Moderator: This session was moved over from yesterday and it's the update of the incident response working group and Norm is going to do that for us, Norm.

Norm: OK, thank you and good morning. OK. I'm just going to give you a quick update on the status of the incident response working group which was created since the last meeting in Sydney.

               A little bit of background first. Why did we create this group?

               Turning back time to the spring of this year, there was a worm called Conficker C that was threatening to utilize about 106 ccTLDs – that means to reach its command and control. This was identified by the cyber security specialists and there was actually an incredible gathering and coordination of the ccTLDs to respond to that before it could do any damage.

               However, it was not without some pain in accomplishing that and there was a post mortem done at Sydney to look at lessons learned, what we could have done better, what we might have done worse.

               But I think the big message that came out of there was that it was not an easy response and simply we weren't prepared for it.

               The ccTLDs were not really well coordinated to deal with a synchronized response to a threat.

               Probably one of the first and foremost problems that was identified is there was no established conduit to reach the ccTLDs for an emergency. There were some other problems too that were identified.

               Most registries did not have mechanisms in place for blocking domains. Some of the domains had already been registered so there was – it's called a conflict or sorry – these domains had to be checked to make sure that they were not malicious in any way.

               Some registries simply didn't have the resources available to deal with this in a timely manner. Some lacked policies. And some actually had a financial impact through this.

               So what was done?

               Conficker was really a wake-up call. It's likely not a singular event. It was the first incident that really got everyone's attention that we were not well coordinated.

               In response to that though, an incident response working group was formed. It's an ad hoc group and its role was to create a repository of emergency

contacts in the ccTLDs, set the processes up and procedures for engaging those contacts.

So what are some of the guiding principles we set forth?

First and foremost, it's all about preserving the security and stability of the DNS. That's first and foremost in everyone's mind.

It also recognized the fact that the ccTLDs for the most part do not have a binding relationship with each other or in many cases with only their governments.

There's a lot of diversity in language, time zone, resources and expertise. It's kind of what makes ccTLDs so special.

And also up front we knew that we would need to respect particular policies and practices by which each ccTLD may be governed. Because it's a cyber security event, there's different legal structures, government structures, policies, procedures, etc., that need to be respected.

So what were the work plan objectives?

First and foremost was to create a reporting point. This is a repository. So in the event of an emergency, how do you reach the ccTLDs?

And there are two sides to this. One is this would be a threat to the DNS or a threat that would utilize the DNS.

Actually Conficker C was not a threat to the DNS itself but it was attempting to utilize DNS.

The other objective is to provide mechanisms for the coordination of counter measures. In this case you don't necessarily want everyone going out and doing their own thing. It's best to coordinate a response.

Also, the communication channels have to deal not only outbound but also within the ccTLD community, with the gTLDs and with the DNS route managers.

The other role that was identified would be the technical support in response to an incident. It wouldn't be enough just to report the incident and reach the ccTLDs, someone would have to understand it and respond to it.

Uri, there you are.

Another aspect of this is actually to ensure the security of the DNS registration itself. It's not only simply about the DNS but an attack could also go through the registration system.

And lastly to actually develop a common incident repository so that should an event occur that's been dealt with before, that could be looked and we could see how best to mitigate it.

So what's the status?

We got off to rather a slow start, it was the summer. And we started with a small group, I'd like to recognize Eri Ito from ICANN, he has been very, very instrumental in pulling this together in short order.

The work group expanded from four people up to over thirty, so there was a very high level of interest in this group, which is a good thing.

Also, we appointed a Vice Chair, Hugo from Chile.

We created a draft plan so the elements and mechanisms of the repository are defined. So this is the contacts, how we go about engaging those contacts, what are some of the processes involved, how do we do the process for event handling and also who maintains the repository and creates it. And we have asked ICANN staff to do that and that will be under the security organization within ICANN.

There are still some tasks undone. The plan is near complete but it needs to be finalized and vetted with the group. We need to design and create the repository, the database, which will have a web interface for updating the contacts, recognizing that the contacts will not be static. So these may change over time, people actually might want to go on vacation and actually put somebody else in the contact while they're away. Also there would be multiple contacts from any registries. And the contacts may not just be within the registries, they may be within other organizations, not least of which would be the regional organizations.

The repository itself will need to be populated. And then we'll have to test it. So the test such as how do make sure that we have verified that we can engage the community in a non-crisis moment.

We will probably learn from that and have to refine things. We hope to have the, by the way, we hope to have the database created and hopefully populated before the next ICANN meeting.

Some other work to be done is to find the process for threats originating from within the ccTLD community.

So we started off on this saying that we need to coordinate ourselves to provide a conduit coming into the ccTLDs but threats can also originate from the ccTLDs themselves and not threats but identification of a threat.

And also identify threats and remedies to the registration system themselves.

And that's a short summary so thank you. Any questions? Or am I not supposed to say that?

Moderator: No, you can say that, that's OK. You're allowed to say that.

So no one has any questions for Norm? Well I'm not surprised; most of the people in this room are probably on the working group.

Norm: It's all good.

Moderator: OK, well, I guess we'll hear from you again next time, with more news.

Norm: Yes.

Moderator: Good. Thanks very much Norm.

OK. We're going to move on now to our next session for which I am going to need the roving mike, so I'll go and get it.

Did everyone go to the gala last night? Was it good? Good.

I didn't go. I was working. I was working, I was!

OK, we're going to move on to our session on IDNs and what have you.

Bart can you come up for this one, please? Because I need your document don't I? No, I won't do geographic names first but let me…

OK, so we're going to talk about IDNs.

There are three things to talk about. There's the fast track, there's geographic names and there's the PDP.

We've set aside a fair bit of time for this session, I'm not entirely sure we'll need it all but we'll see how we go.

The geographic names stuff we talked about in some detail yesterday with Rod and Peter and Michael. And Anabette (sp?) I know you've had

discussion with Michael which we might get you to talk about. Would you be OK to do that? Is there anything to say?

Anabette (sp?): Thank you. I had a chat with Michael Silver in the break yesterday about the geographical thing, because under the discussion yesterday it seemed like he understood better than Peter and Rod, what we were talking about and what we really meant.

So we grabbed him in one of the session's coffee breaks and he promised to take it further on in the Board so we'll see what that leads to.

And we have to decide what to do from our side. So Hilda and I made that presentation on the few points of what we think we have done, what we have achieved and what we have not achieved. So Hilda will take it but so if we start with that, and we'll see what we do further on.

Moderator: While that's being set up, we had a Board ccNSO council breakfast this morning. I don't know if any other tables that were at that breakfast talked about the geographic names but I did. OK, I did.

And I was with Rod and Jean Jacques (sp?) and Ramundo and Patricio was there, Becky was there – sorry, how could I forget you? And we talked about if this were to happen, how this might happen, the possibility of there being a different sort of contract that would allow the government to say, "We don't think that Peter should be running .Australia anymore," – I know, it's bizarre isn't it – "shouldn't be running Bell Australia anymore and we want it to be transferred to Martin." Not the whole of Australia, just the…

And just the bit that works, just the bottom right hand corner.

