

**GNSO IDNccTlds group teleconference
8 August 2007 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO IDNccTlds group teleconference on 8 August 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

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

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/idn-ad-hoc-08aug07.mp3>

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency group co-ordinator

Yoav Keren - Registrar c.

Tin Tan Wee - NCUC

Bilal Beiram - CBUC

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Absent apologies

Mark McFadden - ISPCP

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: Thank you, Sir. The call is now being recorded.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you very much. Hi, welcome to each of you on the call.
We - either only three of us - four of us from the group plus Glen.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And - so we'll just make the best of that. Don't worry about that. They give us the chance to make some decisions of maybe even easier. So we'll just go ahead and proceed.

Now, I haven't spent time on conflicts of interest in this little small group mainly because I think we all have probably conflicts of interest of some sort which regard to IDNs. And as long as everybody understands that, you know, I think we can just, you know – beside what we are doing is just preparing a draft that the counsel is going to consider.

So as long as nobody objects, we won't spend time talking about that. I certainly, you know, (unintelligible) shortly has a lot of interest with regards to IDN, New gTLDs and so forth. And I think most people we wouldn't be on this group probably if we didn't have some special interest there either for our own businesses or personal reasons or whatever because of interest on IDN.

So, what we were going do is and I hope that you have the document in front of you. It will make it a little bit easier. But if you don't and you can't bring it up, that would be helpful. I sent out on Monday afternoon my time a revised version that included everyone that it's in comment except for the very last things that Sophia did. Because I – that - the

document was already – a previous version was already being work by
- worked on by...

Coordinator: Excuse me. Mr. Keren joins the call now. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Who was that?

Yoav Keren : Hello everyone this is Yoav here. Sorry for being late.

Chuck Gomes: Yoav , okay. All right. Well, Yoav this is Chuck.

Yoav Keren : Hi.

Chuck Gomes: And we have Bilal on, Glen, Olof and Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Yoav Keren : Hi everyone.

Chuck Gomes: So, we're just starting to go through the document.

Yoav Keren : Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for (unintelligible) us. And what I'm going to do is I'm going to just go through it chronologically and look at the edits there. And I'm looking at the version which was dated August 6 and the title - it didn't have everybody's name. I'll shorten it once everybody had gone through it. So and it just basically has the – all of the edits and

comments that everybody inserted except for - Sophia made some changes after I'd already given the document to Yoav and Bilal on Sunday and those are not in here.

So Sophia, is there any of those that aren't captured correctly in here that you want to add we can do it today?

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. Actually – can you hear me? I had it on mute, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I can hear you fine.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. No. Actually, I did not put any changes. What I just did was I had put everything in comment section versus within the documents...

Chuck Gomes: And you put it in the documents?

Sophia Bekele: ...as it had given instruction to with so many emails later. I lost your instruction there. So, all I did was moved my comment into integrated as part of the text.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Sophia Bekele: So it's not like I had new idea.

Chuck Gomes: No, that's what I understood and I didn't communicate it very well. But I did not - we did not use your version. So some of those may not have been incorporated into the text and we can do that today if you want.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. I saw it yesterday. Everything is okay. Everything is incorporated.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, yes.

Sophia Bekele: I don't see any place that was not incorporated. So everything has commented on has been in there.

Chuck Gomes: Very good, okay. Then I think...

Sophia Bekele: It just that (thing) we had made additional comment.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Sophia Bekele: So it takes that different version that actually it is the same. I went to it yesterday.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. The first paragraph I come to is the paragraph that starts out - it's on page one that starts out the comments are intended to provide ICANN board in the community as a whole and there is some edits made there.

Well, first of all, Mark McFadden had a comment and he has suggested adding another paragraph prior to this has not been able to provide the text there yet. So I'm still waiting for that. He's been on vacation. And then I also added – I inserted some text there. And my comment – I thought that suggestion was good. Does anybody not agree with his suggestion about adding a paragraph? Obviously, we'll have to evaluate the paragraph once we draft it. But any comments on that? Someone got an okay idea?

Bilal Beiram: You mean – this is Bilal, Chuck – you mean the comments regarding urging the ccNSO and GAC and interested party to address the policy? I support that. Yes.

Chuck Gomes No, the comment I'm talking about from Mark is he said this. I believe that we – it's comment MM1, okay?

Bilal Beiram: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: I believe that we might consider a set of general overall principles by which we form their answer. For instance some texts that urges the ccNSO-GAC and the said governments to address those policy issues that are specific to ccTLD issues.

Bilal Beiram: Mm-hm.

Chuck Gomes: In addition, there's a principle that operational and general policies are going to budget NSO's ongoing work on the introduction of New gTLDs and IDNs. I think a separate paragraph prior to the detailed comments would be helpful and I would be happy to supply some text that goes after this paragraph.

Bilal Beiram: Okay. Now...

Chuck Gomes: That's the comment. Is everybody okay with that suggestion? Anybody not okay with it?

Then what – and what I – I thought it was fine and I had asked him right after he made it which was a couple weeks ago to go ahead and

drop the paragraph. He wouldn't be able to get to it right that. And still hasn't. But I will encourage him to do that if nobody objects.

Now, the – and that's all my comment said was as I thought that was a fine idea. Now, there are some edits that are made in that paragraph. I added they're kind of in the middle of the second sentence where it says contains comments related to an interim and an overall approach to IDN ccTLD's associated with the ISO 3166-1. Two-letter codes in the context.

All I was really doing was I cut that sentence later in the paragraph and moved it up in the paragraph. Any problems with that? Can I accept that change?

Okay. No objections. I'm going to accept that and I'll accept the deletion of that same sentence down below. So, that's taken cared of.

All right, then in section A, interim and overall approach to IDN ccTLDs. Again, we have a comment from Mark on that's inserted there. And I'm scrolling down to the comment here. Why is it going so far? It's because there's so many insertions there.

Okay. Well, I'm not sure what's going on there. Let me do this.

Olof Nordling: I can read it out for you. I've got it in front of me.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Go ahead and read it out for me because I – oh actually I found it. This is excellent and I think I – we should lead with this rather than have it at the end of the response.

Okay. That's right. So, all I did here, I previously had – what is now section A at the end of the document and Mark thought we should lead with this section.

Is anybody opposed to that? That's okay? All right. So, I can probably delete that comment. And would – so the orders okay the way it is. Oh, we'll accept the insertion there. And then I'm trying to get rid of that comment and it's not going to let me, I guess. I don't know why. I guess it's probably related to the PC problem.

Tan Tin Wee: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Tan Tin Wee: Tin Wee here. You are referring to the draft six that was - have been circulated?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Tan Tin Wee: Okay. I'm trying to follow your edits along the way.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. I appreciate that. And we're on right at what is now section A. And the comment by Mark McFadden that the – that section A used to be section B and I just moved it in front based on his suggestion. No – are you okay with that?

Tan Tin Wee: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And any – well, I have to reject that comment later I guess. All right. Okay there we go, got rid of it. All right, so that's done then. Now,

then we go down to item two, underneath that first paragraph in Section A. And there were some changes made there. And Yoav you had made a change there.

And so item two now reads the GNSO should be primarily responsible for the introduction of IDN gTLDs under the New gDTL policy. And for developing any another native policies and procedures and include – and including coordination with other ICANN supporting organizations and advisor committees as well as with any relevant language communities external to ICANN. A couple minor edits that I made there.

