

## GNSO Council Comments on IDNC WG Final Report July 30 , 2008 at 15:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council Comments on IDNC WG Final Report on July 30, 2008

Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-idn-redraft-group-20070717.mp3>

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

### **Participants at the meeting:**

Edmon Chung - Registry c group leader  
Chuck Gomes - Registry c  
Avri Doria - NomCom appointee  
Olga Cavalli - NomCom appointee  
Jon Bing - NomCom appointee

### **Staff:**

Olof Nordling  
Liz Gasster  
Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: Excuse me. The recording has just started.

(Chuck): Great. Sounds like we're ready to go. Thank you.

Woman: (Pier).

(Chuck): Did you hear, Glen, that the recording has started?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

(Chuck): Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks, (Chuck).

(Chuck): Well who's leading this meeting?

Man: Whoever spoke last I think.

Woman: I would kind of think Edmon who has been leading us all the way through if he's willing would probably be the best person to do it but...

Edmon: Sure, I can. I - I guess actually - (Avri) you can lead if that's what (unintelligible) I'm on my cell and also I drafted the document so maybe it's actually better to have somebody lead the actual discussion.

(Liz): (Avri), it's (Liz). I'm not volunteering to lead the discussion but I do have the document up and open so that I could track changes if there were, you know, changes that this group wanted to have made. So I'm certainly volunteering to be the scribe to capture any points that - or changes the group wants to make.

Edmon: So I mean...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): I just have it up in the - sorry Edmon. I don't have it up in Google Docs for public view. It's kind of hard to edit that way anyway but I'm happy to, you know, track changes here and send it out.

(Chuck): Let me ask a question, Edmon. In this doc - the latest document that was sent out, has it been updated since the final report was posted in Paris?

Edmon: Yes, actually. Much of it was rewritten since then. Some of the elements are still there actually, the main elements are still there but it has been pretty much revamped. It's now the final for it. At that time it was the draft final for it and much did change in Paris.

So I guess the first thing to ask is whether most people have read through the document.

(Chuck): I think we should assume that. Is that true of anybody?

(Olga): The problem I have is I don't have it in this computer and I don't have internet access so I don't have the document with me now.

(Chuck): So we should talk about the points we're talking about so that (Olga) can follow along.

(Olga): That's okay. I just wanted to let you know that.

(Chuck): No, I think it's helpful to know. But you've gone through it.

(Olga): Yes, but I don't have it with me now.

(Chuck): Thanks (Olga).

Edmon it seems to me - I personally like the start that starts off on a positive note. How do others feel about that?

(Avri): Hi, what do you mean it starts off on a positive note? The IDNC or our response?

(Chuck): I'm talking about our response (Avri).

(Avri): So we do think that we support the report as written. Yes, if we agree that this is a good idea then we should probably start off positive.

(Olof): As it is written right now it is pretty much like that, very positive comments, then some concerns highlighted.

Edmon: That would be the idea, is to start on a positive note. Overall I also was hoping that we stay on a positive note. Most of the concerns pointed out are things we believe could be addressed in the implementation process.

(Chuck): Now let me ask a question as a fourth possible positive note. That is to recognize, and I have side motivations on this as you will see, is to compliment them for recognizing that the process may not be able to start until the IDNA revision is completed.

My ulterior motive there is to kind of indirectly put a plug in for delaying this a little bit because we know that a prime motivation for us that IDN TLDs don't go before gTLD IDNs so what do people think about that. Should we talk about that, it's not quite as direct as the other three so it may not fit, but I'll throw that out for discussion.

Edmon: How do we want to go about this do we go point by point and then add this in or do we want to go by chunks because in general I have sort of made it into three sections.

First one being items that we think are good starters but need some attention to this first part. The second part are clear issues that we see

that need to be really addressed in the implementation and then the third part is just a few notes on some of the points that we have been making in previous discussions on the subject.

(Chuck): My preference would be chunk by chunk and then within chunks do the detail as needed.