And Rod said, "Well, we could find a way of doing this, etc." All of the conversation – a lot of it was about – well if we do this, how can we do this so that it works? And Becky was saying from a legal point of view, "Well, yeah, you can do that, if you really want to take on that sort of a risk and all of that." And at the end of it, I said, "What I'm not clear about and I would like to get an answer to is you have been told by the ccNSO and the GAC that they don't think this is a good idea. I certainly don't get the impression that there are hordes of gTLD folks out there saying we want country names. So why? Why?"

And I think that's where we are with it. We just don't get why.

Do you want to do your presentation and then Peter you can say what happened for you and…? OK, cool.

Hilda:	OK, I'll try to keep this short. But this is sort of a summary for those of you who are constantly wondering why we're getting up and saying, "Look, geographic names, it's very important." And people are thinking, "Oh God, not again. There she goes again."
	So the demented twins, or whatever you want to call us, I'll give you a short summary!
Moderator:	I actually hadn't thought of that but that's a really good name!
Hilda:	I prefer dynamic duo myself but…
	So, just to wake you up in the morning, this is a short picture from a Norwegian newspaper, drawing what will happen right now. Apologies to anyone feeling offended by the characterization of the country. We're the one with the, in the red suit, with the hat down over our eyes so we can't see anything.
	That's Norway. Oh, no, that's not Norway, that's just our funny characters.
	But basically what has happened is that the Council actually made the resolution in 2007 and then nothing happened. So an ad hoc working group was put up just to make, aid the Council in making further input into the new gTLD process.
	And that working group circulated the input once on the ccNSO list. The reason why you haven't seen any more from that is that basically we didn't have much more work to do because nobody listened to the input so it was, you just repeated it and repeated it and repeated it, so we didn't need to write very much new things.
	But the goal of the ccNSO was and is that we would like country territory names – well, first we said as ccTLDs, not gTLDs – if you narrowly define a ccTLD as two characters, then probably that's not what we want. But that's semantics.
	We don't feel that country names should be part of the gTLD space and we've been arguing saying that, well because you're defining a mark of a ccTLD is not really the number of characters in the TLD, that's an easy way visually to separate them today before IDNs.
	But it's actually where it gets its authority from, where does the policy come from? And also we've been saying country names are not generic, you know? And it should at least be removed from the gTLD process until the ccTLD IDN PDP, the full process has finished.

Also the ccNSO has had as its goal that the definition of a country and territory name should be broad enough to give sufficient protection. So points have been made that lists are difficult to handle, it should be a meaningful representation, and the name should be protected in all languages.

So, what did we actually achieve in the DAG?

As you might have noticed, for those of you that were here last morning, so far, ICANN in its analysis leading up to the DAG, does not accept that country and territory names should be excluded from the gTLD process. They argue that governments may want a .country name and currently the gTLD process is the only way to get it if it's not an IDN fast track TLD.

And that other stakeholder groups, although none are mentioned specifically, support that country and territory names are allowed in the gTLD process.

And besides the requirement that the government has to actively support or non-object to an application should be protection enough, so basically what are you making such a fuss about?

On the other thing, the definition of a country and territory name, we have actually achieved something. Not in the DAG 3 but in the DAG 2, they expanded the definition to cover all languages, not just the six U.N. languages, which is good news for a lot of us.

But they do keep referring to an exhaustive list instead of meaningful representation and you can read the arguments afterwards – I won't use your time in going through that.

The good news as Chris was saying is that GAC seems to actually share our goals. That's nice. They say in a letter in August 2009 that strings are meaningful representation or abbreviation of a country name or territory name should not be allowed in gTLD space.

Actually they go even further later in the letter and say that it would be logical to apply ccTLD policies to any TLDs that are intended to service a specific community within a specific national jurisdiction. Like, for example, the capital cities that the ccNSO hasn't been messing around with because we thought it was hard enough actually to fight for country names.

This input seems to not have been included in the analysis leading up to DAG 3 because the government sent it in a bit late but there has been a letter from the ICANN Board to the GAC and those who are interested can read it. It's not very promising in the answer from ICANN.

So, what do we do now?

As Chris was saying, do we tell them yet another time that look, you didn't listen to us the last four times we told you this but we're trying for a fifth time, that might be the charm. We have this time actually been able to speak with some of the ICANN Board members. Do we try to explain in excruciating detail why we think this is a bad idea? What do we actually want to do as a community?

I would note that last time for the DAG 3 – for DAG 2 there were very few comments – if this is something that you feel strongly or even luke warm about, I would sort of urge you to actually also in addition to whatever the ccNSO send in, to consider whether you want to comment and just say we support that the ccNSO Council has been saying for years.

We could also decide to focus on finishing the IDN cc PDP. Because ICANN's main argument for keeping this in the gTLDs is that, well, it's the only alternative if somebody wants it right now. So if we finish the IDN cc PDP for all languages and all scripts, then we might argue that they are ccTLDs.

That's it. That's the question. I'll leave you to get the answer.

Moderator: Can you go back some slides?

Hilda: Yep, which do you want?

Moderator: Keep going.

Hilda: This one? This one?

Moderator: Yeah. So one of, what became clear yesterday I think is that one of the issues is that there is a lack of – our message is perhaps not as sharp as it could be – it's more a blunt message.

The reality is, we're not actually saying, really, country names are ccTLDs, yet. We'd might do, but we're not saying that now. What we're actually saying is they are not gTLDs. And that it's not, we're not saying they should be available to be issued as ccTLDs and we can't say that because we don't have any policy for that yet.

The problem is if you say, "No, no, no, no, they shouldn't be g's, they should be c's," then that can be interpreted as a sort of power grab argument and in the gTLD world, it's all about power grabs and so that sort of argument fits very neatly into their belief on all the way that these things work.

So I think we should re-deliver the message but I think we should re-deliver the message in a slightly different way. I think that what we should say is, "We have no idea whether" – we wouldn't actually say it this way – "But we have no idea whether dot Australia would ever be available as a ccTLD but we're absolutely clear that it shouldn't be available as a gTLD and here's why."

And I think it might be worth putting some legal arguments together Becky on the dangers and all of that sort of stuff – I'll get you one second – can you flip forward another one for me Hilda?

That one. Now that last paragraph is actually extremely dangerous. That's a direct quote right? From Peter's letter?

What that actually says is we will issue a country name as a gTLD but if in a year's time or fifteen months or twenty months time, the ccNSO decides the country names should be ccTLDs, then we'll stop doing that. Which is a seriously bizarre way of dealing with it because what that would mean is that dot Australia and dot Norway would be out there as gTLDs and then suddenly all the others would be ccTLDs and that really is very, very odd.

What I'm saying is that if somebody applied for dot Australia and the government of Australia consented, it would governed by a gTLD contract.

