

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 06 July 2010 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 06 July 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-iig-20100706.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung - co-chair

Jian Zhang - co-chair

Sarmad Hussain

Avri Doria

Rafik Dammak

Young-Eum Lee

Hanchuan Lee

ICANN Staff

Olof Nordling

Bart Boswinkel

Kristina Nordstrom

Glen de Saint Gery

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Gabi Schitteck

Doron Shikmoni

Fahd Batayneh

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's JIG call on Tuesday the 6th of July. We have Edmon Chung, Sarmad Hussain, Han Chuan Lee, Jian Zhang, Avri Doria. Rafik Dammak will be joining us shortly.

From staff we have Glen de Saint G ry, Kristina Nordstrom, Bart Boswinkel, Olof Nordling, myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from

Gabriella Schitteck. (Doron Shikmoni, who may be joining later on or he sends apologies if not, and Fahd Batayneh.

But please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Gisella. So I sent out a very brief agenda today, just really two items -- the general schedule going forward and then to, I guess, walk through a draft that I sent out earlier on single-character IDN TLDs. I was going to start with the general schedule. I'm thinking that because it really - a lot depends on how much we can push forward Item Number 2.

I'd like to maybe reverse the order of the discussion, except that we did get an email from Chris, Chris Disspain, just earlier mentioning about the public comment periods or the particular timeframe right now in summer in Europe that we might need to consider slightly longer times. I just want to touch on that a little bit. I wonder if (Bart) can add to that, and, you know, what types of lengths of public comments are more, you know, usually what is the length for these types of public comments during this time?

(Bart Bartholme): Hi, this is (Bart). Say, let me explain normally how the ccNSO deals with working groups and output of working groups. If they come up with recommendations or for council decisions, they are most of the time submitted just prior to a face-to-face meeting.

The reason for that is that, say, during a ccNSO meeting itself, so you have the ccNSO meetings, which is the members meeting and the council meeting, which is at the end of the members meeting is that that members and others, the ccNSO community at large, have the opportunity to look at, say, a file output and the council more or less uses that opportunity to see what is the sense of the meeting.

And so moving forward, so that's probably the end point is the cutoff in the meeting when something comes out, say, for a final output of the working group on any of the three topics. So that's the first one. And currently we have one major public comment period or public comment document, and there will be and there is a second one dealing with the review.

Say the one initiated would delegation - redelegation has a public comment period because of the summer period until the 15th of September. And after the 15th of September, they start to work towards recommendations and everything, again, with a view of the cutoff in a meeting. Say, the second one will be and there will be a request for the ccNSO review, again, to extend the comment period until the 15th of September because, say, from experience we know that this is a very, very bad time to solicit public comments.

And one of, say, and probably that's a difference between the ccNSO and GNSO. The ccNSO is not very stuck on, say, a 28 or 20 days comments period. They more or less see when it's - what the duration depends on the possible input to on the possibility of input. So that was more or less, I think, Chris's concern if you look at the type or the timeline you suggested, that's say in July, early August, or August, you will hardly receive any response from the CC Community or (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Hmm. Okay. Yeah, thank you for explaining that. Of course, I guess, at least from the GSNO side, and I think, you know, really on everybody's mind as well, including CCs, the Board has said that they want to sort of consider the new gTLDs in their Board retreat, which is in September. And that was partially why partially what has driven the initial thought on the schedule as well, so that at least one of the times can make its way into being considered.

I do understand the consideration from the CCs. A couple - I would like to sort of bring up also that because whatever's produced from this group will eventually go back to the respective councils, who would then consider actual policy recommendations. So does that help us in terms of allowing the

documents to move ahead and then be, you know, leave it back to both counsels, which could work in different speed?

(Bart Bartholme): I think, as I said, say whatever the output of this working group will be, say, the final output on any of these three topics, my guess is -- and (John), please correct me if I'm wrong -- but say based on the experiences, the counsel will consider this after having a discussion at a face-to-face meeting, and that is unfortunately Cartagena, so what I could imagine, say, is if it's just if it's for the GNSO purposes, is that the working group moves ahead until, say, with it's draft documents and then maybe submit it.

