JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 23 November 2010 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 23 November 2010 at 1200 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jig-20101123-en.mp3

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

Participants on the Call:
Edmon Chung - Chair
Jian Zhang - co-chair
Rafik Dammak

ICANN Staff
Kristina Nordstrom
Bart Boswinkel

Apologies:
Avri Doria
Sarmad Hussain
Fahd Batayneh

Kristina Nordstrom: Hello everyone and welcome to this JIG Working Group call today, the 23rd of November. On the call we have Jan Sangh, Rafik Dammak and Edmon Chung.

From Staff we have Bart Boswinkel and Kristina Nordstrom, and apologies we have from Avri Doria, Bob Bratina and Sarmad Hussain.

Edmon Chung: Okay, thank you. Seems like we don't really have a lot of people on the call. I think in terms of last time we met, we said we were going to try to wrap up some of the discussion on, sorry, the – I guess the draft final report from the JIG on single character IDN TLDs, and for the issue of variant TLDs we would try to get that discussion in Cartagena.

And on – sorry, I'm sort of losing my voice. Sorry. And so on that I guess thank you Bart for sending out the invitation to Tina, and Kurt, I understand that Tina will be joining our session in Cartagena.

I think that will be very useful and very important for us to synchronize some of the ongoing discussions about variant IDN TLDs, so I think we look forward to syncing with that.

On that I just want to get a sense Bart if you could – I guess I'll do that too, but to just sort of bring Tina's attention to the document that we have tried to put together and some of the issues so that we could bring her up to speed before the discussion in Cartagena.

That probably would be most useful and also – yes, and also the Staff report and work plan, if we could have any kind of indication or, you know, any kind of summary of where that is, it probably will help this group consider, you know, what to talk about going forward as well. Any update on that?

Bart Boswinkel: No, sorry, I don't say regarding the say the document, the – say the – from the Working Group until now I've sent it to Tina already and Kurt some time ago but as a first step to avoid overlap or – and so they have a copy.

But I'll forward it again to Tina and ask Kurt and Tina to provide at least yes, probably it will be done at the meeting itself, but if possible before we meet in Cartagena provide an update where they are with the say the issues paper which they were asked to produce for the Board.

Edmon Chung: Right. I guess that would be really useful because I guess everyone's intent is to try to minimize the overlap, especially should things sort of branch out and create contradicting – conflicting results.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that is very clear so I think from - as you've noticed from Tina's email that she's more or less – or she's I think very much on the same page on this - is yes, there will be ample possibilities to interfere and yes, avoiding overlap or doing two things at the same time or yes, at the same time, two groups working or three groups in fact working on the same topic is a bit overkill.

Edmon Chung: Right. Exactly, and I'm very aware of the IDN ccPDP. I actually take this opportunity to apologize. I keep – so the timing - I keep missing the meetings, but I am on that list.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, but it's say for your information, I'm quoting information of the JIG, let me give you a brief update where we are with the PDP if you don't mind.

Edmon Chung: I think that would be great.

Bart Boswinkel: Say, we got to say variant management. The PDP hasn't started any discussion on that topic yet. They are focusing on the criteria and requirements for the selection of IDN ccTLDs so that revisiting part of the IDNC Working Group recommendations and to the IDN Fast Track process itself.

And what they've done, they've made a - or they distinguished between criteria and requirements on the one hand and process and procedures on the other hand, because if you look at the current implementation plan and at the IDNC Working Group, it is all a bit lumped together.

The criteria are embedded in the process and procedures which makes it very confusing. It reads easily but in order to understand what is – what are the criteria for IDN ccTLD strings, it's a bit difficult.

So the Working Group is now – has more or less reached a consensus position on some of the major criteria and it will publish a progress report on where they are hopefully by the end of this week.

And that will focus mainly on the criteria and some still need further discussion with the community, especially with the GAC. That's about where the Working Group is.

