
Hiro Hotta: Good morning everybody, it's going to be a Working Group 2 meeting. I would like to have everybody's name on record. For that purpose may I invite our ...

Paulos Nyirenda: Paulos Nyirenda .mw.

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth Lange .no – Norway.

Bart Boswinkel: Bart Boswinkel, ICANN staff.

Demi Gretschnko: Demi Getschnko, .br.

Mary Uduma: Mary Uduma, .ng.

Dejan Djukic: Dejan Djukic, .rs.

Siavash Shahshahani: Siavash Shahshahani, .ir.

Hiro Hotta: Hiro Hotta, .jp and Chair of this Working Group.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Jian Zhang: Jian Zhang, .cn.

Daniel Kalchev: Daniel Kalchev, .bg.

Ed Mitchell: Ed Mitchell, .asia from the GNSO.

Hiro Hotta: Okay, thank you. For this meeting I think we have two kind of big issues. One is about the one vote per one what problem. That's one big issue and the second big issue is the timeline for the communication for a report from us because who were in the Working Group 1 meeting. I think that the overall timeline is the same with the Working Group 1 so how should Working Group 2 proceed. Any other big issues in your mind?

If not let's discuss one by one. For the first issue, which is one vote per what issue. We had emphasis in SO meeting; we had a kind of consultation with the ccNSO members and ccTLD members and at least I felt that the floor didn't say their preference. They said about their concerns, in one case so may I have your views on what you felt in the ccNSO meeting. Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange:

I think we need more time to digest what's been said. It was two very good presentations that gave good arguments on both sides and as I see it it is no, either of the solutions will give 100% of what we want, so we have to find the best of those that can cover the thoughts behind it. So the way I see it is, should it be, we have the ISO as a bottom picture with all the country codes that we live within the ASCII world and as I talked about Norway, when we have three delegated but just one of them are operating now, if we would have operated the other two in my view we would still have only one vote.

So the registry that if it's operating more ccs it's still one vote, but if two other registries had .bb and .sj it's not the same territory it is just delegated to us of historical reasons then I would see it as natural that they have each level in the community.

But if NO had had a script, so we could have 10 different ways of writing NO then it would be very peculiar if we should have 10 votes. It's the same for the same cc. So it is kind of not, one solution you have to have one bottom rule, in my view and then some alterations, whether it is one registry or different registries running the cc. Did I manage to explain what I felt about that or was it too complicated?

Hiro Hotta:

I believe you are clear enough but everybody, you have questions?
Thank you.

Daniel Kalchev:

I just wanted to comment on the one reg, one vote thing. I wonder if we see that at one moment we have one registry operating several TLDs even for the same territory, which is by the way not well defined at this moment because with time definitions may change, I mean the meaning of IDN TLDs for particular territory, there may be in some not far future situations when we start creating more ASCII TLDs for the same territory, like a variant spellings or full country names or whatever.

When we talk about registry we have a confusion here because some people by registry mean the entity that manages the registry activity and other people mean a registry like a repository or the common data base that pertains to that particular ccTLD. We should at least clear this confusion when we refer to that option.

Bart Bostwinkel:

Daniel I think you are right, BUT, however part of say if you go back to say one of the documents, say the initial drafts has already dealt with the membership definition. And as a result of that membership definition you'll see you end up with however you want to term it, some members may represent different county codes. We're talking about say, the whole discussion on one vote per member relates to potential members of the ccTLDs are defined already in the ICANN bylaws, and even based on that current definition and that's what happened yesterday, you saw that one member acquired two votes.

Daniel Kalchev: Can I just add one more thing, so the example we had yesterday for Nigel is what may happen if we have this rule and we say that each individual organization even if they run several ccTLDs registries actually, they may decide at some point to clone the organization and create some how different organization, that is not that difficult and they could proceed even with redelegations. So they will again have the same, what do you call it, I mean if we are afraid of that development. So there is absolutely nothing we can do to stop this kind of thing.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you, yes.