But the ccNSO council will probably decide upon it after consultation, after the face-to-face meeting in Cartagena. And we in doing some backtracking, you can see, say, summer is a very difficult time.

Edmon Chung: Understood.

(Bart Bartholme): And building on that moving forward, that would be workable probably.

Edmon Chung: Okay, understood. So, yeah, I appreciate that input, and, I guess, we appreciate that input. And we'll try to take best care of it. So I guess instead of jumping into the actual schedule, I think perhaps, you know, looking at the first document, in Brussels we talked about splitting up the three items, so...

(Bart Bartholme): Edmon, I'm sorry. I've just been thinking, so to close this off, is it an opportunity or an idea that you, (John), and me on email try to revamp the schedule so it both accommodates the needs of the GNSO and the ccNSO, so...

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I think that would make sense, but I was going to at least first get a sense of how far off we are with the first draft. You know, if it's way off then, you know, then there's much more work to do and we would come back and talk about the - a more realistic schedule. If we're, you know, if we're pretty

close to this particular item, then we'll come back and talk about, you know, how we can speed it up or, you know, at least make it comfortable for the ccNSO, but at a pace that is, you know, a slightly faster.

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah. Okay, I'm sorry.

Edmon Chung: Does that work? Okay. Cool. So, yeah, so that really brings me to the discussion on the draft that I sort of grafted together. In Brussels, we had a very good discussion I think. We finally finished off the briefing from staff, especially from (Tina), on some of the basic elements.

And then we started talking about the issues. Realized that they are quite different than probably the variance issue would take a little more time. And so in view of the single-character (unintelligible) TLDs, which seems to have a more ground to build on, that was - that's sort of where we were. And so this draft document was put out. I wonder if most people have had the chance to take a look at it?

(Bart Bartholme): I'm sorry I didn't.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

(Bart Bartholme): But good notes.

Edmon Chung: But I guess probably the best way is that we sort of walk through it then. To summarize, there are three main parts of it. First part is really a background of what has been done on this issue, both on the ccNSO side and the GNSO side, and as well on the staff side. And then the second part is a stock taking of issues, really, that's so those four issues were identified in our Brussels meeting.

And then the third part is the some preliminary thoughts on those four items. You know, how we can create policies to address them. And so that the

whole idea of the initial report is to put it out for public comment so that, you know, people can - we can obtain feedback whether the approach is, whether the preliminary viewpoints are appropriate and also whether the stock taking is complete, whether there are other issues that we haven't considered. So those are the three main parts.

Now, on the first part, I can, I guess, quickly go through the background of relative works. As I mentioned, there are three areas. First of all, the IDN implementation working team, which is the staff and Board-initiated working team, it had a number of recommendations. A few of the key ones I've taken out or extracted from the final report.

Critical one being that there is it does not recommend banning one-character TLD's and also but that additional policy considerations that the ccNSO and GSNO needs to be taken into account. And the report also talks about what - how to define a character. And I think that's based on the Unicode Standard Annex 29.

And then the second part of the background is the GNSO considerations, GNSO IDN working group and the GNSO new (GCLV) report. There were a few key recommendations singling two-character IDNs were in that policy were considered that they're applicable. Single letters, which is single ASCII letters, are reserved. They're not considered part of new (GCLV). And single digits, which are - which essentially may be possible confusion with IP addresses, are also reserved and not available. And then another important items was two letters, which is reserved for (CCLV).

And then the IDN, the third main part is the IDN (CCLV) Fast Track. So the IDN CC final report, there were a number of key policy items that were included in that final report, which is relevant to this discussion. The one of which is that the Fast Track is for non-Latin scripts only. That's one type of restriction. There's the meaningfulness requirement, which the select string needs to be a meaningful representation of the country or territory. And then

there is also a technical requirement that the TLD be no shorter than two characters and non-ASCII. So in the IDN (CCLV) Fast Track, the IDN final report actually does mention that names should be no shorter than two characters.