So there are only two scenarios here. One scenario is that if the cc's say we do want to have country names as cc's, then any g's out there have to be brought in as c's. Or, the other scenario is we have an inconsistency where some country names are g's and some country names are c's, and neither of those is an acceptable position.

Hilda:	And Chris actually we have that situation already because for example, dot China in Chinese would be a cc because it can go through the fast track.
Moderator:	Correct.
Hilda:	Or it could be a g if it wanted to go through this process today. If that process is actually accepted. Because dot China in Chinese would also be able to enter the gTLD process as a country name.
Moderator:	But that implies that they couldn't, that paragraph implies that China couldn't apply…
Hilda:	Yep.
Moderator:	…for dot China in Chinese as a gTLD.

Hilda:	Yep, except that what that implies and what's in the process are two different things.
Moderator:	Yes, yes.
Hilda:	But yeah.
Moderator:	Becky wanted to say something specific about this and then I'm going to ask Peter to…
	Gabby could we grab the…?
Becky:	Like you, I haven't heard any ground swell of interest outside of in the g's space at all for country names. And what we heard that was repeated and which is something that I've heard in other context was, "Oh, there's a big demand for it."
	It seems to me as part of our input, we might want to test that process, that thesis, and see if we can get members of the community to say, "No, there's really not a big demand for it." Because I haven't heard of a single intending applicant at all.
Moderator:	I agree. Peter, would you like to just – did you want to mention what happened?
Unknown:	Yeah. Thanks. Yes I agree Becky but I think some of them make it a matter of principle and that's probably why they wouldn't make a statement saying that there wouldn't be any interest in that.
	This morning I spoke to Peter during breakfast on this issue. And I think the discussion yesterday really triggered something because what we have been indeed four times the same submission to them. But this is the first time that they really seem to understand how important it is.
	And it wasn't washed away in a tsunami of other submissions on that issue. So I think that that was very well done.
	The other thing is I realize that the trigger for us to keep that attention is to focus on the post delegation effects of this. So basically forget about the part – well it will be discussed in the delegation on new gTLDs – but forget about the delegation itself and focus on the legal aspects of a post delegation period. So privacy issues, transfer issues, etc.
	And basically Peter urged us to send as soon as possible another detailed list of comments.

Moderator:	Well to the DAG – well, we'd write to the Board and put those in as comments to the DAG.
	We'll get to how we do that in a second. Did anyone else want to have a…? Byron did you, were you on the same, did you want to say anything? No? OK.
	Anyone else?
	I got the distinct impression that Rod thinks that this is OK and that we need to try and find a way of doing it. And he said that – if you think I'm wrong – and he said something actually quite interesting which was, "This may be our opportunity to make governments realize that it's time for them take some responsibility," I'm paraphrasing but he was saying, "You know, if there is a problem and dot Australia gets granted and then ends up being turned off because there's a new government and they decide they don't want it, well that's fine, that will just teach people that this thing, this is what happens."
	So, he did say that didn't he? Yeah, exactly.
	So but I was encouraged that Jean Jacques (sp?) was listening and in the end he actually said that he's not perhaps as great a fan of it as others might be.
	Oh yeah, he's a distinct minority, yeah.
	Well, we've also got, I mean, we've got George Mu (sp?) on the Board from this meeting, we've got Patricia – I'm sorry, I forgot the name of the – Gonzales, thank you, thank you. I am terrible. No, Mike's still there, who's the third one? Who's the third new Board member? Anyway, there are three new Board members so they – oh right, two new Board members.
	So now I know this is grossly unfair Keith but just because I spotted you in my line of sight, do you have any input that you might like to give us from the gTLD world about country names? Don't feel you have to but if you've got anything that you think might be valuable.
Keith:	I don't have – is this on? OK. I don't have a lot to add. I mean, I think that in the gTLD space there are – from the perspective of the gTLD registry operators – there are a lot of other issues that are taking a priority.
	I think that this is not a primary concern to a lot of the registry operators in the gTLD space. It's just one of many.
	And I think that there's probably an opportunity for some level of compromise here but that still needs to be worked through.

But one of the things that I would say is that it is important, if you feel strongly about this, to make the comments, to submit the written comments to the record. Because if you don't, the ICANN staff will take that as an indication that you don't care.

Moderator: Yeah. What's the deadline? Right.

              Yeah.

Hilda: From the governmental side since that's where I came from before I got here, I think that it's a danger that we might point to as well. Because we have someone behind ICANN that really wants to grab what's happening in ICANN and that's ITU.

              And a lot of the governments are – they are ITU friendly and they do a job that – now it's the last year in the IGF process, one more meeting after Sharm el Sheikh, and it shall be decided what to do afterwards. And do we really want the new (unintelligible 31:38) process to quarrel again?

              We have achieved quite a lot in these five years and find a balance between the stakeholders – IGF is functioning between them like it does discussion forum – and it's been a lot of development in the ICANN world as well.

              So I think it's risky since the governments are so opposed to this and it's a lot of governments outside the ICANN area. It's only about a hundred that's on the GAC membership and if we are about a hundred registries in the c standard zone and it's 278 or some countries or territories in the world. So what about those that are not there? They won't even know what's going on and then suddenly they will find out that their country names have been used by someone and even if they gave us support, they don't know what they are doing.

              So it will be problems afterwards and that will fire back on ICANN.

              So I think we help ICANN as a society as well, to leave this for the moment, and then give it some really better thought than we have time to do now.

Moderator: Thanks Hilda. I think – I agree with everything you said – unfortunately I think that arguments of passion don't seem to be getting through. So we actually need – it's not that we won't put them – but we need to put some legal stuff in the way as well and say – as you said Peter – don't worry about the delegation, what the hell's going to happen after that?

              So I'm wondering if we could perhaps get a small – did you want to say something Keith? OK.

If we could get just like a small team – I'd like Becky definitely involved with that because of the legal stuff – and just put the dynamic duo together with Becky perhaps and a few others – and just do a document that says, "Here's what we've said," and I think we need slightly adjust the thing and not say, "They should be ccTLDs." But actually say, "They shouldn't be gTLDs," and we could have a section that talks about the possibility that they might be ccTLDs in the future, but right now.

Because otherwise that paragraph thing comes up. And put all of the arguments that you've talked about but also the stuff that we discussed Becky about you know, well how are you going to rule it if the government changes its mind, etc.

Keith?

Keith: So I'd like to also add to what Becky said earlier is that Newstar is active in the gTLD space where we're acting as a back end registry operator, looking for potential new business in the new TLD round, and we have heard not a single, not a single interested applicant talking about country names, or anything close.

We know of some folks who are interested in city names – dot NYC as an example that's been pretty vocal out there for New York City – but not a single applicant has surfaced in our awareness for country names.

So I personally don't understand why the ICANN staff in its development of the guidebook for new gTLDs, hasn't basically ticked this one off as a non issue and accepted the recommendations of the ccNSO and the GAC.

