

2090624-0910

Chris: I'm going to stay and talk about money as well, so... exactly. We're going to have a presentation from Curt and we'll have a discussion about it.

Curt: Good morning, everybody. Just give me one second to load the presentation.

[Chatter in background whilst loading presentation]

Okay, thank you. Thank you very much everybody for indulging the time it's taking to do this. I'm going to report on the Treatment of Geographical Names in the new GTLD Guidebook. There's been substantial changes to that treatment in the past few months, given input we've received from the ccNSO, from the GAC, and what we heard at Mexico City. We took all that back - ICANN did - and amended the Applicant Guidebook to reflect many of the comments of the community.

Okay, I'm ready now. So, the guidebook is really a proposal up until the time it's made final by the board when it's approved by the board and the process is launched. As we receive community feedback, we'll make amendments to the guidebook. Not necessarily that it is thought to be a final solution or the end, but rather to really point up the public discussion.

We can write memoranda about handling of geographic names or other issues and have a good rich discussion of the issues, but I think that putting it in the stark black and white of the Applicant Guidebook showing how the thing will really be implemented, whatever the thing is, gives a clear indication of what the issues are. Then we can talk about changing "ors" to "ands" or taking out paragraphs with great clarity. The reason why you see the Applicant Guidebook changing is really to point up that public discussion. It's not intended to be an indication that that's the end game.

You might remember in the last ICANN meeting in Mexico City, the board made a resolution. That resolution was made taken into account everything it heard... I'm sorry, I'm coughing. I can't clear my throat this morning. What is it? Taken into account the input of the... I know. You're sitting next to me. The ccNSO and the GAC and, of course, the GNSO and what we heard in the public sessions and, so what that board resolution said after significant amount of discussion, was that the board was generally in agreement with the way the treatment of geographic names at the top level.

We're going to talk with specificity what that was in Mexico City and what it is now, but gave three directions. One was to sharpen up the definition of what a country or territory name was for purposes of providing protections at the top level. The second was to provide greater specificity as to what was required in order to get a top level domain for a region. So, regions are continents or sub-continents.

The U.N. has a list of 49 regions and there's so many countries or territories in each region. They wanted to sharpen up that definition. And then wanted to identify implementation issues associated with the GAC's advice, starting again with the understanding that we had found a compromise at the top level, but not at the second level. So the focus there was on protection of geographic names at the second level.

So, what was in the guidebook at the top level? Well, in Mexico City, the guidebook said that if you apply for a country or territory name, you required the approval or non-objection of the relevant government. So, what is a country or territory name was this list of four bullets.

The first bullet, Meaningful representation of a country or a territory name, that sort of appropriated the definition that was developed by the IDNC. Protections were also provided for these other sorts of names - the sub-region and the ISO 3166-2 list. Capital cities of countries or territories on the ISO list, or city names in the case where recognizing city names are often generic terms or city names are shared by many jurisdictions. City names that identify with a particular city or jurisdiction were required the approval of that government.

As far as continent names or regional names, the guidebook said approval of a substantial number of relevant governments. So, what did the board not really like? They didn't like meaningful representation even as extrapolated to the IDNC definition or substantial number. They thought both those were a little vague and asked staff to investigate the meaning behind those terms and come up with a more objective standard for this version of the guidebook.

As a proposal in the guidebook, a more objective list for country or territory names was developed. So, what is that list? Well, if you go and buy, and I don't have it with me, the ISO 3166-1, Part 1 list – it's the one you have to pay for. It would be the long form or short form list of country or territory names in that list and translation of those in all languages.

One area where the guidebook was changed was that that was formerly the U.N. languages only and the official languages of that country or territory were in the U.N. languages. That's been broadened into translations for all languages. Also, there's the Alpha 3 Code associated with the countries is located in that that list. There's also a list of, and I'm looking at Kim Davies, because he's the expert in this area... Here is the ISO 31. Thank you. So, if we have questions later, we can look up the answer.

There's another list, a 543 list, of exceptionally reserved names of about eighteen territory names. Then if you look at this list, there's a remarks column. The remarks column says things as "also known as" or "the principle islands of" and then has a number of other territory names or island names. Those names are all included.

There's those and then there's a separate list if you look in the Applicant Guidebook of twenty-six what we call "separable names". One form of separable name is Bosnia and Herzegovina, so each one of those names is reserved separately. Saint Kitts and Nevis, each one of those is reserved separately. And then there's names such as Russian Federation, where we would leave the name into the properly known name and create Russia for that.

There's several of those, but that's a very distinct list of twenty-six names. And then permutations of the above, so not to let people take advantage of where to put the word "the" or "of" or switching the two words around and avoiding that. It's a fairly broad list

that includes all the translations, but it is intended to satisfy the board's desire for more specificity in the definition.

As far as region names or continent names, there's a list, and I don't have the link here, but it's in the guidebook of the forty-nine U.N. regions, with that definition. In the guidebook for discussion is the approval of 60 percent of the countries or territories in that region, and no more than one objection. So that's just intended to avoid the situation where one territory or country can have veto power over an application, so you would need at least two objections in order to defeat that.

Is that clear? Yes, and certainly if anybody has questions along the way, I am... okay.

Chris: Okay, I have a question. I just want to be sure that the context of this is completely clear. What we're talking about is definitions for the gTLDs, yes? So, no one is suggesting, I hope, that the use of the term "meaningful representation", in the IDN ccTLD implementation plan is a problem.

Curt: That's exactly right. This is for the definition of country and territory names at the top level.

Chris: Got you. Hang on. You, Roloff, Steven, Hilda – you're just saying yes because you think you should, right? I know, okay. How much more do you have to go?

Curt: Well, this is the last slide on top level.

Chris: Top level, so...

Curt: If we want to focus on top level for a while we can and then go to second level, where I think there's only one or two slides there.

Chris: Are we okay to do that? Okay, so, can we start with Gabby? We're just getting her turned on. So, I'm going to go, Steven was first, Roloff, and then Hilda. Thank you, Bart. Thank you, Gabby. Roloff and then Hilda.

Steven: My question is – is this cast in stone and are they English only names? Or can we... it's three. Can we add more?

Curt: So, it's not cast in stone. Like I said, we put these things... ICANN puts these things in the guidebook in order to really sharpen the discussion so we can debate exactly what should be in the guidebook. The whole guidebook is really a proposal and certainly this is... it's not English only. So, if you look at the long form and short form list of the country names, it's those names and their translation into all languages.

Chris: Can you explain....? No, I'll get Roloff to go first.

Roloff: Well, maybe you'll want to make your original point but you hit on my point exactly. If a meaningful representation is acceptable in the IDN ccTLD project, so to speak, why is it a difficulty in the new gTLD project?

Curt: It's not a difficulty and I'm going to challenge the reasoning of others here. The definition of "meaningful representation" in the IDN ccTLD process is for inclusion. In other words, if you want an IDN ccTLD, you say, "This is a meaningful representation of my country or territory." It's a broad definition meant to allow a large number of applications in that process.

In the gTLD process, it's more of an exclusionary process. If you want a country or territory name in the gTLD process, these additional protections click into place if it's a country or territory name as defined here. Because one is inclusionary and one is exclusionary, it's thought that it's logically okay to have different definitions for that. That was discussed in the board for quite some time. Not that the board has approved or not approved yet, but in asking ICANN to develop a more objective list, the sense was that it would be okay if the definitions diverged some.

Roloff: I'm just trying to grasp the reasoning.

Curt: It's a common thing.

Roloff: In both cases, I think somebody has to judge - probably the board - if this is a meaningful representation, if it's either for inclusion or for exclusion.

