
TORONTO – At-Large IDN Working Group
Wednesday, October 17, 2012 – 16:30 to 18:00
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

MATT ASHTIANI: Welcome everyone to today's At-Large IDN Working Group meeting on October 17th, 2012. Please be sure to state your name before speaking, and to please speak at a reasonable pace for our interpreters. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Matt, and thank you everyone for joining the working group meeting. So just a very quick introduction, this is the At-Large, the ALAC, IDN Working Group. I'm going to be able to...how do I move to the next slide?

[background conversation]

EDMON CHUNG: Sorry. There you go. Okay so a brief agenda was sent around basically to get started, and in terms of what some of the things that we're doing. But I guess before we do that I guess we'll have a quick roll call around the room. And let's see, Dennis is sort of running around so I'll start with him. Let's start with a brief introduction.

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.

DENNIS JENNINGS: Dennis Jennings, consultant/project leader on the IDN Variant Program Project.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC.

YJ PARK: YJ Park, APRALO.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Jean-Jacques Subrenat, a member of ALAC.

MATT ASHTIANI: Matt Ashtiani, ICANN staff.

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella Gruber, ICANN staff.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.

EDMON CHUNG: And Edmon Chung here, as the Chair of the working group and also as the IDN liaison for ALAC.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Andrew Sullivan. I'm a consultant on this IDN Project 2.1.



GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, NARALO Chair.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, member of ALAC.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Sylvia Herlein Leite, LACRALO.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio Salinas Porto, ALAC member for LACRALO.

EDMON CHUNG: If any of you at the back, at the side of the room, any of you interested, do come around. I think we still have more chairs so don't be shy. Dennis wants to immediately jump in, so...

DENNIS JENNINGS: Yes, my apologies for stumbling over what I meant to say. I'm the project leader of ICANN's IDN Variant TLD Program.

EDMON CHUNG: For those of you who joined the table, just a quick introduction of yourself if you can? If you wish to?

CHRIS DILLON: Chris Dillon from University College London.



EDMON CHUNG:

Let's get started. I put up a very brief agenda. We wanted to update everyone on the relevant items that we have been doing, and then spend our time mainly on two areas. One of which is our response to the public comment that is ongoing on the Variant Issues Project. A draft was posted for public comments in late September, I think. And the public comment period ends...I can't advance the slide, it's because my browser stalled. I apologize for that, I'll keep talking. Okay, thank you.

So these are the current issues. Let's keep advancing as well, the first few slides I've got to...okay, this is good. So basically the public comment opened in late September, it's due to close this Friday although it is within the ICANN meeting time. And then the reply, there's an additional period where replies to the public comment is accepted. That's until November 9th. So on this particular item we are working on a response to feed in to the public comments period. A brief set of notes was sent around the working group, actually just a few hours ago.

Hopefully you may have a chance to take a look. If not, this is the place we're trying to go through it and try to get your feedback on it as well. So basically the draft response...I sent around a few bullet points, a few items in terms of points commending the work of the project team. Looking at the report it seems that there's good progress since the beginning of the...Phase 2 of the VIP...I don't even know what to call it anymore. But it is the IDN Variance Issues Project. So Dennis wants to help me out.



DENNIS JENNINGS: It's the ICANN Variance TLD Program. This is Project 2.1.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. ICANN...

DENNIS JENNINGS: Variance TLD Program.

EDMON CHUNG: Variance TLD Program. Okay. There's no "IDN" in there.

DENNIS JENNINGS: Well there should be, then I've forgotten it.

EDMON CHUNG: See? It's very confusing.

DENNIS JENNINGS: Yes it is.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay, so it's the ICANN IDN Variant TLD Program. Okay. So, in any case, I think the previous slide you saw the link to the public comment and hopefully have had a chance to read it. It's a pretty good read. It's somewhat technical, but a good number of parts of it are talking about processes so I think that's a good read. In terms of our response, at



least from my point of view, I drafted a few points. First of all I think there was good progress there. I think one of the things that is encouraged...as ALAC, we're encouraged that Rinalia has been accepted an observer to the group. I think that's been encouraging.

Overall, the whole framework that is being proposed consists of a primary and secondary panel. So what happens is that a set of...basically a particular language community or a script community would work together as a primary panel and make a proposal of the IDN variant policies to be put in place. And then there's a secondary panel that is formed to check on the validity and the security and stability of the proposal.

And I think, overall, the framework seems to be sensible and it's consistent with what we have been saying at ALAC, which we believe is the community consensus. That there are vast differences between language or script communities, and therefore a framework that allows that and also allow the different communities to work at their own pace through the process is something that is important.

So these are the points commending the work from the project team so far, and then three points on some of the concerns that we see from an ALAC point of view. First of all is the proposed composition of the two panels. Based on the current public document, neither of the panels are anticipating to have any policy expertise to be included. Also it seems like it is somewhat technically biased. There are many arguments made that this is a very technical piece of work.

However, as I guess as ALAC has always engaged in, we understand that IDN and IDN variant issues are often a cross-section between policy and

technology. So, Rinalia? By the way, just before Rinalia...feel free to just raise your hand and this is more like a working group, so just jump in when you feel you want to clarify. And if it gets too chaotic we'll try to deal with that at that time. So, Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Edmon. Rinalia Abdul Rahim, for the transcript records. I think it would be helpful if you were to clarify what you mean by "policy".

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. This is a very difficult question. What do you mean by "policy"? I don't think even the policy staff of ICANN could answer that. Dennis wants to try.

DENNIS JENNINGS: Well just to point out that policy in a technical IETF context means the set of rules that apply. So policy is a word that is very fluid in its use. If this were entirely an IETF activity, we'd be using "policy" instead of "rules". But we don't in the ICANN world because policy is such a loaded word, with all sorts of other meanings as well.

However, I think the policy things come in Projects 6 and 7, and Project 2.1 is entirely a technical project at the secondary panel because it's all about protecting and securing the root. So where the policy issues come in are the looking at policy for the processes that evaluate and delegate, and those are Project 6 and Project 7. I don't think it's

appropriate here, but you're raising the point and it's for discussion. I'm just giving my opinion.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Dennis. So I'll continue and just wrap up some of the thoughts I threw out to the group first. So these are my personal thoughts that I'm hoping will get more feedback from the group. So in any case, I think in terms of my belief is that even though there are technical rules there are some administrative policy implications to which that could be important.

