JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 22 January 2013 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 22 January 2013 at 1200 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jig-20130122-en.mp3
On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#jan
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:
Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)
Chris Dillon
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Mirjana Tasic

ICANN Staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Jonathan Shea

Coordinator: Okay the call is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Sam). Good morning, good afternoon, good

                       evening. This is the JIG call on the 22nd of January 2013.

                       On the call today we have Fahd Betanyeh, Mirjana Tasic, Avri Doria, Chris

                       Dillon, and Edmon Chung. We have an apology from Rafik Dammak.

                       And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all do please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Nathalie and thank you everyone for joining the call.

I just want to start by apologizing last - for the call last month. I was in transit to the - well actually leaving the LA new gTLD privatization call so I apologize for that.

So in any case I - we're looking to get the discussion going back on track I guess. The - I sent around a very brief agenda just there were three items on to for discussion.

I wanted to just to update everyone and maybe have a little bit of discussion on the IDN variant project that is ongoing, the IDN variant TLD project I should say.

And then to cover a little bit the and to work out a finalization of the final report, I mean the draft of final report on the universal acceptance which we hope to present to the community before the Beijing meeting in April and to try to have a open session there to get more input on the subject.

So that's the (unintelligible). Any additions, thoughts? If not I'll jump right in. The IDN variant TLD project I guess most of you probably followed and seen the publishing of the report from project 2.1 I think it's called.

And that's the Label Generation Rule set and also another published - publishing of the User Experience Report which is a draft final report which just came out a few days ago.

So I don't know whether actually if we've got whether there's any one from staff who knows a little bit more about this that they can share their any update.

Bart Boswinkel: All right.

Edmon Chung: Just Nathalie you and Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes and so I have no clue.

Edmon Chung: Okay. No problem.

And I guess in terms of that I guess I can give us a quick update. And then I - there is one particular thing that I wanted to talk about.

So both reports - both working teams have been progressing steadily I guess. And there have been community input and questions in Toronto and in LA previously and some conference calls were done.

And then there were - a couple of drafts reports came out. On I think for the project 2.1 which is the Label Generation Rules set the general framework is to have two - a two panel (setup).

That would be a linguistic panel would be created and then to look at some different language and scripts.

And then it's going to go into the secondary panel that determines whether there are any security or other effects of issues so that it could integrate because it's called the integration panel to put into use at the root level.

And then the Project 6 which is user experience project identified as quite a number of different challenges and issues with the - with variants.

In fact that I think there are some of them we might want to take a look and see if we would include in the discussion of universal acceptance.

Because it seems like there is some, if we are going to see IDN variance at the TLD which is at - that's where our direction is pointing, that all the discussions are pointing then there would be some - that would be potential universal acceptance issues that and maybe should be included.

I'm not saying extensive conclusions into what we're doing but at least we should point to those reports that are out there.

So that's the quick update. But I guess I'd like to see if anyone would want to add to it. But I think there is one particular issue that I wanted to raise and see if this group would be - in fact I would recommend this group to take a look at and report to our councils.

And that is for both the project team reports from the variant issues, variant projects it has been identified fairly clearly that there are processes and procedures that needs to be in place beyond what is being considered with the within the variant TLD teams right now. And those may be policy considerations that the respective SOs will need to deal with.

So I think as a group I'd like to ask that we take a look at that and report back to our respective councils and highlight it to them.

Because I, you know, I guess this is part of - this would be somewhat part of our job to try to bring to the councils the respective councils' attention that this just may need more input from the two SOs, the ccNSO and the GNSO as the work on the IDN variant TLD continues.

So I don't know whether I'm making sense so I just want to see if anyone has any questions about the reports that have been out whether we wanted to

respond to them in any particular form but also more importantly to raise to highlight it and bring it back to the respective councils. So...

Chris Dillon: Edmon this is Chris Dillon. And I have a comment and a question for you. It's just quite basic stuff but I know there was a draft of the Project 2.1 report just before Christmas.

Now what is the latest draft of the Project 6 Report because I haven't seen a new draft for some time and I'm wondering if I have missed a draft of that report? Does anybody know when that report came?

Edmon Chung: I saw one that came out on the 18th January.

Chris Dillon: Oh dear. Okay.

Edmon Chung: So a few days ago.

Chris Dillon: Yes. I haven't read that.

Edmon Chung: I actually just came across it and I saw it come up but I haven't read it in detail in either myself. And it's not in a redlined version so I don't know, I can't quickly identify what is been changed.

Chris Dillon: Okay. But thank you for alerting me to the existence of it so I can (unintelligible) looking for it.