Edmon Chung: Great. Thank you for the update. So I guess that's where we are in terms of some interaction with the ccPDP and also on the issue of IDN TLD variant. So I think we would like to spend most of the time at this meeting going through the Draft 2 of the final report.

I think the original target was to try to get this sent – published before Cartagena. I think it seems to me that it could still be done. I have had – in the last meeting I think the main issue was on the – whether our recommendation would distinguish between alphabetic versus non-alphabetic single character IDN TLDs.

Since then I have had a number of discussions and also incorporated some of the changes into the latest draft. Again I apologize for sending it out relatively late but it should incorporate the discussion we had last time.

So I think probably the best thing is to walk through it. I understand that we don't have a lot of people on the call today, so I think in terms of process I'd like to walk through this, especially with those who are on the call today and then put this out sort of for last call for the remainder of the week and, you know, and try to wrap up any further comments on which Sarmad who was – who has been having the most comments on the issue of alphabetic versus non-alphabetic script IDN – single character IDN TLDs has indicted that he would respond shortly on the list.

He wasn't able to join the call today so that's sort of the plan right now. Any questions or thoughts about that?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe…

Jan Sangh: Hi, this is Jan. Hello? Hi Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Jan Sangh: Yes, actually I got a quick question. Do we still have enough time to put our, you know, output from, you know, our meeting or, you know, our final report into the gTLD Guidebook final version?

Edmon Chung: Well I think that's a question that is relevant and irrelevant at the same time. It's relevant that, you know, of course we would like for it to be but I think we – when we started the work we have said that, you know, we would not hinder the New gTLD process.

Right now looking at, you know, the original proposed schedule I would say it might be a little bit tight, but I think with most of the things at ICANN we can expect – I hate to say delay but a bit more deliberation and input into the process which would bring the end date a little bit further forward for the, you know, further.

So I don't know. I mean, I'm not sure. Since Olof is not on the call I don't know whether Bart or anyone can enlighten on this, but I think right now it is possible. But I don't think that needs to be - necessarily be the target of the group.

Bart Boswinkel: I don't know if Olof – Edmon, this is Bart. Olof is not on the call. I don't know if it's possible but I could imagine or what I could envision is that either you or Chuck would contact the responsible Staff in this case, probably Kurt,

and send us – and ask if he can send this along given that this is ongoing work.

Edmon Chung: Right. Yes, I'll definitely do that. In fact I have alerted Chuck on this and kept him up to date, but note that the GNSO Chair is also scheduled to be changed by the end of Cartagena.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe you as Chair and together with Jan as the two Co-Chairs inform Kurt or the Staff people responsible that this is upcoming. We have to go through the process and I want to send – do you want to send a strong.

Edmon Chung: Right. I think yes, I – again I think this is a good question and I think – and I agree with Bart that we should start the process, even though we don't know whether we'll make it but I think we should start the process and giving some heads up to Staff and to GNSO about the final report.

Jan Sangh: Okay, thanks Bart. Thank you for your position.

Edmon Chung: Okay, with that let's I guess – Bart, you had a – did you want to speak because Jan - you started speaking and then Jan…

Bart Boswinkel: So it's – please, I'll – I have some – then maybe what we've got to the process itself with publication as well, say what – if the Working Group agrees on a text by I would say end of this week, I could try to have a public announcement by Monday.

I think that's still feasible, Monday or Tuesday, and my question – the real question is, what would be the end date for the public consultation? I think we discussed that at the time but…

Edmon Chung: That's a good question. That would be the 29th and if we go with a 30-day period which would be 21 days plus, you know, a number of days for the ICANN meeting, that would take us to the end of the year and I would – I

think I'd like to suggest the 29th actually because that gives us the whole week of – at ICANN and then in that extra week afterwards for any consideration.

And then, you know, it prepares us in the possible scenario to put something forward to the Councils – the respective Councils in their January meeting.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, probably you will – I don't mind but you probably will get some pushback because say the meeting itself closes…

Edmon Chung: On the 10th.

Bart Boswinkel: The 10th, yes, but then you have one week and then maybe two weeks and then it's Christmas.

