Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting

ISPCP Meeting

Tuesday 16 July 2013 at 14:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

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

Coordinator: Okay. This is the internet service provider and connectivity providers' meeting.

Man: Okay. So welcome to the ISPCP meeting here in Durban. The agenda is posted but obviously things happen as the meeting progresses up to this point, the Tuesday. So worst, we will be covering the issues. There are some changes to the agenda. There's also some changes to the running order of the agenda.

Mikey will be posting the agenda up on the screen at some stage. But at the moment he's helping with the - and I'm going to get the meeting going. And the first item we're going to deal with is the issue of IDN.

I just want to check. I believe we have Dennis on the line. Is that correct, Dennis?

Dennis Jennings: That's correct, Dennis Jennings here calling from - I've been called from Dublin.

Man: Thank you very much for joining us, very much appreciate that. We also have Edmon here with us and Chris Dillon as well. So we've got a lot of expertise in this area. Very much appreciate you joining us for this.

The background to this is that, as someone described it to start with, I think as ISPs we've been a little bit sleepy watching the progress of - at the IDN variant work. And we're now at the stage where as ISPs we're getting a little bit concerned because we're always in the hot seat when anything new is rolled out into the network for issues with it - our support centers where the funds start ringing.

So what we've actually asked for is a brief introduction of where we are with IDN variants, the work that you guys have been progressing and to try and identify as a first stage some of the issues which we're going to face as these things are rolled out as ISP so a very brief background. And Dennis, feel free to interject at any time please but initially I'm going to ask Edmon just to provide...

Edmon Chung: Thank you and thank you for having me here. I - as mentioned, I didn't really prepare any kind of presentation so to speak but I guess I will highlight a few items that I think is especially relevant to ISPs around the world in the world of IDNs and especially IDN variants.

And I actually wanted to bring attention perhaps to two pieces of work that the JIG is working on, the joint IDN working group between the ccNSO and the GNSO, one of which is a document that went out for public comment which is our draft final report on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

And that I think is especially relevant because a lot of the issues surround the acceptance of IDN TLDs at various, I guess, nodes of the network including through ISPs and hosting and applications and those type of areas. And I think it - it's great to be here and not - also great to hear that the constituency

is sort of waking up to this because I think as IDN TLDs, in fact as new gTLDs, they're implement those are probably some issues as well.

But as IDN's new gTLDs are being introduced you will certainly see more, for lack of a better way to describe it, probably more failures happen in the network. And that eventually will affect users and, you know, you probably will get some calls. That is certainly the case.

But in terms of the scope of what are some of the issues I think in - the universal acceptance piece of work which draws upon the SSAC work about ten years ago but - and then also staff work and work at the IAB and IETF and also recently with the staff universal acceptance team, it sort of draws on all those and adds a few pieces of things for IDN TLDs.

So I draw your attention to that particular document. And we - I'm not going to go into details unless we - questions or we can jump back into it. So that's one area which is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs that I think needs to be flagged.

The other piece of work that the JIG is working on is a response to two documents that the variant - the - that the following from the VIP which is Variant Issues Project that was in IDN variant program team from staff. They generated two reports, one of which is what is called a label-generation rule set process root. And the other one is a user experience document of IDN variants, especially IDN variant TLDs.

And of course I'm drawing more attention to the latter one which is the user experience report. And in that report there are - it's pretty comprehensive, comprehensively lists about a number of potential issues that would come downstream including two different parts of the network including ISPs, of course, hosting management of domain names and websites and all those areas. Again I won't go into the specific details until we create a dialogue.

But in response to those two reports the JIG also has drafted a response and has identified at least two key recommendations, one of which is the realization that this -- well not realization; actually I should say confirmation -- that the issue of IDN variant TLDs is not really a purely technical matter. And the reason why I say that is in the report it was pretty clear that in terms of IDN variants there is a competing view of what is called conservativeness.

Is - at the root in ICANN in terms of policy we always want to be conservative in terms of security and stability and - of the network. But here we're faced with two views of stability and conservativeness.

One view is from the, I guess, pure technical community where less is better, less is more conservative which means let's do least amount of IDN TLD variants, almost close to zero.

On the other hand there is a linguistic community which is the - I guess the user community at large. And the linguistic community view on IDN variants is that the maximum protection is the more conservative way. So we catch all of them. We put all the variants in. That, you know, at one end of the spectrum we provide all the variants so that users, no matter which variant they would be able to utilize it. That's one end of the spectrum.