Curt: No, it doesn't.

Roloff: So, it surprises me that it's easier to know what meaningful representation is if it's for inclusion, then if it's for exclusion. Or am I missing something?

Curt: It's not reserved. It requires approval of the relevant governments for the application. It has to...

Roloff: Yes. It has to be read to go in, or it has to be read not to go in. I mean, I will still have to judge if it was read.

Curt: My understanding is, and Chris can improve on this answer, I'm sure, is that in the IDN ccTLD process it's more of a self-certification process that the government or the requestor of the IDN ccTLD certifies that this is a meaningful representation of the country name because it complies with the definition of meaningful representation.

So, at the end of the day, the board will approve the delegation of the name into the root zone, but is not necessarily involved in the operational process of proving up that the meaningful representation exists when, in fact, the process relies on the country to do that. In the gTLD process, there'll be a panel. It's quite a complex task adding the names of countries and territories in all the languages.

It's quite a complex task to take an application that doesn't have - that's not accompanied by the approval and having the right sort of expertise on hand to say, "Wait a second. This is a translation of this name on the ISO list and so the approval is required".

So, in each case, operationally, the board's not really involved. The board's always involved in the end in the delegation process.

Roloff: There's no... In the case of the IDN ccTLD, there's no judgment of the term "meaningful"? Okay, maybe I'll get this one.

Chris: Okay, take as long as you need.

Roloff: I'm not a list kind of guy, or bloke maybe I should say, so maybe you can help me out with the text next to you. The criteria that you had on the screen just now - would that cover USA?

Curt: If that's the Alpha 3 code...

Roloff: Not to start with the obvious Dutch example.

Curt: What? Yes.

Roloff: I'm avoiding starting with the obvious Dutch example. So, let's take USA and U.S. of A.

Curt: Right. So, if USA is the three letter code, and I think it is, then it's protected. United States of America is protected and I think United States is protected. And, then...

Roloff: U. S. of A.?

Curt: U. S. of A. is not protected. Is it? No.

Roloff: And Holland?

Curt: Holland I don't think is protected. I don't think it's...unless it's listed under the "also known as", but I'm not so sure...

Chris: We'll protect you. Don't worry. You'll be fine.

Roloff: Thank you. Why don't we have scribes when you say things like this?

Chris: If we had scribes, I wouldn't say things like that.

Roloff: You're on my record now.

Chris: So, just so I'm clear, Curt, and to take Roloff's point, the objection can still be made to Holland.

Curt: Yes. Yes, on a community basis. This is born out of our examination. We're trying to create more objective tests and this was born out of our examination of available lists. So, if there's a way to help or do additional examination as to what other list might be included, I think that would be good.

Roloff: Yeah, because I understand your attempt to make it more objective, because it would make the judging easier. But the problem with lists is that they're never complete. We've heard the discussion in the GAC yesterday I think as well.

Curt: Yes.

Roloff: And that's the risk and I'm sure that afterwards it would be very difficult to get something on the list if it's not already there.

Curt: Yes, well, you're exactly right. I mean, the beauty of relying on a list is as the ISO authority changes the list, we can change with it and can do that with authority, but things change slowly that way.

Chris: Hilda...

Hilda: I'm Hilda Tunem from the Norwegian Registry. I'll start with a disclaimer. I'm really actually a nice person and I'll happily buy you a drink later on, but... When I was looking at the changes that has been made in the new version of the guidebook and looking at the input made by the ccNSO and the ccNSO council, not a single thing of what was requested after Mexico has been taken into account. So, that's kind of sobering.

If we start at the principle top level of it, we have explicitly requested repeatedly since Los Angeles, I think, that while we are in the process of running a CCPDP for IDNs that the GTLDs should not grab all the country names while we haven't still decided on whether these are IDNs and ccTLD IDNs or gTLD IDNs.

And we also have said that we think that the country name or the territory name should have the protection that the cc have, of being a ccTLD or a user in Norway, there shouldn't be a difference on whether they register on their .no or on their .no in Chinese, if we ever get to the point where we would register that on behalf of the Chinese community in Norway. It should be a ccTLD and the subsidiary principles should apply.

The GAC has also, in its letter from Janice Karklins, said that geographic names are special cases and should have special rules applied to them. The ccNSO has proposed that country or territory names in the ISO list are treated as ccTLDs. This seems to be a sensible approach to insure that geographic names are afforded sufficient protection.

I do not really think that has been taken properly into account in the process that has been. I see that the reasoning in the summary - and the summaries are good that we get some of the reasoning behind why things are done the way they are. While some governments might need a country name right now and currently gTLDs are the only way to do it, so that's why we're including it. I will not say neither in English or Norwegian what I think about that very thing, because it wouldn't be polite in public.

But I think that if you're at least going with that reasoning, the consistent way would then be to say that any country name that it already covered by the ccTLD IDN project should be removed at ccTLD because it's obviously already available as a ccTLD. But my preference would still be to stick with what the council said and what the ccNSO has said for the last three or four meetings.

On to the list, and just a small comment on that as well - like Roloff, I'm very skeptical to lists. I realize why this is done. It will make it much easier for the ICANN board and for the ones running the process, but I think that this is a...

Well, first of all, there will be things slipping through that is not slipping through now according to the original definition of a meaningful representation. I do have worries that the gTLD and the ccTLDs are using different definitions of country names. If this goes through in the gTLD process, then the board will turn around and say, "Well, we need specific things in the IDN ccTLD process as well." That's what I would have done.

So, I would like to turn around and say, well, you know, already so far we've been discussing the fast track and we would like to keep that definition for the gTLDs as well. If there should be a difference, if one definition should be narrower than the other, then I actually think that it's the fast track of the IDN ccTLD that should be narrow and the protection afforded to country names in gTLD that should be broad.

We don't have the ISO list available. We haven't bought it yet at least. So, I have no idea whether some of the names like Svalbard, which is part of Svalbard and Jan Mayen, two separate islands, is still protected or not with the new definition. And I can, of course, check by buying the list and then making a specific check, but I'm very much concerned about how this has turned from a general principle of protection of meaningful names and the abbreviation of names into a specific formula that is very, very hard for the people it's meant to cover to actually check.

And now I'll shut up and actually let you tell me something back about why this is good and why I shouldn't worry.

Curt: Thank you. So, first I think there is an accommodation that was made in the number of languages, so I'm sure you'll regard it as small.

Hilda: No, it was actually very good, but it was made before the annex of a meeting. We said in our input that we really loved it, but it didn't address the basic problems, so this being the basic problem. After that, nothing happened.

Curt: Yes. So, what order do I want to take this in? Quite a bit happened and while there's a few paragraphs written about it in the comment analysis, there was a lot of discussion. There was the discussion among the board. Certainly the board resolution in Mexico City was born out of a lot of that discussion and then following that again at the most recent board workshop a month ago or so. There was again considerable discussion about it, so I think one of the problems as we put proposals forward, a lot of discussions and decisions are made that are 60/40 decisions or 51/49 decisions, where there's... I have a lot to say.

Hilda: [Inaudible 0:26:36.1]

Oh, okay. You don't have to be. Anyway, the comments of the ccNSO and all of the policy-making bodies of ICANN was taken very seriously by those that write this stuff, including me, and also the board that spent a lot of time on discussing these issues.

The nuance I would put on your interpretation of what's in the comment analysis was that ICANN didn't feel like it could deny... If a government wanted to make an application for a gTLD, ICANN didn't think it could create a space where ICANN could say, "We're sorry you can't have that name, even though you're willing to become a gTLD," and do that. Given the idea of sovereignty, we didn't think that was ICANN's place to deny that, so not so much that the gTLD is the only place you can get one for now.