Edmon Chung: I understand. I'd like to – I think – well let's try to do it like last time where we include the Chairs of both ccNSO and GNSO in considering the date, but I – if we can – but again it depends on the remainder of the week.

If we have substantial issues then we might not even make it. So – but if we are okay then I think we'd like to get the two Chairs involved in – to see what date might be a – an appropriate date.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe rephrase the question. When is the next or when is the GNSO Council scheduled to meet in January?

Edmon Chung: That's a good question. I think last time we asked that question as well.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. That's another way of approaching it, say then you can do some backtracking.

Edmon Chung: All right.

Jan Sangh: Bart, when – is going to meet?

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry?

Jan Sangh: When ccNSO going to meet?

Bart Boswinkel: It hasn't been scheduled yet but I'll doubt it will be before – it will be something around the – either the 18th or the 25th of January.

Jan Sangh: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: That's my guess.

Edmon Chung: It says 6th of January so it might be pretty tight anyway.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. So why not aim for the say - and you have – the GNSO has its meetings every three weeks, doesn't it?

Edmon Chung: Correct.

Bart Boswinkel: So if it's the 6th then it will be - the next one will be the 27th.

Edmon Chung: Correct.

Bart Boswinkel: And I think if you would aim for the 27th that will – and inform the Chairs that you want to do it on the 27th, that would not put too much pressure on it, and inform the say New gTLD Staff by the 27th it will be adopted or not possibly, and not – it almost – so then you have a fixed – then you have the real date, a hard date without really putting a lot of pressure on people.

Edmon Chung: No, I think that makes sense. I'd like to – but even with that I'd like to sort of put a date for the comment period, a – my gut feeling says if we put a date

within 2010 it gets more people interested to talk about it and come up with the comments at – in Cartagena.

But, you know, that's why I'd still like to suggest the 29th, but I'm happy to move it a little bit so that, you know, people feel more comfortable. But just because of the 2010-2011 thing, you know, it just – because if we catch people's attention that, oh, within this year then I'm sure people would be more willing to discuss about it and provide comments shortly versus if it's 2011 then they would wait after Christmas and then, you know, basically…

Bart Boswinkel: So perhaps between that…

Edmon Chung: That's my sort of worry but I'm happy both ways.

Bart Boswinkel: So say from another point of view say if – it also – if you have – you close out the comment period by the 29th it will take a couple of days as of the 29th until say the next week, so the 5th or 6th, nothing will happen from our end either.

So January you need one or two weeks to do the analysis, discuss it with the Working Group before you can send a final report if any to the Council, so 29th I think is a good date and then again you still need to aim for the 27th.

Edmon Chung: Right, that's sort of what I have in mind so…

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so I'd like to, you know, propose the 29th and then if both Chairs are, you know, really uncomfortable with it we'll make adjustments.

Bart Boswinkel: And you can always waive the date as Chairs.

Edmon Chung: Right. Right. Exactly.

Bart Boswinkel: As we did with the previous version – as you did with the previous version.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: That's clear.

Edmon Chung: So with that I'd like to jump to the document itself. The – I summarized some of the changes that were made but I guess I'll, you know, I'll sort of walk through it and see if anybody has any thoughts and comments on it.

So to start with we talked about having a session to outline and to clarify what the – this sort of draft final report is for and also the process forward, which is to get the public comments and try to finalize it.

We've also added a part where it says, you know, if the comments turn out to be quite substantial then we might not have a final report. We might need to have another draft final report to solicit further input.

But if it seems okay then the process forward would be to present it to the respective Councils, and then thereupon actually it would be up to the respective Councils to make the decision on how and what to act on the report.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, I have to say, one question regarding the first paragraph.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: That's to propose policy recommendations. I would leave out the word policy in this case. It say from – if you would go for the – I have some questions about the Fast Track as well.

But if you would go for the Fast Track, the Fast Track is not a policy by definition.

Edmon Chung: Okay, that's right. You're right. I think it's probably better to leave out policy anyway. That's a good point.

