JIG

TRANSCRIPTION

Tuesday 3 May 2011 at 1200 UTC

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded. Please go ahead. Thank you.

Kristina Nordström: Thank you. Hello everybody and welcome to this JIG call today on the 3rd of May. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Wei Zhao, Suzanne Woolf, Dennis Jennings, Avri Doria, Edmon Chung, Andrew Sullivan, Jian Zhang. And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Olof Nordling, and Kristina Nordstrom. And I think Naela Sarras just joined.

Naela Sarras: I did just now. Yes thank you and sorry I'm late.

Kristina Nordström: Welcome. And for apologies we have Sarmad Hussain, Fahd Batayneh and Young-Eum Lee. And may I also please remind you to state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you and thank you everyone for joining the call. I sent out a brief agenda a while back. I guess the main item for the call is to really continue our discussion from San Francisco and thereupon our coordination with IDNVIP, which is right now getting started, and also with the work at IETF, especially the (expansion) working group and to consider whether there are any items to be you know discussed and any collaborations on. And then to discuss our next steps basically and especially Avri brought up some questions about - especially on Item Number 2 and so we have (unintelligible) and Andrew join us.

But I guess before that Dennis if it's okay we will put you on the spot to give us a little bit of an update on the IDNVIP - the work of getting the study groups together and perhaps how you see - you know with the progress now how you see us working together going into the future.

Dennis Jennings: Edmon thank you very much. Dennis Jennings here.

So briefly on the IDNVIP, the proposal for the project was published on Wednesday the 20th of April on our schedule after having been put out for comment. We had a number of comments, which were incorporated into the revised proposal. The main change apart from noting the various comments was that we agreed to increase the number of cases to six by including a Greek case. Now you will find that on the ICANN Web - the proposal.

Also on the 20th of April we published the Call for Volunteers. That is the call for volunteers from the community to perform various tasks in the case study teams, including the call for a case study coordinator and optionally local host organizations. That was published on Wednesday the 20th of April as well and the target date for recruitment of teams is the 6th of June. Again, you will find that on the ICANN Web site.

Since then, we have been responding to inquiries from - excuse me. From various organizations around the globe, and I am happy to say we're making some good progress. We have initial proposals under discussion for the local host organizations for the Arabic case, for the Chinese case, for the Devanagari case. I should point out we changed the (indig) to focus more narrowly on Devanagari. I hope I'm pronouncing that word correctly and we have some initial indications of interest for the Latin host, the Greek host, and possibly the Cyrillic host.

In terms of the case study coordinators, again we are discussing with a number of people are we are fairly well advanced with discussions with individuals and organizations. Primarily individuals for the Arabic, the Chinese, the Devanagari studies, the Greek study, and we are still at a very early stage for the Latin and the Cyrillic case studies. And in terms of the case study teams, we are accumulating a number of expressions of interest and it is looking fairly positive for a number of the case studies.

On the project side, we are intending to enhance our team with two positions, a DNS technical individual as a consultant to the project and a linguistic expert or a number of linguistic experts. We have identified a number of people and we expect to conclude agreement with the DNS technical expert sometime during May, but that is all work to be done. And we are continuing preliminary work on the glossary of terms, identifying expertise, gathering information on existing IDN tables.

In terms of future work, we need to do more work on the detailed budget and work out how we're going to spread the budget across the case studies and across the support activities.

We are preparing for the Singapore meeting and we are planning to hold most likely on the Saturday before the ICANN meeting in Singapore - possibly on Friday but most likely on Saturday - and all-day set of meetings with an introductory meeting for the six case study teams. And then the teams will split into individual rooms to begin or to continue to do their work, and we haven't worked out what budget allocation we will make to support that activity in Singapore.

We have had a number of inquiries for more detail on what is required for the local host organization, and I am working on that and hope by the end of the

week to have - be able to respond to those inquiries, to those organizations that have indicated an interest.