Where we end up with and how we determine what the - what it should be is going to be a policy decision that ICANN and the ICANN community will need to make. And that's one of the key recommendation. And as such the two SOs will need to, you know, will need to work on it.

And the following from that is to look at the two SOs, whether policy - currently whether policy development processes is required. And we looked at the ccNSO side. And we see that, you know, actually ccNSO has not worked on it yet.

They had an IDN ccPDP. And they specifically said they are not looking into this yet. And then the recommendation there is to - for them to start working on it.

On the GNSO point - part there is actually two parts. One part is that we recognize that the IDN working groups off the GNSO quite a number of years ago now but it's - was incorporated into the new gTLD recommendations. That already talked about IDN variants.

And with the implementation of the root level that I think the perspective is that no further policy development is required. The framework is there. It's a - an implementation item.

I talk about that but the other part of it is that there is also a recommendation for registries to - a set of recommendations for registries and registrars. And those recommendations have been deemed to be optional by the authors of the report.

But I guess it's important to note to ICANN which we - part of our recommendation is to make sure that they are optional at this stage. If they are going to have to be implemented then policy development process will need to be in place because that hasn't been covered before.

So that's in terms of IDN and IDN variant TLDs. I think those are two reports that are - hopefully we would get some feedback from - and I guess finally one important aspect is that this is not - there are a lot of technical areas in it but this is not a purely technical matter. There are policy decisions and compromises to be made.

And the other thing is that there is a list of - a pretty long and comprehensive list of issues that ISPs, hosts or technical community might face as we implement IDN TLDs and especially with IDN variant TLDs. And those should be looked into.

Man: Thank you, Edmon. Is there anything you wanted to add, Chris or...

Chris Dillon: Edmon has given a very good at least description of it. It's - the use of this word conservative in the two different ways is quite interesting.

First - the first way is basically a technical way of looking at it so to - perhaps to allow things in the root zone is not conservative. The other is really dealing with the fact if you don't allow languages to have the variant forms which is really what the - difficult to understand.

The other script very frequently there are several additional ways to write the other definition of conservative. Basically if you don't allow the - personally I actually only use the word in the first sense.

Man: Well that approach seems to make a lot of sense to me certainly. Dennis, is there anything you wish to add at this stage?

Dennis Jennings: Yes, if I may. Can you hear me all right?

Man: Yes. Please go ahead.

Dennis Jennings: First of all thank you for inviting me to join you. I'm a long way away but this connection works very well.

Edmon highlighted two documents. The most important one is the user experience document which I would urge everybody involved here who is going to have to deal with IDN both as TLDs and (unintelligible) into second and lower levels read that document very, very carefully indeed and try and develop some understanding of what might work and what won't work at least initially with IDN domain names.

Another document that I would refer you to which has been published now by ICANN is a doc - a risks document that I wrote back at the beginning of the year with the help of a significant number of experts around the globe, both IDN domain names and (unintelligible) risk which tries to highlight some of the risks, potential risks, that there might be for users in using IDN.

Let me try and give you some impression of the issue here. I can only give you a brief impression but I do urge you to read these documents and to - first of all with IDN domain names not many of the applications actually work. Very few of the browsers really work very well. But certainly email doesn't work.

And you cannot at this stage use IDN email addresses as unique identifiers to log into commercial transactions, sites or to Google or to Facebook. So the deployment of systems that understand and deal with IDNs is very limited at this time as far as ICANN (unintelligible). This is IDNs even without considering the complexity of IDN variants.

To give you some idea of the complexity of IDN variants let me remind you that with ASCII domain names the - as far as makes almost no difference the following are true. The code point set is fixed. There are no variants unless you count upper and lower-cases variants but there are no variants. And once a string has been submitted the only question is whether it will be allocated or not, whether it's at the - by ICANN at the top level or by a registry at the second level or by a user at the third or lower levels. So there's no allocation issue.

With IDN domain names at every level the question of what code points are used is an issue. The question of what the definition of the variants are is an issue. And in some cases there are many different vary - definitions of variant in the same script depending on which particular linguistic community you're working with. And the allocation of the resulting strings and the policy around those allocations are an issue.

So just to give you the first and simplest example, at the root, at the top level, ICANN will certainly tend and certainly should, in my view, fix the character set so that's no longer an issue, fix the rules of the variants in consultation with the various communities around the globe, the CJK, the Arabic and so on, communities.