Bart Boswinkel: I've deleted it. Also is – what I'll do is – because I thought maybe add some stuff to make it as I did with the previous report as well, and send it to you and Jan by tomorrow morning my time.

Edmon Chung: Yes, that would be great.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I will do that. So I'll make some notes.

Jan Sangh: Yes. Okay Bart.

Edmon Chung: So otherwise the sort of first section should be relatively straightforward, repeating some of the things that we said and just outlining the process forward, and then the introduction and background.

That – most of it is copy and paste from the initial report, except for just a update on the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook from the previous version to the current version.

Do we think there's any other additional thing we need to add to this background section?

Bart Boswinkel: I would say that one more – I don't know. I couldn't read that so quickly but have you included a reference maybe in this section to the issue report and

the public comments, et cetera, just document where it can be found, et cetera, so that's more as a procedural update.

Edmon Chung: In fact we included it in the next section where it's just, you know, repeats part of the initial report and then have pointers to the public comments.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay. Leave it out.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so essentially that's Section 2 and 3. Section 2 is just reiterating the policy aspects that were identified in the initial report and with the discussions included in Appendix A, because I think that the flow is a little bit better that way because that's a bunch of discussion which led to the public comments which are more important for this report.

So I sort of have a list of the policy aspects and then followed by the summary and responses to the public comments. So in Section 3 starting – started with the – just a pointer to the Staff summary report and then on each issue a response to the set of comments.

Bart Boswinkel: I would include the initial - pointer to the initial report itself as well, but I'll check on that one.

Edmon Chung: Well, that's right. I – that's a good point. I – actually I should – I – for some reason I didn't but I should include it I think in Section 2.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Yes, I think it's…

Bart Boswinkel: Two or in Section 1.

Edmon Chung: Or in…

Bart Boswinkel: But let me check but it should be included.

Edmon Chung: Yes, I think 2 or 1, at the end of 1 or, you know, at the beginning of 2.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Either way it should be fine. So that's a good point. Okay, I guess a number of substance – a couple of issues of substance would be the - going through each issue for the summary response.

I sort of excerpted from the Staff summary report and public comments of the six issues, and then provided some response from the Working Group. So Issue 1, there were – one of – part of the main takeaway from the public comments was that string confusion between IDN and ASCII string and within specific scripts should be further considered.

So that's where – that's sort of the genesis of the discussion of trying to take a look at the IDN – the scripts in terms of alphabetic versus non-alphabetic. We had a pretty long discussion last time and also a, you know, I guess we'll have further comments from Sarmad as well.

But – and generally things like what we want to do is to generally allow single character IDN TLDs, but to pay special attention to alphabetic scripts especially on technical confusability such as the – like – such as with relevance to keyboard layout.

So beyond visual confusability is to also take into consideration when considering confusability keyboard layouts of certain scripts and sort of typo errors. Any thoughts on that? This is pretty much standing corporate of the discussion from last time so…

Bart Boswinkel: Are you waiting for the note from…

Edmon Chung: Sarmad.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Yes he said he will provide a more in-depth review. He's traveling today and not able to join the call.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay so if I send it out…

Edmon Chung: So yes, in the next couple of days he said he will send in the next day. So but we've had - we've been in contact and hoping that this would work.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So issue number two is mainly it's the issue with I think on economics. And we - even in the staff report we have made the comment that they should look into the JAS Working Group. So I didn't think there were any further comment or response was required.

So on issue three…

Rafik Dammak: Hello…

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: …which working group?

Edmon Chung: The JAS which, you know, Rafik you're you should be familiar with. That's the - it's (issue) to the comment was that sort of ICANN should support - should have financial support for - well actually should use some of the income from, you know, their auctions or whatever to support new gTLD applicants especially for some IDN new gTLD applicants.

And that issue, that comment didn't seem to be relevant specifically to single character IDN TLDs. So our response was sort of that, you know, this comment should go to the JAS, the joint SOAC working group on new gTLD applicant support. And with that we had no further comment.