It could be that there's some blurriness or misunderstanding of what it is exactly is being recommended and it could be that perhaps coming up with the list, the list of names that are basically being recommended to be removed from the pool of potential new gTLDs, that represent country names.

Moderator: Yeah.

Keith: It could be an effective path forward.

Moderator: Yes and it's an incremental gain isn't it if we said – first step is well obviously if your name on the ISO list, obviously, not an issue there. Secondly, obviously your name on the ISO list in the translated, in the eighth and ninth column on the ISO list which are in the official languages, no problem there.

It gets more complicated each step that you go. But the first couple of steps are really easy so it doesn't…

	I have a theory that Paul Evans and Karen McCarthy are going to leave and try and get dot Australia and…
Keith:	So I mean, just as an example, in the United States, I know that the U.S. government would not be happy with a dot USA or a dot United States of America.
Moderator:	No. Sure.
Keith:	But dot America is – so I guess what I'm saying is there could be shades of gray and I think what's important is to move the ball forward in terms of defining what it is exactly that the ccNSO and the GAC are asking for, is potentially to come up with a list that can be referenced.
Moderator:	Sure.
Keith:	So, just a thought.
Moderator:	Thanks. Hang on.
Unknown:	But see, as we started with the meaning thing that we have in the fast track and it's been changed now to a list that ICANN already has made and that list is changed from the DAG 1 to the DAG 2 that we – or not 2, the DAG 3 – that we have commented, the chance to comment on now.
	So the list is there actually and it's based on the ISO. And they have admitted that we could have a support so why they can't say that the same list applies for – leave it as it is as a country and territory name – leave them out – according to the definitions we already have now. Because I think that the battle over the meaningful representation is most probably lost.
	So we have a list. And if they think it's easier to find out what's on the list instead of meaningful – because that's a kind of value evaluation – and so we have to do that much more difficult – we are there already with that list. So what we want them to do should be to not to make it – get them to understand that we are not asking for making them a ccTLD – but as Chris say, not gTLDs and in the IDN process where we go forward now, to treat some of the country and territory names like a ccTLD – not necessarily making them a ccTLD but the impact of the national – the local Internet community, the subsidiary principle – those things that we have been voting for before, that should be prevailing in that area.
Keith:	So one possible approach or path forward would be to use the terminology that ICANN is familiar with and that has existed in gTLD contracts for years, for the last decade. And the nomenclature would be a reserved name.

	In other words, don't classify these words, these strings as a cc or a gTLD; put them on a reserved list so they are neither.
Moderator:	Yep.
Keith:	And that language of "reserved domain name" or "reserve name," is something that ICANN is familiar with, it's included in existing contracts and perhaps that's a path forward.
Moderator:	It would be a path forward provided that it was an interim measure pending the result of – at some point in the future we're going to have to face considering the possibility of whether these things should be ccTLDs.

Now, my personal view is that they shouldn't be, but we're going to need to do that. Because if we're going to have dot China or dot India as an IDN and we're going to have – we have to at least consider, and it won't be in this PDP, but we have to at least consider whether having now got Gihan (sp?) with two IDN ccTLDs in two different scripts, he should have some flexibility in the ASCII script.

So whilst I think putting them on a reserved list is helpful in the sense that it gives them a place to go right now, as opposed to just hanging out there in space with no designation, we just need to be careful I think that we don't – that we have a mechanism…yes? |
Unknown:	I also think the problem of putting it on the reserved list is, as I said, that would cover China in Chinese. And I think they won't be very happy after getting the IDN ccTLD fast track, that there's a reserved list covering the translation of all of the country names in any language being reserved.
Moderator:	Yeah, I…
Unknown:	So then we would have to say OK every name is reserved except the ones that are allowed already in the ccTLD IDN fast track.
Moderator:	I think you were just talking about ASCII weren't you? Yeah. It's such an American attitude.

No, we're getting ourselves confused now because we're straddling ASCIIs and IDNs etc., so let's try not to do that. Kim did you want…? |
| Kim: | I think the point I was just about to make was said, but the Draft Applicant Guidebook has a list of criteria but then it says, "And all translation of these," so I think it's – by saying there's a list is a little simplistic because it will always come down to evaluation. |

Moderator: Has to.

Kim: Because there will always be that issue.

Moderator: Has to. Has to. And I think evaluation is great. I mean, I know it's cumbersome and I know it's expensive but I think it's great.

                 So, will you kind of get with Becky and find some other people that you're comfortable with and get some…? And I'll be involved as well, yeah?

                 Does anyone have any other comments on the geographics or is everyone comfortable that they've said everything they need to say and that we know what we're going to do which is to draft something up quickly?

                 OK. Good. All right. Excellent! Thank you very much Hilda, that's great.

                 Now, what was I doing next Bart? Which one?

                 Fast track! OK. Fast track's done. Anyone got anything they want to say about it? Good, let's move on.

                 I mean, it's done, it's going to be signed off on Friday morning I guess we can discuss what you have to sign, don't have to sign, what you have to pay, what you don't have to pay voluntarily, if you like, but it's done. Gihan (sp?).

Gihan (sp?):   I just went through that yesterday and it wasn't quite clear to me this issue of variance. As in the exact, in the current fast track, exactly where are we supposed to put the amount – I'm not sure I'm asking the right forum – but…

Moderator: Who was at the fast track presentation on Monday afternoon with Tina, with Tina by video? Anyone else? Very few people were actually.

                 OK, so, there is one specific – the problem is the term variance being used to describe lots of different things.

                 My understanding is that the expert technical group which is – Ram is on and Ram Mohan is on and Syavash (sp?) is on and various other people are on which is an ICANN thing that they've set up – will be producing a report this week or next week that deals with variance.

                 The issue – there are two or three issues. The first issue is that – in my understanding and I may have got this slightly wrong – but my understanding is that in the Arabic script, and it's specifically in the Arabic script, there are occasions where a character that looks identical – a character can be got to by two different ways. In other words, there are two Unicode points that produce the same character.

And in the example of Iran which – and as Syavash (sp?) put it to me as plainly as this – in the example of Iran, there are x% of the population who have keyboards that have one of that character on there and then there's y% of the population that have keyboards that have the other of that character on there and it literally depends on whether the machines that you buy come from America or come from somewhere else.

And it's the same – and it actually applies to ten – it applies to the names of – ten Arabic speaking countries and Iran for Farsi and Pakistan for Urdu – that the actual name has in it a letter or a character rather, that can be got at in a different way.

And for the native English speakers amongst us, the closest example I can think of – actually Doug came up with this yesterday – is the word encyclopedia can actually be spelled with an a and an e or with the a and the e combined. And if you have a keyboard that only has the a and the e combined on it, then you can't spell it with an a and an e and if you have a keyboard with only the a and an e, you can't spell it with the a and the e combined.