So I think we have good progress on the project. Nothing is agreed yet. We are liaising with the ICANN board variant working group to keep them informed. And sometime over the next few weeks we will have a discussion with the variant working group on the selections for the case study coordinators, the local host organizations, and the team members. So that is my update and thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. I wonder if anyone has any questions - (check the queue). No questions. Okay, well if that's the case, I actually want to ask you mentioned the 6th of June. And that's I guess the target of getting all the teams together and starting the actual discussion. Did I get it correctly?

Dennis Jennings: That's right.

Edmon Chung: And in terms of an overall timeline, is that still within in the original target for December?

Dennis Jennings: Yes, we haven't changed the target. We are certainly making good progress on the early stages, but it will really depend on how quickly the case study teams can get to grips with the issues and produce a report.

One thing that's been flagged to us in the comments on the draft proposal was a concern that all reports would not have to wait for every case study to complete. And if that is the case, we are hoping to bring all the case studies to completion at the same time and have a synopsis issues report, but we're not going to hold up any particular case study because of delays in other case studies.

Edmon Chung: That's great news I guess.

Dennis Jennings: Well as best we can Edmon. You know how these things are (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: I understand very much. Very much understand. I guess the - I actually also
                 have a couple more questions, but I wonder if anyone has a question now (to
                 get started). Still none so I will continue.

                 You - okay yes. In terms of I guess for this group working with the various
                 case studies, I wonder if there has been any thought put to that. Is it
                 appropriate perhaps for I guess myself and Jian as co-chairs to be observers on
                 the various groups? I know that probably among us we will have people on
                 different case study teams, but I was wondering if there has been any thought
                 given on that and whether there is - whether that might be an inappropriate
                 approach?

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings here again. Edmon, to be honest, we haven't thought about
                 that and it's a very good point. And I think that the idea that you would be
                 observers at the all-day meeting in Singapore and other such meetings is a
                 reasonable proposal. And I will bring that back and we will discuss it in the
                 project, but we haven't thought it through.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Dennis Jennings: I suppose it's up to you guys. I mean what are your proposals? And if you
                 have proposals, we would be very happy to hear them.

Edmon Chung: Did I hear Jian wanted to ask a question?

Jian Zhang: Yes, actually I agree with Edmon. That if you wouldn't mind that if we could be an observer on your case study at the Singapore meeting that would be nice.

Dennis Jennings: That sounds very reasonable to me. I will discuss it with the project team.

Jian Zhang: Okay.

Dennis Jennings: And the only constraints I can think of are - since we are looking for six rooms, they are probably going to be quite small rooms. So I'm just being a little cautious not to invite too many people and have too big a crowd, but it seems very reasonable to me. And subject to that constraint, yes I will talk to the project group about it.

Jian Zhang: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. and I guess going forward as well you know in phone calls where you know physical space might not be as big of an issue and mailing list and such, it would be nice to you know keep a tab on the progress across the board. But I guess you know I will leave it to you and the team to you know see if that's appropriate and perhaps we (will see it further).

Dennis Jennings: Sure. I will make a note of that.
Edmon Chung: Okay, so...

Dennis Jennings: Just one comment if I may.

Edmon Chung: Please.

Dennis Jennings: Our current thinking, and it's early thinking, is that there will be a mailing list for each of the case study teams. And we will also have for each of the case study teams an open list, but monitored by members of the case study teams so that there's a general community. There's ability for the community to provide feedback in general and a private list for the case study team members, but again we haven't thought that through further. And any thoughts that you have on that on how we do that would be most welcome.

Edmon Chung: Sure. As a first reaction, it feels strange if there are two parallel discussions and you know this is (quick reaction) to what you were suggesting. But it might be - I also have - you know you just brought it up so I haven't thought it through yet, but that's my quick reaction to it.

Dennis Jennings: Sure.

Edmon Chung: So if there's more information, please send it our way.

Dennis Jennings: Sure.

Edmon Chung: Okay with that, any more other questions for Dennis? If not, I will move to Suzanne and Andrew.