Rafik Dammak: Oh I see. So comments (suggest) on that matter. I think that (unintelligible) the GNSO (council) also added a motion about…

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: …rethink IDN applications may be interest to (unintelligible). But I'm not sure how. But now we talked about IDN (unintelligible) for in the service community that they maybe they want to apply for many train in different scripts so…

Edmon Chung: Right now I think maybe what we should actually do is to - for the - to, I guess myself and James will send a note to you actually, well actually to the JAS and saying that we received this comment from the - our comment period which might be relevant to your discussion. That should sort of close the loop.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so I'll wait for I mean (unintelligible) to continue.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: So the Issue 3, on Issue 3 the…

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry Edmon…

Edmon Chung: Sorry, please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Regarding Issue 2, do you want to include this that the chairs of the (J team) form the JAS?

Edmon Chung: That's a good idea. Yes we should probably add a sentence there to just say that we pass this on formally to the JAS. Would you add it or do you want me…

Bart Boswinkel: No I'm, I said I'm taking notes right now.

Edmon Chung: And that'll be great.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: (Unintelligible) this one.

Edmon Chung: Okay cool. Okay so on Issue 3 so most of the comments received are really about sort of a geographic name. And so again it's, you know, the response is to sort of emphasize on the restrictions and qualifications for geographic names, similarity and confusability and those kind of things.

I think as we mentioned last time it's really mostly these are issues that are covered in other areas already of the new gTLD process but also, you know, on the IDN ccTLD Fast Track and, you know, any - I'm sure it will be covered in the IDN ccTDP as well in terms of confusability.

So that that's not specific to the single character issue. So that was the response to the public comments on Issue 3.

So Issue 4 was that there was comments on, you know, whether errors, more errors would be made in typing one character when the response is as I mentioned last time we spent a bit of time talking about this as well.

There are - there is raised an issue about because it's a single stroke, you know, certain - for certain, especially alphabetic scripts which is one particular keystroke then keyboard layouts may play a part in terms of confusability.

That mainly pertains when there are more than one single character IDN TLD application perhaps in the first round or in subsequent rounds.

So when considering the confusability then there should be suggestion for, especially for alphabetic scripts to take into consideration keyboard layouts which is sort of like a technical confusability in any evaluation of - or a specimen of confusability. That was the response on Issue 4.

Okay on Issue 5, it's essentially similar to Issue 3. It's talking about the - it's the distinction between IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs but mainly about geographic names.

So again it's covered in Issue 3 in that we think that this is an issue that is addressed in other areas already. But we would emphasize it, I guess the (gig) should emphasize it in our recommendation that special attention should also be made in this type of issue and not be left out for single character IDN TLDs. And that was Issue 5.

Okay in terms of Issue 6, that's the acceptability of IDN TLDs, well in this case single character IDN TLDs.

I guess the response is really just to take note of the comment. And we do understand that this is just one of the issues that we have identified as an issue of common interest.

We haven't gotten to it yet. And we will address the issue after the work (unintelligible) character IDNs and IDN TLD bearings.

That's sort of - that's the end of Section 3 which is essentially just a summary of the responses and what we discussed as we talked about the comments received in the initial - from the initial report.

Okay so Section 4 is about the recommendations on single character IDN TLDs. So last time we had - well I just want to highlight a few main changes.

Last time I again apologize. I didn't include the ccTLD portion. I've added the ccTLD part into this. I don't think we need two sets of recommendations because I think there are - they would be fairly similar. So I added a particular point focused on IDN ccTLDs and then made some adjustments to the issue of alphabetic and non-alphabetic.

And also I think the discussion last time was that there was a pointer to say just to reemphasize that other restrictions, requirements for two or more character IDN TLDs would equally apply and that instead of being a bulleted recommendation I've moved that into just a general discussion so that it's, you know, we make that statement but it's not sort of part of the set of recommendations.

