San Juan ICANN Meetings
 New gTLDs discussion
IDN
 23 JUNE 2007
11:30 A.M.
 Chris Disspain – ccNSO Council chair

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay, let's start. The next thing on the agenda, I've invited Chris Disspain

-- hello -- conversations, thank you, onery class. I have invited Chris Disspain to come and

talk about basically the ccNSO and GAC and IDN concerns. People may have seen the letter

that was sent to the board. There have been ongoing discussions. We've all recognized

throughout this discussion that there were concerns that went beyond the GNSO and there has

been, I guess, some public forum discussions on it at the last ICANN meeting.
 So thanks, Chris, for coming to explain.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Avri. Good morning, everybody. Thanks for having me. I'm

going to run through with you the sorts of issues that the ccNSO and the GAC have been

looking at in respects to IDNs and mostly in respect to IDN is as they relate to ccTLDs, as I

think we all recognize, however, there are a significant number of crossover issues that

cross between the gTLD space and the ccTLD space.
 I actually want to start at the end, if I can, first because I know that there is some

concern in the gTLD community about the letter that the ccNSO sent to the board. Perhaps, I

can deal with that first and deal with it simply by saying there is probably a reasonable

level of consensus and recognition in the ccTLD community that whilst the policy issues, most

of which I will talk about in a little while are very difficult and will take a considerable

amount of time to find solutions to.
 There is a recognition that there is a pressing need, not least to significant number of

members of the ccTLD community to have IDNs quickly. I recently attended the APTLD meeting

in Dubai and it was refreshing to have a meeting in the Asia-Pacific meeting where ccTLD

managers were prepared to stand up and figuratively beat the table and say we know what we

want and we want it now.
 So our community is split to a degree between those who -- for whom IDNs are not a

significant cultural issue who are wrapped up in concerns about making sure that we tick

every box, cross every I and cross every T and other parts of the community who have complete

clarity about what is it they need and they would like it now.
 So what I suspect the results will be in the next few months is that having completed our

list of extremely difficult policy questions and sent those off to the board and assuming

that we come up with some sort of mechanism for dealing with those over a period of time, I

also suspect that we'll start working pretty quickly on some sort of interim measure or

interim way of dealing with IDNs while we are taking however many decades it takes to come up

with an overarching policy.
 So having dealt with that -- obviously I will be happy to answer anyone's questions at any

time -- let me give you some flavor, if you'll like, of the challenges that lie ahead for the

ccTLD community in respect to IDNs. As you all know, the board -- the ICANN board asked the

GAC and the ccNSO to work together to come up with a list of questions that we felt needed to

be dealt with in order to put IDN ccTLDs in place. That was a very specific request to come

up with questions.
 I suspect if we had been asked to come up with answers, we would still be working on it and

got almost nowhere. But because we were asked to come up with questions, that's proved

relatively simple.
 Now, our document which we are hoping to sign off on here in San Juan and send up to the

board is a list of the sorts of things that need to be decided. We don't think it is

exhausted because, of course, every question tends to lead to another question and we find a

solution to one thing, it opens up other questions.
 But we think we've covered some fairly substantial ground in looking at what we need to do.

And most of these questions are difficult not because they are technical, because they're

not, but because they're political and involve policy.
 And the sorts of things -- the sort of questions we're asking, based on the fact that there

is currently no real policy -- I mean, in respect to ccTLDs, they're just there. The ISO

list exists. A decision was made to use that list. If you're on it, you get a ccTLD. And

if you're not on it, you don't.
 But because IDNs are coming into the space at a time when instead of being all very young

and undeveloped, we're all quite old now and have gone through a whole series of steps of

development, there are some questions which even though we tend to assume are taken as read

are actually not written down anywhere.
 The first one, for example, is which territories would be eligible for an IDN ccTLD? Are we

just going to say if you're on the ISO list, so you've got an ASCII one then you can have an

IDN one. And if you can, what sort -- under what sort of policy? But if you make the

assumption, and it is fairly fair assumption to make, that we are going to maintain the ISO

list as our constituency, if you'd like, then we can move on and look at real questions about

the sorts of things that are necessary for IDN ccTLDs.
 So should an IDN ccTLD string be meaningful? It's not something that the gTLD world really

struggles with because the original ones have sort of gained a meaning, and new ones have

presumably been applied for because they have some sort of intended meeting. But in the

ccTLD world, we have a simple two-letter abbreviation of a name of the country. And in some

cases, it is actually meaningful. So in the case of United Kingdom, for example, U.K. is

meaningful because everybody in the United Kingdom calls United Kingdom. In the Australia,

