sent a note in to Chuck and to the Reserve Names Working Group on -- Thursday?

Sophia Bekele: Maybe I can clarify, Ram...

Ram Mohan: Please. Go ahead.

Sophia Bekele: I sent that - I sent a matrix for everyone right after the call last time, the 5:00 a.m. call I guess California Time, and solicited for comments for people so I could provide for the Thursday meeting coming for the RN Working Group. And so I took the comments of the ones that have (unintelligible) incorporated it in there and submitted it to the Working Group.

So if there are any additional comments, that's why I was asking for your clarification and the questioning if there were any other comments, then I suppose, you know, we can still - it could be a live document where we can get information from people.

But just so you know, that document, the last one I submit it was based on, you know, some of the feedback I got. So that means we have -

the RN Working Group document is - has incorporated the, you know, the people's comments from the IDN Working Group. That's all.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Sophia.

Yeah, the reason I added that to the agenda today was because last week you had sended things just a little bit before the call begun and I didn't think there was an opportunity for members to perhaps read it and comment. But since a week has passed, if there are any comments, let's take an opportunity for those comments to come your way.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. Thank you, Ram. Excellent, yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's Mike Rodenbaugh. I have a comment or question.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead, Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thanks.

So, Sophia, I'm looking at the table and it seems like you have similar language in pretty much every category (unintelligible) I'm just looking at the single and two characters because I'm leading that subject in the Reserve Name Working Group and we actually have not yet incorporated any of this language into our report.

You say IDN versions should not be reserved unless there is a request from the language script community requesting it. Can you just tell me more precisely what you mean by that?

Sophia Bekele: Okay.

May I clarify for you, Mike -- I don't think you were on the RN group, the Thursday meeting, right?

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, I've been on vacation the last several days, forgive me.

Sophia Bekele: No, that's okay.

What happened was - that report actually Chuck thought it was my own comments. So I wanted to clarify that right now. And there are two reports that I submitted for that group.

One is Chuck has come up with a format for one in the subgroup to submit their own, you know, final recommendation. So I guess I voluntarily (sealed) that document and sent it to Chuck saying, "This would probably be the final recommendation from the opinions that I collected. However, the working document that we used is the matrix which incorporates some of the loose comments that people have made."

So in translating those comments into the final document, I think that's what you're reading from right now. So...

Mike Rodenbaugh: So I should not be looking at the table document, I should be looking at the textual document.

Sophia Bekele: I would suggest you should be looking at the table document. The textual document is the one that Chuck said could incorporate everyone's comments and then will be there for the final.

Ram Mohan: Just for clarification, I think the - what you're referring to, the textual document in the email is the document that is titled 03 Report on Reserve Name for IDN WG from SB.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Got it.

Sophia Bekele: Well, that's the matrix; that's the loose document...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right.

Sophia Bekele: ...which just comes in a table format, Ram.

Ram Mohan: So which is - I'm confused then as to which of the two documents we should look at.

Sophia Bekele: We should be looking at the table document.

Mike Rodenbaugh: The one called Recommendations?

Ram Mohan: Is the document titled Recommendations for RNW from IDN WG?

Sophia Bekele: No, it's the 03 document, Ram.

Ram Mohan: It is the 03 document, okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

03 document is the one that we should be looking at that you're intending to be final and send to the Reserve Name group. Okay.

Cary Carp: From my own information -- this is Cary -- what is the timetable that the RN group has right now? When are they planning to wrap things up and find out the wrong reports?

Man: (Unintelligible)?

Ram Mohan: Sophia, would you able to answer that question?

Sophia Bekele: I think from the last consensus of the meeting that I got, it's not only for the IDNs. I think there is a general consensus that some of the subgroup is still working on the issues and there are issues that are supposed to be finalized, you know, in the next few weeks because it's for additional work, there were various things that were recommended for additional work.

So in my opinion I think the IDN work, although nobody requested it, we can still solicit or, you know, put in all our information. And Chuck has agreed he will incorporate it in the final report for Lisbon. So I think we still have time if people want to, you know, send their comments in.

That means there has not been like a rigid deadline.

Ram Mohan: So I would like to make the following suggestion. I do not plan to have a review this document in full on this call today. That is not our plan or agenda.

But I would like to suggest to the IDN Working Group members to carefully look at the document that is - from Sophia, sent last Thursday, that is entitled -- inside of the email there are two

documents, but the one that is important for us to review for accuracy and for completeness is the one that is titled 03 Report on Reserve Names for IDN WG from SB.

And we need to provide some comments in there.

In terms of a process of doing this, my suggestion is that you provide these comments to the entire working group and, you know, obviously choose to either send the comments as they're tracking comments in the Microsoft document or merely writes to a specific topic in the - on the list.

But - and, you know, we'll ask upon - call upon Sophia to incorporate the various comments into something that is cohesive and can be passed on to the Reserve Names Working Group.

Tina Dam: Hey, Ram, this is Tina, can you put me in the queue?

Ram Mohan: And you have the floor.

Tina Dam: Thanks.

William Tan: William Tan -- can you put me in the queue please?

Ram Mohan: Sure.

Go ahead, Tina.

Tina Dam: Thanks.

So just a recommendation because I'm a little bit confused as to what parts of the Reserve Names Working Group's tasks that we can still provide input to, because I know that they finalized some of the reports just yesterday.

So I would just recommend that we perhaps do a quick follow-up with Chuck around, as he is the chair of that working group, about what reports do they still have outstanding, just to make sure that, you know, we're tasking members of this working group with work that actually be used by the other working groups.

Ram Mohan: Good suggestion. We'll certainly make a note of it and follow it up.
Thank you.

William?

William Tan: Yes. I'm not sure if I should be making comments directly with - to the documents right now. Are you suggesting that we...

Ram Mohan: You're certainly welcome to do it, William. I was merely suggesting that for those members who had not had a chance to review it yet, to follow through on to the mailing list as well.

William Tan: Right. I was just as confused as you were as to which document was I supposed to review and - but looking at - I just have one specific thing to clarify.

Looking at the 03 Report, on the fourth column, under IDN WK Comments, the first paragraph says locals should be the only thing

being registered the corresponding Unicode and its variants and the ace form should be hidden and not open to registration per se.

I had always thought that we - the IDN registries have always been using the (Ace) form as the primary registration string. And the Unicode if ever provided to the registry would just be there for cost checking or document purpose.

So the definitive string is the Unicode string and not the local script as it is called in this document.

Cary Carp: Can Cary add something to that too, please, Ram?

Ram Mohan: Sure.

William, are you done with your question?

William Tan: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Cary.

Because of the anguish that this causes and the fact that the one form is the more necessary in some context and the other in other context, all of the IACS documentation, the stuff that simply illustrates the problem, if I understand it correctly, it's pointing at the direction of there being an absolute necessity for presenting the two versions in tandem.

There's a certain amount of mathematical over-definition there, but nonetheless, hiding the one is simply no longer appropriate. Both need

to be there and you use the one that's most appropriate to the context that you're immediately processing it.

William Tan: Can I just reply to that?

Ram Mohan: Go ahead.

William Tan: Yes, I agree. And for the purpose of registration, I am pretty sure that at least that the (Ace) form is more pertinent and more important for the registry in terms of DNS (unintelligible) population and who is and so forth.

Cary Carp: Well, in the context...

((Crosstalk))

Cary Carp: ...in the context of what is actually resolving, it is the (Ace) form, but in terms of what the name holder believes him/herself to have - to be holding is -- actually it's not even the Unicode representation, it's the local representation, that they're going to say, yeah, that's the name I thought I had requested it.

So on the presentation side it has to be the Unicode form, and on the - in the zone, it can only be the (Ace) form.

William Tan: Right. And we have to be careful when we say local because local could pretty much mean anything from the - from a written form to a non-Unicode based encoding which....

Cary Carp: Just so, that's absolutely correct. But the protocol horizon does not extend past the Unicode form. But there needs to be some recognition of the Unicode perhaps being in turn converted into some other character encoding before the user actually sees it. And it is not invariably true that every single encoding system has a direct one-to-one correspondence with the elements of the Unicode character set.

So there's an issue there that a registrar might have to address which is beyond the ability of registries to deal with. And the registries need to deal with things that are beyond the reach of the protocol to deal with.

William Tan: Okay.

Ram Mohan: William, do you have a suggestion?

William Tan: I presume that that texture should be connected to either what Cary said which is that both forms are important depending on which context, one or both, will be needed. We shouldn't be saying that one form should be heading and not the other.

Cary Carp: Would you please put that text, the modifications through into the document and into the mailing list?

William Tan: Sure.

Cary Carp: Thank you.

William Tan: I think I would just email it to the mailing list.

Cary Carp: Yes, thank you.

William Tan: All right.

Man: (Unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...put on queue, please?

Ram Mohan: Welcome. You're in the queue and you have the floor.

Man: Okay, I just wanted to ask a question and to clarify the point by William and Cary.

What happens if that (unintelligible) and the (Ace) encoding system?
Does that mean that the person who registered the old version of (Ace)
now has to (unintelligible) because that's not the one that means -
that's - either that's the one that's being listed...

