

**Internationalized Domain Names Group - IDNG
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 02 December 2009 at 21:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the **Internationalized Domain Names Group - IDNG** meeting Wednesday 02 December 2009, at 21:00UTC 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-idng-20091202.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung - Registries Stakeholder Group - Group leader

Chuck Gomes - Registries Stakeholder Group

Cary Karp - Registries Stakeholder Group

Steve Delbianco - CBUC

Eric Brunner-Williams - CORE

Avri Doria - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)

Adam Palmer - Individual

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund

Olof Nordling

Glen de Saint G ry

Apologies:

St phane van Gelder - Registrar C.

Coordinator: Okay as a reminder today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect. You may begin.

Edmon Chung Thank you.

Glen de Saint G ry: Can I do roll call (Edmund)?

Edmon Chung Sure that would be good.

Glen de Saint G ry: Thank you. On the call we have Eric Brunner-Williams, Edmun Chung, Avri Doria, Adam Palmer), Steve DelBianco, Berry Cobb, Chuck Gomes and from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Olof Nordling, and myself, Glen de Saint G ry. Thank you (Edmund) over to you.

Edmon Chung Okay thank you. Hi everyone so I guess I'd like to start off by saying that it's good to have a more well more discussion on this topic than on the mailing list. I put out a just a few points to go over for the meeting sort of like the agenda.

Each particular point I wrote a little bit more than sort of short set but I wonder if people have had a chance to take a look at it and whether they want - anyone wants to add any item to it. I'll quickly go through it just and the reason I chose it is really trying to lead towards whether there is possibly a line of discussion that this group can take.

So there were four items one is we sort of mention it on the list as well about the time difference between IDN ccTLDs and IDN dTLDs and whether we are continue to be commended towards minimizing that time lag which has become well it seems to have become apparent that there would be.

The second one was there was quite a bit of discussion of whether - well as characterized as such you might agree but in essence whether a discussion of implementation of IDN dTLDs would affect the - like a focused discussion on IDN dTLDs would affect or not affect the time schedules of the full dTLD implementation.

Whether or not we talk about tracks or, you know, how we go about this. This was number two. The third item was we I guess both (Chuck) and I mentioned and also Eric talked about this dealing with the issue of having a

confusing similar dTLD and right now the fact does not handle that at this point.

It's just one of the areas that IDN dTLD should pay attention to and at least add or augment the deck so that it's possible. The fourth one goes back to really the question of titlization whether a follow up on number two really whether a crack or any type of titlization or focused discussion on IDN dTLD would actually help the whole process overall so.

Man: (Edmund) could you restate number two again please?

Edmon Chung Number two was - well every time we raise this issue about IDN dTLDs whether in the light of a special crack or not if we spend time to discuss this issue there has been...

Man: Right that's the claim that if we do anything we'll stop everything.

Edmon Chung Right correct.

Man: So anything is the progress of everything (unintelligible) excuse me. Okay thank you.

Edmon Chung So this was the four items that I sort of listed out. Anyone have anything to add that they think should be on the agenda? Okay well I guess, you know, we can get started and feel free to jump in I guess there isn't a lot of people at this point.

But if it gets confusing at that time we'll take a queue sort of thing. So and of course I sort of define this flow to try to get obviously some - see if there is some consensus that could be around the group so that we can drive towards a particular line of discussion.

So the first item was whether people felt that there is continued commitment. This was raised on the list earlier whether there is continued commitment towards trying to minimize the time lag that has become seemingly apparent between the introduction of IDN ccTLDs and IDN dTLDs.

I guess I can start by saying that I think there is continued commitment towards that. And we are - we're standing by the couple of resolutions that (Chuck) did point to earlier on the list from the QNSO about this issue. Anyone want to add to this topic?

Avri Doria: I want to ask a question about (unintelligible).

Man: Yes I'd like to get a few also.

Avri Doria: Can I go?

Edmon Chung Go ahead (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay the question I have when you ask of the commitment I believe that in the GNSO world for the most part there may be a commitment to that. I'm not sure what the answer to that is in ICANN in general.

And I'm wondering when you ask that you're asking both questions or you're just asking does the GNSOs still want to? I mean I haven't gone back to the non commercial stakeholder group. And I will do that at a certain point with these questions once I fully understand them.

But - so that's one question but I think the other one is just asking whether there is that commitment in general within ICANN. Or is that not really a feasible question to ask.

Edmon Chung Well I guess at least on my point from a GNSO point of view not the council but the general but the GNSOs council the issue that I think I'm bringing it up

as a, you know, a general GNSO point of view. So not necessarily ICANN overall but does anyone else have any idea on this? I don't think - (Chuck).

(Chuck): (Edmund), Eric wanted to be in the queue but please add me to the queue too.

Edmon Chung So Eric and then (Chuck).

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. In the first instance I think the issue is the council itself has made a policy statement and if the policy statement is no longer - if the council repudiates it it's good to know.

So since several of the persons who are on the council who are on the list register in particular have indicated that they are opposed to what I interpret myself naively as the continued application of that previous statement of the council.

That there be a minimum delay and that there no be advantage then it's useful to ask does the council repudiate its former position. If so then we know where we are. If it doesn't then presumably we have something to go forward on. And I'll now let (Chuck) speak.

(Chuck): Thanks. First of all I don't think anybody in - on the council or in the GNSO disagrees with a commitment to minimizing the lag. I don't think anybody really opposes that.

What people oppose is specific steps to do that that might cause delays for some new dTLDs over others. So I think first of all we need to restate the issue. I think it's a no brainer answer to the way it's worded right now.

Nobody's - I don't think anybody - I think everybody wants to minimize the lag between the two. But some people are concerned that if we take whatever steps to do that it may delay their answer being fulfilled. So I think we should

replay this and I think Avri may be at least in part be kind of getting at that point.

Edmon Chung Right and that sort of is why that number one and number two items, number one and number two in that sort of sequence and together. But I guess going back to Eric's question is do we need to go back to the council and I think generally I don't - at this point as (Chuck) mentioned I think on this specific topic without number two.

Number one seems to be quite clear and I think I get that sense except for are we asking whether this is talking about the GNSO or the ICANN community in general. I'm not sure about the ICANN community in general but at least on the GNSO side that seems to be continues to be extended which brings us to number two really.

And number one and two are really it cannot be discussed in isolation in a sense so number two is, you know, so if we talk about certain steps being taken the first step will have to be a discussion of what those steps might be. What these sequence steps might be there seems to be a concern even for taking the first step which is to form some sort of a team to discuss it.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Are those correct?

Edmon Chung Right so...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well we have at least three people on the list who said this list shouldn't exist because it might harm the - it might delay the introduction of ccTLDs generally.

Edmon Chung Right so one thing we don't - and seems to have them with today but Avri was - not quite my point exactly but...

Avri Doria: I have some more points. First of all it has nothing to do with the list existing or not. I think the list existing is not a problem. It goes back to my first question. If getting new dTLDs is as I suspect within the ICANN community at large sort of an up hill swim because there are some kinds of new gTLD that are strongly objected to.

Now there's different communities objecting to different things. Some object to the corporate, some object to anything where, you know, it's a general one as opposed to something that resembles (unintelligible). Some are objecting (unintelligible).

So there are many groups that are objecting to all kind of gTLDs coming out so I see not only the fear that could be anything out of the pack as a centerpiece slow down the rest of the pack that's sort of a natural effect of dividing up a pack.

The other part that concerns me is that if some are allowed to go through some may be stopped completely. And basically it's a divide and conquer strategy and so those are the two fears I have. I'm certainly not clairvoyant but I'll say this will (unintelligible).

It's just those are the fears that I see if I look at letting the effort be divided. It could slow down for us and it could (unintelligible). And those are the fears that I think we have in store. But having the...

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible) Steve DelBianco, if I can get in there too?

Edmon Chung That was Steve right? Did I get it right, that was Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Edmon Chung Okay anybody else want to be - Steve go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: It's just a mirror image of the comment, the concern that Avri raised I know not on her own behalf but trying to paraphrase the others who are concerned about the delay aspect. I would say to you that (unintelligible) gTLD and policy development for new Latin gTLD.

I would say that was delaying the consideration of IDN ccTLD because of the broader issues of trademark and intellectual property protection that are sort of afflicting and slowing down the Latin gTLD policy development processing. And it might well be that violates one of ICANN's new commitments under the affirmation commitment.

Number 9.1 said to ensure the interest of global internet users and the global internet users 56% of whom don't even use our alphabet can't get any gTLDs today. So one way to read this is that all of the work we're doing on the Latin gTLDs is getting in the way of the IDN gTLD. What do you guys think of that?

Avri Doria: I have a question on (unintelligible). The question I have is why would any of those issues that are blocking Latin gTLDs (unintelligible) not affect the non Latin, non LDH that we don't have (unintelligible). But why would that any of those and - don't we have the same group capacity problems? Don't we have the same (unintelligible)?

Steve DelBianco: As a theoretical matter - this is Steve. As a theoretical matter it shouldn't be any different but as a practical matter we've just watched as the fast track for IDN ccTLDs have gone to market and no intellectual property community tried to get in the way of that.

So the trademark owners as a practical matter are far more concerned with the Latin gTLD risks that they face. And they are not nearly as concerned with the IDN whether it's CT or Gs. You know, the evidence is clear. There was almost no concern from the IT trademark community for the fast track of IDN gTLDs.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'd like to add to that also if I may Steve.

Edmon Chung Please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: The reports of abuse involving the dot CAT registry are for in a period of four years for 40,000 registration. The number of reductive registrations for museum is also quite small so while in theory there should be no difference between the Latin and the IDN.

For any particular policy area in practice there's a substantial difference between registry operations between policy registries or between policies of registries. In general I support your point Steve. Thank you.

Edmon Chung I'll add a couple of things and I guess all these questions going back to Avri. I'm sorry you're sort of a spokesperson for those who are have concerns about this process. But you mentioned that different groups are objecting different things.

And I really, you know, sort of adding to discussion from Steve and Eric it doesn't seem to have been a lot of objection about IDN ccTLDs in particular and in fact sort of repeatedly heard people that as IDN ccTLDs become available IDN ccTLDs are somewhat expected to become possible.

You mentioned about same issues (unintelligible) and I think Steve made one particular point. Of course this sort of brings us to the number three and number four item on my list but there are possibilities to address this physically for IDN ccTLDs to, you know, to address those issues in a particular - in possibly different way.

But the question with this group right now is whether we - well this group and also (unintelligible) at the council I guess is whether to allow for that discussion to happen.

Avri Doria: First of all I apologize (unintelligible) for being a poor representative of that point (unintelligible) viewpoint much better. So I'm pretty much (unintelligible). I guess - okay I totally accept that we have a stronger inflexible Western property lobby in ICANN now that we have a non asking influential property lobby.

I would contend that at this point all of our (unintelligible) theoretical. I think as soon as we see (unintelligible) as soon as we see somebody other than perhaps (unintelligible) in another alphabet, in another script or something that's close to it like a (unintelligible).

We'll see (unintelligible). So theoretically I think the fact that we don't have the IPR lobby in (unintelligible) is really not that strong an argument to say (unintelligible) basis for the objection. You know, the same thing with putting IDN into the root.

You know, if (unintelligible) how is that any different? I asked that same question with (unintelligible). Maybe IDN (unintelligible) and that's fine. So I really don't see (unintelligible) I think it was interesting that when (unintelligible) one had to do with IT lobby and one had to do with there's fewer problems in a supported category than in a general category.

And that seems to bear (unintelligible) but, you know, there's different groups (unintelligible) for different things one in two basically get there. There are in the ranks quicker. Now I'm totally (unintelligible) and have been arguing for quite a while that (unintelligible) IDN need to come out to get a full competitive (unintelligible).

But I don't see that as an argument for their saying well we don't need or they can wait or, you know, (unintelligible) are so strong that maybe it's better if they don't happen at all as long as we get the IDN (unintelligible).

And that really, you know, even in this conversation that's kind of (unintelligible) and that's my concern. And that's okay I'm speaking individually here I haven't taken it to this to the MPSG yet to get their view on any of it which I will do at the right point.

(Chuck): And (Edmund) please put me in the queue.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Likewise this is Eric.

Edmon Chung Then Eric.

(Chuck): Okay first of all I'm going to back up a little bit with something Eric said I'll bring it all forward to where we're at now. Eric asked the question was whether or not the GNSO council should consider retracting the statement it made in regard to what we're talking about. And I don't think there's any need for that.

I don't think the positions changed. We said in our statement that ideally they should go together but we also said if they don't then that should be taken to mitigate any issues that are resolved from that. What was that? Okay and so I think the statement the various GNSO statements that have been made on this still stand.

I don't think there's any need to repudiate those. Now bringing us forward to what we're talking about right now the bottom line is that the one thing we can do to reduce the gap is to do everything we can to make sure that the over arching issues and the - hold on a second.

Okay that the over arching issues are solved and the registry registrar separation issue is resolved and then, you know, and everybody's for that I think. So now to the extent that we start breaking it down into certain categories going first that's whatever way we go we're going to run into antagonism.

Because like I think Avri said, you know, everybody's looking for their own interests there and what they want which is understandable. So as a general principal none of the things we can do to reduce the gap is to, you know, do everything we can.

I'm not sure we're the right one to do that to make sure that the over arching issue are resolved quickly and the - including the registry registrar separation issue. Now what can we do there? I don't know but whatever ideas we come up with I think we have to keep those in mind because any solution that doesn't deal with those will run into problems.

Edmon Chung Okay Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. I appreciate Avri that you're speaking individually and sort of stuck with representing the points of view of (Mike) and (Stefan) and (Adrian) but they being on the lift. But I want to respond to your by making again the claim that in theory there's no need to distinguish.

Or there's no utility in making distinction which would the point of my mentioning that cap and museum have different abuse properties or observed abuse rates than other registries and that is a given the presence of the IRT I'm glad Steve's on the call.

That seems to be a tremendously relevant fact similarly we also have difference of size in the ccTLDs we could just to be absurd for a moment we could have an application from (unintelligible) script which actually isn't only exists on a couple of tablets.

But my point is we could have a very small applicant, very small number of users to be benefited by an IDN application by a ccTLD operator. That's at one extreme at the other extreme of course there is the People's Republic of China seeking a Chinese string.

These are not things that we should pretend don't exist. Size does matter. And if we're going to try and make the lack, you know, prevent event into existence then we also have to pay attention to which registry, which - what size registrant base is going to be benefited and not simply treat them all as if they - we are all equal. And I'll stop there.

Edmon Chung I guess that was sorry I missed it.

Man: (Unintelligible) get in the queue.

Edmon Chung Great. I wanted to say a couple of things first and then one - I guess one of the questions in that area that position is right at this point this group is really talking about a forming a team to come up with those steps that (Chuck) has mentioned that we have continued to say that we want to minimize it.

One of the steps that could be I put out a couple of possibilities earlier that, you know, really this group is more focused on whether that team would be formed. So, you know, at least right now it seems like the A team that would be formed is also an issue and that is one area that I continue to be a little bit confused or I don't understand why.

There are different ways to do and I think everybody does agree that if we are going to talk about IDN dTLDs and especially if we're going to talk about new IDN dTLDs in the breath of new gTLDs then those same issues possibly apply whether they apply the same or they apply in different like of IDN dTLDs.

I think we somewhat differ there. I think there are possibilities to deal with that differently so that everyone would be faster. And then on the faster issue at this point we're not even, you know, we might not be talking about at least I'm trying to say it's not a fast track.

But a discussion of whether two things whether a particular track would actually make the whole process faster this one. The other is whether the current stack in fact the current whole direction of the implementation actually already takes into consideration fully all the aspects of IDNs dTLDs which comes to my three point which is confusing some of the things which we talked a little bit about in the last couple of days on the list.

So those two things I still find somewhat, you know, I in fact can't understand, you know, why could be the objection is to even go down the path of exploring that is it seems at least it seems to me that there are possibilities to deal with it, you know, and a focused discussion for dTLD. So sorry I forgot who is in the queue.

Steve DelBianco: It's Steve DelBianco.

Edmon Chung Please go ahead Steve.

Steve DelBianco: And I don't want to delay at all considerations the point you made on confusingly similar TLDs. But just to prolong the agony of our first two points a tiny bit longer. When Avri correctly said it was a motion of specialness with the IDN ccTLDs it called to mind the conversations I watched with the GNSO and (unintelligible).

That the specialness, the special priority of IDN was about the communities served, the non Latin user community but the registrants then users that was the specialness and that special need when on behalf of registrants and users is identical to the IDN gTLD community.

So to the extent that this special stature that is deserving of the fast track observing of an early launch is there we share that specialness. But there was something else that the ccTLDs had in addition to their specialness. They also had simplicity in one regard.

They had no contention problems to worry about. There wouldn't be two countries looking for the Arabic version of Egypt or two entities, two registries bidding on the Chinese version of IDN so they had no contention that made it simpler.

They also probably didn't have objections based on morality and public order there's another big chunk of bag. So but they were just as special as they are and as simple as they are because we do have probably going to have contention and objections.

Now with respect to intellectual property concerns the defensive registration concern they're the same. There should have been just as much defensive registration concern in the IDN ccTLDs as there is in the IDNGs or ICGs but there wasn't as a practical matter.

And it may just be they weren't paying attention, you know, to Avri's point. So we're already special and the question for us is how to make it simpler to justify a quicker launch. And (Edmund) you proposed an idea back in I guess it was Seoul on how to make things a bit simpler which was to go ahead and embrace all aspects of the IRT report for instance.

And say we'll just do it all. We won't quibble. We won't compromise. We'll just do it all that was an example. I'm not advocating that necessarily but we're already special. The question is how do we make ourselves simpler.

Olof Nordling: Olof, can I be in the queue as well?

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead Olof.

Olof Nordling: Oh very, very quickly because there is one other component in the thought structure for the IDN ccTLDs and that it is not only IDNs it's non Latin script quite clearly so there is quite a restrictive approach in that resort.

Because when we're talking about IDNs quite clearly that would include anything that includes Latin scripts with diacritics. So we may want to be very clear about what we're talking about.

(Chuck): And that would be really the thing to do.

Olof Nordling: Sorry.

Steve DelBianco: That would be a really easy thing for us to pick up on I think.

Olof Nordling: That's one of the facts of the IDN dTLD cross track.

Steve DelBianco: What I'm saying is that if the - if we decided to pursue something here it doesn't seem to difficult for me or for us to start off in that same level all, you know, totally avoiding any use of the LDH characters. Well I shouldn't say that because the heightened would be fine I guess so.

Olof Nordling: I think you want to say non Latin script in that case.

Steve DelBianco: Yes I think you're right.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'd like to touch that. I'd like to...

Edmon Chung I think we've got - Eric was sort of in the queue but Eric we do...

Avri Doria: No I'll wait. I didn't realize Eric was on the queue. Sorry I'll wait.

Edmon Chung No worries.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. Steve I really take your point Steve and in fact a few days ago for the lift I wrote that this was my attempted - I sent my attempt to translate the ccTLD IDN fast track conditions what they would mean if they were bought as - to sheet.

And the - your second simplicity point that is that no two countries are attempting to acquire the same strength is certainly also true is we take a look at just the existing TLD operators and their attempts to acquire or I shouldn't say their attempts.

But the strength that they might acquire in various scripts it's clear that they're not going to go for the same string as this is going to go to even if they both use the same scripts.

So that I really take the point about the literacy being the important part of why IDN has - is special. But the simplicity point I think we certainly need if we take just a look at the existing gTLD registry operators and their registries.

Steve DelBianco: Agreed.

Eric Brunner-Williams: We need those bogies including the bogey that we are talking about non Latin scripts. I'll let the next speaker speak now.

Edmon Chung Eric just one point I guess and then I'll pass to Avri. For the detail in fact for IDN ccTLDs while there is a possibility that a different registry would like to apply for the thing and that creates intention that for IDN ccTLDs in fact that could happen as well but just wanted to clarify that. Avri.

Avri Doria: I guess two things I want to say one is - actually three things because you asked me a question about there being some kind of working group that, you know, was working on facilitating things going quicker for example. And I personally wouldn't argue against that.

Again I haven't (unintelligible). On the - it's easy to say we're not going to extend it to any of the expanded (unintelligible) because the ccTLDs didn't. I'm not sure that's true for the whole community so it's quick to say. And if I

understood what Eric just said quickly is it's so much easier if we just restrict this to the incumbent folders of names.

And that struck me as being sort of completely against sort of where we were trying to go with the TLDs which was to open up the market to new people, to open up the market to new local language registry as such and not have it just be the incumbent Western registries that are doing it all.

So to say we're opening it up for literacy is all well and good but if we put it all in the incumbent name I mean the incumbent control of the North control registries we haven't achieved one of the large things which was to expand the base.

So that becomes yet one more restriction that we're adding that seems to be taking away from what was intended. We never intended this to be just a game for the incumbent or to make it easier just for the incumbents.

Steve DelBianco: Avri this is Steve. The registrars and then users who achieve the benefits of opening things up. They will only concerned with the vendors who happen to run the registry our charter is to open it up so I can register my name is all Chinese and then users can type it in all Chinese that would be achieved...

Avri Doria: It's also to open up the competition...

Steve DelBianco: But no matter who the registry operator was that would be achieved.

Eric Brunner-Williams: This is Eric. I take Avri's point. However I don't know who's going to be the first IDN to detail the operator. And I don't want to say that it can't be any of the existing detailed operators if they meet some criteria that the hypothetical ones can't get as team.

So at some point we have to say who the first one is and why that one comes first. And if we say that it can't be any of the ones that are presently holding a

registry delegation of the IDN we have to come up with a good reason why we're doing something else which may take longer.

Avri Doria: Eric I didn't say that it couldn't be an incumbent. What I said is it can't be only an incumbent.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Right see...

Avri Doria: And basically the restriction you're trying is limited only to incumbents.

Eric Brunner-Williams: It mirrors the existing (unintelligible) program.

Edmon Chung I'd like to take a queue actually so it was Eric and then who?

(Chuck): Put (Chuck) back in.

Edmon Chung (Chuck), Eric, (Chuck) and then was it Steve? Okay so Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Right thank you. The point is there's a limited but rather there has to be a beginning based on a initial one or more registry applications which are (unintelligible) become operation. And if we take as a guide conditions imposed on the ccTLD fast track that is one or perhaps two particular scripts for registry scripts for non Latin.

And of course the appropriate restriction that it's only (unintelligible) registry and to say those are useful restrictions that cause the program to occur that did not otherwise occur. And there are no other TLD programs that is actually taking place right now.

There's just one aspect (unintelligible) okay those conditions made that possible and timely in replicating those conditions presumably deals with the objections which are plaguing the general detailed program. Thank you.

Edmon Chung (Chuck) and then I'll add myself to the queue. (Chuck).

(Chuck): Yes well I'm going to (unintelligible). We're coming up on the end of our time and because we've had such good discussion on the list regarding item number three on the agenda I would hope that we at least spend five minutes on that to kind of see where we're at after all that discussion.

Edmon Chung Okay. And that's sort of where I was hoping to head as well. So we talked about it being first or second or faster. There is also a - I also laid this issue that there might be situations where the current process doesn't take into consideration at this point.

And it's quite at least at this point right now it's like specific to IDN dTLDs and all those who are interested in IDN seeing IDN dTLDs happen. That is that, you know, current IDN dTLD registries are interested to introduce IDN version in I guess in quote of their existing TLDs in the current process and seem to be very welcoming to that.

Especially on the issue of just using a similar there are possibilities to address those issues which (Chuck) and I mentioned and in fact those are, you know, those also address some of the items that Avri and the group mentioned about the over arching issues.

So my question really is do we think that there is need to address that particular issue of actually applying for confusingly similar TLDs and whether sort of a specific policy for such applications should be developed.

Whether I don't think there are any policies developed it's just that really me whether an implementation plan for that needs to be put together. Anyone want to - Avri and then there was some other person or?

(Chuck): (Chuck).

Edmon Chung Avri, (Chuck) and Olof, anybody else? Avri please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I heard Olof first but unless you want to jump first then kick me out. Olof might say something...

Olof Nordling: I can be very, very quick actually because now the policy as its stated says that well there should not be confusingly similar to a fault. So either the IDN things that you're thinking about asking or whatever are confusingly similar and then there is a need for policy change. Or they're not and there is no need for policy change. That a policy as it's around us right now it's pretty clear.

Edmon Chung Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes I don't know that that necessarily covers the issue which is something that is confusingly similar unless the guy that owns the thing that is confusingly similar to it wants it. Now my feeling is that in that case the follow up extended procedure was the appropriate solution.

And the reason I argue that is because of the complexity of resolving the issue. I think it just a couple of conversations we already saw there were several different ways in which that complexity could be dealt with. That that complexity does not even deal with closely, you know, the look alike by example of giving three things

That if all could be offset would be the equivalent of my domain name so which of those three in (Chuck)'s view would I have been entitled to and then on the others on a first come, first serve basis. And I'm sure that processes could become a registry could come up with a coherent set of recommendations for how they would deal with it.

But there's no standardized set of those. There'll all be very complex. And I don't think it's anything that you want to front load into the process. I think if you want to do that it's got to be in the extended evaluation. Thanks.

Olof Nordling: Well Avri in the objection process because the standard variation doesn't address the confused in the assembler any further than done in the initial evaluation.

Edmon Chung And then I am putting myself in the queue as well.

(Chuck): Yes and I agree Olof that the policy as it's stated right now is kind of black and white. But I don't think that was ever intended to be - I don't think that was ever the intent to restrict multiple IDN versions of a given name. And if anybody thinks differently I'd love to hear it.

But - so I do think that either a policy change or a policy clarification and if you look at the whole development of the recommendation number two for this probably a faulty clarification to do that. And I'm still not convinced it has to be an extended evaluation although I'm not opposed to that if that's the way to go.

The string evaluation process has two parts to it. It has the preliminary screening and then it has a more detailed screening. And I've been - it doesn't seem like it'd be hard for me for the panel that that was the second part of that process to determine whether in fact that there really isn't the confusion that we're trying to avoid.

There may be exceptional cases where it may need to go to an extended evaluation but at least where I'm at now it doesn't seem like that should necessarily be true. I guess another question that we have then is okay this is a little bit different topic than what this group was formed to do.

