

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 18 May 2010 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 18 May 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-20100518.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung - co-chair

Jian Zhang - co-chair

Yeo Ling

Rafik Dammak

Fahd Batayneh

Cary Karp

Avri Doria

Chris Disspain

Doron Shikmoni

ICANN Staff

Bart Boswinkel

Gabi Schitteck

Kristina Nordstrom

Tina Dam

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Sarmad Hussain

Karen Hayne

Olof Nordling

Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JIG call on Tuesday the 18th of May. We have Edmon Chung, Rafik Dammak, Fahd Batayneh, Avri Doria, Doron Shikmoni, Chris Disspain, Jian Zhang, Yeo Yee Ling, Cary Karp. From staff we have Gabriella Schitteck, Kristina Nordstrom, Bart Boswinkel, Tina Dam and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies from Sarmad Hussain, Olof Nordling and Karen Hayne. I hope I haven't left anyone off the list. If I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you (Gis). Thank you. I think it's great to have (unintelligible) on the call last night. I think the last couple times we have been waiting to - for you to be on the call to get the conversation really started. Chris first brought this up and I think it's really valid that this group should try to base its work on the work that's already being done and not try to overlap much.

The two items being most importantly one coming out from the IDN implementation team report, the one for single character IDN TLDs and also some additional work for IDN variants or somewhat related with the recent synchronized IDN ccTLD discussion as well.

So with that, perhaps I'll - if I can pass it on to (Tina) to further discuss a couple of things - of those main items. I just sent around an email last time and those were pretty much the items that we need some clarification on and sort of how we can then organize the work in this group.

So Jian, I don't know if you want to add anything to that. If not, then we can get (Tina) started to - so we have a basis to start discussions.

Jian Zhang: I'm fine with it.

Edmon Chung: Cool. So great to have you on the call (Tina) and I understand that it's been crazy busy for you. Thanks for taking the time. Let's get started on what this group can do on those two main topics and where we should start and - because we - I think we all read the implementation team panel report. These seem to be a couple of items that could need some policy work to further the

- for the deployment, especially for IDN gTLDs but also essentially have some impact for the gTLDs as well.

(Tina): Sure. So your - first of all you're welcome and I'm sorry I wasn't able to join the JIG calls sooner although I will admit that I was kind of relieved that the last one was cancelled and rescheduled because it was just was a really tough time.

I haven't seen - you said you just sent around an email with some questions. I haven't seen it. But I mean I guess I could just start with sort of like an overview of where some - the staff is on all of this.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Well actually I just - I sent it last time which is May 4 just before the meeting last time because I realized that I had to be on a flight and I wasn't going to make it. And just a few questions on, you know, basically what exactly we need to do. But it doesn't matter. Just I think it would be - it will work fine if you laid the ground.

(Tina): Okay. Oh, I thought you said you just sent it. Sorry about that. Here let me see. Well instead of, you know, spending too much time looking for it and then I guess you can just ask me questions. But brief status sort of like where the staff is on the topic of variants; so yes. We built this implementation plan for the synchronized IDN ccTLDs. And that was sort of like the second attempt to try to get a certain type of variant TLDs allowed in the Fast Track process.

And there was a lot of discussions about how would that affect then the gTLD process but it wasn't clear or it wasn't immediately clear that that - that it would be possible to just simply merge it over and do it exactly the same in the gTLD process.

And there's a lot of reasons for that. One was that those principles for it that the Board approved in Nairobi was specifically built on top of what was

already in the Fast Track process. So there were some requirements there didn't exist and limitations I should say that doesn't exist in the gTLD program.

But it certainly was always and always will be the intent of the ICANN staff that whatever you built in terms of variant field using one program should be impossible in some way perhaps with some additional rules and stuff but in some ways should be adopted into the other process as well.

So it's not like we're doing one without thinking about the other. But the synchronized plan was specifically, you know, intended for the Fast Track process.

Now it wasn't approved and there was a lot of discussion on it specifically in the technical community. We used some terminology that meant something very specific from a technical standpoint. And so they weren't really happy about it. And I can absolutely understand that.

So we got a lot of feedback. We built like a Q&A to address some of that. Had a couple of webinars to address some of that. But at the end the process wasn't approved by the Board. So what we're doing right now is we're working with the Board Working Group on the subjects.