So it would be impossible for Iran to apply for an IDN ccTLD in only one of those because that would mean that only x% of the population would actually be able to get to it, literally because they can't type it on their – they don't have the character.

It would also be impossible for Iran to apply for one and then have the other one reserved – well, it would be possible but it amounts to the same thing – the fact that it's reserved does not help them at all.

So my understanding is that applies to Pakistan with the "k" – well, the equivalent of the "k" in Urdu – and I don't know what the examples are for Iran, etc.

So, I met – this is clearly a problem – and this is something that needs to be sorted out. My understanding is that the experts report will say that if you – it is a delegation so if you need to do both, they are two delegations – that's what they will suggest anyway, that they can't see any other way of doing it.

But what's lacking is any form of process or ability or tagging something or other, that actually makes it into one. Because if it is physically two delegations in the sense that there are two entries into the root, then under the current INR processes, it would be possible for re-delegation application for one of them. Currently, right?

So something needs to be put in place that actually allows for those two – in the case of Iran – those two names to be, strings to be delegated and

contractually obliged to be – it's like they've got to become conjoined twins, that's the only way you can do it, you can't do it any other way.

And there is a lot of work going on right now to try and figure out how the hell to do that.

Now Iran's position is well, if that takes a few months, it takes a few months, we understand and if we don't make an application in the fast track for next three or four or five or six months, we can live with that. I don't know what the position of other people is but certainly that's Iran's position.

Is that a fair summary of where we've got to? Did you want to say something Kim?

Kim: Just a question actually and I'm completely naïve in this area but it seems to me the scenario you just described could be characterized as a software issue, so it's some piece of software convert the URL one way and some convert it another way and you end up with two different domains. Do you know if this group has considered at all whether our focus should be on getting software vendors to have a constant approach rather than us addressing it at the DNS level?

Unknown: I'm on the Unicord group which is discussing that so that's been discussed and Unicord has a particular approach to that which in my opinion is a bit too vague and probably might not be implemented the same way by everyone.

But yes, I agree with you, this needs to be done in software. But the problem is, if I'm understanding the Iranian case, that both are varied and if they pick one and not the other, half the country might start a revolution again.

Anyway, these types of issues, not revolution, but that is to write letters to newspapers.

Moderator: Yeah, and I, yes there may well be software solutions for these problems, I'm not quite sure. I suppose with the keyboard that only effectively works because of software doesn't it? It's not like a typewriter where you…remember those? No, you're too young.

Did that answer; I mean you asked about variance right?

Unknown: …in the forum itself, but maybe it's the wrong forum. Let me just bring it up since other people may have same issue. It asks for string one, string two and so on, what was not really clear to me is, is this supposed to be for different scripts or is it supposed to be for variants?

Moderator:	Variants. If you want to apply for two scripts which presumably at some stage you would like to, that's two separate applications. And they don't have to be at the same time. You might be ready in one, not ready in another.
	India for example, is not going to be ready in all 22 names or all 12 scripts.
	So it's only variance.
	What concerned me about the discussion on Monday in respect to this was that – if I understood Tina correctly she was suggesting that this was a self select mechanism – so that effectively, when you bring your application for dot Iran, you tell them that these are the variants. And because you've told them that these are the variants, they end up getting reserved.
	Well, no. That's not workable. Because those variants have to be tested to make sure that they actually are variants.
	And if I could give a really simple example and this is not actually correct in fact. But if the United Arab Emirates comes and says "Well, we want dot Emirati (sp?), but we're also called, Emirate (sp?) so we want dot Emirate."
	Dot Emeriti (sp?) is not a variant of dot Emirate (sp?). They are two different names.
	And this is where the arguments become really confused because I think some people think that a variant just means well it's a slightly different name or slightly different way of saying the name and it isn't. Well, it might be, but not in this context.
	In this context, we're talking…
Unknown:	It's not clearly documented in that document as far as I could see.
Hilda:	And this is something, I don't see what's the variant? Because Emirate and Emirati for me, both are the same.
Moderator:	The point is that that the – under the terms of the fast track – it's one name per language, right? Currently it's one name.
	Now the Iranian issue is it's the same name. It's exactly, it's identical, it's just you use a different character to get there, OK?
	We cannot have a circumstance where more than one name is being issued because if we do, we end up where the policy development process is immediately – we may well decide that there's more than one name – but we haven't got there yet.

So and it's taken me a really long time to get to understand this but I do get it now – it's the same name, it's just a different root to get to that name by what you actually type.

It's a different set of Unicode points – yeah but Emirate and Emirati is a different set of Unicode points as well – in the sense that – but it produces the same letter, the same character if you like. It's an appearance, yeah.

So this needs to be worked out. It's not going to stop the fast track launch thing and the people are working on it. So I guess we will see how we go with that. And those – anyone who's actually involved from – I mean, I've said to Sayavesh (sp?), "You know, we'll keep talking, etc.)"

So, does anyone else want to say anything at all about the fast track for this room?

Yes Peter.

Moderator: Right. Can't remember. If it was important, it'll come back to me but right now, I probably covered them in sort of the general mesh of everything.

Jan?

Jan: It just talked about – actually my understanding is in that working group, IDN working group, they defined the variants into two types.

Moderator: Yes.

Jan: One is the one looks similar, one is non-similar, the looking, OK? So you just talked about Arabic variants, so how about the Chinese variants?

Moderator: I can't talk about it because I don't have anything to say about it. I don't know enough about it to talk about it. You've got, you have a different issue. Your issue is a different issue. You have two different scripts.

That's a different type of variant to the one that I'm talking about.

You have two distinct and different scripts. There's traditional and simplified. So they are – they don't just have different Unicode points, they have different script titles because they're two different scripts.

So I'm not saying they're not variants, I'm just saying that that's a completely different issue to the point that I'm making. But you can talk about it.

Jan: Yes, it is different.

Moderator:	Not the point that I was making, but anyway.
	So go ahead Jan.
	But if you guys want to talk about this here now, that's fine. But we've got a meeting this afternoon at 5pm with ICANN to specifically discuss China, so it's your call.
Unknown:	Actually may I just give the definition that's going to come out from the working group about the variant types?
	Actually I'm one of the persons in the work group so in the work group we have been identified the variants being two types.
	Type 1 is the variant that appear visually identical to the base label.
Moderator:	Which is the Iran thing.
Unknown:	The Arabic thing.
Moderator:	OK.
Unknown:	Which is the visually identical but they have different code points.
Moderator:	Yeah.
Unknown:	In the Type 2 variant is the variants that do not appear visually identical but are considered, according to the base label, in some orthographical sense.
Moderator:	So can you just say that again?
Unknown:	That's the orthographical sense – that's a hard word.
Moderator:	Yeah, got you, yeah.
Unknown:	So that may be the two types of variants and actually they are representing the same.
Moderator:	So does the report say that they should both be treated in the same way?
Unknown:	In the report, we recommend that the variants can be delegated if they meet a certain situations.
Moderator:	Right.