Suzanne Woolf: Yes this is the part where - okay, I can start real quick and then Andrew can say whatever he thinks needs to be said. Give me a second to get off my - okay how does this sound?

Edmon Chung: Loud and clear.

Suzanne Woolf: The update consists principally of IETF did meet since ICANN met in San Francisco and there was a (DNSA EXT) meeting that was devoted in large

part to the problems statement. There's some more to do on the document. It's getting close to being ready. I think the next major revision will be most what it needs to be an informational (RSE), which was the original target for it and then Andrew can talk about the process around that if he needs to and where working group consensus seems to be on it.

But as the other document - the two takeaways I have from that discussion. And I will admit that I'm a little behind the curve in getting that revision out, but we discussed it extensively in the working group meeting and I think the two takeaways in regards to working with JIG and the ICANN project. Anything we can get from the case studies is still of great interest as far as characterizing the problem space and the use cases that we're interested in. So that's still on the table for us and that's still input we'd like to have.

The mismatch of the timelines - well it's not even necessarily a mismatch, but the separately considered timelines. You know I had a problem which is sort of a fact of life. But without committing specifically to holding up the document to wait for input from the project, which I suspect - you know which basically is not something that anybody seems really to be pushing for any input on those cases.

And general comments because part of the audience for this document and I can (slide) the next major revision for the group. But part of the purpose of this document is just (it's mandatory) not only to the DNS experts, but to at least provide some background on how the DNS experts think about this set of issues for non-expert audiences. You know it's not going to be a layperson's document. We hope it will be comprehensible to a slightly wider technical audience.

The other thing that we took away though is that we have done a fair amount of thinking and discussion on the mailing list among the DNS folks and so on about terminology and abstractions, and so on, and about how to think about some of these things. And one question that came up was how do we best share frankly some fairly bruising experience of trying to figure out how to talk about these things with JIG and the IDN project. So that may not be something that we can conclude today.

But that's a question I can bring back to you guys is along the lines of we think we have some ideas as some of the technical experts have to have a certain kind of precision about how do we think about these things. And we would like to be helpful with that and so far as we can help other people maybe avoid some of the mistakes and pitfalls we have bruised and broken ourselves on from time to time.

So that's principally where we're at right now. There needs to be serious work on the next revision of the document and that will be - that hasn't really happened yet, but will be happening in the near term. And those are kind of the - those are kind of the observations to bring back here. So I can take questions or Andrew if you want to add anything to that.

Edmon Chung: Thanks. Andrew, did you want to add anything?

Andrew Sullivan: Well one thing that I heard pretty strongly in the Prague meeting was some resistance on the part of the working group to waiting for too long. So I think that there is going to be a certain amount of pressure from within the IETF to make sure that we get a document out relatively quickly even though there is work ongoing in the ICANN community. One thing that would be very helpful is to have some people who are not you know regularly involved in the DNS extensions working group - to have some people (lead) the draft and say whether it's intelligible to them.

Because one of the problems that we've had in the past - and I think Suzanne was alluding to this. One of the problems that we've had has been a sort of gap in communication. You know not - we've had maybe sometimes not complete agreement on terminology. We've had cases where terminology has been misunderstood, and I think that it would be very helpful if we got some people to read that draft and say you know yes I understand this, or I think I understand this, or no I don't understand this and here is where I don't. Because that would be very useful input.

Edmon Chung: Okay, thank you Andrew. Just a clarification. You mentioned that - you mean people not normally in the extension to kind of provide suggestions and edits to the document that Suzanne was talking about in terms of revamping at this point, right.

Andrew Sullivan: Right, so the - I think as Suzanne was suggesting, it is not necessarily - this is supposed to be a problems statement that is going to guide work within the DNS Extensions Working Group. Therefore, it would sort of necessity include a certain amount of technical focus. And so if you are not familiar with the DNS, there is going to be some terminology there that's going to be a little bit mystifying.