And that is the concern that is being raised. There's a particular one the proposal right now has that the secondary panel, the panel which checks the work of the primary panel, to be formed entirely of paid consultants of ICANN. And that's a particular requirement....Andrew?

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

This is Andrew Sullivan. So one of the questions that I have for you, these are some concerns. Some of these, of course, were raised at a two day session here just at the beginning of this week of meetings. And a number of these have, of course, been acknowledged and the plan is that the next version of the draft will contain responses to these.

So for these...I understand why for formal reasons you might want to include these issues in your response to the posted draft, for that reason. But are there ones here that you are concerned about as a long-term trend or are these all things that you think have been addressed in the agreements that came out of Friday and Saturday?

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Andrew. Edmon here again. I think most of them have but, as you said, because the posted document is still out there and the comment period is still out there this set of response will be specific on that particular document. Because publically we don't see what's in your computer just yet. So yes, I think most of them have been addressed. I think some of which we may not have full agreement on yet. In any case, on that particular one...you mentioned about the paid consultants one, we may have. We'll see what the next version looks like.

But I guess the concern that is raised here, especially from the ALAC point of view, At-Large point of view, is this seems like a concern. I don't know whether others agree. If not then we'll say it's not. The other part, the other main part, is the secondary panel processes, at least on this current particular version that is posted for public comment, seems to be unchecked. The secondary panel basically can say no, and no, and always no, and there's no review process or there's no way for the community to chime in and say, "Hey, there might be some problem with it."

And right now the concept is that it requires unanimity of the entire secondary panel to say yes for a particular language community proposal to go through. That also opens up possibly for a sort of blockade by one person. Dennis, I see your hand up.



DENNIS JENNINGS:

Thank you Edmon. Dennis here, Dennis Jennings. One thing to note and it may not be clear in the current document but it will be clear, is that all the decisions will be public. The whole process will be transparent and all proposals from the primary panels will be published and all decisions by the secondary panel will be published with a detailed rationale for every decision. And there will be public comment associated with both those facets.

So this will be very, very open and available to people to comment, and those comments will be taken seriously. Since this is primarily a technical security and stability panel, the secondary panel, we believe that the approach that's taken is the correct one. And the reason we want to ensure that these people, whether they're paid consultants or not, are under contract to ICANN, which is a refinement of the paid consultant, they must be under contract. And they must adhere to ethical provisions which we specify.

This allows ICANN to...if there were such a situation where there was a repeated and incessant blockage by a single person that would be grounds for dismissal, under contract, by ICANN. Now we haven't written those contracts and ethical things yet, but that's the idea. That's not yet in the document, but that's to respond to that concern and that will be in the next version of the document. I'm just looking to Andrew now to make sure I haven't overstated or understated anything.

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

This is Andrew Sullivan again. Yes, I think that that is correct. To continue along that line and to respond to the second issue that Edmon has raised here, we believe that the unanimity requirement is a feature



and not a bug. We believe that the point of this procedure is to ensure safety above all over things, or to weigh safety above all other things.

I suppose if safety was the number one thing we wouldn't do anything. But apart from that, given that we have decided to accept some risk, what we are trying to do is minimize the risk that can be taken. And the point of having the unanimity requirement is to say, "Well if somebody still doubts this then we're not sure and therefore we should not proceed." That is consistent with the way we manage other parts of the process around the root zone and so we believe that it is correct in this case as well. That is the reasoning behind that.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Andrew, and thank you Dennis. This is Edmon here again. Here I just want to let you guys know, and to get a feel of...I'm now really wearing my ALAC hat on and therefore these are some of the issues that bring to mind. And I would have agreed with you, in fact you know that I agree with you with a lot of the items and just want to set the right tone. But these are certainly, as an ALAC point of view...while if I wear my GNSO hat on as DotAsia it would probably be a little bit different. So I'm just saying that.

So in terms of, again, coming back to At-Large point of view, the unanimity, that raises a sort of a flag. The entirely formed of paid consultants, that raises a certain flag. And that's the reason why I've sort of highlighted here. Okay, so the final part, even more so would be like an ALAC point of view as sort of a hat on, is that we like to consider that these documents...even though you can say it's very technical oriented, these are supposed to be read by the community and that



includes the At-Large and some of the thinking from the general audience I think it needs to be taken in to consideration.

And by reading the document as it is right now, it seems like there's a lack, some lack of consideration for how this will then be integrated later and also, especially a few points on some information that seems not to have been included. Any why they're not included, one of which is a sort of what we are calling a "first-mover advantage" for those scripts or language communities that come together in primary panel formed, earlier in the process rather than maybe a few later another community that has an overlapping interest might come later and find that they are, "Too bad. We have the ones already in. You need to work around or we need to make it a much bigger issue." So there are certain first-mover advantage, right now it's not clearly explained so as an At-Large point of view some of our people might now realize they need to get their act together sooner and to avoid that.

And the final one is that we would expect that many of the viewers of the document could be TLD applicants, whether it's gTLDs or ccTLDs. And we'd be thinking how this plays in to the whole process. So a little bit of an explanation there might be useful, how it plays in to both the new gTLD process and the IDN ccTLD process. So that's all I have. Dennis wanted to add first?

DENNIS JENNINGS:

Thank you. Dennis Jennings here again. We've tried to balance what we think are significant competing requirements. The first requirement is to have a procedure or a process that facilitates those communities, those writing systems that are ready to move ahead, on the one hand.



And on the other, not to give any advantage to anybody who doesn't...not to give any advantage and not to disadvantage people who come later. Those two requirements are in direct competition and are irreconcilable. So we've just tried to sound some reasonable balance there. You can't have it both ways.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Dennis, for the clarification. Hence that particular balance I would, in a way, call policy. So, Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I think it's become apparent to me what Edmon means by "policy". I think it has to do with who determines the principles of fairness in dealing with these issues that could be political, and are you going to leave it to the technical experts or is there a different mechanism in which that would be considered?

DENNIS JENNINGS: Dennis here again. Thank you for the question. This proposed procedure will go out for public comment and will require, as we envisage it, to be adopted by the board before it can be implemented. So that's where those balances might be reconsidered. But there is no resolution to...if you allow anybody to move first then there's no resolution the fact that that may create a first-mover advantage.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. And Rinalia, please?



RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I just wanted to flag that on the point of the secondary panel, whether it should be fully comprised of paid consultants or more than that. I think that it will invite some debate within the At-Large community because I've heard some feedback that there may not be full consensus on it, and I think that we need to discuss it.