Cary Carp: Can I comment on that?

Man: ...(unintelligible) yeah, thanks.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead, Cary.

Cary Carp: There is no - nobody is contemplating any change to the encoding system. The only thing that is being contemplated in the modification in the character repertoire that is available for encoding in two directions, that there are characters that are currently available for encoding that

are likely to become unavailable, and there are characters that are not available for encoding that needs to become available.

But the algorithm itself is the last thing anybody wants to be changed.

Ram Mohan: (Unintelligible) does that answer your question?

Man: Right.

So - but it doesn't answer the question that if sometime in the future there is a change. So, is it the Unicode one that I own or is it the ASCII one that I own?

Cary Carp: Well, I'm afraid I don't have a crystal, so there's no way that I could possibly comment meaningfully on anything that's under - anything that might be considered in the future, I can only speak hopefully with some utility on the thing that is currently being contemplated.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: (Unintelligible) did you have a recommendation there?

Man: I was just asking to clarify.

And so if the Unicode version then changes or if a particular language group which didn't have a Unicode table now might suddenly have one because a new version has been updated, well, and they want to get on. So, how does that affect?

Cary Carp: Well, this is one of the highest priorities with the protocol revision, that the current name prep is locked to Unicode 3.2, Unicode is currently a 5.0, will be a 5.1 before we get them much farther.

And there has to be a mechanism for the rapid accommodation of scripts that have recently been encoded. And this is being done in a manner that will in no way damage things that have already been encoded. And the unassigned code points are assigned, but there are no previously assigned code points that are being reassigned.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

(Subaya): Well, I wanted to be in the queue. (Subaya) here.

Ram Mohan: (Subaya), hi welcome. And you have the floor.

(Subaya): Okay.

This raises an interesting point. As far as I'm concerned, any of these suggestions, having both as Cary suggests or having just one primary and the other hidden, they're all within the ballpark of, you know, as long as you trap all three, maybe more than two (unintelligible) local encoding, trapping all of them is obviously a necessity, so which ones you want to make preeminent or display both, that's a secondary issue, and I think I'm okay with any of these actions.

However, I suddenly realized the legal issue that (unintelligible) you know, just occurred to me. And I think from a legal definition, if there is

future changes, you know, no crystal ball as Cary said, so in the future there are some changes of any kind, whether it's the underlying algorithm or the new characters and so on and so forth, from a legal perspective it may be important from the owner's point of view of the domain names what it is that is (precedent) that the person has bought.

That has to be clarified from a legal perspective. I mean we're talking about, you know, perhaps technically, you know, want people to show them the differences and so on. But from a pure legal point, maybe Mike Rodenbaugh, I believe he's a lawyer, maybe he can say something about this, is there a necessity for defining something to be legal?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Defining something to be illegal, (Subaya)?

(Subaya): No, legal, legal, yes, between these variants of the name, you know, there's the local language version and there's a Unicode version and (unintelligible) Unicode and then there's the (punicode) version, these versions that we are trapping them for the purposes of, you know, recording them, you know, recording them, making sure there's no confusion in all of those things. That's what we're discussing about it, from the purposes of - from the perspective of the person who bought the name, like from a legal perspective, what has he actually bought, do we need to define that? Has he bought the legal - what has he actually bought from a legal point? Is it just the name in that local language or just a Unicode version of those? I mean, is there something that needs to be specified from a very legal perspective?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Actually, good questions, (Subaya). I think that, you know, as with all legal questions, that's going to come to a country by country situation.

But, you know, generally as far trademark law goes, it's much more concerned with the Unicode version than the (Ace) version, obviously, since users don't really see the difference.

(Subaya): Right. But my point is that, I mean, all of this can be decided, but I'm just raising the issue that we've seen it all from a sort of technical perspective so far in the discussion where this policy group is really about policy.

And so it may be worthwhile in this effort, maybe a recommendation should be put in somewhere. I don't mean just the Reserve Names (unintelligible) itself, at some way it should be noted that along the lines, there will be work that's defining, you know, legally what it is that we think that the person has bought in the documents as we go forward.

I mean it's not a question that, you know, I mean not putting a legal definition could there could work against us in the future, but this is a matter deciding what it is. You know, we're trapping everything technically, that's fine. But from a legal perspective, we probably need to state that as well for clarity with each...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think we wanted to stay away from saying, you know, it's a legal definition or whatever, but I think you can address what you're trying to say by defining domain name as both the (Ace) and the Unicode version.

Cary Carp: We're also assuming its property, and is that massively contentious?

Mike Rodenbaugh: That is still contentious sometimes, sure.

((Crosstalk))

(Subaya): Well, more importantly, whose property it is, Cary.

Ram Mohan: Thank you for the question and for the responses.

We're about 10 minutes beyond where I thought we would be in beginning the discussion of the Draft Outcomes report. I would like to just take a quick moment and ask -- ii there are any other questions or comments before we get to opening up the Draft Outcomes report and working through the document?

Alistair Dixon: Ram, it's Alistair here. I just a comment or question in relation to the single character at the top level issues.

Ram Mohan: Yes, please, go ahead.

Alistair Dixon: I noticed, Sophia, that you've written me to release all single characters at the top level. And I guess in terms of the - both Mike Rodenbaugh and I are on the subgroup that's working on this particular issue. And one of the arguments against release the single character to the top level is risks of mistyping. And I guess it seems to me that, to the extent there is such a risk, this would apply to both IDNs and ASCII characters. And I just wondered if anybody had any comments on that.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram, I'll put myself in the queue.

Werner Straub: This is Werner. I would also like to be in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Edmon as well.

Ram Mohan: Who was the third?

Edmon Chung: Edmon.

Ram Mohan: Edmon, okay.

All right, my comment is that I believe that single characters as they are defined right now are not an IDN specific issue and that therefore it's my opinion that we shouldn't be spending a great deal of our time discussing the merits and demerits of opening up single characters at the top level in an IDN discussion.

Werner?

Werner Straub: Yes. Actually it is not in contradiction to what you said, but actually it would appear to contradict it.

In the context of IDN, there is more reasons to have a single character top level domain because in many languages there are characters that actually represent entire syllables and take multiple strokes to type. Actually it's to type a single character and then in Chinese, in

Japanese, for many of them - it takes multiple strokes to type it, same for Koreans.

So actually even though it appears to us as a single character, and in some cases may be single character (unintelligible) Chinese, or glyphs as in Korean representing two sometimes or up to five different characters in a single square. It is not the same concept with the single characters that we have in the Latin script, and really would be overkill to require that in a language where it wouldn't take several keystrokes to type a single characters, that it would have to put two or more.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Werner.

Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Werner actually covered everything that I wanted to say. But sort of add to that is -- so certain - probably certain languages, certain scripts are - may be dealt differently in terms of single character (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you for those comments. They're very helpful.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

At this point, I'd like to direct your attention to the document that Olof Nordling sent out earlier in the week and are job here that I'd like to focus us on is to send the next 75 minutes or so to focus on the - on Section 4 -- outcome.

And in there, what I'd like to really send initially the most amount of our time on is to look at areas where we have - we have said there's "agreement" because I want to make sure that if we say there is agreement, because the way we have defined it, let me just - let me quickly say what we mean by the following terms -- there's "agreement", there is "support", there is "outside of scope".

And what we mean by "agreement" is that it is something that we can send over to the council as something that we believe that, you know, it's kind of the consensus view.

"Support" says that there is some gathering sort of positive opinion but competing positions may exist and full agreement has been reached.

And "outside of scope" means the topic has been discussed but the group considered it to be outside of purview.

Alternative view means that if different opinion exist but it does not gone or enough attention to get to either support or agreement status.

So I'd like to focus our initial attention on the areas where we say - we've said here in the draft of our team's report, agreement exist, finish that up and then move on to the areas where we see support exist, finish that up and then finally get to - and along the way, I expect they will also - we will automatically get to areas of ultimate reviews all of the things that are outside of scope.

I mean end of the day, our working groups primary job is to shine light on an area where much heat has been generated and to provide a clear set of recommendations to the council in terms of what areas

might be good for PDP to start whether there are any such areas or not.

So with that being said, I'd like to start with...

Avri Doria: This is Avri...

Yoav Keren: Ram, this is Yoav, is that's a common (thing) something before you start?

Ram Mohan: Okay. That was Yoav and before Yoav...

Avri Doria: Avri.

Ram Mohan: ...was that Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I wanted to ask clarifying question.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Avri, go ahead please.

Avri Doria: Okay.

In the report agreement says "broad agreement" and you use the consensus word. And so...

Man: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ... what it is you're saying?

Ram Mohan: But really broad agreement is the intent consensus is really what - I used it in appropriately broad agreement is what - is intended here. Consensus as we have said in our - in earlier calls, if something is kind of (unintelligible) that we will leave or just the council.

Avri Doria: Okay, how do you define "broad agreement"?

Ram Mohan: What we said before what "broad agreement" means it's a recommendation if you will that when it goes into the council, our working group members would say we agree that'd be, you know, a general nodding of head. In a (nite) we have context, you would get a loud hum in the room.