But that if a government requested one, we didn't feel it was...we thought it would be difficult for ICANN to say no. I know you're... I'm not going to say don't worry, but I will say that the approval of the government does provide some safeguards. In the case of Norway, where the TLD is very much a community-based for local use, the government could take steps to ensure whatever gTLD is given with whatever geographical place name there is associated with Norway and all the names that are associated with that.

The government can take steps to ensure that that TLD has restrictions in place to comply with whatever the community restrictions are required.

Hilda: Just one question.

Curt: Sure.

Hilda: Just one question but if they approve it as a gTLD, it will be a gTLD with ICANN rules, and ICANN accredited registrars and ICANN WHOIS policy which breeches Norwegian law.

Curt: I'm not the company attorney, but I don't...

Hilda: No, no, no. Basically, ICANN WHOIS policy is in breach of European law.

Curt: Right, so I don't think that ICANN can ever ask anybody to breach local law. The telnet gTLD got an accommodation in their WHOIS requirements because of local law.

Hilda: But in competition things we would still or whomever run the gTLD in Norway or Sweden or anywhere else that doing this things would still be required to use ICANN-accredited registrars instead of the locally accredited registrars according to local process. It would be UDRP instead of disputed resolution made by the local community.

I'm not really very worried about the Norwegian government because I think they are here and they understand what's going on. But I am a bit worried about ICANN creating a process where the countries that are not here or that might not have this information end up in the situation that they wouldn't like.

I think, especially when we're doing IDNs, we should be more conscious of the less-developed world as well, so that there's something left for them and that there's something left for them that is truly for their community and their government.

Curt: Yes, I agree with that and, not to just gainsay what you're saying, but that's been given some thought, at least, and that the requirement for government approval has changed,

where the government approval has to okay it for everybody else and acknowledge what it means to be a gTLD.

I think you have to use an ICANN-accredited registrar, which means that's an additional expense. It's a limited expense, but there's an expense associated with becoming a gTLD registrar. A gTLD registry, I mean.

So, I understand your comments and as long as the country that wants one is cognizant of that, ICANN is saying it's the government's or country's election. It's not really ICANN's, I think is the point.

Hilda: Would that mean that if the government decided that it would want to make the ccTLD into a gTLD, it could because it fits the government's selection?

Curt: Except it couldn't have that two-letter code.

Hilda: And the difference is...?

Curt: Excuse me?

Hilda: Why? I mean, if it's a principle thing that the government can pick, why couldn't it take the two-letter code and make it into a gTLD, if it decide that was what it wanted?

Curt: Why would I want that?

Hilda: No, that's my interpretation. I can't really see why a government would want to have a gTLD, but I can see that –

Curt: Neither can I.

Hilda: In the new process, that if there is that very few governments will want to make their country name into a gTLD, I would prefer instead a process that said these are ccTLDs and the government would then make a specific case for something instead of saying that these are generally available as a gTLD as long as the government has said so. Especially considering that in the letter where sovereignty is mentioned, Karklins also very expressively says that he thinks that making the country names ccTLD seems to be a sensible approach to protecting these geographic names.

But I'll let somebody else say something as well.

Chris: Do we have any other questions before we move on to the much easier subject? The easier subject of the second level? Okay, so...

Curt: I've got one more comment. Isn't that sort of a policy decision? What we think, where we're constrained in the Applicant Guidebook for gTLDs and for the treatment for ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs, we think we're constrained in two ways. One by existing policy, where it exists, and two is in respecting the sovereign rights of governments.

What's in the guidebook now is meant to be out of respect and in deference to both those things. The idea of expanding the definition of a ccTLD or saying that a two-letter code could be a gTLD or saying country names that aren't two-letter codes are really ccTLDs, that seems to be creating policy to us.

What we're saying is given what the existing policy is and respecting the rights or desires of governments, this seems to be the path that's available to ICANN given its limited scope. ICANN staff can't write into the guidebook a change in policy and what's the definite expansion of the two-letter code.

Hilda: Obviously I disagree that this is the expressed bill of the government since they have particularly, to my mind, said that they actually want protection and think the way we have suggested this sensible approach, I think, that at least more effort should be made to talk to both them and us before setting aside something that we have been saying from the very beginning of the process.

Curt: Okay. And, anyway, the last thing I'll say about this is I readily understand all of your arguments and I'm not... This is what makes ICANN so interesting is it's a very close discussion.

Chris: You know you're in trouble when you start saying, "I acknowledge that we don't agree with each other," and that's why I'm so fascinated by this process.

Curt: Thank you, Chris.

Roloff: Where it goes wrong is so much in our face. A country name, any representation of a country, is quite the opposite of a generic name. It can't be further apart. So, I really don't understand why ICANN, or the board, or part of the community still thinks that a TLD that has the name of a country or a "meaningful representation" thereof, or a brand for that matter - let's stick to the countries - can qualify as a generic top-level domain.

Curt: I think generic is such a misnomer. Generic...

Roloff: That's what it means.

Curt: Well, that's what the word "generic" means. But when I came to ICANN, so what's an STLD? A sponsored top-level domain, which is kind of a community-based TLD. And I was told, well, that's a subset of the gTLD. And what's a restricted top-level domain? Well, restricted is really a subset of the generic top-level domains, which I am still confused by it.

Our lexicon says there are two kinds of domains - ccTLDs and gTLDs. But gTLDs are really comprised of community-based TLDs, sponsored TLDs, restricted TLDs. Given the scope of the IDN ccTLD process and the gTLD process, we just find it hard to picture ICANN saying, "Sorry, you can't have a TLD 'til now".

Chris: Let's be a little bit more specific about it. I understand exactly what you're saying. You can have subsets of gTLDs. No problem. It still means generic top-level domain, whether you've got subsets or not. That's the first thing. Second thing is that if you ignore, just for

the moment, the possibility of brand gTLD, so .ebay or .ibm, which are clearly have to be satisfied the rules of being owned as a brand.

You can create whatever subsets of generic top-level domains that you like. So, could you give me... there's not a single gTLD, not one single gTLD right now that in whatever subset that it is, is a name. They're all words that are generic. Co-op, cooperative, info, post - well, okay... perhaps not post yet. But they're all generic. So, by definition, the current gTLD are generic, because they all are.

What we're saying is that's fine. And if you want to have a fight about, if there is a... Roloff and I talked about this yesterday. If there's a product called... if there's a manufacturer of Earth-moving equipment called "Holland", and they want to put in an application for it, of course they're entitled to put an application in for a gTLD, because it's their name. There should be some protection built in for them, sorry, for Holland rather, or the Netherlands.

So, it doesn't make sense to... I don't think you can argue that just because there are subsets of gTLDs that that's okay now to start moving into specific words, specific owned words. The public policy issues alone, I mean, I actually do think that this will be a nightmare for ICANN, if dot... I'm just trying to think of an example.

If .au were to be registered as a gTLD, now, I accept completely, by the way, that the only way this could happen is if the government said that they wanted it. It's a gTLD. The problems that would arise with content or could arise with content are huge. Just because the government says yes and let me again be blunt. If the government of Australia says they want .au, then that's probably okay.

But there are... but there are places around the world where the government might say they want whatever it is and in two years time, it's a new government and it's not okay anymore. It's a very, very dangerous game to be playing with the names of countries. It just doesn't make sense to me. Either ban them completely, which is fine - perhaps not fine for governments, but fine for us. Or stick them in... don't stick them in the gTLD world where they're subject to contract with you. Stick them in the ccTLD world where they're subject to contract with the government. It just doesn't make sense.