EDMON CHUNG: So let's discuss it. What are some of the arguments? I know, unfortunately we have a lot of conflicts during these meetings and Rinalia, if you have heard of certain arguments please feel free to bring it to the table and we can talk about it.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Edmon. Rinalia, for the transcript record. So I'll be the devil's advocate and channel some of the questions that had been posed before. So if the consultants are not paid by ICANN, what value would they bring to the table and how would we address the accountability issues?

EDMON CHUNG: Alright, that's exactly what the document says right now and it's the accountability and making sure that ICANN can hold them accountable that we want to make sure that the whole...well the proposal is to make the whole secondary panel composed of paid consultants. That's the argument for it, correct. One of the arguments against it is that there...two things.



One is we were trying to avoid a conflict of interest, but by having all of them as paid consultants we have aligned their interests, essentially, with ICANN. Whether that's a good thing or bad thing is a question, right? Is a public interest question. The other one is that by eliminating any person who doesn't want to be paid...I understand we addressed this issue. But the current draft doesn't say that so bear with me. Okay, please Rinalia...

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Edmon. Rinalia again, for the transcript record. I also want to contribute to the discussion in terms of the arguments for not having a fully paid consultant, and it came from another channel. I will not say the name, but I'll read the input and I'd like to hear the perspective of Jean-Jacques and also of Dennis and even Andrew, if you have a point of view on it.

So here's the framework. One, in terms of the secondary panel you want the best advice that you can get. Two, you want accountability to ICANN. And three, you want to avoid any conflict of interest. Okay? So getting the best advice requires that you may well want to let some people participate regardless of whether they participate pro bono or are paid by others. Avoiding conflict of interest requires that if they are paid by someone else you need to ensure that the payer will not benefit from the opinions expressed by the expert.

That is moderately easy to determine in most cases, because I think ICANN has experiences in trying to ensure people state their interests and how to address those. Maintaining accountability to ICANN may imply that at least one half of the secondary panel should be paid by



ICANN and responsible as paid consultants to ICANN for their work. So that's another perspective that I would throw in to the pool. Of course there are other frameworks. It's open for discussion and I think I also was one of the culprits who raised the issue during the LA meeting that full alignment with ICANN may not be in the public interest but that's up for interpretation. So I'll leave it open. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Rinalia. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. I understand the rationale which led to that person proposing that setup, or those setups. But for me, in ICANN experience, what is even more important is maintaining a level of trust which allows for efficiency. There are several ways of arriving there. One is to have paid consultants; another way is to have not paid but never mind, that's not the main thing. I think that what you need is, as the head or the Chair of that particular subset of people, someone who enjoys the total trust of all those who that compose that group.

That's obvious. But I don't think that we should let ourselves be bound by rules such as a proportion should be paid by ICANN directly or not. I think that's not the important thing. There should be, however, a very clear statement of conflict of interest on the part of anyone being part of that so that it is taken in writing and can be referred to at all times. That's the first point. The second point is a good mix is always very productive, so it's up to the Chair of that group to determine what is doable in terms of competence and balance. As everywhere else in



ICANN I think it's very much a question of balance, but I don't think that we have to have very strict rules about what constitutes that balance.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Jean-Jacques and I think that's a very good point. It is exactly the...we probably, at this level, doesn't need very strict rules like half of it, or one half/eighth. I think if we put in the comment, it would be that that shouldn't...it's the principle of the balance interest that is more important than whether they're being paid or not or that particular element.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Excuse me, this is Jean-Jacques coming back just for a moment because I wanted to mention a word and then I forgot. It's the transparency and accountability which allows for the ultimate quality of the group and its reliability. If you have those mechanisms inside, which are built in, then the proportion matter is less important.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Jean-Jacques. I wasn't sure whether, Dennis, you wanted to...okay. So Andrew and then Rinalia? Or you wanted to...?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I just wanted to clarify one point Andrew, sorry. So are you saying that you agree that the secondary panel should comprise of some kind of balance representation between paid and non-paid consultants? Can you just clarify that please?



JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Rinalia, no. That's exactly what I was not saying and that's the problem for a non-native English speaker. I was saying that the actual proportions don't matter that much to me. The principle is there should be a certain balance, but there is no fixed proportion about that. It's up to the Chair of that group. However, there should be clear principles about accountability and transparency, a very clear statement of interest on the part of all participants. So, in other words, it is stating the principles and respecting them, which is more important than any particular balance or proportion.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Jean-Jacques and I think I grasp that concept and, personally at least, I agree with that approach. I have Andrew and then I have a question from the remote.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Andrew Sullivan. So just to be clear, and in case...if this is not clear in the posted draft it would be very helpful if you were sending comments to the comment period to highlight that this isn't clear. The point of the procedure and the point of having the two panels is indeed exactly to ensure this openness and transparency that you are talking about. The secondary panel has to justify every decision it makes and it has to justify it in detail and it must justify it in its public posting, which is then subject to public comment.

And then that secondary panel has to take in to account those public comments and respond to them. And if it responds to them by saying,



"Oh and we've made a change." Then the public comment starts again and you wash, rinse, and repeat until this results in people just disagreeing. And if people are just disagreeing at that point, then somebody will have to make a judgment about whether this is a disagreement because somebody's attempting to block the process, which is one possibility. Or if in fact this is sound technical judgment on the part of that secondary panel and it is safe. But remember that the default position is always "no".

So each case where the panel permits something it needs positive justification. And the reason it needs positive justification is exactly the same reason we require that in every other case when we are going to do something. It's the root zone, it's a central shared resource for everybody on the Internet, and therefore, the most conservative approach needs to be taken there. And that is the central principle behind this. I hope that is clear from the document. I hope that very principle of transparency is in here. Indeed, that is to me, the reason that there should not be an appeal process for that secondary panel. Instead we need to exercise the public comment period.

If we really have a rogue secondary panel that has gone insane, that's the point of having the...I don't care if they're paid, but the point of having the contractual relationship between and the secondary panel. So there can be sanction, they can be removed, and this is something that can be done. We need to use the procedures we already have rather than invent yet more layers of appeal that eventually lead us to the same place anyway.



EDMON CHUNG: Rinalia, is it on this particular...? Then we'll take Rinalia first before I go to the question on the chat room.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I just wanted to reemphasize what Andrew said is that he doesn't care whether they're paid or not paid as long as they have a contractual obligation, and that is my understanding from our discussions from two days prior to the ICANN meeting which is why I'm actually comfortable with that. But I think the At-Large needs to discuss that first. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. Dennis, also on this particular...or?