Avri Doria: Okay, so you basically (unintelligible)?

Ram Mohan: Yeah.

Man: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Man: That was my (took) consensus that we didn't agree on anything.

Man: Yeah. Ram, I would like to...

Ram Mohan: Yes?

Yoav Keren: ... this is Yoav, can I - I'd like to show it now.

Ram Mohan: Yeah, please go ahead.

Yoav Keren: Okay so I would like to comment and maybe go over further on this. I think that there's a little - I feel that there's a little - kind of a problem with the current term that we're using with the "agreement", "support" and the "alternative views". And I specifically speak about the support term. And I'll say - I'll explain why.

I think that this can be very confusing for a lot of people when you say "support" - if the word "agreement" whether there so people will think that it was the same.

And when you're saying "support", it's kind of - it's saying okay, this is what we think is the right thinking. And although the "alternative views", it's really (unintelligible) put out this point.

Now I think that this is - this whole thing is not very clear. We didn't really count votes or anything. And we didn't have all over - in all the call, everyone's there and within - I think it will be even impossible because right now I think maybe we have over 40 people on the group and to have everyone discuss all points, it will be very hard that he exactly what's the view.

So I think that where we don't have an agreement or I think it will be much better not to say support but just show alternative views. Because - if on one situation there were a fewer people saying okay, there is support for the thing - they support on that point and maybe there were 10 other people that were not on the call that really (unintelligible) it's not.

Now, it's really problematic at this point and we don't - and I think it will be better for all of us not to - to put out for the council all the alternative views and on the same way. And then, you know, they will need to discuss which one is alternative view. And also, they have a kind of - there's a boarding system on the council.

So I think that will be - smarter and less confusing.

Ram Mohan: So I would like to make this an observation and then very, very quickly take it back to, you know, to discuss in the document.

My (process) is the following Yoav. I understand what you're saying. My thought is that we should not worry about those who - it's either did not attend the call or did not listen to the transcripts and did not do their homework and provide certainly, you know, a perspective.

Every recent call that we've had has been archived available on MP3 and transcribed. And, you know, I find it unacceptable that if somebody did not participate in the call that, you know, their voice is not heard. I think those who wanted to get heard had ability to get heard.

Having said that, I totally understand that being on a call live, you get the ability to interact but you don't get in a mailing list format. But we have what we have which is a joint conference call mailing list type of office scenario.

My concern is the following which is that if you put everything as an alternative view, then we really are saying not much to the council and we really do not have any recommendations at all.

So my part is that if - if you're - I see what you're saying about - support without agreement might give them an impression that that is what we think is the right thing to do.

It's possible to modify the word "support" but I'm a little concerned about calling every view an alternative view when for instance you might have a topic where there are only two views and, you know, support exist for both of those views but not any other.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And may I just take one more comment or suggestion Ram if I could (well)?

Ram Mohan: Sure. Go ahead please.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I mean really now is the time, right? We have a draft report. Everybody's certainly has an opportunity now to say whether they disagree with any of these things. So I guess I don't really see what the concern is.

Yoav Keren: Maybe I'll clarify again, Mike.

The term is problematic and I'm not saying that - don't get me wrong. The points here where it says support which is really - even things that I think I personally said. And some points were I think they're right are alternative views.

So it's not specific. I'm just saying something general that I think the worse support can be confusing on how this is taken later on. And the alternative views will be less considered although in some cases, they should be considered on the same level.

And we don't really quantify the support because I - maybe Ram, you can correct me. I will be - maybe I assume much better if you could explain to me how did you - when - I don't see - you did it all anyone else when you did this react, how did you come to a conclusion that on this point, you have a support and on that point, there was an alternative view and not support.

So how did you come to that conclusion because it was - so my saying is it would be a subject feeling that was during the call and not really what everyone or - would have thought.

Ram Mohan: Fair enough, Yoav. I have I think perhaps an elegant solution to this, first is that, you know, each of these is actually been and out - and out to the group that if you look at the early ones, we publish this almost immediately the week of the call.

And, you know, there's opportunity for folks to make corrections. However, it's not too late as Mike was saying, we're going to go through this one by one. Yoav and if something that's called alternative view and are opt to be called support does an opportunity to modify that now.

So I'd rather go there rather than, you know, recraft the word "support" itself. Because it's really not too late. I mean we have an opportunity to upgrade, downgrade what views are being said in the document.

(Subaya): (Subaya) on the queue please.

Sophia Bekele: Sophia here too.

(Subaya): (Subaya) on the queue please.

Ram Mohan: Okay, (Subaya)?

(Subaya): Okay, yes.

Actually, you know, I mean I think that, you know, I might say that what Ram is suggesting maybe okay. I mean that, you know, I misunderstood that, maybe that's some worries about, you know, what's up and what's down or what we can address this as we go along perhaps, you know, that seems to, you know, a good (unintelligible) so I think that might be a way to go for it. That's just my comment there.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Subaya).

Sophia?

Sophia Bekele: I guess I was going to sort of go that route. It is a bit confusing where there's not, you know, a defined rule. Actually, you know, you are the chair, you - I supposed to come up with this so this words have not seeing one of these kind of coming to consensus type of way of doing things and the other working group is either or kind of thing.

So I think it leaves a room for confusion on how the support is defined. And, you know, the - for example one can use, you know, if there's no agreement for example then someone can go through alternative view list. We're doing the same thing with the support.

So I think if you allow to - that we go to every step and come up with a clear - a defined consensus, then and I think that's okay. But initially, when you look at it, if it keeps an impression that it (leaks), feels to voice this out so. But I agree with the new proposal that you have right now.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. In fact that was my proposal.

Man: Yeah. I think it's just okay, Ram when I'm the first one to do - to comment.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (all) you're welcome.

Man: Excuse me and (Alex) have to say something.

Ram Mohan: (Alex), go ahead.

(Alex): That's not our fault that we doesn't participate and then that his making (process) so and we have this agreement so I agree with Yoav in this case.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Alex).

(Alex): Okay.

Ram Mohan: Okay. I will draw your attention to 4.1.2 that is the first topic that has currently been tracked as agreement. And again, my pop here is that we will go through the document, look at the areas where we say agreement exist and we either agree that it's - that's, you know, it is -

we could call it broad agreement or we downgrade or - it and we move on to the next area of agreement.

I'd like to go to that areas of agreement today and then focus on support and alternative views if later in the call today and if we're running out of time in our - on the mailing list as well in our final call next week.

So 4.1.2 which is under the main heading of introduction of IDN gTLDs and relation to new gTLDs, it currently reads that there was agreement to avoid ask this (unintelligible) situation for applications to new gTLD that's accepted for insertion, the root of an earlier stage in IDN gTLDs could preempt later application for IDN gTLDs.

I'd like to open this topic for discussion now.

Werner Straub: (Unintelligible) this is my comment.

Ram Mohan: Werner, you're in the queue and you have the floor.

Werner Straub: Okay. I think that this is not through the change in there such that it is an exactly of a little bit fortunate what is found on (unintelligible) because that would be (unintelligible) this should be live. People would probably look at one deal - and may lead of the other because, you know, as I would actually flee to exist possibly both ways so maybe it could some fundamental examples.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Edmon was in the queue.

Edmon Chung: And actually I think it would be (unintelligible) of itself but I think it's been - might be - I'm going to get some clarifications as to how this is actionable because how would let's say for example, the ICANN board is considering an application how would it come to determination whether it, you know, whether it's currently on force this particular state. That I think would be kind of I'm certain.

Ram Mohan: My thought Edmon is that since we're actually addressing this to council. If the council wanted to act on it, they would then have to take this recommendation from us and crafted it from something, you know, that would become policy.

Edmon Chung: So the - in order to make it actionable, we will come back to (unintelligible) what we're discussing.

Ram Mohan: But working group advance in (Lisbon) so I suspect that it would actually go to the GNSO council.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Ram Mohan: But however if you would like to suggest different wording, this is opportunity to do it.

Edmon Chung: I'm not sure whether it's a good idea to, you know, just make that this particular which is this is somewhat related to I haven't looked to the whole document that there was a discussion but what - how does it determine the community where, you know, you go to four particular language or both (unintelligible) just this particular part would relate to that and that is still very much in need of discussion.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Comment is noted here. I'm making the notes to the document.

I head somebody else who wanted to make a comment.

Sophia Bekele: This is Sophia, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Okay, go ahead Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: I apologize. Are we on 4.1.1?

Ram Mohan: 4.1.2 -- agreement to avoid asking supporting situation.

Sophia Bekele: We jumped from 1.1? Sorry.

Ram Mohan: There are only - we're going to first discuss agreement, (unintelligible) areas then and to the document and then go back to areas where we think there is (unintelligible).

Sophia Bekele: Okay. I missed that.

Ram Mohan: Any other comments on 4.1.2?

Man: (Unintelligible). I just have - I think on the (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Go ahead.