And in terms of the set of recommendations there are four points. The first point is newly added which is - which pertains IDN ccTLD.

So we've added a recommendation that says single character IDN ccTLDs should be assessable for IDN ccTLD Fast Track and the IDN ccTL - ccPDP with the considerations based on this particular report.

Bart Boswinkel: So that's Number 5 because that's still called the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook.

Edmon Chung: That's number - okay sorry. Number 5 is yes, that's obviously a connotation error.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Right. So that's…

Bart Boswinkel: Well that's fine. Edmund can I ask you a question about Number 4?

Edmon Chung: Sure.

Bart Boswinkel: Is first of all say in the first sentence the (unintelligible) makes I would say the following recommendations regarding not policy implementation recommendation, just recommendation.

Edmon Chung: That's fine. Yes I agree.

Bart Boswinkel: And for both yes, IDN TLDs to both IDN ccTLDs. Then single character should be I would say, should be acceptable as IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs.

The reason is I don't know if it's wise at this stage to go for the Fast Track. It's very clear that it's a very valuable recommendation for the IDN PDP.

Whether you want to sort of Fast Track is something else. But maybe that's - so by leaving it a bit vague it's probably up to the ccNSO council or maybe even add it to the language if it's up to the ccNSO council whether they want to advise the sort of Fast Track yes or no.

And then can go on in suggest it added because these requirement play a role both in the IDN PDP and in the Fast Track, say in case it's implemented in the Fast Track these are the suggested changes.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I'm okay with that. And so what you're suggesting is really sort of to combine A and B and to make it more generic and just say basically IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs?

Yes and then it say for the - and say would - and you can add say that's A and then you had a note say for the GNSO council (blahdy), (blahdy), blah and for the GNSO council (blahdy), (blahdy), blah.

Edmon Chung: Okay yes I think that works well. In fact I agree with what you're saying. And I think it's better that, you know, in terms of Fast Track or the PDP it would be up to the ccNSO to make the final decision.

Bart Boswinkel: And it's with regard to the GNSO council or what the new gTLD process it's similar. So and then…

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: …you would add something like okay if you do it these are the suggested changes.

Edmon Chung: Right okay. So yes that's a good idea. That would make it easier for the two councils to make recommendations that might, you know, be a variant, you know, be a meaningful variant of what exactly is here but still be able…

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: …to use this body of discussion. Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Good.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. That was all I had for regarding four. So Number 5…

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: …was (rule) change and so that's for the ccNSO.

Edmon Chung: Yes so Number 5 is supposed to be the ccNSO and as well as the cc TLD
                 Fast Track.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, Fast Track.

Edmon Chung: There is already a document there yes, and some suggested edits. They're
                 really just - I'll go forward to that.

                 There are three suggested edits. One the first one is basically just changing
                 the minimum length from two characters to one.

                 I don't know why I haven't changed anything there. I - it's supposed to be…

Bart Boswinkel: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: It's supposed to say the string must be a minimum of one character long and
                 it still says two there. I apologize but it should say one.

                 And the second part is to add an additional bullet to say that IDN ccTLD
                 strings like single characters especially, it really shouldn't be confusable with
                 two character ASCII strings which is consistent with the recommendation in
                 general.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: And then to add one more portion to the technical evaluation which is what so
                 the DNS stability technical panel such that for single character IDN strings
                 that they not be visually similar to one character label in ASCII or two
                 character ASCII labels and also add in the consideration for confusability in
                 keyboard layouts because it's a single keystroke.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Edmon Chung: That is essentially Section 5. And then Section 6 is the suggested as to the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook.

I actually note that there are quite significant changes to the IDN portions in the proposed final Applicant Guidebook. So the text reflects that change.

But essentially we have let me see four or five, five suggested edits. The first one again, it's really just adding a single character on top of a two character so apply for single character and two character IDN gTLD strings.

And basically both requirements would really be for it to be checked against single character gTLD strings and two character ASCII strings.

And then the second one - in fact both the second one and okay both the second one and third one are in the same section. The second one contains the existing description about handling of two character IDN strings.