DENNIS JENNINGS: Yes indeed, if I may. Dennis Jennings here, just to say that we...this program is overseen by the Board Variant Working Group, a sub-group of the ICANN Board, and we had a meeting today to update them and get their guidance. One of the areas that they were very keen on is we should emphasize the contractual nature, the public comment, and openness and transparent nature of the process, the ethical requirements that will be imposed and the declarations of interest. And we used "declarations of interest" rather than "conflicts of interest" because it's the declarations of interest which is the important thing. So be assured that this is being overseen with those things very much to the fore.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Dennis. I'll just quickly go to the question and then come to you YJ, okay? Because it's a very short answer. The answer is "no", but I'll read the question. Does the ICANN Variant TLD Program's definition of "variant" include linguistic variance, for example, ".moscow" and [.mosfa] in Cyrillic considered variants of one another under the Variant TLD Program? What about ".org" and ".org" in Cyrillic? My belief is the short answer is "no" and the long answer is also "no". I don't know whether...

DENNIS JENNINGS: The answer's no.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. So, YJ?

YJ PARK: Hi. Well actually I've been quite away from this kind of discussion for a long time so I'm not so sure what I'm saying is still relevant. But one of the sort of things I've observed in this IDN discussion is the kind of relevant community participation seems to be lacking. So if I wanted to remind you of sort of the rationale why people wanted to be very excited by this concept of IDN at the beginning of ICANN was they really wanted to get those sort of community to be more engaged with this kind of idea and discussion.

But as we know all sort of...this is still a discussion in English. We have to sort of talk about this all English, so still it has very big barriers of what that relevant community to get seriously engaged. So I'm



wondering whether ICANN and sort of we can facilitate more multi-lingual kind of discussion if there were some coordinators and facilitators there to help them get engaged with this discussion. So then hopefully we do not really have to depend on this paid consultants down the road.

I guess one of the main reasons we have to depend on the paid consultant is we do not really have secured enough volunteers from the relevant community. Mainly because sort of this lack of understanding and communicating in English could be one of the main reasons for their lack of participation, well that's my personal observation.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you YJ. Before...I just want to clarify what YJ really wants to say. Are you saying that in a way that the report or the final report needs to be in various languages so that people can read it better? That's one thing. You also mentioned about the panels themselves. Are you saying the panels need to be able to conduct their business in various languages? Or the composition of the secondary panel or the primary panel needs to have different regions or different language people?

YJ PARK:

Yeah, the second part could be ideal. But I guess in reality right now, which will take lots of time to identify sort of the right person who can contribute to this kind of process. So maybe I suggest that can be identified as long-term but probably not really achievable at this short-term period. And yeah...



EDMON CHUNG: But the first part is still something you think is important?

YJ PARK: Yeah, yeah.

EDMON CHUNG: Dennis? You wanted to...?

DENNIS JENNINGS: Yes. Dennis Jennings, for the record. We have tried very hard to have this involve as many experts of the community as possible. So the first phase is the issues phase. We formed panels, six panels, and for example the Devanagari panel. I am certain they conducted all their discussions in the languages supported by the Devanagari script, which I'm so ignorant I can't actually...

[background conversation]

DENNIS JENNINGS: Excuse me?

[background conversation]

DENNIS JENNINGS: Primarily Hindi. I am sure that the Chinese panel conducted all their discussions in Chinese. Now admittedly the reports were produced in



English and the *Integrated Issues Report* was produced in English. We recognize that limitation. The request that this particular procedure be translated is a very reasonable one and I think we should take that onboard. It's a very precisely written document, and one would want to be very careful to make sure that it's very precisely translated. We do not want to add further complexity by having inaccurate translations which would cause complete chaos.

The primary panels are essentially those panels...there'd be some oversight from ICANN, there'd be some advice from the secondary panel, but the primary panels are people who use a writing system. Be it the hand script in Chinese and Japanese, or the Devanagari script and the languages there, or whatever. So this would be very much...the proposals that come out of the primary panels will be entirely driven by those local community writing system language script requirements.

So to the maximum extent possible this is really driven by those who have the interest in getting this right. It's controlled, if you want to use that word, by a technical group, the secondary panel, to ensure the safety and stability and security of the root. The suggestion that we might have multi-lingual experts there is a very good one. The challenge is going to be to identify them. There are not many people with the skills, on the globe let alone in any particular language, that have the skills that will be required for the secondary panel. But the point is well made and we take it in to account.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Dennis. And I think what YJ said is also in the long-term we'd also like, as an At-Large point view and for everything ICANN does, we'd



like for the secondary panel to also have some cultural diversity in its members but we understand that that might not be possible at this time, but this is a long-term goal. This is one of the things that we might want to add. Oh, okay. Dennis and then I have Jean-Jacques.

DENNIS JENNINGS:

Yes, if I may just follow up a little bit on that. One of the things that will become clearer in the next version of the document is that the experts from the writing system community who participate in the primary panels will not be able ever to serve on the secondary panel. You cannot be a proposer and a decider on the same subject ever. So that will become clearer in the document, so there is a clear separation to make sure that no conflicts arise. As I say, that will become much clearer in the next document.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Dennis. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Edmon. This is Jean-Jacques. A remark and a question. The remark is that I see that there should be several phases, the short-term and the longer-term. In the shorter-term, I suppose that it's difficult to arrive at what YJ is suggesting, which is a very inclusive system with experts from language communities and script communities operating in their own languages. But that's something we have aim at.

And in that respect, I think that the feedback period or, Edmon, the comment period will be the real test. Because when it's put out we

have to make sure before putting it out that the translations are already perhaps unofficially vetted by the ALSs or RALOs or whoever who are anchored in their local communities and who can really check on that. Because the problem...I know a bit about languages, and the problem is that you have excellent interpreters and translators but who are generalists.

And it takes a high degree of specialization in order to bring across not only the right words but also the cultural background of Internet matters. That is much more complex. So before putting out something officially please check through unofficial channels that it flies, that it is reasonably good. And then when you put it out, then it has to illicit a lot of feedback from the language and script communities. That was my remark.

My question goes to Dennis, about, for instance, the Chinese script people were the participants from various parts of the world or does it happen that it was populated mainly or only by people who are beholden to one central authority, if you see what I mean?

DENNIS JENNINGS:

Dennis Jennings here. I'm not competent to answer that question. It was a technical panel, as far as I'm concerned. I don't know but Andrew may know whether there were Chinese people from outside China.

