JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 01 June 2010 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 01 June 2010 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-20100601.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jun
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Edmon Chung - co-chair
Jian Zhang - co-chair
Yeo Ling
Doron Shikmoni
Sarmad Hussain
David Cowen

ICANN Staff
Olof Nordling
Bart Boswinkel
Gabi Schittek
Kristina Nordstrom
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Avri Doria
Rafik Dammak
Fahd Batayneh
Karen Hayne

Coordinator: We are now recording.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's JIG

call on Tuesday, the 5th of June. We have Edmon Chung, Sarmad Hussain,

David Cowen, Doron Shikmoni, Jian Zhang, Yeo Yee Ling and from staff we

have Olof Nordling, Bart Boswinkel, Kristina Nordstrom, Gabriella Schittek,

Glen de Saint Gery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies today from Andrei Kolesnikov, Karen Hayne, Rafik Dammak and Fahd Batayneh. And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. So last time the conversation - a lot of conversation was about the variant or - of what part of it is now called the synchronized TLD part which was utilized for the IDNCC TLD fast track.

I think (Tina) mentioned that another more comprehensive document was being prepared by staff which she may be able to share at a later time. But I think that has - we haven't seen that on the mailing list yet.

But at the end of the - last time we said that this - on this call - this week's call we were going to look into - talk a little bit about the one character TLD - the one character IDN TLD issue which is the second issue that we have identified previously as an issue to the talks out here.

Since - while - we talked about that both issues actually came from the IDN implementation working team final report. And we were hoping (Tina) would brief us on what the (posse) implications may be and why we need to talk further about single character IDN TLDs.

I understand that perhaps gathered here right now (Farmad) you're the only one that was on that team. Perhaps you can share a little bit more insight into what the - sorry for putting you right up.

But if you can share some of the insights on what the - what the policy discussions need to take place for a single character IDN TLDs then we can formulate probably a strategy to tackle the issue and address some - address those policy issues.

(Farmad Hussein): Okay, so thank you. I'm just going to talk - I guess the crux of the matter was that we - when we were talking about this there has been the history of reserving all the two lettered TLDs for country codes.

And generally the three letters were - the three letters and plus were then eventually three and four letters were given to gTLDs. Now with IDNs coming in and obviously gTLDs coming up we see ccTLD space opening up as well.

There was obviously the possibility of having ccTLDs and gTLDs which could be more than three characters, you know, to four characters, five characters and we've already seen some of the IDN ccTLDs coming in.

However, when we - the one open - another open possibility was what about single character TLDs. And the implementation committee when it was doing the discussions said that there were actually no technical issues involved in delegating single TLDs.

But they said that this may eventually be a policy discussion - decision. So the implementation committee was more skewed to discussing technical issues. They decided there are no technical issues associated with them.

But they said that it should be a policy committee which should eventually decide on whether to give it out freely if that's what is desired by the community.

Or whether they want to restrict their views in some way whatever that way would be. So we were - and the reason for, you know, singling out single letter TLDs was because, you know, two and two plus TLDs were generally open.

But as we said that the number - the number of characters were getting smaller or reduced things were getting too specialized and it's, you know, we

shouldn't comment on it. The policy body should actually comment on it. So that really was our background.

We thought that single character TLDs are special in a way like two character TLDs are special.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you. I guess I - I'm still a little bit puzzled. Okay. Let's take the new gTLD process for example. It covers basically any type of new gTLD. How would - why wouldn't let's say a single character new gTLD fit into the new gTLD process? What would be the policy implication?

(Farmad Hussein): Right. Actually when - when we were discussing this there was at that time I think, the gTLD process was not probably available for discussion. And in any case I think what the - what we were seeing was not that gTLD process would not take care of it.

What we're seeing in the implementation committee was that we will not comment on this and we will let the policy body comment on it.

Edmon Chung: I see. I see. So I guess that's sort of open...

(Farmad Hussein): Yeah, sorry, but what we did was...

Edmon Chung: Please.

(Farmad Hussein): ...that we said that the - it is actually a category that could be separated out. Again, the policy body needs to look at it and decide whether it should be done this way or lumped together with all the other gTLDs.

Edmon Chung: Understood. In that case I guess, you know, we don't have a lot of people so perhaps we can, you know, just feel free to jump in. And if it becomes chaotic we'll take a queue.

But, you know, I guess I just want to open it up to anyone who - is there anyone who feels that there should be a separate process or a set of policies for delegation of single character IDN TLDs?