So and then there are a number of things, just to make sure that we know that there's an ongoing IDN ccPDP. And then there's the ongoing implementation for the new (GCLV). There's the ongoing the actual already implemented IDN CC Fast Track and such. So one of the key items is whether this group can take the above as, you know, as a basis for working forward. And that's the background session.

Any thoughts, questions, ideas?

(Bart Bartholme): Edmon, this is (Bart) again. May I suggest in Brussels, the IDN working group under the ccPDP and at the meeting session more or less agreed that the IDN PDP would include Latin as well. So but that is they will start off with the IDN definition from the IDN (bis), so there needs to be at least one, say, non-ASCII letter in the string itself.

Edmon Chung: Right, so, yes, the ongoing discussion at the ccPDP is, of course, relevant. I guess why the reason why I singled out the ones in the IDN Fast Track is if we want to implement single character IDN TLDs for the Fast Track, then we have to go back and change those policies as well.

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Any other thoughts, anyone? Did I miss out anything that you felt was important or some of the results you feel should not be included as the basis for this group to consider?

Hearing no questions, I guess? Does everyone feel it's reasonable background that we build upon?

Woman: This is (unintelligible). I agree.

Edmon Chung: Okay. All right, so we move to the second part of the document, which is intended to be a stock taking of the issues. These are the four issues that were identified in our Brussels meeting. The first of which is the possible confusion with reserved single-character ASCII TLD strings. So far, single-character ASCII TLD strings are reserved, so there could be a confusion if there's single-character IDN TLDs.

The second one is whether special financial consideration should be considered. The third one points to the relatively smaller pool of possible names and whether special allocations should be considered. That was Number 3. And Number 4 that was identified was that because of the relatively shorter string, it is possible - it may be easier for users to make mistakes and end up at another TLD, another single-character TLD. And if given that situation, whether special policy should be considered.

These were the four items that were identified in Brussels. Anyone can think of others at this point, or is this pretty much - or whether I sort of characterized this appropriately?

((Crosstalk))

(Joan): Edmon?

(Bart Bartholme): This is (Bart).

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Yeah, it was (Bart) and also...?

(Bart Bartholme): (Joan).

(Joan): (Joan).

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah, (Joan), please go ahead.

(Joan): No, (Bart), you can go ahead.

(Bart Bartholme): As I recall from, say, I didn't attend the full meeting, unfortunately. As I recall, say, one of the, one of the probably major factors that's going to be looked upon is if you look at single-character IDNs, how do they - but how will be viewed as a ccTLD or as a gTLD? And I think what I recall from the meeting is, say, and that's part of the Fast Track and part of the policy development and part of, I think, the discussion we had in Brussels as well, is the distinguishing factor will probably be the meaningfulness, whether or not they represent the name of a territory.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

(Bart Bartholme): If they could.

Edmon Chung: I - okay. I did recall that conversation. I didn't know it was a part of the issue, but that's a good point. So given a single-character IDN TLD, how would people view it whether it the ccTLD or gTLD?

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah, and say and the distinguishing character or distinguishing characteristic, I would say, is whether it could be construed as a meaningful representation of a territory.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

(Bart Bartholme): Because I think the more you look at it, a single letter will be very difficult to construe as such, and so it means so that makes the split between

applicability of the ccTLD rules and then the practices, and the gTLD, new gTLD, rules and practices as well and for all that that distinguishes it. Sorry.

Edmon Chung: Okay, cool. So, yeah, I think we have another items that we should consider. (Joan)?

(Joan): Also I wanted to mention that there was mention of the difference between an ASCII single character and an IDN single character.

Edmon Chung: Sorry, I didn't quite get that, so...

(Joan): That there's a difference between, I mean, when we say single characters and ASCII single characters are different from an IDN single character.

Edmon Chung: Okay. That's so an ASCII and an IDN difference, so and I guess I'm not sure how to describe it as an item.

(Joan): I didn't mean to, I mean, act as a separate items, but I was - I'm just mentioning this I think because I would like it to be discussed at this point.