Edmon: Okay. So I guess (Chuck) your suggestion was really for the first part. To add one more point specifically on the IDNA 2008 as somewhat of a prerequisite which the work that confirms that the intent was to the IDNA 2008 ready as a prerequisite.

(Avri): I don't know if we should be as optimistic as them and call it IDNA 2008. I think we should probably keep referring to it as IDNA bif. Maybe you have a different impression being in the room yesterday and the day before than I do listening to it but I think IDN 2009 is probably going to be a more realistic estimate.

Edmon: I was just thinking about that and also thinking about what (Chuck) said is that it definitely will work in terms of giving them a little bit more breathing room or sort of a delay to the process as we say that.

(Chuck): We can say it in a way that it applies to us and them so we're not singling them out.

(Avri): Right, but no IDN - I mean I think it's probably good if we confirm our view and either accept that they've accepted it or encourage them to accept it that there is no IDN TLBs in such time as IDNA bif is completed by the (IATF).

(Chuck): Now if (Kerry) he might disagree with this because I think he believes that it really doesn't have to be a prerequisite.

(Avri): I think that's for sure, because I talked to him about it yesterday that would not surprise me at all.

(Chuck): So if we agree as a group to put that in we can always pull it out if he convinces us otherwise later on. Because we're a drafting team that's going to put this forward further so we could deal with it that way.

(Avri): Yeah, well I mean at the moment there's a complication/wrinkle that's going to take at least two to three months for them to clear away - he found it and he pointed it out to me and they're already talking about it - something that actually would mean there could be no IDN TLVs according to the current standards.

Because the TLV as it's currently defined in host requirements which was standard three basically says there can only be letters in TLV's period. And that's the current standard so at the moment standard is that there can be no IDN TLV's period according to the standards.

(Chuck): So (Avri) do you think that's a separate issue or it could be lumped into the same one?

With regard to IDNA bif?

(Avri): I think it can be lumped in. But if anybody then tries to divide the question and say oh, no, no, no, it's possible, actually then to point out that no at the moment it's illegal, it's against the standards.

Edmon: You're talking about the, I think it's 1123.

(Avri): Yeah, it's Standard 1123 and from what I heard from (Kerry), the VNS Directorate is already going to start basically putting together an update to host requirements that says TLV's can be things other than just letters.

And so that will be an update to Requirement III, but that's not going to happen quicker than two months. I mean that's the quickest I can imagine it happening.

(Chuck): So (Avri), are you thinking then that if we add this third point on the IDNA bif prerequisite and that we would also note that this particular issue needs to be resolved first?

(Avri): It's not a bad thing to do, I don't know, what do you think Edmon?

Edmon: I don't mind adding it; I think it's good to let the ICANN community know it seems like the - probably the ICANN community isn't as aware of the issue.

(Avri): I wasn't as aware until yesterday. Until (Kerry) had pointed it out I had missed that point completely.

(Chuck): So would it be best to have someone draft Point 4 after this meeting or do we want to try and draft on the phone?

Edmon: I think I can help draft it after the call. I think it's pretty clear what we want to achieve that we acknowledge that it's a good idea to wait for

the revised standards to be ready and do we want to also bring up the issue - we want to go together on this point as well.

(Chuck): Not in the positive points because I don't think they'll receive that as a thought. That's really not - I think your first chunk really is some compliments to the report. Right?

Edmon: Each point actually adds a little bit of a you know...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Yeah I got you. I would say though because - that would fit better in the issues of significant concerns.

Edmon: Okay, that's fine. So all we want to do is to commence at the (unintelligible) taking this into consideration and also we would actually highlight the issues from the other standard the, if I remember correctly, it was RFC 11.3 and that also needs to be updated.

(Chuck): Yeah.

(Avri): Yeah and you can just probably just put it in the context of until the IDN standards are ready and this includes IDNA bif and the update too.

(Chuck): Good approach.