Edmon Chung: It's right on the front page of ICANN. I think it was just...

Chris Dillon: Right yes okay. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: So I think it describes some of the challenges. And what is important to note is that it also highlights that there is a balance to relate between security in

the pure technical sense and the linguistic requirements I guess or the need for desires of the linguistic community.

And that that's where I guess the policy part comes into play. And similarly the Project 2.1 team also recognize that there are - there comes a point where it is - let me try to phrase it well.

And there comes a point where a variant is "safe" to be included in the root in terms of technical security. But whether it should be and how it should be becomes a policy issue.

And that would fall into the realm of the - that may fall into the realm of policy implementation done by staff or requires some input from the two supporting organizations from ccNSO and GNSO.

So therein lies where I think we might want to highlight that development to the two councils for that either to ask them to have us look, to take a deeper look or that they respectively should take a deeper look at what those issues or what scope that might be.

Anyone else? I guess Bart or Avri whether you have any thoughts on what I highlighted or thought or (Mariana)? No one?

If so I guess I can probably provide a little bit more into the main list but since I do have Bart and Avri on this call I wonder if you have any immediate thoughts on that particular part.

Because I guess, you know, going to Bart first I understand that the PC -PDP is somewhat wrapping up part of the work as well.

Is it worthwhile to, you know, raise it there and for that team to take a deeper look into this area or, you know, how do you see that?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. So you're right about the PDP there it's wrapping up. So what will happen over the next week or two is that the interim report will be published. And that's a combination of the two, the final report of the working groups.

So this...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...allows for some smaller tweaks I would say. So if you think it's worth to submit anything then and raise it say it will go back again.

But say with regard to the variant stuff et cetera, it's that will be revisited anyway at a later stage. So that...

Edmon Chung: Right. I think it's more of the latter which is I'm not suggesting we make any changes to the current document.

I'm suggesting more so that the later discussions might want to start sooner because it is at least I'd like doing that to maybe the review for the council's attention is that as the variant team is working on the - some of the things it may be valuable for the council or the working group to consider some of the policy or implementation impacts that would come down the road and get a sense of what the group might need to do later on.

Bart Boswinkel: In that sense say Edmon you're part of the working group anyway. And so the working group is still alive said the IDN working group or the IDN PDP working group one. So that's a point to raise it.

It will - if you look at the ccNSO counsel it might be brought to their attention and but they are waiting recommendations of the IDN working group.

So what will happen so you understand what will happen, in a way to counsel the ccNSO counsel is very passive. It's not...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...and so they will not give any guidance or direction to the working group say until the stage that it needs to be revisited and there is an indication that the work on the variant could be started because otherwise say it's getting close.

And maybe to give you a sense of timing the - say the interim report will be - as I said, will be published in one or two weeks.

It will be a relatively short public comment period because we have to go through the process because say both parts have been passed over an extensive public scrutiny et cetera.

And then it will end up in a final report. And hopefully by Beijing the council will - the ccNSO council will vote upon it.

And then post Beijing, so between Beijing and Durban the ccNSO membership will vote on it. So by Durban it should be completed. But so this is more a procedural stage than anything else. And...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...so I think the best way to do it is to alert the IDN working group one -- and you're part of it -- and say and maybe have a discussion there what is the best timing to start and say work on the variant issue. Because everybody knows it needs to be addressed at some stage.

Edmon Chung: Right. So that's a clearer path in terms of the ccNSO because the IDN working group is sort of alive and (then) and expecting a little bit more work on the IDN variant issue.

The situation on the GNSO is a little bit different. The IDN working group long time ago has wrapped up it's work and there is I don't think besides this particular group there is no active discussion about IDN in the GNSO.

So I'm curious whether - and Avri you're on the call, whether you have any thoughts or suggestions that can - because just to recap a little bit again the two reports are pointing to that there are certain policy decisions to be made.

You know, once a variant TLD is cleared for technically and security-wise to be - it is possible to put in the root there is still a policy decision from implementation to decide whether or how or with what other processes need to be in place to actually put it in.

So how we go about doing that is sort of a question here. And perhaps, you know, whether this group can make any - can highlight this to the council or somehow. I don't know Avri if you're still on the call...

Avri Doria: Yes I'm still here.

Edmon Chung: ...or - so I wondered if you had any thoughts from that?

Avri Doria: Other than going through I mean it seems like once all is said and done yes, this group needs to report it to the council.

The only way council has a - it would have to kick off a new PDP to do any new policy work on the gTLDs.

Now I don't think any of this - or actually it's almost a question because I haven't paid attention that any of the new IDN gTLD applicants I mean the applications for new IDN gTLDs do they have this as an issue?

If they do then it probably has a high level and somebody should be telling the council quite soon that a policy is needed.

Now I don't think it's the case. And therefore there's is no hurry if it isn't the case for any of the current applicants and that when all the dust has settled on these discussions yes someone will have to ask for a issues report that basically gathers these other things together by reference or by however and then gives the council its ability to say yes we need to start a PDP that does ABC and D.

But since I don't think it's an issue at the moment for the new batch unless somebody, you know, knows for a fact that it is an issue for one of the applicants I don't see doing anything at the moment other than reporting.

Edmon Chung: So - right. Thank you Avri and I could say for some certainty that it is an issue for many of the applicants and especially those for Chinese and I believe some for Arabic and some of the language (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And we'd use (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: We - right. And so what we are looking at is a couple things. We're looking at the report from the IDN variant team.

It seems to be saying that in terms of the Label Generation Rules set it would simply provide ICANN with an indication of whether a resulting string - whether a applied for string and a resulting IDN variant string are both safe to put into the root.

What it will not say is whether it should be or must be or how weather, you know, because there are other parts where, you know, you might need

additional evaluation, you might need additional fees. Those issues are considered outside of the scope of the IDN variant working team.

But without those, you know, you basically and up with saying okay yes this variance you can put it in but there is no process to allow them to be put in.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. Yes I'm not...

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...I understood that. If indeed this is going to be a problem for any of those new gTLD applicants I'm surprised that they're not coming through, you know, the NTAG and the other subgroups of registries saying hey we've got a problem here how are we going to do this?

But this group should certainly than report to the council that - alert them to there is this problem.

I don't think we have any council members on this group at the moment. I mean, you know, you or I certainly can talk to the council and get put on their agenda if, you know, we feel it's necessary.

But they have to initiate, someone has to initiate and issues report to get a PDP started in the GNSO. You know, and...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Avri Doria: ...this group can't initiate an issues report but can...

Edmon Chung: No.

Avri Doria: ...certainly suggest it to the council. And while the ccNSO could initiate one that doesn't make sense. So the only...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Avri Doria: ...way it would happen is if the registries asked for it or if this group
                 recommended it.

Edmon Chung: Right, okay. Thank you. Thank you Avri. And that's I guess in terms of the
                 answer to your question while they have been jumping up and down on other
                 lists just not on the NTAG and...

Avri Doria: Or registries.

Edmon Chung: ...registry lists.

Avri Doria: Right.

Edmon Chung: And it is coming very, very soon and actually. And we've brought up as I've
                 been wearing different hats I've been tasked to do that.

Avri Doria: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: So it will be - it will be coming. But I think, you know, of this particular group
                 so I guess I get a sense that it is probably appropriate for this group to try to
                 draft something and bring this issue to the attention of at least the GNSO.

                 And on the ccNSO side we might actually be bringing the attentions directly
                 to the IDN working group that is still alive. Is that - I guess that makes sense
                 right?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. It seems like it would make sense. In fact it's probably the same
                 report with a different last line, you know?

Edmon Chung: Yes, yes.

Avri Doria: I exaggerate a little but yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay so in that case I guess I will - I'll draft that and send it to the list. And we can see if we can as a group be comfortable with that and send it over as the JIG. So that's - that I think is the - that particular agenda item.

Any other thoughts on IDN variant (unintelligible) and the work from the project team?

If not I guess I'll move on to the next item which is working on finalizing the batch final report that we hope to put it out I guess before the Beijing meeting.

And that means the Beijing meeting is April 7 to 11 I think. And so if we want to put it out and keep the public comments alive during that time so that we can have a session on it I guess we should put it out in March.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Is that the - that would...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: (Unintelligible) timeline yes.

Edmon Chung: Right. So I was looking back at the notes that we had and I think we've pretty much covered the sort of four recommendations.

I'll quickly repeat them. Number one is to recommend that IDN TLD's operators themselves be supporting universal acceptance in their own systems and we're sort of pointing to the IDN sidelines to remedy that.

Number two is for us to recommend to ICANN to set aside specific budget for this work.

Number three, the third one is to recommend that checklists and guidance for new IDN TLDs including gTLDs and ccTLDs, you know, things like what they should be aware of as they launch their new IDN TLDs to create that kind of checklist from ICANN and enforce a more general recommendation that staff continues the work and provide some suggestions on the - some of the things that could be worked on.

So there was a discussion whether number two and number four would be combined together as they are, you know, without the budget there wouldn't be, you know, (allocation) staff right?

I thought about it a little bit more but I think I still want it to be two different things.

Because the allocating budget it might be the case that, you know, our suggestions are not (coming up) before ICANN comes up with additional suggestions and they would, you know, modify more of (these) and (unintelligible). And they're really two different processes in these - in the whole ICANN process.

So I thought we would - it attaches to different parts of ICANN I think I guess. So I think we - I'd like to keep it being those four recommendations.

And we have pretty much gone through each one of them and have broad strokes. What is left for me to do is to compile those notes into a - an actual draft. Because right now it's a number of notes and here in there and it's not fully formed at this point.

But on those four items I don't know if there are any thoughts on whether there are any additions or any concerns with just going forward with that.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: I'll take the best way forward is probably if you and I and (John) could say go over it and send it to the list again and discuss it at full length at the next call because I think...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...most of us have forgotten all about it.

Edmon Chung: Right, understand. And that works well with the timeline as well because we've been doing a monthly call at this point. By the time February call comes along I think we'll use this month to I guess Bart you myself and (Jane) will work on a full draft once - and then send it to the list and then we can work through it in our next meeting...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...which would give us another month to - into March.

And for the March meeting we should finalize it and put it out for public comments so it will be a live doc published in live documents come Beijing.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Chris Dillon: Hello Edmon. This it's...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes?

Chris Dillon: ...Chris Dillon. There's just one thing I would like to highlight and it's actually in the summary of recommendations under B. And it's the use of the word toolkits there.

And I think be quite interesting to know what kind of toolkits whether people are talking about libraries of bits of code or tables or exactly what that word means. I feel as if it needs expanding about.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Good point. That is taken directly from the - I think it's called a toolkit. I - because the previous work that the universal acceptance team from ICANN has produced is a - is a programmatic so it's an algorithmic toolkit. It's a piece of software and a piece of code to be used.

And that's what I'm calling a toolkit. I guess I can make sure that that's the wording that is correct that is used by the ICANN team and probably put a link in the description so that it points to that, what we're trying to say because that's - that is already in place. It's there.

There is a piece of code where you can check for the TLD listing stuff. And that's the toolkit that I'm - sorry so...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: I mean the reason I'm (slacking) that up is obviously there are a budgetary implications of that. And generally speaking with budgets often it tends to be good to be quite specific.

You know, we want money to do this, that and the other because a lot of budget committees will give, you know, they'll get money for one thing but perhaps not for other things. So generally speaking the more detail you give the more chance you have of at least getting part of it from it.

Edmon Chung: Right and thank you for the input. And one other - the suggestions that we discussed earlier is there is in the financial, in the strategic plan which is being used for the budget process, there is a particular item or a set of items that is called competition consumer trust and consumer choice.

And that I think is the area where we suggested that there should be an item under that to consider universal acceptance as part of the program for considering consumer trust and to the DNS.

Chris Dillon: Yes but it's more actually within that, you know, within that possible budget for universal acceptance, you know, exactly, you know, it's really just trying...

Edmon Chung: Right, right.

Chris Dillon: ...to break it down into specific sorts of well, you know, sort of informational materials all variant audiences and tools for use in certain situations, you know, in certain operating systems.

I don't know, I just feel instinctively it would be really good to have, you know, that bit just expanded so that, you know, if there is a chance of money in the future that, you know, committees could look at it and say well, you know, we've, you know, we would have a remit to fund this but there's no way we can look at that sort of thing. That's not better than nothing.

Edmon Chung: Right. So I guess from this group probably we won't have the full plan because that will be defined by the staff. But what we probably can do is list out some priorities like these are, let's say, these are the few things and this is some of the priority that when you think about it if you had enough money than number one should go, number two should go.

Chris Dillon: Yes, yes.

Edmon Chung: So with that...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: Lovely yes.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Chris Dillon: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: It has to go through the councils again. So it should come as a suggestion from the councils.

Edmon Chung: Right. So eventually that would be the case. But I guess - and you're right. Bart correct me Chris that we - we're not trying to make it as a - all the (unintelligible) as a full recommendation for a future budget.

                  But I guess we are listing out some of the things that we think would be useful to think about. And it's more - it's stock taking.

                  And I would put those under a description of the things rather than, you know, rather than the actual recommendation itself. It's like these are some of the things that you want to think about and these are probably the priority.

                  But if and...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...if any eventual actual recommendation that goes through the budget process it has to go through the council.

                  So this report goes to council. The council could adopt it or not adopt it. And then eventually when the budget process comes along they could then take

whatever this and formulate into a specific recommendation. And does that make sense Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes completely, that completely makes sense. And what, you know, what you're saying is that, you know, we would like to recommend a particular prioritization or conceivably more than one. So, you know, we, you know, we would like to say that, you know, that we - you know, we think this is important and just see what the councils do with that.

Bart Boswinkel: And going yes and going back Edmon...

Edmon Chung: Right yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes if you agree with that it's a - because you have to go through the council it sets the tone for the draft final report as well.

Think of it as a recommendation to the councils and not directly to the board. That would make it easier.

Edmon Chung: Right okay. And Chris I wonder if with based on the stuff that's already there do you think you can take a first stab it maybe some broad strokes as what do you think the priorities might be and list a few of them out and go to the (unintelligible) and we can discuss from there?

Chris Dillon: I will have a go at doing that. I mean, you know, we can always play around with it to a considerable extent but yes I'm happy to do that.

Edmon Chung: Sounds great. Okay so with that I wonder if anyone has any further thoughts. And thank you Mirjana for the input. That will certainly be included in some of the background information in the report.

Mirjana Tasic: Sorry I didn't catch exactly what did you say?

Edmon Chung: I was just thinking you for providing the information earlier on and we would...

Mirjana Tasic: Oh.

Edmon Chung: ...as soon as catalog that into the final report and just, you know, say a point to that as an example...

((Crosstalk))

Mirjana Tasic: Oh I forgot. It was a month or maybe two months...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Mirjana Tasic: ...before (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Two months ago right.

Mirjana Tasic: Yes. Okay.

Edmon Chung: But still thank you.

Mirjana Tasic: I'll try to help.

Edmon Chung: So with that I guess that really brings me to the end of this particular part. And we have somewhat covered the next steps in leading into Beijing's.

So this month we'll work on getting a full draft out circulated to the mailing list. Come February we hope to be able to walk through the whole report with the group.

And through February and into March we'll try to finalize it for a public document. And right after the March meeting we'll try to publish it at for public comments. That's next steps.

And I guess the question then is all along we've been saying that I think the - we held a sort of more public session for single character IDN TLDs in Cartagena and that was quite successful in my view with a pretty good interaction there.

So I'd like to try to suggest a similar approach for this report in Beijing. And I wonder how we could initiate that scheduling and all that in the call ICANN meeting process.

And so I'm sort of asking to see if Bart or Nathalie who would be able to help us to negotiate some...

Bart Boswinkel: What precisely do you want Edmon? What do you want to do? Because I know the schedule is filling very, very rapidly right now.

Edmon Chung: Right. So what I was - I think would be useful is to have a - an open and public session which would invite the whole community to come talk about this particular subject which is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs focused more IDN (unintelligible) because that would bring the relevance to ccTLDs as well.

And we'd invite - it would be less of a working group session and more of explaining to the community at large on, you know, what the recommendations are looking like and what the thinking was about and what we are asking the ICANN - what we're asking ICANN and actually also the ICANN community to work on for this particular subject and try to get feedback from the community at large.

So we'd sort of like a panel we will invite (maybe) a few teachers from this working group and also beyond this working group to talk about this particular issue but also to lay out the recommendations and see if there are additions or comments into it.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay say that - okay now it's clear. Let's try to do this on say the rest of it online. And I think the best timing for it would be Monday afternoon late in the afternoon again.

Edmon Chung: Right. So...

Bart Boswinkel: So because that's going to be the issue is to find say an appropriate room and say and the timing in the schedule.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: Time in the schedule.

Edmon Chung: I guess especially given that we are going to be in Beijing I guess we can attract, you know, a good audience on the subject so...

Bart Boswinkel: It needs to be...

Edmon Chung: ...if we get a bigger room. I'll try my best to, you know, get more people, you know...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes so we're talking to you about a midsized room but let's say...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...so fine...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: ...and see if we do that this month so we can fill in, say put in a room request.

Edmon Chung: So I guess I'll - so Bart you'll be helping us...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...with that right? Cool.

Bart Boswinkel: I'll be liaisoning with you and (James).

Edmon Chung: Okay. So with that I guess that's pretty much all I have prepared for this meeting. I wonder if there is any other thoughts, suggestions?

If not as mentioned we'll try to put the full draft together as soon as possible and circulate it through the mailing list. And thank you everyone for joining.

Mirjana Tasic: Bye-bye.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye. Bye all.

Mirjana Tasic: Goodbye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Sam). You may now stop the recording. Goodbye.

END