Any problems with those changes? Look like we may be didn't need an end there, gTDLs under new gTLD policy and for developing any other needed policy and procedures including. I think that and before including should deleted.

So I'll do that. Did I miss that one when I did my read? Any problem with those changes that I think they're fairly minor?

Olof Nordling: Chuck, I've got – not a problem with those but slight problem with the logic here to take Indents Two and Indents Three. But in the context it's, clear what we mean when we talk about primarily responsible for the introduction of and so on.

But if you take it out of context, well, it seems like GNSO could be – become operational and take care of the introduction. You see what I mean?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, how would you suggest changing that?

Olof Nordling: I would suggest that we delete the introduction of the IDN gTLD. But rather to refer to for policy for IDN gTLD sent for developing any other needed policies and procedures and so on.

And I think I would rather say something similar for three just in order to avoid any misunderstanding. We know what we mean but this – if it's kept and paste to somewhere else it's made look a bit awkward.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So okay. I don't think I totally followed what I – you're okay with two the way it's changed but you think it should be – where they should be change on three as well?

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Well, on two I think we should – what a balance a little about responsible for the introduction of IDN gTLDs.

Chuck Gomes: Oh.

Olof Nordling: If you take that letter by the letter it means that GNSO becomes operational and takes care...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I see. So you – so, shall we say the GNSO should be primarily responsible for the development of policy for?

Olof Nordling: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: For the development of policy relating to the introduction of IDN gTLDs.

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So then we would probably take out what Yoav had suggested there.

Olof Nordling: Mm-hm, possibly becomes a little...

Yoav Keren : What?

Olof Nordling: ...of the psychological.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, because it's kind of covered already. So...

Yoav Keren : Why do we want to take out from here?

Chuck Gomes: Where it says under the new gTLD policy after developing any – now, may be or to some...

Yoav Keren : But it's important that you said the New gTLD policy because the notion here was that this is the, you know, framework now that it should be, you know, everything should be develop. That was my idea, so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let's see if we can figure out how to fix this in, okay? I – so Olof is saying that it should say that GNSO should be primarily responsible for the development of policy relating to the introduction of IDN gTLDs.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, may be we could simplify it up because I fully understand and agree with what Yoav is saying. And it's just what I've – it stops me a little if the introduction of IDN gTLD.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it's not the GNSO that...

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...these things then. Yeah, okay. So we have a suggestion there, Olof?

Yoav Keren : Maybe - should be – should...

Olof Nordling: Maybe like this, should be primarily responsible for IDN gTLD policies under the new gTLD...

Yoav Keren : Yeah, right. Good.

Chuck Gomes: IDN gTLD...

Olof Nordling: Policies.

Chuck Gomes: ...policies.

Yoav Keren : Yeah, under the – yeah.

Olof Nordling: Because I mean the overall framework is the New gTLD policies.

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Olof Nordling: Is that a correct?

Chuck Gomes: So what came after gTLD policies?

Olof Nordling: Then it rounds us before so we just delete the introduction of and add policies of the IDN gTLDs. The only two changes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olof Nordling: But the GNSO should be primarily responsible for IDN gTLD policies under the New gTLD policy may go out along.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So it's under, okay. That's where I missed up, okay. So the GNSO should be primarily responsible for IDN gTLD policies. Well, we don't need under the New gTLD policy then.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, we do. Because it – that is the overall framework. And we should be able to agree on. That's fine also for IDNs.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So would read the GNSO should be primarily responsible for IDN gTLD policies under the New gTLD policy...

Olof Nordling: Mm-hm.

Chuck Gomes: ...and for developing any other native policies and procedures including coordination with other ICANN supporting organizations, et cetera. Is that right?

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I guess I'm struggling a little bit with that under. But what does that mean under the new gTLD policy?

Yoav Keren : I think that...

Olof Nordling: Under New gTLD policy.

Chuck Gomes: Under the New gTLD...

Olof Nordling: Because you could say under the New gTLD policy framework if you want them...

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Olof Nordling: ...and a little less awkward perhaps.

Chuck Gomes: Under what? Say that again.

Olof Nordling: Under the New gTLD policy framework.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. That works better for me. That's where I was struggling, okay. Is that work Yoav , is that okay?

Yoav Keren : Yeah, it's okay. It's exactly what I meant.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I'm going to leave those changes highlighted because there will be changes that people aren't on the call wouldn't have seen and we'll finish those up later, okay? Okay, anything else on two?

Now on three, the reason I highlighted in yellow there it's because I was having a software problems in adding comments. So I added...

Man: You too? Me too.

Chuck Gomes: So...

Glen de Saint Gery: Chuck, excuse me. Tin Wee had just joined.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. He was on a little bit ago so.

Sophia Bekele: That's right.

Chuck Gomes: So, okay. So, okay. So now and I – if I'm correct here, I think that Yoav I don't know – excuse me Bilal, that was your edition, right as well with any relevant language committees external to ICANN. Is that correct?

Bilal Beiram: Yes, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any problems with that addition as that I highlighted in yellow? And then Olof you had I think suggested you may want to change three to be consistent with what we did in two.

Olof Nordling: In deed, yes, in order for it to be able to stand alone and not be misunderstood. So for IDN ccTLD policies, well, the ccNSO should pre- be primarily responsible for IDN ccTLD policies including development and so on and so forth.

So to delete for the introduction, that's so – that's not misunderstood that they should sit there and best applications.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let's see if I capture this. Okay, so the ccNSO well should be primarily responsible for IDN ccTLD polices...

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...including development of any needed policies and procedures and including coordination with other ICANN (unintelligible) organization (unintelligible) as well as any relevant language committees external to ICANN. Is that okay then, that sentence?

Olof Nordling: That for me, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody else. Okay.

Yoav Keren : I'm okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, very, very good. Going on then to item four and I'm – unless somebody tells me to stop and cover something that wasn't – there were no edits or comments for, I'm going to skip ahead to the next edits and comments. And in this case, it goes to item four.

And again Bilal I think it was your addition here so that's why I highlighted here in yellow because I couldn't get comments to work. And - so the - you added the et cetera and then the close at the end for an IDN ccTLD should be similar to those for an IDN gTLD to ensure that there is no unfair advantage.

Yoav Keren : Right, correct.

Chuck Gomes: Any problems with that edition?

Tan Tin Wee: So that – was that added by Bilal? This yellow thing as autumn up...

Bilal Beiram: Yeah. What happened there Tin Wee as I said, I – when I got his - both (unintelligible) and Yoav worked on changes the same day on Sunday.

Tan Tin Wee: Oh, right.

Chuck Gomes: And so, I took Yoav changes and save them in a new document. And then I added Bilal's into that version. But I couldn't get the comment function to work after – by the way trying for a couple of hours. So I finally use another tactic and added them right into the text and highlighted it so that they would stand out. That's all of it. That's why it's done that way.

Tan Tin Wee: Yeah. Better off than I was. I just simply couldn't get this to work at all (unintelligible) up.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'm not sure what happen to the comment function and I don't know if was – it's related to the problems I'm having. It sounds like other people were having their problems. So there maybe something going on with my laptop that I'm going to have to have fixed. That's why I'm not connected right now, so.

Okay. So, that's okay? And – all righty. So, okay. So, we'll - and except that insertion, and except that insertion. And accept that. Okay. So that number – oh okay. On number five, I just - there was some changes made in number five.