Unknown:	One is to identify, in addition to the base ident TRD label, a number of variant labels.
Moderator:	Yep.
Unknown:	The applicant must clarify the variant label as designed or un-designed.
Moderator:	Yep.
Unknown:	And then the designed variant label would be allocated at a minimum to the applicant.
Moderator:	Yep.
Unknown:	It would be allocated, so allocated…
Moderator:	That's not delegated, that's different. Yep.
Unknown:	OK, so un-designed variant label would be either allocated nor delegated (unintelligible 58:00), that's what un-designed is.
Moderator:	Yes.
Unknown:	So the designed variant label we are proposing would be delegated to the same applicant provided full conditions are met. A) The applicant requests the variant label. B) The domains under the variant labels are to be mapped exactly to the corresponding domains of the base IDN TLD label.
Moderator:	Yep.
Unknown:	So C) The applicant must demonstrate how this mapping is achieved, preferably by presenting earlier works on a test pad.
Moderator:	Yep.
Unknown:	And D) The applicant must provide information on how it intends to inform its registrars, resellers, registrants, about the correct set up of name servers; allow the applicant application servers that process domain names directly.
	So that end users confusion can be ideally be prevented. Or at least, held to an acceptable minimum.
	Third one, E) ICANN should conduct period checks to ensure that the same mapping is in place and F) the delegation document for base IDN TLD labels, whatever form it takes like contract, accountability, (Unintelligible 59:15), the registry to the points above.

Moderator:	So in other words, you get checked up on to make sure that they're mapping.
Unknown:	Yeah.
Moderator:	Yep, which makes sense. OK, so that's great. So that means that that's coming out of the group at some point, right? Hopefully. And then there will be steps that need to be taken to deal with that.
	So I suppose the point that I was trying to make was that there will be, there is still some work to be done in respect to that, be it in the Iranian case or the Chinese case or whatever it might be, because those recommendations from that working group are going to need to be put through whatever ICANN process they need to be put through and so on.
	So, I guess it just means that if you have a variant issue, of whichever type, then you might need to wait for a little while longer than the 16th of November.
	Anything else?
	OK. Sorry, yes go ahead.
Unknown:	You just waited for Gabby to get back here so that you could…
Unknown:	I do not think that's a necessary hold back for the application to somebody on the November 16th. Because I think – in here we are proposing that to be delegated – it's demonstrated mapping and actually has nothing to do with ICANN to you know, to point out which kind of mapping should that registry take.
Moderator:	No, no, I agree.
Unknown:	The registry should propose their own mapping techniques or pointing techniques and actually once it's mapped, it should be delegated immediately. So I don't think that's a hold back for…
Moderator:	I wasn't suggesting, I wasn't suggesting that was the hold back. What I was saying was that I imagine, and I don't know for sure, but I imagine that that working group report needs to go through some sort of process for it to be accepted as the way that it is done. Because right now it's a recommendation. Yeah? So all I'm saying is, we don't know do we whether that will actually have happened by the time we get to the 16th of November.
	I don't know, I'm asking. I guess it's coming out as a report and it's got to become part of the methodology for issuing these things. So I don't know

what the process is and I don't know whether the working group's discussed that process with ICANN but it seems to me that clearly there's going to need to be some sort of acceptance of that as an acceptable way of doing it.

So I have no idea. And perhaps we can find that out this afternoon when we go to our meeting.

OK. So I think we're done on the IDNs. I'm waiting for the first one. Once the first one is done, then it's done. And then we can accept that it's been done and that's really great.

And it brings us to the last little bit of this session which is the IDN policy development process update, working group update.

As I said yesterday, we produced a topic paper – when we did the IDN fast track at the very beginning – we had this joint GAC ccNSO working group – some of you were on that. The methodology that we used that actually got us to the point where we are today where we're about to have IDN ccTLDs in the fast track, was to start with a list of questions and work our way from that list of questions and then work out if we'd covered everything with questions and then try to fill in what the answers were.

So we've done that again and what we've done is we've produced a topic paper which we sent out to you but unfortunately didn't go out when we thought it went out and is only very recently been sent out.

So that topic paper is currently on the website as being open for comment until Gabby, is it the 23rd of November? I will ask the council this afternoon to extend that time through until probably around the 10th or 11th of December to give everybody a bit more time to be able to make comments.

Secondly, because I know – that's great Bart – because I know that some of you won't have had a chance to read it or consider it at any length – we'll talk about it briefly now but what we will do is set up at least one and probably two conference calls in different time zones, so that anyone who wants to can hop onto that call and discuss, talk about, etc, the document.

Now, this is an attempt by Bart to show us the new topic paper and what the changes are from the one that we used in the IDN fast track. But quite honestly Bart…

Bart: What I'll do is I'll send it to the list, make it available on the PDP. This is a comparison between the topic paper and the joint GAC issues paper. What you'll see it includes some of the experiences from the IDNC working group final document and the implementation plan because now we have – for instance, a reasonably stable definition of what is a meaningful representation

of the country name – that is included. So the questions are now referring to some of these topics as well.

Moderator: Could you find, could you put up the actual existing – the new one, the one we've published? Can we get that up?

Bart: But it probably…

Moderator: Well yes, but it won't have blue lines all over it. So…

              You've got a resolution issue with your screen, that's the problem.

              That's better. Yes I know but all I was trying to do is if you get the other one up, we can just go through the questions. So I'm happy to just go through the questions at this stage.

              Fantastic.

              So just very briefly, we'll just go through the questions.

Unknown: (Unintelligible) for a week so what's the reason for delaying the comment period or extending the comment period?

Moderator: Because it's, people haven't had a chance to actually look at the document in any detail before this meeting. And our experience has been that a physical meeting or at the very least a teleconference is needed, if we just leave it to the list. So in order to do that and to make it easy to work that out, it's easier to extend the comment period through until the beginning of December and then put a conference call in place. Because people haven't had a chance to seriously consider this.

              So what I'm going to try and do is to just take us, just go through the questions, and then we'll…

              So a number of these questions, we already have, we have answered in the fast track in a particular way. It doesn't necessarily mean that they have to be answered in the same way for the full blown policy.

              So which territories are eligible for an IDN ccTLD?

              Who was – was anybody in the GAC session on Sunday when the GAC was talking about a document that they were at the time calling IDN ccTLD principles? But is now been changed to Input to the PDP – at least I hope it has. Because that was drafted by saying that IDN ccTLDs should be – sorry that territories that should be eligible for an IDN ccTLD should include territories on the ISO 31661 list.

And I suggested to Janis (sp?) that it might be a sensible idea to change that because it didn't make any sense since it is limited to the ISO 31661 list.

And there was actually a discussion about changing that. And saying, "No, no, we should widen the availability of IDN ccTLDs to territories and distinct economies, that are not on the 31661 list." So Scotland presumably could have in Gaelic.

