

**ICANN
Transcription
Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group
Tuesday 28 May 2013 at 11:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN (JIG) Working Group on the Tuesday 28 May 2013 at 11:00 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/gns0/gns0-jig-20130528-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#may>

Attendees:

Jonathan Shea
Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Minjung Park, .kr
Jian Zhang, NomCom Appointee, Co-Chair

Apologies:

Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)
Chris Dillon (Observer)
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Sarmad Hussain

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Go ahead. We're now recording.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the JIG Meeting on Tuesday, 28 of May. On the call today we have Jonathan Shea, Minjung Park, Jian Zhang and Edmond Chung.

We have apologies from Chris Dillon, Sarmad Hussein, Avri Doria and Fahd Batayneh. And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I remind all participants to please state their names before speaking, for transcription purposes? Thank you very much and over to you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you and this is Edmond here. Thank you for, everyone, for joining the call today. I guess I'll start off by apologizing for last week we were supposed to have the call last week and I had a bit of an incident with my knee and I was hospitalized that day and thank you, Bart and Jian, for rearranging the call so I can join today.

But in any case I guess the main items are still the same as I brought up last week before I - before I - the incident happened to me. But so I sent out a couple of items to talk about.

There were - they were the update on our draft high (level) report on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs and then would spend a little bit of time today to talk about the Board resolution that is asking for the SOs and ACs to respond to the user experience report on the IDN variant TLDs.

I also, I guess, have a sort of an (ALD). I guess we could start planning for Durban as well. So those are three items that I have in mind. Wonder if anyone has anything else they want to add or think they're okay with these three items?

Jian, do you have anything to add or?

Jian Zhang: No, I think that'd be all - pretty much covered all.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Hearing no further comments I guess we'll get started. The first item should be pretty short. I haven't been following closely. I guess, Bart, did you have any update on whether...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, it's - yes, Edmon, this is Bart. It's still on my plate. And I need to get it out today or tomorrow to Web admin to have it posted. You sent me the last one. I do have the list of, say, working group members, etcetera. I need to combine it and send it out for publication.

Edmon Chung: Okay so...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...essentially it's still in the queue and we're...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...just expecting it to be done...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: And as soon as it's out - and as soon as it's out I'll inform the JIG.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you, Bart. So that is the update for now. And we'll wait for the - once it's posted we'll get more information from Bart. And I guess when that happens we'll also reach out to the other parts of the community and, you know, to really seek their feedback and comments into the public comment period.

So the second item is really coming up from the Board resolution from Beijing, which adopted the two reports from the IDN variant TLD group a (unintelligible) in essence to the VIP team. I guess that's the easiest way to refer to them. That was the - sort of the final - not the final product but one of the interim products that was produced.

And the Board is asking the Supporting Organizations and the Advisory Committees to provide staff with any input and guidance they may have to be factored into implementation.

So I understand that the GNSO and the ccNSO has received the request. I am - I have started a conversation with people from the GNSO Council and to see if they would like (unintelligible) our input into it. I guess I was wondering also whether the ccNSO side there is any discussion on this topic.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Let me explain a bit. You will receive an email shortly from - probably from me with a copy from Leslie that a - the ccNSO Council will request to the JIG to prepare an answer to specific questions, say, doubling the energies and using the same resources was a bit over the top.

To explain a bit of the background, say, the ccTLD members or the ccNSO members on this working group will know that the ccNSO has adopted what is called a bit of a triage method or working group that will make suggestions to the Council on how to deal with requests like this but also other ones.

And their advice to the Council was to, first of all, inform the individual ccTLDs whether they wanted to respond but also to invite the GAC - or not the GAC, the JIG - to prepare a response in time if necessary.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: And the background is, again, say people on this - on the JIG are interested in the topic. It will take quite some time to - and will probably overlap anyway with the ccTLD members on - or the ccNSO members on this group. Why not

ask the JIG to do it? So I'll prepare an email and send it to you. But I wanted to provide the JIG with a heads up first that they can expect it.