At the same time, we would like to be relatively sure that what we are describing is in fact something like a problem that people think they have. And if we don't - and if it isn't clear from what the document says, that if it's anything like the set of problems think they are addressing in for instance this group, then we will have failed. And I want to make sure that we don't you know rush ahead publishing a document because we think it's ready to go, but it doesn't actually say anything that anybody - you know that will solve anything for anybody.

Edmon Chung: Okay, I guess with that I would like to open for any questions on that. Avri this is - partially you suggested this arrangement so that we can talk about the collaboration. I guess you have something in mind as well.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So besides Avri, is there anyone who wants to be in the queue? If not, Avri...

Dennis Jennings: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay Avri and then Dennis.

Avri Doria: Okay fine. I switched lines. I heard that I was sort of faint on this one, so let me know if I'm not shouting loud enough.

I guess I do have a set of concerns. First of all let me say that I have read various versions of this. I think I speak both languages. You know I'm certainly not a DNS expert, but I have been following the group and think I understand what's in the document. I think I understand also on the policy side sort of what the set of questions are.

So my general impression is that the document is certainly in you know sort of a correct area. What concerns me though is that you know I'm just one person with one perception of the policy issues and I certainly don't necessarily understand the policy issues completely from the ccTLD side at all.

I think also that we need to distinguish between the concerns that the JIG comes up with, which are very much at sort of a macro policy level and concerns that Dennis's working group are going on, which is sort of accepting

that there are variants and such, what are they, and how do we delineate them, but not so much - and I may be wrong so correct me if I'm wrong.

Not so much to answer the question are there variants and do we need to do something about them, or what are the variants and how do they actually (unintelligible), et cetera. So that may be a wrong conclusion on my part, but that's where I see the division between the work that the JIG is doing.

So I guess what I'm getting at is I think we need to take the time and sort of something I've been trying to get us to for a while in my sort of muddled way is to get this group to actually work its way through the requirements document. And having Suzanne here who is the original language creator as opposed to me who is sort of just a translator between two worlds I keep a foot in each of, to basically work through those conversations so that the intelligible people on both sides of this so-called unreachable there is technical language there is policy language actually talk to each other at this point.

What will (unintelligible) me about this document becoming the informational (RSE) that then guides the work before that happens is that then we will get people with technical solutions or the declaration that there can be no technical solution before we've had both sets sort of having the same understanding of the problem. And if we get to a year from now where all of us in ICANN say we understand the problem, and we have the IETF saying, "We already understand the solution. It's too late," I think we're in big trouble.

So that's where my concern and my issue and sort of my desire to see us as a JIG not worrying about Dennis's group - certainly Dennis and you know (Kenneth) should participate and bring that group's concerns in you know as

an observer but as a participant. And you know just to make sure at this point this group that's been talking about this stuff and worrying about this stuff for years understands what's going to become an informational (RSE) and that the communication has happened at this point. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Avri. On those particular points if I can just summarize. So I think that you have been advocating this and I think this is probably the right time to really work on it is for JIG to take the requirements document as a working document for the working group here and consider our inputs. But I also hear from Suzanne that since their Prague meeting there is a number of updates that are anticipated, so I guess I'm wondering how the timing of the whole thing is envisioned from the DNS (EXT) point of view and I guess when we should start to work and in what state we start to work.

I will come back to both Avri - you and Suzanne, but first Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you Edmon. Dennis here - Dennis Jennings again just to respond to a couple of things.

First of all to point out that one of the very first tasks in our project for all the case study teams is a terminology task. And any input that we get to that would be most helpful and most useful, so I'm looking forward to that. Secondly, Suzanne I'd love to read the document again, so I will happily try to read it and see if I have any input on it.

And thirdly, there is a bit of a mismatch in the timing since the output of the project that I'm leading is indeed a set of issues reports which attempt to state the problems from a user perspective. So it may be that if there are major differences between the informational (RSE) statement of requirements and

what comes out of the project that we would have to revisit that and I'm sure that's understood Suzanne.