Edmon Chung: Oh, okay. Cool. So, basically, not really adding as an item, but as...

(Joan): Right.

Edmon Chung: ...but pretty much a statement within the document so that people understand that there's a, you know, a difference, right?

(Joan): Right.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so okay. Cool.

Avri: This is Avri. I thought in some way that was already there, but it's good to mention it. But I think the issue that we have on that one is when the IDN

single-character looks like an ASCII single character. You know, so that's really where we have our main issue there.

Edmon Chung: Right, and that was Item Number 1?

Avri: Exactly. So you may just need to expand, you know, in that Item Number 1 include a sentence, you know, "Albeit that IDN single characters are different than ASCII single characters," et cetera.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Avri: I don't have the text in front of me at the moment.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Cool. Any other suggestions of items to include? Okay, in that case, I guess we - did somebody want to speak? Oh, that was my echo. Okay, so let's go on to the preliminary viewpoints. These are viewpoints that were, again, those four items were discussed. And there were a number of viewpoints that were expressed during our Brussels meeting, so it was just really cataloging it.

One of the key items, actually, throughout all four is, especially on the GNSO side, is whether the current new (GCLV) policies already take care of the - of those issues. And I think on the ccTLD side, also one of the key considerations, first of all, is whether the existing IDN ccTLD Fast Track policies and implementation already takes care of that particular issue. And then, of course, on the ccTLD side there's also the ongoing IDN ccPDP.

So on the Issue Number 1, which is the possible confusion with reserved single-character ASCII TLDs. So essentially, the based on the GNSO policy, well, because ASCII ccTLDs are not single character at this point, so that's something separate. But on the GNSO part, there is the - there is a policy for not, well, reserving single-character ASCII strings.

So if there is a introduction of single-character IDN TLDs, that's if, you know, if the IDN itself is similar to a single character or, in fact, even two-character ASCII reserved name, then there might be additional policies that need to be considered. So based on the discussion we had, of course, one of the main things is really to handle it like what the current implementation for as the new gTLD draft up and guide book already includes consideration for two characters.

So a similar approach could be taken, basically saying that any - the two-character one was basically saying that any two-character IDN gTLD that may look like an ASCII string will not be, you know, basically not be allowed. So we can take that same concept and apply it to single character IDN saying that, you know, a single-character IDN TLD that is - that looks like a single-character ASCII or two-character ASCII string, then it is not approved. That's one way of looking at it.

The other one that we talked about is a policy that might be similar to the IDN ccTLD Fast Track where only certain scripts are allowed. In the IDN ccTLD Fast Track case, those might be it did mention that only non-Latin scripts are allowed. That be one way to go.

Also discussed a possibility of combining those two, so perhaps very similar to what is being in the handling of the IDN two-character IDN TLDs where it says in the current draft applicant guide book that if it's Latin, Greek, or Cyrillic IDN, which is single-character, then they are by default considered potentially confusable with single-character ASCII TLDs and special sort of justification would be required.

So those were the three possible ways to address. And, you know, I think this particular document the idea is to take all the possible ways and then put it out for public comment.

(Bart Bartholme): Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Thoughts? Yeah.

(Bart Bartholme): Edmon, this is (Bart). I think I'm, as I said, I didn't read it before this call, but going over it and looking at some of the issues you mentioned, I think the way the issues will be addressed is primarily determined by whether it will be considered a ccTLD or a gTLD. So, say, if, say, my suggestion would be, say, that is the first issue, whether there could be a distinction or whether there should be a distinction between single-character IDN CC - or IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs as a first question.

And flowing from that, you come into, say, like for instance, the financial contribution, which is addressed quite differently in the new gTLD process or under the Fast Track or under the IDN PDP process.

Edmon Chung: Right.

(Bart Bartholme): And so and the...

Edmon Chung: But regardless, the issue of being confusingly -well, confused with...