Edmon Chung: Okay thank you for that. And I think, at least from informal discussions with the GNSO Council people that would be similar situation on the GNSO side as well unless something transpires. So I guess it is a - it is probably a good item for us to keep on and for - this month and essentially this coming month...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...to at least discuss and see if we can come to - come to a conclusion on some position on this item.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So in that case I guess we'll jump right into it. I have to admit I haven't fully fleshed out my thoughts on the - on the topic. But off the top of my head I have a few items that I think would be our suggestion to the Council. I guess we'll start from there and I'd like to get people's input and thoughts and points to it as well.

So looking at the two reports, especially on the User Experience Report, I guess it is a - in terms of the implementation I think ultimately IDN variant TLD has a policy aspect to it. And the two SOs should let the Board understand that all the policy aspects should remain in the SO's realm in terms of oversight.

Not to say that the, at this point, there is anything that is required to be done but the overall - once it's implemented and once, you know, as we implement it - the process - I think, you know, in an oversight position I think the SOs should remain in that position. And, for example, some regular or periodic

review of the process, you know, those type of things. So that's my - that's sort of my first point.

The other point is this is more on the GNSO side. I haven't compared it fully with the IDN cc PDP yet. But on the GNSO side I guess this - at this point the implementation does not seem to have additional policy development (deployment) from the GNSO and that would be probably the direction that I'm suggesting so that - since - to summarize that, essentially, is to say that the policy development - there is no policy development process required for the GNSO side to bring this forward into implementation.

I would like to, you know, I understand that no other GNSO (unintelligible) here yet but - from this particular call- but I would certainly, you know, make sure they further comment on this.

But on the ccNSO side on this particular subject I wonder if Bart, Jian or Jonathan or Minjung, what are your thoughts on whether, given these two reports, are there - and the IDN cc PDP whether there are additional PDP requirements for - before the implementation can happen.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...all the reports yet but - yeah, Bart, please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Say, with regard to the variants, as you may recall the whole variant discussion was - is not included in the PDP results because we couldn't wait for the outcome and the (unintelligible) overview. This is the first time, I guess, that the JIG and others are in the position to identify policy aspects, if any, that need to be addressed for the delegation and re-delegation of variants and how to select variants, etcetera.

So that still needs to be included in the PDP as a whole.

Edmon Chung: Right. So...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Just a moment. Sorry, Edmon...

Edmon Chung: Yeah, please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: There is another element and this is where it becomes a bit, say, ambiguous, that's probably the word. Some aspects like from the whole variant issues project like the - I don't know what it's called, the root server algorithm or something, what is it - no, the...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: LDR...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, LDR.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Say, that's more of a matter of implementation and this is foreseen in the PDP, in the sense that, say, these are more the technical requirements and methodology that following - or that is part of the implementation. And there is no role for the policy development process.

There is, however, in the PDP there is a - and I think this is new for every PDP - there are two provisions - or there is one very important provision is that the ccNSO, say, if something like - is part of the implementation plan that the ccNSO should monitor and at least adopt or (prove) adopt the implementation plan in order to ensure that it is following the policy itself.

So there is, in that sense, an active role for the ccNSO during implementation. Now this will all work out if, say, the - if you look at the PDP it's covered the - it's for the members to determine how to adopt - the ccNSO members. They are voting on the results of the PDP.

Once they've adopted the PDP it will be submitted to the - or to the Board as a ccNSO recommendation so a full ccNSO recommendation meaning both Council and members of the ccNSO. And then we still need to wait for a GAC advice or opinion, if any, before it will go into implementation.

And you still have the risk of supplemental recommendations, etcetera. But if everything goes well, say, the PDP has not been adopted yet and has not been submitted and it's - and we still will wait even although it's submitted to the Board we have to await GAC advice before anything comes ready for implementation.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I guess - thank you, Bart, it's very clear to me now with that. I guess my immediate question is maybe whether you think it is appropriate to include what you kind of mentioned in a - I would sort of call it a letter that we would draft to the two councils. Would it be necessary - how much of what you mentioned could be in the letter or that should be considered part of the process of ccNSO anyway and we should just focus on the substance?

