Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Group (JIG) TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 20th December 2011 at 1330 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Group (JIG) meeting on Tuesday 20th December 2011 at 1330 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-20111220-en.mp3\

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/

Attendees:

Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Jian Zhang, NomCom Appointee
Dennis Jennings
Sarmad Hussein
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Jothan Frakes, IDN VIP (Observer)
June Seo, RySG
Sun XianTang, .cn
Yung Lee

Coordinator: ...conference is now being recorded.

                      Please go ahead. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Would you like me to do a roll call?

Man: Yes, please.

Nathalie Peregrine: All right. Perfect.

And good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the (unintelligible) call on the 20th of December 2011.

On the call today, we have Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Chris Dillon and Edmon Chung. From staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We have apologies from Fahd Batayneh and (Jan Jones).

And I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking, for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Man: Thank you Nathalie and thank you everyone for joining the call.

I sent around a pretty brief agenda today. (Jane) couldn't join us -- she has some emergency that she needs to tend to. So I guess we'll start off with a bit of an update from the work at the VIP -- mainly the Variant Issues project.

And then talk a little bit about the update on the - on our address to response to the August board resolution and then come back to the initial report that looked - hoping to finalize that and see if we are at a point we could post it out for public comments.

So with that, I guess I don't hear (Dennis) on the call. In terms of the VIP work, I have been following the integrated - what is called the integrated team work. And we had a - we had a face to - well, there were a couple of graphs were sent around.

A face-to-face meeting was conducted about a week ago in L.A. And so apparently the December 15th original target was missed a little bit. A further - a further draft is due -- actually, I'm looking at it -- has just been sent out earlier to, you know, in a, you know, a few hours ago.

It was supposed to be sent out yesterday, but in any case, it was sent out a few hours ago. I will circulate that latest draft to this group as well, I guess -- as we speak, I guess.

And so the - I guess we - the timeline is now hoping to have this draft - well, have this go out for publish - for public comments end of this week or some time, you know, some time next week and then have it run for about three/four weeks for public comments and then finalize everything in time for board consideration in - for Costa Rica.

The - in the - through the course of discussion, it became clear that it - this integrated issues report is going to be a - more of a staff director report. So it's a - not a community product.

The Studies team report would be more of a community product and this integrated issues report would be a staff directed report. There are some - there are quite some differences to it.

I'll - I'm just about to forward it out so everyone can take a look. And I guess from there we could consider further work on one of the issues that we identified, which is the variant - IM variant issue.

So that's a brief update. I don't know whether anyone else has any thoughts on that and any questions.

Hello? Are people still on? Trying to make sure. Anyone who's on can speak up.

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes, I'm on. This is Nathalie.

Man: Oh, okay.

Chris Dillon: I'm on. This is Chris.

Man: Okay.

So I guess we'll forward it out. It's quite different from the Study team reports. Much - I don't - I don't think change is the right word, but it is an attempt to consolidate some of the thoughts and to present a possible approach for further development of the work.

So it's quite distinct from the Study team reports and I guess it will give us quite a bit to chew on when it - when it - when it - when it comes out. I just forwarded it to the list.

Anyway, so I guess we can - one of the things we can do is in the next couple of weeks take a look at the draft and whatever becomes the final version that goes out for public comments and consider whether this group should try to draft some comments into the public comment process.

Okay. Any further thoughts/questions on the VIP work?

Woman: Mute off.

Man: Mute off.

Somebody's trying to speak? Or - hearing nothing. If anyone's trying to speak, please jump in at any time.

Okay. So the next item is the update on the response to the August board resolution. In - for - the process forward was that the GNSO council and the ccNSO council would consider it and if they adopt it, then will forward it to - they would in turn forward it to the board.

What has happened is in the GNSO meeting last week, the letter and - basically was adopted -- the response was adopted. And in the - as you can

see from (Jane)'s email to the mailing list early, you know, it's not too long ago, the ccNSO council has opted to draft a letter of their own.

They appear to be still supportive of the work that we've done, but have - would - is considering - would be considering, you know, actually drafting a different letter.