((Crosstalk))

(Bart Bartholme): That was second step. That was my second step. So you have a set of issues that are the resolution of it will be determined - predetermined by whether they're considered ccTLDs or IDN ccTLDs or gTLDs. So you probably will have, say, for instance, possible confusion. You'll also have a set of issues which are common to both gTLDs and ccTLDs.

Edmon Chung: Right.

(Bart Bartholme): And what I would suggest is if you look at his is first try to distinguish between a set of issues which are common. And secondly, a set of issues which are driven by this distinction.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

(Bart Bartholme): It's probably it's reshaping, say, the what you've included here in this document. But, say, that, so that would be the first step. And that would also help the JIG to move forward as well to really focus on the common issues.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so it seems to me that Number 2 and 3 may be somewhat separate.

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah.

Edmon Chung: And Number 1 and 4 are common.

(Bart Bartholme): It's (Bart). Yeah.

Edmon Chung: The issues themselves are common.

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah.

Edmon Chung: They are issues that need to be considered.

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah.

Edmon Chung: How it needs to be addressed may, you know, for 1 and 4 may have to split, but for 2 and 3 - I mean, for 1 and 4, there...

(Bart Bartholme): And that's completely something for the JIG to look into. Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Right.

(Bart Bartholme): And maybe some recommendations to the others, but that's up to the JIG.
But, say, as a first step is, say, look we distinguish these, as a JIG, we distinguish these two sets of issues.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

(Bart Bartholme): Flowing from the identified issues.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Yep, I think that's a good approach. That makes it clearer for people when they consider. Yeah. Okay, we'll - I can definitely implement that structural change to the document.

Back to the substance of Issue 1.

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah.

Edmon Chung: I wonder if anyone has any thoughts or additions to ways to address this particular issue of confusing with single-character and actually two-character ASCII TLDs which are reserved? Okay, hearing none.

Well, again, this is really a document to really to try to solicit more input, so and did somebody want to speak?

Woman: I actually would like to ask you to repeat your question, or repeat...

Edmon Chung: Repeat? Okay, no problem.

Woman: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so I was going through the Issue Number 1 and Issue Number 1 is the possible confusion the sort of single-character ASCII TLD string.

Woman: Right.

Edmon Chung: And we identified three ways to suggest it. One is so that we would, if it's similar, basically if it's visually similar with a single-character or two-character ASCII TLD, then that IDN TLD application would not be accepted. This is regardless of whether it's ccTLD or gTLD.

Another type of policy could be that single-character IDN TLDs are only allowed for certain types of scripts. This is a method that was used - a similar method was used in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track. So this is another way, you know, for example, we say only Chinese scripts or Korean scripts are allowed for single character. For example, I'm just saying this approach, this general approach.

We could also have a combination approach, which is essentially what the Applicant Guide Book, the Version 4 of Applicant Guide Book has taken - has used for two-character IDN TLDs because two-character IDN TLDs also has a potential to be confused with two-character ASCII ones, which are ccTLDs.

So combining the two, essentially saying that Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic, they're by default considered to be possible confusable. And we would anyone who's willing to apply for those would need extra justification. Otherwise, if using the visual confusability test in saying that it cannot be visually confusable to reserve the single-character and two-character ASCII strings.

So those were the three items that we sort of touched on. Essentially, the underlying thing is that these are methods that were used in the new TLD process already or the IDN ccTLD Fast Track. The question was whether we have any other ways of addressing it.

Woman: Well, I think we still need to, I mean, in the Other Comments section, there is mention of the even in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track that the string must not be shorter than the two non-ASCII characters. And that is something that we

would need to address in one way or another because this is something - I mean, the ccTLD, again, PDP is in progress. And I wouldn't want this to be imposing on the IDN PDP of the ccNSO.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Woman: So that's simply a mechanism for dealing with that. I'm not saying that we should go one way or another, but I'm just saying that because since there is a CC - I mean, there is a statement that says that it's a, again, a ccTLD string must not be shorter than two non-ASCII characters. And that's something, I mean, we would need to come up with a mechanism for dealing with that.