Bart Boswinkel: You can do both. Say, it's fairly simple; if you would go, way, to make it easy on the JIG itself you just refer to the mechanisms for seeing in the, say, to the rules of the PDP and what is foreseen in the IDN PDP recommendation.

But you could make it more explicit because what I just said is just recap the, say, the most important parts related to this work. So it's - to make it easy on yourself or on ourselves you can refer to what's in the PDP and in the rules of the ccNSO and then you can see what's happening. Or we can make it more explicit.

Edmon Chung: Right. No, I think just a reference would probably work best for this purpose because...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah...

Edmon Chung: ...I would like to keep the - yeah, keep our document very short...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...for this particular purpose, yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, say, what I'll do is - and please send me a reminder. Say, I can pinpoint you to the rules as, say, in the PDP rules in the ICANN bylaws so that's with regard to the GAC advice, etcetera. And I can pinpoint you to the ccNSO - the PDP itself so the IDN ccTLD PDP and the real - on the recommendations or the proposals so that's fairly easy.

Edmon Chung: Okay. That would...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: That would...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: What I'll do is I'll send you an email right after the call including these rules otherwise I'll forget and...

Edmon Chung: That would be very useful.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: So with that I guess I'd like to open it to others and what your thoughts are in terms of the item itself and also any kind of substance - substantive point that you want to raise on the implementation of IDN variant TLDs.

On the - I'll just, I guess, briefly note that on the GNSO side I guess what I was planning to do, at least, is to highlight a few of what has already been talked about in the earlier PDP with the IDN working group outcomes report and highlight a few items from there that already provide the policy directives, if you will, for the implementation. And so far from what I understand the two reports does not conflict from what those are.

The ccNSO side is a little bit different because it doesn't, as Bart mentioned, it does not - the cc PDP did not include both considerations in the cc PDP. The question then is whether we should - whether we need to go back and take a look at that.

The situation may be a little bit different. I'll bring one particular example. One of the examples on the GNSO side is that there is a particular - in the report there's a particular recommendation that it is one string per application with an exception for IDN variant TLDs so there's a particular sentence that specifically says that it is always one string for application except when, you know, that provides the policy directive for the - for IDN variant TLDs.

On the ccNSO side, however, I'm not sure it applies because I don't think there is - at least on the IDN cc PDP there is no particular specification on how many things one can apply for except for that it is within the - sort of a the framework that is there. So there is a different...

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. Say, that's one of the reasons why there is a variance placeholder. In principle - in principle one, say, with IDN ccTLDs there is one string for a meaningful representation of the country name in a language slash script.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: So, I mean, in principle per language so one per language.

Edmon Chung: Right, okay. So there is no...

Bart Boswinkel: That's it.

Edmon Chung: ...current description or specification that gives an exception for IDN variants.

Bart Boswinkel: No, that's what I refer to - that's why there is a variant placeholder.

Edmon Chung: That is a good - that is a good point. So we should identify that, at least, as a, you know, potential item that...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, that needs - and it's - and, say, the reason for this variants placeholder is because it was unclear what the policy issues or the issues are that need to be addressed through a policy.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: So it's not developing a policy because, say, you want a policy if you know and understand what the issues are that need to be addressed and not the other way around.

Edmon Chung: Right, right. So that's one example so I wonder if, Jonathan, Jian or Minjung, you have other items in mind?

Jonathan Shea: Hi. Jonathan here.

Edmon Chung: Please, go ahead.

Jonathan Shea: Yeah. Well from what Bart has described it seems that at least we should - or somehow someone has to communicate with the ccNSO especially the PDP working group, if it's still there, to look at how to expand the placeholder into a functional part of the PDP. And, Bart, would anyone be doing that?

Bart Boswinkel: Not at this stage, Jonathan. Say, if you'll recall, say, and that was, say, as a result of the resolution in Beijing or the ccNSO Council, say, there was a final report from, say, in fact from both working groups. As a result and because that was adopted both working groups were closed. So there is a stand-still.

What it means the placeholder is in fact is that we run an additional and we create an additional working group and another method and launch an additional - because that's going through the process is that we launch an additional PDP to resolve this.