(Avri): And I think calling it Standard Three is actually better than RFC11 because A, they know that it's a standard and it also just by looking at Standard Three shows that it's updatable by just them updating it.



Edmon: Okay.

(Avri): And I'm pretty sure it's Standard Three, although I can confirm.

Edmon: I'll dig it up as well to confirm.

(Avri): At the moment I would offer to help but at the moment I've got no network connectivity and I don't know when I'll have it again.

(Chuck): Edmon can drop something and send it around to each of us. So it should be a quick response. If each of us will turn around a response within 24 hours or so we should be able to move it right along.

(Avri): Assuming that we get network connectivity, yes.

Edmon: So any other comments on the first two points and the very short introduction?

(Chuck): It will now contain 4 points, right?

Edmon: Yes, it's 4 points now. I guess I was asking whether there were any things about the other 3 points that were originally in the graph.

I guess for (Olga) and (Avri) who doesn't have the...

(Avri): No, actually I have the file.

Edmon: (Olga) doesn't so....

(Avri): I'm going to bring them to her shortly.

Edmon: Okay, but the first three points, the first one was the official language and (unintelligible) thinking that it is a good thing to stick to the finals.

It was a good attempt by the (unintelligible) to define it and I pointed one issue which it leaves still very much open those that are not on the UNGEGN list and how it is being built which is really quite loosely the point added the point that we should learn from the (unintelligible) discussions before the (unintelligible) discussion in the (unintelligible) process that part, I guess then the staff should take a look at when they define the implementation process.

And also in the last draft there was a reference to internationally - yeah the final report referred to some international body but without naming any one of them. I thought it would be good to name the (unintelligible) potential body to work with network point number 1.

Jon: Excuse me, (unintelligible) body to work with

(Avri): I think so.

(Chuck): Does that answer your question Jon?

Jon: It's only my skepticism for an organization (unintelligible) worked with for some time.

(Chuck): He raises an interesting point. Maybe we ought to think about that.

Jon: No there was no serious opposition.

(Avri): No, everybody is skeptical. However (UNESCO) does have the most complete list at the moment and they may be in a position obviously they would have to agree to do it and have the capability, but they're possible.

Edmon: I guess my point was - the reason for bringing up (UNESCO) is right now it's quite loose and it almost includes that internal expert which would determine, you know, and I think that's what we want to point out to the (void) that a - I guess a ccTLD would just seek some internal expert linguist advice and have that presented. And that being literally accepted at face value because the final report does not disallow that.

Okay, the second point was the request for information part that was added in (unintelligible) to say that's a good idea but also bring up the point that (unintelligible) of the R5 should be maintained as much as possible because in the work group discussions that was one of the things that remained a potential issue.

And I think the final report doesn't really say much on that point but I guess on the implementation as a staff we would like for the R5 to be implemented as transparent as possible so that people can see who is interested and (unintelligible)

(Chuck): By the way Edmon, I really like the way you integrated with the compliments on what they are recommending, some suggestions for improvement further that's well done.

Edmon: Thank you.

(Avri): If I can interrupt a second if (Olga) tells me what room she's in I could give her a USB Stick with the file on it.

(Olga): I can go and get it (Avri), where are you.

(Avri): I'm outside the hallway.

(Olga): I can go there.

Edmon: And the third point was the ongoing process just to affirm that it's fine because originally, back when the concept was perhaps to have it at one go, the outcome suggests an ongoing process.

I think its okay but I think for - in general the community would like for it to happen in some sort of round. I mean the application process could continue to be open but when it's actually allocated to be in round so that both the IP community and technical community can pay attention at the right time if there is any issue that might arise.

(Chuck): That's a good point in my opinion.

Edmon: Okay, I guess we are trying to coordinate that.

(Avri): Yes, I have passed the files over and I'm not on mute anymore, but I was listening.

Edmon: Okay, but it seems that whole first part is generally okay with the addition suggested earlier.

(Olof): Edmon, nit picking is there is a super fluid B at the very end of the (unintelligible). Sorry for that.