AU is not meaningful at all because no one calls Australia AU but it's gained a meaning

through time. And now people recognize that if you see a name with dot AU on the end of it,

that means Australia, unless you think it means Austria, in which case is more confusing.
 But on the assumption that the current situation is that you just get assigned a ccTLD and

if you're lucky it has some relationship to your country name, if you're not, it doesn't,

what should we do in respect to IDNs?
 As a result of asking that question, there a couple of things that have become abundantly

clear. The first is with respect to the IDN space, in most scripts abbreviations simply

don't work. There is nothing meaningful that Saudi Arabia could have in Arabic. They are

very clear that what they want is AUDI and I think that's four characters and that's exactly

what they will be asking for, United Arab Emirates are very clear they want Emirates because

that's the name.

As a result of that, we then move to some fairly new territory because up until now there has been a distinction between ccTLDs and gTLDs. There are two basic distinctions at the overarching level of this stage. The first is that ccTLDs are two characters, and gTLDs are three or more. Now, we are going to lose that because two characters in Chinese or two characters in Arabic simply isn't going to work.

So a natural distinction or a natural way of identifying whether something is a C or a G is gone.

The second way in which CCs differ from Gs is a contractual way. gTLDs are effectively granted, if you'd like, in the ICANN process under a full contract with ICANN and ccTLDs are very different. We sit it in a different space. And the way that we're bound to ICANN varies enormously. There are some ccTLDs who have one of Louise's contract, there are some ccTLDs that have absolutely nothing. There are the ccTLDs that have accountability frameworks and so on. It is a question under what mechanism is ICANN going to make a grant, if you will, of an IDN ccTLD. That's something that we'll also need to sort out.

How many IDN ccTLDs per script, per territory? Right now you have one ccTLD and that's it.

But clearly if you are going to have an IDN and ccTLD that's going to lift your number of ccTLDs at least from one to two. But three? Four? Five? Per script.

So if you have simplified Chinese, can China apply for just one represent presentation of China in Chinese or should they be able to apply for more than one?

Is there any limits to the number of scripts per territory? I had everyone probably knows India, I think we're up to 22 in India. There are 22 different scripts available.

Is there any issue with that at all or is it just a case of, okay, you got 22, you can have 22? And what does the status of the language that relates to that script have to be in order for you to be entitled to have a ccTLD many that script? There are 860 languages in Papa New Guinea. I am prepared to accept that a language spoke in Papa New Guinea by one chap sitting on the top of the hill somewhere is not eligible for a ccTLD, but what is? How many of them?

We have played around with the concept of official languages, but that's problematic because the U.K. for example, has no official language. Swedish is not an official language of Sweden. So the term "official language" doesn't really work for us.

As far as we can ascertain at this stage, there isn't actually any objective third-party recognition of languages. Some countries choose to designate a language or a number of languages as official in acts of parliament, others don't.

So there's a challenge to be met there.

I've already talked about the number of characters in a string, and we are pretty clear that we can't limit that, the number of characters in a string, to two, as we do in ASCII. But of course there's the other end of the scale. The IDN characters map back to ASCII characters, and there is a limit of 63, I think. 63? The first four of which are xn dash dash.

So one assumes that it is entirely possible that some ccTLDs might ask for a name that in fact they simply can't have because it translates back into ASCII to more than 63 characters.

So we need to handle that.

Are there any rights attached to a given script? There are some countries who believe that they own their language and the script upon which that language is based and that, therefore, no TLDs, C's or G's, should be granted in that language or that script, rather, without their

consent.

Now, personally, I don't think that's going to fly, but nonetheless, it's there. And it
needs to be dealt with.

And on a similar point, what is the policy going to be for applications for ccTLDs in a
particular script? Official language? Chinese is the second most spoken language in
Australia. It's only recently become that, but it is the second most spoken language in
Australia. So what would have to happen for Australia to be able to apply for a Chinese
version of Australia? Or should that not even be possible?

Now, one of the things that happened -- It's important to remember that this discussion is
taking place with governments as well. So some of the discussion has been tilted very much
from a government perspective and what governments want is certainty and clarity. And some
of it comes from the CC community to just want to make sure they get what they want.