Jonathan Shea: So I think all, I mean, the related communications will have to go to the Council directly.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. And the suggestion would be...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: And the suggestion would be, I think at this stage, once it's clear what the issues are - and this could be a role for the JIG or others - is describe the issues and then launch an additional PDP to - in order to address the IDN variants issues.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. And I guess adding to what - I think this is the letter that we hoped to draft. And this would include probably a non (unintelligible) list of a few items, one of them, as I mentioned, is the one-string items. Another item that I was going to draw from the GNSO side report as well is the confusingly similar items; how that relates to IDN variants and a kind of exception needs to be in place - might need to be in place.

And we could identify, in my mind, there are probably three or four - and if others can, you know, bring up others - we can include a few of them and say, hey, these are a few items that are policy-related and will require policy development on it.

And we can, you know, on the GNSO side we can say, hey, this - we found this from the, for example, on the GNSO side what we can say is we found these already in the original report or if we don't find it - find additional issues that is not there and we should identify those and remain somewhat that it's non-exhaustive but so that identify whether there is additional work or no additional work for the two councils that would be, I think, the most useful.

And on the ccNSO side it seems like it's more clear at this point that there is additional policy work that needs to be done. There was a placeholder and anticipated additional work. What we need to do is probably identify a few items at starting point.

And I think until the PDP working group comes together they can use these few points starters and then there might be additional items. I don't think we need to prescribe an exhaustive list. That's how I kind of see it. I wonder if that makes sense to you, Jonathan, and Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes it does for me at least. Jonathan?

Jonathan Shea: Yes, it makes sense. Yeah, I totally agree.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Jian and Minjung, any?

Minjung Park: This is Minjung. Yes, I (unintelligible) but just one question. Then if at the end of the work if we decide to go for the PDP then do we get to have PDPs; one for the gTLDs and one for the ccTLD?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, of course. Then, you know, once it - if we identify that there are additional policy development work to be done then the councils will have to initiate that work; the respective councils will have to initiate that work.

Minjung Park: So then we'll be having two separate PDPs on variants? One for the...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Minjung Park: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Unless some magic happens and the two councils somehow decide to form one. I think that's highly unlikely though because it's so - the IDN cc PDP and the new gTLD process is so different...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...I don't see a possibility of them coming together.

Bart Boswinkel: Fully agree, yeah, Edmon.

Minjung Park: Okay. Understood, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: And they'll put that - Minjung, don't forget the processes are different as well.

Minjung Park: Yes it is. Yes, I just - I was just looking at the (unintelligible) PDP and it seems quite different, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Jian, you were going to ask something?

Jian Zhang: Yeah, basically Bart already said all so, yeah, I think once if we - I just had, you know, two items if that's going to be, you know, two parallel PDP developed separately so.

Edmon Chung: Okay. With that I'm sensing that we're exhausting the discussion we can have at this point here on this call. I'd like to suggest a couple of things. I guess myself and Jian especially we'll go off and try to work out the first draft and point out some of these items as a draft so that we can send it to the mailing list and everyone can comment and ready for our next call.

The second item I'd like to suggest is that we add an additional call in June so that we can provide primary response back to the two councils. I don't have the Council calendars in front of me but I wonder what the dates are the two next - the GNSO Council meeting and the ccNSO Council meeting?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. I can tell you for the ccNSO that's meeting on the 11th of June.

Edmon Chung: And then it will be after July 1.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: And then the next one would - so June 11 is two weeks from now. And it will be happening around this time is that the case?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. It's scheduled noon UTC.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So if you say if...

Edmon Chung: I think we will - okay I don't think we will have something ready for the Council to consider before the 11th...

Bart Boswinkel: No...

Edmon Chung: ...which means that we won't have anything before June - July 1 for the Board. In fact that might be the case for the GNSO as well. So I'm guessing that we might want to ask for a slight extension on the matter.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, it's - maybe - say as a working method, at least from the CC side, is that Jian and you will receive the request from the Council to look into this. Now as you will receive it very closely to the 1st of June I think your response - or the JIG response might be - and this is just a procedural one, yeah, thank you very much but we cannot do it before the first of July.