So that poses an interesting, I guess, situation for this group as well as for, you know, how we should interact with both councils. And I guess, you know, I'd like to see if anyone has any thoughts on how we should...

Woman: Mute off.

Man: ...go about the situation.

So in summary, the GNSO council has approved the letter and the ccNSO council did not approve the letter, but, you know, but will draft something on their own.

So I wonder if Bart has anything to add to this or anyone else have any thoughts on how -- I guess as a joint working group -- we should proceed with this situation?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

After Bart, put me in the queue.

Bart Boswinkel: So the - it's - people are saying - this is Bart.

Can you hear me?

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: Yes, Bart. Please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: No, I head Avri saying something. But she was fading...

Avri Doria: Yes.

                 I said after Bart, please put me in the queue.

Bart Boswinkel: ...and you as well, at the end.

Bart Boswinkel: Avri...

Avri Doria: I said after Bart, please.

Bart Boswinkel: ...you want to say something first?

Avri Doria: I said after Bart, please put me in the queue.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

                 Say - what - said the council meeting just finished about quarter past 1. They
                 spent quite some time on it and I think, say, my suggestion would be that at
                 least the two chairs - so that's the chair of the ccNSO and the GNSO get in
                 touch with each other and sort out how they want to progress.

                 So that - what would - could always happen and - but that's more - the logic
                 of it is that both the ccNSO and the GNSO send their own letter. But that
                 would weaken the - probably the message.

                 The ccNSO - to be more specific, the ccNSO would say their intention is to
                 ask more clarification at this stage to the board -- say, "What is the status,"

and, "What are the, say, the specific questions to the SSAC, et cetera," and then move forward.

At the - at the same time, they still - they support the original introduction of single IDN TLD's. So it's - say - that's what I suggested in the council call as well -- that the chairs get in touch with each other.

Man: Okay.

I - Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. Thanks.

I was going to say something similar, but obviously from a different perspective -- that yes, I think the GNSO and the ccNSO should attempt to have the same letter.

And I think several times in other issues we've seen a, you know, a communication go back and forth between either two SO's or an SO and an AC trying to get things aligned. And I think that that would be the best option.

Man: Right.

Yes, I very much concur. And even though it would (unintelligible), I think that's probably the better approach at this point, unless it diverges significantly and is, you know, the letter that the ccNSO council is interested in would be focused only on CC - IDN ccTLD's.

And there - at that point, we might have to take a look at, you know, how to go further. But at this point, I think the - probably the - in the GNSO resolution that we helped the GNSO council draft, it also stated that in the - that the letter would be sent only if there is mutual approval from both councils.

So in this case - I mean, the GNSO is not, you know, without further resolution on the - on the subject, the GNSO council wouldn't be sending a letter out, anyway.

So that, you know, in - even in the case where each council would send their own letter, further action would need to be taken in the GNSO council, as well.

So that's where we are at this point. And so I guess as Bart and Avri both sort of pointed to, I think the - probably the best step forward for the GNSO council and the ccNSO council chairs to try to sort out how best to go about it.

And I, you know, if - it's probably useful for myself and (Jane) to join the discussion as well. I wonder, Bart, if you think it might be a good idea for - maybe for me to start an email thread with - basically with (Stephane) and (Leslie), (Jane) and I and - to start the discussion?

Bart Boswinkel: I think - I think it -- but this is more a procedural step -- I think as a first one is that (Leslie) informs (Stephane) of what has happened.

Based on that one is - as a next step is that they start involving the JIG is where we are.

Man: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So I'd say normally (Leslie) is quite quickly in following up on what has happened, so I think that would be the most appropriate route.

Man: Okay.

Yes, I think that makes sense. I guess we'll wait for the - I guess the signal from (Leslie) and the ccNSO council. And we'll…

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

                   And say - and then it flows back and say then you have - then you have a
                   starting point for a conversation.

Man: All right. Sounds good.

                   And I think this is a - this presents us with a - with a - with a very interesting
                   situation and a situation where - would provide actually good experience for
                   these type of joint...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Man: ...between SO's.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Man: Any further issues or thoughts on this?

                   If not I'll move to the third item, which is the initial report on universal
                   acceptance of IDN TLD's.

                   I sent around a revised - an updated draft a few hours ago and I wonder if
                   people have had chance to take a look at it. Basically, it...

Woman: Mute off.

Man: ...added a number of things to it -- relatively minor -- mainly from the
                   suggestions and comments received, especially from Avri, spelled out some
                   of the acronyms and added some more description to a couple of issues,
                   especially as was discussed in Dakar -- most importantly, the topic of

emerging industry standards, such as the Mozilla Public Suffix list and how that plays a role with - in IDN TLD's.

And as new IDN ccTLD's and IDN gTLD's are added, the situation where these lists are out of sync with the root list or root database managed at ICANN and what should be done there or, you know, some, you know, the community for further...

Woman: Mute off.

Man: ...input on this particular issue.

So I wonder if anyone have any further thoughts or comments on it? And...

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Man: Okay.

Yes, Avri. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

Yes, I think for the most part I thank you for responding to most of my comments. And I think it's a lot clearer now. At least, you know, I understand it.

The only question I still have -- and I'm not sure it's in there and I'm not even sure it needs to be in there, but it's a question -- is, what emergent industry standards?

I say that - I understand the suffix list, I understand the Wikipedia TLD list, but what emerging - I mean, what emerging industry standards are we referring to, specifically?

And I don't...

Man: Well specifically, those are the two.

Avri Doria: ...see them in the notes.

                Maybe I'm missing them, but...

Man: Yes, those are the - those are the two that were listed...

Avri Doria: Oh, because it...

Man: ...because those were the...

Avri Doria: ...seems to be listed like they're - oh, okay.

                I - never mind. I'm being an idiot. I see the category difference. Never mind.
                I'm fine with it. Thanks.

Man: Oh.

                Okay, because those were the two that we identified. But, you know, I guess
                we - just for completeness sake -- we're not saying that these are definitive.

                So if the public comments come back and other people identify some other
                lists...

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: ...or things, then, you know, that.

Avri Doria: Right.

Can I - yes, this is Avri again. Maybe I can recommend, because these are okay and I - and I see what I've - what I'm - what I'm understanding incorrectly.

First of all, you're right. It is B and then there was I and II -- I should have noticed that. I and II -- Mozilla and Wikipedia -- are not exactly industry standards -- they may be de facto industry standards.

And perhaps B, for peasants like me, might be better expressed as emerging de facto industry standards such as, and then - and then leave it open with those two examples.

And then - because when I was looking - thinking of industry standards, I was looking for W3C, I was looking for IETF, I was looking for IEEE, I was looking for an SDO -- a standards development organization -- more than, you know, an industry de facto.

And I agree that Mozilla and Wikipedia do establish de facto standard-ish things, but it - with - I don't know if that wording would be problematic. But I suggest something like that and maybe it's just for peasants like me.

Thanks.

Man: Oh no, thank you.

Avri, I think, you know, the - just calling it de facto would probably be more clear. I usually use industry standards for Internet standards, but you - I think you - the way you described it is probably clearer for most readers, so I'll update that.

Anything else that people (unintelligible) I, you know, since you haven't quite joined us before, I was wondering if you have had a chance to take a look and if you have any thoughts to document?

Chris, are you still here with us?

Chris Dillon: Yes, I'm still here.

Yes, I had a look at the document and actually found that, you know, very little to comment about it. I mean, you know, obviously as a representative of academia, I look at some of the sections and wish that, you know, I could, you know, academia was perhaps mentioned as being, you know, some of the organizations that ICANN is interested in involving in this.

But that's really about as far as I got as regards criticism.

Man: If you have, you know, if you think there are a few organizations that you would insert in there, please feel free to add to the list.

It's...

Chris Dillon: I think I would - I would like to see - I mean, you know, not specific organizations, but just, you know, more of a mention of academia, because at the moment, you know, not very many academic organizations attend ICANN meetings.

I always do look out for them and I don't really see them. But, you know, it would be, you know, good if there was more mention, because, you know, at the end of - at, you know, at the end of the day, you know, they will be able to provide unbiased comments on various matters.

Man: I think that is valuable, you know, for the ICANN community for sure.

I wonder if just -- I guess thinking out loud here and making a suggestion -- perhaps in various areas -- especially under two where, you know, which organizations ICANN should better work with -- we can add a - sort of a generic description of - as well as, you know, academia - academic organizations or institutions, you know, sort of relevant academic organizations and institutions.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Man: Would that...

Chris Dillon: I mean, at the moment as I say it, you know, it does - it does seem as if relatively few are active in the area.

But it would be nice to try and open it out, perhaps.

Man: Sure.

Do you have a, you know, such as, you know, because that helps - I guess us and readers better understand, you know, what are the kinds of people we're talking about?

Chris Dillon: I mean, you could - I mean - you see - you see, oddly enough, if you - if you were - if you were actually to say academic organizations, you know, involved in Internet governance for example, that would really close it down to a very, very small number of universities.

So my own preference would be actually to leave it quite open in the hope that you actually encourage various academic organizations to get involved.

Man: So I guess your suggestion is just to leave it at a generic description and not have a such as or example?

Chris Dillon: I mean, one could - one could give examples such, you know, one could - one could list subject areas so, you know, this might be, you know, areas such as Internet law so academic organizations researching or teaching Internet law.

You could also perhaps mention universities teaching large numbers of languages, because, you know, the whole IDN area is of the, you know, is of potential interest to them.

Man: Okay.

So that would still be a generic statement rather than...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Man: ...an actual...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Man: ...organization or university or...

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Man: Okay.

No, I think that is - that is fine. And I'll add that along with Avri's suggestion earlier.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

Man: Any further thoughts or comments?

Rafik, are you still with us? Okay. Well, I guess hearing none. I'm interested to know in terms of the timing, because I recently have been in discussion with (Carla) and the new gTLD team.

They're also looking at this subject and we're trying to see if there are - there are things we can do together and also try to, you know, reach more people in the community to get their feedback on the - some of the topics that we have raised and some of the questions that we have raised.

So in terms of timing, I'd like to turn around this document with the - I guess final touches that we just discussed and see if we can post it for public comments shortly.

In terms of the - I guess staff side, Bart or Nathalie, I wonder what is - it - are - it - are the offices still open next week? Or...

Bart Boswinkel: No they aren't.

Man: They aren't.

Bart Boswinkel: But it's - say, I think you have a couple of - couple of points.

I think if you turn it 'round, say, to strengthen the document and to avoid discussion, I would suggest that the working group adopts it as such on the email list over the next couple of days. And that, say, the officers and staff is - the offices are closed next week as of Friday afternoon and they open up again on the 3rd of January.

And say - and I suggest that the first week of January, the working group posts its' interim document, because nothing will happen during the seasonal break anyway.

And it's - it strengthens - it's like - I don't - not to be accused of being a thief in the night publishing something just before the seasonal break while nobody's reading email anyway, they'll publish it around - yes, say the first week of January.

Man: Given the time, though, especially if the - I understand that the new gTLD group is interested in putting this out and also we are a little bit late on our own schedule, we are supposed to put this out for public comments within this year.

I'm hoping that if I can turn this around and have a couple of days of, you know, for us to confirm it and if we can have this posted on Friday...

Woman: Mute off.

Man: ...that that would - that would work well.

I guess, you know, the question is how - who would be able to help us do that? Is it - is it a Bart or - would you be - or Nathalie and whether, you know, whether timing might work, because that allows us to have this published within the year -- at least we're not, you know, optically we're not as far off.

But we could put it out for a longer period.

Bart Boswinkel: Oh, that's no issue.

Say, I'm available. Say, if you have it by Friday and - say, I can prepare it and so - see if (unintelligible) staff is available to publish it on Friday, that wouldn't be too much of an issue.

It's more the -- but that's a working group decision -- is - what is best optically? And then you can prolong it, but, say, how it works and if you have

the buy-in and if you consider it, you have the buy-in of the working group before Friday on a final draft X study, that's fine.

Man: Sure.

                What - I guess what do others think? Avri?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Man: Yes. Hi.

Avri Doria: I'll always have an opinion.