[Inaudible 0:40:14.4]

Tina: I would also like to point out that... Sorry. Since we're talking about the definition of what a regional name is in relationship with IDNs in the ccTLDs, we have a fast track, which is not closed, that if the government wants to apply for an IDN, in the second round or third round of the IDN process, then they can apply for a fast track.

So, the reason that Curt gave about ICANN not having the right to deny governments, I don't think applies.

Chris: Demi, you had something to say.

Demi: I just had a question, maybe a suggestion. I agree that this is a serious problem and maybe we can circumvent this problem if we have an easier way to arise objections to

certain names. Then the question is it would be an easier way for governments, for example, to raise objections to names that they think that are related to the country names or something like this, or is there normal object and procedures for all the people?

I remember that there was a cost related to the objection and, for sure, I think it would be very difficult for departments to be able to pay a fee to raise an objection. How is that objection thing dealing in this very case related to country names?

Curt: The way the... Sorry. The way the objection process works with regard to country names is that it would be... There's four areas of objection, four limited areas of objection, and the community-based objection was created for the protection of geographic names originally before the additional protections were put into the guidebook.

The way that works now is that the country or the proxy of the government would pay a filing fee for that objection and then that gets... The objection gets adjudicated and then the loser of that objection process pays for the time and the objection. And, so, Demi, you were saying that payment of a fee or problematic for that?

Chris: Can I just... Roloff? Sorry. No, I just have a question I just wanted to ask the room. Bart, have you got a microphone there? We've got... What have we got to do this morning under the span of IDNs? We've got this, geographics, what else do we got? Money?

Roloff: We've got money, the implementation plan, DOR, and the IDN variance tables.

Chris: Right.

Roloff: And a presentation of numbers.

Chris: I don't know if we've just... I'm happy for you to say something else, but I just wanted to get a sense from the room as to whether we've delivered our message – yes? Or whether we need to go get a big stick? What I mean is, do you want to carry on? Yes, we need to get a big stick. Do you want to carry on talking about this for a little while longer? Roloff, you wanted to say something, sir? Well, somebody did. Roloff has another question.

Roloff: Because I think the previous remark only solves half the problem. If you can object as a country to a particular gTLD which you think represents a country, but now a variation of Hilda's question – if the Netherlands, if this procedure becomes the procedure, the Netherlands wants to have dot Holland, would it then, according to the policy obviously that the board now adheres to, that the country itself decide since if it's a gTLD or not? Can it opt for dot Holland to become a ccTLD?

Chris: No, not currently.

Roloff: That's weird, isn't it?

Chris: Well, hold on. Not currently, because the fast track doesn't allow... it's not an IDN, right? So, the current situation is that it's not the fault of the implementation managers, is what

I'm trying to say. The current system (the guidebook rather) is that you get one and it's going to ask you for one and it's got two letters.

Roloff: Okay, so that's the current system, but it's not the recommendation and the ccNSO is [Inaudible 0:44:50.8].

Chris: No, the ccNSO hasn't suggested at this stage suggested that change. It's...

Roloff: It's a meaningful representation...

Chris: That's for IDNs.

Roloff: That's for the IDN ccTLD.

Chris: Yes.

Roloff: In this particular thing, it cannot become a gTLD. That was our principle.

Chris: Yes, yes.

Roloff: So, if it cannot become a gTLD, obviously it would...

Chris: It's preserved effectively, it can't be anything...

Roloff: And it will become a ccTLD one day.

Chris: If the policy changes, yes.

Roloff: Yeah, exactly.

Chris: Okay.

Roloff: So, the choice is one way only. You can have... That's what ICANN says now, isn't it? It's either restricted or, as a county, you decide that you want it to be a gTLD and then it becomes a gTLD. But it's not the other way around. You cannot decide either .nl or .holland to be...

Chris: A ccTLD.

Roloff: One a ccTLD and the other a gTLD.

Chris: No.

Roloff: So, there's only this choice where it makes things easier?

Chris: I think so.

Roloff: Yeah, okay. That was my point.

Chris: All right. Now, do you want one more go, Hilda?

Hilda: Well, actually, I think we might have delivered the message as much as we can in this format, unless it's unclear for people what we're talking about, because then... but then probably somebody else should ask questions, rather than us doing things. But I think we might be the big stick, but I think it's unfair to Curt to apply that...especially in this room-

Chris: Oh, I wasn't planning on applying it to Curt.

Hilda: No, I think, higher up.

Chris: So, now, Curt has some things to talk about at the second level. Are we... can we do that? Are we concerned about that? We don't mind, right? Because we do all sorts of weird things at the second level ourselves, so that's okay. So, we don't need to do the second level...

Curt: Oh, but it's good. It's more protection for government names.

Chris: Yes, but only at the second level.

Curt: Right.

Chris: I'm just conscious of the time.

Curt: Okay.

Chris: So, all right, cool. So, what's next, Bart? André...

Curt: I'm just going to say that these second level protections mirror exactly what the GAC letter Paul Toomey indicates. Essentially it adopts and puts all of those recommendations into the guidebook.

Chris: Good. Now, you are sticking around, aren't you?

Curt: I'm going to go and then come back.

Chris: You're going to go and come back. Well, you deserve a massive round of applause for that, so well done. Have you noticed how it's always Curt that ends up with the difficult ones? You get the short store every time.

Okay, we're going to move on now to a presentation... We're going to move on now to a brief presentation from André on IDNs and more specifically on .rf, I guess. Is that right?

André: Yes.

Chris: Okay.

André: It works, okay. Hi-tech. We have a lot of discussions around IDNs, the rules and the global principles. I'll just take a little bit of your time, talking about a particular case for the Russian Federation and I think it can be interesting for you. I'll be short.

So, what do we have? We have .rf, which is on the screen, which is very... which has no competition with other similar characters, which identifies the country, which is called the Russian Federation and it has a special character "f", the Russian "f", which is not existing in other scripts. So, basically, Russia, in this area, has no competition. It's easy to agree with other Cyrillic nations and we already did it, so what's the whole plan?

We've developed the rules of registration and some basic principles which were studied at the beginning of the year and even in last year, and published it openly in April of this year. Since we started the developing of the rules, it was been an open and public discussion. Anybody can Russia can participate and give their suggestions, their ideas.

We ended up with a document – 112 pages – who is main principles. Based on this principles which were approved at the big Internet conferences, it's like the Internet Society in Russia. What we have now is a couple of statements, which will be the rule for about the last documents which will be the rules of registrations in the IDN domain, .rf.

So, what we have in the plan, we want to complete the documents by October and we plan to be on sync with the fast track procedures. So far, we hope and we believe it will be completed this year. So, and before we begin, we also have to sign up the registrars. We now have 20 registrars for .ru and we plan on maybe it will be five to six for the IDN domain, most likely the same guys. We plan to open the priority registration in November and we expect the delegation of the .rf, the main name, in December to February. And we will plan to open the registration March 2010.

What will be the rules? That's the most interesting thing. It's basically the same stuff as we have for .ru, but with a few exceptions. We will reserve the domain names for the mental institutions and the geographical domain names, but to express that it's not the geographical domain names based on existing, how to say, map. The geographical names will be defined by the Russian Constitution, basically which defines the structure of the Russian Federation. There'll be no anonymous registrations, of course.

I think that Russia was one of the last countries which were allowing anonymous registration. And, I should tell a few words about the stop list because it's a little bit on sync with the previous subject. We will not have a flat stop leads like file with the names with the bad words. We will use very sophisticated technology based on Russian linguistic developed by the leading search company in Russia.