But one of the suggestions that was -- that we talked about is whether there should actually
be a mandated list. Because currently, we effectively have a mandated list. It's ISO
created the list and when there's a new country or new territory that, by some mystical
process, it ends up getting added to that list. So you could decide, if you wanted to, that
we could find an authoritative third party, and no one is suggesting it should be ICANN, but
an authoritative third party where every time a script is released, if you like, for
registrations at the top level, goes away and comes back with a list of the 246 territories
listed in the ISO 3166 list, a list of what they should have if they were to have one in that
particular script. It doesn't mean they can necessarily have it because that's a function of
policy. But at least it means that there will be a name reserved, if you will, in perpetuity
in that script for that particular territory.

Now, that has some attractions to it, certainly from government's point of view, because it
means they don't have to do too much work. They would presumably lobby this authoritative
body if they were pretty clear what they wanted, and the list would be the list. And it sort
of solves, to a degree, the reserved name issue because you don't have -- it's been mandated,
that's what it is, and no one else can have it. And it just sits there, and if you don't
meet the policy for having an IDN TLD in that script, then it just sits there on the list.

The major, major challenge with that -- there are several. One is, of course, that there is
currently no one doing that. And if ISO were to consider doing it, our information is it
would probably take them about five years to work out what the policy should be for coming up
with the list. It won't take them five years to come up with the list. One assumes that
once it's figured out how to do it they could do it as and when the scripts are leased. But
it's going to take them a fairly long time to come up with a policy. And some of you may
know that arguments already erupted in the ISO space about whether this is something that
should or should not be done and in the classic way of these things, the French are fighting
the Brits and the Brits are fighting the French, and that's the way of the world, I suspect.

It's possible -- It is possible to shortcut that process, we believe, by using a single
country standards institute to create a policy that is effectively an industry policy, and
then have that -- use that, and then have it work its way up through ISOs so eventually it

becomes a full-blown ISO policy and we believe that would take about 18 months. But again,

that may or may not be a way to go. And I just want to go back to the beginning where I said

no one is saying we can't do anything until that is done, but it may be that that is actually

a way of solving the overarching policy issue from the point of view of who gets what name.
 And those of us who are talking about it, of course, are talking about it being ISO, because

we don't know of anybody else that could do it.
 But if you don't have a mandated list, then you run into the next question, which is who

selects the string in the absence of that list. Is it the government of the ccTLD? And if

it is the government of the ccTLD, does it have to be an act of parliament or is it a

minister? And it is a minister, which minister is it? And how do you know that this is

actually an application for a particular string that is authoritative from that government as

opposed to just being from the cousin of the Minister's wife.
 Again, because we have never had to do this, there is no policy in place. You guys have it

easy because you just have to apply. You form an organization, you decide you want to have

dot squiggle, and away you go. It's slightly more complicated for us.
 What happens if there are competing requests from within a country? What's the role of the

existing ccTLD manager?
 Now, most, if not all, ccTLDs would accept that from an international policy point of view,

you simply cannot have a policy that says a new IDN ccTLD must be managed by the existing

ccTLD manager. Most ccTLD managers would accept that if they really want do that, it's their

job to go lobby in their own country to be the manager of that ccTLD. But from an

international policy point of view, it's completely ridiculous to say "and it must be run by

the existing ccTLD manager."
 It's perfectly logical, for example, that a language spoken in a particular region of India,

that the government of India and the people of that region would be desirous of having a

registry the ccTLD manager in that particular region. Not least because that's where they

speak the language and it may not be spoken anywhere else.
 But that, of course, has effects on us as a ccNSO, and ICANN with the ccNSO as part of its

constituency.
 So India suddenly has 22 ccTLD managers, so that's 22 memberships of the ccNSO, is it? 22

votes. That's obviously not going to work. So how do you deal with that? And how do you

decide which one or two of your ccTLD managers is actually going to be represented on the

ccNSO? Which of course begs the question who are the appropriate actors anyway? Do you have

to have the involvement of an existing ccTLD manager?
 And there's, of course, another -- there's another issue which some ccTLDs are particularly

concerned about, and that is what is to prevent the government of a country applying for an

IDN ccTLD, getting that IDN ccTLD, managing it, and basically moving all traffic,

effectively, from the existing ccTLD and then ending up having the ASCII ccTLD taken out? Is

that something that we're happy with? Never mind just as a simple ccTLD manager but from a

global policy point of view, are we happy to have the possible circumstance where you've got

ccTLD -- some ccTLDs with no ASCII representation with their ccTLD retired?
 The delegation of an IDN ccTLD is also challenging. As I've said, it's almost the same as

the redelegation issue in the sense that delegating an IDN ccTLD could purchase fit into the

same difficulties that a redelegation has: Consent of existing ccTLD managers, how much

government involvement, any government involvement, what sort of a contract, what sort of

accountability framework, and so on.
 And finally, is the operation and management of an IDN ccTLD different from that of an

existing ASCII ccTLD? In that does it require any specific global technical requirements in

addition to the current ones that ccTLDs run under. And if that's the case, then how are

those requirements going to be developed?
 So that's a sort of overview of the big questions for us. And there are some answers out

there in the sense that most ccTLDs, I think, for example, accept that government involvement

is going to be required. But of course then when you get down to questions of the level of

government involvement, it starts to get a bit more complicated.
 So just to summarize where we are now, if we manage to sign off on this particular document

here in San Juan, and that means both us and the GAC doing so, we will then send that up to

the board. And it's then a matter for the board to decide what the next steps are.
 And I see those next steps as splitting into two. One, the next step to answer these

questions, and it may be that the answer to that is we launch some sort of policy development

process within the ccNSO with, you know, some sort of formal government, GAC involvement, and

obviously involvement from the other communities as well. So that's one side of it.
 And the other side of it is, okay, given that you are going to be doing that and that's

probably going to take some time, what, if anything, can we do in the interim, which is what

I suspect that you guys are probably the most interested in.
 So I'll happily take questions and happily answer and discuss any points that you would like

to raise.
 >>AVRI DORIA: Okay. I'll start by taking a queue. So I've got Chuck. Anyone else? I've

got Philip.
 Okay. Let's start there and then I will keep adding people.
 Okay. Chuck.
 >>CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, Chris, for sharing that. Much appreciated.
 I noticed at least in the questions you shared with us that the -- they were all purchase

focused on existing ccTLD registries, governments, and so forth. Has that working group also

considered questions with regard to user experience? Because it seems to me that that's --

There certainly is some similarity in some of the issues you are dealing with and that we

also have to deal with, but with regard to user experience, I think we're probably close to

being on the same page with regard to IDNs and IDN TLDs.
 Questions like what about user confusion, depending on how all of this rolls out? What

about dispute resolution processes when you have multiple -- possibly multiple registries of

various versions of ccTLDs or country names that are operated by different registries and so

forth?
 And then you also have the issue of existing IDN registrants at the second level, a problem

that you have, just like we have. There are probably, between us, CCs NGs at least two

million IDN registrations right now. Now, the majority of those people really wanted a full

IDN experience to start with. What happens to them? And so forth.
 Has the group considered those kind of questions as well?
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: In the main, no, because in the main, they sit -- the answers to those

questions sit in the ccTLD themselves. In most cases, they are not what I call global

questions.

So to take your example of existing second-level IDN registrants, those existing IDN

registrants sit behind a number of different ccTLDs. And it's a matter for each of those

ccTLDs to decide what policy they think they should put in place in respect to those.
 In the case of competing registries, effectively the same thing would apply. So to take an

example, if we were to -- if we were to have an IDN ccTLD in Australia in any particular

script, then what -- our current system would deal with that in that there is a system in

place to allow for more than one registry at the second level. And so, therefore, we would,

presumably, map that system across to deal with more than one registry in Australia, if there

was, at the top level.
 So I would categorize most of those questions for us as being individual ccTLD questions

rather than global policy questions. That's not to say they are not incredibly important.

It's just that they are not the sorts of things that at a global level we need to be

concerning ourselves with.
 >>WERNER STAUB: I think the list of questions that we have is extremely detailed, probably.

 Addresses so many answers that I'm a little bit afraid -- impossible to understand, I am a

little bit afraid we might get lost along the way.
 So I think the best thing to look at in the meantime is what to do in the meantime. That

was the last question asked by Chris. And I actually believe that very much what we are

going to do in the meantime, if we're smart, is not going to be such about solution for the

long term. And in this context, the practical things, sometimes they have unexpected

resources within.
 So if you look at the question whether there should be somebody else rather than the

existing TLD manager running an IDN TLD, well, of course you can have the arguments why this

should be the case. But if you look at the problems that it causes, then it's probably

better to say let's just start by restricting it to them. They can apply for the ccTLD,

ICANN goes back to the government, the government says yes, off we go. That's one simple

solution to go.
 If they then have to give it to someone who is specifically in charge of the script, that's

under their responsibility, and within the country they will be able to do that.
 If, however, we try to resolve this process outside of the country, we actually punish

everyone with unacceptable delays, and the Arabs who really need theirs, the Indians who

really need theirs, they have to wait forever. This is not something we can do.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: And I agree. I hope I made it clear that there is a general feeling that

there needs to be some sort of intermediary measure.
 Now speaking entirely personally, because the ccNSO hasn't yet got to a discussion of the

sorts of things an interim measure would look like, and we're hoping to do that on Tuesday, I

can see an argument for saying in the interim, one CC -- one IDN ccTLD to a country or to a

territory, managed by the existing manager, with government agreement. There would need to

be some sort of -- There would need to be some sort of agreement to deal with any issues that

arise once that ccTLD is operational. If it's causing problems then there would need to be

some sort of agreement even perhaps to take it back out again, if necessary.
 But from a pragmatic point of view, as you have said, that will certainly solve a number of

the timing issues for a number of countries. And we could then concentrate on dealing with

the high-level policy issues.

However, having said that, it will be unfair of me not to say that there are some countries

that would find that problematic, because the choice of one makes -- is very difficult for

them. And I mean the totally pragmatic answer to that is tough. If you can't choose one,

don't have any.

But it would certainly solve a substantial number of the issues if we looked at it that way.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: Thanks, Chris. Philip Sheppard with the council.

First I'd like to thank you for giving us all in gTLD policy matters an enormous morale

boost in that our problems suddenly seem so small in comparison

[Laughter]

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: I share your concern with ISO processes, having had experience with

those, and the time scales you mentioned there. And I think for me the biggest political

question here is we are about to dive into our new TLD process with IDNs.

The more interesting names, the dot Emirates, the dot Saudis, et cetera, are going to be

registered by other people before your process is complete. And I think the interesting

question, therefore, is what is the nature of the reaction and the kick-back going to be from

those who believe those are their names.

In particular, those who are the less vigilant, and who will not be diving into our small

little window and our process at the moment that may allow them to object to such things.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely. Extremely, extremely good point.

Let's look at it in an ideal world, then what would happen is this. You guys would burst

forth with IDN gTLDs and applications would be made. And one assumes that there would be

some sort of process under which the citizens slash government of Saudi Arabia would lodge a

fierce objection to the registration of Saudi, for example, or Emirate or Australia or

whatever it may be.

Now, the problem with that is -- And that would be fine, because one assumes that that

process would say, well, don't be ridiculous, of course it's the name of a country and quite

clearly it shouldn't be registered as a gTLD.

But the challenge is, as you pointed out, that's fine for those of us who are aware of

what's going on, first off, and it's also fine for those of us who actually have the

resources to find someone who speaks the language that the script -- that uses that script

and check through and see whether there is a possibility that the applications that have been

made in that script might in some way be infringing on sovereign rights, if, indeed, such a

thing exists.

But that's going to be fairly challenging for the Pacific Islands, for example. Every time

a new script is released, someone in Samoa, for example, is going to have to toil through and

find out what Samoa is in Korean and how the hell... you know.

The problem is for this in the longer term -- and you are basically commercial animals so

you know this, you can be -- ICANN can advertise in every newspaper in the world and CNN and

BBC World and all of that stuff and you guys can have your IDN gTLD because no one has

objected and be happily carrying on for five years, and then someone wakes up and says, "Hold

on a minute. That's actually the name of my country." And it doesn't matter that it's been

advertised in every newspaper in the world. It doesn't matter that you have been running it

for five years. You are going to end up in a fight. And that fight may go one way or the

other but it's certainly not a given that you are going to win simply because you have given

notice.
So there does need to be some sort of mechanism in place.
Now, your reserved name stuff is kind of workable from that point of view. It's just a case

of making sure that it's out there.
The beauty about a mandated list -- and again -- I keep talking about a mandated list. Is

IANA actually in favor of them, and I sort of waiver from day to day. Sometimes I am,

sometimes I am not.
The beauty of a mandated list is it does actually solve that problem to a degree because you

are given a representation and that's it. Ans anything else is up for grabs. But as we all

know, that's a massive timing issue.
>>AVRI DORIA: I have Jon next. Jon.
>>JON BING: No.
>>AVRI DORIA: Occur, you didn't have your hand up. Sorry.
Then I had Mawaki.
>>MAWAKI CHANGO: Thank you.
I agree that we have a lot of questions, actually, to address. And I'm not sure whether we

really need to address all of them before we start with IDN.
For example, when you asked the question that there's a possibility that the IDN ccTLD will

kind of take over from the ASCII ccTLD, I'm not sure we need to address that and for what

purpose will we need to address that. Because, you know, the country code list has been

there before the Internet. And if the public, the interested public decides not to use it,

for some reason everybody is using the IDN, then that's fine. I don't see any huge problem

out of that, policy program or whatever.
At the beginning you talked -- you asked the question who will own the IDN ccTLD. I was not

sure whether you were referring to the country code managers or to the countries.
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: To the countries.
>>MAWAKI CHANGO: To the countries. It doesn't mean that in -- in the possibilities that

you contemplate, there is a possibility that another country will own the ccTLD for another

country, of another country in.
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. It was more a question of are we -- is our starting point going to

be that you can only have an IDN ccTLD -- there can only be an IDN ccTLD issued to a

territory that is on the current ISO 3166 list? Now, I am not suggesting that that should be

any different from that. I am saying there's no policy, it doesn't exist at the moment. So

there needs to be a statement if that's the way it's going to be, that in respect to IDN

ccTLDs, the starting point is the ISO 3166 list, or not. But at the moment there's nothing

written down anywhere, because there is no policy for IDN ccTLDs. There is only some kind of

practice in respect to existing ASCII ccTLDs.
So that was the point that I was making.
>>MAWAKI CHANGO: Okay. And about the representation of -- from the different scripts, IDN

script, on the ccNSO, is it possible to think of a situation where the IDN ccTLDs, the

existing ones, will organize in order to delegate one representative to the --
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure. But that assumes you made a policy decision that there is only one

representative at the ccNSO per territory. And again, that's fine, but it hasn't actually

been written down anywhere yet, because we have never had a reason to. Because currently,

there is only one. And so, therefore, there is only one.
>>MAWAKI CHANGO: Okay. Last point. I would like also to raise the attention to the fact

that we may also consider a policy where, instead of -- I mean, this is to resolve the

problem of official language, for example, where we will have a bottom-up process, leaving up

to people to apply for a string, for example, and go through an objection process and

consent, of course, with the interested country and then make a decision.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.
 >>MAWAKI CHANGO: Okay. Thanks.
 >>ALAN GREENBERG: This was sort of alluded to in Philip's question or the questions

following it. We seem to be moving towards two classes of countries, those who use ASCII

script natively and those who don't.
 If Canada decides they want dot canada, do they apply for a gTLD dot Canada or do they go

through the new ccTLD process for dot Canada?
 And we have, perhaps, conflicting policies where the same string --
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's exactly right. If you answer the question "how many IDN ccTLDs

per script" any other way than one, so if you say, actually, you can have two, the next

question is in that case, "why can't I have two in ASCII?"
 So again --
 >>ALAN GREENBERG: Why can't my citizens use my name like Saudi Arabia can?
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Correct. So if you answer the question it's only one per script, then

that question doesn't arise, because if it's only one, then it's only one in ASCII, it's only

one in Korean, you could argue.
 But if you answer it two, then you have to go back and ask the question again in ASCII.
 I take your point, though. Why should you be able to identify Saudi Arabia as Saudi in

Arabic and as dot SA, which is completely meaningless, in ASCII? And that's a perfectly

valid question.
 >>ALAN GREENBERG: I think the one per script should sort of be one per -- if you end up

with that rule, would be one per name. To say the two-character abbreviation that's been

imposed on them is a version of their name I think puts ASCII people at a great disadvantage.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I accept that.
 >>AVRI DORIA: Mike Palage.
 >>MICHAEL PALAGE: I'll pass.
 >>AVRI DORIA: Cary.
 >>CARY KARP: I don't waiver about conviction that a proscriptive list is simply a

nonstarter. It would work if it were created by governmental voices in a context with the

formality of the ISO, alas, not the GAC, and that's going to take more time than we have.
 If we try to do an end run around that process and try to have some ad hoc mechanism for

creating the list anyway, one of two things is going to happen. Some government is going to

say, "We never authorized this," they are going to request that the process be delayed until

this is considered, or they are simply going to say you take your list and do whatever you

want with it, we are applying for the following label and there is a process for us doing

that. Too bad we couldn't do it in the CC context.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yep.
 >>AVRI DORIA: Next I had Marilyn.
 >>MARILYN CADE: Because I think I'm mostly just agreeing with everyone else's comments here

as well as yours, but I wanted to ask a couple of questions.
 I actually wanted to say something about a term Philip used earlier which I want to just say

I don't think actually vigilance -- vigilance is one issue, but given the lack of awareness

of many of the potentially affected parties of this process, it's actually not even

vigilance; right? And I will use two examples.
 There are -- If we were to try to come up with some categories -- and let's say that we

decided that the U.N. recognized economies regardless of their size, might be a category that

you could look at.

I'm not sure that that's the relevant -- I haven't looked at that to know that that's a

relevant and broad enough list. But, for example, just in my limited experience, I know of

two -- hmm -- cultures, the Maori and the Navajo nation of which whether they are on the U.N.

economy list or not have much more than a culture and would believe that they would probably

fit into this. And they, of course, are well-known, well recognized and numerous, let alone

the many others subcategories or categories that we could identify.
 So rather than that a list that is trying to list every example of the Maori, the Navajo,

the this, the that, did you guys also talk about other kinds of categories? So not asking

the U.N. to come up with or some other treaty organization to come up with the list but

trying to do what essentially John did and that is pick a few examples of existing

categories?
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. It would be fair to say that most of our discussion was based on the

premise that -- as a starting point that what's currently captured in the ISO 3166 from the

point of view of territories, not their abbreviations, what is currently captured in that

list is what we are actually talking about.
 To take your example with the Navajo, then the way that that would work is if the U.S.

decided by whatever methods, they were lobbied, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, decided that

that language -- that that script was spoken, like India where there is 22, this is a ccTLD

and it is really important that there is still -- there are still distinctions. And the

ccTLD is representing the territory and that territory is on that list.
 So, Marilyn, it wouldn't be a representation of Navajo. It would be a representation of

U.S. in Navajo in the context of a ccTLD. What you do in a gTLD is a completely different

issue.
 >>MARILYN CADE: I was making reference -- that's why I am getting way over in my depth.

The Navajo tribe has a treaty agreement of some kind with the -- so I was just using them

because they have somewhat of a special standing as, I think, the Maori do as well within New

Zealand.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, they do.
 >>AVRI DORIA Paul.
 >>PAUL TWOMEY If I could just make two observations. The first one, I would like to say

how pleased I am seeing this dialogue going on, and I have been thinking about in the context

we have go all sorts of reviews, GNSO reviews and all sorts of reviews underway as mandated

by the bylaws.
 One of the things I am pleased is with our pragmatic learning as to how to work across the

constituencies on common issues. This is a dialogue. If I look in the bylaws, there is no

space in the bylaws for this dialogue but I am glad we're having it anyway. That's the first

thing I wanted to say. I think this is a very healthy, and thank you to those of you who

have organized it, dialogue to have. It is what we need to have because a number of these

issues we are facing going forward as a community are really a cross-structural format.

That's my first comment.
 My second one, perhaps, just to the last conversation we have just been having is, I think,

two parts. I personally think it will be an exceptionally dangerous space for ICANN to move

-- if we move into anything that looks like any determination of what equals a territory, I

think we will then unleash the hounds of hell in political terms.
 So I think the 3166 Part 1 was something, even if it is not a policy, is really something we

should anchor on.
 To come to the sort of questions that Marilyn was raising, which are very good questions,

the one aspect of the way the maintenance agency works, of course, is that it had an

interregnum. It takes its advice from the U.N. Statistical Bureau. So to come to your point

of a government function of saying what is a territory, there is the 3166 maintenance agency

uses the U.N. Statistical Bureau.
 Having said that, I think we should be very, very careful to not to use anything, particular

towards the U.N because if you look at the maintenance agency, it keeps a list of territories

that are not the same thing as U.N. member states and we should be very careful about that.
 And I think some of the other issues that were raised about aspirations of subnational

groups or groups that think they have a national basis, I think we've -- I think you have

been doing very good work in the GNSO context of trying to think through how that might be

handled. There might be space in the gTLD space for that, but I think you have also been

thinking very carefully about objection mechanisms which might also -- I mean, I have found

myself in conversations with ministers in Europe where minister from Country A says, it is

absolutely impossible that anybody would think that Group B could possibly be given a gTLD.
 And then they said, the British wouldn't put up with it. And I've said, Well, if you look

at Blair's government's policy, they have actually involved Wales and Scotland and who knows

where that's going.
 It is not a tall, clear country by country where people sit on such issues. I think the

objection option that you have been thinking through in the GNSO space, I think it is a

useful one.
 But I think that's a very distinct issue from what is personally considered to be a

territory, and I think we should think about that 3166 list.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely. Maybe I can use this -- You mentioned the U.K. Maybe

that's the better example to answer Marilyn's question. No one is suggesting that Wales

could apply for in Welsh dot CY or comery (phonetic) as a ccTLD because it's not on the list.

 So if you stick with the list, as Paul has said, then it doesn't become an issue. If they

want to apply for the dot comery (phonetic), then that's a gTLD.
 But what we are saying is that it would be entirely possible for the U.K. to apply for

whatever U.K. is in Welsh if they wanted to. In fact, that doesn't work because Welsh is not

a different script. But leaving that aside, if it was a different script, then it would

work.
 >>AVRI DORIA: Anyone else want to comment or ask a question? Marilyn.
 >>MARILYN CADE: I don't really want to ask a question, I just want to make a comment just

to remind all of us again about that comment I made about vigilance for either on the ccTLD

side or on the gTLD side. I know that ICANN is committed to very broad outreach and notice

and awareness and all those kinds of things, but it really does -- this conversation really

does just reinforce to me, Chris, that part of our work as an organization is going to be

just as important as actually the decisions that are made so that we make sure everybody is

aware decisions are being made.
 >>AVRI DORIA: Yes, Mike.

>>MICHAEL PALAGE: Just to follow up on the vigilance issue here, this is one of the things as the chair of the subgroup working on the geographic reserved names list, we actually account for that, although we talked about publications, we actually required, if you will, TLD applicants for ICANN to explain to them what the obstacles were likely going to be. We talked about in that recommendation how the GAC would potentially be able to oppose not only that, but we said even after the formal process, and I think it is important, potential applicants should also be advised that the failure of the GAC or an individual GAC member to file a challenge during the TLD application process does not constitute a waiver of the authority of the GAC vested to the GAC under the ICANN bylaws. As I think everyone is aware of in connection with the actions taken in connection with a certain TLD in Lisbon, the GAC is, I think, not going to be asleep at the wheel.

So I think in making those recommendations, you know, although there may can some holes in publications and newspapers and stuff like that, we have been very thoughtful in, if you will, providing many mechanisms so that if there is a problematic TLD hopefully the applicants coming forward will look at the guantlet that has been provided for them by the work of this reserved name group to understand what they are doing and the potential for something to slip through. I just don't see that happening. So again Philip raised the issue of how some applicant could come forward with dot Saudi and try to sort of get that in.

I just don't see that happening from a market perspective based upon these guidelines that have been set forth.

>>AVRI DORIA: A couple more comments. I guess, Mike Rodenbaugh.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: It is a process question about next steps. There is a lot of really very interesting questions that you raise, many of which I have never thought of before. So I am wondering if you are going to provide those to the broader community or what is the next steps?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: The paper is actually, I think, released. It is on our -- on the ccNSO.ICANN.org. It is called draft issues paper version 2, selection of IDN ccTLDs. And that has the list of the questions together with the original draft paper and the comments that were made on that by governments and CCs.

>>AVRI DORIA: And I'm hoping that this is only the first of various discussions where we come together and discuss these issues.

It's now time for this particular session to end. I want to thank you, Chris, for coming and talking. I want to thank everybody that brought up questions. And it's now our lunch break. There's a working council and working group lunch in this room. Now, our schedule says we reconvene at 1:30. Let's reconvene by 2:00. Actually starting in the room -- because people have to leave and come back for lunch. So those that aren't, stay here for lunch. And what we will reconvene with is the -- basically staff discussing their note on implementation issues. Then we will go on from that to general discussions. Thank you.

>>DENISE MICHEL: If I can make a quick announcement, for GNSO council members and other constituency leaders that are interested, the board governance committee GNSO review working group would like to invite you all for cocktails and an informal discussion this evening

starting at 6:45 in Salon Delmar, which is on the second floor here in this hotel. Glen will

be passing out paper copies of the summary and working draft that was posted earlier this

week and she will also e-mail you details of those cocktails and discussions this evening.
 >>AVRI DORIA: We have all kinds of parties to go to tonight. Lots of drinking. Thanks

to everybody.
 (Lunch break)