                For me, the holiday is hostess and that's today. And, you know, I'm not sure about people not reading during the period just because ICANN is closed. So I would suggest that if people can fit it into the schedule, because I know when people are rushing towards a holiday they've got to fixed amount of work they've got to get done and adding something on the Tuesday/Wednesday may be unkind to people that are trying to get out to vacation.

                But if it can be handled, I think your suggestion of making it a slightly longer period but getting it out at - as soon as you can is reasonable. As I say, a lot of us don't take off the next two weeks.

                They're slightly quieter, we can catch up on our reading, we can do a lot of work without having, you know, lots of meetings. And so that's a great working period.

                So, you know, and happy Solstice, everyone. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: You know, it's - say, as I said, say, that's up to the working group.

Say if I have a final deck, say, by Friday morning my time, the - say, and I can prepare the public comment document and et cetera in advance, it - we should be able to publish it on Friday...

Man: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: ...but that depends a bit on NDR.

But I - so - but it's more the working group -- if you feel comfortable with the final text.

Man: Okay.

So I guess the, you know, most of the text have been quite stable for some time now. And I, you know, I'm - unless others speak strongly against it, I'd like to try to turn around the final two edits probably in the next hour or so.

And we'll circulate it one last time for a couple of days to end of Thursday and, you know, if we don't see any further requests for adjustments, then we'll consider it finalized and pass it over to staff Friday morning -- I guess Asia time.

That gives us then - Bart, it gives you some time. I guess you're in the European time zone.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Man: And then, you know, Friday to work on it and then pass it over to the team in US Pacific time.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And it says I can do the preparatory work anyway.

So that - that's not the issue. It's - say, I can't control the NDR and what they need to publish. But what I can do in advance, I can do in advance. So - and it's up to, you know, when you have the final text ready.

Man: Understand.

So I guess that's - at least that's the current target and plan. And thanks for being flexible. And we'll hope that staff could turn around. I agree very much with Avri.

And in fact, you know, of the last, you know, quite a number of Christmas and holidays is the best time to read up on this very - these very exciting documents.

So that's also, you know, part of the motivation of trying to, you know, get it out, is people do tend to browse around for the stuff during this time.

Okay. So I guess with that, we are - this was a pretty short meeting. We shortened it because of the text issues earlier, but this actually brings us to the end of the meeting just in time.

So I wonder if anyone has any further thing they want to raise before we close the call?

Avri Doria: I assume we're not going to meet until after...

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...ICANN comes back to work.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: So - oh, that's a good question.

                       So would we be able to go back to the cycle so that this, you know, our next
                       meeting would be two weeks from now -- that will be January 3rd. Is that a
                       possibility or should we move it further to January 10th, given the time
                       zones?

Avri Doria: I would recommend moving it the one more week...

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...and restarting the cycle on the 10th.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Chris Dillon: Yes.

Man: Right. Yes, I think that makes sense.

                       So Nathalie and Bart, I guess you got that?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. We'll sort it out.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: And should we move it back to the 12 UTC or the 13 UTC time?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: That's again up to you.

                       Say, it's - say, 1300 is easier for the people in - say that's 2:00 pm CAT.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: It's easier for the people on the east coast.

And then, say, like Avri or in the US, but more difficult in Asia, so it's up to you.

Man: No, I'm fine.

The later the better for me, actually. So let's keep it at 1300, then -- 1300 UTC at least would be...

Bart Boswinkel: Thirteen hundred UTC? Okay.

Man: ...a better time.

Thirteen hundred UTC for the - I guess for the wintertime. And then we'll revisit this when we go back to summertime.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Okay.

Man: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So that's - the next meeting will be on the 10th of January at 1300 UTC.

Man: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Man: Okay.

So I guess with that, thank you everyone for taking the time. And Merry Christmas and a happy new year.

Avri Doria: And happy Hanukkah and Saturnalia and Solstice, too.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

                Okay, bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, everyone.

Nathalie Peregrine: I was - bye.

Man: Thank you.

                Goodbye.

Chris Dillon: Merry Christmas.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much.

                (I was wondering) if you could you please stop the recordings?

                            END