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

Indeed there were, and I believe in fact somebody on the panel...you were on that panel, weren't you?



CHRIS DILLON: Yes...

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Sorry, Chris. Of course you were.

CHRIS DILLON: That specific Chinese...

EDMON CHUNG: You just need to announce your name.

CHRIS DILLON: Oh, sorry. Chris Dillon, for the transcript. That particular Chinese panel had experts from mainland China, from Taiwan, from South Korea and from Japan, at least. There may have been other areas.

EDMON CHUNG: And yourself.

CHRIS DILLON: Well...

EDMON CHUNG: And yourself from London. And also from Canada, Toronto.



CHRIS DILLON: Oddly I also have a Japanese background.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay.

DENNIS JENNINGS: Dennis Jennings just to clarify. I have no way of saying whether Chris was or was not controlled by particular central authority, that's the point I was trying to make. I just don't know, right?

EDMON CHUNG: Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, a follow-up remark. Actually I put that question because we know how these things happen and I just wanted to make sure that, for instance, if there were one or several people from China, that people from Taiwan or indeed from Chinatown in San Francisco or anywhere else, Paris or London, were able to give input which was taken at the same level of respect and importance because the thing about languages is that they no longer belong to states. They belong to communities.

I, as a Frenchman, cannot consider that French belongs to me. It belongs to Canadians, to Malians, to a whole series of people. So out of fairness, and to be really inclusive, I just wanted to make sure that that has been respected.



EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Jean-Jacques. Just specifically, I wanted to summarize on what Jean-Jacques said and you might have an additional response, so why don't I do that first? I want to get a clarification, Jean-Jacques, are you asking like this to be included in the response and say this should be a component of the future of primary panels and these type of discussions, or not?

And I had one more clarification, so that one. And the other one is you mentioned about it being translated and then potentially vetted by the RALO. Are you talking about this particular document or future sort of program documents or are you talking about the reports or explanations that are put out by the primary panel or secondary panel? So, these two clarifications.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Well I'll respond to your second question first, which is ideally you should do both. Cover a large spectrum if you can, and if not well go to the essentials. Ensure that at least the essentials are done in various languages. To answer your first question, yes I would officially request as one of the members of ALAC that this be taken in to account and integrated in to a response because I think that, as I said a minute ago, languages and scripts no longer belong to a state, a sovereign state.

We're way beyond that and, for instance, a Turkish language community exists in Germany. There are Chinese language communities all over the world, for instance, in France. And so I wouldn't want any government or sovereign state to claim that it is the sole owner and therefore the sole determiner of any language or script. Of course, in legal terms, for instance China or France do establish regulations about



the standards of language or even writing. But on the Internet it's more complex than that. So yes, please integrate that.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Jean-Jacques. And Dennis?

DENNIS JENNINGS: Thank you. I think that would be very welcome. It is a concern. I would think that the Chinese issues report had the most diverse representation or participation. If you think of Arabic and the vast area of the globe from Africa to the Philippines and lots of places in between where Arabic is used, the Arabic issues report did not have such a wide and diverse participation. The Cyrillic one was very much Eastern Europe participation, and had no participation from the far part of the Russian federation. So actually the Chinese one was the one with the greatest participation and diversity.

But the reason I mentioned the others is the complexity and difficulty of getting participation of all the communities who use a particular script and writing system. Because look, some of these languages stretch across vast parts of the globe. Including parts where there are people in communities and writing systems which do not yet use the Internet. So it is a significant challenge. One that we're aware of and there's a lot of sensitivity about.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Dennis. Okay, so that I think covers a good part of the ground but I had a few more points there. I wonder if there any further



discussion on it. One of which, in particular, about the current proposal of the secondary panel is at the...their decision basically is final. Again, I'm not trying to say that that shouldn't be the case.

But rather there is no review process of the panel except for ICANN staff or however determines that the panel has become rogue. There is no formal process to take a look at the outputs of the secondary panel over time and see if there is any changes that need to be made. Whether that is a concern for the community....Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Yes, thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Edmon I think that's a very important point. I haven't followed this closely enough to remember whether you are following the same principles and the same rationale as in the rest of ICANN, which is to have periodic reviews with a sort of accountability system which is very stringent. And the review would not be performed by the group itself or not alone, but by outside expertise and to ensure neutrality.

So I think that it would be a good idea to include, if you've not done it yet and sorry, I don't remember. But if you've not done it yet please include it in the larger framework of periodic reviews. Whether it would be every two years or every five years I have no idea, but just think about that as a possible mechanism.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Jean-Jacques. Andrew?



ANDREW SULLIVAN:

Andrew Sullivan. One of the reasons that the draft, as it stands, does not include a periodic review team is because if we created a review team and we could find sufficient expertise to populate it we would deny the secondary panel of that expertise. In the case of Unicode, there are perhaps ten people on the entire globe who can do this job usefully. If we need to use up two of those in order to make a review team, we're now down to eight people who could possibly do it and probably five of those people are conflicted and now we're down to practically nobody who can serve on the secondary panel.

So we've really got a serious resource problem here, that this is an extremely peculiar expertise that we want. And that is why, from my point of view, what is better is to use the public comment approach in order to address the behavior of the secondary panel, combined with the administrative responsibility of ICANN for oversight of the secondary panel members. I feel very strongly that adding another layer of review or appeal to this system is...we'll just run out of people to do it.

Moreover, it will become very difficult for anybody to comment usefully on the review team's output, which of course is another thing that we do, right? We post review team reports for public comment, but if there's nobody left who knows anything about the subject or who knows enough to speak authoritatively about it then we actually run out of the ability to just run our processes normally. So that is actually the foundation for that, and I'm extremely resistant to changing that.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Andrew. Jean-Jacques, did you have...?



JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, a brief follow-up to that. Thank you Andrew. I think your point is very well taken, that the administrative unit should do something about verifying the validity of the work. But I don't think that should exclude a review system simply on the grounds of available human resources. If that's really the problem in the long term then it is the duty of this group, and of ICANN as a whole, to prepare for the training of a sufficient number of people. Why are there only a dozen top specialists of Unicode in the world?

Because it was a very restricted outlet or career opportunity or whatever you want to call it. And there was no more of that simply because there was also no advertising for it. But now that the need is more clearly identified for the kind of thing you are doing then you have to bring the message out. And I think that when there is a need and it is made known, then you have volunteers who appear and who are willing to go through the stringent training in order to achieve the highest level worldwide.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Dennis, would you allow me to clarify a little bit? And also add on to what Jean-Jacques is saying. I think one of the things that we're really talking about is the review of the process, not necessarily just about whether they were right or wrong but how the process that led to that particular answer...is that the process we want?