So I don't know if you guys recall but there was a Board Working Group formed in Nairobi as well which is called the ESWG. I think it stands for Equivalent Strain Working Group.

But in any event, their topic is variant and how to go about it. And so we actually (Giff) submitted from the staff side a briefing paper to that Board Working Group on how we would like to proceed. And part of that is to continue on with the synchronized process for part of it is also to look broader than just the (fini).

And I guess we can go into details about what that means. But to go - to look broader and to also include like a number of things such as testing the DNAME and, you know, defining more specifically the different types of variant and then to have a community discussion about what do we believe is necessary.

And synchronize then would be the proposal for what would be necessary for one type of variant and then it would be - need to be a discussion about what is necessary for the other types. And that I think is very much in, you know, in the line of what the JIG is doing and something that I imagine would need to be taken up in this group.

So this is just like very much new and everything. But the thought was to do like a session in Brussels on the subject. Now I don't have that on the schedule at all and I don't have it approved by my management at all so I'm just mentioning it as, you know, latest development and stuff. And then I guess see what your feedback would be on something like that. But that's like overall that's where we are.

Edmon Chung: (Tina)...

Chris Disspain: (Tina) - Edmon can I - this is Chris. Can I ask some questions?

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible).

Chris Disspain: (Tina), there's no - I have to go back - I have to apologize because I need to go back a couple of steps. So bear with me on this.

(Tina): No.

Chris Disspain: There are two - there are two issues here. Let's just - for the moment let's just talk about the Fast Track. There are two issues or one issue in the Fast Track. There is a - there's - a problem arose in respect to a small number of

IDN ccTLD Fast Track applications leading to a desire perfectly understandable requirement to look at putting in place an adjustment or some side steps to enable what we intended to have happen to actually happen.

And the - that's one issue which is how you deal with a particular - how you deal with a particular set of problems that arose in the Fast Track in respect to China and possibly some others would air. If you follow - if you actually follow really tightly an interpretation of the Fast Track rules, an issue arises that creates a result that we didn't intend. And I understand that.

But it seems to me that widening that out into a discussion of variant generally and the possibility of having something, which we for the sake of this discussion will refer to a synchronized TLD, is actually in fact policy.

So I'm unclear as to why that sort of thing is being dealt with as an - as part of an implementation plan either by staff on their own or in conjunction with the Board Working Group when in fact it's policy and so it should be dealt with really by the policy making entities in ICANN which in particular circumstance are the GNSO and the ccNSO. Because if you're going to do anything other than fix a particular problem and that particular problems fits in a very tight box of being the Fast Track for IDN ccTLDs.

If it stretches anywhere outside of that then without question surely it's policy and so therefore it should be actually an issue for the GNSO and the ccNSO. Is that - you see what I mean?

(Tina): Yes I see what you mean.

Man: This is...

(Tina): I guess it's just really hard for me to answer because - well one thing I wasn't in Nairobi but secondly building the Board solution in Nairobi that asks staff to do the implementation plan for synchronized based on the principles that that

Board Working Group set out and would support from that Board Working Group that's formed.

I'm happy to take it up with them. And I don't know if I understand you completely right but I could - but I'll tell them whatever it is that you guys want me to tell them. But if I understand you right, then you don't want - you don't want the - well, it's wrong to say you don't want them involved. But you want the policy groups to lead the work or something like that.

Chris Disspain: First off, what I'm - it's Chris again. What I'm actually saying I think is that if you want to try and solve - if we want to try and solve a specific issue that arose in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track, that is one thing, and we can talk about how we resolve that. But that's an issue that exists between the ccNSO and the staff and the Board. And that's an issue that fits very tightly within a box called IDN ccTLDs in the Fast Track.

But if what is being thought to be done is to create a circumstance or a set of guidelines, rules, whatever you want to call them that actually applies A, ccTLDs outside of the Fast Track and B, possibly in the gTLD space, then that fits in a different place. It fits in respect to IDN ccTLDs in the IDN policy development process.

And in respect to IDN gTLDs in the gTLD GNSO policy process and I suspect that were we to get - were the GNSO (unintelligible) decide to get together and say this is the same problem across both Cs and Gs, then we could probably together either in this working group or another one set out a process for dealing with that.

My point is simply that trying to solve a problem that exists in the Fast Track for IDN ccTLDs is just that and no more than that unless there is a suggestion, and I don't know, but unless there is suggestion that this is not policy and is actually purely implementation.