Wait a second. What did I do? Did I skip over to number four? Let me - sorry about this. I apparently – now, did we just cover number five? We didn't, did we?

Olof Nordling: I think we did.

Chuck Gomes: Oh we did, okay. So I'm sorry. I'm showing that's it's early in the morning, huh. I don't know why I got lost in myself. Okay. So, now we're on to the next paragraph where it's says the GNSO Council is aware of a proposal for introduction of IDN, ccTLDs presented by the Asia Pacific Top Level Domain Association, et cetera. And then a closing paragraph were inserted by me. Any problems with those?

Olof Nordling: On the closing paragraph, well, I'll be into the next. The GNSO is committed to working with the ccNSO?

Chuck Gomes: Let's take the first paragraph first. Is that okay? Any problems with that?

Olof Nordling: No.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. What about the closing paragraph? The GNSO is committed to working with the ccNSO cover possible and so on.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. I just - at the very end, but we will not support any preference. I think that could perhaps be expressed that preferential treatment or something. Because...

Chuck Gomes: That was the...

Olof Nordling: Perhaps it's very, very wide and it could be the use of preference and whatever. So just precision by little?

Chuck Gomes: So, preferential treatment instead of preference?

Olof Nordling: Yeah. I think that's more to the point.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody have a concern about that? All right, very good. Going on then, the next change was that the ordering of A and B – sections A and B. So...

Tan Tin Wee: You know, next time could we put some of these texture stuffs on G-mail or I'm sorry, Google document or something that we could – do you make the amendments as we go along?

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you mean like using a live thing right now. That would be very good. Glen, is that...

Glen de Saint Gery: Chuck, I'm looking into that very seriously. I have got – ICANN onto looking into that for us.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, very good. All right, yeah. That's a good idea, Tin We. And if we can do it we could use. So that's really good idea if it can be done functionally. So I fully support that.

Olof Nordling: If we – this is Olof. I think we haven't tried and, you know, and if a New gTLD commit a meeting to you to (Shincoro) which – well, provide some of those functions. But we abandoned it at the very end.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I – personally, I didn't find (Shincoro) all that good. But that's my own dealing. But yeah, you're right. We did try that. Okay, going down then to - at the end of page two there, paragraph A. Should this relationship be maintained? And there several changes in that section

there, the GNSO responses. This appears to be a question that should be primarily answered by the ccNSO, the GAC and those governments that currently are involved in the ASCII ccTLD.

And then it goes on. A consideration that seems important to keep in mind is that the user experience as one of the fundamental motivations for deployment of IDNs. That was I think suggestion by Mark McFadden there that I added in. And again what happened on Mark's, in several cases he made some suggestions, but didn't change the text. And so I attempted to accommodate his suggestion by adding some text.

And that's why you'll see that there – so, you can see that I added some text there and then it goes on and we had – Sophia had a comment there to add a section there. And I think that's what then Tin We try to add in the following paragraph. Okay?

Now there's a part of that I'd like us to discuss a little bit more. But let's look at the first paragraph first. Are there any problems with any of the changes in that first paragraph - the GNSO response? And if anybody wants me to read it, just tell me.

Okay. So I can accept those changes? So we can delete the comment and there's some - I just need to accept all of these changes. Some of them are on pieces so that it's - I'll do it one at a time. Okay. And then delete that comment. And with that, all right. You can't see this? I really like that idea Tin We.

Tan Tin Wee: Oh is it super?

Chuck Gomes: If there's some way of doing that.

Yoav Keren : This is Yoav . Trying now, maybe I could do something about it.

Chuck Gomes: If you can find some tool or something and pass it on to Glen and me and Olof that would be great. The – yeah.

Yoav Keren : There's something called Webex...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Yoav Keren : A company called Webex. I think they have something like that. I'm not sure. But I think it is something.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Sophia Bekele: So actually, it's just expensive or something, I think?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. We (variously) in use of Webex. So - yeah. I'm familiar at that. Now I've never seen it used so with – I'm trying to think with a live document editing. I supposed that could be done now just so you have dealings with, yeah. That would be good.

Okay, yeah. So I'm aware of that. Yeah, probably is quite expensive. But I know that ICANN Staff is looking into tools to help the falls of development process and this is certainly one that would be very helpful.

Now, let's go to Sophia's comment. And my first question for Sophia is the paragraph that Tin Wee added after that. Did that accomplish what you we're suggesting in your comment?

Sophia Bekele: I think so, with the exception of the bottom. I'm trying to understand the way it's written but...

Chuck Gomes: We're going to look at that wording. Because I have some – I thought that was something we want to discuss further as well. So, I'm going to delete your comment there. But then let's look at that paragraph. And we'll take it piece at a time. It starts off – it is also noted that a significant number of territory based ASCII ccTLDs are not operated as a territory based ccTLDs.

I suppose we should say as territory based ccTLDs to be most grammatically correct there.

Tan Tin Wee: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's just minor. And then it says some of these are not even operated by the government's concerns. I flag that sentence and I know what's being said there. The – but how was that relevant here? I mean like for example let's just be real specific. The – let's take one that verifies and operates. We operate...

Tan Tin Wee: Mm-hm.

Chuck Gomes: ...Tuvalu.tv.

Tan Tin Wee: Mm-hm.

Chuck Gomes: But it's under an agreement for the – with the Tuvalun government. They have a set, you know, a say in that. They – I guess that would be – would that be considered Tin Wee...

Tan Tin Wee: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: ...as being operated by the government?

Tan Tin Wee: Well...

Chuck Gomes: I mean, they're not doing the backend but they – it's under an agreement with them. They (can) there a party to the agreement. Is that what you mean there? Is that what you're talking about or is it something different?

Yoav Keren : Well, I'm talking about those countries that have sort of (C-Bit's) full control of the systems who – the DNF system to a contractor. In other words like as if ICANN dates of records are in the (room) server (controlling), have server (controlling) act directly on behalf of the community and ICANN who distribute the record and so.

And so, in a sense ICANN still in full control of the context.

Chuck Gomes: Well...

Yoav Keren : So, the thing...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah...

Yoav Keren : So the thing that...

Chuck Gomes: ICANN has always – I mean, IANA always has control of what goes in the root. But even in the situations you're describing, it seems like – I mean, there's lots of ccTLDs that don't operate their own backend to provide their services. So, I don't think...

Yoav Keren : Yeah. But the...

Chuck Gomes: ...that would do anything about it.

Yoav Keren : ...Chuck, this is Yoav . There – the few ccTLDs – I'm not sure whether the one the .tv actually comes on this one. It's not operated by the government but you're saying that it's under some contract with the government. There's some supervision of the government.

But then in some places, you don't even have that. Our country – see (Unintelligible) for example. (The dollar Yale), it's just a nonprofit organization that got it, you know, historically from the university.

Chuck Gomes: Mm-hm.

Yoav Keren : And they managed it. And I'm not – I think that this is similar in some other countries too. If I'm not wrong also in Mexico.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Yoav Keren : It's very similar. Maybe in some other Latin America countries, it's quite similar that they have – also you may put Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico, it's

also the same. And so, it's not really – there's no government intervention.

Chuck Gomes: Right. No, no. And I'm fully aware of those. I don't think this sentence says that.

Bilal Beiram: May I go on the queue, Chuck. This is Bilal.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Bilal. Please do.