(Bart Bartholme): This is (Bart). Say, might be best that you're dealing with the IDN PDP. Say, what I could imagine that, say, the final output would be as part of the PDP. It's, say, until the Cartagena will be the next staff, then knowing this is happening and know that Chris is the chair of the working group and I'm the issue manager of that policy development process, so whatever is the outcome with regard to one or single character would be used as input into the PDP.

Woman: That's good.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so I guess I can add that to other comments. That doesn't quite - that's not the adjusting it. As you mentioned, we'll add that to the other comments. Well, (Jane), you were - you wanted to say something? Hello? (Jane), are you there? We can't hear you if you're trying to speak.

(Jane): Hello?

Edmon Chung: Hello. I can hear you now.

(Jane): Hello? Hello?

Edmon Chung: Yep, we can hear you.

(Jane): Okay, (unintelligible). Actually, I think, right now I think like it sounds like to me now we're mixing the issue because for every issue we mention here, you know, we're mixing whether it's, you know, a ccTLD or a gTLD. I feel like we're, you know, we're confused, you know, by either we should, you know, differentiate them on every single issue you listed here or not.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Well, I guess that's when (Bart) mentioned that, you know, out of the four issues and then one additional on top was really, you know, there is the CC issue. I mean, whether it needs to be dealt with differently between G and CC, Issue Number 1 and Number 4, I think, are common. It doesn't really matter whether you're G or CC, you still have to address that. And the policy to address it needs to be consistent across ccTLDs and gTLDs.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Number 2 and Number 3 probably are issues that need to be dealt with, but may be dealt with differently between ccTLDs and gTLDs.

(Jane): Yeah, great. So, as (Joan) mentioned before, when we talk about Issue 1, actually, I'm not very clear, you know, what her concern is, but I think her concern is, you know, whether the single-character policy will be confused with ASCII single-character policy, right?

Edmon Chung: I guess (Joan) can add to this, but my impression was that she was trying to make sure that in the IDN ccPDP, you know, single characters would be considered, and perhaps input from this discussion from this group can be input into the ccPDP. Is that?

(Jane): Yeah, agreed. That's actually occurred, (Bart), because I'm not in the PDP yet, so I'm not very sure. Correct me if I'm wrong. So far there's no limitations IDN ccPDP, right? No limitation of the letters of the string, right?

(Bart Bartholme): So what we've done - this is (Bart). What we've done until now, say, we as a starting point, we copied in some of the requirements of the Fast Track and this could be one. But this could change along the process, say, in that sense we're still at the, say, the major discussion until now of focus whether or not to include Latin or not and to keep the meaningfulness in place.

And now we're going into the second phase more in detail in whether it should be one string, or one-character string or not. But given the definition of what will be an IDN, probably it could end up with a single character, but it's hard for me to imagine that a meaningful representation of the name of a country in a single character.

(Jane): My understanding is maybe it's possible for Korean, yeah? Like for Korean, it may be possible. But right now, my question is right now for - from, you know, policy level there's no limitation on that, right? There's no limitation for CC, you know, for the string to be ccTLD, no limitation on the number of the character, right?

(Bart Bartholme): Under the Fast Track there is a restriction on at least two characters is in the document.

(Jane): Right.

(Bart Bartholme): But under the old rule policy, it's not addressed. That's what I'm saying.

(Jane): Right. Okay.

(Bart Bartholme): So that's still open. And we can, say, what is the outcome and (Adnan) is quite right. If you can be consistent across the line between gTLDs and ccTLDs that would be very helpful...

(Jane): Yes.

(Bart Bartholme): ...on all respects. That's why I say distinguishing between those policy issues related to both and the other set of issues is probably the first that the working group needs to go through.

(Jane): Yeah, agreed. Yeah. So probably, you know, for even, you know, for even the Issue 1 probably it's also, you know, probably need to be differentiated.

Edmon Chung: But the policy should be the same. I don't see how it would be differentiated. How it's implemented might be different, you know, where it's implemented might be different. For the ccTLD side, you might decide to implement it later on both on the IDN ccTLD Fast Track and the ccPDP. I don't know whether it's possible to go back and change IDN ccTLD Fast Track. I'm just hypothetically saying.