But it seems to me from the way that I look at it, and I'm prepared to be persuaded differently, but it seems to me that it is policy and so therefore it fits into the template that I've just described.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. Thanks Chris. Before - I'd like to hear from (Tina) as well. I actually share the same thoughts as (Tina) you were providing us with the update and echo Chris' thoughts on whether the SOs should be involved and in fact where it should - where the discussion would take place.

And before (Tina) answers, since we have a quite a number of people on the call, I wonder if anyone wants to get on the queue. No. Okay. (Tina) any thoughts on that and how we proceed? And I think you mentioned something in, you know, to do in Brussels. Perhaps that's one of the areas that we'd like to start this work as well.

(Tina): Yes for sure. And I was going to - I was going to mention that again as well. But first of all in terms of like where does this work belong? I think it's a mix. I think there is policy. I think there is technical. I think there's implementation. I think there's, you know, all of that including educational and, you know, all kinds of stuff.

So I think it is a mix. And when there's a mix like that, it just becomes really hard for where, you know, where does it belong. I guess what ICANN staff always tries to do in those kind of circumstances is to attempt - at least attempt to coordinate things. And I think that's what we're here for. So that's one side of it.

Another side of it is that of course we follow Board direction. And I think part of that should be viewed, as this is a really important subject area for the community. And the Board wanted to do something to attempt to solve it quicker than what previously had been the case.

So I think it should be seen as just all positive developments, not - and not in any way of trying to put it once place versus the other and so forth because I - but I - because I think it do belong everywhere. So as an example that's not policy, it's technical, right. And for the technical side of things you saw that the technical community got very upset about the synchronized plan. They didn't like the terminology and stuff used in it.

But when they were explained what we were trying to do, a lot of them actually said, oh, okay. Well that's totally fine with us. You should go ahead and do that. But you have to come back and let us know what it is you need from the technical perspective and what it is you need the technical community to do. And we said yes. We will do that.

And one of the things they need to know before they can go and look at things from a technical perspective is to understand a little bit better what it is that we're trying to do. And that certainly has a policy component to it. So it becomes difficult, right.

I mean if we want to try to do this, I'm not saying that we should do it in a rush manner, but if we want to try to do something fast, I think it's hard to simply leave it as a policy subject because I don't necessarily know that that's going to make things happen as quickly and as much - and as much in parallel that the need in the community seems to be. So...

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. Sorry. This is Edmon. I just want to mention that I think it's a great thing that it's moving forward and I'd like to see it move forward quickly as well. I don't want to put words in Chris' mouth and I don't think we are - Chris please add to it after.

I don't think we're saying, you know, we want to slow it down or, you know, that we have to have policy aspect of it discussed first or anything. But since as we both identified there would be costly aspects to it. Perhaps we should

start earlier. In fact I had something (in mind) on the other way that, you know, if there are costly elements of it, let's get it started because, you know.

And also we know that the new gTLD part is going forward. And if there are any implications on the (tag), we should identify it and add it in as soon as possible. And also the ccPDP is also going on. If there are additional questions to be included in some of the discussions, then we should add it onto that agenda as well as soon as possible. And I think that's really where my head is.

Chris Disspain: Edmon, this is - it's Chris. I agree with you and I - let me just - let me see if I can - if I can sort of split it up into easy bite pieces. (Tina) you're quite right. There is a massive technical aspect to this. I agree. And the question is to whom is the technical community - well, one of the questions is to whom are the technical community reporting or feeding information?

But there is - in the - currently there exists only one process by which IDNs are granted and that is the IDN ccTLD Fast Track. If a problem arises in respect to that, then that problem is a problem in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track. And there is a - there is an existing methodology for dealing with that. And you can argue, discuss whether it's implementation or whether it's part of the Fast Track rules. No problem. We can talk about that and that fits in a little box that is the IDN ccTLD Fast Track.

But if there is going to be a concept introduced and for the sake of this discussion we'll call it synchronized IDN TLDs and that concept is going to have any movement outside of the IDN ccTLD Fast Track, either into ccTLDs in the full blown policy development process or into gTLDs in the general gTLD process which will have a part of it IDN. Then that is clearly seems to me policy.

And what that means to me is that in respect to the ccTLDs, the ccNSO should be the - should be the repository of information from the technical

community and in respect to gTLDs the GNSO should be where that input from the technical community comes. And if we decide, and I can't see any reason why we shouldn't, that because the same problems arise in respect to IDN Gs and IDN Cs, the SOs should work together, then we can do that.