So, it will stop any attempt to register a bad word. It's not aesthetically, is what I want to say. It's a thing which will protect trademark owners, for example, from the similar transcripts. It will protect from the registration of the bad words. And it will do some other tricks.

We also... we probably will give this knowledge to the registrars, so there'll be some commercial product. The administrator, the end-user, may buy the domain and protect the

similar meanings, so it will be a commercial product, but not for us, because we're not-for-profit.

So, about the stages. First, we go with the governmental needs, geographical domain names, and we're going to have about five to six technical domains for our own use, like [inaudible 0:53:51.4] .rf, which is like WHOIS in Russian. And we have a prior registration to protect the trademark owners. Due to the specifics, we will protect only trademarks, which is written in Cyrillic, combinations not allowed. We're not going to protect them, because it's really hard.

We started to drill really deep into this area trying to protect as much as we can, but we found no criteria in the very bottom so we decided to do it simple. If the trademark isn't Cyrillic, if it's registered in Russian or international registration bodies, that will protect it. The guys will trademarks will all be able to apply for their domain during the period of about four months. Then we probably will extend it for another two months, because we want to make sure that everybody is protected. This is one of the highest priorities in this project.

We'll also have time for collecting the wishes from the different agencies – federal board is executive power of the Russian Federation, like maybe Russian church. We're not sure. We'd like to avoid it, of course, because we have like five churches, okay, five official religions. It's kind of sensible subject, but we don't have an answer, so we'll try to solve it as we go.

Then, we have an open registration planned for the beginning of the second quarter of the next year and we'll get some tricks around it. The open registration will be like a sunrise period, which is the most popular word - term for the IDN now and for the new domains. It will be about eight plus weeks and we'll have eight steps with the cost. I should tell a few words about it.

We will have a special account, a special bank account, and we will open sunrise period, hold the money from the prior registrations. The sunrise registration will be collected on this account and most likely we will use it for the church purposes. We consider this like unique resource which belongs to, I don't know, God? I don't know, President of Russia or something. And so we think that we should collect this money separately and use it for the proper purposes.

There will be about eight weeks and we will start with like 10 million *rubles*, which is like \$100,000 or \$200,000, just for the marketing purposes. I don't know if somebody will apply for this, but let's try. So, it's a very short presentation of a very particular case called .rf IDN and if you have questions, please.

Chris: André, thank you. I think that's the first time we've actually heard from someone who's doing it and getting it done.

André: It's real, guys. It's real.

Chris: Yes. It's real. Does anyone have any questions? Peter?

Peter: Thank you. Thanks, André. Very interesting. Will it be possible, unless it takes us too far, and it may be better to postpone until one of the next meetings, to talk about a bit more about the stop list that would also protect the trademark holders?

André: I said a few words, but this is network service provided by one of the leading Russian linguistic companies, let me put it like this. I mean that Russian language has certain specifics... well, like any language, okay? The combination of words, of meanings, combining two words in the different directions may end up as different results, so those guys are... I can tell you the name. It's [inaudible 0:0:58:02] Partners. That's the guys who developed the most sophisticated search knowledgebase in Russia back in the end of the 90s, beginning of 2000s.

It's very sophisticated thing. According to what I know, they will filter up to 99 percent of the suspicious words. Also it's dynamic so you can tune up for the strict or non-strict, or different combinations. This system is like self... It has like self tune-up kind of algorithm inside, so we will launch it.

We will see how it works and we'll set properties of the system. It will protect the... the basic meaning protect from the bad words actually, but also it has a certain feature which may protect the simple brand. For example, you enter some brand and enter some word and all combinations, like wrong, but similar script of this word will be protected.

I think this maybe this will be good for the project of geographical names as well on the global scale. Maybe it's the solution. I don't know.

Chris: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else? André, thank you very much indeed.

André : Thank you.

Chris: What's next, Bart? Tina must be next. Hi, Tina. You're here now, so... I want to see what we want to talk about. We get into the stage now where those of you who are interested in this and those of you want your IDNs, etc., really do need to be paying attention to the documents that are being put out. We don't have the time nor is it appropriate at this stage now to start going through the document line by line. We've done that meeting after meeting.

All right, so while you're thinking about what you wanted – if there's anything I'm looking for from you is guidance on what particular things you would like to talk about that are currently in the implementation plan. For the implementation plan for the fast track, so have a think about that.

All right, while you're thinking about what... if there's anything particular you want to raise, Tina's going to talk a little bit about the variance issues, which I know are of particular concern or interest to some. So, Tina...

Tina: Do you want me to pull up the slides so we have something to look at?

Chris: Oh, do you think so? Okay. Fair enough.

Tina: Okay.

Chris: Sorry, we're just getting her slide. Good morning, André.

Tina: We can - maybe while I put up the slides, we can see what other topics there is of interest so we can kind of get a little plan in front of us. And I... Chris just asked me and I selected variance like on top of my head because it's the one topic... well, it's one out of maybe three or four topics that I've generated the most discussions this week, but if there's anything else that you would rather talk about then...

Chris: I think we'll start with that and then we're going to do money later. Next, aren't we? Curt's going to come back and we're going to do money. So, I think, Tina, that anything technical that you think we should focus on would be really helpful.

Tina: Okay. I would say variance and then maybe probably it should be by a show of hands if there's any interest in the IDNA protocol revision. That's going like to the extreme technical, so...

Chris: Actually, no, that's good. So perhaps just before you do variance and while you're getting the slides ready, how about an explanation of what might happen if the current revision is not yet adopted.

Tina: Okay, so, yes. Thank you for asking the most difficult question on that topic. But, sure.

Chris: Just so everyone's clear, the current IDNA protocol is being revised. It hasn't yet been, whatever the term is in the IETF, signed off on. Both the joint GAC, ccNSO, IDN working recommendation and I think the GNSO recommendation -

Tina: Yes -

Chris: On new detailed leads said that they should not... IDN should not go until such time as the new protocol is complete. And that may change.

Tina: Right. That may change because as you all know and hopefully agree on, we really want the IDN ccTLD to go into production. So, as we're trying to fast track things, we're also trying to enable things to go live potentially before that protocol revision is finished. I will say it really depends a lot on what elements of the division are we waiting to reach a consensus on in the IETF. And right now, they're discussing what, for me, is one of the major outstanding topics and that has to do with mappings.

It looks like we may get a resolution on that by the next meeting for the IETF, which is in the end of July in Stockholm. And if that happens, I can only say sort of like what my personal opinion of - of course, there needs to be like a technical review within ICANN staff on whether that's good enough. But my best guess is that then we will have a revised version of the protocol that is solving the question of mapping, that is Unicode version independent. That topic, I just want to stress, is really important, especially for developing regions so that when they get their characters into Unicode, it works pretty much automatically as IDNs.

And, of course, those other regions where IDNs are like really needed in order to get Internet penetration. So, we have mapping, Unicode conversion independent, and we also have fixed that problem that was discovered with certain right to left scripts. That is a much better and much more stable and forward, usable, technical standard than what we have in the 2003 version.

Using that version, regardless of whether it's a draft or not, is going to be a lot better than using the 2003 version. I think it's fair to say that we're like right on the edge of maybe having something that is useful and something that we can use. And then if there are any other topics among the engineers that needs to be solved, well, maybe that's going to come in a later version, but we need something that we can use now for IDN ccTLDs. So, that's where I think it is at.

Chris: So, yes, do the variance now.

Tina: Yes, I was going to do variance, but I was going to see if there was any questions under protocol provision, because, I mean, I just spoke like, what? Like a minute or something about it and it's quite a... yes, it doesn't look like there is much interest on that, so let's look at the IDN tables and the variance.