I mean we would hope that you would revisit. Obviously we don't have any influence over what the IETF does, but if the statement of requirements and issues that come out of our project are substantially different from your informational (RSE), we would hope that that somehow would be taken into account. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Dennis. I guess I just want to ask Avri, did I summarize it correctly earlier on and then if so then I'll ask to, I guess Suzanne and Andrew to further respond on that on the timing and...

Avri Doria: Pretty much. Except that I guess I'm confused into - on listening to Dennis's part that we don't end up with yet another set of terminology. And that I guess I didn't quite understand the level of the problem from the user's perspective and going into each of the language/scripts that, you know, (complications) that they're doing.

And I'm wondering, again, what I've almost been doing is forming a sort of macro and micro nature of this problem and the macro says there are variants and they need to be dealt with.

And, you know, then the implications of that statement and whether it matches the notions of synchrony, etcetera and how they match is a different issue.

And the particular case studies of in this particular script we have these sorts of, you know, problems that need to be solved is more at a micro level. But I'm not sure that that's a reasonable analysis.

And I'm not sure if the ICANN research group is pretty much doing the same work that we've done just at a more specific level or not. And I just - I don't understand that, so that part's not clear to me.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I think that's a good point. I guess we'll come back to the terminology part. I also have some thoughts on that and questions. But I guess first on the requirements document at - well, at IETF being discussed right now, I guess Suzanne and Andrew, what is the, I guess, general timeframe that we're looking at and you mentioned it somewhat being - a bunch of changes are being incorporated right now.

If the JIG, I guess, is interested in working on suggestions or, you know, thoughts or edits, should we wait for that next version to come along or, you know, how do you think we should work, Suzanne or Andrew?

Suzanne Woolf: Sure, I can start with that at risk of contradicting my working group Chair without knowing what he's going to say. From my perspective, first of all, to Avri's point, sort of at the high level, you're right that these are different aspects, different levels, different frames around problems that may or may not be related and may or may not...

And basically all I'm after with the document is a coherent sort of description of how one particular set of aspects of the problems look so that when people - when we come back later and either say, "There is a set of solutions to this set of problems that does or does not," you know, whatever we end up doing, "does or does not involve the following changes to registry practice or the DNS protocol or whatever."

There's a common basis for explaining that set of understandings and that's the only thing I'm after with sort of this idea of synthesizing how we're talking about this set of issues.

You're right that there may be some overlap, no overlap, or a great deal amongst the micro which - what I think I heard you call the micro and macro aspects here.

It's just that not having a common way of talking about it has caused a certain amount of duplication of effort and a certain amount of - and a certain amount of confusion on what's already a confusing subject and frankly, as far as I'm concerned, if the only contribution we make is to have a clear - one clear vision of how these things fit together, it's not what I hoped for, but I can certainly live with it.

To the timeline consideration, yes, there's a set of changes that need to be integrated, but frankly, I'm interested in comments whenever, of whatever kind, particularly given that most of the comments that are pending for the next revision are from DNS technical folks on issues of how we would think about the ICE morphism problem in the context of the protocol.

So - and some security considerations, I believe. So the comments that we'd be looking for that would be relevant to the use cases, I think that this group represents enough of a different perspective that I'm happy to have whatever comments people want to contribute.

And I can make sure the point the to the current draft is refreshed for everybody because, you know, IETF people, you know, IETF (habits) know where to find these things and, you know, it can be obscure to everybody else.

With that said, I think, particularly on the terminology issue in the next version, we'll have a different - will be somewhat more coherent, so if the current version is hard going, it would also make sense to wait for the next version, so if - so I would suggest anybody interested, take a quick look at the current document and see if they feel they can constructively comment on it or tell me what they need to see in the next document to get more detailed comments.

Final point on the timing, and the - and Dennis's point about changes and later comments, RFC - many people have forgotten at this point, because it's not how it works culturally all the time, but frankly, RFC is Request For Comments.