But the idea that the technical community would provide input to staff and the Board on something that is clearly policy for IDN Cs or IDN Gs is (unintelligible). It has to go it seems to me to the two SOs.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. (Tina), do you want to...

(Tina): I think - I mean it sounds like we're pretty much in agreement. So it's just a matter of how do we (unintelligible). And just technically where and what and how that works. There are several components to it. One is the IGF involvement and one is the specific technical test involvement. But I think it's hard to move ahead with that without having had some further discussion about exactly what should we be testing for.

So I don't know if we can just talk about it a little bit more practically like how do we - how would you like to see this moving ahead towards Brussels which may make it easier to get that on the schedule. Or if you want to talk more about how it fits in gTLD and so forth, I'm happy to do that as well. You know, synchronize Fast Track versus gTLD and not - I don't think I'm 100% sure of what you want me to say or talk about.

Edmon Chung: Okay. This is Edmon. Perhaps I can ask that. At least in my mind I think what we would like at least what I would like to see is perhaps if you can identify a few policy items like policy aspects like whether this group or the GNSO and ccNSO separately. What are the actual policy aspects that we need to talk about and create those policies so that SAS can actually implement it when it comes to the IDN TLDs?

So if we can identify it like if you point where it - where policy recommendations need to come out, that would be particularly useful.

(Tina): Well, so I guess it depends on what process you're looking at. But for example, you can take - you can take something like the synchronized and you can see how that process was proposed to be built so that everything that was all synchronized would then be allowed for delegation with a specific set of additional requirements to it.

And you could look at how do you move that into gTLD. Because right now - and specifically because it's not even approved for Fast Track, there is nothing like that being added into the JIG because we simply don't have anything to add in there. It's not an approved subject matter and there has been no discussions about how would that - if that were to be fitted into gTLD, how would that be done?

You know, one glaring obvious difference is that Fast Track has to do with specifically country name. And they can be anything. You know, or, you know, not 100% everything but very close to being everything, right. So there is that - there's that limitation in the Fast Track that makes it hard to go sort of like around the rules.

And around the rules I mean something like IDN tables where you build an IDN table and take advantage of the fact that you can put anything in an IDN table you want and you can claim that anything - the variant in any way that you want. And if we starting seeing stuff like that at the top level, then we're going to quickly start having problems that I think none of us would like to see.

So...

Chris Disspain: (Tina).

(Tina): ...any kind of rules like that I think would be appropriate in a policy setting. So that's one.

Chris Disspain: (Tina). (Unintelligible).

(Tina): Another thing is don't want to do it layer by layer. So to synchronize trying to like take it layer by layer and say okay, where there's this kind of variant and this kind of variant may not be as difficult to solve as the other types. And maybe you disagree with that. And that I think could be a policy discussion as well.

Chris Disspain: (Tina), it's Chris. Can I - maybe I can - maybe I answer your - maybe I can answer your question by giving you - and I don't want to be difficult about this. But let me try and give you some very, very specific examples of what I think the problem is.

(Tina): Okay.

Chris Disspain: Let's look at - let's start by looking at where the issue arose which is in the Fast Track. An issue arose and that issue arose in the context of a request for delegation being made. And I'm very well aware of the fact that once a request for delegation has been made, then the whole sort of system closes in on itself and becomes totally un-transparent and completely dealt with within the staff. But I cannot quite understand why that is. Perfectly fine.

But the problem arises and the staff go away and they try and figure out how to solve that problem. That's fine. If the solution is simply a solution to that one problem, then I'm more than happy for you to - for you - ICANN, not you specifically (Tina), but you ICANN to say that is an implementation issue and it's been dealt with in the context of an internal process to deal with an application that's been made or request rather that's been made.

The moment you step outside of that and you say we have to create something that fits for both of the problems, there isn't a thing we have created that will apply to other things apart from this one or two individual problems, that becomes policy. It doesn't matter whether it's policy in the Fast Track or policies within the IDN ccTLD process generally or within the gTLD IDN process generally.

It becomes policy. And what that means is that it's not actually for you, not you (Tina), you ICANN to create a suggested solution and send it to the Board. It's actually for you if you wish to create a suggested solution and send it out to the SOs for their consideration or for you to go to the SOs and say we have a problem. Let us work together to come up with a solution.