So what is still an open issue -- and I think Edmon referred to this as a policy area -- is which if any or at all of the resulting potentially several strings is variant, will be allocated in the root. If you take a slightly more - so just taking top-level domains the user experience will be reasonably predictable from a code point of view cause that'll be defined by ICANN, the variants will be defined and published by the various community groups, coordinated by ICANN but the - which actual variant is allocated may vary from one gTLD to another.

So the ability of the user to develop a picture in their mind as to what the rules are may be very difficult. And this may lead to users having difficulty using variant TLDs.

If you go to a slightly more complex case but that is where a second-level labels or allocation of the domain name is a second-level, not top-level and the situation is that each registry defines their own rules about which characters are used, what the vary - how the variants are defined and which of the resulting variant strings are allocated then you can see immediately that you have enormous complexity for the full domain name, second-level, top-level.

If those rules or choices made by the registry are different from one gTLD to another even within the same script you can see that there's the potential for significant user confusion. They will be unable to build a model in their head as to what - how it works and what works.

Add to the complexity that how this is implemented will depend to a very large extent on the implementation of IDNA2008 in the actual device that's being used, then you can see that there's a potential for the user experience to vary when they move from a tablet to a phone to their home computer to their office computer to a computer in a - an internet café.

Whether all these potential risks will materialize and add to that the complexity about which applications work and how they work, whether these complications and confusions arise or not is of course unknown. But I think it's extremely likely that they will.

And my view is that the registries need to get together to develop some - let's not call them, standards, let's call them conventions and agreements, at least within each clip as to what these rules will be so as to provide some consistency to users when they use devices to access application - using applications to access services that use domains.

I think that sufficiently highlights the complexity. But I'd - and that's probably left you all gasping (unintelligible) anyway with all the detail I provided.

So let me reiterate. Please do read the user experience document and the - endeavor fraught with risk, the IDN risks documents. And do participate with Edmon in the JIG. Thank you.

Man: Thank you, Dennis. That was extremely helpful.

Am I under the wrong impression that already on some of these issues the train has left the station and we are in a position where there'll already be confusion because it was mentioned that I think the ccSO hasn't taken any decision on this at all? So are we not already in a situation where there will be the potential for confusion out there now or am I missing the point?

Dennis Jennings: No. You're correct. However, there's a tremendous part of - you're correct in the sense that's confused folks already.

Man: Dennis, are you there?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: I guess in the mean time I wanted to go back to - and probably would like to answer that. So you asked about the current situation.

In terms of the ccTLDs in the Fast Track which is - Fast Track does not view the current delegations as IDNs. Reality I think there are two TLDs right now, .china has implemented.

In terms of the confusion that is in the place. And I think the two things I really want to bring up to this community, one is that - what Dennis has said and actually what the user experience document said.

There will be failures. And there will be users who are very confused. And there will be system administrators who'll be very confused why I need to - but like for example. That's one. I wasn't tired of it.

The other part that is important to note as well is that it has been put in place. And the user experience so far has been (unintelligible).

Part of going to see these issues but they're not going to come at us at a - like a tsunami. It's going to trickle in.

It's, you know, as IDNs are being adopted and implemented things are going to start trickling in. So you're not looking at a tsunami coming at the ISPs but not to say that, you know, you shouldn't pay attention because the resolution rates and registration rates for IDNs are still, you know, at a very nice - early stages.

So I just want to leave it with those two. So it's a real issue that currently does, you know, it's more user benefit, you know, from the - are real issues. But, you know...

Man: Yes please. Would you like to - for the record if I could just ask you to say who you are. Thank you.

(Asmus Frankhyde): My name is (Asmus Frankhyde) and I'm speaking here in kind of a past capacity as having been one of the (unintelligible) for the development of the better generation rule sets for this. Coming from that perspective then the issues around this and the concerns that have been raised, especially the one that raised - so nicely articulated by Dennis right now in terms of who is also in this project, having on the horizontal level bearish registries coming to maybe a better agreement on their policy so that the user experience is predictable.

The - in the roots on LGR procedure document a lot of time going after all these different terms for these different things not only conservatism but we actually had a term for that other aspect. We didn't call it conservatism. The surprise, the - having users be able to form expectations, working consistently that we distinguished that from conservatism which is - things from being allocated, delegated in excess of what is needed.

Average defined large list of variants, a conserve - it can help a conservative goal if the status of these things, a large part of, say, the root or zone space identified as things that can be considered a variant of something else and

therefore can't be delegated is itself a conservative measure because it keeps these tables out of circulation.

In that sense I would be comfortable with taking an expansive activity which is to be in the data tables a large number of variants, conservative act because the actions for each of that takes the stuff out of circulation. That was kind of conservative mean - conservative does not always mean minimalist in the data table.

So backing up is a - it's very worthwhile to try to figure out how one, even with the cat partially out of the bag or very far out of the bag, is - you think about what can be done, on what level, what framework, to try to recover the situation and get to a better predictability. Getting predictability would mean in that sense you have - on the second level you have all the registries for a given script be on handling most uniformly as possible. That would be the ability to have.

Horizontal level, it's tricky understanding. It's not - fits in the vertical model of ICANN dealing with a direct contact partner. So it will take box to get anything done at that level.

I was enough of an expert in this area to know the goal is to really provide people with a good user experience. Something in that area must be attempted.

Man: Thank you for that. I just want to check. Dennis, are you back with us now?

Dennis Jennings: I am indeed. Thank you. And I'm sorry that I missed the last few minutes. I heard what - half of what (Asmus) said. I send him greetings.

Man: Good. Thanks. So the reason I think that as ISPs we have suddenly woken up - and you refer to the user experience which is really important. But the reality is when they get bad experiences we're in the hot seat.

And there hasn't been much engagement from - and obviously I think engaging more in this - but one hole that currently is left in my mind from this discussion is that the ideal situation, it appears to me, would be -- and I think Edmon referred to it -- to have some - something that - in your experience is there a willingness from that to - going to happen? Aren't we at the stage now where that...

Edmon Chung: It's a good question. But in the JIG actually that topic was raised a little bit in terms - I don't want to speak for the ccNSO but I think the general feeling is that that's within their own ccTLD sort of station. And it's going to be very difficult to find, to - that's my feelings.

On the GNSO side though I - I'm more optimistic. And in fact as (Asmus) was saying I was thinking through my mind this is precisely the kind of thing that we should get a PDP started.

Let's look into the registration level. And hopefully this is not something that will slow down the current process which we might - doesn't. It would be few - that is possible. And I think it is possible to come to some sort of consensus agreement around what the parameters should be and how similar we should be within g-space.

One more thing I wanted to add is that it's - not all is lost, at least perhaps Fasken can help us here is that all these new gTLD applications and also new IDN ccTLD app required to provide their registration policies and variant policies at the second level. And this actually includes (unintelligible).

So we do have a definitive list and a definitive set of tables that each proposed new gTLD is going to implement. So we have that information and we have - it is a definitive. It's not an, you know, it's not an infinite list. That's why I'd want a set of lists and set of documents.

I wonder, you know, perhaps one of the things that we ask staff to do is do a little bit of study there and see what the implications are because in the initial evaluation of new gTLDs which I personally have helped a number of IDNs work through, there's extensive questioning on the specific issue is how the variants are managed and if there's, you know, I - generation and how they're managing both.

I guess I can (unintelligible) that information. Perhaps we should actually.

Man: Thanks, Edmon. Thanks.

Woman: My name is (unintelligible). So I don't know. I'm new to this group so I'm not sure if special request were to come, one area Edmon (unintelligible) and looks into their practices (unintelligible) the one (because we go ahead and) (unintelligible).

In fact I was told they are probably (unintelligible). So to just answer your question (unintelligible) (lasting sometimes), there are 34 IBM ccTLDs in the room as of today. (Unintelligible) that is significant (unintelligible) as presented earlier this year and there were actually two other reports that followed that one (unintelligible) looked at what the staff did and then (we) were (to review) both sets of work.

So the conclusion that was reached is in that independent review the reviewer looked at the probability of these risks that were named in the report, the probability of them happening and then the impact if they were to happen. And they used the low, medium, high (unintelligible). Some of the risks that were presented (unintelligible) certainly with ICANN the user community everyone has work to do.

But the report did not conclude everyone go home and (get) comfortable, we all have work to do but (if we can) - we're at a point where we need to continue to work, we can't (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) difficult (unintelligible).

Man: Well, you know, I think - I was in the middle of asking a question when he fell off the line. I just wanted (unintelligible).

Dennis you gave a summary of the situation as you see it and I just wanted to see if that was a summary of IBMs or whether that also included IBM Variant. And if it didn't (if there were) other issues (that you) (unintelligible). (Peter), Dennis or Edmon or any of the rest of you could you (unintelligible).

I thought I knew what you were describing, so Dennis, (Crystal) (were you) (unintelligible).

Man: So before we (go) Mikey let us ask (Chris) (various ones) (unintelligible).

Man: At this point (to design) (unintelligible). Officially (it's used to form a (unintelligible) what Variant (unintelligible). (We didn't distribute for the) (unintelligible).

Man: Okay, yes Dennis the floor is yours, thank you.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you, thank you for the question I will cover IBM and Variant, especially Variant (unintelligible) things that at least we clarify (will be best analogy from) ICANN, but ICANN (unintelligible) (work is done).

Especially (unintelligible) the delegation of the (request here) (unintelligible) without Variant, much more done than Variant has allocated. Specifically ICANN (unintelligible) (permission) by integration (unintelligible) it's their responsibility when second level (enable control the) delegated their registry which also had (unintelligible) ICANN focused on domain name - full domain name (A dot B dot C) and (unintelligible).

The other question that I (adjusted for last myself) was whether the (unintelligible) that are out there already. And I think it's worth looking at (they're usually more conservative) analysis of the various -(the) differences between which highlight the complexity. But I think that either only one or a small number of the gTLD is not going to create pretty much use (because they're) specifically association with the (terror tree).

And but if the rules (just slight from the rules) of convention of the registry come up with I think users will be (hopeful) (unintelligible) because (unintelligible) are limited. Then there are hundreds or thousands of Chinese or whatever gTLDs and therefore the exact number of registrars and they're not in coordination (unintelligible) Variant allocation. At overtime the potential (unintelligible) over time.

Man: Okay thank you Dennis and this has been a very good start for us certainly and (unintelligible) comments should have wet our appetite. One of the things that we're looking to do is to (print the engagement) of the constituency and certainly we're focusing on some parts of the world (on the Internet) in some cases.

I wish we had another hour but we clearly don't. What I would ask is that having started in this conversation of Tivoli we've all got some homework to do and I'd like to that (take it now) (unintelligible) Edmon creates and the rest of (unintelligible) to meet with us again (unintelligible). I think (we'll) substantially (have some) questions by then which we'll need your help with (unintelligible).

Man: I'll make a suggestion.

Man: (Three two, three two).

Dennis Jennings: I think it would be very useful if the ISP or the (red clay) (unintelligible). I think to refine that to work with (JK), Chinese, Japanese, Korean registries

because I think that the Chinese, Japanese, Korean community is probably the (cause of this event) of all the communities.

And I am sure that they are the best in coordinating convention for gTLDs. So I'd like to get that specific action of the IFC community.

Man: Thank you Dennis. Is there any (routine) to do that - an easy route (sort of) Dennis.

Man: Personally though I think (now and then) (unintelligible) (with a virus). (Unintelligible) issue also would probably (unintelligible). And then I think probably working with the NTAG (unintelligible).

Man: Okay thank you very much and we (look forward in this) and very much appreciate it (unintelligible), it's been very helpful - we've had a good start. And thank you to you Dennis as well for joining this meeting from afar, you've been very beneficial.

Man: Thank you (for standing up).

Man: Thanks everyone. So we need to move on to other items on the agenda. (Chris Mondainy) is standing in for Sally Costerton when we talk about outreach. Basically an engagement plan but that institutes a (unintelligible).

What I wanted to (an issue) that's really from an (unintelligible) is coming up tomorrow in a GNSO Council and we have to discuss whether we're going to support the resolution that's been (suggested by) (unintelligible) and discussed in the Council sessions over the weekend. Since then there's been some early developments and there's been some modifications proposed (unintelligible) resolutions particularly after the session of the GNSO Council (unintelligible).

I should hand it over to the GNSO counselors to lead them (unintelligible). If I could ask you to display the (unintelligible) (Mickey)'s going to put on the screen an amended resolution that's been proposed (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) on the (unintelligible) later on.

Man: I think the (unintelligible) they have a (unintelligible) motion we are (unintelligible) just to the knowledge of all the (unintelligible) domain. So that's (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) his opinion (unintelligible) hated but not (unintelligible) outside the pure (policy development) (unintelligible) put to the Board then (unintelligible) from the action (unintelligible) shielding that may be (unintelligible). So that's become alive and (unintelligible). I'm being as objective (unintelligible).

First thing I'll obtain (unintelligible) which there's from the screen. But we had some (unintelligible), particularly the (unintelligible). We haven't discussed it (unintelligible) could be. (Unintelligible) body of (unintelligible) could be (unintelligible) focusing (unintelligible) speaking that's (unintelligible) current (unintelligible) to say that ICANN I would like to support this (unintelligible).

For your suggestions (unintelligible) business (unintelligible). I think it might be (unintelligible) for me every time it talks about GNSO (unintelligible). GNSO Council it's a body (unintelligible) in motion. (Unintelligible) of the meeting is very interesting because (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) of the bill not to be just limited on policy development you're asking here (unintelligible).

So I would like to avoid (unintelligible) personal response (unintelligible) hardly this (unintelligible) in the ability (unintelligible) anyway not to (unintelligible) so when (Chris) does come we'll move to the stakeholder engagement I suggest (unintelligible) that's really the best way (unintelligible) issue.

One round has been (unintelligible) just where we are, what we mean (unintelligible) which are from the GAC (unintelligible) in question first (unintelligible) request the (unintelligible) mandate. Because ICANN (unintelligible) protection of the (unintelligible) and certain domains (unintelligible) and not only for the (unintelligible) but for the record. They participated in the group that IOC Working Group and now working (unintelligible).

And so they reported was public (unintelligible) the comment for tomorrow but basically (unintelligible) for different top (unintelligible) sources, top level (unintelligible) - top level protect the (unintelligible) from - protecting the domain name only, protecting the (unintelligible) and the (unintelligible). Giving them special permission (unintelligible) the list can be (unintelligible) the name list creating a modified list of the names (unintelligible) the names that are naming the list it cannot be used by anybody. But they wanted to leave - they wanted to open the ability that they always take the name they use that would be identified by the...

Man: Vendor (unintelligible) similar for the same (unintelligible) the second level. (Unintelligible) more or less a gross representation of the same then the third (unintelligible) communication (unintelligible) criteria because they are enclosed not only in domain accommodation but they are to their own international number of implementation of which we separately (unintelligible) legal protection.

(Unintelligible) then usually (unintelligible), so they are (unintelligible) for NomCom representation. For governmental organization (unintelligible) because they have to be created (unintelligible) treaty and Red Cross has imposed (unintelligible) countries (unintelligible) internationally (unintelligible). Although the protection (of their full names) not necessary for the acronyms.

The problem is that some of them say I recognize the acronym. While others usually they are well advantaged, known by well advantaged. So and also some acronyms coincidentally are the same for different things (unintelligible) though one use among the others. So what would be the (unintelligible) for those.

And then finally the starvation (unintelligible) for which the report to try to in this international (unintelligible) trademark (unintelligible) trademark protection because the international (unintelligible) particular, they don't have trademarks. Their names are not significantly trademark (unintelligible) international treaty.

The international NomCom organization don't even have the treaty, so usually the trademark (unintelligible) so they cannot (unintelligible). That means we would need to have a special provision for (unintelligible) to do that. Those are basically the gross (unintelligible) options that we are working - the working group had a question was how the constituencies, the people in general (unintelligible) different options. But we are working - waiting for the command issue for this.

You know, I give you my personal opinion I would be agreeable and give them full protection for name and acronyms at the top level. Right now there is no problem (unintelligible) new gTLDs have any conflict with any international organization that we know of or at least nobody complained about it. And I think at the top level you should be treated differently so I would be agreeable to that.

But including those names in the sub-name list that would mean that they wouldn't be able in any new (unintelligible) logistics there their names are at the top level. I think that we should since they need it - and they are asking for more international protection that they are in a modern organization just to allow them to be included on the INT domain (unintelligible).

Then on the second level I was supposed I was supposed to give full name (unintelligible) protection at the second level of the organization and then only give protection from the (unintelligible) with INT domain. Actually the INT domain (unintelligible) something (unintelligible) domains. Most of the (unintelligible) using these acronyms and they are probably owned by are reduce to that.

So to give them this protection would mean that those (unintelligible) second user and we will need to go over to other (unintelligible) registration (unintelligible). I think that there are registration (unintelligible). And there should be conditions for the (unintelligible) and they (unintelligible) national treaty.

Man: (Unintelligible) we should know them.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: That's the point the procedure for claims, the idea was to modify material so that if any sort of (unintelligible) the list and (unintelligible). And if anybody has any rights than those names they would go through (unintelligible) procurement house and for a special (unintelligible). Thank you.

Man: Except for the IOC direct cross, I haven't seen any material or (unintelligible) pertaining to any known governmental agency limitation. In (unintelligible) limitation (unintelligible). Also they usually don't have any special protection community countries (unintelligible) own country (unintelligible).

Any - we need to make a decision on this and (unintelligible). He was supposed to (unintelligible) at the top level but (unintelligible). The trademark should be for the second level, the idea would be to put them on the same name list for the top seven. (Unintelligible) or any complaints we got in the acronyms (unintelligible) put it in the server name but would be in the trademark report.

Man: How envious, right. But some (unintelligible), besides you get more (unintelligible) - sorry, sorry?

Man: It's not intended to be supported by (unintelligible) proposal.

Man: Let's move (unintelligible) question.

Man: You're welcome, it was (unintelligible). And that way you'll have all the answers for (Chris). The issue we have has come up a few times during the sessions. It certainly came up in the conversation we had before this morning in terms of the (unintelligible). And (unintelligible) by the response to be quite honest.

           But the issue came about indirectly because within this constituency the setup subgroup that deals with (unintelligible) they try to get more engagement. And putting aside any project issues at all we're aware (unintelligible) the implication from (Sally). And we have been told that some of the efforts that we're making should be (unintelligible) without program.

           But we've had no discussions with (Sally) or anybody that you ask (unintelligible) what elements (unintelligible) the program how we can actually get into that activity or what's expected of us. And with somewhat an (unintelligible) at the manner, so on top of that somebody made a statement this morning that these projects they just (unintelligible) all these. So that's for you (unintelligible) this canvas.

           I've never heard that before and if that's the case than so a lot of talk that needs to be (unintelligible). So I've been set back, we're very keen to (unintelligible) what you (unintelligible) is what the real estate situation is and what we need to do if we're going to engage in that project.

Man: Thank you very much.

Man: (Unintelligible) a lot better looking than I am, but I think she may actually have planned it at this point. The (unintelligible) a little bit we'll talk about (unintelligible) engagement and the concept behind it. And really what I want to (unintelligible) even though (unintelligible) very quickly.

They do have to make the caveat. (Unintelligible) the apparent data to the various budget restraints. But the engagement that has taken place at this point in the stage is slow so they (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible)...

Man: (Unintelligible) engagement I think that we may have a circle diagram we talked about (unintelligible) circle (unintelligible) to go. (Engage) (unintelligible) ICANN (unintelligible) chair. (Unintelligible) and then (unintelligible). It's really looking (unintelligible) that we would (unintelligible) we will have (unintelligible) my understanding (of) ICANN is really that (unintelligible). My understanding (unintelligible) the members of your group to do so (unintelligible). Or (unintelligible) or could you please (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) so from you but also ICANN (unintelligible) environment.

Man: It doesn't (unintelligible) to achieve some help with and some of that relates back to budget. One of the things we try to and wanted to get better at. We have people in this constituency who have done substantial outreach in their (community) in various. Given a number (unintelligible). (Tony Harris) is another that's done this in South America and what we were hoping to have is some assistance in (unintelligible) pushing those activities forward and certainly I think the request we put in for budget helped. Probably enabled us to do the level to what we've done through the engagement process that we could dig deep and (unintelligible) doesn't really fit with that scenario so that this is something (unintelligible). What is your advice in terms of those activities?

Man: I'd certainly be more than happy to be the joining up and the narrowing of the (unintelligible) there (unintelligible) directing and actually identify. (Unintelligible) mutually are (unintelligible) and so forth. (The) stage the (unintelligible) that going into the (group).

Man: Sure. And with more (unintelligible) so far the (unintelligible) we can carry on doing it. (Unintelligible) maybe none and that's not really (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) and we had the money. (Together this morning). You sort of feel on the (unintelligible). Doing the (overwhelmed) (meeting) and I can tell you (unintelligible) that perspective oh, great. (Unintelligible) (boot camp). There were some good sort of get on the right cultural (unintelligible) things. It was very (unintelligible). And we had the (message) internally. We have some many initiatives to see how they start to work. So he heard that a month ago. I definitely do that. Because we recognize the joining (unintelligible) and when I went (unintelligible) individuals influence and intensifying so when I (unintelligible) talking about the and my mind (goes) oh, well, we'll (take) some Google (hangout) or Webinar or (unintelligible) but why don't I come and recorded and put it on our learning platform. This is the (unintelligible). Your (subject is already). I have to ask that (unintelligible). That little bit the nature I look around and the world (unintelligible) (birth) of (these things). There's always that (media) world. Nobody notices. So (unintelligible) global or global (unintelligible). The last is probably (unintelligible). One analogy of marketing and sales is what (believe) they're effective your opportunity to (enhance) environment which is what your organization (helps) particularly (messaging) too because we have followers and Tweets and all these (unintelligible) of ICANN or the outcome is what I hoped for but at least the (unintelligible) somehow gratifying. So I haven't had (unintelligible) quality of (unintelligible). Who (died) as a result of (unintelligible) ICANN. Now we're getting to the bottom.

Man: What we were looking for was (unintelligible) was putting some. The answer for me to your question irrespective if it was (PC) or -- maybe there's still time

to fix this. Maybe the (unintelligible). Having heard Fahd's response to us this morning, it came over a bit (unintelligible). It came over way (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Woman: I would like to talk to a general audience (unintelligible). Are there (unintelligible). Like I said (unintelligible) tangible (unintelligible). And I will be reaching out to you.

Man: We need to thank you very much. Okay. We need to move on. Mikey, there were a couple things I know you were (unintelligible). One was the proposal that was put forward (unintelligible) constituency our support. Yes, we need to. Did you make it (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, that's the one.

Man: Can you -- okay. So, just before we look at this and put forward and explain the background.

Man: Funny how the meeting is (unintelligible) lawyer from London and he was speaking in his capacity as representative of... The subject of the meeting was what happened with Amazon application gTLD (unintelligible) I heard from colleague what was GAC advice had now become (in stone) and that would be (rejected) by ICANN. (Nick) said that Amazon actually presented more or less come to the fact they would (lose). But what he was proposing to the all the GNSO constituents is a non-contracted (unintelligible) is that we should think in the public forum which is actually what happened to Amazon and other (unintelligible) also. As far as the GAC sees what is written in the guidebook and they object to blocking various applications. So basically what this presented us with the constituency is (unintelligible) forum and the options are would we come to the mike and make a statement, would we write different statements along the same lines or supportive of pressing this public forum. That's where we are right now. This is the advice from us as a

constituency as to whether we (unintelligible) to this and if so would we be willing to say so in some manner or in some form during the public forum.

Man: Private meeting (unintelligible) representatives involved in (unintelligible) to hear our budget. One time getting the (dates) out there.

Man: Oh, yes, that's quite true and I might also add the (breakfast) this morning for the members of the (unintelligible). He was very enthusiastically telling them they should (put) a certain line of objection. Getting back to the document...

Man: Would you like to read that (line)?

Man: We ask that the GAC Board of ICANN, we ask that this board stakeholders before you today and the people we represent to reject GAC advice on geographic names that were not specifically by the guidelines set forth in multi-states (unintelligible).

Man: All of us.

Man: There (unintelligible). Get back to (unintelligible) it just seems to be there is an opportunity to (unintelligible). Many members to support it (unintelligible).

Man: Can you send the draft?

Man: There's one thing I do want to tell people. We as representatives it doesn't matter (unintelligible).

Man: You should talk to (Nick). And if anyone (unintelligible) personally but...

Man: (Unintelligible). There's one other thing we need to do is go back to the (unintelligible) session (with the) GNSO. (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: As close still seeking (unintelligible). The answer…

Man: That might be a question too about the model. They came to (unintelligible) yesterday. The GNSO lifted it and also right now we have the problem of new (unintelligible) coming who do not fit into any of this. And they see what's involved in being validated and end up walking away. We're losing people who could be coming to ICANN because they have nowhere to stay really.

Man: Okay. That's fine. What I would suggest to you is to cover (unintelligible). There are some questions that we need to (unintelligible) back on. There is that issue. The other issue which I did my (unintelligible) my records following now coming back that went back to his team so (unintelligible). So, (Tony), if you want to use me to respond back to that point on any of those. Send me your input on that. Looking at the agenda that we...We did have the session (unintelligible). It's not (unintelligible) approve our agenda or any other business. So the closed session is some of the inhouse for (unintelligible) to meet between now and next conference.

                     Thank you very much and make sure you leave your details. So with that, thanks to everybody and the official meeting is over. We'll also ask (members) just to stay. We have a few housekeeping issues. Can we close the official.

                     Yes, thank you.

                                    END