Just because it's published as an RFC, informational, a current, you know, guideline for how a particular working group is looking at a set of issues, does not mean that, you know, the document itself is fixed, but does not mean either the consideration of the problem or the working group's decisions are mutable.

So later input is not a problem, it's just that at a certain point, you have to put a stake in the ground and demonstrate some progress on how you're thinking about things and make a decision about immediate next steps and an informational RFC or problem statement is key to that, but is by no means the - considered the last word or a closing of the issue. So I don't think that's a problem and I can stop there.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Avri, does that...

Avri Doria: Yes, (unintelligible) I guess, as I said, I've been reading each draft as it comes out and I've sent pointers to this group and I can certainly do that again, that's

not a problem and from what I read of the minutes, from the last meeting, certainly it does seem like the changes are not large in terms of the policy implementations that we would see.

So unless there are other changes than the ones that were noted in the minutes from Prague, I don't see a problem with us during a review on the current one and we can also just print out, you know, it was quite clearly laid out, what the comments from Prague are, so we could have those.

And especially if Suzanne can participate from time to time, I think that's great. I do worry about Dennis's group going away and coming up with a new set of language once this set goes to (end while) 20 years of dealing with IETF and writing RFCs, I know it's only a request for comment and that yes, it isn't a sword in a stone.

It gets pretty close when people start working on (based) and the strong, you know, emphasis to, you know, we have an RFC, we're working on it. Yes, it's just informational and I realize that that's not standard level, but changing things a year after there's an understanding I, in my experience, not as easy as it just sounded.

So I'm more concerned about us being on the same foot on terminology and at the moment, I mean, I'm trying to get myself to Ottawa, I've signed up in the hope of actually being there and been begging my friends for payment to get me there, but - and there - because I think that's important and I think within this timeline, I would guess, and of course, I can't speak for anyone, but I would guess that Ottawa would be a strong time for bringing these things together within the timeline.

But I do agree that we should start with what Suzanne's got. It's good. I don't agree that it's hard to understand, but that may just be me. I think it's actually quite clearly written and so I'd really like for this group to be able to spend the time and if Suzanne's got the bandwidth to work with us walking through it, it would be great.

Edmon Chung: All right. I guess - well, thank you Avri and Suzanne. So it seems like a, you know, it would be good to take it as a working document for us here, too. The - from Suzanne, you mentioned that probably we should take a quick look at the existing current document; I actually just sent the link to the list as well.

And then, you know, we probably could do more serious work, providing suggested edits and stuff on the upcoming version. I wonder who dropped off? But hopefully if Suzanne is still on and I was going to ask, so when - when is that - sort of when do you think the next version will be out, and also, when's Ottawa, actually?

Suzanne Woolf: I can't give you - yes, I can't give you a date on the next rev at the moment because I have to...

Edmon Chung: Sure.

Suzanne Woolf: ...consult on the (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Ottawa's the last week of July.

Edmon Chung: Okay, thanks. Do we have a general idea of the, you know, is it going to be within the next month or so? Is it going to be before Ottawa? Is it going to be...

ICANN
05-03-11/8:40 AM CT
Moderator: Kristina Nordström
Confirmation # 7388221
Page 20

Suzanne Woolf: It's going to have to...

Edmon Chung: ...after?

Suzanne Woolf: Yes, it's going to be just before the next IETF by quite a lot and Andrew can sort of chime in on that because he's the one that sees the timeline pressures more. So...

Andrew: Well, from my point of view, the sooner the better, but obviously, the IETF is a volunteer effort, so we only get documents when - we only get documents when people have the time to write them.

                The next IETF meeting is in Quebec City in July and there will be some - I mean there's a cutoff on time, you know, a few weeks before that, so we know that if we're going to have an update by then we, you know, we'll have to have it before July, but that's a little way away yet.

                So just to pick up on something that has also been in this conversation, though, I think there is reason to be concerned that if a document is published saying, "This is what we think the problem is," that there will be armies of future people immediately seizing upon it as a reason to do work.