That review does not necessarily always have to include the type of expertise within the secondary panel. And the other point is that you



mentioned about the public comment itself can be...but the public comment is about the decision of...each public comment would be either a specific proposal from the primary panel or a specific decision by the secondary panel. None of the public comments will open for a, "Hey, do you think this process is working well?" Right? That is what we're talking about.

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

Sorry, it's Andrew Sullivan. I don't see how that follows at all. When I do reviews for public comment, if I think that the entire procedure is screwy then that's what I say in my comment. It seems to me that's an entirely legitimate thing to say in such a public comment. "This is bad because these people are all completely conflicted." That would be a totally appropriate thing to say, I should think.

EDMON CHUNG:

Okay. I have Dennis, and then Rinalia.

DENNIS JENNINGS:

Dennis Jennings, for the record. I think when the word "review" is used it's important to condition that with stating what is being reviewed. One of the things we're concerned about is that the word "review" might be used in the sense of appealing the technical decision, and this is where Andrew gets very exercised because that simply is not going to work.

However, if we're talking about reviewing whether the contracts ICANN has with the secondary panel members have turned out to be effective



that's a different thing that's being reviewed. Or whether we're talking about whether...we're reviewing whether the composition of the primary panels has worked out satisfactorily to all the users of a particular script is a different matter. So I would ask you, when talking about review, to be quite careful to specify what you think needs to be reviewed and why.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Dennis and I at least think I know that we are not saying a review that would make Andrew very upset. That's the kind of review...but Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Just a thought really. Whether it is a particular type of review or administrative oversight, when there is rogue behavior, borrowing Edmon's words, and then you would have to remove a panel member it seems to me that it may not be possible to do that due to the scarcity of experts.

So this is a real dilemma because it's capture essentially, and that's why I think I would support Jean-Jacques suggestion to put in place a training program to make sure that we have a sustainable pool of experts. This was one of the things that I raised at the LGR meeting that we have a long-term frame and we need to make sure that we have a sustainable pool of experts whether they are alternates or the same guys who are on the panel itself. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Rinalia. I have Jean-Jacques and then Dennis.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, to follow up on what Rinalia just said I agree completely. There's a sociological remark that I'd like to make. It's that, as far as I'm aware, the dozen people in the world Andrew mentioned, about Unicode, who are not driven by cultural or linguistic or script concerns...or at least they didn't have the background for that. I suppose there were many technicians, engineers, etcetera. No? Okay.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: So some of them are...primarily they are computational linguists. It's just a very specialized field. I want people to understand what we're talking about here is funding people in their PhDs.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Right, okay. So sociologically that can change, is my message. And that depends on us. The description you're giving is for a certain period. Let's say 1970 to 2000. It depends partly on us, on you, on your group, to change that by underlining the interest and the importance of having a stock of people who are willing to devote part of their time to it.

And it is because the current dozen specialists worldwide were brought to this by their own motivations, but not by a call. This is what I want to underline. It is up to you, to us now, to make a call well-documented in order to be convincing enough to recruit that kind of people.



EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Dennis first, and then Rinalia.

DENNIS JENNINGS: Dennis Jennings. Actually I think we have covered that in the sense that we're looking for the secondary panel to have say four or five experts on it. But in addition, we're looking for a pool of what we call advisors. These are technical advisors. Six or ten who will be available as resources to assist and advise the primary panels. And as long as those advisors don't end up working on a primary panel, which would then preclude them from ever being on the secondary panel, we will be creating a pool with expertise which may address...it doesn't solve the problem, but may address the problem.

So if you read the next version you'll see that there's a lot more talk about the advisors as resources and that may go some way, Jean-Jacques, to addressing building up the pool of expertise. The rule is if an advisor then moves on to a primary panel, they are locked out of becoming an expert on the secondary panel, for the same reason if you're part of the proposal process you can't be part of the deciding process.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Dennis. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Edmon. I'd like a clarification from Andrew. Would the contracts for the secondary panelists identify what rogue behavior would be?

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

Well that's a good question, but I think the right answer is almost certainly something having to do with the development of the contract. I think what we have in the procedure is a set of principles and a set of goals. Right? We say, "We have these principles for what good behavior or a good result would be. And we have these goals that we're balancing against them things that we would like the procedure to yield." So for instance, we would like the procedure to be as unarbitrary and as inclusive as possible so that you don't prefer one kind of character over another, for instance. And that's an important goal of the procedure.

On the other hand we have the overarching conservatism principle and the various expressions of those principles that are the constraining principles in there, and these are intentioned in some way. And so we can't specify an algorithm of what the right decision would be. If we could do that, of course we wouldn't need all of these panels. Therefore, it seems to me that something that is a correct contractual obligation says that you have to be implementing this procedure in a balanced way, in a fair way, in a disinterested or unbiased way. That you remain...you do the best efforts to implement the procedure as it's written.

But I doubt very much that you could write a contract...and I am, alas, not a lawyer so I couldn't specify this a little better. But it seems to me that that would be the kind of content that you'd have to go to. Ultimately, of course, this entire procedure is judgment all the way down.



But there's another important factor to keep in mind here. The people who are going to be involved in these panels, there are very few such experts in the world but that also means that their professional reputations are at stake all the time. Right? You can't be sort of one of the world experts and then behaving like some yahoo who's just ignoring all of the evidence in front of you whenever it becomes convenient.

What you do in that case is destroy your professional reputation, which is the only thing that makes you one of these small number of worldwide experts. After a certain point you're not a worldwide expert anymore, you're a clown. And the...I don't know, even from outside of any kind of academic specialty eventually you can sort of spot..."Okay I don't really understand that academic specialty, but at the same point it's pretty clear that this guy over here is just completely out in the weeds." And either he's a visionary and he's completely right, in which case we will find out in the fullness of time, or else he's a crank. And it is that reputational value that we are partly relying on in order to keep the secondary panel honest. And I don't really know how we could break that in to a contract, but we need to depend on it.

EDMON CHUNG:

Okay. Thank you Andrew. And I have Dennis and then YJ. But we're slowly but steadily running out of time and there's a couple things that I really want to get to. But Dennis, and then YJ.