(Tina): Okay. I think that's very much what - I think that's very much actually what we were trying to do. So when I said earlier that the staff provided the Board Working Group with sort of like an overall here's what we think we need to do to that Board Working Group. That's because there's a Board Working Group to support staff and we need their input first.

So - and then the thing that would happen after that is the Board Working Group agreed with us was that we would put that out to the different policy working groups and suggest that we have a meeting on it in Brussels.

And so that - so I think, you know, we're not trying to say this is how variant should be dealt with. What we're trying to say is here's all of the work that we see that is necessary and that's done and with support from that Board Working Group and then to put that out to the community. And some of it would go out to the technical community too for sure.

But it would then go out to you guys and get your feedback on it and see if it's something that you could take on or, you know, how you would like to go about it.

Chris Disspain: (Tina), I - I...

(Tina): So I think we're...

Chris Disspain: ...I understand what you said and I accept what you said and I really want to stress this. I'm not having a - I'm not trying to be difficult or criticize or have a go. But that's actually not what happened. What happened was that the staff went away and created a plan and the result of that plan going to the Board, a Board Working Group was set up.

So the situation is that - and I acknowledge that we all - we learn as we go along. And we're all learning as we go. This is a new - this is new stuff. But it seems to me that the process should be problem identified, problem revealed to the people who are concerned about the problem; that's us; and we work together to try and figure out the result of that.

And then if it goes to the Board and the Board wants to set up a working group, fine. But in this particular case, problem identified, possible solution created by a staff without any input. I acknowledge input from the technical community but no input from the SOs. Then it goes to the Board and the Board Working Group is set up.

So I guess what I'm saying is I don't think that - what I think is that we are now late in this process instead of early in this process.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon Chris. I think we - at least I understand it very clearly and I think (Tina) understands pretty quickly - clearly as well on that subject. I wonder (Tina) for - would it work - you mentioned that a document or plan was - has been created or even circulation at the ESWG.

I wonder if that document could be also circulated to this group and perhaps to the SOs as well. Because then we can discuss this in parallel which addresses - perhaps addresses Chris' part - at least part of Chris' concern

because it's not - at least from what you mentioned earlier, this is not something that's already baked.

It seems to be there is a document now being circulated at the Board Working Group. Chris mentioned that perhaps it should have been circulated through the SOs first. Well could we do it in parallel at this case given what has been done? And, you know, I think if the document we can start looking at it. We could then address my issue, which is what are the positive aspects of which that either this group or the SOs can take on.

(Tina): Right. So let me answer - let me try to answer Chris first because Chris I was talking forward-looking and you said well that's not what happened. And I'm like thinking well it hasn't happened yet because it's the future of us and it's what I'm saying that we're intending to do.

But let's look back though (unintelligible). In terms of what happened in Nairobi and it may not have been in the synchronized plan and it may not have been entirely clear but it certainly has been not a secret at all. That Board Working Group and the principles and everything around it was developed during the Nairobi meeting.

The Board normally does not do anything that quickly and it definitely is exceptional for them to form a working group and to work. They met I think every day throughout the Nairobi meeting to build something like that to come up with a quick solution for a place in the community where there is a very urgent need for something. So I think it was very positive and I think we agreed on that part.

But I think it was very positive for them to do that. We did then on staff follow their direction. We drafted the implementation plan. We posted it for public comments. We got a lot of comments and the plan wasn't approved. And we can certainly argue that yes, maybe we shouldn't have done it that way,

maybe we should have, you know, taken the principles back to the ccNSO and back to the GNSO if they wanted to look at it for gTLD and so forth.

But the attempt from the Board was to solve something within a really short time for like a very limited group. And they weren't capable of doing that and then they did the exception resolutions as we said as we saw on the 22nd of April.

So I really do think they should be applauded for attempting that. I can't tell you that...

Chris Disspain: I agree with you (Tina).

Edmon Chung: Yes, (Tina), can I add just - it's (unintelligible). I think both Chris and I think that, you know, that's great and that's for the specific problem for the IDN ccTLD Fast Track. I think we both agree and I think that we would agree that's a great job done and that's a good way to do it. We're talking about afterwards, you know, applying to the bigger context.

Chris Disspain: Absolutely I agree.

(Tina): Yes.