The only change is to - for it to say that is - for it to change in a way that it doesn't - it's not one character with any script but focused on ASCII script because that would - that then opens it up back to Number 3 which we add back in the single character IDNs, you know, these strings.

And that sort of is - it wouldn't make sense if it was the other way around. Because if a two character IDN TLD string happens to be sort of similar to a one character IDN TLD string which is in the same round they would be - they should be identified as a contention sets.

And rather than eliminating the two character one and allowing the single character one. And that's the reason for the edit, the main reason for the edit for Number 2.

And Number 3 would be to simply just add back the section so that there would be a review specifically for single character IDN TLD strings such that it would not be visually similar to one character label as well as two character ASCII labels.

And then also to add in the recommendation from this group which is to take into consideration confusability brought about by, especially by alphabetic scripts because of the keyboard layouts and their single keystroke.

And then Number 4 and Number 5 are just basically symbol edits to a couple of sections in Module 2.

So instead of two characters as the limit, say one character, a single character, actually one or more visually distinct character should be allowed.

And number - the fifth point is similar to the second point in which the - instead of where two character IDN TLDs must not be visually similar to anyone character in any script it's changed to it shouldn't be visually similar to any one character ASCII label. That is again the same as rational as I mentioned in Number 3 above.

And then most of - we crossed out a number - a very lengthy discussion which was in the earlier version of the Applicant Guidebook but it's no longer there which I think makes a lot of sense anyway because those would be notes essentially to the evaluation panel.

I think a similar rational now anyway would be passed on to the evaluation panel and for two character IDN TLDs as well as single character IDN TLDs.

So I think, you know, and again just following the latest version of the Applicant Guidebook we've taken away that part. So that's in six.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmund one question.

Edmon Chung: Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: It's more a question say, this is the final sentence is the above our only
                 suggesting to assist in the implementation of the policy recommendations.

                 I think in this case you want to leave in policy recommendations don't you?
                 Given this is coming…

Edmon Chung: Well it's I think it's fine in this particular case. It seems to me…

Bart Boswinkel: Yes that's why I asked just to make sure.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Because it's GNSO, yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I sort of have the same structure for Section 5.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: And that maybe we can take away policy on that one if you…

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I've seen that one, yes.

Edmon Chung: Yes okay. And then Appendix A is essentially a repeat of the initial report.
                 Nothing was changed. It was the bulk of the discussion about the various
                 policy aspects.

                 So that was the - that sort of a completes the whole draft final report. Any
                 thoughts, comments?

Bart Boswinkel: No just say to recap the actions I think, so we got the date set or tentatively the final date for the 29 December. I'll include something like that in the introduction that (blahdy) blah for public comments.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: I'll make some adjustments to the introduction and - or to the as we discussed. I got the notes.

Edmon Chung: Great.

Bart Boswinkel: And I will send it out. I'll redraft it tomorrow morning. I still have to do another one first, send it to you and (John) and we'll wait for the comments from (Hussein) on the bits on the - he discussed…

Edmon Chung: Right the alphabetic non-alphabetic one yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And then you include it and say maybe we should aim at Monday or Tuesday for public comments so that means by Friday or Saturday is the alternate dates.

Tomorrow is Wednesday so we need to send it out no later than tomorrow evening to the whole working group.

Edmon Chung: Yes I - that would 0 I think that would work well and do a final call and aim for Monday or Tuesday to have it…

Bart Boswinkel: Published yes.

Edmon Chung: …published.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes (unintelligible) properly okay.

Edmon Chung: Sounds great. And we're at the top of the hour.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. You've done well then. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Any thoughts? (Jane) did you have any comments or before we close?

(Jane):   No actually not. I'm fine. I think Bart has already said bye-bye. We should end now.

Bart Boswinkel: I'm still here. I was a bit in a rush. I want to have coffee.

Edmon Chung: That's great. So thank you everybody for joining.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, bye-bye.

(Jane):   Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye.