**GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO
Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper on IDN ccTLDs
January 16, 2008 at 22:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Rework Group Meeting re GNSO Response to ccNSO/GAC Issues Paper onIDNccTLDs on January 3, 2008 .
Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-idn-rework-group-20080116.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan

Meeting notes from Chuck Gomes are at:

http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-cc-idn-tld-rg/msg00065.html Agenda:

http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/agenda-idnrw-15jan08.shtml

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency group co-ordinator

Edmon Chung - gTLD Registry constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee

Olga Cavalli - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Stefanie Lai - NCUC

Adrian Kinderis - Registrar c.

Absent apologies

Bilal Beiram - CBUC

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager Policy Development

Tina Dam - IDN Director

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor - GNSO

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to inform all participants this call is being recorded.

                    If anyone has any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Thank

                    you, you may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Welcome everyone, and hopefully Edmon will join us shortly. I'm sorry that we picked such a terrible time for Bilal. He must not have been on the call when we picked this time, so - and we didn't think to check that. But we'll talk about that in a minute.

So, any changes, any suggested changes to the agenda? Okay. Let's just quickly review our meeting schedule. Obviously, we moved this one a day later and looks like the turnout is good as a result of that, so I appreciate everybody being flexible there.

Adrian Kinderis: I appreciate it (unintelligible). Chuck, it's Adrian. Thank you for that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's okay. I'm glad you're able to be on and everybody else as well. And hopefully Edmon will join us on.

And our next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, the 22nd, at the same time, unless we decide to pick a different time to accommodate Bilal. And then I suggested that everyone keep the 29th of January open if we need that -- and we may -- at the same time.

Now let's talk briefly about is there any adjustment we can do to time so that it would be earlier? I never got a response back from Bilal in terms of how early he would need it to be, so I don't really have an answer there. I'd sent him an email yesterday on that. It's probably pretty tough. If we go earlier, it's middle of the night for Hong Kong which doesn't work. So I suspect there may not be much we can do. Anybody have any suggestions there? Then I think we just leave it alone. If I here back from him, we'll deal with it then.

So for this meeting today, Liz will again be editor until she has to drop off about an hour and a half into the call. And I appreciate that very much, Liz, and I appreciate Avri picking up after that.

So the first thing we want to do then is to just confirm what we did last week on our call. And hopefully you have either looking at the Google Document Live or you cut and paste it like I did. And first thing we want to look at is Section A. And I'll just take that, a paragraph at a time. This is in the section title responses to issues paper question, Section A, Interim and Overall Approach to IDN ccTLDs.

The first paragraph there includes five sub-statements in it. It's a fairly long paragraph. And note that I - if you look at 3, you'll note that I inserted a comment in there that I thought maybe it would be a good idea to take that parenthetical statement that's in there right now and make that Item 4. And I think it's kind of an independent statement. What do you think about that? Is that okay? Anybody object to that?

Tina Dam: I have a question on that.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Tina.

Tina Dam: Because isn't - what is in the parenthesis there, isn't that talking against your support of the ccNSO fast track?

Chuck Gomes: No.

Tina Dam: No? Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think so. That's - Tina, that's probably one of the things that there's been a lot of misunderstanding on. All we're saying is, is that we - before any names are actually put into the space, the - you know, we better know what policy body is responsible for those names, right?

Tina Dam: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Now that doesn't prevent work being done on the fast track. Now, once the fast track is completed and if it's decided to implement the fast track, then it comes into play. And maybe we can word that differently so that we avoid that implication. So far we apparently haven't been very successful at that.

Tina Dam: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense?

Tina Dam: Yeah, that makes better sense to me.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. Chuck, it's Adrian.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I think you certainly need to clarify because what Tina said I exactly thought when I read that statement, the first one. So maybe to put some wording around as you just said that this would not impede the development of a fast track process, however it would impeded the implementation.

Chuck Gomes: You got that, Liz?

Liz Gasster: I'm just getting it now.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody have any objections to first all making this Item Number 4 on the list as separate item and doing - adding what Adrian just suggested along with what's there in front of this right now.

Tina Dam: So did would not impeded the fast track development process, only the implementations process?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. It shouldn't impede the fast track process at all. I guess the process - maybe process is the wrong word.

Woman: (Okay).

Chuck Gomes: The fast track group that's currently ongoing…

Liz Gasster: Effort that's underway.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. But it could impact implementation of any decisions that come out of that. And all we're saying really very simply is that, you know, we need to make sure that - and this would apply to gTLDs as well. So the basic general principle here, we need to know which policy body is responsible for policy on certain IDN TLDs and before they're put in the (root), otherwise we won't know which policies apply.

Liz Gasster: So do you want to change that to allocation of any IDN TLDs as opposed to of any IDN ccTLDs?

Chuck Gomes: I think that's fine. Anybody object to that? I mean the paper that we sent to the board I think kind of talked about TLDs in general as well. I don't have any problems.

Liz Gasster: Just IDN TLDs.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, just take out the "cc."

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Now this is Number 4, meaning we'll have total of six of things …

Chuck Gomes: Correct. Yeah.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Any objections to that? Any other comments on that first paragraph, which is a very long paragraph including those six items now, before we go on to the next paragraph? Then we'll say that one is confirmed.

Going on to the second paragraph which is a paragraph with - where bullets under it there. Any comments on that? Can we conclude that one? Okay, we'll concluded it.

And then the last paragraph is a nice short one which is a couple of sentences, any objections to finalizing that one? Okay, so that takes care of that part of our work from last week.

And then we proceeded into a second B.

Liz Gasster: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes?

Liz Gasster: Avri just sent me a note saying that she was trying to come in with
                 some comments but nobody could hear her, and she's going to try and
                 call in again.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Liz Gasster: So…

Chuck Gomes: I'm obviously not looking at email right now, so…

Olof Nordling: I think if we - this is Olof. If we backtrack a little of previous five and not
                 recently 6, there is some yellow here from - that should be avoided in
                 those exceptional cases where this is not possible. And it says
                 "Rework theme to come back to this language."

                 So I just wonder, have we (captured) that?

Chuck Gomes: Oh I see. Yeah, rework theme to come back to this. Thank you, Olof. I
                 appreciate for catching up. By the way also notice that I added a
                 couple of edits in 5 as well. I said any such IDN ccTLDs -- (plural). I
                 think that's correct wording.

                 The - so let's see. So, now what - Liz, do you recall what we were
                 talking about there?

Liz Gasster: I thought that it was - we were going to delete it first I thought and then decided that the text might be useful somewhere else then I recall.

Chuck Gomes: So we were going to delete it and then use the text something else, is that…

Liz Gasster: That was my recollection, but…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: …I'm not sure.

Chuck Gomes: And just - okay. Do you recall why we were going to delete that? I thought that we had pretty much agreed on this.

                 Anybody else, help us out here? Memory from last week.

Avri Doria: I am back.

Olof Nordling: Wasn't it so that this was a bit too (unintelligible) because it's mentioned earlier? I've tried to, well, just have a slight recollection of that.

Chuck Gomes: Where is it mentioned earlier?

Olof Nordling: I don't know. I mean I know it rings a little bell somewhere.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Let's see if - I'm just trying to scan it. Let's see.

Avri Doria: Where are we now? I'm sorry, I got back on.

Chuck Gomes: Avri, we're on what was Item 5 will now become Item 6. And there's a little parenthetical in the middle there that says we rework theme to come back to this language. It was a comment put in there by Liz. And we're trying to recall from last week - were we going to delete that language? I don't recall that, but we're just trying to find somebody that's got some recall there.

Didn't we pretty much finalize this language in those exceptional cases where this is not possible?

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And then with my edits, any such IDN ccTLDs must be governed by a contract that contains similar conditions to those contained in gTLD contracts.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think we're good.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I like - yes. I agree, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: So let's just…

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: … - so we can just get rid of the parenthetical then.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for catching that, Olof. I appreciate it.

Avri Doria: Can I ask - are we trying to speak…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, we're already past there.

Avri Doria: Okay. I get it.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead please.

Avri Doria: I was just wondering what wording you came up with, and I have nothing to say.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, what wording for that? I'm sorry. Oh, for…

Avri Doria: The impeding of the IDN C Working Efforts.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olof Nordling: Avri, it's live on the Google Docs. I think she's already made the changes.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead and read that. You can go ahead and read it, Liz, if you want.

Avri Doria: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: The Item Number 4?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Number 4.

Liz Gasster: The apportionment of the names basically in gTLDs and ccTLDs should be determined prior to allocation of any IDN TLDs. And they should be done jointly by the GNSO and ccNSO.

Avri Doria: Right.

Liz Gasster: I can take out (unintelligible). Hang on.

This would not impede the fast track effort that is currently underway but could have an impact on the implementation process.

Avri Doria: Could - yeah, I was trying to suggest alternate wording. But if you guys are all fine with that I can go away. I was just sort of, you know.

Chuck Gomes: Feel free to suggest it. Maybe we like yours better.

Avri Doria: What I was going to suggest, this would not impede the IDN C Working Group efforts to create a fast-track mechanism, but could impede the deployment of that mechanism.

Chuck Gomes: I like that. What do people - what do the rest of you think?

Liz Gasster: Efforts to create a fast-track mechanism.

Avri Doria: But could impede the deployment of that mechanism.

Liz Gasster: Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? Good. That sounds good.

Avri Doria: Sorry I fell off. It's for some reasons (unintelligible) just blocked me from being able to speak or they did, so I'm calling on my cell phone now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And sorry about that from a cost point of view.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And then there were no comments on the second paragraph with four bullets. Did you have any, Avri?

Avri Doria: No.

Chuck Gomes: And then there was this small paragraph at the end. There were no comments. So we basically then have finished that part of the document.

Then last week, we also got to Section B there and the first general question - general issues regarding IDN ccTLDs. And we had under A,

should this relationship be maintained, our proposed GNSO response was yes, mapping to the ISO 3166-1 list must be maintained.

Can we say that one's done? For B we will then. B is our very simple response to that question there. It was yes. Any comments on that?

Okay, going on the C. The proposed response was not applicable. The GNSO support continued use of the list there.

Now, I suggested that some change wording there. So I have a suggestion there as you can see. The GNSO supports continued reference to the ISO 3166-1 with. And my reason for that as I say there is - that the list itself cannot be used for IDN ccTLDs.

Avri Doria: Can we use "mapping to the" as opposed "reference to the"?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Sure. That's fine.

Anybody have a problem with that? Is that change in wording then with Avri's edit okay?

Woman: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So now we pick up where we left off then last week. And we go to D. The question then is - again, like - let me say this again like I did last week. I'll probably try to move fairly quickly. Slow me down where I need to be slowed down.

I think what we're going to find as we go through this is that there are some general principles that we're going to come to that will apply in

other places below, and that hopefully will facilitate us moving along at a good pace.

Avri Doria: I think this might have been the place that Olof was referring that at this point we had already spoken about this.

Olof Nordling: Yes, but - indeed…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right.

Olof Nordling: …that's probably the connection which…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right. Then what we go here, you said we already talked about that up there, so.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I see what you're saying. Yeah, got you.

Avri Doria: (Right).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: What we need to get into.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

So, should anything be done about ccTLDs already being used as gTLDs? And the first part - that you can see the first part of the original GNSO response there, our proposed response was that there seems to be an issue of primary concern for the government associated with individual ccTLDs.

Now let me comment. One of the things if you read - if you reviewed some of the comments or just remember them previously, there's quite a bit of a concern expressed in various comments with regard to too much talk about government involvement here and government sovereignty and things like that. And there seems to be a consistent theme there. And it certainly it comes into play right here, so - and then the subsequent parts of this answer to D.

Does anybody have a suggestive way of rewording our response here?

Olof Nordling: Maybe - well, just thinking aloud, but maybe if we talk about community associated within the ccTLD.

Chuck Gomes: Does that work?

Olof Nordling: I don't know.

Chuck Gomes: I mean it seems like a good possibility to me. I'm asking others to comment. So in other words we'd say this seems to be an issue of primary concern for the communities associated with individual ccTLDs. Avri, you were one of the ones who had a concern for a government? Does that work for you?

Avri Doria: Could you read it again? I'm not sure.

Chuck Gomes: "This seems to be an issue of primary concern for the communities
                associated with individual ccTLDs." Or should we just leave that out
                entirely, not even…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: … - we don't have to respond to this question.

Avri Doria: No…

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, from…

Avri Doria: Okay, go ahead.

Adrian Kinderis: No, you go ahead, Avri. I'll pick up after you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks.

                What I was - and as we had already said that for future one that there
                was a concern about contractual conditions for something that would
                be used as a gTLD. Now imposing that and sort of post facto is a
                difficult thing to say. But isn't that sort of what we want to say?

Chuck Gomes: That it should impact the existing ones as well?

Avri Doria: Kind of. It's kind of what we always sort of do when we're doing
                something within the GNSO…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: …and we start talking about, you know, a new policy for future TLDs (unintelligible), but wait a second, you know, and how do we have a consistency between old and new. So since we do believe that anything that would be a gTLD like in the future should be controlled by contractual condition. Don't we actually believe that that could happen even though we see no way in which it could?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I call everybody's attention to Edmon's comment there, especially the last part of it where he says, you know, is this really a fight we want to pick at this point in time. I think he's probably got - there's some validity to that.

Adrian Kinderis: So, but…

Avri Doria: And I guess my answer to that would be yes.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, I agree with Avri. Chuck, it's Adrian. The - from what I understand, I think we have to look at how this is going to play out in reality and try to deal with those - with that reality.

                And from my understanding and from the discussions I've had and tapes I've listened to, et cetera, et cetera, MP3 or whatever it is, the - it certainly seems like to me that the government is the only way to go. And I think we should be supportive of that…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure Avri is suggesting that the government way is the way to go. Are you, Avri?

Avri Doria: Not at all.

Adrian Kinderis: No, that's - I'm not necessarily agreeing with Avri on that point, meaning - okay, let me say - well, I don't see how it can be any other way. And I don't know - Avri, can you explain to me why it shouldn't be government?

Avri Doria: Well first of all - I mean that there is no tight linkage between ccTLD and government. And I don't know that we as a…

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: But there's no - but we're not talking ccTLD; we're talking IDN. And they are two completely different bases as far as I'm concerned.

As far as what my understanding is the IDNs are going to be given in a completely different manner. This is sort of saying well, okay, we can't repeat the problems of the past and give the - an ad hoc basis to universities and so on - individuals and so on and so forth as we did with ccTLDs. So IDNs, now we're starting afresh and we'd like everyone to have a contact with ICANN, and we're going to use government entities as a springboard.

Avri Doria: Okay. I think everything up through that last sentence I agreed. And I don't know that there's been any sort of agreement. I know there's been discussions. But any sort of agreement on either of the two last clauses. One, yes, we believe that the contract should be used with

ICANN, but I'm not sure that they all agree to that. And then B that I don't know that the ccNSO or, you know, certainly people in the GAC would like governments to be as a springboard. But I also don't know that the GNSO necessarily buys into that governments need to be that springboard.

So I don't know that we wanted to take a position on that it should be governments per se. Maybe we do as a gNSo. I mean personally, I would prefer to leave that one open on what is a springboard while I totally agree with the fact that from the GNSO perspective, we would want to say that there should be contracts with IDN.

Olof Nordling: With the - this is Olof. With Adrian's comment, I start seeing the question in a slightly different light that - well, we talked previously about the possibility of backtracking, but maybe we can - the question can certainly be interpreted that should anything be done concerning IDN ccTLD in relation to the ccTLDs already being used as gTLDs.

If we could - well that's different - well, a different way of viewing the question actually. And the answer is probably different as well.

Chuck Gomes: The more I look at this, the more I wonder why they're asking that question in this context, in the context of this overall document because this is about IDN ccTLDs.

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Yeah, but that question isn't. That question is about .tv and .nu.

Chuck Gomes: Exactly. That's my point.

Man: Exactly. Yes, agree.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Why is this question being asked here and…

Avri Doria: Actually, we could come up with an easy answer for this one. And that basically say that these already existing gTLDs should be governed by the same rules that will govern new ccTLDs, new IDN ccTLDs or whatever we're calling them.

Chuck Gomes: But that's not going to be true of other - the IDN rules that they come out may be very different than the rules of ASCII ccTLDs. So I don't think that necessarily…

((Crosstalk))

Man: And there's no way you're going to get this because these guys don't have agreements with because of the way it was done. They can't enforce any changes or anything. So I guess I'm trying to look at the reality is that there's no way you're going to be able to go back and retrospectively get any current ccTLDs to change in any way. It's just - that's not possible.

Avri Doria: Well, do we know that it's completely…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and I think…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …point comes into play there.

Avri Doria: Do we know that it's completely impossible and does it really matter in terms of what we believe should happen whether at the moment we don't see a way for it to happen?

Olof Nordling: But I don't think there's any - we're going to need to be putting down ideologies here. We need to try to deal with what's reality was my original point. I understand what you're saying and what would be idea, but I don't think there's any point enlisting that if it's never going to be a reality.

Chuck Gomes: Well, what if we were to - now that - I think there are some things down below we say that might still be useful. But what if we just restrict the first couple responses to just what we already - what Olof suggested, the change in the first response there and just say this seems to be an issue of primary concern for the communities associated with individual ccTLDs?

Avri Doria: I could live with that.

Chuck Gomes: And then we would delete that next - the next (black) text where it says if it is agreed by that, the associated governments, et cetera.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And then now let's go with that last section there real quickly.

In that regard though, it seems appropriate that any IDN ccTLDs added should be done for the sole purpose of benefiting the applicable local ccTLD language community or language communities as applicable and so on.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Isn't - Chuck, isn't that the answer to the next question?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Man: So you really - I mean, sorry. The…

Chuck Gomes: I think you're right.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I think you're right.

Man: Yeah. I think that we were answering that in the next question. I think if we're to - if - I like where Olof was going. If that's all this question needs, let's leave it with that opening sentence and then, you know, all that the next last part that you just read is actually the answer that should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful.

Chuck Gomes: Yup. I actually - and of course that's the broader question. There are some sub-questions, so it's a…

Man: Yeah. Yeah, yeah. I mean - yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Are you with us, Liz?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody oppose to that approach? So we have a very simple answer
to D. It's just that one sentence, and we changed "governments" to
"communities." And then that text, the last (black) text there under D,
we're going to use here coming up shortly. Okay. So you can just
highlight that for us to move it where we want it later, because I think
that there is some meaningful that I think fairly well written right there,
that section if we can use it.

So now we go then to should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful. And
we go down to Question A which is, is there an obligation to make the
IDN ccT…

Avri Doria: Quick question.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Looking at the last text, that whole paragraph in that - okay, it's gone.
Never mind.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right.

Question A then is, is there an obligation to make the IDN ccTLD string
meaningful and its representation of the name of a territory? For
example whereas .uk is meaningful because is a commonly used
abbreviation for United Kingdom. .uk is not meaningful because the
commonly used abbreviations for Australia or US or AUS.

Now, first of all I'd like to just start some kind of general discussion on this. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the intent of at least the people that work on the group that I led to develop these originally responses, the whole idea of suggesting that it should be meaningful was actually a means to make sure that it's restricted which is I think one of the things we've come to agreement on. Making sure that we're limiting and that it's - and I also think that that's the intent, for example in the fast track, Edmon sent around the Council a document today, kind of a draft document for the fast track. And I highlighted one thing from my own use. With regard to string selection, what they have in there that is that the string must be a meaningful representation of the name of the territory or an abbreviation of the name of the territory in the relevant script.

That starts to narrow it down in a way that I think is where we were trying to go.

Avri Doria: It sounds good.

Man: That seems palatable to me.

Chuck Gomes: So, in fact, we may want to use the wording right out of their draft document that I just read…

Avri Doria: I would think that'd be good.

Chuck Gomes: So, do you want me to read that again for you, Liz, or…

Liz Gasster: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz Gasster: So we wanted - what I have done at first was moved the paragraph that we just took out at the preceding question into this.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: …is that, right.

Avri Doria: I don't think that belongs there. I thought it was - I think it's just a deleted sentence at this point.

Chuck Gomes: Well let's find - I think we'll come back to that. I think we're going to have to find out if we move that somewhere and where, whether it goes right here or not, notice that the broad question, should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful, has several sub-questions. And so we may actually find a place to put that or we may delete it. But let's just leave it hanging for right now.

So with regard to this question, is there an obligation to make the IDN ccTLD string meaningful and its representation of the name of a territory, it seems to me that that would be a good place for what I just read out of the draft document which says the string must be a meaningful representation of the name of the territory or an abbreviation of the name of the territory in the relevant script.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Man: Yeah, I agree, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Liz Gasster: Okay, one more time please.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. The string must be a meaningful representation of the name of the territory or an abbreviation of the name of the territory in the relevant script.

Avri Doria: Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Adrian Kinderis: So if the…

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Just a quick comment from Olof. And this may be core to the whole issue of apportionment between (cc and g).

Chuck Gomes: I - in my own opinion, I think you're right. It's in fact that's where the ccNSO is going. My own opinion is, is that that will help a lot to deal with the concerns that we're having from the GNSO perspective. Now…

Avri Doria: I think that maybe just where they're going for the fast track.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And if that's true, then my statement is not accurate, okay? And you could be right although I think they're trying to be as consistent in the fast track as they can to the extent that they know where they're going on the bigger policy effort but - you know.

Avri Doria: Yeah, no. And I think if this is what was there and it's got codified and blessed and made formal, then I think you're right, there'd be very little to argue about.

Chuck Gomes: Now my understanding is the issues paper that we're responding to is really for the larger policy effort…

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: …more so than it is the fast track.

Avri Doria: Oh, completely.

Chuck Gomes: So, now, there were quite a few comments on this one. Does anybody want to comment anymore? Are you satisfied with that response? I'm just kind of glancing ahead. D says if so, how is meaningful determine; we'll come to that in a minute. I wanted to see.

Avri Doria: (Right).

Chuck Gomes: I guess that's the only two sub-questions. So let's decide whether we want to do anything with that text that was…

Avri Doria: I only have one question.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: If some territory wanted its ccTLD two characters merely translated into their alphabet because they reduce to (XI) even though (XI) means nothing to them and isn't a well-known abbreviation for the country name, would our answer allow it?

Chuck Gomes: Well, to the extent that a script, you know, would allow that kind of thing from happening, I can't see why we would oppose that.

Avri Doria: Right. But I'm just saying does our answer allow for it.

Chuck Gomes: It may not. And it's a good point. But let's first all before we try and maybe modify our answer to accommodate that if that's what we want to do, any other comments on that? Is this theme reasonable to allow that?

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Well a very quick one on it. This is from me. I mean if we take meaningful to also encompass the existing ccTLD abbreviation…

Woman: Oh, good idea.

Olof Nordling: …well then if that's - it has, well, grown in meaningfulness than for the community and for that reason, they transliterate it.

Avri Doria: Oh, and we can include that below and that how is meaningful defined.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. I mean…

Avri Doria: Right.

Olof Nordling: …maybe.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

So now going back to that section, in that regard though, it seems appropriate for any IDN ccTLDs added should be done for the sole purpose of benefiting the applicable local ccTLD language community or language communities as applicable. For example, if (unintelligible) ASCII ccTLD .xi -- by the way, there is no .xi -- serving a territory called (Island X), and IDN ccTLD for xi should only be added using a specific script that is used by an (Island X) language community that - and the purpose of that ccTLD should be to serve members of that particular language community on (Island X) including any that may be located elsewhere in the world. And IDN ccTLD for .xi should not be added to serve a generic global purpose i.e. making it the de facto gTLD.

Now in my own opinion, there's some value in fitting this thing somewhere because it adds a little bit more definition to the restriction of what these things are going to be. But what do you guys think?

Liz Gasster: Well for once, it's also adding a definition of what is a relevant script.

Avri Doria: It may belong under a part of the discussion of meaningful.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, well that's what we thought previously. We just got to figure out where to fit it. But first of all, do you agree that these - the points made

in this section under than in that regard though, which was just a lead-in part, is something we want to say?

Avri Doria: Doesn't seem a bad thing to say. I think it's confusing sometimes reading it, but…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. It was kind of hard…

Avri Doria: Right.

Chuck Gomes: …to write because - and that's where we went to an example because - to try and illustrate it.

(Olga):   I think - this is (Olga), Chuck. I think it's hard to read, but I think it's a good example too. And I would like to have this wording.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And maybe you guys can help fix the wording so it's not so hard too.

               But - so then the next question is where does it fit. We have two sub-questions under should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful. Does it go under A or B or does it matter?

Woman: Actually…

Avri Doria: Leaving it under A is probably okay.

Chuck Gomes: So we would…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: We didn't think so at first, but…

Chuck Gomes: After the…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: …other response that we already put in from their draft paper. Is that what you're saying?

Avri Doria: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Other - anybody oppose to that?

Liz, are you with us on it?

Liz Gasster: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

And of course like we're doing each week, we'll come back and look at this at the beginning of our meeting next week and how it ended up and do a final approval on that.

Liz Gasster: And then I assume the next sentence comes up completely because that was the previous answer to this question.

Chuck Gomes: Hold on a second on this (c). Oh yeah. Are you talking about the IDN…

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: …ccTLD should be meaningful? Yeah, we just replaced all of that, yeah.

Liz Gasster: Yeah. That's what I thought.

Chuck Gomes: In fact there's two sentences that are…

(Olga):   Chuck, this is (Olga). I think this IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful and so on should - could be a response to a number - B. How it's meaningful that (unintelligible) perhaps.

Chuck Gomes: Thoughts on that?

Avri Doria: Possibly, but I would hope we could come down the sovereign part.

(Olga):   I would take out the government's choice. I would say community's choice or something like that.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh. Yeah, it does kind of relate to the - so…

Avri Doria: Yeah. I think taking out the - in the script of the sovereign government's choice, if you take that clause out, I think it is fine.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And would that replace what we have under B right now?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

(Olga): Yes. I would replace it. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Any problems with that? Or did you get all that list?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. You're keeping up with this really well.

Okay. Now, we go to how many IDN ccTLDs per script per territory. This may involve a little more discussion. In Question A, there is should there similarly be only a single IDN ccTLD for a given script for each territory or can there be multiple IDN ccTLD strings? For example, should there be only one equivalent of .cn and China script for China or .ru in Cyrillic for Russia?

Now, let's make sure we're first all understanding the question. And I'm asking that of myself. So maybe all of you understand it well. Are we talking about for example two different simplified Chinese versions or for - that associated with the .cn country code? Is that what they're asking here? Are they talking about - I don't think they're talking about a situation like India where they have multiple scripts that apply.

Olof Nordling: Well this is for a single script. And well, the next question then - perhaps it's easier to address concerning Russia because you've got

Cyrillic there and should you have two Cyrillic IDN ccTLDs for Russia. And that's how I read the question.

When it comes to China's script, well, given that they have simplified and complete, that becomes a bit more trickier really.

Chuck Gomes: And in fact, the more - I think you're right, Olof. I don't know what others think. I'll give you a chance to jump in a minute. But - and I actually think then that when we as a previous group in responding to this question did not interpret it that way. And hence, you see the response that you see there.

So maybe - is this just a simple matter of yes, answer of yes?

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, it's Adrian.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Adrian Kinderis: I don't know if I'm being pedantic or whatever, but for example, should there be any one equivalent of .cn in Chinese? I don't think anyone is talking about an equivalent of .cn here…

Chuck Gomes: Correct.

Adrian Kinderis: …with respect to IDN. There is no such thing as an equivalent to a two-letter. We're using the 3166 as a reference as far as which territories are allowed, but there's no such thing as an equivalent .cn.

Am I being too pedantic there?

Chuck Gomes: Well…

Adrian Kinderis: The question is wrong.

Chuck Gomes: They worded the question poorly.

Woman: Right.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay.

Avri Doria: But it is…

Man: Well…

Avri Doria: …just one entry per ISO 3166-1 per script.

Adrian Kinderis: So maybe we could write that as our answer. When we say yes,
                instead of just saying yes, say yes, we believe there should be one
                entry per 3166 just to make sure we're a 100% clear.

Liz Gasster: Per script.

Chuck Gomes: Per relevant script.

Adrian Kinderis: Per - yes, per - one per territory as defined by 3166 per script, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Does that make sense?

Tina Dam: Just so you know, there actually is an equivalent of CN in China for - in Chinese, and there is an equivalent for .ru as well for Cyrillic. So for those two specific examples, you can actually talk about the equivalent. Now in a global scale you can't.

Chuck Gomes: So the question is okay for those two scripts. Thanks, Tina.

Tina Dam: For those two examples, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And I didn't know that. So that's - oh, actually I knew it for rush for Cyrillic because that's been one that's been in the discussion recently.

Tina Dam: Yes. China is two characters as well.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. So, Liz, were you able to capture the response there?

Liz Gasster: I just got - there should - the GNSO believes there should be one…

Avri Doria: One IDN ccTLD…

Man: That's really (named) differently. It's not an IDN ccTLD…

Avri Doria: Right, right. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: …ccTLD string perhaps.

Avri Doria: Right. One string per 31 - ISO 3166 entry per square.

Man: Relevant script.

Avri Doria: Or relevant script, right. Now we have later questions -- how many
                scripts? And then we could answer that further.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, right.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So that just replaces the big, long third paragraph there that they can
                just go, because we're responding to the wrong question there. And up
                until this point, I didn't even realize that, so.

Tina Dam: Okay. So we're not going to use that text anywhere else.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think so.

Tina Dam: Okay.

Avri Doria: We seem to be getting more short answers.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

                So now we're going on the B which says, could there be several IDN
                strings for a territory and a script? If so, who would determine the
                number and what are the criteria?

                And we had quite a bit a discussion on that, as you can see - or
                several comments anyway, and the previous response was if multiple

scripts are used in a territory and if it is judged that those scripts will add value to the user experience, then that sovereign government -- we got that again, we'll fix that -- should make the choice of which script and what number of scripts will be in use for IDN ccTLDs.

It's easy to fix this sovereign government thing, but let's talk about the question of whether we believe - I think we may have answered this last week, because didn't we come to a conclusion last week that - I guess this is - or maybe this wasn't in this group, this was in the council maybe or…

Avri Doria: No, I think we did it in this group.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Didn't we decide that, on an exception basis, that we're okay with an exception basis for multiple scripts? Can you…

Avri Doria: Multiple scripts when there was community need, essentially.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's right.

Woman: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And we - didn't we tie it in some way to national policy? Wasn't that a suggestion?

Avri Doria: Yes, that's right, when it was - when that - when national policy of government, I know we quibbled over the word "national" versus "government." I suspect maybe we could do it in the…

Chuck Gomes: I know. I mixed…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: In the council. We've had this conversation in so many places.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. So it could be related to the letter to the board.

So anyway - so let's - regardless, I think we've got a sense of what we probably want to say here. Let's see if we can put some - put it into words. Anybody want to take a stab at it?

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm just looking for the statement where we wrote it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Avri Doria: I do believe I have it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Because I think that was worded pretty well.

While she's looking, what are - anybody not able to follow what we've been talking about on this so far? So I think what we're saying is that, you know, in cases where there's national policy with regard to multiple scripts, that it might be appropriate to have multiple IDN strings associated with one ISO 3166-1 code.

We just have to be able to put that in words. You know, so what I'm asking right now is, is there any disagreement on that statement that's not worded very well yet?

Tina Dam: Well, Chuck, I don't know if I'm misunderstanding something, but I don't - I think the question is still about one script and not multiple scripts.

Chuck Gomes: Oh.

Tina Dam: Isn't this about…

Chuck Gomes: So, how is this question different than A?

Tina Dam: I think this is about variance maybe. I don't know.

Chuck Gomes: Could there be several IDN strings where a territory in a script -- because it does say a script, doesn't it, Tina?

Tina Dam: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: You're right on that. But then, that seems like the same question in A. This must be why we got confused the first time around on this.

Man: Do you think that script describes the main string, not?

Man: No.

Man: Not?

((Crosstalk))

Man: It's - Tina is perfectly right in that we sort of lost track of the question (in one second).

Chuck Gomes: But how is B then different other than the second part - second question, how is B different than A?

Man: Well, I think we can recycle the answer to A and make it clear what the thoughts are.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: There's no harm in clarifying the question in your answer, Chuck, because if we're just going to repeat it, Bob, I think it's a waste of time, I think you are answering a valid question. So, why not just, you know, we have interpreted the question as such, and as such, here is our answer. Just in case that's what they meant.

Avri Doria: Yes, you're right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Because I think it's pretty clear what they meant given the question above. It's a lead one before the leading question.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think that this slight nuance and difference between them is focused in the word "equivalent." And in the first one, they're saying, an equivalent of .cn and then you're saying, can we have, you know, several different names for it in a script that aren't necessarily equivalent?

So for example, and this is in extended ASCII, but is .aus the same as .australia. Could you have, okay, you got that Australia, but could you

have .aus too? You know, in extended ASCII, that one doesn't work because someone else might have (unintelligible).

But what I'm saying is I think that the difference between these two questions is focused on the word "equivalent." And this question sort of (unintelligible) no to more than one equivalent, but how about several variance of our names? Could we have, you know, .us, .usa, .unitedstatesofamerica if we used other scripts?

Chuck Gomes: Well, we're going to say later on, assuming that we keep it what way, that the same thing that the IDN working group said, is that variance should be avoided. And by that, that doesn't mean, you know, in other words…

Avri Doria: Right.

Chuck Gomes: …same thing as the IDN working group said.

So I think we're going to cover the issue of variance.

Avri Doria: So I think we want to say pretty much the same thing, that there should still only be one…

Tina Dam: You know, if it was me, I would postpone it to the next call and meanwhile have someone check with the ccNSO and what the difference is between those two questions.

Chuck Gomes: Now, they do ask the question, who would determine the number and what are the criteria? But if we say "No, that's an irrelevant question

anyway." So Tina may be right. Now, the question is, Tina, are you working with the ccNSO on their work?

Tina Dam: I am.

Chuck Gomes: So you might be a natural to get clarity on that question for us. Would you be willing to do that?

Tina Dam: Absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: Once again I pick on you when you bring something up.

Avri Doria: Yes. The question is, what is the difference between these two questions?

Chuck Gomes: Right. So if you could do that, that would be great.

Tina Dam: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? Thanks a lot.

Avri Doria: I think in the meantime we could just sort of temporarily just copy the answer we have from the first one onto the second one, so we remember kind of where we are. We'll put it in brackets.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay, Liz?

Liz Gasster: I didn't catch it, exactly which text though.

Avri Doria: The answers from above.

Chuck Gomes: The answer that we ended up with for A.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now, we probably won't leave it literally verbatim even if we find out that they are the same question. I don't know. We'll just say "See above," but that's just a - just kind of - that will be a placeholder for now, so we know where we're at in brackets for B.

Okay?

Going on to C. If an IDN ccDL string is not applied for, for whatever reason, should an IDN ccTLD string - excuse me. Should an IDN ccTL string that could be associated with the particular territory be reserved or protected in some way?

Now, the response - the proposed response that was there was basically referring back to what the reserve names working group did in the GNSO, noting a difference though in this regard. Now if you - the discussion is important to look at, the comments that were - that are there from -- looks like four different ones of us that comment on that.

The - with reserve list, I agree with Avri that the reserve list -- well, let me back up a second. It seems to me, judging by comments as we proceed through this document that people have put in a long time ago, that we may be heading towards the suggestion that there be a list of what the IDN strings for cc - course mapping to the 3166 list are. And if that's the case, isn't that going to become on reserve list?

Avri Doria: Not necessarily. There's sort of a difference between a list of available names and designating it as reserved. I mean there's - there is a difference between those two.

Chuck Gomes: Well…

Avri Doria: So one can create a list saying "These are the lists of names that, you know, make sense for you to pick one off" versus "These are the list of names that are reserved."

                Now, we may want to, you know, someone may come up and say "No, there should be a reserved name list" and then we have to take that back to, you know, then we have to discuss what the GNSO's view on it. But the GNSO did already pretty much go through a decision procedure that said we don't agree with any reserve name list.

Chuck Gomes: But we did agree to reserving at the top level the two-letter…

Avri Doria: Oh yes.

Chuck Gomes: …the two-letter names. So if in fact we support IDN TLDs corresponding to those two-letter names, why wouldn't we also reserve those?

Avri Doria: I suppose if this, you know, this community-wide decision were made, that they should be reserved and that the GNSO was part of making that decision, then I suppose we would support it. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And that's all I'm getting at. So…

Avri Doria: Right. So if we said something like, if the ICANN community at large were to decide that, you know, a reserve list should be created for, then (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: So I think - it sounds like there are two kind of separate but related issues here. One of them is, until such time that the IDN strings are determined that mapped to the 3166 list, should there be a reserve list? And secondly, once they are determined, should there be a reserve list at least on the GNSO side? Although I'm not sure they're not too concerned - well, I'm sure they are concerned about what we do on our side too.

                 So am I - was that a correct interpretation to suggest that there are two parts to this?

Avri Doria: Well, the only reason they would want a reserve list would be to keep gTLDs from taking them.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck, it's Adrian.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Adrian Kinderis: In my discussions, I had a chat with Chris Disspain about this the other day. And I'm of the understanding that the ccNSO, and this is just a chat with Chris Disspain, you know, between me and him obviously, that they're only concerned about their IDNs and that anything outside

of that, they're referring and relying upon the arbitration process in the GNSO. And they're confident that that will hold them in good stead -- if that makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Adrian Kinderis: So in that - I mean other than - if you've heard the same thing but, you know, I'd say Chris is a pretty good authority, that, you know, in this case there would be no need for reserve list.

Chuck Gomes: Well - you mean once they determine what the IDN strings are?

Adrian Kinderis: Correct. Sorry. Outside of the - their determined IDN - no, outside - yes, exactly. The ones they're going to get, they can't go ahead and block anymore, or that they don't want to go ahead and block anymore. For example, you know, they may decide .qa for Qatar is fine, but .qatar (unintelligible) if someone goes (unintelligible) block it. And he's adamant that that's the approach they're taking, relying on the arbitration process of the GNSO.

Chuck Gomes: Now let's go back to the question at hand. It says if an IDN ccTLD string is not applied for. Now that makes - it sounds like there's this possibility of an ongoing - you know, that the list is going to be made up of those that are applied for and approved, okay? And so that if something is not applied for, it's not on the list. And so what they're asking is, should other names be reserved? That'd be - it sounds like it becomes almost an undoable situation.

Avri Doria: Well, no, because what they're saying is if no one has applied for it yet, that's okay, because as soon as somebody that's not them does apply

for it, they'll raise the objection flag on it. And then when they're ready to apply for it in five years, they'll follow whatever process has been agreed to to apply for it.

Adrian Kinderis: That's right. Avri?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right. No, I've had conversations with (Janus Culkins) who was basically, you know -- yup, I think we're going to have to have the reserve list.

So there may be a difference of opinion on this one between GAC and ccNSO position. And that may be where the question comes out, is that in that dialogue, because I know (Janus) came to me at the end of, I think it was the (LIA) meeting and said, you know, I think we're just going to get to the point where we have to have a reserve list. And that that's going to be GAC view.

So - and they're not saying they've done that. That was just similar to your conversation with Chris sort of a conversation.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes. I hear what you're saying, Avri.

Can I be pedantic again and say, if an IDN ccTLD string is not applied for, I think applied for is different. I could apply - or Australia could apply for 3,000 IDN ccTLD strings and not be successful (unintelligible). But - so, does that mean that I'm covering all those?

Avri Doria: Well, I think when a cc - when a country or a ccTLD applies one, they expect to be successful.

Adrian Kinderis: That's right. They expect to be. But, you know, they're setting up some rules to say that they might not be.

So I just want to cover ourselves and say, I think it needs to be applied for and successful in, you know, being allocated.

Man: And granted.

Adrian Kinderis: And granted. Exactly right.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let's for a moment look at the response that's already there. Okay? It may not be sufficient, but it - but is it okay, what's said there?

Avri Doria: I think (unintelligible) yes. My view.

Chuck Gomes: Others? Anybody objects to what…

Tina Dam: What's the reference for those?

Chuck Gomes: Excuse me? Yes. If you go to the very - that's the reserve names working group report, I think.

Man: Am…

Chuck Gomes: At the very beginning of the document, there were four documents that were referenced to make it easy to refer to them. Now if we want to do that a different way, we can, but that's the way it was…

Tina Dam: That's fine, for to be sure it wasn't something in the text.

Chuck Gomes: No. At the very beginning of this document…

Tina Dam: Yes, I see.

Chuck Gomes: …there are four documents referenced.

Tina Dam: Great.

Chuck Gomes: New TLD recommendations. Reserve names working group, I think, and the IDN working group report and probably the board resolution asking for feedback, without scrolling up there, that's all from memory, so, hopefully I got that right.

              Okay? Now, do we need to add anything else to this then?

Man: I've got just a comment, and I don't think we should add it. But just recalling a little study I did myself. And noting that there may be reasons to have a reserve list for different reasons than reserving it for to use, but rather that confusing similarity may call for, for example, reserving two-letter or two characters, Cyrillic and Greek -- Greek scripts because of confusing similarity with existing ccTLDs. There are roundabout 60 such. Especially if you use (capital) characters in Cyrillic and Greek.

Tina Dam: So you're saying that a reserve name list should be created for the purpose of…

Man: Avoiding…

Avri Doria: …similarity.

Man: …confusing similarity. But that can be dealt with in other ways as well.
                 Sorry to - it's just a comment since…

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: …and it's slightly beside the point.

Chuck Gomes: Yes…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …here, but it may be an issue.

Avri Doria: Yes. I see that as becoming - what we had talked about in these
                 groups that there was this list of names that had been objected to and
                 rejected that weren't quite a reserved name list. But they were, you
                 know, basically a list that people could refer to. I know that, you know,
                 applying for this was really not a very good idea.

Man: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Now, I think we've got that covered in the GNSO because…

Woman: Yes, we do.

Chuck Gomes: …we have a - Recommendation Number 2 says, it has the confusing similarity there, so they could be challenged on that basis. And we didn't reserve two character IDN script names.

Woman: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So - but we've got a (method for handling it) interestingly enough that that might not be good information to pass on to the ccNSO as they're considering this, because it might be very helpful to them. You know, if - you know, maybe they've already thought of that, but even - I'm not sure there's another place in this document to put that.

Should we add something about that here acknowledging that it's not, you know, address of this question, but it does have to do with the reserved names lists and a consideration that they might want to keep in mind, because it seems like a helpful thing to communicate.

Tina, what do you think about that? Is that helpful?

Tina Dam: I think it is.

Chuck Gomes: And for lack of another place to put it, would it be okay, people, do you think to put it in here?

Anybody opposed to that?

Okay. So now we just need to put that into words.

Olof, can you help us maybe put some words around that so that Liz can capture them?

Olof Nordling: Well…

Chuck Gomes: Or do you want another alternative rather than putting on the spot right now, would you be willing to just email…

Olof Nordling: I think I rather do that and…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. No, no, that's good. And it's probably quicker for us, too.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Email, Liz, some wording and then, Liz, you can put that in in brackets or whatever and we will go over that next week.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Liz Gasster: Yes, got it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Okay going on to how many scripts per territory, and A is, can a territory apply for more than one ID and ccTLD string and different scripts if more than one script is used to represent languages spoken in that location?

Now I think this is the wording that you were looking for somewhere, Avri, do you ever find it?

Avri Doria: Here, (yeah).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Not too long ago, I put it away.

Chuck Gomes: Where was it?

Avri Doria: Basically it was - allocation of a limited number of IDN TLDs representing territories designated in the (ISO) 3166 that may have a special need the GNSO council…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: So it had - the special need was the language.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: But it's not (coming out of) sentence that can be listed. So - but we talked about - while we recognized that there are places that are at special need. They didn't find a specific sentence that we could look.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

   Now - but I think we did talk about the idea of some, you know, allowing for some exceptions, right?

Avri Doria: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: …where there is a special need.

So now the question is - now what we say here is that if there are multiple scripts used in a territory, the best user experience would be to provide IDN TLDs in all those scripts where feasible, repeating and then the goal of IDN - going to user needs for how many years and so on like that.

I don't know if we still want to say all that or not, but what about that first sentence, if there are multiple scripts used in a territory, the best user experience would be to provide IDN TLDs in all of those scripts where feasible or do you want to modify that to use the special needs type language.

Adrian Kinderis: Sorry, Chuck, it's Adrian. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Adrian Kinderis: Sorry.

Sorry, (I've been thought of reading), taking that in and I may be backtracking a little, I apologize (unintelligible) and please tell me to stop, but why is - I'm just trying to sort of work out where this question fits within sort of like a fast-track scenario or the, you know, provisioning of the name, why couldn't we say, they can only have one and if they want more, they just simply go through the gTLD process?

Chuck Gomes: Well for - first of all, let's recognize that this Issues Paper really is for the broader ccNSO PDP process, not the fast-track. So…

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah.

Okay understood.

Chuck Gomes: So that's the first answer to your question, okay?

Now, that doesn't mean that we, you know, with regard to what's going on in the fast track, we can also, you know, apply what's yours. I think that applies more with the IDNC work that's going on.

Did that make sense?

Adrian Kinderis: Can you say that again?

Chuck Gomes: The fast-track issue that the IDNC is working on is a much more narrow and limited focus and this Issues Paper was created for the bigger PDP. The policy development effort, the ccNSO has embarked upon this. It's probably going to last a couple of years, not just - not the fast track.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, yeah, I understand that, but…

Chuck Gomes: Or are you suggesting that we want to say that in the long-term policy that there should only be 1 per 3166 country code?

Adrian Kinderis: Well I'm just thinking, you know, our biggest concern is trying to get these guys contractually bound with ICANN. The best way to do that is to try and push them towards the gTLD reps, right?

So if we're not going to win on the contract, fine, and maybe we will so that will be okay for the IDN territory top-level domain and why not just let them have one for now and then so okay, you're entitled to have as many as you want. No one could oppose you because you are the legal entity of your country or whatever and we've got a, you know, the objection process in place.

So why don't just, you know, for the others you want on top of that, go ahead and jump in the queue at the new TLD round.

Chuck Gomes: Let me repeat something you've heard me say before.

My fear and it's a big fear on my part there, is that if we get a bunch of those kinds of TLDs that are basically operated with government control or influence, strong influence, it could drastically change the complexion of the GNSO, something I don't think we want to happen.

I would rather see them have multiple IDN script versions associated with their 3166 code and be focused towards that community abuses that they have not being used as a gTLD. Keep in mind we're saying elsewhere that if it's being used as a gTLD, they should have a contract.

Then that have hundreds of these TLDs that all of a sudden are in the GNSO space and we have this huge government influence in the GNSO space. Now that's my own personal fear. Did that…

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I hear you. I understand the government (unintelligible), but I think it's just going to happen.

You're going to get - well okay. I thought - I'll need to think about your point. Maybe we're getting off-track here, but I just wanted to highlight - I mean, (unintelligible) it's an easier answer, but you're right, it does have other ramifications that I haven't quite got my head around yet.

Chuck Gomes: And they could be huge.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: And they could be huge.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Now, let's take the India example. It's a classic one in this case, but I mean there are others as well.

But in India, obviously, I think it's easy to recognize that there's a need for the - some IDN TLDs associated with .in in multiple scripts. Are we opposed to that?

I don't think we are, are we?

Adrian Kinderis: No.

Chuck Gomes: So, is - what we're saying here already - okay, you know, 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.

And then go on and say I don't think we're repeating it any more because I think we delete that. The goal of IDNs is to meet user needs for many years - I don't know - again, we can debate where we want to say all this, but we have recognized that a large majority of the world does not use English as a primary language and therefore we work to solve that problem. We really want to meet user needs.

Why would we create restrictions that would prevent - keep in mind, I'm not talking about the fast track. If we really want to meet user needs, why would we create restrictions that would prevent us from doing that in certain circumstances, unless of course there are technical reasons relating to security, stability and interoperability. And that…

Adrian Kinderis: Okay, Chuck, you've got my full support. If you - if this (unintelligible) contracts at ICANN and I know that's one of - I'll provide those, but (wait, I'm) not get a hit on all of this.

So if they're not going to sign a contract with ICANN and you're saying it's, you know, it's basically unlimited, you go ahead and do whatever you want, there's going to be a lot of crossover there or that the potential for crossover.

So I'm just saying that's one of the issues we could have is that when we sell them contracts…

Chuck Gomes: Well, and keep in mind that what - so far in this group, what we said is that if a TLD is being used as a de facto gTLD, then they need a contract like ours. We're not saying it in other cases where they're not being used as a gTLD.

But keep in mind if they're restricted to a meaningful representation or abbreviation of their territory…

Adrian Kinderis: Who's determining meaningful? Because the government of (unintelligible) could tell us that .television in French - in a - I don't say it's a (relic) or whatever, means (Tonga) and who are we to argue?

Chuck Gomes: Well…

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: …if they want to try to generate some revenue?

Chuck Gomes: And that's why we added that other example of (Island X) to be a little more explicit there with regard to meaningful and that it should address the language needs of the community and so forth.

So - and you're right, we are backtracking a little bit here.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. Look, I'll let it go. It was just an issue and I guess just noting it that and, you know, we just need to be prepared if we're missing a few of these sort of specifications that we're putting in.

Anyway it's right.

Chuck Gomes: And we're also - let's spend a couple of minutes on it because we're also going back to discussions we had in previous meetings about, you know, we can say all we want about requiring CCs to have contracts

with ICANN and we certainly are welcome to say it in this, but I don't think it's going anywhere.

I mean look how far it's gone so far. ICANN finally back down and did this letters with them that are meaningless.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. But from - I look up the record conversation with somebody - well - you know, as far as just to chat, I think it was - well if you don't sign a contract with ICANN, you're not getting your IDN. I mean, Tina has probably got some ideas around, you know, that but if that's the case, that's the impression I was given that might not hold true whatever, but that's certainly more comfort for me as a GNSO member.

Chuck Gomes: Tina, you want to comment or you want to skip it?

Tina Dam: I think I'll skip it for now and - but we - and listen now, we're just trying to if something happen to the texts then we're just…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah. Adrian, did you do something to the texts because it shows your update and I can't find what was there before?

Adrian Kinderis: Oh, there's a lot of zeroes on my screen. I thought you did it. I looked down, was I pressing on zeroes or somewhere.

Woman: Yeah.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay. I'll delete then.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: I'll delete the zeroes.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …lots of problems, Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. You know what I'm going to shut up for the next hour. You guys go ahead. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: No, no, no. We don't want you to do that. So please…

Woman: Yeah. We want to get back to what we had before then.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well, I cut - I'm working off a cut and paste following (Adrian's) suggestion from several weeks ago, so that I don't mess anything up and it's easier for me to stay with it.

So…

Adrian Kinderis: Okay. I'm - Chuck, just on that, I think Avri is going to have to tell us how to go back on the revision because I just realized I'm - I don't know how the hell (unintelligible) anywhere near my computer, but that…

Avri Doria: Actually, Chuck, if you have a copy-paste of it, could you just send the - whatever was in A to send that to Liz and she can copy back (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Woman: Well I actually have - I'm using the preceding…

Woman: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Looks like it's fine again.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Let's evaluate where we're at here. I think then…

Woman: I have to give up the pen anyway. So this is the perfect time.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right.

                Avri, can you take over the pen?

Avri Doria: Yeah. Okay let me find where we are.

Chuck Gomes: We're on how many scripts per territory and unless I have misheard
                things, the original - proposed GNSO response is okay. Is that right?

Avri Doria: No.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Now, I didn't go over the last sentence, too, which had to do with the variance, too, which is in it.

Okay, Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay. Now, where is the text in - oh at the moment all I see is dashes (in the A).

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Woman: Yeah. So we don't have the text.

Chuck Gomes: All right.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: So I'm - let me go back.

Chuck Gomes: Hold on, I can send the - I will…

Woman: Oh there, okay.

Revision 1252 was (Adrian's) - the 1251 is what we wanted.

Woman: Right.

Woman: Okay. Just loaded 1251.

                Now is that correct and if it is I will save that and make that our current.

Woman: Yeah. 1251 is right because we haven't made any changes since then.
                I just didn't how to save it (at the current).

Woman: Okay. Let me try saving and I save that.

                Revert to this one, there's a button.

                Revert to this one, are you sure you want to revert to this reversion?
                Liz, I am sure I want to revert to 1251?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Woman: Okay. I have reverted to 1251.

Adrian Kinderis: This is fine. I'll be sure to do this every 10 minutes or so.

Woman: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So is everybody okay? Are we okay now or should I try and send the
                documents that I have?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

                Well I'll…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I think we're back.

Woman: Yeah - no, we're fine.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Woman: I think we're fine.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good.

                All right.

Woman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So now, back to my question. Let's look at the proposed GNSO
                response that was there already. It's been there for several months.
                Okay?

                What do we want to change in that?

Woman: Okay. Yeah. I thought - (I mean), I guess, I've been talking about, A,
                dealing with the best user experience issue.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …we're referring to a specific user experience.

Woman: But - okay. But in this case it seems like we're advocating, creating as many IDN ccTLDs as possible.

Chuck Gomes: So maybe we can fix the language a little bit so it doesn't come across that way because I think you're right in that.

At the same time we're supportive where there are special needs for that to be done. So how can we - and that's what I'm asking now, how can we fix this language to deal with that issue and in any others that we…

((Crosstalk))

Man: Actually it says IDN TLDs. It doesn't say IDN ccTLDs there…

Woman: Uh-huh.

Man: Yeah.

Man: …in our response.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And I think that was intentional…

Man: (Yeah).

Chuck Gomes: Because it was a general principle that was being stated there.

Man: Indeed.

Chuck Gomes: But…

Woman: I mean, I think it's tried to develop something in those cases of territories or communities with a special need for multiple - for IDN ccTLDs (matched) to the ISO 3166-1 codes in multiple scripts, this should be possible or something like it.

Chuck Gomes: Let me get over to the…

Woman: And so, (unintelligible) basically just - in those cases of territories or communities with a special need for IDN ccTLDs (matched) to ISO 3166-1 code in multiple scripts, this should be possible. It's an awkward sentence that needs to be (words in it).

                So in other words, we're keeping to because I think we did make a sort of decision that sort of said while one would be best we recognize that in some cases that's not possible that the political realities are such, special needs are such.

                So that, you know…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So…

Woman: So perhaps just another way of doing it. Using multiple - using - (another way), using multiple scripts in those cases of territories and I still learn to spell, (unintelligible) should be allowed. How's that as a sentence?

Chuck Gomes: I'm trying to get to the live document where you're at so I can see what you did.

Woman: Yeah. I've written 3 possibilities now.

                   Two possibilities, here's the first one, here's the second one.

Chuck Gomes: Oops. Now, it's just going to jump around on me, so I'm not even try.

Woman: Okay. Basically using multiple scripts in those cases or in the case of a territory or a community with a special need should be allowed in those cases (unintelligible) with special needs, should be allowed.

                   So that's kind of what we were saying.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Woman: We weren't going so far as to say, well gee, you know, they should have them in every possible one.

Woman: How is that different though than the first sentence? If there is multiple scripts used, the best user experience would be to provide IDN TLDs in all those scripts…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: There are 43 - as far as I understand that there is something like between 20 and 40 languages used in California.

                   Therefore, you know, and probably an equivalent number in the US, so we'd be saying in that first phrase that the United States should be able to have ccTLDs in every scripts that we produce a driver's license manual in, because those languages are in use. And we have some

states that have made them, you know, legal languages for doing business in the state in. And so that would be allow, you know, over 20 or 30 ccTLDs for the US.

Woman: But wouldn't your rewording also allow it? I mean, (unintelligible) going to argue it's a special need. It's a legal language in this part of the world. You know, we need to support it.

Yeah, I don't…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah. I mean you could be right. What we were trying to deal with was things like, you know, India where people would rise up in the streets and riot if they picked one (versus) the other.

Woman: Yeah. I have never been a proponent to talk about a certain number. I think it has to do with what is the need. But I don't - I think for the first sentence in this and you were to propose revisions, I don't think they're going to change anything about the US being capable of claiming that they have a special need because they have the formal languages.

And the other places in the world are going to do the same thing so that - so if you want to try to eliminate something like the US situation with 40 plus labels I don't think these revisions are making that restriction.

Woman: Understand.

Woman: Yeah. You know, I'm not…

Woman: You know, I understand you're not advocating a position. You're just saying that the wording don't do it.

Woman: Yeah, exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

              (There's) a situation where we need to advocate additional work rather than taking it or that we're supporting of meeting the needs of a territory, the various script needs of a territory.

              But this is an issue that has lots of implications and deserves further attention, something like that (unintelligible) now, I guess we're kind of (panting) a little bit on it if we go that approach, but I'm starting to sense that maybe the best we can do here or what do you - if somebody had some other suggestions?

              Because (Adrian's) point is valid, too, that, you know, again, we don't want just to be on unlimited number. I think you're saying the same thing and at least in part of what Avri is saying here. So…

Woman: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah. I'm just trying to allow…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …limitations on it while at the same time showing some flexibility.

Woman: Okay. So basically we should add a sentence and maybe we can come back to it, add something that restricts to or no, restrict somehow. And we have to figure out that…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: In later discussions we talked about tying it to official languages and apparent - and that didn't work. I think the more discussion we had the more I saw that didn't seem to work.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …have an official language?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. You had talked about relating it back to currency and I think Adrian commented that that doesn't work (in all case). I'm not sure that works for us either, but is there some way we can show flexibility and still not have this wide open game.

Is there anybody that would be willing to take a crack at this and come up with some wording and put it into the document in the next few days this week and then we can take a look at it next week?

Woman: I'll take a crack at it. I've been arguing about it (enough).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. If you'll do that, that will be great and we will review it next week. Any other…

Man: And, Avri, in the meantime, if you want to bounce that to me, I'm happy to help get something together.

Avri Doria: Okay sure.

                Yeah. Let's work around together then.

Chuck Gomes: That's a good suggestion.

Man: Could I just provide some food for thought here because they bring up a particular - very particular and rather odd example, which is the Japanese language because that's one language, and using three scripts as defined, the kanji, the hiragana and the katakana. And normally for expressing Japan in Japanese, you will use two kanji characters, but you could express the same thing theoretically in three hiragana characters and very theoretically in three katakana characters to make the same sound.

                Well would that be - but normally that's - especially with the katakana, we could only use for (loaned) words from abroad, it would be a - a Japanese would never do that.

                And - but should that be a possibility…

Woman: Wouldn't that be (confusingly) similar?

Man: Well, that's - or should it be considered as a variance to be avoided and things like that. But it's actually - well, it is a slightly different question that they give - provide in the example. I mean, it's - to me it's much more like, all right, in the case of Japanese, of course, it's

obvious that you would allow a script mixing between the three scripts that are used for the language, but that's sort of not exemplifying the original question we make to my mind.

Woman: Yeah. But it's basically any time we've got more than one way to represent the same sound we've entered very much the confusingly similar world.

Man: True.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And whatever we do on this one, it seems to me that we do want something - the basic contents of that last sentence with regard to variance.

Man: From that perspective, it should probably be kept in the very last sentence, yeah.

Woman: Okay. Yeah, so un-bracket that one.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I think that's a good idea (unintelligible).

              And you can tell by what we're talking about right now, some of what we're talking about is probably a variance issue, some of it it's not but some of it is, so. Okay?

              Then going on then what's the matter, why is my document not scrolling? Where - okay.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And what's the consensus, would it be appropriate to introduce a limit on the number of scripts on territory (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I'm having trouble (unintelligible) letting my Word document. What's going on here? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah. I'm not doing anything (to that one).

Chuck Gomes: No, I know that. That's why I'm puzzled, okay.

                Where are we? Okay.

                So now we're in Question B, right, which is in what circumstances would it be appropriate to seek to introduce a limit on the number of scripts a territory may choose to introduce for a ccTLD or any TLD with the national connection. Now this may - actually in answering in this one may help deal with what we're talking about in the California example and some things like that.

                The - I think at least part of the response that's already there still seems to be valid. Obviously if there's any security, stability, interoperability issues that's certainly a reason.

                Now we get in the national government again, which I suspect we're going to want to change if - with regard to policy issues, and they're trying to develop policies so maybe that's not even needed here.

One of the - and one of the things that came up in the working group that worked on this response was that, you know, is it possible in some territory country that one language is more official than another and what they were getting at, I think, was, you know, maybe government agencies and so forth are represented in one script would be recognized as more official than in another script even though they - well scripts may be used in the country.

So, I think at least the first sentence of that response is still valid. The question is what…

Woman: And I think…

Chuck Gomes: …what do we want to add to it.

Woman: I think the second sentence should be not confusion - use of confusion. It might be another issue, but I think that could be strengthened to, you know, they should not - they must not cause user confusion.

Chuck Gomes: So that's good. I think that's a - I think it is better to make that stronger. Anybody disagree with that?

Okay, so that's good. So you can go ahead and make that change. I don't know if we want to include any or the rest of that stuff there, but we may want to add something in place of it.

Suggestions?

Tina Dam: This is Tina. I don't think you want to add the rest because I - there certainly is some cases where you cannot talk about one language being more official than the other.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Tina Dam: And governments can't make that choice because they all are considered equal, so…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'm leaning the same way that they're leading those - the last two sentences there.

Anybody opposed to that?

Okay. Now, is there something else that we want to add to that answer?

Woman: Do we need the cost in the first sentence that says we're not aware of any such reasons at this time?

(They're saying) what would be reasons. Well an obvious reason would be, you know, (unintelligible) it's not for us to say whether it is such a reason or not that's (unintelligible) and all them to do that.

I mean…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Am I in the same place as you…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes, the previous sentence, the most obvious reasons for limiting the number of scripts would be technical to ensure stability - the security, stability and the interoperability, but we're not aware…

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I see. What you're saying is do we need to…

Woman: To have that but we're not aware of any response - of such reasons…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: We may not need that. I mean, I'm - and I don't think I am aware of any but, Tina, are you?

Tina Dam: No, I'm not saying there are any. It's just that do we need the clause?

Chuck Gomes: We don't necessarily need it.

                   Anybody…

((Crosstalk))

Tina Dam: …I'm going for short answers.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody opposed to deleting that last clause, the but clause there in the first sentence?

Man: I think that's maybe the safe option to delete the last one. I mean what happens if we - well there are not 10,000 scripts, but…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. Okay.

Let's…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Leave that up to (FX), you know?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And so that's - so we'll - that's okay to delete it then. And then you've got the stronger sentence that follows that on user confusion. Do we want to say anything else here or is that sufficient?

Woman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: All right.

Woman: If somebody thinks of something later, we can add it and come back.

Chuck Gomes: All right.

C, can a territory apply for an IDN ccTLD string even if the script is not used in a language with any official status in that territory, for example, let me come back to the Japanese example and then also an Australian example, can Australia apply for representation of Australia and that script even though needed a script nor any language (driving) from it has any official status in Australia?

Sorry about the rudeness there, disrespectful opening, Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: No, I didn't…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: It was…

Adrian Kinderis: I didn't know a better way to say that, but…

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: …it just felt like you were saying there with your hands on your hips saying…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …we told you already.

Adrian Kinderis: …already.

Chuck Gomes: The intent really was more to say, hey, we're repeating ourselves here so that people, you know, if they see that we're saying the same thing over again, but it is - your point is well taken. So don't worry about this.

Woman: But in this case, I'm not sure that we're in that same position or I don't think we're arguing to that position quite any more.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's true, yeah.

Woman: I mean because we basically said that it's okay to have multiples if there's a special need and we want to limit that. So this one would be, I guess…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …if there's a special need (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: And so this just a "yes"?

Woman: (Well), yeah.

Woman: No, I think…

Man: Basically it was…

((Crosstalk))

Man: …always apply for whatever question is more whether they should be granted that.

Woman: Okay.

Right.

Woman: Yeah. So…

Woman: I think so far we've been saying - sorry.

Woman: No, go ahead.

Woman: I think so far we've been saying "no".

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …what I was going to say.

I thought you guys were trying to limit it and now you're saying, oh yeah, you can have anything you want.

So, I don't know. If you're saying, yes, to this one then you're…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Then we're not limiting?

Woman: Yeah, that's not what you tried to do about it, and I'm not saying either one is better or worse. I'm just saying it's contradicting.

Woman: Yeah.

Woman: I think then we have to say no.

Man: I'm for no.

Chuck Gomes: I'm for yes.

Man: Maybe…

((Crosstalk))

Man: It's about maybe.

Chuck Gomes: By the way, I was serious.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: (I was) just being (unintelligible).

                You know, I - why you should - I mean, if Australia has got, you know, various, you know, languages that are used in this country quite frequently, I don't know. It seems to me that .au and versions of that should be able to be provided in those scripts.

Adrian Kinderis: But how do you write - if it's unofficial, how do you ratify? I think you're opening a can of worms and you just don't want to.

Woman: Yeah. This is the one that opens a way to the name of your country in every possible script and why wouldn't you, you know, but you could have the name of your country and every possible script and it's not costing you any thing. There's no contract and there's no - I mean, why not…

Adrian Kinderis: Is this the one that's speaks to that says Australia is made up of many different multicultural groups and that if the Japanese community within Australia why don't they have .australia, in Japanese they should be allowed to?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Woman: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. See, I mean my personal opinion that doesn't wash, it doesn't even spin-dry but yeah, I'll shut up.

Woman: Okay, spin-dry…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And what - help me understand our rationale there, why really are we concerned about that? Because they're not…

((Crosstalk))

(Olga):   My concern - Chuck, this is…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …because they don't have a contract?

(Olga):   Yeah, contract.

Woman: Yeah. (Olga), you were trying to say?

(Olga):   Yeah. My concern is that if a country does have other languages than the official one, how can you know that and maybe they apply for as many as they want because there is some entrepreneur in the country

that's promoting that and that will really be quite confusing for everyone.

And I made this question in our last telephone conference. What is a country that doesn't need an IDN because it's abused in a different script and it's comfort with the present ccTLD in the ISO list would apply for as many other strings just because they think that they are not official but they like them. That's my concern. That's why I would say no.

Chuck Gomes: Let me tell you where I'm coming from. I'm looking at it from a gTLD side and maybe that's where I'm off-base but, you know, we have - approaching 1 million second-level IDN names in .com and .net. All - most of which the users really would have liked to have had a full IDN experience for obvious reasons.

Why shouldn't they be able to have that experience?

Now that's a - from a gTLD side and if we're going to treat that differently, my concern is that it's being inconsistent. If I believe that on the gTLD side, how can I turn around to the ccNSO and say it's not the same for them.

Woman: Well, and one respect that's different is you are expected to go through a whole lot of hurdles, prove a lot of things, pay a fair amount of money, establish business practices, and go through quite a few checks and balances before you can do that.

Chuck Gomes: And that's what I was looking for when I said, okay, what's our thinking here so that I'm trying to make sure I have it so that I can - in my mind so that I can articulate it.

And that make sense to me, okay? So that's helpful.

Woman: (See), I think it - at some point we really start to have a problem with, you know, one of the core values of ICANN, which is, you know, promote fair competition wherever possible.

And at a certain point…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah.

Woman: …when you have basically told governments, especially, many of them that are used to telecom monopolies that this whole wild open field is a (fallible) to them.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Woman: The ability of anyone (unintelligible) to compete is just shock.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. You convinced me.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …convince somebody…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I concede.

Woman: ….of a competition argument?

Chuck Gomes: So is our answer here just "no"?

Woman: I would say no.

(Edmond):   This is (Edmond). Sorry I joined the call about 14 minutes ago.

                 (Unintelligible) we say it already depends because if you apply for it
                 and then the process for the application and process for, you know,
                 granting it is - has those things in place to avoid the situation where we
                 really want to avoid it then the answer to the question itself is, you
                 know, it depends, right, because we're talking about an application
                 from them and how that it's processed and what requirements are for
                 them to be granted, that's really - that seems to be the class of the -
                 what we, you know, the part of the answer rather than just a simply
                 yes-no.

Chuck Gomes: Comments on that. Thanks for joining us, (Edmond).

                 So say it again, it depends on what?

Woman: (Unintelligible) depends on the process required for granting an IDN
                 ccTLD.

Chuck Gomes: And would we then maybe have to elaborate on that a little bit?

Woman: Right. We could go, for example…

(Edmond):   Have we…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Edmond):   …already talked about it before like…

Woman: No.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think so, yeah.

(Edmond):   Did - where do we talk about, you know, the contract and they should have…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …to do with the de facto gTLDs.

So we definitely talked about that and it may come up again. But not in a - in this context, I don't think.

Do we want to say something like it depends on the process?

(Edmond):   I don't know because from what I hear - I mean, the main thing that we're worried about is that they get all these ccTLDs and it's sort of not fair.

But if they go through a process whereby, okay, it is not official and it's - there are these issues, but if you do really want it, you can go through

a process that's similar to a gTLD, but we will still put you under the ccNSO.

Then, you know, perhaps that's something we can live with.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Comments? Others?

Woman: So I thought that the concern went back to something completely different and that is to say let's say there's, you know, x number of languages in the world and multiply that with the number of existing TLDs, gTLDs and ccTLDs, that turns into a big total number. And so if we're going to end up with that, there might be a technical concern and there is also going to be an administrative concern from the ICANN standpoint or IANA standpoint of processing the applications or whatever you want to call it.

Woman: Yeah. Well that would be - I think if we talked anything other than no, then I think we have to add the same clauses, you know, that we have in other places about security and (confusiability) and as we have a standard of, you know, security and (confusiability) even on national scripts.

So I think you're right. I think if we say anything other than, no, we need to add, you know, a clause that says, of course, you know.

Chuck Gomes: And, (Edmond), are you advocating that we - that approach, the latter approach?

((Crosstalk))

(Edmond): I guess I just - I mean it's just not comfortable. I feel uncomfortable saying, you know, that's a definitive no because I can easily think of situations that, you know, that there might be legitimate reasons for trying to do this but a particular language does not have, I guess, "official status."

Whether that immediately then jumps into being a gTLD is, you know, I just, you know, really think it is - I guess, (stepping) back from what (Tina's) comment, I don't think that's really - it should be a big issue - it - and also depends on, you know, how the application processes, I mean, is - let's say there is a - hypothetically there's an application fee or an application deposit, then, you know, there are some barrier there and there's no different from, you know, opening up the gTLD space, where - I mean, you can have a million applications.

So I don't think we can justify by saying that, you know, oh then, if you times by 200 (total for that) times let's say, I don't know how many language in total, 300 or 400, that's an, you know, unmanageable number. I don't think that's a good argument to follow, you know, to…

Chuck Gomes: Now let me make a suggestion here because we're coming up on 2 hours and I don't want to go beyond that if possible or at least not very much beyond it.

(Edmond), would you be willing this week and it's - hopefully by Friday, to draft some proposed language that would accommodate what you're talking about and entered into the Google document and then we'll come back to this next week?

Woman: Right. Yeah, just to say where we're at now, what are you thinking, (Edmond), at the moment, we've got three answers in there.

We've got a quick one [No] in brackets. We've got - it depends on the process required for granting an IDN ccTLD. For example, if a process is similar to that developed for gTLDs (unintelligible) ccTLDs, then it may be dot-dot-dot and that's the one that I guess he'd be asking you to rewrite and say what you wanted to say.

And then there's the impolite yes, which (unintelligible) impolite was the one that say, sure, if you want them that's cool.

Do I - first of all, do I leave all three for now?

(Edmond): No, you should delete the yes. I conceded, remember?

Woman: Okay, you conceded on the yes, so now we're between a no and a maybe. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Edmond): I think we should - I think - and I agree that we should start with, you know, generally speaking, it should be no. But - and then go on.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …to take a crack at that, (Edmond)?

(Edmond): Sure, sure.

Chuck Gomes: And then get it in this week, please, that'll give a few days in before our - so again, our meeting is on Tuesday so that would give a couple of days for people to review it.

So that we can kind of wrap up at a meaningful place thus very quickly look at the - if official - (process) required, sorry about that, but you won't be able to hear me, good, my wife. Hello, wrong.

If a status is required, who will define it and who will (defend) it in each case (unintelligible) and the (response) that was in there before was this question should be answered by the ccNSO and the GAC and we could say related and the related community, you know, that are involved in the ccTLD.

Thoughts, should we change that? I know we want to - probably don't want to say in the…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah - no.

Chuck Gomes: …governments but…

Woman: Right.

Chuck Gomes: …if we modify that and the related community that is in - that are all involved in the ccTLDs, does that work?

Woman: I guess my only recommendation was ISO (unintelligible) and then someone want ISO on the local Internet community.

Chuck Gomes: Well - but ISO is not going to do that, is my concern there.

Woman: Yeah, that's right. ISO is not going to do it. I can live with the answer.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I mean, don't you agree with me? I mean, yeah, all of the evidence right now and Tina can comment on this is that, ISO - if they did do it, it's years down the road.

Is that right, Tina?

Tina Dam: Yeah, it that's right.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah, countries do define their own official languages.

Man: (Unintelligible) is Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: (Except for)…

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: …do we want to change to modify…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I already changed communities.

Man: Yeah, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Man: As it appears now, that's been - oh, you know, looking at the live document, Chuck, but Avri is spontaneously changing and has fixed the document.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Yeah, I'm not - I wouldn't be able to stay on top of the meeting. So anyway, okay. Then what we've got then is - this will be our take-off point next week.

Again, we made some good progress. I think, by the way, I kind of glanced ahead a little bit. We've got some easier ones coming up, and we probably would be able to make pretty good progress next week. We still may need the 29th.

But any comments or questions before I adjourn?

Woman: I'd like to suggest - I mean, a lot of us wrote comments, but now some of us have actually been doing words missing in our heads, and so I just like to suggest that anyone that thinks they have an answer for something, (going) - and then…

Chuck Gomes: (Right), go ahead.

Woman: …we've already got some words to play with.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right good. Yeah - no, I think that's - so feel free to do that everyone and I know as you know, I went in last week and (answered) a couple of things just to facilitate things and I think that is…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah. Instead of adding of comments, try to actually just put some words in it so that we can just talk about the words.

Chuck Gomes: Good suggestion. Okay. Anything else? All right. Well then I - the meeting is adjourned. We'll…

Woman: One o'clock in the morning, yay.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: I'll do my best not to delete the document in the meantime.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Adrian. We do appreciate that.

Adrian Kinderis: Thank you.

Woman: It's cool how you can recover.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes, it is.

Woman: It's cool - recover.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Bye.

Woman: Okay, bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye.

                              END