Anyway, I think that they've managed to bring it back to the 31661 list and I don't think this is particularly controversial for us. I mean, basically we've all of us pretty much accept that it's the 31661 list.

Should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful? Again, we've spent a lot of time working on that in the fast track and working out a methodology for figuring out how it is meaningful and ICANN has put in place mechanisms to check that it's meaningful for the fast track etc. So whilst of course it's open for us to say, "Actually it doesn't have to be meaningful at all, if you want to have, if you want to call yourself dot whatever," it's unlikely I think that that discussion will vary too much from what we've already decided. Which is that, you know, it's got to meaningful representation of the name of the territory.

This is the tougher one I think – how many IDN ccTLDs per territory? Is that still split as a question between that and language?

Unknown: I would say in order to avoid – this was an attempt maybe it's a wrong attempt – but it was in the drafts all along, is to combine something like language and scripts.

Moderator: Yeah.

Unknown: Into a language/script combination.

Moderator: Sure.

Unknown: And so therefore, when there was, when you talk about languages, for instance all of the cases of India now are on the list because of the language/script combination. So there is this distinction between language and script is not as relevant anymore as it was in the previous.

Moderator: I'm not actually sure I understand that. It's the language that is, it's the language that is, I mean sometimes it's the same as the script, but it's the language that is actually the thing for the country. The script is the way the language is written but it's the language that means something for the country, isn't it? Rather than the script itself?

Unknown:	The same language may use multiple scripts and multiple languages maybe the same script. Right, so you need this combination of language plus script for a unique identifier. Which is what I assume what is really stated there, right? So therefore each combination of a particular language with a particular script, there should be one or possibly more IDN strings.
Moderator:	No I think actually I'm almost through my puzzlements, but if I re-state it in terms, for example, the Japanese language. There is one language…
Unknown:	Yes.
Moderator:	…two scripts…
Unknown:	Yes.
Moderator:	…and therefore two variants that you would allow.
Unknown:	Yes.
Moderator:	And so if we were to go back to the Arabic issue that you had earlier, you would allow again two or for those countries concerned, that you would allow two…
	Yeah, they're not.
Unknown:	No, they're not variants.
Moderator:	Right. OK. That I think is where I'm still running at it…
Unknown:	The context of where this is introduced is how many, how many TLD strings per territory. Now under the fast track it is one per official language. But then you run into problems if one language is written, like Jan was saying, one language written in two scripts or you have multiple languages written with one script. So then you have to again, introduce a very difficult mechanism and our thought, if you use a language script combination – because then you capture all these differences – so then it's one string per language/script combination.
Moderator:	That's right. But that's one way of doing it. There are heaps of other ways of doing it. Anyway, the number is, I suspect, going to be open to significant amount of debate. And in fact I think, for what it's worth Bart, that we probably need to deal with, we need to first ask ourselves the question as to whether we're moving outside non Latin to asking – are we going to consider ASCII with accents – in this?

Because in the fast track what we did was we said non Latin scripts only because trying to work our way through the accented ASCII's space was just going to be way, way, way too hard. But for the policy development process, are we going to have to deal with that? Are we going to have to deal with acutes and graves and umlauts and all sorts of other and circumflexes – I'm just showing off my ability to come up with the names of accents.

Unknown: Your question is there.

Moderator: Is it? Yes, I was thinking that that comes first before – because the problem with ASCII with accents is that it's entirely possible that you could have a string at the top level that fits into that ASCII with accents category but it doesn't have any letters in it that have any accents on it. And so therefore it's going to look exactly the same as one that doesn't fit into that category. And that's really confusing and I have no idea how we're going to get through that but I guess we'll work it out when the time comes.

Gihan (sp?) – good huh?

Gihan (sp?):   Let me try to get my view on that. In my view, Latin is one script. So you could have all the western European languages are written in Latin script with all sorts of different (unintelligible 01:16:16). Cyrillic would be a different script and Greek would be different. So yes, so if you want to write – right now I can't think of the country – but whatever country we had well, Norway, right? Norway would have no accents? Oh, OK.

No, no, the word Norge (sp?) doesn't it have? It doesn't have any accents? OK, sorry.

Right, right, exactly. So right now what happens is a Spanish guy who wants to write his name in Latin script has to write it wrong – his spelling teacher Grade 1 would put a wrong next to it – saying you haven't put the right letter. So that's basically – so Latin as far as I'm concerned is one script. ISO Latin 1 or whatever and so yeah, whether or not any particular string has an accent is a different matter.

Of course, then you get thrown the interesting thing of multiple ways of representing that in Unicord which we'll deal with later.

Moderator: Yes the minute you start talking about Unicord, my eyes glaze over.

There's also the question of course about in the number we're going to have to look at whether it's one name – whether it is one name for language or whether you can have more than one name.

And if you could have more than one name – again, this is – the order we do these questions in actually quite important – because if you can have more than – if we decide that yes, you should be allowed to have more than one name in (unintelligible 01:18:00) or whatever, then that takes us back to the meaningful representation question. Which is OK, so you can have more than one, so therefore there has to be more than one meaningful representation of the territory.

So it's going to get fairly complicated.

What's the next one Bart?

Moderator: Variance, yes I can see that, yeah.

Number of characters in the string – I think we've kind of dealt with that already. I mean, we can't go backwards so at the moment it's limited in the ASCII equivalent to XN dash dash to 64 (??) but you can't, we can't do that.

Should a list of IDN ccTLD strings be mandated? No, but personally – this came up again in the GAC the other day and I think what they've put into their document that will provided to us as input is not that there should be a mandated list. I think they've actually comes to terms with the fact that that is almost an impossibility.

But what they are asking and I think this is probably quite sensible is if we could find a way to – when an IDN ccTLD is delegated it goes onto a list as being the IDN ccTLD for that territory, for that language – and there may be a way of actually doing that on the ISO list. Actually asking ISO to extend the columns on that list to include a column that deals with this particular thing – there may be, there may not be, but the concept of a list is worth considering from the point of view of security and stability into the future.

Because the beauty about the two letter code is it's the two letter code. If currently Australia was to ask for dot Australia as an IDN and get it, the fact that that's being chosen rather than being designated means that presumably it can be un-chosen, presumably the government could come along and say, "Look we've decided we don't want dot Australia anymore as our IDN ccTLD, we want dot Aussie," or whatever.

No, if you change its name it's different. Because that is an actual change of name and then that can be dealt with. But anyway…

We also need to consider – which isn't there as a separate question I don't think – whether or not – oh is it, is it in the language – can I have Australia in Chinese? Whether it has to be an official language, yeah. We need to consider whether it has to be an official language.