DENNIS JENNINGS: Thank you. Dennis Jennings, here. I regret I have to go but I have an important question. Does anybody need a ticket to the gala tonight? Because I'm not going.

EDMON CHUNG: Now all the other questions are so unimportant anymore. So YJ, you had a comment.

YJ PARK: Yeah. Well since I don't know the exact timeline of how to form this panel down the road I have some specific suggestion, whether you can consider that one of sort of options. Because if we look at this meeting and also the GAC meeting we provide the interpretations so one of sort of the things that we can consider is...there are two directions, so one direction you are demonstrating here is there is some expert who has very good command of English-speaking skills and but also who is sort of have good understanding of other character sets and things like that.

But another approach is there is sort of this local expert who could add understanding of their own transcripts and their kind of language. And so if we can kind of identify those experts in that local group and working together with interpreters and some kind of volunteers. So, for example, for those Korean experts case I would happy to volunteer to translate or interpret what he is talking to this community and other language groups can organize their kind of volunteer...sort of the communication channels. So maybe we can think about the second kind of option is down the road, if you have sort of enough time to form



these panels. And then we can have good balance of these volunteers and sort of experts who are paid by this ICANN process as well.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you YJ. So I want to wrap up this particular part of the discussion. So I just want to summarize some of the few things in terms of the secondary panel that we discussed, and make sure people are comfortable with this summary. So we talked about the diversity of the group, and this is something we have concern, we think is important. And that related somewhat to the concern of the small pool of experts that is expressed, that raises a flag, that's a concern. We should...this is something that ICANN needs to look in to further.

And then we also mentioned that in terms of the review process, it's not about the technical merits of particular decisions but the process itself and general review is something, at least from the ALAC point of view, is a...I know you don't agree, necessarily agree, but this is our view at this point. That...okay? Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Just...I agree with what you said but I would add, however, something about Andrew's remark that in addition to the review approach there is some merit in following also a more administrative path, which is what you had suggested. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you. So the final part of the suggestion was basically some lack of explanation of some more readable element in terms of how it relates



to the overall new GTLD process and the IDN ccTLD process. And also the first-mover advantage which is not discussed or explained in the document. I wonder if there is anything we want to add to that? And people are comfortable with sort of taking that position? Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Edmon. Rinalia for the transcripts. I am comfortable with that. I think it's relevant. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. So I guess that sort of wraps up the response. I'll redraft some of it based on the discussion we had. We'll probably require a little bit more time to circulate this so we might not make the 19th deadline. Unfortunately Dennis is gone, and I wonder if Andrew would be able to give us some insight on whether if we get this whole thing together and hand it to you before October....when, when the reply process begins. Would that work for the...that's great. Francisco. And we also note that this particular public comment period ends within an ICANN meeting. I think the community has repeatedly not to do so. But please.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes, so the alternative was the date would end before, and so we thought...

[background conversation]



FRANCISCO ARIAS: Sorry?

[background conversation]

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Oh, sure. This is Francisco Arias, from ICANN staff, working on the project to work on the Label Generation Rules set in relation to IDNs. So the alternative was to have the process, the public comment period to end before so we thought it would be better to extend it so it would include this meeting so that the discussions that we had here could make some people realize what was going on and they provide input.

In any case, I was thinking that perhaps one way to solve this issue, if you need more time to provide input, is ALAC has an observer in the process and perhaps the observer could provide the input to the team and we can include it. Even if it's after the public comment period, it's not really an issue because we are going to a second public comment period by the end of November so you provide the input. I will have to ask Andrew when that should be so we can include it before the other public comment but I think there is a mechanism there with the observer in the team.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Francisco. And I note also that there's a reply period which runs until November 9th so perhaps we can put it in there. But the first option is to try to wrap it up within the next couple of days, have it go



through the ALAC and by Friday we will miraculously be able to put something in. So that's the first option, if not then...we'll work with the November 9th and then if not also we'll send it through Rinalia. And there was a question from the remote.

[background conversation]

EDMON CHUNG:

Oh, okay. So okay, in that case let's move on to the next topic. I know we have only about 15 minutes left but it is a topic that we've talked about for a year, unbelievably. So let's see if I'm able to forward the slides. I no longer am able to forward the slides. Can you pass it back to me? I refreshed my browser. I think I should be good now. Okay, so basically this is Next Steps. Tomorrow also, there's going to be a session so those interested should be there.

Okay, quick item on this. We did draft a statement on the IDN ccPDP. It's fairly general and it just commends the assimilation to the Fast Track, [truthful to learning]. I also have the urgency of IDN Variant TLDs there in the process. This has been on the work place space and it's up to be voted, I think tomorrow. So please take a look at it, I think it's in pretty good shape so unless there is any...there is. Hong wanted to add to this.

HONG XUE:

This is Hong Xue. Thanks Edmon. I've had a close look to this IDN ccTLD PDP document. Sorry, I was overlooking this. It seems ".china" has



been delegated and I noticed that something is quite weird. One issue is that the confusing similarity of IDN ccTLDs scripts will be decided purely according to the visual objective standard. What I mean is that without interference of the language culture background. So what I mean is that, let's use the example of Chinese. For Chinese IDN ccTLD, for someone who knows Chinese you would feel that it's confusingly similar. But for someone who don't know this language they just look at the visual appearance as completely two different strings. I understand this is an objective assessment. It has this rationale; this is because this is will be putting to TLD list and eventually.

But think about it, this is ccTLD and ccTLD community has been emphasizing the difference from gTLD that are serving local communities. It is primarily for the use for the local who are using those scripts rather than for the persistence of co-existence of all the TLDs. So I know this is very late, I just talked with ccNSO IDN PDP Working Group and they said it's really too late. This subject has been settled down. Following subsequently there will only be procedures. There's no way to change that. But I want to raise it now for our consideration.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Hong. But I want to understand the question a little bit better. From what I see, it is different from the new gTLD process. The new gTLD process actually has a confusingly similar objection process. That is in addition to the visual similarity. And the ccTLD one does not. Right? So what the ccTLD one does is actually provide even better protection for the IDN ccTLD itself, right?



So...because then somebody else can't try to argue that it's not...even though it's visually similar it is distinct and therefore we should get it. Right? So in a way it provides the kind of...it spans a bigger protection set for each particular IDN ccTLD. Or what is the...because I didn't quite get what the concern was.