Man: It seems to me that this particular issue could be, if this is what you mean. The proposal as I understand the new gTLD policy is that proposal for new gTLDs would be put up for public comment and that if

somebody is wanting to propose an IDN form of (unintelligible) TLD, then there would be an opportunity if you can comment on this.

I would have thought also that a (Spana) or an (Spaña) would - a (Spana) would potentially because confusing similarity (unintelligible) (Spaña) (unintelligible). And I think - so with that particular requirement.

So it seems to me. I think this is actually - my initial (unintelligible) this is difficult to implement practically. But I think if you could take into account those, you know, the opportunity to public comment about proposal for new gTLD, you know, I think there is a possible way I'm around this (unintelligible) problem.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Any other comment?

All right, thank you.

The next carrier that has been in the draft document that we have listed - as agreement existing is 4.3.1 which is at they're correlating to existing gTLD trainings and existing IDN as of this.

Olof Nordling: Ram, this is Olof. And you're actually skipping 4.2.3 and but about you're the chair and you choose (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: I'm sorry. What I have is 4.2.3 is which is support for developing policy.

Olof Nordling: On agreement?

Woman: Yeah, just an agreement.

((Crosstalk))

(Sharam): (Sharam). I have comment on 4.3.1.

Hello? (Sharam) have a comment.

((Crosstalk))

(Sharam): Hello?

Ram Mohan: Yes?

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: We can hear you (unintelligible).

(Sharam): (Unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Yes, we can hear you now.

(Sharam): Okay. Now, I have a comment on 4.3.1 okay?

Ram Mohan: Actually, I just noted that (I'll just skip all those three), I would like to us to sponsor that three.

Man: Okay, Avri.

Ram Mohan: If you could you hold your comments when we - until we get to 4.3.1, I'd appreciate it.

Avri Doria: This Avri. Can I say something on 4.2.3 the first agreement.

Ram Mohan: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I'm not sure that I agree that GAC consultation is helpful. It may be necessary, but I'm not sure it's helpful.

Ram Mohan: So you would recommend to change to GAC consultation as necessary.

Avri Doria: Right.

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Any comments on that change?

Werner Straub: This is Werner. Could we say may be necessary?

Avri Doria: That's fine with me too.

Man: I like the may part a little bit more.

Ram Mohan: Okay, thank you.

Yoav Keren: Well, I would - this is Yoav, I would like to comment on the second here.

Ram Mohan: Please go ahead.

Yoav Keren: I just wanted maybe to add an example, when you say appropriate bodies, maybe say for example suitably convened language committee for the gTLD selection in that particular language.

It can be a - maybe even say further that it would be (unintelligible) language and fairly representing the geographical distribution of the community worldwide. I think it will be (unintelligible) to, you know, to add this here so it will be more clear what we're talking about.

Ram Mohan: Okay, Yoav, so the following modification from Yoav is open comment. The are modification that I've written down, that's at the end of the second agreement in 4.2.3 which says agreement that are suitably processed for consultation, identification of appropriate bodies is needed when considering new IDN gTLD strings. We say you all suggest.

For example, a suitably convened language committee for the gTLD selections, that particular language, one per language, fairly representing the geographic representation of the community worldwide.

Yoav Keren: Yup.

Ram Mohan: Comments?

Sophia Bekele: Actually - Ram, this is Sophia.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead.

Sophia Bekele: I think that's a very good idea to clarify for there maybe I would even for the - where he mentioned for the gTLD selection and award in that particular language is to clarify further.

So basically were suggesting or I'm suggesting is that I guess there has to be it while we're taking for GAC consultation and it's maybe unnecessary but I think also to bring in the language come indeed important so I think that's what words were playing with and at the same time, that language community is important for their gTLD selection doing this TLD selection and the award process as well.

So, I think what Yoav said say is okay with the exception just to add award next to the selection would further clarify it as well.

Ram Mohan: So the modified suggestion is that follow it says - for example, it's suitably convene language committees for the gTLD selections and award in that particular language, one committee per language fairly representing the geographic representation of the community worldwide.

I will be posting this on the Wiki as well by the way.

Sophia Bekele: I think geographical distributions that are - instead of representations.

Yoav Keren: Yeah, I'm okay with that too -- Yoav.

Mark McFadden: Ram, it's Mark, I'd like to be in the queue.

Ram Mohan: Mark, you have the floor.

Mark McFadden: Thank you Ram.

I understand the language. I don't have it written down in front of me. As I understand the language, what's being suggested here is the creation about - it's not creation of a process, you know, bodies are being created on the fly, is that what's going on?

For each possible new gTLD we have a language (unintelligible).

Sophia Bekele: Can I speak to that GAC - I mean, Ram?

Ram Mohan: Sure.

Sophia Bekele: Okay.

Just to, you know, just to answer that I don't think, you know, this is a suggestion of creating any body on the fly. I doubt if language community is sort of a community which you can, you know, isolate and say to create on the fly, I think it's important community that probably has been even - or now TLD meeting has been considered to go to, you know, clarify such as issues so this is just a recommendation and I think it's okay to suggest that nobody is making a policy out of it yet that we're saying is a language community is very critical in terms of (gTLDs) selection and award process for the same reason, you know, that GAC consultation is important.

So, it's a matter of identifying the critical bodies, it's not creating one. The creation I said I suppose will be determine to, you know, as time

goes along that this is the document that we put our recommendation and then I suggest that, you know, we put our inputs there so.

Cary Carp: Could you put Cary in the queue first, Ram?

Ram Mohan: Cary, you're in the queue and you have the floor.

((Crosstalk))

Cary Carp: I've commented on this before where actually I really don't need to do it again but I can't resist and that just calling attention to the fact that in the grander ICANN scheme of things, the GAC does have ascendancy in speaking on behalf - speaking on any issues that national government regard as there and this language stuff without suggesting for a moment that it's not an issue significance to our activity, it still something that we are not going to be able to buck GAC's something thinking on that that. We don't have control over this issue and (unintelligible) this issue, but I can see that leading nowhere productive.

Sophia Bekele: I'm not quite clear with that.

Ram Mohan: What do you recommend?

Yoav Keren: What are you saying?

Cary Carp: What I'm recommending is that any action that we wish to undertake on behalf of the generic top level domain that requires anchorage in language communities to the extent that any government might have some thoughts on that matter has to be anchored in the GAC.

Yoav Keren: Cary, this Yoav.

I therefore want to say - I said language community, okay, clear that, you know, that the GAC has and, you know, GAC representations or maybe will be a part in that language community so but not only them because the language community would probably if you'll take for example I think the easiest for the Chinese, it won't be only that the reps in the GAC, probably Chinese people from other countries and not only from China, from all over the world, so that's the language community.

((Crosstalk))

Cary Carp: I'm not speaking - I'm not expressing my personal perspective on this, I'm simply commenting on the way this - the various aspects of this discussion have been posited in the ICANN way of doing things.

And whoever it is that reasonably ought to be speaking on behalf say of the Chinese speech community of the world, absent GAC participation in that, nothing is going to happen in ICANN.

Man: No one said that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...that GAC is going to be absent.

Man: No, he...

Woman: I think Cary was just saying...

Man: I'd like to get in the queue.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Excuse me I'd like to get the people in the queue rather than just speaking aloud because it's hard to make out who's speaking.

((Crosstalk))

(Subaya): (Subaya), I would like to be in the queue.

Man: (Unintelligible) queue too.

Ram Mohan: Who was that?

((Crosstalk))

Sophia Bekele: Sophia on the queue.

((Crosstalk))

(Sharam): (Sharam), (Sharam).

Ram Mohan: (Sharam) (unintelligible).

(Sharam): Right.

Ram Mohan: Sophia, okay? Okay.

(Sharam), go ahead.

(Sharam): Okay. Regarding this issue, I think in my language (unintelligible) in several countries and in this situation I think the language constituency, that includes all of these countries can be useful.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Sharam).

(Subaya): Okay. I would like to (unintelligible) into this topic right now, the original, if I'm not mistaken, the original agreement that predeceased my own, you know, participation in these meetings, I joined only last week, now, it appears that there's already agreement from before, and I mean this is not before, agreement from the previous group which I assume is broad consensual agreement prior to my participation that suggests that agreement that a suitable process for consultation and the identification of the appropriate body (unintelligible) to bring a new IDN gTLD string, okay?

Now, what is being proposed now is not changing that agreement. That agreement says, look there should be appropriate body, there should be a process that's used in appropriate body, you know, to help in this process. Okay.

What is being suggested is that one of the examples is that should be the language committee - community from the language, okay? And what is being pointed out is they should not be left out of such appropriate body. I think that's - I think that's what people are kind of saying at this point.

And so there's no real change to the existing thing that was agreed to by everybody I assume before. What it is saying is saying is that let's make sure that these appropriate body for example include, you know, representations from the language community as a whole and (unintelligible) basically through the GAC or whatever.

Now, I understand that Cary's point of view is let's not do anything because without GAC nothing moves anyway, so don't put anything in. But that would be - if that - I know Cary didn't - wouldn't be exaggerating in as far as I'm about to say, but I'm just thinking that there's logical end, that we can just simply say, look we're not going to be able to decide anything anyway and somebody somewhere is going to just make all the decisions for us, therefore let's not put anything in. It was just recommendation, okay?

And so, I mean that's going, you know, much farther than what Cary would like to say I think, but still I'm just trying to...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Thank you, (Subaya).

Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: I would want to (unintelligible) not to give a feeling that we are extending it to language community is not to be shared from the perspective of not fitting the outcomes (unintelligible) in its capacity will be able to want to actually consult with the language community, I'm not here to speak for GAC but it is a natural harmony for government to consult with a language community and to seek their consultation.

And I think in Los Angeles, I think Avri was there too when we did the gTLD policy and Paul Twomey was there and we talked about IDNs and similar issues with (Grace). And I mean there is consensus. There is an agreement that we need to go beyond GAC and address people who have the language expertise, language expertise GAC does not have and or if they want to hire people from the language community to do so be it but it's their decisions.

That is one comment I have and the other one is probably the one to take out of this particular one is didn't we have GAC liaison for this group, Ram, and, you know, given - don't we have any inputs from GAC so far and what is the status, there is not be in early report like RN Group, I was just wondering if this is an opportunity time to even ask without relationship that we have...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I think the GAC moves on its schedule Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: Okay, so we don't have any comments then it's not going parallel.

(Manion): (Manion) on the queue, please.

Ram Mohan: Sure, go ahead.

(Manion): Well, talking about language community, I think that being one from the language committee is - we support that - or the proposed amendment going to be like, and Sophia just (unintelligible) that language committee from the gTLDs selection/award.

And Sophia, another one that if the GAs - the GAC could consider, basically should consult language communities because we have the expertise to advise them not only the scripts perspective but on the right TLDs itself.

Thank you.

(Alex): Excuse me, may (Alex) say a word.

Ram Mohan: (Alex), go ahead.

(Alex): I agree with Sophia because actually that's like good intention to leave everything to GAC, but otherwise we need to have it clear or write it on paper that it needs to be agreed with language constituency from like Russian point of view.

Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

I'm going to put myself from the queue here. I'm struck after this discussion -- I'm struck by two things, one is that I've heard nobody really object as to why I pointed out. Nobody object to the second agreement that are suitable process for consultation and identification of appropriate body is needed.

And I do hear - and I'm also struck by I think it was Mike who is saying that what be seem be suggesting here is either the form is that are suitable that we do need to - maybe recommending to the council that

a language committee must be convened for each language that are gTLD application comes in two.

And to me, it seems like that particular example is something we haven't discussed before. What we have discussed is that that a process for consultation and identification of appropriate body is needed so I'm wondering whether we should pick this example and say that - or move that into this support area because it just seems to stand alone by itself and doesn't seem to require the prior agreement that we all have no objection to.

(Subaya): Since my name was just mentioned in vain, I wouldn't mind making a comment to that.

Ram Mohan: Never in vain, (Subaya), go ahead.

(Subaya): So I think there's no - there's no - I mean because as it stands I think that what you suggested was, if I'm not mistaken, you know, reading here what I just jotted down, for example, is a key word, basically an example is being given to include potentially language community in terms of the appropriate body, right? I meant that's all that was done.

So there's really...

Ram Mohan: Yeah.

(Subaya): ...I don't see that it's much being distracted if you would ask a support statement, you know, as you might suggest underneath, was that in reference to the agreement above, you know, for example, you know, blah, blah, blah, blah, whatever that was vague, basically referring to

that agreement, saying an appropriate body could be, there are support to the extent that an appropriate body could be blah, blah, blah, blah as one of many.

(Manion): Exactly I mean that's where I was going as well that perhaps we move this to support for developing their suitably convened language committees for the gTLD selection/award in that particular language, one committee per language fairly representing the geographic distribution of the community worldwide.

(Subaya): What I was thinking was more of it, you know, I mean that's right but I'm just thinking it's even more specific so basically everybody gets what they want, I guess from the discussion that I just heard, which is that you could specify that, you know, basically referring to the word appropriate body itself, saying such appropriate body could be, you know, amongst others, you know, blah, blah, blah.

Man: Understood.

Cary Carp: Can you put Cary back in the queue?

Ram Mohan: Cary, you're on the queue. You have the floor.

Cary Carp: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Cary Carp: I resent having what I'm saying taken to an absurd conclusion in an attempt to dismiss it.

From the gTLD perspective, I think one of the things we do not want to do is have the GAC expressed them to the extent that they have considered themselves entitled some right to determining what gTLD string is may or may - may or not appear in the IDN space.

There is an enormous pressure, and quite a well supported one, to see too that some of the internationalized TLD space is going to be a CC concern long before it's eligible for discussion on the gTLD route.

And if we decide to counter by claiming some superior expertise over things -- if we go to the GAC and tell their Russian representatives, the representative of the Russian government, that they don't have access to Russian language expertise, we are just taking what the kind of trouble that I don't think we want.

And again, this is not an expression of my own assessment of the depth in which we need to penetrate language community. It's an expression of the situation in which I believe we find ourselves just in term of political reality and anything we planned to do that we wish to succeed needs to be cognizant of that.

We can not rewrite this entire process to further some specific goals that people among us happens to have.

Man: Can we comment?

Ram Mohan: Go ahead (unintelligible).

Man: Well, I would have thought that if I could understand the position that - and the elaboration of what appropriate bodies mean, I would have

thought that the language community or committee - community would probably be represented to a large extent by GAC members, you know.

And I imagine that because it's a recognition of the fact that individuals GAC representative might be involve in more than one language at the same time one language may involve subset of GAC members and that they need to sit down in the committee to discuss how the rollout for that particular language is to be undertaken.

So, I think it's - I tend to read that it supports the GAC consultation process rather than create something else. Just a comment.

(Alex): Excuse me, may (Alex) say a word?

Ram Mohan: Sure, (Alex). I had Edmon in the queue before you and then we'll go to you.

(Alex): Okay.

Ram Mohan: Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I wanted to talk a little bit about the general agreement part. I'm - the new suggestion, it seems very specific in for example in terms of one language per committee and it does anticipate creation of its committee so I'm not sure that's the - I completely agree yet and the other part is in terms of the requiring sort of this type of committee, are we contemplating that any application coming in would go through or are we contemplating that applications that have issues for example during public comment or there are contentions or some kind of that

issues turn up and then we do the consultation or that, you know, or it's being consulted every single time there is IDN gTLD applications?

Ram Mohan: The way it is -- to answer your second question first -- the way that's crafted right now, the second agreement say's agreement that is a suitable process is needed when considering new IDN gTLD string so that's because presupposes every IDN gTLD string not just those that generate controversy.

Edmon Chung: Okay, in that case, you know, I'll be worried about the creation of as there was a comment about creation of these committees "on fly" when gTLD string comes in...

Ram Mohan: But let me do this, on the weekly I have uploaded this agreement what I'm -- where I'm -I'd like to drive us to is to stay with the agreement as they were originally written and to add on a brand new area which now say's in reference to the development of a suitable process for consultation and then identification of appropriate body support for developing a suitably convened language committees for gTLD selection award in that particular language fairly representing the geographic distribution of the community worldwide. That's separate and is not part of the agreement.

(Alex): Excuse me?

Ram Mohan: (Alex).

(Alex): Yes. We raised - there are some issues, that's a good example, then someone was addressing kind of Russian government. In the same time we were begging to put us in business constituency and now

we're here but - and the end of work. So if we're talking about language community, so that's us, right, so that's - actually that's the very principle to be put it only.

Thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Is there any real objection to what I'm suggesting to just move - move forward?

We have two areas where we actually have pretty strong agreement, it seems like, and the - most of the comments in the last 15 minutes have been about, you know, the modalities of this committee, et cetera, and I think, you know, clearly there is not agreement on this, there is some support for it but not agreement, so I'd like to move that into the support category.

Werner Straub: This is Werner, I have a comment.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead, Werner.

Werner Straub: Yes. What worries me about the way this is put right now is that each IDN string would actually have to go through the possibly exorbitant cost of developing, you know, convening a language committee, when there will be absolutely no justification to do so which could mean that launching an IDN TLD would be prohibitively expensive and risky.

So again, I think if we see the problem in the context of what Edmon said, that puts you focused on proposing a way of resolution is -

resolving issue, and when doing so, developing a convened or suitably convened committee at ICANN level would be an action of last resort because probably they will already be in specific language and suitably convened bodies that can be accurate for their opinion.

Ram Mohan: So, Edmon and Werner, would you have a suggestion to modify the second agreement if you - suggesting it, do you have some words that you can propose to the group?

(Subaya): I'd like to be on the queue to make a comment -- (Subaya).

Ram Mohan: Okay, (Subaya), I have you in the queue, but I had a question into Edmon.

Edmon Chung: I think I probably would have to - particular about putting a Wiki or putting back to the mailing list would be appropriate.

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Edmon Chung: But the main point would be that I think the wording, I think slight changes would suffice in indicating that. The general concept of acquiring a -- having a suitable process for consultation is okay, I think the addition of the -- of the later part in term of convening committees that one, you know, require additional visitation and when that actually happens and, you know, how what happens.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

(Subaya).

(Subaya): Yeah, my comment is this, to Ram had brought up.

I'd like to just say that, for instance, we conduct anywhere near launching Chinese right now, for instance, (unintelligible) languages. If it hadn't been for the lot of efforts, years of efforts of work the Chinese community put in, you know, three or four years you're well aware, I think Edmon was on the committee again, William was I believe involved at some point and he certainly was.

You know, that community together later with the Japanese and Koreans for the script spent years to work out something that was acceptable to all of them, right, in terms of, you know. And that took time and effort, what's the cost to it, it wasn't just, you know, people's time, you know, the beyond real cost.

So - but we have a very nice solution because of all of it. That's why we're able to go forward, and now a major part of the world languages, you know.

And so the - unfortunately that - if they hadn't paid for that cost for that time, the years will be spent, we wouldn't be able to go forward now, you know. So I think that they're just - that - my point is that in a sort of an exemplary case, we wouldn't be able to go forward. And it does take time and cost, you know.

And of course one is not imagining millions of dollars I think in this point of view, but I suspect, you know, some sort could cause them, you know, getting, you know, people volunteers or whatever from the community. I think that's what it may be intended here, okay?

But my point on - my main point is the reason to a point that given exemplary case just for years and we're all there to see it. Why wouldn't not require at least some small fraction of that asset in other languages.

Werner Straub: And may I response to that?

Ram Mohan: Sure, yeah.

Werner Straub: This is Werner.

I wholeheartedly agree with what you say. It is not the question of whether the committee is actually convened. The question is whether a new one has to be convened at the ICANN level, but (unintelligible) is already being done.

So imagine the situation where the Chinese and Japanese and, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Straub: ...will be told story, but right now we have to go and wait until ICANN convenes the committees. That will be, you know, that will be...

(Subaya): No, I appreciate what you're saying. What you're trying to say I think if I'm not mistaken, and correct me if I'm wrong, you're saying that basically in the cases where there already in the case like Chinese and so on, there's already something convened, something acceptable, that the community accepts, then we can move forward pretty easily. But if you have to sit around waiting for ICANN or whatever to convene

something, this could slow things down. Am I paraphrasing you correctly or...

Werner Straub: Indeed, yes.

(Subaya): Correct. Then I think my thinking given the discussion so far, I didn't think that there were any odds in your view and what, you know, the thing suggested by some of the people (unintelligible) which is that, you know, the whole idea here is that, you know, the language community should be encouraged to come up and to do what essentially what the Chinese have done or whatever in each of the languages and bring their, you know, bring their expertise whatever in a voluntary and essentially petition ICANN to say, look, we're organizing this language group, you know, and we can get some input, and, you know, we'll be able to help and assist, so that we can get our languages out.

I think if something like that were to happen, you wouldn't be upset with that, correct, Werner?

Werner Straub: Indeed. That's why I think the convening of the committee...

(Subaya): Correct. So I think now - maybe just in that what you are suggesting then perhaps it that - perhaps changing the wording of this to suggest that, you know, to say that there should be input from, I don't know, I don't know how to -- you see, I think your - perhaps, again I could be wrong, but your worry is that, you know, that ICANN may not want as an institution, not move fast enough to get a language community going (unintelligible) up to them, but really, you know, you'll be okay if there was a language community giving input.

So then the - maybe the smarter thing to do now would be to find some wording that would accommodate that in this wording. You know, it doesn't - right off the top come up to my head, but just...

Man: Ram...

Alistair Dixon: Sorry for that. Ram, could I join the queue? It's Alistair.

Ram Mohan: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: You have the floor.

Alistair Dixon: Okay, thank you.

My suggestion would be to amend this proposed wording to agreement that a suitable process of consultation including with relevance of language community is needed when considering new IDN gTLD string.

Ram Mohan: Could you repeat that please?

Alistair Dixon: So, agreement that a suitable process for consultation including with relevance of language community is needed when considering new IDN gTLD string.

Man: And I think that the original intent was to be captured. One could add the whole issue of, you know, fair representation or whatever is necessary.

Ram Mohan: Well, I think, Alistair, the other thing we're also consider is, I mean what Edmon said which is not - you do this not every time but when there is a problem that's what Edmon is suggesting.

Olof Nordling: Olof, could I join the queue please?

Ram Mohan: Go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Maybe I got well a quick fix -- I like quick fixes.

If we add, well, if we keep it as it stands and then if needed when considering its use with new IDN gTLD strings, is that what the meaning of the meeting is?

Man: Right. Well, that's not what I suppose.

((Crosstalk))

(Subaya): I could be added in the queue to make a comment regarding what Edmon suggested -- (Subaya).

Ram Mohan: Edmon, what's your suggestion?

Edmon Chung: Well, actually clarification. I think in general in terms of all IDN gTLD, there's a need to have some additional process that will complement

the current process but in the case of - and that should not require certain additional consultation of bodies or external body or committee.

But when certain - when issues arise, this is also included in the general process, when issues arise, then certain outside bodies would be consulted. I think that, you know, just to clarify the original view that I wanted to bring up.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

(Subaya)?

(Subaya): Yeah, and my comment would be I'd go along with Werner on this one, one, there's logic on the previous point, which is that if it were just up to ICANN and, you know, the whole issue is issues are only known by the language community often. It's not known by somebody who's not from that group.

So if we really, you know, so to say that only if issues arise, that kind of just goes around the whole point, the issues, you know, when we not know issues in that language community, so I think that if at some level, you know, inclusion as a standard automatic thing, inclusion of consultation, the language community is not included, you know, it's not going to get used, and they'll just get launched, like in several years ago when, you know, people now understand that what was then launched in the past, multilingually in, you know, IDN.ASCII form, you know, wasn't right in some languages and so on, you know.

And that was done because, you know, that global decision was made. Whereas if it's just when issues come up, well, then the tendency I

would believe an organization, you know, any including ICANN would be to say there are no issues and just go ahead, you know.

Ram Mohan: So, what we have right now is the following. We have a suggestion from Alistair which has the following: agreement that a suitable process -- this is on the Wiki by the way -- agreement that a suitable process for consultation including with relevant language community is needed when considering new IDN gTLD strings.

Edmon, you are still suggesting a modification to this.

Edmon Chung: Actually this is generally fine. I mean the, as I mentioned, I think the general process should include consideration of language community. I'm just saying that, you know, when additional committees are convened, that should be triggered by, you know, when certain issues arise.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Cary Carp: Can you put Cary in the queue please?

Ram Mohan: Cary, you're in the queue, you have the floor.

((Crosstalk))

Cary Karp: Yeah, I just have a general question.

I assume that ICANN who like it or not makes the decisions about what applications that are submitted to it ultimately succeed. Doesn't ICANN refer these applications to experts as they deem necessary and why

would they not refer these things requisite linguistic expertise where necessary?

Ram Mohan: Well, one would assume that they would, and you could make the point here that we are stating the obvious. But nevertheless, the IDN Working Group has brought agreement that ICANN should continue doing something that is appropriate to do.

Sophia Bekele: Ram, can I add to that?

Yoav Keren: Yeah, I would like to also add something. It's Yoav.

Ram Mohan: Okay. Sophia then Yoav.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. I think, Cary, you're right in what you were saying, why can't ICANN refer to other experts and linguistic experts they're deemed to. And I think that's true. But what we're doing as an IDN Working Group is actually to capture the linguistic side of things. And I think that's the kind of thing that was discussed when we were doing the gTLD policy. There is a lack of language expertise that ICANN had.

So what we're - you know, what this practice is really saying, let's just do a retro referral or a check with the language community.

And, you know - and I also understand the concern of Ed in terms of the bureaucracy that's created if we have to identify, you know, for every TLD, we're going to have to convene a new group to consult, I mean - but there is also we need to balance the issue of do we only go there when issues are created. That would delay the whole process

further or do we consult with the language community before any issues occur.

So I mean, that is operationalization of the language group and I think ICANN could be further advised on when to invoke that or not, you know. But from the perspective of writing this recommendation, I think, Alistair had a good, you know, a good recommendation on how to write it with probably one or two words added to it...

Ram Mohan: Sophia?

Sophia Bekele: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: Yoav.

Yoav Keren: Yeah. I just wanted to add that to my view, our language committee or of course a language community is a wider than linguistic experts. A linguistic expert can be someone that is very specific and knowledgeable to language but in a language committee, I would expect - as I said, people from GAC, people from other relevant bodies that represent other issues that are relevant to the language sometimes it could be political issues.

Can I - Cary, you will know what I'm talking about. Do you remember the Bahamas case that we had in the IDN-PAC which was raised and just think about a case that this TLD would really been supposed, requested in, you know. So this is what I mean.

So it's not only on linguistic issue but people in that committee discover all kinds of the things that are relevant to the language.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

Tina.

Tina Dam: Thanks, Ram. So, just some clarifications.