Demi Getschko: I think we have two different things here, different problems here, one is old problems, like with Bart explaining, but I really don't want to deal with, because anyway we have a cap and a fair rule that tells us that we're not going to pass the limit of ISO3166 table, this is the old situation.

The new situation is to prevent future problems or future errors and I suppose we have to deal with this one and let the old one to be sold in its time. I don't think we are just a bunch of registries. We are really a support organization constituted by the cc's and cc the old question of how will we define this or not, but again I think we have to have some kind of cap, some kind of limit that can prevent us to have for example one territory or one cc to have thousands or hundreds of different IDN and I agree with Daniel we can have all other Latin scripts as the same we have now, then, this be an

unlimited process. We have just opened the root for g's it is not impossible to imagine that will happen also with c's. And the only way to keep this community as a community bound by some concept and not really a bunch of registries, is to have another way to define the membership; not the membership in terms of voice or participation but the membership in terms of weight in voting.

We don't have many issues to vote here in cc, but we have to choose Councils, Council Members, we have to choose maybe Board Members and it would be good to have a good way to go forward without have to fear or to interfere with possible decisions in having lots and lots of new strings to reflect the needs of our community.

Hiro Hotta:

Thank you. Siavash Shahshahani, I think.

Siavash Shahshahani:

I want to go to the question that really ultimately concerns me. Let me give you an example. I know it sounds outrageous that Indian would have eight votes, but consider this other scenario. Suppose, look at Spain, Spain now I guess is a member of ccNSO, right? Well suppose it was. Let's just give it as an example. Suppose Spain was a member of ccNSO and then because there's a tilde on the end, and suppose there is going to be an España. Now what would you do if Spain were a full member and this España came around and they couldn't agree on who would represent it. How they would divide the vote between them. What would you do?

What you would have to do essentially would be if you were going to limit one vote/one territory. You will have to tell Alberto from Spain that okay, now you're going to lose half your vote. Or maybe this other guy who is maybe better supported by the Government of Spain will represent Spain from now on, this view.

I think ultimately what it comes down to, to me, is we should have. If we're going to have one territory/one vote we should have due process for dealing with the incumbent ccNSO member. Ultimately that's what it comes down to. That's what we should decide. And I don't want this to be along the lines of GAC because even for redelegation there is a due process, but here we can't have no due process. This is what it ultimately comes down to.

Hiro Hotta:

Alright, yes, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel:

I've been thinking about it, what you are saying, you raise that issue and rightfully so, but I would think maybe that is something out of line. At the end of the day, and that's a good principle within the ccNSO, the ccNSO is not there to resolve issues within country. I fully agree that you need to have a process that – say a transition process, but if there are some issues in country the ccNSO should allow for them to make up their minds but cannot step in.

It's what you see, say with the ccNSO was never involved in individual cases for redelegation or delegation. It is not the platform to deal with this and if you would argue along the lines of what happens if something in country goes wrong, I'll be very blunt and say that's the country's problem or the territory's problem. In individual cases, yes.

Siavash Shahshahani: But just one word. How would you deal with that? Suppose you have this member and you have this other competing member come in. You have to decide who is a member, right? This is...

Bart Boswinkel: I think, on the last call, Demi you proposed a transition mechanism, the Working Group disagreed, but I agree and we discussed it before. If you would say, okay the one vote per territory is acceptable, if you take into consideration that there needs to be an agreeable transition mechanism, you know to avoid that internal issues come to play within the ccNSO. I think then we have progressed a little bit because I fully agree that you need to find a resolution but at the end of the day it needs to be resolved in territory.

Hiro Hotta: Okay, Mary.

Mary Uduma:

Thank you I think they've taken the words out of mind that first the transition process or strategy and secondly the question of territory and country. I think ccNSO should not dabble into the country issues. The country within themselves should decide on what to do and going by what we have for now, the membership definition and the process for the time being until when, because whether we like it or not even the DGs may come up to say we're out of that country because some may take the community, a small community in the country, others may take the city.dial-in for instance.

Okay, they want to join the cc and not necessarily DG so it will be difficult for us to handle at the community level. I think for now the transition as a nation should be what we should be looking at. What do we do between that and when the floodgates are opened. And also I think some of the ccTLDs, those that have taken out the IDN strings, as we heard yesterday, might be just the same incumbent ccTLD, a member of the ccNSO, that is handling it.

So we could also look at how many countries, how many territories have more than one, that would create that problem of saying let's add more to the footing. I think what we have now is still very convenient and I would look at a transition also.

Hiro Hotta:

Thank you. Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, as for country names, for the moment we all know that they are taking out of the gTLD process in the first application round and we do not know what will happen with them. You mentioned España and because they have one non-ASCII letter, they will be an IDN, but Norway will not, so that adds a lot of things to the confusion as well, that some countries will be a G and others might be a CC and we have a real mess of things things that we haven't solved yet.

But can we also have this thought about what happens in the GAC. Most countries have Internet issues spread over in different ministries and they have to solve it within themselves. Who are we going to have represent us for the country in the GAC? And then they discuss internally and try to find a solution on these things and then if its a vote or something they have agreed in before. So I agree with the thought that ccNSO is not a place to solve internal national questions. They have to sort that out themselves.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you.

Jian Zhang: I actually understand – this is Jian. I actually do understand the concern you expressed, ccNSO is not the place to resolve their internal issues, you know, but on the other hand I think we're not the same as GAC, because GAC you know for every country or territory you'll have to one representative who is representing your

country, right, but in our ccNSO or like the issue we're discussing because every... I believe most of you do agree, every registry should be equally treated as a member, right? In that case I think probably it is going to be easier just to go for one member/one vote because then it wouldn't create internal issues for them.

Bart Boswinkel:

Just one point, say for clarification, I think and I think this Working Group agreed upon, all IDN, ccTLDs and all ASCII should be members and could be members of the ccNSO and should be treated equally. What we are talking here is in fact, three instances which are important. We're talking about voting and the voting and to put it very precisely, it is the formal voting according to the bylaws and to the rules and guidelines, of the ccNSO and that is formal voting with regard to PDPs because there is a formal voting process in the PDP.

There is the election and it's the election process itself where you have the formal voting by the members and there is an impact there. And there is the ccNSO rule itself and it is not in the bylaws. The ccNSO rule itself regarding to the election of the ccNSO Board Members, because according to the bylaws, in fact the ccNSO appointed Board should be selected by the ccNSO Council, but the ccNSO Council mandated its power to the members according to their internal rules.

These are the only three and I think that's what the Working Group has agreed or let's say we analyzed this, these are the only three

instances where this voting becomes an issue and that's what we're talking about.

I think because all the rest if you look at the rules and guidelines, it talks about members and whether you have one member/one vote in these situations doesn't really matter because there is no formal voting. This whole voting debate and it's very principled I would say and it's very important, but we talk about these three instances.

The rest is, and I think the Working Group already agreed on that one, it is one member/one vote. If it every comes to a vote, say during ccNSO meetings, informal counting, etc. You can see it already, it doesn't matter whether you're a ccNSO member or not, if you're in the room and you have an opinion you vent your opinion and if you disagree, you disagree. That is taken into account. It's only these, that's what we're talking about, so I think that's very important for the Working Group to keep in mind.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you for the clarification:

Dejan Djukic: The way express it we are about to make a choice whether we want to vote on these three particular cases to be per registry or per country and so per member or per territory. So for me it is a little bit strange to suggest that the ccNSO should be considered as a group of territory representatives because we already have this with the GAC.

Bart Boswinkel: You're turning it around, I think.

Dejan Djukic: No, I'm not because you say that we have to make the choice for these three particular cases, whether – if I sum it up – whether we get voting or not per territory base, one per territory or on a per member basis. So what I just said is that we already have the GAC where the voting is on a per territory basis. So why should we repeat the same structure. We are very likely to get the same voting situations.

Bart Boswinkel: Why do you compare it with the GAC?

Dejan Djukic: Well because of the principle of voting, one territory, one vote.

Bart Boswinkel: So what, I think even in the GAC book, Annebeth correct me if I'm wrong, in the GAC it's one country one vote.

Jian Zhang: I think, sorry could I speak, I think that Daniel's point is we don't have to be in line with GAC because we are not GAC, that's whole ccNSO about, you know, it's based on registries not based on country representatives.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes but does it matter?

Hiro Hotta: Bart, I need your clarification, what is a description of a ccNSO member. Is it country based or is it registry based?

Bart Boswinkel: Currently it is the, if you look at the current definition, it is the Manager of the country code as listed in the IANA database. So there is a reference between membership and the IANA database. And I think looking back at the conclusions of the Working Group at the time was that needs to be updated but maintain that thing, otherwise you end up in a discussion of what is a ccTLD.

Mary Uduma: I think my understanding is that the database or the domain name registry is the common good of each country. Is the common good of each country. And that country can delegate it to anybody to manage for them. If you decided to manage your own, delegate your own to three or four managers because you have non-ASCII or a second string, so it doesn't stitch in the fact that that was the reference point. The reference point was that is common good of the country authority.

So I think this is a reference point. We shouldn't, for now deviate from the reference point until we get to where the floodgates are

opened and see whether we would be able to change anything. I don't know whether I made my point straight, so GAC, I am a member, I've been in the GAC, all right? And in the GAC the country writes to say that this is our representative and it has got to do with the authority the government.

Even in the country, when you get to the country there will be several other people that are in the Internet on that thing. Several Ministries, agencies that are doing one thing or another that has got to do with the Internet. By the end of the day, the best principle is that the Government of that country must write that this is the representative.

Annebeth Lange:

As for the GAC, they are not voting over anything, actually, they are discussing and try to get consensus, but I agree that we can't compare, we're not the GAC, but what makes us different from the gTLDs is that it's the sovereign principle, it's the subsidiary principle. We serve the local Internet community in the cc that we have been delegated, one way or the other. Historically, some of us have had it all the time and it has been delegated, but we serve the public in our country with that.

So you can't get away from that it has to do with the country, that's what makes the difference. So we're not a gTLD and then if one country happens to have 21 scripts, it will be very complicated if that country then should have 21 votes in a Board election or whatever and a country like Germany which is a big country and

have a lot of domain names, they have one, because they don't have non-ASCII at all.

So in my view, the different in ways to write the country code, if you have a lot of scripts in your country, it is the same basis, it is the same reference point that we use to serve the public as you say, but we have to do it in different ways because we want them to be able to do it the same way as those who write in ASCII. Of course, I shall remember, I come to the meetings. That's not the point, and I can be in the discussions and share everything with us, but only about the voting.

Daniel Kalchev:

I do think the compilation we've got is irrelevant to us, relevant or important or correct because the GAC is a top down situation, we are not top down. We are representing a community here. The first point we are not country, we are territory related and we don't have anything to do with GAC because we are not directly related to the government. In many cases we are totally independent from the government, the first point.

The second point is as well said, inside the country, inside the territory we have the Internet community and this community can express itself in many ways as I said yesterday, maybe we can understand IDN ccs as different forms of expression of the very same community. We have represented them until now with the Latin script because if Latin is not sufficient to have other forms of expression of the very same community. Then in my view if for

example the Brazilian territory has three or four or five languages, this is different ways of expression of the same Internet community that is the Brazilian Internet community or so then as I said many times, I think the only secure way to go forward is to stick to the territory as the point we differentiate from the g's.

Siavash Shahshahani:

Okay, I guess this discussion can go on, you know it's got, we can argue from both sides. You can argue that in countries where you have different languages you don't have one single monolithic local community. When you have several distinct languages and distinct registries, it's really, these registries are responsible, have to respond to different communities within that country.

Comparing that to say Germany is not fair because nobody is now comparing Tuvalu Island to Germany which have equal votes in ccNSO so what's the community that is represented by .tv So ultimately what happens is that I guess it ultimately goes back to the legal relationship of ccns to ICANN, versus the legal relationship of gTLDs to ICANN.

If there was a situation where every ccNSO member had to pay a fee or had to pay a membership fee then things would be different, there wouldn't be arguing this, I guess that's what it ultimately comes down to so it seems to me that one way to go about this is to just work a little bit on supposing we're going to have a one vote/one territory. Let's see if we can work out a reasonable transition rule. If we can work out a reasonable transition rule that

everybody agrees to then I don't think this voting thing is going to be that important.

Hiro Hotta:

Daniel.

Daniel Kalchev:

Well as Siavash already has got one of the points I had and that you may have several very different communities within one country and one territory, okay. And the territory division is actually the politic and I mean it is not much in the communities one-to-one at all. Also when we talk about Internet things we should not forget that the community actually is spread worldwide. Like the Bulgarians outside Bulgaria probably are more than that inside.

So when we talk about the Bulgarian registry, even if it is in Bulgaria and is supposed to be in the Bulgarian territory it is actually serving all these people. Even more so with the IDN registries, they will serve their language and script and whatever community, even if they are not located within the territory. So in this sense for me it has never been appropriate to say the ccTLD is under the governance of that government because that government controls the territory. But that's a separate issue, I just wanted to make sure that we understand that distinction global.

The next thing, I have been in this thing for over 20 years now and I have observed several cases where the registry that was, the

ccTLD registry at that time still operates, while at the same time the country is disband or group again, I mean the territory, sorry. So that territory in the political sense I think is not stable, is not stable in time, while the Internet registries are supposed to be. So, even more so with the IDN ccTLDs that are created to serve very specific language and cultural group anyway.

Demi Getschko:

Good observation. I remember that the Soviet Union cc is not existing anymore because they disbanded the territory. Then that is not true, really, it is not permanent the community had a way to go forward with dot issue because we don't have the territory any more. Then it's not related to the community, related to the territory.

Hiro Hotta:

Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange:

Just a short intervention, because we have the new gTLDs now as well and we know that a lot of these, like .irish for example, will not be a ccTLD, it will be a cultural possibility for all the irish people living all over the world and so in the new system, cultural groups and languages groups they can have new possibilities without going through a cc. So cc is kind of a starkly made and just like we got BV, it's a Bouvet Island, it's a rock out in the Arctic and there are only penguins there. So, it doesn't make really

sense but that what's we have as a basis for what we are doing today. We have not created those letters ourselves, when it started John Costell took a set of country and territory codes and used it for this world but I'm not sure that was the best option, but that's what we got and we have to try to find a way out of that with the new IDNs.

Mary Uduma: I just wanted to clarify, if in India you have eight registries, okay the last string is it still expressing .IN, I think India is .IN. The last string is still expressing .in whether it is in one script or the other it's still expressing...

Bart Boswinkel: It's expressing India, not IN but India. Dot IN is expressing India as well.

Mary Uduma: Okay, that's the thing, that's the issue, so we are not talking about that one expressing another territory, it is still Indian territory.

Daniel Kalchev: Just that comment on the lists, in the past it is true that John Costell he has decided to use the ISO lists and just something he is existing already, because he is not in the business to define what's a country anyway. But even now, even with IDN fast-track we are creating a new list and it is not a list that exists already, it is not a

list that some independent body is creating, it is a list that we as community and the process are actually creating and I can only see that this will be more frequent in the future, probably, I don't know what will happen with the cc idea in the future anyway.

Hiro Hotta: Yes, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Just a question for clarification, what do you mean by creating a list.

Daniel Kalchev: By creating a list I mean that the ISO list is created in about the same kind of process in the past by somebody else so that people say I want my country to be represented with that string, they can say "Okay, we'll accept that." Or somebody said somewhere, compiled the list and said do you agree that your country will be represented by this identifier and they said, "Okay but that was in the past before the DNS."

So when the DNS started expanding this was implemented from the existing list. It may be updated but it is out of band for our community anyway. But now with the IDN fast-track we have a process where every territory can apply for a string so it is the territory that decides what the string will be, not somebody else and so in a way now we are creating this second list or extending the existing list by some completely different process.

And as I said I can only see in the future that this process will expand, so we will be able to see the expansion of many more TLDs that will be associated with territories and even if today, the new gTLD process is not allowing country names or city names or whatever to be applied for, it may be possible in some future that it is decided that the cc list which has started to expand with the IDN ccTLDs will be expanded with ASCII country names and even city names or religion names and then we will have completely different story. As it was already mentioned the only difference between the ccTLDs and any other TLDs is the relationship with ICANN.

Bart Boswinkel:

The real issue is whether the real basic stuff is the relation with the ISO3166 list. That is the originating under the over-all policy under the fast-track, that is the originating list.

Daniel Kalchev:

Yes, but this is a huge story. I mean in the future it may have been different and not that distant future anyway.

Bart Boswinkel:

I don't, maybe you are aware of a policy development process I'm not aware of, but I don't see it.

Demi Getschko: Just a follow up on this, as you said the fast-track is initiated by request from territories. Then the list of territories is always the very same, we don't expand in the list of territories. We have different forms of expression of the very same territories.

Mary Uduma: That is exactly what I needed. I needed him to clarify. In expressing your string, does it change the territory. It doesn't change the territory so you consider that as well.

Daniel Kalchev: No but allowing one territory to create several IDNTLDs with different scripts and different languages, this allows the territory to probably better define its internal structure and as we discussed at the beginning, they show it that the territory is actually coming to an agreement between this communities that have served within the same territory.

It's complex, I agree, it's not a simple thing and of course I'm not suggesting that we should try to make those people agree or not agree but in my opinion if we devise what is key and expect people within a territory to agree we are in fact pushing them to go through this process any way.

So the working idea by itself is that you vote because you are not seeking consensus, you vote because you expect that everybody may have different opinions. If ...

Bart Boswinkel:

Again the voting in the ccNSO go back, is defined by the bylaws. It is election that is done by a vote. You could also election process. It is in fact a secret ballot, that's it is. The other one is a vote by the members of the ccNSO currently and the end result of a PDP, again there is a secret vote. It is nothing to do with building consensus, it is the mechanism. It is like you have elections in your country.

That's something else. Building consensus is what we do around say final reports in PDPs and there a formal vote doesn't matter, this is at the end of the whole process, going back to one of the topics that Hiro had on his list. If we take this PDP where this part of, we end up we did public consultations, we had the discussions in the community, we have these discussions, they go into a final report, that final report goes to the ccNSO Council for voting. Again that is a voting. Then if they adopt it, then it goes for an ultimate vote to the members of the ccNSO to express individually whether they agree and there rules there.

So first there needs to be a quorum, secondly there needs to be a majority. If it doesn't make it through that vote there will not be a policy and after passing that stage it goes back to the Council and they submit it to the Board. We are talking about this type of voting, not what is happening, building consensus within the Working Group and on reports this Working Group produces.

Daniel Kalchev:

Well, I but I probably didn't express myself, I said that when it comes to voting it is because it not seeking consensus. I mean the process is different. Either you vote or you seek consensus. As it was said when we think about one vote per territory we sort of, in the cases where there are many ccTLDs within the territory of course, we are moving part of the voting or seeking consensus that is their choice.

We are moving that out of the ccNSO, yes into the territories, so we are making this easier for the ccNSO structure, but maybe more difficult for those territories, and as it was already said when we start talking about territories we at some point start talking about politics. When we start talking about politics it may happen that at some point if you have several ccTLDs within a territory, they may have to select some representative who will vote and when they have to select some representative they may not agree with each other so they may have to select somebody else.

That somebody else may be from the government, maybe not. But if this happens and if this happens often, and why not? The ccNSO will end up with voting members for that particular cases that are actually not the ccTLD managers.

Bart Boswinkel:

Yes, but you assume that say this one, if that is that is the case that means that internal problems, if you do it the other way around, internal problems should be solved at the level of the ccNSO.

Daniel Kalchev: No, no, I'm not saying that. I'm saying that by not imposing on those people the need to solve internal problems, because it is too easy to say you have some internal problem, solve it. By not imposing this internal problem we are just not creating it because every registry or sponsoring organization, it depends on what kind of choices is made, every such entity will have independent voting power, even if they happen to be in the same territory also for other territories it is perceived that that particular territory has more voting power than it deserves in a way, but they will have independent voting power and they will be able to express their vote, not to have to make a compromise or some internal negotiation under whatever conditions, or external negotiations.

Hiro Hotta: I have Paulos service and Demi on my list. Any others?

Paulos Nyirenda: Thank you, I'm an observer so maybe I can just make an observation. I think that it would be probably productive to have a look at the bylaws and how the ccNSO member is defined and there is only one little sentence that says a ccNSO member is a one who manages a ccTLD. So maybe we could, if we are going back to that basic, we could maybe resolve quite a few of these issues by looking at who is actually a member.

Hiro Hotta: Okay, Siavash.

Siavash Shahshahani:

Okay I want to suggest some kind of road map to do this. To me it seems, lets try to take everything to it's conclusion. Let's try to work out maybe a transition rule in case one adopts this option. And let's also explore the consequences of having one vote/one member. Ultimately, the ccNSO existed before IDNS so as Paulos says, ultimately we have to take this to ccNSO body for a decision and some of it will be to ICANN Board for a decision because some of it involves changing bylaws.

Now if it doesn't get to a clear conclusion, any of these or at least at the ccNSO level, one possibility would be to retain the old definition of ccNSO as policy does and maybe create a different body for IDNs because it wasn't ccNSO that really pushed for the IDNs it was somebody else. It was maybe territories.

Well of course, there was, ccNSO was involved. At first, I remember I've been in this, I remember there was some resistance within ccNSO at the very beginning but later it changed. Now so I think let's work out the consequences of either option and at the end when they have a good document, let's take it to the ccNSO and later maybe to the Board, see what happens.

Hiro Hotta:

Okay, Demi.

Demi Geteschko: I understand what Paulos said, and I think we intend to include the IDNs in the cc because the fast-track IDNs and the other IDNs ccs are the initiative of the territories to have a better way of expressing themselves. Of course, at the end of the day this can be the solution, just to keep the ccs in the ccNSO, don't allow the IDNS to be there, but for it is a regrettable solution. I would prefer to have IDNs inside.

Just to help me to satisfy my curiosity. We have, I suppose, three examples of countries that have already IDNs. Bulgaria has posit for IDN, Serbia and also India. In these three cases the registries of the IDNs are really competing in different from the RIPE cc's are operated more or less in conjunction or maybe in the same entity. Or how is the actual relation between the seven IDNs in India and the .in if there is a conflict or it's more less if you don't know, but you don't know how the proposal of this new IDNs comes forward.

Jian Zhang: In the case of China is quite simple because we're running .cn and long before the IDNs instituted a fast-track the Chinese government has delegated this. Dot china and the (inaudible) also assume the responsibility for .china so that, yes they're very simple for us.

Daniel Kalchev: We don't yet have IDN approved as you know because of possible confusion with Brazil, but anyway in Bulgaria there are two

scenarios, nothing is decided yet. Either the ASCII ccTLD registry runs both TLDs, either it is delegated to a separate entity or the government invents something some governmental structure or whatever. But as I said it is not yet decided because nothing is happening.

Demi Getschko: In this case, maybe the (inaudible) proposal is the better to protect the ccs if we don't have any notion what will be happen. Better to be conservative.

Hiro Hotta: So I think it is time to adjourn so what's our timeline to this end of this year?

[background conversation]

Hiro Hotta: Okay, I think we have already had intense discussion so we should have time to write down a report now to have consensus on that so my proposal is for Bart and the Chair's will write the report based on the discussion today and yesterday and circulate it to the Working Group 2.

Bart Boswinkel: Do you have a timeline in mind?

Hiro Hotta: When it...

Bart Boswinkel: My timeline is as of the 11th of July until mid-August, that's a period of four or five weeks I will have three weeks so I don't know. I'm definite, I need to move my daughter on the 11th of July so the start of my holiday. And then move two weeks then we'll be called in another week so I'll be back early, so in between the 11th of July until first week of August I'll be off and on time.

Hiro Hotta: Any other thing for this morning? Okay, thanks a lot for good discussion.

[End of Transcript]