We'll submit something to you, say, by the 2nd or the week after. And then it's up to the councils and, say, for that matter we request you to extend the deadline or request the deadline with the Board.

Jian Zhang: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: That's fairly easy I would say. So then you've got more time and you've got - what we could do is, say, schedule a call, say, we got one scheduled on the 18th, that's the next one. And then schedule another one on the second of

July or week after need be - to finalize stuff. And then we can send it. And then they'll receive and then it's up to the councils what they do with it.

I know from the ccNSO Council if they receive it in time they can do stuff online as well, you know, by email.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Looking at the calendar I would kind of suggest that we finalize everything - when is the Durban meeting?

Bart Boswinkel: Durban meeting starts in July on the...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: I think most SOs and ACs will really start on Sunday the 13th - or is it the 14th? But 13th, 14th of July, yeah.

Edmon Chung: So it may make sense...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...for us to...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: It may make sense for us to respond by saying that we'll provide the letter back to the councils before Durban so that they can consider it then and can respond to the Board - well at that point it's their...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...it's the councils - but that seems to make sense in terms of timing. And it's not too far off. And it does also do one thing is whether we want to spend a little bit of time in Durban so that more people can chime in on this. And if we

schedule our meeting on the Monday then we can finalize everything in Durban and provide it on the Tuesday to the councils.

I understand that makes it very tight but we can definitely have a draft well before probably early July. And I don't expect significant changes but we could have a session where, you know, just to confirm everything, you know, on our Monday meeting in Durban, which usually we get a little bit more participation. Does that make sense for everyone?

Bart Boswinkel: So do you want the additional JIG meeting, say, JIG call or do you want to just stick to the 18th?

Edmon Chung: I'd like to have an additional call. And I think, you know, that allows us to send the - in essence, the final draft and lets people - let the Council understand - let the two councils understand that we will have a session on the Monday on this as well and a finalized version would be provided on the Tuesday.

That would make me most comfortable. I don't know - it might make the councils nervous because if...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah but...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...with moving parts. But it also allows the broader community a little bit more input before it goes back to the Council and eventually to the Board. So balancing the two and the tight time schedule we have I kind of think that makes sense. But, you know, please, others, please comment...

((Crosstalk))

Minjung Park: Edmon...

Edmon Chung: Yeah. Please, go ahead.

Minjung Park: Are you proposing, you know, we ask the Council to extend the, you know, deadline to July 18?

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible) July...

((Crosstalk))

Minjung Park: Is that what you're proposing?

Edmon Chung: The Council meeting is usually on the Wednesday, isn't it?

Bart Boswinkel: CcNSO Council is, yes.

Minjung Park: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Yes, I think both councils sort of meet at the same time. What I'm suggesting is that we would be able - I believe we should be able to produce something within the month. And I'd like to take one more meeting on the July 2 so that we can finalize and send the document to both councils on July 2. And we would leave our meeting in Durban would be July 15.

And barring significant changes - if there's, you know, significant response from the community we'd make some changes. And we would still commit to an updated version to the councils on the 16th. And I, honestly, expect not a significant change but I wouldn't feel comfortable without having some sort of, you know, a (unintelligible) community, you know, at least quick look at it before I jump into it.

But what do you think, Bart, or Jonathan, or Minjung?

Jonathan Shea: Jonathan here. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Jonathan Shea: There is a (CDNC) meeting from the 17th to the 20th of June.

Edmon Chung: Okay. And so you're saying on the 18th would be a...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Shea: Not the - yeah. Are you going to the (CDNC)?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I plan to if I feel well. I am feeling okay so far the last couple days especially. So I am planning to be there.

Jonathan Shea: So the 18th of June may not be...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Yeah, if we keep this timing, though, it should allow us to - well, okay, it runs into dinner time.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, it's just before dinner I guess; it's six hours time difference, isn't it?