                So I think that it is fair to say that if there are things that concern you in this statement of a problem, you now, it would be really, really good to get that feedback on the DNS extensions mailing list sooner rather than later.

                Because the minutes are public and, you know, I actually did suggest in our meeting in Prague to the working group that what we would do is sort of prepare the document, put it out as a draft, but let it rest there for a little while while we waited for some of the results of the current work inside ICANN.

And there was a very strong reaction in the room against doing that. So there are - there's a certain amount of pressure from within the working group to forge ahead, because we think we have an understanding.

So I mean, if you have worries or objections or anything like that, you know, that's noise that needs to be heard because otherwise, people are going to assume that the silence, you know, implies consent.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Did I hear Dennis want to add to that?

Dennis Jennings: No, you didn't, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: No? Okay, sorry. So I guess it just seems that it probably makes sense. I'm just - as we were talking, I was looking at the calendar right now. And from now to Singapore, we're looking at two or potentially three more meetings if we count that particular - well, that week before, for this group.

And probably it seems like, in general, in terms of our next steps on IDN TLD variance it might make sense, as we talked about in San Francisco as well, to wait and observe some of the initial discussions at the case studies before moving more solidly forward.

So perhaps the next couple of meetings might be useful for us to actually take on, as Avri, I know you have advocated for a long time now, to take on the requirements document from the - from, you know, currently being (assessed) with IETF to see whether we have any comments and thoughts on it. And I think that might be useful use of our time for the next couple of meetings.

And then as we get into Singapore we would be - we would probably merge some of the discussions with the case study teams at Singapore - I mean, in Singapore, and then from there forward we will be able to better formulate the concrete next steps for coming up with our initial and final reports for the latter part of the year in sync.

Hopefully by the time that's the first report or all the reports from the case study teams will be out by the end of the year. That sort of us - seems like what I'm gathering from the discussion just now. Does it make sense, Avri, James, others who are on the call and haven't spoken?

Avri Doria: It's Avri, it makes sense to me, but I've spoke.

Edmon Chung: All right. Of course, anyone else? Any thoughts? I don't know, Bart has - you've been a big part of our discussion. I don't know whether you have any thoughts whether that seems to make sense.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. I think in general you made sense. I think that was a bit of a discussion we had in San Francisco as well. I think that this works (with the) JIG participating and seeing what goes on and moving forward and assisting other groups is a good idea. But that's more my - that's mostly what my own philosophy is.

It's very, very difficult to start discussing policies if you don't know what the policies are, or the issues are.

Edmon Chung: Right. Okay, so that's the first three items. If there is no further thought I'll guess I'll summarize what I sort of said and send it out to the list as well and get the discussion started on the requirements document.

I did - I just - as I mentioned, I did send out the - a couple of links that is relevant to the discussion just now and we'll get that discussion started for the next couple of meetings.

I wanted to spend the remainder or five, six minutes on Number 4 which is the - we identified an issue of common interest for this group which is called the Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs. I know it's - seems like a grandiose kind of a motherhood statement.

But in the recent - recently, as I mentioned in my email, recently I've received a bit more I guess noise and discussion about this item because as the IDN TLDs are being implemented we're seeing more issues, different databases or signup applications around the Internet that is not expecting IDN TLDs.

And whether there would be a policy issue or not, we, you know, may or may not be, but I guess coming back to, I guess, I believe it was Dennis that mentioned this concept, or it was - no, it was, sorry, not Dennis, it was Kurt that mentioned this idea that there are certain issues that is under control by the ICANN community or, you know, through policies.

But there are issues that ICANN may be able to influence and exert its influence rather than "control." And this might be one of the issues that if we would come out with some thoughts or strategies on what ICANN should do about this issue. Because as IDNs are implemented, especially IDN TLDs this would become increasingly an issue.

So I don't think we have a lot of time to discuss what we want to talk about this time. But I'd like to, you know, get this particular thread started as well. You know, I guess perhaps some of the first things to consider is, you know,

what, if any, might be policy and what others might be useful work for ICANN.

