Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Group (JIG) TRANSCRIPTION

Tuesday 08th November 2011 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Group (JIG) meeting on Tuesday 18th October 2011 at 1300 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-20111108-en.mp3

On page : http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov

Attendees:
Jian Zhang, APTLD
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Sarmad Hussain
Christopher Dillon
Young Eum Lee

ICANN Staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:
Edmon Chung, .asia (Chair)
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Avri Doria, NCSG

Jian Zhang: So we already started?

Glen DeSaintgery:(Tanya)?

Coordinator: You may begin.

Glen DeSaintgery:Thank you very much. Shall I do a roll call for you, Yen?

Jian Zhang:	Sure, thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery:Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JIG call on the 8th of November. And on the call we have Sarmad Hussein, Rafik Dammak, Christopher Dillon, Jian Zhang. And we have apologies from Fahd Batayneh and from Avri Doria and Edmon Chung.

For staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself, Glen DeSaintgery. And I think it's over to you Jian. But before that may I just ask everybody to say their name before speaking for transcription purposes? Thank you very much.

Jian Zhang:	Thank you, Glen. Hi, this is Jian. Hi everyone. Because Edmon couldn't make it today so he has asked me to chair this meeting tonight.

I think on today's agenda is actually very straightforward agenda. We're going to discuss the draft response letter to board resolution in August, single character IDN TLD.

I'm not sure, you know, if everyone has already read the draft Edmon sent out earlier today. So if you have any comments on the draft we could, you know, start from there.

If, you know, you don't have enough time, have read it, I could brief the content of the draft letter first. So I'm not sure, do you want me to brief it first or everybody already read it? Everyone is on mute. Hello?

Sarmad Hussein:	Hi. This is Sarmad. Jian, could I comment?

Jian Zhang:	Go ahead Sarmad.

Sarmad Hussein: Okay so this is, again, referring to the second point in this letter. It says the single issue of - the issue of single IDN - single character IDNs have gone through four rounds and so on. I just wanted to sort of say that in this particular point it may actually be (deliberant) if the - if JIG had at some point emphasized that this needs to be ardently implemented and possibly considered for the first round.

And if that's documented anywhere a reference to something like that could actually be - portend to make the case stronger. (Correctly) it just says that it is something which is desired for inclusion in the first round but it doesn't really say whether ccNSO and GNSO actually have agreed that it should be part of the first round.

Jian Zhang: So basically you agree with the principal of the draft and you want - you think we should make a stronger term on the...

((Crosstalk))

Sarmad Hussein: Right, so what I'm suggesting is that the letter - the letter is saying that this is something which is has to be (ardently) - so it's not a matter of whether it should be included or not. I think there is general agreement on the - for the community on it.

The issue being highlighted here is the urgency of that inclusion. And - but there is no direct reference to any agreement that actually in a way points to the urgency of the letter not the possibility.

And I'm just saying that if there has been some discussion on this aspect in GNSO and ccNSO I'm actually observer member of the GNSO, I'm obviously not privy to some of these discussions which happen inside GNSO and ccNSO.

But I think the (TSO) - the letter would become stronger if there is some support for the urgency of the topic as well not just the need aspect of it.

Jian Zhang: I think...

((Crosstalk))

Jian Zhang: Yes, your point is well taken. I actually agree with you. I think basically we, you know, provide three rationales why, you know, it should be implemented. But now the first one actually we listed both since both ccNSO and the GNSO Council have, you know, consensus on this single character issue.

Also we also agree both will come to (agree). It shouldn't be delayed because of lack of readiness of one category, you know, or another. So we're, you know, we're not satisfied with the rationale the board gave to us if one category is not ready the other one should be delayed too.

And the second reason we gave is since, you know, the single character IDN has already been gone so many times, actually gone four rounds of community discussion and so far there's really not, you know, strong objections from the community. So basically we reached the consensus among the community so we don't - what we really, you know, think it should, you know, be taken by the board.

And the third reason we gave to the board is, you know, if - although the board asked us to, you know, requires input from all the ACs that there's really no implementation plan for a single character IDN TLD at this point. So we're really saying there should be implementation team, you know, in place to start work out implementation plan.

Also I think actually as a third point, you know, even the board - in the board resolution ask us to request input from collection of ACs. I really think, you know, there is lack of rationale to ask us to do so because, you know, each

time when we publish the report we did give the public comments period. And there is really no objection from any AC or any SOs so far.

So actually I don't understand why we should, you know, get the, you know, endorsement from every single AC at this point. Probably, you know, there's some comments I would like to make.

Actually for the, you know, for the action we have been asked there is three action there. The first is implement the, you know, community consensus on single character IDN, you know, without delay by one side or the other.

And the second one is, you know, to form a implementation team to assist the staff to implement single character IDN. And the third one is update the new gTLD applicant guidebook for (section) implementation.

And I did read the comments from Avri. She did suggest some amend on the wording. I think we could include her comments in our next version of draft. I'm wondering is anybody else, you know, have any other comments on this draft?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart.

Jian Zhang: Hi.

Bart Boswinkel: And say this is more procedural point, say, not based on the comment itself. I think what should be clarified and, say, with both this GNSO ccNSO, so, Council who will send this letter whether it's the JIG itself or the respective ccNSO and GNSO Council. So this could come as a request from the JIG to the respective councils to send it and to adopt the letter.

Because if you look at the mandate or the charter of the JIG it's not clear to me and probably not to the councilors or to the respective councils whether

the JIG can send out a letter on its own yes or no. Yes, as individuals of course but as a working group under both councils.

Jian Zhang: Yes, actually my understanding is once we're finished is a response letter we're going to send it to both councils...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Jian Zhang: ...to get the endorsement from both councils.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jian Zhang: ...to the board.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe that's why. And so - and it's - and then the question is should the councils send it or should the JIG send it in - by itself.

Jian Zhang: Okay. So then could we ask board for clarification or should we ask both councils to...

Bart Boswinkel: I think it's a matter of both councils, say, in the endorsement. But it's part of it, say, you can go either way. But it's more...

Jian Zhang: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: ...a matter of the councils to decide whether they want to send it or they endorse the JIG to send it. But it should be clear that say - but that's more a procedural point.

Jian Zhang: Okay. Anybody else have any comments on the draft?

((Crosstalk))

Christopher Dillon: Sorry, hello, this is Christopher Dillon. I'm wondering, I mean, it may just be that I don't understand the - I mean, I'm relatively new to the working group and it's just that I don't understand.

But I - there's a lot of talk about implementation plan but it strikes me that if the guide book could change the evaluation panels would just process the one character TLDs like all the other applications. I mean, I'm really wondering why, you know, why is an implementation plan necessary?

Jian Zhang: Because it's not only about the guidebook - gTLD guidebook, it also it really factors this IDN ccTLD.

Christopher Dillon: Oh sorry, yes, yes, okay, yes, I see. I mean, the guidebook...

Jian Zhang: Yes.

Christopher Dillon: ...is dealing with generics here.

((Crosstalk))

Jian Zhang: Yes so...

Christopher Dillon: Yes.

Jian Zhang: ...we also, you know, ask to amend the new gTLD applicant guidebook but meanwhile, you know, there should be a implementation plan for the whole package.

Christopher Dillon: Sorry, yes, I understand.

Jian Zhang: Okay. Anybody else have any comments on this?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe - this is Bart again Jian. It's, say, I do understand as we briefly discussed you could interpret the board resolution as coupling both the Fast Track or the overall policy in new gTLD and that's one of the statements. But maybe it should be clarified why the JIG thinks these two are coupled again and on what basis.

Because it's saying the board resolution itself is fairly vague in my opinion. But...

Jian Zhang: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So it suggests something, say, the August - it's under number one, say, the August 2000 board resolution perhaps inadvertently conflicted with this community's consensus and the community consensus is that the introduction of IDN gTLDs or IDN ccTLDs should not be delayed because of lack of readiness of one category.

So, say, the claim is that the board resolution of August 2011 is perhaps inadvertently conflicts with this general broad statement. But, say, in itself if you look at the board resolution as such it is, yes, it's not explicitly mentioned that way. So maybe clarify on what basis the JIG assumes this.

Jian Zhang: Okay. I got your point. Yes, we probably should, you know, raise the board resolution carefully and, you know...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes and maybe it's just a matter of - as a matter of clarification ask whether this is the case and not just make it as a statement because then you make a statement on something which is not in - say which is perhaps inadvertently wrongly phrased or something.

Jian Zhang: Okay, I agree. Probably we should do more homework, you know, on that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, there is a lot of assumptions.

Jian Zhang: Okay. Is there any other comments? If not I think Edmon and me are going to work on the draft again and probably (this) couple days we are going to send another version to the mailing list. If anyone could give us feedback as soon as possible that'd be great.

Then probably we could make it on time before next council meeting - both council's meeting - send it to the - both council. So...

Bart Boswinkel: Jian, you are aware that the ccNSO Council meeting is next Tuesday?

Jian Zhang: Yes. Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Otherwise, yes, you can make a - there is one in December as well.

Jian Zhang: We'll see how far, you know, we could - but I think it wouldn't take long for another version to be released. So probably I think just couple days we could work hard on that version. But do thanks to remind me, Bart.

I think if there's no other issue I think that's pretty much it for today because, you know, this is really something urgent. As Bart mentioned it's really - we don't have much time if we do want different - single character's (name) in the new gTLD first round. So we probably should push really hard to see if still, you know, we could do it in time.

Then thanks everybody.

Woman: Sorry, I joined in late. I was listening in. This is (unintelligible).

Jian Zhang: Hi. I was asking everybody if they have any...

Woman: Yes, I just - yes, no, no, no comments. I just wanted to...

Jian Zhang: Okay. Okay. As I mentioned if there's no other comments we - I already make note with all the comments we heard today. And Edmon and me are going to work on another draft for the - a response to the board. And we probably going to send out another draft next couple days to the mailing list to see - to get feedback from members.

And then hopefully we could, you know, get to the both council in time to have a discussion in the council meeting. If there's no comments or is there any other issue anybody want to raise? I heard none so I think this - that's it for today. Thanks everybody...

Woman: Okay thanks.

Jian Zhang: ...for the comments. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Jian Zhang: Bye-bye.

                                    END