Edmon Chung: Okay. So in that case I wonder if we can do - I guess the 12th - that would be two weeks from now. And - or we stick with the 11th, which is two weeks from now but the ccNSO Council meeting and do it after the ccNSO Council meeting. Would that work for others at least on this call? We'll send it around.

Bart Boswinkel: The ccNSO Council meeting will be finished at - around 1:15 pm UTC. So either what we could do is, say, if we limit the topics we could do an additional call on the 11th at the same time as we did today and have a hard stop at a quarter to 12 UTC so that's around this time because the Council call starts at noon UTC so that's in another 10 minutes.

Edmon Chung: So why don't we plan for that then? So we'll keep this timing and we'll limit the discussion to I guess 45 minutes and...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. And then schedule an additional one for the 2nd of July.

Edmon Chung: If we can do it two weeks from now I'd like to maybe even suggest the 25th schedule...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: That's fine - yeah, that's fine as well.

Edmon Chung: ...and, you know, so at that time we can provide something.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Makes sense.

Edmon Chung: Minjung, you were...

Minjung Park: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Minjung Park: Yeah, I'm okay with 11th; 25th is also okay but, Bart, I remember receiving a email from you about the Finance Working Group...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Minjung Park: ...conference call to be held on 25th. I'm not sure about the time but if it doesn't...

Bart Boswinkel: It's - I think that's - it's - this is 11 - that will be later on the day.

Minjung Park: Oh okay, then, well yeah I'm okay with both dates then.

Bart Boswinkel: Because, say, with the Finance Working Group we've got people on from, say, the - Latin America and North America time range.

Minjung Park: All right.

Bart Boswinkel: But I'll double check.

Minjung Park: I'm okay with...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Okay so between now and the 11th - well hopefully early next week we'll have a draft of - a first draft of the letter. We'll go through it on the 11th. And we'll try to finalize it on the 25th.

We - in terms of the Durban meeting I guess we'll plan for part of it to cover this item, which is in fact one of the three items that we are chartered to work on anyway and also spend a little bit of time on the - once the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs goes out and some public comments received we will probably spend half of our time in Durban on that as well.

So that's - that's really, in terms of planning for Durban, those are the two items that we should cover. There is one more item that I want to bring before we close this call. I received some interest from the At Large group to have a joint meeting during our Durban meeting.

I think it may be a good idea but I don't know how the scheduling would work and how we could schedule kind of an overlapping session maybe part of our session and then part of theirs. I wonder if anyone is against that? If not I think, Bart, we'll have to work with (Analia), who's leading the effort there from At Large, to see if something like this could work out schedule-wise.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: I'd like to keep our own meeting on Monday as I think - I forgot who sent me a note. But I can respond to say that those are the two topics we want to cover now. But it's scheduled - it's supposed to be scheduled for Monday.

Bart Boswinkel: Let's see how it runs out. Can you forward the invitation from At Large?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I'll do that. And - but I guess we'll - if there is anything we'll - I'll forward it to you and we can try to see if anything can be arranged. If yes...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...I'm not against it. Others, I guess, I don't expect any opposition.

Bart Boswinkel: No but it's going to be a scheduling nightmare.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, that's the only thing. That's exactly what I - how I responded to (Analia) already. But I guess our position-wise - you're always welcome - you're always welcome then to, you know, individuals, to come and join the session. And it's - we keep our meetings at ICANN open. But trying to do a - kind of a scheduling acrobat is going to be tough.

So, okay, that I item, I guess, we'll kind of take offline and I'll bring everyone in the loop and see if anything could be done. If so, great; if not then they're always welcome to join our session.

Okay. With that I guess we are running to the top of the hour. Anyone has any other items that they want to bring up? Hearing none I guess thank you, everyone, for joining and...

Jonathan Shea: Edmon, Jonathan.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Jonathan Shea: Oh just a quick one. Can I talk to you after this meeting just shortly?

Edmon Chung: Sure. Just give me a call.

Jonathan Shea: Yeah, I call your mobile.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Jonathan Shea: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: No problem.

Jonathan Shea: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Bye-bye, everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Minjung Park: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Okay bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye.

END