Just to say up front, this has been a topic that's been quite back and forth a little bit because in Mexico City, the paper, and all of these papers are out for public comments. So, nothing is decided yet, but the paper in Mexico City proposed that IDN TLD variance would be allocated or blocked. So that means that if you had, the example of two strings up there for Pakistan, one is a variant of the other. They, of course, look exactly the same but they are actually, from a technical standpoint, different.

Chris: May I stop you and ask you a question...?

Tina: Yes.

Chris: Now they're in the same script?

Tina: Yes, they're in the same script. This is Arabic.

Chris: They're in the same language?

Tina: Yes. This is Arabic.

Chris: So, why is it a variant, because it's simply a case that it's two words that are used for the same thing?

Tina: I probably need to point.

Chris: Okay.

Tina: Yes. Since I don't know the Arabic script and I think there is people in the room who can explain this much better than I can. This character that you can see, looks exactly the same, are actually two Unicode code points. So, that means that they are different from a

technical standpoint. Now, they are also different for users, although users consider them exactly the same. As you can see, they look the same.

But the way that they're entered on a keyboard or any other kind of software is different. So, in parts of the world, people will enter one of them and in other parts of the world, people will enter another one of them and they might not necessarily know which one of them they're entering, or the difference, or anything like that at all. It's just that this particular character or these two characters were coded differently in Unicode. So, we have both of them.

So, it's the same - oh, there's a microphone, good.

Hilda: Yes, I understand it's not the same language. You said it's the same language, but it's not.

Tina: No, it's the same script.

Hilda: Same script, exactly, but two different languages.

Chris: Two different languages. So, it's the same script, two different languages, and it means "Pakistan".

Tina: Yes.

Hilda: You read it Pakistan.

Chris: You read it Pakistan.

Hilda: When I read it now, I read this as Pakistan, I read this as Pakistan. But, of course, if you look at the code, as you said, Unicode it's not, you see?

Chris: I understand, because there's actually a different letter in there.

Hilda: Exactly.

Chris: So, it would be like spelling career with a K or a C, if they were both in common usage.

Hilda: Yes, maybe.

Chris: Yes, except these look the same.

Hilda: Maybe not. It's...

Chris: Well, that's my question.

Hilda: It's not really like that. The problem that you have is the same alphabet represented in two different languages with the same script.

Chris: Yes, okay. Where there is a difference?

Hilda: There is a difference because if you press this, it will appear to you the same, but this might be very good for fishing and all of these things.

Tina: So, there are users, who, okay... get the microphone down there. There are users that will use one of them and users who will use the other one. Now, if only one of them goes into the root, it should be pretty obvious for everybody here that that means that there is a portion of users who would like to use .pakistan who will type it in or enter it or however they do and they'll get no result, because they typed the wrong string.

Chris: The other way, the other way, yes.

Fahd: Actually there are –

Chris: Would you stand up and would you introduce yourself, please?

Fahd: Hello, everybody, my name is Fahd. I'm from .jo. Actually, this letter has three variances and each variance is spoken in a different way.

Chris: Right.

Fahd: It's just the way that you pronounce it actually. Something would be light and something would be pronounced in a lighter way, and something -

Chris: Right.

Fahd: Would be pronounced in a little bit of a tougher way. Then there is just one generic letter for this very instance. And actually the ALAC working group is responsible for studying the Arabic script. Actually we had reached an initial consensus that we would use the generic words in the script and we could probably use them - include them in a very much later stage.

Chris: Okay. Thank you. Unless we need to go into actual specific examples, it's easier just to deal with the principle. Because I'm ... I'm the bellwether of not understanding this stuff and if I can get it, then I think everybody should be able to. So, effectively, Tina, you've got these two representations of Pakistan.

Tina: Right.

Chris: So, how do you decide - and only one of them can go into the root?

Tina: That was what I was getting at. And just to be clear, the only reason why I have it up on the screen as Pakistan is that it's just a good example. I'm not trying to pick on one region other than another. So, in Mexico, we said... I'm sorry, is there another question?

Chris: Can we let Tina finish? Thank you.

Tina: Okay, sure. So, in Mexico we said, well, obviously there's a need for both of these strings in this example. There are other examples where there's more than two strings and so

forth. But there's a need for both strings to go into the root because otherwise IDNs in this particular example won't be useful for the community.

We did not have, in Mexico, a technical solution for doing that and insuring that the two strings are inserted into root in an alias function. Meaning, if I make a registration under one of them, I also... it also will work automatically under the other one. So, if I have Tina dot one of them and you enter Tina dot the other one, it's the same thing. You go to the same site. If it's an email address, you will send the email to me regardless of which one you use.

We didn't have a technical solution for that. In Mexico, what we proposed was that the two strings should be inserted into root separately and the registry operator or the registry manager should be in charge of making sure that the two zone files under each one of them would be exactly the same content. And, in that way, if I have Tina dot one, then the zone file would be copied or however you would manage it and Tina dot the other would also be there. So, you could type in either one of them and you would go to the same place, and that would be my domain name or my website or whatever. We thought that was a good solution.

The feedback we got was that, well, it may be possible to copy the two zone files at the second level, but what about the lower levels? This is going to create, and this is not what I'm saying, but this is the feedback we got – this is going to create an instability in the name space.

The reason why it's said as a name space is that it's not a root-zone stability problem, because IDNs works at the application layer, so there are other stability concerns that comes up in that application layer that has an effect on users. This is a concern for end users that it actually works for them.

So, we have sort of like a very interesting situation where we have a need and if we don't fulfill that need getting both strings in the root then we have a usability problem. But at least where the technical discussion stands today is that if we put both strings in the root as separate delegations, well, then we have another usability/stability problem. So, that's why this is still up for discussion.

Now, what we proposed right before the Sydney meeting was that instead of allocating both strings, we would allocate one of them and reserve the other one for potential future allocation. That could work for some regions. The feedback that I've gotten his week is that that does not work particular for the Arabic, the language communities that are based on the Arabic script.

I can certainly see the difference between looking at the example for Pakistan and if I had had an example for Chinese up there, it is different. The Arabic ones have, at least in this example, a tendency to look exactly the same, whereas the Chinese ones look slightly differently and may not be as big of a confusability problem.

But other than providing this recommendation or this proposal in this version of the paper, reserved or blocked, we're all urging the community to talk about this and see if we can come up with a technical solution, so that we can actually get both strings in the root.

Chris: Okay. Jonathan.

Jonathan: Yes, I'm Jonathan from the Hong Kong, .hk registry. I think it is perfectly fine to have, for example, I take the case of Hong Kong as an example. We have traditional Hong Kong, Chinese characters. We have simplified Hong Kong in simplified characters, very simple; only traditional and simplified. The words looks a bit different, but meaning the same thing.

I think it's a good solution already that I can delegate these two strings as two different strings to say the Hong Kong registry, whoever it is. And then the registry will manage to insure that Tina dot Hong Kong traditional and Tina dot Hong Kong simplified, even though those are two separate domain names, somehow we'll go to... it will look effectively like the same domain name to the user and the registry can manage that.

Chris: Jonathan, hold on. I understand that that registry problem we can manage that, but do you accept that if it wasn't managed, it would be a problem? In other words -

Jonathan: Not necessarily. It's a matter of policy. Not necessarily. It's a matter of policy. No, and other territory can have a different policy, they can treat this at different... I can't speak for them. In the case of Hong Kong, we have to manage that.

Chris: I'm sorry. Maybe I'm not making myself clear.

Jonathan: Okay.

Chris: If I understand it correctly, the... what needs to happen is you have to have the two zone files need to be identical.