HONG XUE:

Okay. Let me put it this way. Let's use the Bulgarian case. Just use as an example. For the Bulgarian people, they don't believe their ".bulgaria" in their character is confusingly similar with ".br". That's for Brazil ccTLD. But the ICANN technical panel, after assessment, they believe so visually it's two confusingly similar strings. And you're right, it's different from new gTLD process, there's no further objection procedure available there. Even though for the Fast Track it's a different story.

EDMON CHUNG:

So you're raising two particular issues? That the current PDP output does not take in to account periodic review. That's one thing. Like it can't be changed later is one of the concerns, right? The other concern is that it did not solve the Bulgaria issue of...did I summarize it...?

HONG XUE:

However, for the first one we can't say this because this is...the process in ccNSO is very complicated and have two working groups working parallel and there's only the working group one presented this draft. There will be a working group two that will combine and make a final report. So procedurally we're not very sure if there is no periodical



review, there could be. There could be a mechanism built in to this PDP. For the second one, well yes...to my understanding it will not be able to resolve the problem like with Bulgaria. But of course that's only one case, probably this very special case. It won't happen again.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Hong. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. First comment is that it's not here in this particular group and at this particular time that we will be able to solve a problem, which is of high importance actually. So procedurally I would suggest that this group take note of Hong's remarks and perhaps ask her or suggest to her that send to you her remarks in writing because it's difficult to formulate like this in just two minutes, I can imagine. So to send to you, as Chair of this group, her remarks and that they be taken in to consideration and recorded in the minutes or the conclusions of your meeting today. That's the first suggestion.

Another remark is that I can support Hong's remarks about the fact that in Chinese script what seems to a Westerner or someone who doesn't know Chinese script, what seems to him or her confusingly similar is in fact not the case. So I just want to support Hong on that particular point because I know Chinese a bit and I can certify that. So her point about local users of those scripts and languages would in effect feel dispossessed if they were made to choose one or the other instead of being able to use both. That I can understand, thank you.



EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Jean-Jacques. And I think...it's on the wiki, the work space, the current draft. I think if you can suggest a paragraph to add to it we can certainly do. And the other thing is that if this is a...this certainly raises a concern but we can describe it as...if we're not sure whether it already does then maybe that's why there's a public comment and say, "Hey, it seems like you haven't resolved this issue from the current draft. We don't understand how this could be solved." And that could be added in to the...and can I...so are you going to be writing and sending...? That's great. By tomorrow though.

[background conversation]

EDMON CHUNG: We're voting...or...okay. That's great.

[background conversation]

EDMON CHUNG: cc...yes. IDN ccPDP...of the IDN ccPDP.

[background conversation]

EDMON CHUNG: It is on the agenda for tomorrow. There is a friendly amendment.



[background conversation]

EDMON CHUNG: Just change it on the wiki is what Heidi says. And Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. It's Olivier for the transcript record. Heidi, do you think that...because I'm sorry I arrived a bit...well very late. The friendly amendment requires a new notification to our members for them to have to read through the...can they basically agree to it within five minutes of reading this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. I've noted on the agenda "as consideration of". So that can mean just discussion or vote, etcetera.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. So we are running out of time, but at least I will spend the next four minutes on a topic that we talked about for a long time which is the sort of...my slides thing...Matt?

[background conversation]

EDMON CHUNG: No, no. Just my slides is fine. Okay so we talked about having a discussion on the long-term IDN strategy and I'd like to use the last few minutes just throw this up so that...we probably won't have a lot of time



to discuss it but at least to start this process and create a document that we can call advice to the ICANN Board and ICANN sort of in general.

I've sort of identified three areas. One of which is the internationalization is a key strategic directive that's the CO made it very clear and some of the things that are being done is also in that direction. I wanted to talk about some of the implications within and beyond ICANN as well, and how ICANN's role and potential role would be. I'll quickly go to it so we have a minute to discuss.

But basically the concept is to talk about all...cover all the aspects of IDN and to cover what ICANN's role currently and what it's potential role could be in setting the agendas and principles and also to reach out and collaborate with other organizations. So this is, in a nutshell, what I'm throwing up and...Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. A general remark. I find this very good as a scheme or as a template for something more developed. There are two things which I don't see, but perhaps you have included them mentally. For each of these sub-items, what are the physical or human resource requirements? And the second is in what timeline? Because in the end things are possible or impossible, mainly because of the resource aspect and also the calendar aspect.

So if you could...I realize that you may not be able to give elements at this stage on all the items you have listed but as far as possible I would encourage you to give some indication of how you think you see those because that would help in the discussion. It would help on two levels.



First, among us or in your group, in order to keep constantly in mind the constraints, the physical constraints, the resource constraints. And the other thing is the time constraint because some things can be achieved within six months, others will require two years. So at each step we have to be conscious of those constraints. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Just to make sure I understand this. So one of the things that you think would be very useful is on each of the items perhaps the timeframe for which you are thinking...okay. Thanks. We have actually ran out of time. I was wondering if YJ or Rinalia has any further initial feedback on this for the time being? YJ?

YJ PARK: Can we provide the feedback later?

EDMON CHUNG: Sure. This was just sent to the list a couple hours ago and I think we'll take this...and also, just before we leave, I don't know...Rinalia, did you want to add before I sort of close?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Edmon. Rinalia for the record. I think it would be a good basis for discussion in the working group list, because there's a big component and maybe you could break it up and have sustained discussion on it. Thank you.



EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Rinalia. And well I think we've run to the close of this meeting now, but one thing we did talk about having a monthly meeting of the group. I was hoping to get that started. I don't know...is that a no or is that a good thing or a bad thing or...? We don't even have consensus on this.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. Edmon, it's not that you don't have consensus. I think it's a question of time allocation and it would not be decent on the part of occasional contributors, I'm speaking for myself; we can easily find time once a month. But for those of you who are in the center of this storm and who have been the greatest contributors so far it depends very much on your possibilities. We are peripheral, hopefully useful, but peripheral compared to yourselves.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. And Rinalia, you wanted to respond.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Edmon. Rinalia speaking. I would really like to leverage on the wiki and mailing list discussion as much as possible and use the calls when we have something to discuss in terms of conflicts or different points of views in trying to reach a consensus in terms of moving ahead. That would really work. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Sounds good, and let's work in that mode first and if we think we need calls then we'll call that through the mailing list as well. Okay? So with



that I think we will bring the session to a close. And thank you everyone for joining and also I'd like to extend a thanks to all the interpreters and all the technicians and everyone that made this possible, and of course the staff here. Matt, Heidi, and Sylvia. Thank you everyone. Goodbye.

[End of Transcript]