Bilal Beiram: I just want to say that I strongly support the comment by Tin Wee. Having said that, I think that for government to go in to agreement with the commercialized like .tv and .cm for another country to work on their own. But I think what we're talking about here is that governments that are not in control of their ccTLD like the example that happened a few years ago. I think it was Iraq where an entity in the United States had control of the ccTLD – the Iraqi ccTLD.

I think that's where we – we're talking about – what you had just said, yes it is a non – not for profit entity that controls the cc - or run the ccTLD. But it is under the confines of the government of Israel. And similarly with other countries.

But of those who do not control their ccTLD like that in Iraq, the situation, I'm not sure of any other situations that they should have that control.

Olof Nordling: It's Olof here. Could I be in the queue as well?

Chuck Gomes: Jump right in.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Well I think as it runs like right now, operated by the government's concern. I think almost most of European cc's are not run by the governments but they're certainly run with some kind of in agreement with the government's concern.

So, I would suggest that we change it like this. Some of these are not even operated in agreement with the governments concern. So, that should...

Bilal Beiram: Yeah, and I see – yeah, that maybe rule would be better. I think the main notion here is that some ccTLDs are actually like gTLDs. They actually compete with each other. That's I think this - what was the main...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bilal Beiram: ...intention of this paragraph, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I made that change. Some of these are not even operated in agreement with the governments concerned. Is that okay? Is everybody – anybody oppose to that?

Tan Tin Wee: No, not here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Then it goes on to say they tend to serve not just the local territory but also target a wider market competing with gTLDs while continued maintenance of the existing and historical inference of a relationship between territoriality and TLDs for such cases is a matter of ccNSO and GAC to decide.

And then it goes on to say, extending this relationship to the newly introduced IDN ccTLDs operated as a non-territorial linked commercial de facto IDN gTLD should be avoided.

Is that something that we should be – that the GNSO should be commenting on?

Bilal Beiram: Hi. I was – this is Bilal again. I was just thinking the same thing if it is within the scope of this working group and the GNSO to go into that. And/or maybe have a recommendation that that's the reasons why - to look into the reasons for the Board to maybe to start an inquiry to go into the reasons for why some of the ccTLDs are not run by the government or with agreement or support of the governments.

So, I don't know. I'm kind of debating the same question myself.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, other people have...

Yoav Keren : Chuck, this is Yoav . I want to...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, please do.

Yoav Keren : ...say something. Look, I think that yes, the GNSO should say that. And the reason is that the GNSO is responsible for policy making for gTLDs and New gTLDs. And if the ccTLD process, and I think that we – probably most of the people here will agree with me.

And if the ccTLD process will be in some way are used or maybe you can say badly used for actually taking ccTLDs and making them actual

gTLDs – IDN gTLDs. While you're running a process of new IDN gTLDs through the GNSO, I think that something none of us really want. And that's...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I didn't follow all of that, Yoav . Now...

Yoav Keren : Again...

Chuck Gomes: ...so the government – if the government – if a ccTLD is being operated by – in cooperation and agreement with – through an agreement with the government, if there's profit involved with that, that's a problem?

Yoav Keren : If what? Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: If there's profit involved, is that a problem?

Yoav Keren : Profit? No.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. And so, that's...

Yoav Keren : No, no, no. In fact that this is that, you know, that the way it is – well, I think that it will breakdown to what would be the strings actually. And if some strings will be used as gTLDs when they were – in this case they were meant to be used as, you know, ccTLDs then what did we do?

You know, I know that, you know, it's – in some cases you have like, you know, that in case of .tv or .cc or some other, that I don't know, the .cm or other like that that are actually used the right now in some way as gTLDs, I believe that if you're talking a new process getting IDN

ccTLDs, then I think that it would be the best that they will be territory based ccTLDs. And that the actual string at the end won't be meant as gTLD.

Not something - while you're running the same process for, you know, launching of gTLD.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And I think I'm in agreement with you there.

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think like for example with the .tv. I don't think that ccTLD should be translated into - in different scripts to mean television.

Yoav Keren : Yeah, exactly. This what I mean, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, yes. So I'm in agreement with you there. I don't think that this necessary says that. In fact - like for example the word "commercial" I don't think - am I correct that commercial is not the problem.

If there's some commercial aspect, if a government or a territory makes a decision to use a ccTLD like that .cc to generate some revenues so that they can, you know, there's some improvement to infrastructure and so forth on their islands and so forth.

Is anybody - is that a problem? I don't think commercial isn't the issue, is it?

Yoav Keren : I don't see it as a problem, yeah.

Sophia Bekele: Maybe we can reword it Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. You have an idea there Sophia?

Sophia Bekele: I was just thinking maybe we can say something like adverse competition to the new IDN gTLD from new IDN ccTLDs operated other than the territorial or that is the one that's affiliated to the country should be avoided as a result.

Chuck Gomes: Mm-hm.

Sophia Bekele: Something like that. Because what we are really trying to say is the new IDN gTLD should not be a competition to the new IDN ccTLDs. No, no. It's the other way around. The IDN ccTLD should not be a competition. So it's just to avoid adverse competition I think.

Yoav Keren : It should not be infect though entry into the IDN GTLD space...

Sophia Bekele: Mm-hm.

Yoav Keren : ...by virtue of the fact that, oh we are ccTLD and we get one both – we got one IDN if (APPLD) is just mistaken. And therefore, I'll tell you what? We'll invent one that has a gTLD manage and we'll farm it out to somebody for commercial purposes. And this guy now takes it as if it was a gTLD operation.

Very much like, "Oh, I'm going to choose .cm because, you know, it looks like .com. And therefore the like of..."

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Yoav Keren : We'll pick it up and ran it as a gTLD...

Chuck Gomes: Let me make a suggestion here in terms of approaching this one because I think that this one is going to be a little bit tough to sum up with the wordings. It sounds to me like we're all in pretty good agreement about what we want to accomplish here.

But coming up to the wordings is going to take a little bit of work. And it's probably better - would somebody like to take a crack at this after the meeting and send it around to the list to see if we can do this. Because I think if we try to reword this one on this call, we're going to spend a big part of it just on the call.

Sophia Bekele: I'll do that Chuck, this is Sophia.

Chuck Gomes: You'll do that Sophia? Okay. And then if everybody else, when she submits something and you don't have to do the edited version of the document. Just remake reference to where you're talking about. And so we'll keep a fairly short email string and we'll - then we can all comment on the wording and improve it based on what Sophia suggest there.

So I'm going to just write and hopefully my comment Sophia will wrap language on that. Okay, alright. So that seem to work that time as long as my comments are short, they seem to work.

Okay, all right. Is that okay with everybody? Anybody have a problem with that?

So the - we'll come back to - let me see. I guess – just don't worry about that right now. I got a comment in there from Tin Wee and I that that's what we're talking about.

All right, going on then to question D, should anything be done about ccTLDs already being used as gTLDs? And we have a paragraph there that Tin Wee added. It says for those governments who do not have control over their ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs and that being commercialized IDN gTLDs, we must then bear in mind the issue of a level playing field and unfair competition. For example in the matter of technical financial and operational criteria pride to IDN ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs operated as gTLDs. Now...

Man: Nice music.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Man: All right?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you for either shutting up the music or muting whatever the case may be. Let me just open that – up to discussion on that paragraph.

Tan Tin Wee: The reason for me writing this, maybe if I could just explain myself – is that I think criteria's a plight to gTLDs for running a global operations where everybody has resolved a very high uptime, high availability, low downtime, you know, able to take millions of hits. That's when the plight to IDN ccTLD in some remote country in the middle of the Pacific Ocean that only need to serve its community for its own language requirements seems to me a little bit more an overkill.

And the same criteria if applied to this kind of situation will infect – create un-necessary values to these a little small town ccTLD language-specific ones and prevent them from actually getting on up to speak with their own language in TLDs.

Chuck Gomes: So what you're saying, if the commercialization resulted in the needs of the local language community not being met that would be a bad result.

Tan Tin Wee: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Is that correct?

Tan Tin Wee: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I mean that makes sense but I don't think that was just – that doesn't seem to say that.

Tan Tin Wee: That's the example of the matter of technical and financial and operating criteria. Yeah. So, on the flip side, right? So how it leads to this unintended consequence is that for those governments who do not have control of their ccTLD or IDN ccTLDs end up being commercialized IDN gTLD.

Whenever we put in the rules, we have to make the necessary clarifications. At well, you know, with that operating as the gTLDs. We can't prevent them from doing it.

Well then, let's be clear that whatever rules that applies to them should not so apply to the rest of the guys.

Chuck Gomes: Whatever rules are applied to who – whom?

Tan Tin Wee: At this – sorry?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. Go head. What rules – okay. I'm losing track of who the rules are applying to?

Tan Tin Wee: Yes. So if a ccTLD is already used as a gTLD within one set of rules, these set of rules may not necessarily be applicable to those ccTLDs that are operated in a small context – in a small localized context. So, you know, we should make sure that something should be done about distinguishing between ccTLDs already being used as gTLDs versus ccTLDs already that are restricted to that country in question.

And then when IDNs are assigned to these guys, then we make that distinction so that we won't end up in the current situation when there seems to be unfair competition for those having a ccTLD being used or misused as a gTLD, like .cm.

Chuck Gomes: So, is this – and by the way people, don't hesitate. I'm not offended if you use .cc or .tv also. So - but I think .cm is a good example as well. So I'm not going to be sensitive in that regard so we can be real open in our discussions here, okay? I just want everybody to know that.

The – so is this a place then Tin Wee where we – maybe what we should be saying is what you said earlier when we're commenting in that previous discussion where the IDN ccTLD should be used. The primary purpose for an IDN ccTLD should be for the purpose of the

local language community or community that has more than one language.

Is that more what would fit here rather than what's here because it seems to me that the way this was worded, what you're doing – it almost sounds like you're going in a direction of somewhere else in the document. I think we talked about and we do it in the new TLD document as well.

This whole idea that the selection criteria's for as operational technical financial shouldn't be – they should be minimal so that there's good interoperability and no technical problems on the Internet security or stability. But they shouldn't be so high that the – that a small entity with less resources couldn't participate.

And that doesn't seem to fit in this category. I'm in agreement, total agreement with what you're saying there. I don't think that's in response to this question. Is that makes sense?

Tan Tin Wee: Yeah, you have a point there. But what I was trying to say here also include – that was just an example. Let state that you must then (realize) that you see in (unintelligible) feel because you have a situation where ccTLD is already in use as gTLD. Nothing really much we can do at this point.

So to prevent ourselves from getting in to the same kind of situation again for IDN, we should take into these things of level (unintelligible) to unfair competition and to avoid this.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. But then...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: This is asking, should anything be done about ccTLDs already being used as gTLDs? It's not really talking about the others. So, I'm trying to figure out how we – anybody else have some thoughts or suggestions on this area?

Olof Nording: It's Olof here. I think that this goes very much in connection. And perhaps it's - well, this addition is more relates that I would say to the question A and the drafting that Sophia took on herself to produce. It's very closely connected to that.

But well, if few things have been said about well, which I'm more to the point here should anything be done about ccTLDs or rather being used that ccTLDs. And that would rather be if they're being used to and not serving the local community to – to the local community satisfaction, that is something to bear in mind for example.

So, I'm also struggling a little with this and the context of it. I think it belongs together with rather - together with A's and so that this relationship be maintained.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And - so Sophia can you – in your rewrite of the text that you committed to...

Sophia Bekele: Mm-hm.

Chuck Gomes: ...you can keep these ideas in mine and incorporate that as you see fit, okay?

Sophia Bekele: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So the – now, do we want to though add something here? Because Tin Wee, I think some of the things you talked about I don't think it says in this statement that you added. I – it might be very valuable here.

And do you want to take a crack at writing something for those and – I mean, particular talking about your – the idea of IDN ccTLD being, you know, that the primary purpose is to be - all right, I can take a crack out of it too if you want me to. But I wanted to give you first shot.

Tan Tin Wee: Boy, I'm not be to let you have a crack at it, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So...

Tan Tin Wee: You must (unintelligible) and so, I.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let me give myself an action item there.

Tan Tin Wee: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And words about using IDN - be local. Okay, I wrote - I think I will do that. So the - and I'll even highlight that in yellow so that I can see that. And so what we're – I don't think we're going to have language like we have here because it doesn't really fit.

Is there agreement on that? But we are going to add something. And so, I'll add another comment that Sophia is going so we don't lose it.

Where is that? Okay. It's on – okay, there we go. Okay. Sophia, we'll consider and answer to A if I'm not to lose track of anything here. So, okay. I think there's - Tin Wee are you okay with the direction we're going on this?

Tam Tin Wee: Okay. I understand your point. And I'm happy that you consider some of those points important enough to be put somewhere else that's fine, so long it fits in.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. All right, good enough. I'm not going to make accept those changes yet. We'll leave those highlighted and then we'll move on now. And obviously Tin Wee and answer to my question you can't really fully answered until you see what we do it and I understand that. But I know you do too.

So we'll see what Sophia comes back with in, what I come back with and we'll take another look at this, okay.

Tam Tin Wee: Okay, great.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Bilal, are you still on with us or did you have to leave?

Okay, he had to leave. He took – he want us in the beginning he's going to have to leave after an hour so. And he will look at the transcript or listen to the recording on this.

Okay. Now we're down to should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful and respond - and then they cover some things that GNSO responds. We had a comment by Mark. I'm having trouble here getting a comment, there we go.

Okay. And his comment is in that first sentence. "This is the first place where I disagree with the draft. I believed that the IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful and should represent and scripts of the choice of the sovereign government's choice a meaningful representation of a territory's name in a selected script".

Let's discuss that. And Bilal by the way supported Mark's comments there. And so what do other think?

Olof Nording: This is Olof. Could I just make a very quick comment? I think...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, you may.

Olof Nording: ...which was what Bilal would have been saying because I think it's widely recognize that abbreviations like we've have two letter code and so dozens of work. They don't work in rapid script. They need country names fully spelled out or in some other fashion and short abbreviation because they don't use abbreviation very much, so.

Tan Tin Wee: And...

Olof Nordling: That's...

Tan Tin Wee: I just want to say this is the (unintelligible) to add on that – that (unintelligible) from up discussion on this issue back in the meeting at Lisbon. And it's not only in Arabic. This is a problem in many other languages and also found in Hebrew and so on. And the members who were the others that talks about the things some a few other people said that this is going to be a problem.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and then the – by the way the reserve names working group of the new TLD committee, we also recognize this issue and address it that at least indirectly in the sense that the whole idea of character – number of characters and stuff as it's starts losing meaning in some scripts and so forth. So, yeah, I know I fully understand that.

Well, is there agreement with Mark's comment then that with his suggestion that the IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful and should represent and scripts of the choice of the sovereign government's choice a meaningful representation of the territory's name in a selected script?

That sounds like it might be a good recommend – a good responds here. Did – do people agree with that? Anybody disagree? And it seems to be consistent. And I think Tin Wee with what – with some of the concerns you were raising about the local community being – needs being met. Any comments?

Tan Tin Wee: Yes, I'm trying to think here. What – okay, there are situations when - what might be meaningful to the local government or local community, may not seem meaningful to other people outside. So, for example when I was to write in the something with, was that we might want to consider a mechanism whereby the local language community or the local government or the local Internet users are (unintelligible).

Communities that have a take in that particular IDN language string and all that script in question should have some kind of formal input into the process. And we make a rule like this that it should be meaningful. We may have unintended consequences.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and that's a good point. And we're going to get to what you tried to add there in a minute. So I think that that's good. So let's - if you don't mind, let's get to that in just a few minutes. What I want to see first of all is whether - now keep in mind that Mark suggestion is that the sovereign government would be involved there and if we add to that, that the local language community should be consulted in that regard. I think we can cover your concern.

So my question then is, would it be okay to make a statement and we may have to modify a little bit like Mark says here, where he says that the IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful and should represent in scripts of the choice of the sovereign government's choice, a meaningful representation of the territory's name and the selective script. Is anybody not supportive of that assuming that we deal with Tin Wee's concern?

Okay. So we could maybe delete the sentence that's there right now and take what Mark wrote there.

Tan Tin Wee: So, which sentence are you deleting?

Chuck Gomes: Well, see the first sentence. Assuming that a government...

Tan Tin Wee: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...should have sovereign control over ccTLD, then it would seem reasonable if the government should determine any obligation associated with the ccTLD including whether the name is used meaningful or not.

And instead, they basically what Mark was saying in his note...

Tan Tin Wee: That would believe that the IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful?

Chuck Gomes: Right, right.

Tan Tin Wee: Yup, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay? So if I replace that, so here I go. Okay, so I - .tv, all right.

Okay, let me just first of all just do a cut and paste here. And I'll fix it up later. And so what I've done then, the IDN ccTLD - it now starts off.

The GNSO response says, "The IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful and should represent in scripts of the choice of the sovereign government's choice, a meaningful representation of the territory's name in the selected script."

Now we're going to get to Tin Wee's concern. Okay. So first of all, I just want to make sure that everybody's okay with that?

Olof Nordling: Could I perhaps - this is Olof? Could I let you on to...

Chuck Gomes: I...

Olof Nordling: ...Tin Wee's concern and perhaps make it just to clarify a bit, that the IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful to the local community. Because, well, whatever it looks like, me as a (Swed) probably wouldn't - it wouldn't be meaningful to me, so, just in order to have some precision there.

Chuck Gomes: So in other words, it should be meaningful to the local community, it's what you'd add?

Olof Nordling: And it should represents and so on, just insert...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olof Nordling: ...local community.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody have a problem with that? That sounds good to me. And should represent and scripts to the choices of sovereign. Okay, yeah. So now it reads the IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful to the local community and should represent in scripts to the choice of the sovereign government's choice, a meaningful representation of the territory's name in the selected script.

Okay? Now, let's deal with – and I delete Bilal's comment of support there because I don't think we need that anymore. That's again I couldn't use the comment function which is my problem. So, now we go on there and this is I think – let's see. Tin Wee, do you want to take another crack at how we deal with your concerns now that we've change that? Would it be a simple matter of just continuing what you already said or could it be restructured to better fit with the change we made?

Tan Tin Wee: I don't mind having it put somewhere else that would fit even better that here. So I thought that this – at that time when people's comments was lying around that we should put this comment here.

Chuck Gomes: Mm-hm. Honestly, let's look what you...

Tan Tin Wee: What you left.

Chuck Gomes: What you added.

Tan Tin Wee: If you want to take it somewhere else, I'm perfectly okay to that. Do you suggest...

Chuck Gomes: I added that next – let me look at that next sentence today. Looks like I added, I think in response to Mark's saying. Okay. So I could actually take out the leak that next sentence because we've just said it. So that's no longer even needed, but then – so Tin Wee added in whether the government also had or doesn't have control, input that is formal, sufficient, appropriate (unintelligible) must be taken from the local language community and local Internet users and other communities.

How about if we were to modify that slightly and say, input is strongly encourage from the local language community, local government and local Internet users and other communities.

Tan Tin Wee: Yup, fine with me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So let's say input is strongly encourage from the local which community, local government and local Internet users and other communities. Okay. Tin Wee, is that okay?

Tan Tin Wee: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now let me – okay. Make sure my formatting is okay. And I leave the red line in that. So that we can all see what was done. Okay.

Any questions on that? You'll all off course get a chance to see this. What I will do – I guess I haven't said this yet in this meeting but I will - what I will be doing today is sending out a version, an 8th August version of this think. So that all of you will be able to see it and even though you can't see it live, while I'm doing it here.

So, you'll be able to take a look at that and before next meeting, in fact, to comment on it on the list in the meantime to see if I missed anything. I need you guys to keep me honest here.

Okay, going to B. If so, how is meaningful determine and by whom? And there are bunch of changes made here. If we look at the comment by Mark McFadden, he says meaningful should mean a meaningful representation of the territory's name in the selected script. While we covered that, oh I guess we may have to cover it again. Let's see, so the way this thing words is worded now with the deletions and everything, it says the government associated with the ccTLD would seem to be responsible of determining what it's meaningful.

We would propose that it should mean a meaningful representation of the territory's name in the selected script. Is that okay, those changes, the deletions and the addition? And it covers Mark's comment, I think.

Okay. No problems with that?

Tan Tin Wee: Nope.

Chuck Gomes: So I can. Let's see now. So I'll delete this comment and then I'll accept the changes. And this by G's here, all right. Yup, that insertion. Okay, so that one is change.

Now we have how many IDN ccTLD's per script per territory? And by the way I apologize for the - how should I say it -- the tediousness of this task. But I think it's the easiest way for us to make sure that we're in agreement for what we're doing. So thanks for your patience.

All right, so the GNSO response here. And again we have a comment on that first sentence by Mark McFadden. He says, "If there are multiple scripts used in a territory, the best user experience would be to provide IDN TLDs and all of those scripts were feasible."

Are we - I'm in strong agreement with that. Is everybody else? I mean I think that again that's for the user experience that's important. Any disagreement on that?

Yoav Keren : Chuck, this is Yoav .

Chuck Gomes: Yup.

Yoav Keren : Well, it seems good. Okay, in general it seems like something that is in favor of the user experience. I will - I would like to say my own opinion. I've said it in the past. I don't think you need IDN ccTLD at all. That's my general opinion.

Chuck Gomes: Mm-hm.

Yoav Keren : Okay? If you're going to have it, so at least have it would be some - it would be done right if you're going to have it. The reason I think that because I think that if you provide IDN gTLDs in the relevance script and languages that would cover everything people would really need.

We already have over 240 ccTLDs and some of them have also second levels, so it's almost 300 I think and more than that. I think if you will now let each country do an IDN ccTLD in several languages, we're going to end up with thousands of thousands of thousands of TLDs. And some would think that that's okay. There are a lot - maybe a lot of opportunities for different people to make profit there.

I think that in one - at one point that would be not the best thing for the user experience because at the end it would be so - there would be so many that people not really know where to go, won't really be able to remember.

So, you know, it seems good but we must remember that it might cause a different problem because we have too many. We're – let's just think that we have 240 ccTLDs. And let's say we have different script, now we're going to have IDN gTLD's and different script so we might get a few dozens of IDN and gTLDs. And then we'll get for 240 ccTLDs maybe, I don't know, an average two, three. That's another added minimum.

Chuck Gomes: Mm-hm.

Yoav Keren : That's another 750 TLDs. We're going to end up with at least a thousand, then over a thousand.

Chuck Gomes: Mm-hm.

Yoav Keren : Well, you know, it's that a good thing? I don't know. People – there are people that think that it is. There are good things and bad things. I'm not saying that I'm not sure that it's so good.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let me break that down because I think there's several issues involve there. And just ask some question that we can talk about it at the group. And the first one is -- let's just use a specific example -- so you don't think that an IDN TLD for China is really needed?

Yoav Keren : Sorry? Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Instead of that .cn...

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...which is obviously and ASCII.

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So if I heard you correctly, you don't think that an IDN TLD for China is --whatever China decided it might be -- is really needed. And that's what I thought I heard. And I'm just trying to clarify. I'm not trying to put words on your mouth.

Yoav Keren : Well, not exactly. No, I'm saying that if there were Chinese gTLDs. Look, China already did what they did. So we know that it's happening. And they are already running an IDN TLD, gTLD and ccTLD.

So I think that if you have a gTLD it would – it could be enough. But if you do have a ccTLD allowing you just an endless number of

languages - or sorry -- scripts for every ccTLD, I think at point it would turn from helping, you know, of doing the good that we want. It would be too much and it would turn to the other side, it would be too many.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let's not worry about the too many yet. I'm going to get to that, okay?

Yoav Keren : Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Let's – I'd like other people to chime in terms of the usefulness of – and keep in mind we're talking about the IDN ccTLD.

Yoav Keren : Yeah. Yeah, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Yoav Keren : Well, the general thing that I've said about what I believe on ccTLD is irrelevant, okay? It's just, you know, a general comment of my personal general comment.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. All right.

Yoav Keren : If there's no evidence right here because this is - we're talking about how do you implement IDN ccTLD? And what are the effects on the gTLD? So having said that, I think that if you're already going to do IDN ccTLDs just allowing any number of languages to any number of all ccTLDs might be a problem. That's my belief.

Chuck Gomes: And you think the problem is technical or...?

Yoav Keren : No. It's - that was - just think of, you know, the different issues here. First, (grant), (grant) protection. Just thinking of normal corporate that would now need not only to register the name in a dozens or hundreds of TLDs. Now it would be thousands, okay? And the next thing is, you know, in a country so you've just to do - in which languages do you do it, you know. Do you do it in every language and then does the government would decide?

And now there are other issues, I've mentioned that in the past in the IDN working group. Just think and I'll take a very specific issue that is relevant to my country. Just think that tomorrow, the Iranians can run a Hebrew TLD. Okay? And they have a few dress people feel living in Iran. They'll say that it's a language use in the country.

And then they can run Hebrew TLD. Maybe they would use a TLD that says, I don't know, something that like Satan in Hebrew and both Satan in Hebrew. They can just decide what ever they want. And then they would just put up website that according for the destruction of Israel and throwing atomic bombs on Israel.

It's that something that we want to have?

Chuck Gomes: Well, first of all, with regard...

Yoav Keren : Well, by the way, if – this is not something imaginary, okay?

Chuck Gomes: No, I understand.

Yoav Keren : It can happen.

Chuck Gomes: But I think we've already covered one of your concerns there in the work that we just said in the previous item. And that is we said that the IDN ccTLD should be a meaningful representation of the country name, okay? And...

Yoav Keren : Who decides?

Chuck Gomes: And so...

Yoav Keren : Who decide that it's a meaningful representation, you know, that's...

Chuck Gomes: Well, obviously the (unintelligible)...

Yoav Keren : So are you saying that – so it would see – you can get the name of the country in the industry. So you say okay. So, you won't be (Satan). It would be Iran.

Chuck Gomes: Oh keep in mind ultimately...

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...that IANA is going to have to decide whether it goes into the root.

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So, yes there was agreement in the ccNSO -- and there's a policy making bodies on this -- that to the principal that it should be meaningful representation.

Yoav Keren : Okay. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I think that there could be - that that could be...

Yoav Keren : Okay. So that covers the Satan issues.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right. Now, I do understand the - that brand issues, the defensive registration issue, those are definitely issues that come up when you add new TLDs.

Yoav Keren : No. By the way, it doesn't cover the political issue that I was talking. Having a Hebrew – even if you have done Iran in Hebrew, okay? And I'm not sure this is something - let's go the opposite. Israel tomorrow does Israel impression. Would the Iranian would be happy for that? A lot of people that came from Iran, you know so...

Chuck Gomes: No. I hear you. It's a good point to bring up. And what I'd like to do know is to get some comment from other people on the call.

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: On this issue.

Yoav Keren : Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: No, it's okay. That's good. That looks like we're having the call. Anybody brave enough to speak up here?

Tan Tin Wee: So, are you saying Yoav – Tin Wee here -- that the local community, the local Iranian version community in Israel will want to have .Israel in

(unintelligible), will make people in Iran upset because it fought Israel in Persia.

Yoav Keren : Yeah. It is totally possible. And, you know, it might – Israel is just an example. It's a very clear example because everyone just knows about it. But, you know, I'm sure that there are other very good examples from different regions in the world. And that I'm sure that this would happen. If this happens it would get – people will be upset.

Tan Tin Wee: Well, they would be upset if it was the Israeli government being in full control of this Persian language .Israel, right?

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Tan Tin Wee: However, it will receive input of local government, of the local community or the local language users. And the community is aware of this problem and decides that okay the Israeli government will not be in charge of this domain. And it should be given to that community that will use it.

Yoav Keren : Okay.

Tan Tin Wee: The Persian community in Israel. So that is why I felt that we need to have that clause in there some way.

Yoav Keren : Okay, so that's maybe also a good place to add this.

Tan Tin Wee: Yeah. If the government should decide something it then has to go to that community concern and to us...

Yoav Keren : The language community.

Tan Tin Wee: Yeah, the language community.

Yoav Keren : Yeah?

Tan Tin Wee: Yes. Maybe it's a good place to add the language community, you're right.

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: That was a good point. It's a good point.

Tan Tin Wee: Yup. A good one, yeah.

Yoav Keren : So, I hope guys understand the reason why we felt - I felt somebody that it should be somehow in the documentation the local input, should come in notwithstanding the government so called sovereign right to decide on – but things should be meaningful or not.

So this becomes the check and balance against a unilateral decisions by warring government, you know, from trying to put things and make it in the front to - in other opposing government and abusing this IDN TLDs as a linguistic weapon. Okay?

Chuck Gomes: So that - so actually, then we've uncovered something here that I think is really useful.

Yoav Keren : Mm-hm.

Chuck Gomes: And that we need to somehow add language to cover. And that is (unintelligible) that in consulting language community it's not only the local language community but the primarily language community of the...

Yoav Keren : Around the world.

Chuck Gomes: ...of the script that's being used.

Yoav Keren : Yup.

Chuck Gomes: And now, who would volunteer to a draft something that we can add in here?

Yoav Keren : Tin Wee, you offered it. So maybe it's you.

Tan Tin Wee: It was you objected it.

Yoav Keren : No, I just brought up the point and you (guy) came with the solution. So, you know.

Chuck Gomes: Hold on and to say actually I don't think this is too hard to do.

Yoav Keren : No, no, it's not.

Chuck Gomes: I mean I can...

Yoav Keren : I don't mind to do it also. I don't mind to do it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Yoav you want to do it?

Yoav Keren : I don't mind, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let me just write a...

Yoav Keren : Okay. So you just want me to put it here in this section?

Chuck Gomes: Don't worry about where we're going to put it yet. I think that's got to be
- that's the less of our concern (unintelligible)...

Yoav Keren : Okay, so just draft something on the language, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Identify this question in item A and that – and come up with some
language that we can deal with that issue because what you brought
up uncovers something that I think is really helpful.

Yoav Keren : Yup.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm just going to write a little comment that says "Yoav will write
some text and submit it to the list and then we can see where to fit it.
Okay?

Yoav Keren : Okay, okay.

Chuck Gomes: In this item and/or elsewhere. Okay?

Yoav Keren : Okay. Okay, good.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So that was useful discussion.

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So, now...

Tan Tin Wee: So what I haven't discuss address was Yoav 's point that if somebody could just proliferate on the basis that, "Oh well, it's multiple scripts will exhaustedly go through every single language known on Earth and represent this on Unicode, whether we want it or not. And this grabs a law. Who knows, you know? It's a land grab thing. And anything remotely related to a meaningful representation of our country, we're going to grab that too and this links up your point about defensive registration fee.

A government now wants deceptively register every single known language for no all good reason other than defensive registration. Just in case somebody comes in and does a gTLD in a language somewhere in another part of world that I may not know of and to project myself of such a situation I'm going to do it a debate out front.

So this will cause problems with what Yoav mentioned that Iran, Coca-Cola and – "Men, I got to register all these languages with .Israel, you know." You know what I am saying?

Yoav Keren : Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, you know, and I think in fact that you just volunteered to write something Tin Wee.

Tan Tin Wee: So, the way around that problem is very simply to cut and paste whatever I wrote above it. Okay. And notwithstanding the government

right to do this, right? And create multiple official scripts in the territory, right, as they should actually receive input from the language community out there.

And in the language community – so in other words, it's not a trivial process now for that government that actually go do that for a 100 languages, because they got to go identify a 100 different – so the pain of doing this kind of defensive registration, right, lodging for IDN ccTLD would become so onerous that it will deter them from doing this kind of exhaustive thing for the sake of doing defensive registration.

Chuck Gomes: So Tin Wee, will you take a crack at writing something up on that regard because I think this is also a very good point?

Tan Tin Wee: Yeah. What I meant was to cut then paste that section that says government – whether government ultimately have so, doesn't mean are control input that is almost sufficient and appropriate constitution must be taken from the local language community, local government, local in vending users and other language community.

Chuck Gomes: Right and – but make sure you also cover the issue that of, you know, 100 different scripts for a thing and some of the problems associated with that in conjunction with what you're saying there. So if you would draft something and send it to the list, then we can work together on it.

Tan Tin Wee: Okay, I'll put an extra item list.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now, I guess I can – and we're back to the response and I hope (unintelligible). So I now run into my problem again. And my file has

hung up. So my ability to work online may have just ended until I read, pull up the file.

All right. The – which is going to make it very difficult for me to operate. Let's see we got about 20 some minutes left. Let me see what you think about the following because of my technical problem. Maybe this would be a time to break and to decide on our next meeting. What do you think about that? I know...

Tan Tin Wee: Yeah, no problem. I have no problem here?

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay, rather than waste time me rebooting the file.

Man: Yes, yes.

Man: So, when will we have the next call?

Olof Nordling: Did we loose Chuck?

Tan Tin Wee: Chuck, are you rebooting? I don't think he...

Olof Nordling: Rebooting his phone as well, perhaps.

Tan Tin Wee: Maybe he just using a sky phone, you know.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, he forgot to use it. He was so sky there.

Tan Tin Wee: Oh it's, not a laughing at it because you see I'm using a VOI cell phone.

Chuck Gomes: Can you hear me now?

Yoav Keren : Yup.

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Tan Tin Wee: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, all right. My little head phone got muted. I'm sorry about that. So I talked to Bilal before - at the beginning of the call. He's okay Monday to Thursday next week, would like it an hour earlier if he could do it. That makes it really nice for Sophia and I, it will be 5:00 in the morning for us. But I can do it and Sophia said she could do it. Is an hour earlier better for people? Is that okay with people? What's – what are your – or is that worst? Those who are on the call are going to have the - an advantage here, so.

Man: I don't mind, if for me to think.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: What's that again?

Chuck Gomes: Well, it's – hold on a second – right now, we're doing it at 1300 UTC, okay? That would be 1200 UTC. And – are there any days that are bad next week? One of the problems with Wednesdays is that the – like Sophia for example has another call a little bit later at 1500 UTC for the Domain Tasting Group. And I don't know if any of you are on the Whois Group. That's still going on too, isn't it Olof?

Glen de Saint Gery: No, no, no Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Is that one done?

Glen de Saint Gery: That one's done. It's just the domain name tasting.

Chuck Gomes: Which is on Wednesday.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So, what about – we don't want to drag this thing out too long. Let's look at – what about a meeting on Tuesday and do it one hour earlier. Is anybody not available on Tuesday, one hour earlier? Again, we can do it at the same time. Bilal wasn't been say, he couldn't make it if it's – he just would prefer an hour earlier.

Tan Tin Wee: Yup. I'm coming off a meeting at 6:00 – at two hours before your suggested time. And I think I should be done on this. I'm (longing) it as usual.

Chuck Gomes: Well, is that matter? Is it better to leave the time like we have today, Tin Wee?

Tan Tin Wee: I'm fine with one hour earlier. I just cut my (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tan Tin Wee: I'm the Chair, so I decide.

Chuck Gomes: So I will send out – Glen, you can send out a meeting request, if you would please.

Glen de Saint Gery: I'll do that Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: We'll just do it one hour earlier on Tuesday the 14th.

Glen de Saint Gery: Fourteenth, Mm-hm.

Chuck Gomes: And we'll pick up where we last off today. And then, you know, plug away as far as we can. In the meantime, if the people that volunteered to write things and then several of us that did that. Get those on the list this week so that we can have discussion on the list and so forth. Any questions or comments?

Man: Oh Chuck, can you just send the draft, you know, with all of the changes that you already did? So, you know, we can have it.

Chuck Gomes: I will be doing that today.

Man: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Hopefully, right away. I think I've saved as I gone through. So I don't think I lost anything on the problem. I just think downward. So hopefully, everything will be okay there. And we will then – so I'll get that out today.

Man: Okay, great.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Thanks everybody.

Man: Okay. Thanks very much.

Chuck Gomes: We made a good progress. We'll keep plugging away. Okay?

Man: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: All righty!

Man: Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

Olof Nordling: Bye-bye.

Glen de Saint Gery: (Okay). Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Hello.

END