Tina: That is possible.

Chris: And that is possible, right?

Tina: Yes.

Chris: Okay. So, we don't have a problem with that.

Jonathan: No problem with that.

Chris: But what do you do about the next level?

Jonathan: That is exactly my question, too. I mean, what is the problem with the next level anyway? I can't understand.

Chris: Right.

Tina: Well, let me -

Chris: I can't see your problem.

Tin: Put first that I'm not 100 percent convinced that there is a problem, but I've been told that there is a problem. But, the problem is that Tina dot Hong Kong, that's mine, right? Well, then you have control that this own file at the second level is exactly the same for the two, but then since it's my registration and I control all the lower layers on that. I can decide what I want to put in the third level and I can decide how to manage that because you gave me both of them.

Chris: And that is physically what can happen?

Tina: Right.

Chris: What's the problem? If I decide I want to have Chris dot traditional Chinese going to one place or Chris dot whatever dot traditional Chinese going to one place and Chris dot simplified Chinese going to another place, the traditional Chinese and simplified Chinese go to the same place? It's just the thing behind "the Chris" that's going to a different place, so what's the issue?

Tina: Well, the issue is that that in that case, the Chris dot Hong Kong will not, in the traditional and in the simplified, those two will not be an alias solution and what, we and if... So, maybe the question is if do we want an alias solution? We've always said that we've wanted an alias solution. And if that is still what we want, then that is not what you're getting.

Chris: Now hold, on hold on. No, that's not right.

Tina: But if that's not what you want then maybe you...

Chris: No. Well, yes and no, in fact. And I misspoke, because it's actually not that. It's if I get Chris dot traditional Hong Kong and Chris dot simplified Hong Kong, I absolutely agree that for it to be workable, those two things have to be the same. So, there are two separate TLDs, traditional and simplified, and they have to be the same.

But if I choose to put mail dot Chris dot traditional Hong Kong and have that go somewhere, and put mail dot Chris dot simplified Hong Kong goes somewhere else, what effect does that have on the security and the stability of the DNS?

Tina: So, it's not the security of the DNS, it's the security of the name space, because it doesn't...

Jonathan: This...Nope, no, no, no.

Chris: Jonathan, you've got the microphone, so you carry on.

Tina: I'm sorry.

Jonathan: Okay, yes. I can't see a problem at all frankly. No problem. And also talking about the point raised by Chris, there is another option, too. In the case of .hk, we are already having Chinese domain names at the second level. So, Tina can register just Tina, for

example, Tina dotpersonal .hk, personal in Chinese. At the moment you can register Tina dot personal in Chinese traditional, Chinese style .hk and so is Tina dot personal in simplified Chinese .hk.

In our case, the user can map these two separately or to the same name server, as they wish. They have full flexibility, so this is another possibility, too.

Chris: Jonathan...

Jonathan: Yes...

Chris: I think you've made your point and I'd like to hear it from other people. Otherwise, we'll... Nashua was next, then I've got Mateo, then I've got Roloff.

Jonathan: Just quickly, though, I really can't see a problem at all.

Chris: Okay, thank you, Jonathan. Nashua?

Nashua: Yes, I'm actually repeating a question I asked last time in Dubai. Back to the Arabic script, I'm not with the group that they're working with the Arabic script and with all of my respect, I really appreciate the work they've done and what they have reached today.

But still I'm still asking – if we have a problem with the Unicode, what's the problem to clarify the Unicode? Simplify it. Do we have a problem with that? Why it's not that so easy to say that this Unicode was created a day that the Internet was not there and they have asked the countries to put their alphabet and then the alphabet was somehow, there's some redundancy in-between.

Why we are not able to clarify or clear this redundancy for the Internet?

Tina: Yes.

Nashua: Thanks.

Tina: I think that's really hard for me to answer because I think it depends on how you want to clarify it. Now, if you want to clarify it so that only one of the characters are used, I can't imagine how to do that. What I've been told is that there are keyboards and systems that use one and others that use the other.

So, taking them out of Unicode certainly doesn't work. Now, mapping them perhaps in Unicode so that they are considered the same from a technical standpoint could maybe solve some of it. But this is quite outside... I mean, I'm not a member of Unicode and, I mean, that is really a question up to the Unicode Consortium.

Chris: Do we have an answer to that? I will come back to you in a second.

Roloff: Nashua, this example in particular, it cannot be mapped. It cannot be. I mean, the second letter as as Tina said, they belong to different languages. One is the Persian and one is the Arabic, so they cannot be mapped. They look the same, they have different Unicodes.

They have to have different Unicodes because they belong to different languages. It's not the same language. It's not Arabic. It's Arabic script, but two different languages.

Chris: Okay, with some of this stuff, you get to a point where you have to say "Alright, we'll take that outside the room". Otherwise, we'll stay forever. Mateo?

Mateo: Mateo. I'm manager of .fr. A disclaimer – I'm neither a technical expert especially with regards to Unicode or languages or scripts. Neither directly involved in any IDN ccTLD project, but listening to the discussion I think we are touching on a very fundamental principle here that...and I acknowledge that everyone agrees that there are different communities with different needs and maybe the issue is there's no one size fits all.

And, this key is we have one of the most wonderful tool and technology to address this. It's called DNS. And the basic principle of DNS is decentralization of responsibilities. It is essentially my opinion that ICANN addresses the central root level issues, but remains very cautious not to get involved into what happens at the lower levels. I'm very stricken by the fact that we're starting to discuss what's happening at third and fourth level.

My recommendation would be to consider what would be the problem if... we've identified it's a problem with variance, maybe and some people want [inaudible 1:26:31.4] and some people want other things. Why not just delegate those variances to the same entity and delegate responsibility to this entity? And choose exactly what it wants to do with addressing its usability problem we've been mentioning.

I think it's been a tremendous job at identifying what issues could be reasoned and then move forward on this basis. And then maybe that Hong Kong, we want at certain level, we can impose new rules, but it's going to be a policy issue for them.

Chris: Okay, I understand that. I'll go Roloff and then I've got Jan, and then Andre. So, can I just make sure I'm...? I just want to make a point. Tina, the starting point for this is that they are two separate TLDs.

Tina: So... That was actually not clear to me. I think the starting point was that if we wanted confusingly similar strings in root, then they had to be aliased, meaning everything below the two trees had to be the same. This is exactly how D-names works at the second level for those registries that have implemented D-names.

Chris: Okay.

Tina: That's the starting point.

Chris: But you... yes, but, well, no. Yes, what you're saying is right, but the starting point is, and just using China as an example, the starting point is you will need to apply for the delegation of two TLDs. Is that right? Simplified and traditional.

Tina: Well, in the way that the proposal stands today, yes.

Chris: Okay, so, that means by agreement because I assume there's an agreement that they look very similar. Anyway, you want them to be the same, right? They will be tied together.

And the red zone file, the zone file for each of those will be identical. Okay. But fundamentally, they're still two separate TLDs, aren't they?

Tina: Yes.

Chris: Okay, just wanted to get clear on that. I'll come to you in one second. Roloff, first.

Roloff: Maybe this is too technical for most of us and should we leave this discussion to somewhere else, because I think a lot of us don't really follow it.

Chris: Okay.

Roloff: My question would be this problem should have occurred already at the second level and maybe that solution can also be used –

Chris: Yes...

Roloff: For this particular case since we all seem to agree that on the first level, this won't be a problem but the problem will be at the lower level.

Chris: Okay.

Roloff: For the rest, maybe I think we leave it to the experts.

Chris: Thank you. I've got Jan and then I've got [inaudible 1:29:15.3]

Jan: I'm Jan from China. I think...