	There are those who say that if Chile wants to have dot Chile in Russian or in Greek or in whatever, you should be able to do so. There are others who say well no, that's completely meaningless to you unless it's in essence an official language.
	So we don't know the answer to that one yet. Gabby, could you give Martin…?
Martin:	Can I go back to your previous one about the ISO list first? And ask whether we've had any further feedback from ISO as to if one were to go through an extension with an additional columns in their table, quite how long they think that might take?
	And then the supplementary question to that, just to put you on notice on it, is if we were to go down that route, do you think that all parties in the GAC would actually accept that, bearing in mind that there is one party in the GAC that does question the ISO list?
Moderator:	Yes. Well it's in – my understanding is that it's in the document. It was in the document that we saw them go through on Sunday. Not specifically referring to ISO but it was referring to it going on to a list.
	Suzanne then said she has been told that it is possible to have the ISO list extended or columns extended and she has been told that that is not that difficult to do – whatever that means – that difficult to do.
	I haven't gotten any further detail with her, except that she mentioned briefly afterwards that she'd been talking to BSI or something…oh is it? OK. Well no actually she said BSI.
Unknown:	Well certainly BSI have been active in this.
Moderator:	British Standards Institute.
Unknown:	Yeah, sorry. They have been active in this for quite some time but we've been through this loop before.
Moderator:	Yes we have.
Unknown:	This is one of the reasons why one of the people on the maintenance agency is part of the working group as well.
Moderator:	Kim.

Kim:	Has it been considered why it's desirable to be added to the ISO list as opposed to some other independently maintained but…
Moderator:	No, no one is suggesting that it would be added to the ISO list, it's just that – the suggestion is that there should be a list.
Unknown:	Right.
Moderator:	And that maybe the ISO list is a place to do it.
Unknown:	OK.
Moderator:	You could just make it an ICANN list, I mean.
Kim:	Just for reference, ICANN maintains what's called the language sub tag registry which is a registry of the world's languages and scripts so, you know, we do that kind of thing as well.
Moderator:	Did we not know that before that?
Kim:	I think you…
Moderator:	So when we were looking, when we were looking for a definitive list of world's languages and scripts, we didn't think…
Kim:	I would never claim it's definitive. It's a registry where language…
Moderator:	Hang on, hang on. Hang on, sorry.
Kim:	It's not definitive in the sense that I wouldn't claim it has all the world's languages and scripts on it. But, in order to use them and creating on the Internet…
Moderator:	Sure, you need to have them in your…
Kim:	…and it's, we've developed something called nano-code for IDN ccTLDs to process them and we tag it with a script tag and a language tag and we use that registry for IDN ccTLDs.
Moderator:	Thanks Kim.
	Did you want to say something?
Unknown:	I just wanted to mention that I believe ISO 636 is the list we usually use for languages – 639 sorry.

Moderator:	Did you say the ISO 666 list?
	And then we go to delegation, re-delegation and retirement of IDN ccTLDs, which I think we can very simply say – same as whatever happens in the future happens with IDNs as it does to ASCIIs and of course the delegation, re-delegation, retirement working group is working on that right now.
	Should there be a formal and financial relationship between ICANN and the IDN ccTLD under the policy? Well, you know, having worked, having managed to get to where we've got to with this tick boxy thing and expected but not mandatory – which is ICANN speak for voluntary – financial contributions – I think we can probably all live with, we can probably all live with that.
	So that one's not going to be too complicated I wouldn't have thought.
	And then we go back to the process.
	So the key ones, the ones that are going to really take the time, are the ASCII discussion, the number discussion and the stuff that flows from that, and possibly the does it have to be an official language.
	I mean, I'm sure that – just to take an example – I'm sure that Australia has the – Melbourne in fact has the largest Greek population in the world outside of Athens – and I'm sure that without too much of a problem, a head of steam could be created that there should be, you know, dot Australia in Greek, or some meaningful representation of dot Australia in Greek.
	Now whether or not as a principle that should be possible, given that Greek is not an official language in Australia, is something that we're going to have to talk about.
	Yes Martin?
Martin:	I think you do have to also consider the wider than just your local population and there could well be trading issues where a UK company trading in China will need to have a Chinese identity.
Moderator:	Sure.
Martin:	And therefore doing it through – and that's an example – the demand really has to come from the people in the country who will therefore say, this is something that would be beneficial and then the decision should be made on that basis rather than arbitrarily imposed centrally.

Moderator: I accept that but if what you're saying I think is – if the UK's main – if the UK's main trading partner were Russia, then the UK might want to have a Cyrillic TLD. My question is whether that would be a ccTLD? I mean, that's what you're saying is that they might want a Cyrillic ccTLD. Yeah, maybe but then you could argue that actually no, as long as they've got access to a Cyrillic gTLD that that would work.

Again, this is, that's a perfectly legitimate purpose for having one. It's just a question of whether we want to go down that road.

Unknown: And for Norway, we have only one, or we have two or perhaps three, but there is one… OK, but we have large populations of people coming from other countries and I think a lot of European countries have that. And a lot of the kids, they take a long time before they learn Norwegian so we should have the same discussion there that's for the IDNs and the fast track that the kids speaking or using Urdu for example, they would really benefit having the same opportunities as those under (unintelligible 01:29:26). So should we be forced to make Urdu an official language in Norway and then Chinese and etc.? So it's kind of impractical and it has also to do with this combination.

Moderator: I agree with you and I could argue there's a political argument that you will be faced with which is, well actually in fact they should be speaking Norwegian, not – they should be being facilitated to learn Norwegian – yes I understand but you know where I'm going with that, right? Because that's what you will hear. There will be people arguing the alternative way.

Anyway, Bart can you just briefly go through the timeline what we're intending to – obviously we're going to have a teleconference blah, blah – but where do we hope to be by Nairobi?

Bart: By Nairobi, there will be say the first attempt by the working group to of a first, I would say, interim paper, answering these questions, up for public comment. We go through that document at that session as well. So that will set the tone and the direction of the overall policy.

Moderator: OK.

Bart: Remember this is just a working group document so that will feed into the PDP and at Nairobi we'll start with the second working group as well, start to form it, that will look into the bylaws, how to accommodate IDN ccTLDs or not. So there are two things happening at the same time. So at Nairobi the main point, the main attention or the focus will be on the direction of the overall policy. So the first set of answers from the working group on these questions. And then again public comments and then by Brussels there should be a final document by this working group and then the second working group

should have its topic paper up as what are the issues to incorporate IDN ccTLDs into the ccNSO structure if the members want to.

Moderator: OK. And it's entirely possible that when we meet in Nairobi there will be at least one or two or three IDN ccTLDs that are live. Kim. It's not impossible that that will have happened by the time we get to Nairobi.

Well I think – unless anyone has any other questions or comments – we're done on this. So we're going to go to coffee. 11 o'clock we start back with marketing strategies, awareness campaigns and registries, a very interesting session, it's going to be chaired by Johani (sp?) – is he in the room? Is Johani (sp?) here?

I won't be here at 11, I have a meeting, but I'll be back as soon as I can. And then at 12:30, we have wild cards with Steve Crocker. And then lunch. So please be back in the room promptly for an 11 o'clock start and those who are presenting if you could get yourselves ready, that would be great.

Thanks very much everyone.