With that I wonder if anyone wants to add to it or ask questions or thoughts on this particular issue. I know (Nyla) mentioned earlier over email that you're interested in this particular agenda item. I don't know whether you have anything to add from ICANN staff perspective.

(Nyla): Right, so no, really I don't have anything to add except exactly what you said earlier, something that we're hearing more and more about, and so I just joined the call (unintelligible) of what you had in mind, (what this group) had in mind.

So perhaps maybe we could start a mailing list (unintelligible) discussions we had in San Francisco and see if we're talking about the same thing, even, and discussions (for the) mailing list that way.

Edmon Chung: Certainly, but you - are you already on this mailing list? Perhaps we can get it started at this list and if there are more that are interested to join the discussion I think we're more than happy to have them join the discussion here, too.

(Nyla): Right. Yes, I am. So I'm happy to write my initial - or write initial thoughts to this list and get something going there. Or I should probably talk to you first and see what you had in mind before we create a thread on this.

Edmon Chung: Sure, by all means. But I think for sure this is increasingly becoming an item and we should at least address it. Since we've identified it as an issue we should at least get started on it so when people - I guess when people ask me I can say, "Okay, we are talking about it," rather than saying, you know, "Oh, we have been pushing it aside for some time."

(Nyla):   Yes, okay. So that's what I'll do. I'll write to you, Edmon, first and then we can share this with the rest of the list.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good. Others? Any thoughts? You know, Avri, I remember when we first brought this particular thing, you know, item up, you had some I guess thoughts and concerns whether this is an issue to be talked about anyway, or whether we would find anything to talk about. I wondered if you had any...

Avri Doria: Yes, I don't remember exactly what my concerns are, but certainly if somebody in the group thinks there's something worth talking about there's something worth talking about.

Edmon Chung: All right, sounds good. Anyone else on...

Dennis Jennings: Edmon, Dennis here.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Dennis Jennings: Just very briefly because I have another call now. I think this is a very important topic to look at because most applications have been designed without any concept of an IDN TLD variance or any of the issues that I think arise.

                 And most of them won't work very well, as we've already seen with the browsers. So cache logging, what those issues - application issues might be, but also trying to work out how the JIG, and indeed ICANN, might exert influence to have these problems addressed would be very helpful and a very useful piece of work. And with that I'm afraid I've going to have to sign off. Thank you very much. Bye.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, and we're also at the top of the hour. So what Dennis brought up is really interesting. I actually haven't thought about variance in terms of acceptance of IDN TLDs. This is certainly an area that would need some serious thought and discussion.

You know, I'm a little bit at loss right now on that issue, thinking about some Web applications that might have to take a particular IDN and consider a variance around it. That seems interesting as I'm signing up for Facebook and I put a URL in, would variance work?

Anyway, so I guess we're at the top of the hour. Does anyone have anything they want to add before we close the call? If not, as mentioned, we'll get started on the two items, IDN TLD variance, and in terms of the first working on the requirements document from IETF and also get the discussion started on the acceptance of IDN TLDs on the mailing list, and we'll reconvene in two weeks time.

If we get some traction on the requirements document perhaps it might be useful is Suzanne or Andrew can help us as we go through the document, as well as Avri mentioned earlier on. I guess I'll, you know, probably in a few days and see how things are. I'll extend an invitation to you guys as well and see if your time works at that time.

Avri Doria: Edmon, this is Avri. As I was saying I think if Suzanne is there, but if she's not I'm willing to offer whatever poor talents I have as an interpreter between the technical language and the policy language.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Avri Doria: And I'm sure you (would), too. Having, you know, both of us have feet in both. So...

Edmon Chung: All right. Sounds good. So I guess with that thank you, everyone, for your time and talk to you on the mailing list and talk to you again in two weeks.

Man: Thank you, bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Bye, everyone.

Woman: You, too, thank you, bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

                                END