I got a little bit - I just got a little bit confused about how you're redrafting this and just want to check and make sure that you didn't this and just want to check and make sure that you didn't remove the GAC from this because...

Ram Mohan: No, I haven't. We were merely commenting on the second agreement which says agreement that a suitable process for consultation including with relevant language community is needed when considering new IDN gTLD strings.

The first one remains as it was modified which is agreement that within the process for new gTLD consideration, the process of determining whether a string has a geopolitical impact is a challenge, and that GAC consultation may be necessary but may not provide comprehensive responses.

Tina Dam: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we keep GAC included in this because GAC is the body that ICANN would consult with for some of these issues.

Ram Mohan: It is. Thank you.

Tina Dam: Thanks.

(Subaya): Ram, may I make (unintelligible) not getting stuck on this point anon forever, may I suggest something.

Ram Mohan: Sure. Go ahead.

(Subaya): Okay. I think that you have a modified version of the original agreement using primarily (unintelligible) which says including, you know, language community.

Now, you also have a separate statement saying there's some support for more or less what originally was proposed, you know, for example, blah, blah, blah, blah. If we lead both those things, I think that's pretty much everyone's issues probably at this point be taken care of, correct?

Ram Mohan: Well, I have not heard agreement on that second point. I have only heard...

(Subaya): I meant support, I meant support, not (unintelligible).

Ram Mohan: Yes, yes. And in fact that's what I have on the Wiki. If you go to the idn.wat.ch page...

(Subaya): It seems to me with the second statement that had included somewhat, you know, and not to the language community - and not to the language community, the second thing of the agreement, the second agreement, not the GAC agreement...

Ram Mohan: Right.

(Subaya): ...but the second agreement. Has it - has added a nod to the language community.

Now separately that the support statement that is more specific about what some of these as an example could be. So it appears to me that between the two is some kind of compromise, and if you could just go with both, and to satisfy, from what I've heard pretty much, everyone's thoughts on the matter.

And just one last point, I think Yoav might be a bit polite, too polite, to bring up the issue of the hippopotamus, but I think at one point some time ago, just so everybody understands, that from what I understand the case would be, Yoav, correct me, but the hippopotamus was a, for the lab test of the DNA or whatever it was, sometime long ago, some testing of domain, not DNAMEs, but, you know, domain names altogether for some testing purposes of this test several months ago, someone came up with the word. HIPPO, hippopotamus could be the word - the string that would be tested, some random string in every language, I believe. And it turns out that the coordinate or the equivalent of (unintelligible) picked up could be in either Hebrew, Yiddish, I don't know whichever one, I'm never confused about...

Man: It was Hebrew, (Subaya).

(Subaya): But - Hebrew. But one of them that it came up, it actually in practice meant essentially a word that you may not want to talk about in this phone call, let's say it begins with ASS and then goes further. Okay?

So that's the term...

Man: Yeah, that was the meaning, yeah.

(Subaya): Okay, that was the meaning? On a daily basis for the people who speak and use this, the only people in the world who happened to be...

Ram Mohan: I think we agree with you, (Subaya)...

((Crosstalk))

(Subaya): The only point that I was trying to make was that...

Ram Mohan: The reason why we are in the, you know, what we have here. I think we have agreement. I'd like to move forward to the next point.

Man: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: I'd like to move to 4.2.5 which says agreements on the following statement. Specific to geographic and geopolitical names that have an IDN component, the working group will identify the ramifications of multiple languages and scripts, provide that along with expert commentary into the Reserve Names Working Group deferring to that group.

This is - this has been or is being done. So I would not - I would not like to open this up for questions or comments. This is merely saying that we're going to take action, which events have already transpired.

Werner Straub: And it will not just be - and we're already confused about the timelines here.

Ram Mohan: Yeah, this - you know, this was really from the minutes of the earlier meeting Werner?

Werner Straub: Uh-huh.

Ram Mohan: And so, what I'm going to do is in the final document, I'm not going to call this agreement, I'm going to - really, it doesn't going to go with the commentary that the IBM Working Group provided expert commentary into the reserve names working group.

Werner Straub: Uh-huh.

Man: Let me move to 4.3.1, aspects relating to existing gTLD strings and existing IDNS and TLDs and SLDs and those. 4.3.1 says...

(Sharam): I have a comment for - hello? I have a comment on 4.3.1.

Ram Mohan: Okay great. Go ahead please.

(Sharam): Okay, actually regarding this issue, the issue of the (unintelligible) actually we have some variance in characters widely used by clients in my home country (unintelligible) not in any other language, I have no vocation on them.

I think - actually there are many variant characters in my language and more in my neighbor countries (unintelligible) like Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Armenia, okay?

And so I think, you know, we have to add a next question in this agreement. And my suggestion is - my suggestion is to add this phrase at the end except in the rare cases of needed alternative variance of new gTLD. Okay?

Ram Mohan: Could you repeat that, (Sharam) -- except in the rare cases?

(Sharam): Except in the rare cases of needed alternative script variance of new - of that gTLD.

Ram Mohan: Okay, got it.

(Sharam): Okay? Thanks.

Ram Mohan: So, the 4.3.1, the amendments that is in front of everybody is the following, agreement to the approach of the new gTLD PDP is one string for each applications except in the rare case of needed alternative scripts variance of that gTLD.

Open this up for comments.

Avri Doria: Okay. This is Avri. I want to be in the queue but I don't necessarily want to speak to this amendment.

Ram Mohan: Okay.

Edmon Chung: On that particular - it's Edmon, this is Edmon.

Ram Mohan: Go ahead, Edmon, why don't you go first and then Avri goes after you.

Edmon Chung: I actually think it's a good idea to add that.

Ram Mohan: Okay, you Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay. Obviously, this is had not to do with that amendment. There has been the notion I had floated at conversations I had with people from various language or communities about the - at least options of getting a LDN alias. And I was going to ask you alias for an IDN name.

Now, there has been a certain amount of support for that IDN within the group certainly not agreement on it, I wouldn't want to claim that there was agreement. Now, I'm not sure this is exactly at fifth year (causing) in one sense, it's still is one string. It's just got an alias.

And so, I'm not sure how to get that but I don't see that represented somewhere else in the report unless I missed it. So, I'm bringing that up in this instance.

(Sharam): May I have a comment?

Ram Mohan: Yeah, please.

(Sharam): (Sharam).

I don't agree with alias. I think alias is something that can be an alternative meaning. But what I meant is that the (unintelligible) variance. We have some characters that they are already the same, they are all the same, we pronounce them the same, but the only difference is in the Unicode ID?

Avri Doria: Yes - no.

(Sharam): Do you understand?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I understand. This has nothing to do with the amendments for variant. This was another issue related to 4.3.1. It was not at all in response to your - to the proposed amendments for variants.

(Sharam): Okay.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof, may I ask to be in the queue?

Ram Mohan: Olof, you have the floor.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible) to Avri that I didn't captured that in the draft. And I guess, well, depending on whether there is support or agreement on it, it (unintelligible). So - but I think it's a separate point.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I agree, it's just probably separate. It's just this was the closest one to hang it to.

Ram Mohan: Fair enough. Avri, would you mind stating what you would like to see into this 4.3 and then perhaps we can, you know, we can open it up for discussions.

Avri Doria: Okay. And you want me to do that now or do you want to wait until he finished the discussion on 4.3.1 and I'll try to press the words?

Ram Mohan: Sure. I'll ask one last time on 4.3.1. The current amendment follows, is that follows agreement that the approach with the new gTLD PDP is

launching for each applications except in the rare case, needed alternative and (script) variance of that gTLD.

Okay, Avri, the floor is your now.

Avri Doria: Okay. So, I guess that - and what I'd like to see is something to the effect of agreement that it be an option in an application for an IDN and just be accompanied by a single LDN - I mean, LDH area. I'm not sure of the wordings, not a little awkward but ...

Man: But probably, I used to just seeing a single character or more...

Avri Doria: No, no, no a single LDH area's label. In other words, yeah, now, it would be long but not the A label. In other words, some other, you know, labels that that is an LDH and as it, it is a proper ASCII LDH label. Now, I'm certainly not suggesting it be a second (guide), single character.

Tina Dam: Ram, this is Tina. Can I ask for some (unintelligible) clarifying questions?

Ram Mohan: Sure please.

Tina Dam: So Avri, maybe you have an example or something because I don't necessarily noted that everybody understands or put the same meaning towards what has (unintelligible), LDH Alias is.

Avri Doria: Okay...

Tina Dam: Oh sorry...

Avri Doria: No, that's quite all right. Let me go to - okay, let me say that in (Hebrew) somebody wanted to do an IDN (unintelligible), which is a cat. And, now, of course, we can't use that (tag). So we have to find something else.

Man: (Ca tool).

Avri Doria: (Ca tool), right. And so...

Man: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...someone could - and would guess an LDH alias and that could be pussycat, it could be (unintelligible) in Hebrew. But it would be a single LDH label that associated, as an alias. So, as an alias, it would have the same entry, it would always point to the same sTLD - I mean, SLD, all the way to - it would be a proper area - I'm not saying the name because that's - and that's an implementation detail as suppose to alias, but...

Woman: Right.

Avri Doria: ...if the names worked then you might do one of those to do it.

Tina Dam: So, do you mean that by - do you mean just one alias to whatever the string is that you want?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tina Dam: And prior description of that is (tender) - does that mean that it's not a variant but it could be anything, you know, just to strings that someone thought should be associated by aliasing but not necessarily variants.

Avri Doria: Well, I think the variants is being used as a technical definition of a character variant within the same IDN if I understand correctly.

Man: That is correct.

Avri Doria: Right.

Tina Dam: Right, right.

Avri Doria: Whereas, this is an ASCII LDH string that I would think that should have the same meaning. But...

Tina Dam: Okay.

Avri Doria: But, I don't know that that I'm saying that it must have the same meaning. But I would expect it too. So if it was, you know...

Woman: Can I ask (unintelligible) questions I want to Avri maybe?

Man: Go ahead.

Woman: Okay, is this assuming that we have aliasing in place, and if so - if not, it that's not being decided by the working group yet, would it make sense to add it as a point item or an action item?

Avri Doria: Well, aliasing exist...

- Man: It seems to me that this is not about aliasing rather than - rather that it's about an alias labels.
- Avri Doria: Where aliasing exists.
- Tina Dam: Where aliasing exists.
- Avri Doria: It can be done in an IDN and Tina, please correct me I'm wrong, the name may not be the way of doing it, but aliasing exists. I do it in my own DNS entry.
- Tina Dam: Yeah, I mean, we don't have any aliasing at the top level at this point in time and in the (route tone), but, there's different technical way of providing that functionality.
- Avri Doria: Right.
- Tina Dam: If we want it at the top level, I would assume that it's - that we needed to do a test out of it to make sure that it's working the right way. And maybe compared the different ways of providing that functionality before we choose which one is providing it from a technical standpoint. But other than that, I think it's a policy decision of whether that or whether aliasing is something that is needed.
- Avri Doria: Yeah. And I mean, I just think aliasing would need to be tested at the top level. I know it uses pretty much at that the other level below top level.
- Tina Dam: Yeah, yeah. If you said second lower level.

Avri Doria: Right. I know it the third level all the time.

Man: It's (unintelligible) name right that's about the domain name system.
They just (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: You know, Avri, I know just a bit you can help whether long and probably me as well as of the others, if - what (unintelligible) the reasoning in of the purpose of introducing...

Avri Doria: Okay yeah, okay, there was basically two quick reasons that I mean, that they're in the mailing list to get into it more (unintelligible).

Man: Sorry.

Avri Doria: The first reason was that there were people that there were people that wanted their - they wanted an IDN because they wanted something with their national identity, with their language identity. What they also wanted is to be accessible by people that weren't in that language community. And so therefore, that was one reason.

The second reason was when they travel and are using non-IDN, reports borrowing my machine as it were or, you know, going to the ICANN and sitting down at the machines that are made available publicly or in Internet Café.

Man: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: And you don't have the character set from your IDN as supposed to having to list, you know, the A label, you can actually work on the ASCII.

(Subaya): Yes, so, then, when you are suggesting this, is this to - what you're thinking in terms about everything to that. So the second level itself that's supposed to just (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Is that what the (unintelligible) of course, that would be up to the registry. If you were a registry, I mean, this is just an assumption. If you were a registry that wanted this alias at the top level, then you would probably either suggest it or enforce it at lower ones but that's...

(Subaya): But if...

Avri Doria: ...the registry.

(Subaya): To me it seems like- okay, it's just as a that the technical issue rather than a policy issue. If it is that the purpose is that you want to be able to access a TLD that is an IDN TLD because the character set isn't there on the keyboard or whatever. We're talking about just at the top level. Then, you know, these string that in general, I mean, where we're going to be issuing a TLD is they're going to be short as the one, two, or three characters whatever.

So, there isn't the possibility - whereas it may not be obviously the most ideal possibility. But is there not a possibility that you can actually type the (unintelligible) string for itself...

Avri Doria: Oh, that's what I'm thinking. The other option is that people do start using the A labels all the way through. And certainly, that is an option. It was not one that people were totally happy with because, you know, it's as difficult as the number and being a non-logical set of characters too. But yeah, it's possible.

(Subaya): Yeah, I mean, in the sense that that this if for people, I mean, the reason you're bringing this up is because in case that you wanted to be able to - because you're really stock and you wanted to be able to access it, you know, and asking that in a sense. And the issue I'm talking about the second level, the second level, which generally a little bit longer anyway, and that's really not an issue here because that's really up to the registry of going forward whether you want the third and the fourth label that's just, you know, is different.

But, at the level of the top level that we're talking about, my point is that already exist the way as long as it's strings are short enough, xm-- and type that and get that.

The second point I wanted to make is, I mean, there's it's one like there's no other way, there is a way. And secondly, it may not be elegant. But the second thing I wanted to point is that if that is indeed the need, then practice people have probably going to do this anyway in the next five or ten year roll out. And finally, I'm not going to be, you know, people already have a Web site that's dial - whatever, you got a multilingual label, and a multilingual domain name, blah blah dot blah blah.

While then, if you - a lot of this - you already have, nobody's going to give up their ASCII domain, I mean, if that were through then, you

know, maybe we should all not be buying (Rayocine) stock anymore. We all believe that, you know, .com is going to continue to grow and ASCII labels are going to continue to grow. So the possibility exist that based on individual user wants to, you know, have a domain name for the Web site, well, you'll get the blah, blah, blah in addition to and ASCII string that they already have. And that's for the same IP address, so if they were traveling, that's what you'd use.

I mean, it seems to me, then this is - obviously, somebody who does know of some English right?

Avri Doria: Right, yeah, that...

(Subaya): You know, I mean that...

Man: It was like between what you are saying Avri and what you are saying (Subaya) perhaps the, you know, the suggestion from Avri that's - that be called agreement perhaps should go to support.

Avri Doria: Right.

(Subaya): I don't know, I'm just...

Avri Doria: And I would just say, it's just an option, it's not a requirement.

(Subaya): Right, you know, I understand yes.

Man: Okay, thank you.

Man: And may I have a comment please?

Man: (Aram) go ahead.

Man: You know...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Pardon?

Man: It's not that (unintelligible) I know an example. We have a character set in Persian that is very, very similar to the Arabic. So, and what happened is - and your (unintelligible) and then he wants to type the Persian TLD, but he does not have this character set, what has that - what that happens? (Unintelligible)?

Man: This is what I'm...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sure, go ahead...

Man: I think the overwhelming has the criterion that we should use as what the (unintelligible) is going be email to the list of documents, if our approach really works, it's going to be decided by the user. And we should not put unreasonable problems that can be avoided in front of them. So what - we just then - and how did it question regarding Persian and Arabic just probably in the same levels as what Avri pointed out with respect to an NLDH alias.

So we should keep the path open for registries who did actually do their homework and sort out what they need for the specific community to request aliases we need for script aliases or (unintelligible) convenience that actually are useful for the community that they want to serve.

We should not overly restrict it, we just let - ease the burden of proof on the applicants.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

What I'm going to do on this topic now, is I'm going to, Avri, take a suggestion and move that into what I'm calling support at this point.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: Publish it - the document that will get updated here and then we'll get back to this in our next conversations.

Avri Doria: It works for me thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

I realized that we are now at the two-hour mark and that was our designated time for this call. And we have made a little bit of progress but - and last, I must confess to you that we've made less progress or at least our - we have had velocity so there has been some direction here. But we have not achieved the end goal. What I might end up doing here is to ask for an extraordinary - extra meeting to be held between here next Tuesday's meeting so that we can actually have

sometime to go to agreements and go to the areas of - because we have some - left some amount of time left to be, and to some amount of topics left to be discussed.

I would like to suggest that we go to the early hour on Friday and what I would like to do is release, should have discussing the calendar here, I'll ask Glen to propose a time and if there are, you know, if there's a huge number of people who cannot make it, then, you know, we'll consider an alternative at - it seems to me that we need to press forward because that's been a very good set of discussions today and I'm quite pleased that they've already gotten a move forward on one, two, three, four areas of four topics where we say we've got agreement. And I look forward to going further in the next call.

(Yuar): Ram, may I just make a comment, this is (Yuar) you have, I think on the last point when you said your support on Avri's point, and maybe we can start from there on the next call if we don't have time right now, because from my position I just thought about it a little more. And I think that the - what (Sharam) brought up was not really understood by everyone and I think that there's some more issues there that we need to think about. And then - so, if you don't want to go through it right now, and maybe we should start from it the next call.

Man: I'm happy to do that (Yuar) thank you.

Man: Okay, thanks.

Ram Mohan: Folks, thank you for your time, I appreciate your thoughtfulness and being on the call. I look forward to seeing you on the next call, which will be later this week. Out of time to be announced, please watch your

emails and also watch for the document that it is modified to come your way.

Thanks very much.

Woman: Thank you all.

Man: Thank you. All right, thank you.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Glen Desaintgery: Thanks, (Robin).

END