Or do people really think that the existing process even though it's not completely finished but in fact, could handle single character IDN TLDs? No one has any thought on that? Okay.

Perhaps I can try to change it the other way around and say if this group recommends that a single character IDN TLD should follow the same set of policies for new gTLDs and for the IDN TDP that's going on in - for ccTLDs would that be a problem?

(Yeung Sung):   Okay, I'm not...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

(Yeung Sung):   (Unintelligible)

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

(Yeung Sung):   I'm not sure (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Sorry (Yeung). You're breaking up a little bit. Can you try to repeat?

(Yeung Sung):   Yeah. Actually I'm not sure what is the current policy for IDN ccTLD for a single character - single character policy.

Edmon Chung: Well based on the - if I'm not mistaken, for the IDN ccTLD fast track it is for two characters or more. So that also doesn't - at this point doesn't accept single character fast track IDN ccTLDs. For the IDN PDP, the ccPDP then I think that's still being discussed. It - Bart perhaps you can add to it if I'm mistaken or...

Bart Boswinkel: With regard to the PDP we are not at that stage yet. Fast track - as far as I remember but I need to check and I'll send you an email, there is no such limitation. But I'm not sure so I'll check. So it's - I can't answer today. I really don't know.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I vaguely recall that there was. Anyway...

(Yeung Sung): I can remember there's no limitations on fast track.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

(Yeung Sung): (Unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: It - the best way to do it is just check it and I will send it to the list so everybody knows.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. That would be cool. But in any case, if it doesn't, then the same question would apply whether a fast track IDN ccTLD comes in with one character. Of course it will have to follow all of the other rules that are in the fast track.

Would that suffice? And it - if not is there any issue people want to raise about that - that we need to especially look at it? Especially knowing that, you know, from the implementation working team they feel that there is no technical problem or reason to not allow it. Okay, well - please.

Man: Also one character IDN TLD because obviously the ASCII length is different in those two cases.

Edmon Chung: Right. Right. We are all talking about single character IDN TLD.

Man: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Okay, well I do understand that a few people including - including (Chris) and (Carrie) and others have some thoughts on this issue as well. Of course we are not trying to draw any conclusions on this call.

But I guess as a starting question perhaps what we should ask is whether - the starting point being using the existing processes until somebody says, you know - and basically ask what if there - what and if there is any additional policy considerations that need to be taken into place, what they may be.

Doron Shikmoni: This is Doron Shikmoni. I don't think there is a - I cannot think of a problem with allowing single character sub level domains. The question I'm asking myself is regarding the semantics of the whole thing.

So if you take one step back and look at it from a user point of view top level domains are there to separate domain space into divisions that make sense so to speak, to the community. And they apply some sort of semantics whether it would be the ccTLD semantics of gTLD semantics and so forth.

The question that I'm just asking myself is whether a single character top level domain can actually create this type of semantic that has any similarity to how top level domains are defined today. And I'm not sure I can visualize the situation where it does create a semantic such as would help the community.

So I would think and this is really off the top of my head, I would think that I will want - would want to see a policy process that called for such semantics to be demonstrated when the application is being applied for.

I'm assuming that the process has that requirement. Then there shouldn't be in my view, any other problem. But the question of semantics I think has - it becomes a bit larger when you talk about the single character names.

Edmon Chung: Okay, thank you. It's an interesting thought. Being Chinese and coming from a Chinese speaking community, a single character can easily mean - have a significant semantic - well meaning to it. So a single character Chinese IDN TLD definitely would support that.

So, you know, at least there are some IDN TLDs that would fit that. Then my question maybe back to you is why is - why would that be an issue? Like if I propose a new gTLD that's like X54Z is that, you know, when it satisfies all of the requirements.

And why should - and it makes no semantic sense even though it's multiple characters. Why is that more acceptable than a single character then?

Doron Shikmoni: Well first of all you've just answered my questions about the - about that semantic issue. So I stand corrected about the ability to provide semantics. The question regarding why is that important though, again stems from looking at the whole question from the point of view of the entire community.

And assuming that this is - at some point it has to make sense that the general internet user I think that a desired outcome would be to create name space division at points that would make sense to a community. And a community can be any community.

So that would be probably a partial answer to your question.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Woman: Actually (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Anyone else?

Woman: Yeah. Actually may I add something?

Edmon Chung: Please.