Edmon: Sorry.

(Olof): Well, it's got the nit picking comment at the be - to be responsive process there's a B which you can delete.

Edmon: Okay. Thank you.

(Chuck): I totally missed that one. Good catch (Olof). I guess we're to the significant concerns chunk right?

Edmon: Yes. So there I also had three points. The first two are somewhat related, well actually all three are somewhat interrelated.

(Unintelligible) that it's non-contentious only within the territory. There's no process for determining non-contentiousness and the lack of mechanisms to enforce (unintelligible) the contract item.

(Chuck): So the third one is really different than the first two?

Edmon: True.

(Chuck): And by the way they're pretty consistent with GNSO positions all along in this process.

(Olga): So where are you on number three?

(Avri): We're on - B is empty in this one but C&D on page 2.

(Olga): Page two, okay.

(Chuck): Yeah the significant concern ones (Olga) which in my document starts at the end of the first page but A, B; I have an A, B, and C with something in B. so we must be looking at.....

(Olga): Yeah I have it.

(Avri): So maybe I have the wrong version because my B is empty and my C is Lack of Process.

Edmon: Should I send it again?

(Avri): It won't do me any good. So that's okay, as long as I know that's fine.

I think I'm at the same version it just maybe it came out looking funny on the (unintelligible) so it could just be me.

Edmon: It's supposed to be A, B, C.

(Avri): I have A, C and D. So I think I have the same stuff I just ended up with a blank line for B for some reason.

(Olof): (Avri) could you retrieve the - this version was the one that (Glen) sent out before this call - three days ago - so if you can retrieve that one off-line then you would have it.

(Avri): Okay, great, but go ahead.

Edmon: I guess I'll just read the title then, since there might be some issues. The Title of A was; Definition of Non-contentious Only within the Corresponding Territory Departs from Current ccTLD Practices.

Man: I was thinking better it would help to understand that sentence if (wanted) some citations marks over some things which identified the place at the (unintelligible) and not part of the sentence.

Its additional citation marks start noncontiguous only with the corresponding territory and put citation marks stops depart from current.

Man: Okay, sure. Then I would be also - is that the intent is to use the same wording as the final report. If that's the case then I will probably take out only because I added only in it to emphasis.

(Chuck): Yeah and the only - seems fairly important to me. That's really what they did and that was the concern we had. I think you're suggesting and we all agree that contentiousness should be evaluated outside of the territory as well where applicable.

Man: Right.

Man: And that's, Jon, originally I was going to use quotes that I (unintelligible) edited in the only part.

Jon: Perhaps we could use italics or something like that which wouldn't imply that is (unintelligible).

(Chuck): That would be good.

Man: Okay. And basically Point A goes on to argue that currently ccTLDs, I mean countries don't get to choose their own streams and it's an international collaborative effort and the methodology departs from that current ccTLD practice.

(Chuck): Now, I understand the point really well but what's the alternative.

Man: I didn't suggest one.

(Chuck): No, I know that. Sorry I'm just helping us - I want us to think through this carefully. We're raising the point so what's our point.

Man: I guess the point is that we shouldn't be afraid of it being a process that it's not only within the territory because that is what is happening today. And there has been a lot of push back for that because of the sovereignty issue and that is simply not true is, I think, the main point. And as long as we're not afraid that that has to be the case, that is the point itself in my point of view.

(Chuck): Okay, I'm with you. So I guess what I'm thinking is if you look at your very last sentence. This is a significant departure from the current ccTLD practices which is the true statement. Maybe that's where we ought to add and therefore - something like this, don't use my precise wording - it's very important that this process be handled cautiously or whatever we want. You follow me?

So we're saying yeah we recognize this is a significant departure therefore this ought to be done with great care or something.



Man: I'm fine with me.

(Chuck): And that kind of leads into things like, you know maybe there should be a dispute process and stuff like that; other things that we've said. I'm not saying say that here but does that make sense?

Man: Yeah. I'm fine with it. You want to think about it and suggest an edit to the last sentence.