But we have pretty good diverse representation in this group including those that are on the call. And we could possibly come back with a recommendation to the council if there was interest in doing that of a

suggested clarification in that regard. So I guess the question I'm asking is there interest of those that are in this group in doing that?

Edmon Chung I guess I'll continue with that thought is that (unintelligible) is that people - whether people think there needs to be a clarification on this part I guess by the council and whether there needs to be further work on the subject here or at the council or elsewhere. Anyone want...

Eric Brunner-Williams: This is Eric.

Edmon Chung Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: To answer (Chuck)'s question obviously I mean you do know that I think the policy needs clarification here. It was never really intended to deal with multiple applications by the same applicants for strings which are proximal to each other. So we should clean it up.

(Chuck): And by the way this was not only for existing registries because I think there will be many new TLD applicants that want to offer their string in some IDN versions as well. So it would apply to them as well.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I agree. There will be applications for something in the Arabic script and Arabic script in Farsi which are a Anglo evaluator in Marina Del Ray would conclude are confusingly similar but which just as LTCD equivalents are for Chinese are intentionally non-confusing to their similarity.

Edmon Chung Okay. I was just thinking of the very long ccTLD final report as well that would be recommendation does have it fairly simple. There's a long discussion in the - further down below which talks about the intent which seems to be pretty clear what the intents were.

And what we're talking about right now is not in violation of those intents. The question, the follow on question is whether it is just the clarification or

whether there's more work due in terms of, you know, how this could be added into the implementation plan.

And the applicable question is whether we just make the clarification and so it's back to staff or whether we try to form a team that would talk about how the implementation would look like and then pass it to staff.

And Avri seems to be - Avri seems to say that evaluation is - what, you know, is a mechanism doing that. I personally think, you know, if we can solve the issue with a clearer implementation set of criteria then, you know, it's not necessarily that approach.

Because I actually disagree with what we mean by the many complexities and in fact I'm still wondering whether you understood the sort of possibility that (Chuck) and I had mentioned in the last few emails on the list. There are possibilities to simply make a really simple and see that, you know, those confusions does not occur.

And most importantly not anything above and beyond the IDNs in the second level that could happen today. So my real question, you know, there are two real questions. One is whether, you know, a specific process for this issue should, you know, could be created and whether something could be put to create that.

And the other one is, you know, I don't sort of agree with the argument that its currently going to be extremely complicated and we cannot set certain simple rules for, you know, initial validation. Avri I'm not sure whether you want to add to that because...

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'd like to get in the queue for after Avri responds.

Edmon Chung Avri doesn't seem to want to respond. But why don't you go first Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: You went on forever. This is Eric.

Edmon Chung Eric why don't you go first?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. I think what we have is a more general problem than merely the string collision by a single applicant. We have the more general problem of the evaluation process assumes that all applications are independently authored and evaluated independently.

And we have no mechanism yet to signal that a group of applications share some valuation property. And that I think is the general problem that we're looking at. It is the case that we can pass all these string confusions into extended evaluation it's not an accepted cost for them to go that way although it's avoidable cost.

But we wouldn't be taking the opportunity we have of changing the way that the evaluation approaches a stream of applicants so that the applications which have a relationship with each other can be evaluated dependently rather than independently.

And there are significant savings that can be achieved by evaluating applications which have interrelationships in a dependent rather than an independent fashion. Thank you.

Edmon Chung Thanks Eric. Is Avri still on the call? I just actually want to make sure that Avri you did understood something I had mentioned because it was from the latest email and your example, the other example doesn't seem like you sort of fully grasped what we were talking about. Is anyone still on the call actually? Suddenly it got quiet.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes we're still here.

Edmon Chung Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Still here.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): (Edmund) if I can jump in there, we're not going to resolve it now I don't think because we don't have everybody on the call. But we - a simple decision I think this group needs to make is this particular issue one that we want to tackle and try and come up with a recommendation that we could put forward.

Or should this be done in a different group? I'm perfectly comfortable with doing it within this group. It is a little bit different track than what was originally intended. So I think in the coming days if we could find out what the sense of people on the list are as well as those on the call right now that would be very helpful.

Steve DelBianco: That's a good idea.

Edmon Chung Who is it?

Steve DelBianco: Steve, (Edmund).

Eric Brunner-Williams: I understand (Chuck)'s suggestion to be to splinter off using these similar ccTLD and launch that as a concern once we've validated the concern with the members of this group because that'll have a life of its own apart from the question of how to speed up the launch of IDNG.