Woman: Actually the purpose, you know, for us to resolve this (unintelligible) issue is because, you know, like Chinese - because I'm Chinese too. So because, you know, Chinese there are a large number of meaningful words actually in, you know, in single character.

                 So that's actually is, you know, one purpose why we want to resolve this one single character issue. I hope this, you know, will help, you know, understand why we're doing this.

Edmon Chung: Right. Thank you. Well I guess the - I'm a little - I understand the semantic sort of argument but I'm a little bit worried, you know, how sort of - what's the reasoning.

                 So I come back to it in sort of saying that if we have a specific policy for single character IDN TLDs again, we're talking about IDNs not ASCII - single character ASCII TLDs. We're talking about single character IDN TLDs here.

                 And if we single out that for some sort of requirement that it means something I guess the question is why is - why do we have to single it out is the big question. And then the question becomes if we do find a reason why then why wouldn't that also apply to multiple characters?

Doron Shikmoni: Well I don't want to take over the discussion but if...

((Crosstalk))

Doron Shikmoni: I totally agree with you. It doesn't need to apply to - in my book it doesn't need to apply to a single character only at all. And actually I've just been educated that it definitely does make sense in some scripts to - and it does make semantic sense to actually do that in a single character.

So the question, I agree, would not be towards - specifically towards a single character name. It just occurred to me and I agree that my cultural bias actually hit me there. I was thinking about single character domain and it was a pretty narrow view.

And I agree. The - if at all, the same consideration should take place for every top level domain. And the reason for that is because I'm trying to see how we serve the community best - we as in the larger we, I mean ICANN in general.

Edmon Chung: Yeah. Understood.

Doron Shikmoni: And having some sort of semantics would make a logical division of the name space to me.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Well since we don't have a lot of people on the call today and especially some I think who have expressed opinions about this, perhaps rather than sort of continuing on I'd like to jump back a little bit on our general process, what we think we should do in - within this group in - to drive towards some - I guess some product from the group.

(Dan) and I have talked about it a few weeks ago, about trying to perhaps come up with a document that describes the discussions that we have had on these two main issues and then also the universal acceptable - acceptability of TLDs as a third item.

And perhaps to work on a document to do that so that we can put it out to public comment. And in fact, to ask those questions as in, you know, whether the community feels that there needs to be specific policies as well.

And we should probably also add the question about requiring some semantical - meaningful word, some justification of a single character IDN TLD. How do people think about it? Do people think you know, we can lump all three into one document or do we want to separate it out?

Or is even creating a - such a document and putting out perhaps for the larger community, to provide feedback on, is a good idea? Anyone have any suggestions, ideas, agree, disagree? Okay.

I guess hearing no objection or discussion about it I'll suggest it to the list, at least to go forward with that kind of process.

But in - we still would like for - as I mentioned earlier, we would still want (Tina) to brief us on (unintelligible) briefing on a couple of issues before we put forward a document coming from this group.

So with that I guess, you know, we're probably at the end, at least for this week we, I was preparing to talk about the single character IDN TLD issue. If there is no further discussion on it I guess we can close it, close the call.

And also would we - would two weeks time be ICANN or would we have one more meeting before the ICANN meeting?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon this is Bart. In two weeks time it's going to be the 15th and you'll meet face...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: ...to face tentatively on the 20th. So...

Edmon Chung: Okay. In that case I would - if everyone is okay I would suggest that we skip the 15th and go directly into the ICANN face to face meeting. And meanwhile we'll have an update from Bart just letting us know what the situation is with the IDN ccTLD fast track on the number of characters.

Whether or not there are any limitations. And also hopefully we'll get an update from (Tina) between now and then.

And if Bart were - well if Bart you can help us - I'm not sure on - she mentioned there was a document prepared and she would be able to share some of the - some of the information in it. I know you circulated the blog entry as well.

But I was wondering if there were any further information about the - the documents that...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...(Tina) mentioned last time.

Bart Boswinkel: Let me check with her. I will.

Edmon Chung: Right. Thank you. So - and that will be useful. And then we'll see everyone at the - in Brussels. Anyone else want to bring up anything before I - before I close the call?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon this is Bart again. I think say a week before the Brussels we should set a - the definite time and venue for the face to face meeting.

Edmon Chung: Okay. But we'll sort of deal with that...

Bart Boswinkel: But you can do that online.

Edmon Chung: ...(unintelligible). Right. Okay. So thank you everyone for the time. And the - see you all in Brussels.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you all.

Edmon Chung: Thanks. Bye-bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Thank you.

END