(Chuck): Actually what I just said is probably sufficient.

Man: Okay.

(Avri): Could you repeat it?

(Chuck): This is a significant departure from the current ccTLD practices and therefore it is critical that the overall process be designed and implemented with caution.

(Avri): So does that imply that we're okay with the departure?

(Chuck): Well, that's kind of what I was getting at (Avri) when I asked the question what's the alternative.

(Avri): The alternative is that there's public review.

(Chuck): Well maybe that's what we should say then.

(Avri): Well, isn't that what the next bullet says? Doesn't it? Lack of process. We're saying, first of all, that we're concerned that they redefined

noncontiguous and so this first is really the point is we think you should continue use noncontiguous as it existed before this working group happened.

Then B we have, in the draft here, there is no process. And so that seems to be the recommendation for what happens if we don't accept the lack of a process for - I mean if we don't accept the new definition of noncontiguous which means only the people wanting to do it consider it noncontentious.

(Chuck): In fact, I like what you've said and it does relate to A and B. What if were to take that last sentence in A and say this is a significant departure from the current CCTLD practices and therefore we believe that ongoing public review is critical.

Woman: That sounds good.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Review is critical.

(Chuck): And B then we're going to say that that review needs to beyond just the local territory. That's good thanks, (Avri).

Edmon: Ongoing public review is critical. I'm not feeling 100 percent sure about that.

(Chuck): How would you say it Edmon?

Edmon: Because neither does the ISO (31626) - I mean the ISO (31626) is also not as much as like a public review, ongoing public review.

(Chuck): But this diverts from that and it's a totally new procedure and therefore the public review is more necessary. That's an established process.

Edmon: I understand and that's why, you know, I feel we need to add a little bit more there to make sure we're not suggesting - we're not saying that ongoing public review is the current ccTLD practice. That's not either.

If you read the sentence that might be what's being...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon: I guess I understand the point there...

(Chuck): Feel free to make it fit. I understand what you're saying and I'm comfortable with what you want to try and do.

Edmon: (Avri), you understand...

(Avri): Yeah, yeah I know what you're saying.

Edmon: I'll, I guess I'll think a little bit about it and suggest a (unintelligible) sentence as well.

(Chuck): Good.

Edmon: And in B, (unintelligible) you wanted to add something now.

(Chuck): No, no I actually was okay with B.

Edmon: So just a flow into B.

(Chuck): Yeah it does flow into B.

Edmon: So while (B) was lack of process for determining noncontentiousness exposes ICANN to challenges from the community. Basically the main thing was that the initial report of the, I guess the workers did solicit the response for objection mechanism. I don't think there were any comments against it, at least not in public.

So, but the final report completely, that part was completely left out and the argument is that without a process it would expose ICANN to challenges from everywhere potentially.

B was the lack of mechanism to enforce compliance, the whole point was to urge for having a contrast or a legal arrangement. I have stayed away from either of the wording. I think used expressed understanding in the - as the term and to point out that we should have a certain understanding to enforce the (IDNA) standards, the (unintelligible) guidelines and also the point that Jon brought up which is when fast track (unintelligible) leads me to be moved into the IDN CCPDP (unintelligible).

(Chuck): I'm fine with what you have there. Anybody else have changes?

Man: I'm fine.

(Avri): Yep.

Edmon: Okay and then the third part was really just cut and paste on, I think, some of the points that are still valid from the issues report and also not discussed any points about and there were four points that I picked out. Out of, I think, I forgot 18 or something.

(Chuck): My only question - did we talk about the lack - paragraph C, Edmon? Lack of mechanism to enforce compliance. I was okay with that but did anybody else have any thoughts on that before we got to the last one?

(Avri): So, this is the paragraph that is, sort of careful diplomatic speak for saying that have no contracts.

Edmon: Well that was the intent.

(Avri): Okay because I read it and I thought it was that but...

Edmon: Is it explicit enough, you think?

Man: I think it is explicit enough.

(Chuck): It's fine. We all know the politics associated with this one.

(Avri): Yep, no I just wanted to make sure that we all knew that and because we know there are certainly council members who will consider that a really important issue.

Edmon: I think (Tim) spoke up on that as well and (Tim) said he was going to be - he wanted to join the call or the draft team. Did he respond?

(Chuck): You know what you could do Edmon, is when you prepare, modify the draft to send to us you might either include him in the same distribution or just separately send him an email and say hey (Tim), you had expressed interest in this so I want you to see what we've done.

(Avri): Oh I was going to ask what people thought about a slightly different distribution process at the end but I can do it now. I was thinking that once we've gone through this phone call, sending it, perhaps, to each other but since today is a week before the next meeting to actually send it out to the council.

(Chuck): I'm okay with that.

(Avri): And then we can all comment on it.

(Chuck): That solves a problem that I was concerned about it and that is getting this to the council in enough time and that wouldn't, in the least, prevent us from suggesting some edits between now and the council meeting...

(Avri): Great, we could just do a pot luck on the council list.

(Chuck): Exactly.

(Avri): And get everybody into it. So that's what I was going to suggest to be considered but I wasn't going to bring it up until the end so it matches what you were kind of saying.

Man: I'm comfortable with that.

(Chuck): So is Edmon going to send to us and (Avri) you're going to send it - no you may have connectivity problems.

(Avri): I can't be relied on to send it. I would suggest that Edmon send it to the list.

(Chuck): To the council list?

(Avri): And to anyone on this call who doesn't happen to be on the list but yeah I think everybody on this call is on the council. So...

(Chuck): Sounds good.

Edmon: I'll make those edits and I will send to this group first. It actually includes (Tim), I believe. I originally also included (Tim). I'll send to this group first and I guess I'll wait for about tomorrow morning and send to the council list. Does that work?

(Chuck): Okay with me.

(Avri): But tomorrow morning their time is still - it's still Thursday (unintelligible). Yeah it's probably good enough. It won't be quite a week before the meeting but it's close.

(Chuck): Yeah, that's good.

Edmon: Okay.

(Chuck): And then Edmon you'll go ahead then tomorrow morning and send it out to the council list.

Edmon: Okay.

(Chuck): And you can note the small drafting group may still have some comments but they'll provide that then as soon as possible before the meeting.

Edmon: Okay.

(Chuck): Now in your last chunk, the only thought I have is should we be more direct about the fact that neither - it is still our firm belief that neither IDN, well maybe the second bullet covers it.

(Avri): Yeah.

(Chuck): Yeah, I think it covers it okay. You know what I'm getting at here.

(Avri): Yeah, I know what you're getting at but we have to be careful. We've always put it in this particular language and it left an ambiguity that we weren't saying it could specifically.

(Chuck): Yeah, I'm okay with that.

(Avri): I wanted to bring up another issue and that's we received a specific request from India to back away from a previous position that's still fairly publically published. And that's our one main per script.

(Chuck): Yeah, we should clarify that language. You're right (Avri) and I saw your email on that. Yeah we should clarify that and change the



statement to the way that we said we really intended in response to the Indian rep.

(Avri): And I was thinking that we could put it here and sort of say in response to the request that we modify our language, you know, etc. and basically sort of explicitly bring out the comment that they asked us to do it. We thought about it. Yes, of course. Does that make sense?

Man: I'm okay with it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I'm not sure whether (Tim) might have any comments on that because I checked my own notes earlier when that happened and I realized that the reason in Delhi that we did not change that particular part was because of strong opposition from (Tim).

(Chuck): On the language script issue?

Man: Yeah. I had...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, in Delhi, I had suggested different language for it and you know, in order for it to go through we maybe compromised and kept it this way.

(Avri): That's true.

- Man: So, that's why I chose to not say anything but I think it's really up to us whether we feel strong in that it's so important that we need to bring it up again and clarify.
- (Avri): I think we have to bring it up in the council again even if we decide against it. So maybe it'd be good to put it in as bracketed language and sort of say, we know this needs council discussion.
- (Chuck): Yeah, I like that idea. The bracketed approach and...
- (Avri): Because they asked us to reconsider and we haven't reconsidered yet. So, you know, it gives (Tim) a chance to reconsider. If we come up with the same compromise then we leave things alone.
- (Chuck): Okay but...
- (Avri): If they ask us to reconsider we should.
- Man: Okay so the suggestion is really - in Delhi I suggested language that was more broad than what we now seem to be fine with which is just to add per language per script but that's the language at the very end of the sentence.
- (Chuck): Right.
- Man: Right. I feel that, you know, this should be fine because originally I had suggested more broader language which (Tim) was uncomfortable about.

(Avri): And they would like us to remove any mention of it and so we still would be giving them, you know, perhaps...

((Crosstalk))

Man: What is the suggestion really remove that whole thing or add some language next to it?

(Avri): We've got that document and I don't think we're going back to that document so I would recommend adding a...

(Chuck): How about a small paragraph after the four bullets because the point we're talking about it is one of the 18 or so bullets but you don't address it here. And it probably doesn't make sense to include it as a bullet because of the way it's worded. Might be better, I think, that we also included the following principle and in response to a request from India or however we want to word it. We suggest this wording and that's where we would bracketed and say council discussion's needed.

(Avri): Yeah I'd bracket the whole thing. I would put it before the finally paragraph.

(Chuck): Yeah, in between the bullets and that. That's what I was thinking to.

(Avri): Oh, okay sorry.

(Chuck): Yeah, no that's good.

((Crosstalk))

(Avri): Basically something like in response to the request made by the Indian government at the Paris meeting, you know, we modify or whatever the principles to read as follows or something like that and then bracket that whole thing.

Man: You mean just before the last paragraph?

(Avri): Just before the finally. And finally the (GNSO) would like to reiterate. I would put it before that.

(Chuck): Oh okay. I guess we are thinking of different places. I'm talking about the final report.

(Avri): Because that reiteration...

(Chuck): I personally think it goes better after we talk about the four principles but I can live with that.

(Avri): Okay and that's okay with me but then he's got to change the finally.

Man: Okay.

(Chuck): Yeah, right. I got you.

Man: I understand. I also feel it's better - I like right before the final paragraph. So I will change -

(Avri): So it's the new finally.

Man: Right.

(Avri): That's okay too. I was just looking - well that's finally, this comes before finally but yeah, okay. I have no problem.

(Chuck): And I thought the last paragraph was fine. So Edmon my compliments on a nice job and with the little refining that we've done today I think we'll have a pretty good document and something that should be easy for the council to act on with maybe some, who knows whether they want modifications. (Tim) will probably be the most interested one in that regard.

(Avri): Yep.

(Chuck): Okay.

Man: Works for me.

(Chuck): Any more questions from you Edmon?

Edmon: No, I'm fine.

(Chuck): Okay...

Edmon: There are three places right that I will be adding stuff to.

(Chuck): The number 4 in the first chunk.

Edmon: Right.

(Chuck): At the end of A in the second chunk and of course, (Olof) had suggested that minor edit up in the first chunk. Yeah but that's - and then what we just said. Is that right?

(Avri): I think so.

(Chuck): Sounds good. Hey, thanks everybody.

(Avri): You had that UNESCO thing too, right?

Edmon: What UNESCO thing?

(Chuck): It says he's got UNESCO in there.

(Avri): Oh he's got that in there. That's fine. That's - I wasn't looking at text at the moment.

((Crosstalk))

(Avri): Edmon, I'll say this over again in the meeting when we have it but I really appreciate the way you've taken this and sort of carried it through this whole long process.

(Chuck): Absolutely, great job.

Edmon: Thanks.

(Chuck): Okay everybody. I'm jumping off.

(Avri): Yeah, me too.

((Crosstalk))

END