(Bart Bartholme): Edmon?

((Crosstalk))

(Bart Bartholme): Sorry, Edmon. May I make, say, in two weeks we're going to have a call.

Edmon Chung: Mm-hmm.

(Bart Bartholme): May I suggest that we try to restructure this and to separate the two as we just discussed because I think there is a reasonable consensus about it to distinguish between the sets of common interest and between the sets of, say, that need to be dealt with separately. And really structure the document so it's clearer over the line and people have the chance to read it as well.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I think that makes a lot of sense.

(Bart Bartholme): And that we try to do it this week and send it out, say, a week in advance.

Edmon Chung: Mm-hmm. Yeah, we're - that's a good idea. I'll - it shouldn't take too long. You know, in a few days, I'll be able to turn it around and...

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah, and if you want assistance, just send it to me.

Edmon Chung: That'll be great.

(Bart Bartholme): And then at the same time, try to include a, say, re-work the schedule as well.

Edmon Chung: Right, right. So we're close to the hour...

(Bart Bartholme): Yeah, that's why...

Edmon Chung: ...right now. Why don't I - I guess it might be useful for everyone that I quickly walk through the remainder of it so that you can have an idea of what's in the document. And then we'll go through the restructuring of the document to what CC and G and the common items. And then we'll come back and look at the items of substance in two week's call.

Okay, so we talked about Issue Number 1. I'll just quickly go through Issue Number 2, 3, and 4. Number 2 is about the financial considerations. The main aspect of the issue is that was brought up in Brussels is that a single character may be considered premium real estate and, you know, maybe special financial considerations, application fee, a special ICANN fees, or some contention resolution mechanisms.

The what we talked about in Brussels, again, was for gTLDs there is already an auction mechanism, and it seems like that is a possible candidate for adjusting the issue of financial considerations.

On the ccTLD side, there is also - there is a consideration for that it has to be a meaningful representation. And once it is a meaningful representation of a country or a territory, then it falls under, I guess, also GAAP principles on this

issue as well, which is that, you know, when there's competing and confusingly similar situation which creates the contention, which creates the concern for financial consideration, there - those are the items that need to be taken into consideration.

There's already a framework for, based on the GAAP principles, at least, based on those, there's already a rough framework for addressing this issue, whether we should follow that. So that's Item - Issue Number 2 on the financials.

Number 3 was the smaller pool of names. This is a little bit different from the consideration of financial because the idea is that if there is fewer number of possible single-character IDN TLDs, should there be a mechanism to a different time of allocation not financially driven? For example, not as financially driven? So, again, on the ccTLD - on the gTLD side, that is - there is already a process for considering community priority, so there's the community single-character IDN gTLD. That already has the priority, so that's, again, utilizing the existing new gTLD process that probably already takes care of it. That's one potential way to address it.

On the ccTLD Fast Track and the ccTLD side, then it - the issue seems to be similar to the financial consideration part because on the ccTLD side, the ccTLD world's a little bit different from the G, that those two items -- financial and the community item -- is already considered in together. And so the same framework may perhaps could be used. So those are possible. And, again, as (Bart) mentioned, Number 2 and 3 probably the way to address the issue may be quite different between ccTLD and gTLD. So we'll structure it out as a separate item number.

On Item Number 1 and 4, so Number 4 is another common item, which is that because it's a relatively shorter string, it's easier for users to make a mistake, and then that mistake leading to landing on another TLD, and another domain, and another single-character IDN TLD. So on the, again, on the

gTLD side, there is I dug up a number of items that already is in the new gTLD policy for addressing confusingly similar strings.

And there are a number of ways to handle it, including abusive type of use, potentially type of squatting. You know, if a TLD is really targeted as a type of squat for another single-character ID and TLD, then that's definitely a way to stop it. And just for the similarly on the IDN ccTLD Fast Track, there's also a strong confusion and contention module, so, you know, those are some of which are similar.

And basically, the whether, you know, basically the documents argues whether those are appropriate ways to address the issue. And the issue is a common one because it's - and it probably should be dealt with in a somewhat common way in terms of confusable, at least visually confusable TLDs.

So we're at 9:00 right now. And I think what (Bart) mentioned makes a lot of sense. We'll restructure it and let everyone have a longer period of time to take a look at it before we come back. Does anyone have any thoughts, just (unintelligible) feedback on some of the things before we structure the item in the document and continue further? Hearing none and a ringing phone.

Man: Yeah, that's me. Sorry.

Edmon Chung: That would be an alarm clock for us to wrap the meeting.

Man: Hi, this is (unintelligible). I might have a comment on why we're discussing Number 4, which the (unintelligible) shorter string and maybe it makes it easier to perhaps make mistakes. I'm wondering whether it's also then going to make it more generic and perhaps also include usability of (unintelligible) character TLDs for, you know, longer strings?

And, you know, I'm thinking aloud from a user perspective, from a (unintelligible) perspective. That way we have a complete kind of options and some other, you know, autodetect detection for (unintelligible) which automatically make URLs light-blue color and, you know, things like that. Whether there is going to be an impact, I'm not sure at this time. But there may be a usability kind of angle also associated with letter TLDs which may be different from multiple-character TLDs.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Yeah, I think that's a good item. And, in fact, the probably should be a separate issue, maybe Issue Number, you know, a sixth issue because we (Bart) identified a fifth. I'll renumber it, anyway. I'll have to renumber it because we're restructuring it. But I think that sounds like a sixth item, which is usability of the single-character TLD, as you mentioned.

Man: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, okay.

Man: Yeah, but, you know, but I was also thinking it could be sort of the more generic version of 4, so 4 can be consumed in this particular issue.

Edmon Chung: Hmm, because it seems to me like it's quite different. When you talk about usability, to me, seems like directing much more towards universal acceptance of TLD because, you know, right now we have the issue of long TLDs. If we introduce short TLDs, we might have the issue in that as well in your applications or certain countries would consider them differently. Like in the case of long TLDs, anything beyond three characters might be considered something illegitimate, right?

Man: Sure.

Edmon Chung: But the single character that may be a typo of the single character might lead to something else is, I think, it seems to me that there is a distinction between the two.

Man: Sure, so I'm okay with that, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Okay. All right, we're a few minutes over. I guess that will be a wrap. (Jane), did you want to add anything before we close? You're probably back in (unintelligible).

(Jane): Edmon?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: You called?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, so I guess we'll wrap here. And thank you, everyone, for taking the time. And I think we had pretty good progress today. We'll turn around the document this week and continue to push forward.

Woman: Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Sorry? Yes?

Woman: When is next call?

Edmon Chung: Next call would be two weeks away.

Woman: Okay. And, Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Same time, so it's bi-weekly. Yes?

Woman: Okay. I actually wanted to make a comment. I was on mute and I didn't know how to get off. I wanted to add a comment to Issue Number 3.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Woman: In addition to the fact that it could be considered from a (unintelligible) point of view, I was just going to say that as the single characters are shorter and there's a resource issue with the single character, then are we going to say that there's similar, I mean, a similar kind of principle could apply to two characters or three characters, I mean, two characters versus three characters and so on?

So I think that's something that we would need to address. Why is it - why are we stating this just for the single characters, and not for the two characters versus three characters and so on?

Edmon Chung: That's a very good point. That's actually a very good observation. So two characters should be different than three, three different than four, four different than five. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I mean, are we going to say that, or are we just going to mention it, right, just in case?

Edmon Chung: Right. Yeah, I think this is a good item to include in Other Comments, sort of making sure, you know, people understand that this is not something, you know, special, you know?

Woman: Okay.

Edmon Chung: All right. Thank you. Thank you, everyone.

Woman: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: I'll send things through the list, and we'll talk again in two weeks.

(Bart Bartholme): Okay, thank you. Bye bye.

Woman: All right. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END