Edmon Chung Well I think those are two issues. I guess we want to first of all make sure that is being handled with a whole new detailed discussion. And then I think question number two would be, you know, if we can handle that whether it could be implemented sooner or at the same time. So they are two questions at this point I think. (Chuck) if you want to add to that.

(Chuck): Well they are two different questions but - and obviously this group was originally formed to deal with the closing the gap and the possibility of speeding up the offering of by the end gTLD.

So my basic question was are the people in this group right now including those that aren't on the call interested in pursuing the confusingly similar topic? Or would they prefer that be handled in a different venue?

Edmon Chung Well I for one I'm comfortable with, you know, doing it here and probably proposing a resolution to the council. Anyone object to that? I guess I'll float on the mailing list as well because it seems like we now have very good consensus on this call with Avri not speaking.

And we will be, you know, a lot of things we will have consensus but that doesn't really mean much and we should post it back to the list and have it there. But I think that, you know, I'll take (Chuck)'s for the suggestion. And I think and second it in a sense that I think this, you know, we could sort of tackle it in a way and try to present a resolution back to the council.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. Just very, very short moment just keep in mind that all right the confusingly similar aspect is not IDN specific actually so.

Edmon Chung I do understand that. But, you know, I think right now at least the, you know, at least from that's the bias based on this group and perhaps when we talk about it if we bring it to council then maybe we can run it up.

But I think the urgency at least whether for it to be fast track or whether the actual lag, you know, this is an urgent issue that needs to be addressed. And the urgency is the IDN gTLD side.

(Chuck): By the way I think Olof's point is a good one but I think the arguments that have been made on the list the last few days would apply whether they're it's confusingly similar related to IDNs or not. The bottom line is if two asking

names are confusingly similar by the definition that's in the lag don't result in the user confusion that we're trying to avoid then they should be fine.

Olof Nordling: Yes well point taken still I just want to that we recall that its not only when most certainly when we're within (unintelligible) then if you wanted address confusing similarity meaning and other things well there are plenty of languages that use the Latin script. Is that what we mean by confusing similarity?

(Chuck): And it's not so much we're getting into what - whether it's meaning or sound or visual similarity. What we're really talking about if the end result of two strings or more does not appear to result in creating user confusion those shouldn't be eliminated just because they're confusing - because they are similar. In other words two strings may be similar but not create confusion.

Olof Nordling: Right and in the eye of the user which is what counts.

(Chuck): Right.

Edmon Chung All right okay we did run for about an hour. I think a lot of...

Woman: (Edmund) sorry this is (unintelligible). I've been on mute. Avri has been (unintelligible) since you asked for her to comment and she didn't make a comment. She was disconnected.

Edmon Chung Okay. Is she going to try to call back in?

Woman: I don't think so. It looks as though she's left the call.

Edmon Chung Okay.

(Chuck): I've got to jump off too (Edmund).

Edmon Chung Right so I guess, you know, just trying to wrap up here. The - it seems to me that a lot of things that were clipboard at least has been brought up in the list as well. There's at least one action item out of this discussion which is be confusingly similar ccTLD item and I think I'll float that with the list and try to see if we can take it forward.

The other issue seems to remain somewhat unresolved which is whether we could form a team to discuss the IDN gTLD issues separately or I shouldn't say separately but I should say focus on IDN gTLDs and whether, you know, we could actually resolve the issues for IDN gTLDs faster as well as make the whole process faster.

So I think that's really what everybody wants. The whole discussion about having to contract is that if we - the whole premise is that if we focus our discussions on particular categories or new gTLDs we might be actually be able to resolve some of those issues faster rather than, you know, lump everything together and have to deal with all types of gTLDs in the same breath.

So I guess we'll take the action item from the confusing similar part and I guess we'll continue to try to raise the issue of the IDN gTLD and we'll continue the discussion on the list. Does anyone want to add anything before we close? Hearing none I guess that's a wrap for today. Thank you everyone for...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Just one question you send us the list the CDNC contact information that they're dealing with the same subject matter? Thank you.

Edmon Chung Sure I'll - it's pretty, you know, just quickly on that issue is that the CDNC is considering essentially the same issue whether, you know, a group could be formed to talk about having IDN gTLDs and resolving those over arching issues with the view of IDN gTLDs and see if we can come to a conclusion faster.

And the issue of existing gTLDs applying for IDN versions of their gTLDs for lack of a better phrase. So yes I'll send up a long - I'll ask if people on the CNC is okay with that. First, you know, if that's okay then I'll back to this as well. Okay thank you everyone for...

Steve DelBianco: Okay thanks (Edmund). Bye bye.

Edmon Chung Right.

END