Chris: Speak closer.

Jan: I think for some point of view, those are two TLDs. Actually from the technical world, those are two TLDs. But actually we should consider them as one TLD.

Chris: Well, then you can't split them. You can't say it's one TLD, but at the third level, we'd like to have a free-for-all. You can't. That doesn't work. It's either one or the other.

Jan: They are one TLD, but just because of the technical issue, actually we don't need any technical resolution to align them. That's why are IDN tables for. Every time, if you get application, let's say for any example in Chinese, just talk about the Chinese. If you get any application in Chinese, you just look at the IDN tables. That IDN table, you've already got it. That's what the IDN table is for.

Chris: Okay.

Jan: You look at the table and then you got actually not only simplified and the traditional Chinese, all the words actually, but how to treat other ones on the policy level. That's another policy issue, but the way we're doing it is just, look at warrants table and see what kind of warrants we have and then, just, basically that's one TLD. That's the point I'm trying to make.

Chris: You've made your point.

Jan: Yes, yes, yes. Just one point. And secondly, exactly I agree with Chris, but we really didn't see what is the problem for the second level and this other level.

Chris: I understand. Same as Jonathan.

Jan: Yes, yes. Yes, yes, yes. Exactly.

Chris: Got it.

Jan: Yes, and then, also, we actually have resolved all of the technical problem and the policy problem perfectly already.

Chris: That's fine. We understand.

Jan: Yes, so, we just...

Chris: You just want your name. André? And then after this Liz is. André?

André: Actually, I appreciate it coming from Mateo that those problems should be probably sought by the communities that are effected by those problems, but I have one question – one technical question which I'm not too sure about. If the Pakistan is the case and they would like to have delegated both, can they use D-name below the root level as it is below, because then we can register more variants of the name and they could be equally the same?

Tina: Right. Well, we actually expected was the D-name would function at the root level exactly in the same way as it works at the second level. But that was tested out sometime ago by a few members of the Root Server Advisory Committee and the result was that it doesn't work in the root. And actually it was tried, they were being quite creative around how they tested it out, not just as d-name entries, but as d-names in the zone and so forth. And none of it worked and that actually was a surprise to some of the engineers who did the testing.

So, one of the things that might be... there are several things coming out of the Sydney meeting, but one of them could be for those who have engineers working in the IETF who are interested to take a look at the d-name RFC and see if it's possible to make any adjustments to actually make it work and that would be a great solution to have.

Chris: Okay, thank you. Now, Bart, can you... Bart? Bart? Abdul was next. Right here.

Abdul: My name is Abdul and I'm from [inaudible 1:33:11.2] ccTLD. My comment is about using variants. We need variants in all the labels of the domain names, whether it's TLD. Yes, we need to use variants in all the labels, whether it's TLDs, or second or third level because this is part of the problems that we had with the Unicode. Unicode is not like perfect. We have to work with it and this is what we have now. It has a number of corrections that's being duplicated. It's not only this little calf, but... [Inaudible 1:33:49.0]

The names, like Yemans, Sudeah, and, uh, many names that which has “yeah” and “calf” and we’ll have a problem variance. Users of these scripts will have difficulty to read these names if there are not variants. Our keyboards, particularly in the north, they have different code points.

So if, for example, I have Mecca, which is a very well-known name for most of the Muslim world, they cannot tie if they are using a normal keyboard, because there is no Arabic calf. So, we need really like a variance in all the levels of the domain name. Variance is very important, even the TLDs. Thank you.

Chris: Thank you. There was somebody at the back, I think, Bart. Or Gabby, whichever gets there first. Thank you.

Navit: Hello, my name is Navit. I am from Pakistan. And, uh...

Chris: Which one?

Navit: Well, the expression of interest that I can send us on November, in November of last year, asking us if we are interested to have our own IDN ccTLD. I don’t recognize which one of this Pakistan was which we sent back to ICANN that we’re interested to have as another IDN ccTLD.

Well, what I’d like to request here is that at the top level domain, this is something that we were working on for the last seven months. Our Ministry has allocated some \$2, \$3 million budget on that work with some experts. So, at this, after eight months, what we are having is that we may have a Pakistan IDN ccTLD, not on the root, because of some technical issues. We may get this block.

Well, I’ll just request that if there is a technical solution at the root available, so we can have Pakistan at least at the top level domain site. Maybe on the second and third level, we may not use this or we can have some blocking issues, too. So, we may go do this policy and get in on that more quickly then waiting for some other technical solution to come over.

And after 18 months, Pakistan is being told that you cannot have this IDN ccTLD string over there, because it has some issues. So, that’s what I request. If I had the root, we can have Pakistan there in the shape of an alias. We could go for that and then leave the rest of the registry, telling them that at a second or third level you should have this issue so you could have the blocking or you should not use it or whatever.

Tina: Right, so just to make sure that everybody understands, I didn’t put Pakistan up there by saying they want both or anything at all. It’s just an example.

Chris: We’re going to need to... one of the problems with this audience stuff is that it’s incredibly important and intensely technical and all those other things and, for some people, it doesn’t effect them as such. We’re going to need to wrap this up, because if we don’t we’re going to run out of time. Well, we’ve already run out of time. Jonathan, you have to be really quick.

Jonathan: Yeah, okay. Just a quick comment about IDN protocol. Protocol do have permissions and you have permissions and they are never perfect. Again, we have a few registries that are working on earlier versions of the IDNA at the second and the third level anyway, for the past few years. So, I don't think there's a reason for delaying the launch of the IDN fashion. I can't really see that there's a reason.

Tina: Right, I don't think we're looking for 100 percent solution. We're maybe looking for maybe an 80 percent solution. So, we definitely agree on that.

Maybe just a last observation as you're moving on to the next topic...

Chris: Yes...

Tina: Is that, of course, all of this variant management and how to deal with it also has to do with how IDN tables are developed. That's where the variants are defined. And, right now, the deal is that tables and variance and everything is developed locally. But we did get some feedback in this meeting as to whether I can or should have more to say in terms of how tables are developed. I'm not sure that that's a possible thing to do, but just to throw it out as you think about variants, keep in mind how variants are actually defined.

Chris: Okay. Thank you, Tina.

Tina: Sure.

Chris: I'm going to make a what might be a slightly radical suggestion. Because we have run out of time and it's coffee break and I definitely need a coffee, and we do have a full agenda, now... Is Curt here?

Tina: Yes...He's down there somewhere.

Bart: He's in the back.

Chris: What I would like to suggest is that those of you in this room who are in the IDN world, so, you know – Jan and Jonathan and Abdul and whoever else is here, Nashua - perhaps you could convene a meeting with Curt, perhaps in the coffee break or perhaps in one of the other sessions, and actually discuss the money elements. And I'll come.

Discuss the money elements with him, specifically to do with IDNs, which is what we're talking about, right? So, it's not the big ccTLD thing, it's just the IDN thing. Curt, you game to do that? Yes? Peter.

Peter: Chris, very respectfully, but I think this is a very...

Chris: You want to do it in the whole room?

Peter: Yes, I think it's an important issue. Yesterday, we were not allowed to ask any questions on it because it would be discussed in detail...

Chris: You are quite right and thank you for reminding me. Very good point.

Peter: During this session, so...

Chris: All right, well, in that case, let's go and have coffee, let's tie Curt to a pillar, so that he doesn't leave. Let's go and have coffee and let's get back here in fifteen minutes and start the next session, okay?

Yes. No. Guys, sorry. Just hold on for one sec. We will not go straight into financial contributions. We're going to do something else first, and then we're going to do financial contributions, okay?