Chris Disspain: That's exactly right Edmon. I don't - (Tina) I'm not criticizing in any way the Board's actions in respect to the particular issue. Neither am I criticizing in any way your work on trying to get that issue solved. Completely understand that and I - it's perfectly fine. It's...

(Tina): Okay. Well then for (unintelligible) because it wasn't good enough.

Chris Disspain: Well yes, I understand that. But that's the way these things work. And the point is that you do a heap of work and it doesn't necessarily get over the

line. But it doesn't change the fact that all the work that you did results in a right result. So it doesn't matter.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Chris Disspain: I mean the point is it was worth doing and it was great. My concern is not that. My concern is is that they - this will be stretched out into other areas. That's my concern.

(Tina): Yes. We obviously don't want that. So let's look forward then. And so the overview that the staff gave to the Board Working Group we gave to them because they see the urgency in this subject and they want to have I wouldn't say control but they want to have a certain insight into what staff is doing on the subject.

So as opposed to going to the policy group or the technical groups or anything like that at all, what we said is what we need to get a little bit more coordinated. We did a paper. We gave it - I just sent it - I just sent it to the Board Working Group I think it was yesterday or the day before. And I do need their feedback before that is (unintelligible) because they want to sure that we're covering everything we need to cover.

And that, you know, that puts a little bit of a limiting factor on staff but it also is a support to the staff in terms of what we should be doing. And the Board is entirely in their right to do something like that. But I will say - you know, I can - actually I can look up the email and I can tell you that what my email said to them which was something along the lines of we want to - we want to get something like this in front of the groups in Brussels so we need your feedback urgently.

Here let me see. And it also stated that the synchronized draft implementation plan is very close without the terminology choices it's very close to addressing a subset of variant and that it might be a good idea for us

to finish that and let those types of variant go ahead in the Fast Track process.

And then that way we also get some experience right and I think that would be helpful in the ongoing work. So as soon as we have some feedback from them and I hope it's positive and if it is, then that means like yes, we can go ahead and share it with you guys and post it publicly or add it into like the agenda in Brussels and propose a meeting and talk to you guys about when would it be a good time to have a joint meeting on this assuming that you would want to have that.

So I guess if you want to you could go ahead and start looking at that between the ccNSO and the GNSO and the ALAC or, you know, whoever else needs to be involved. But I think the JIG is, you know, I'm sorry but I can't remember, but the JIG is across all groups, right. Is that right?

Edmon Chung: Yes.

(Tina): Is it - yes it is. So wanted to, I would be more than happy to work with you on setting up that meeting and then getting that paper to you so that we have like common ground. And it doesn't mean that that's like the right answer, right. It just means that this is like the staff's view on all of the different aspects that needs to be dealt with.

And you will see that it's a lot and you will see that, you know, maybe it does make sense to try to do something, you know, once slice at a time which then would push the synchronized plan in a revised version forward. So we have different options for how to do it.

I'm just looking up one thing I could point to you. I did a blog post and I think it's not...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Tina): It was about synchronized - what did I call it? Clearing the confusion on synchronized or something like that. And that actually talks about update about synchronizing ccTLDs. It's from the 11th of April and I can send it to you - I don't know if I can send it to the list but I can send it to you and you can send the list.

It has at the end of it - it has like an overview of where it says more work is required to create a general mechanism. The term variant has been loosely used and we need to like clarify our terminology choice and stuff like that.

And then it says a more general solution depends at least on the following. One, definition, what is being though by a variant solution; two, definition of the different types which might inform the answer to the above; three, review and test of GNAME; four, review and test of ENAME if it at all is susceptible to test since it's only an ID.

And then I can't remember what the number is but then review and test variant management in the way that we for example are proposing it with synchronize. And maybe synchronize is sufficient for everybody or for all types but as necessary.

So those are like a list of things that is in that paper as well that we from the staff believe well these things are definitely necessary.

((Crosstalk))

(Tina): Maybe that will help.

Edmon Chung: Yes (Tina), this is Edmon. I think yes, that will be - that will be useful if you can post to this main list. I think you should be able to send it into the list. Looking at the time, I was wondering if we want to continue on this or if we want to touch a little bit upon the single character part as well. There...

Chris Disspain: Can I just (unintelligible)?

Edmon Chung: Yes. Does anyone want to add to this? I have - I jotted two notes down (Tina) you mentioned about the - in terms of policy aspect of this item, it seems like the kind of variant is one aspect that policy might want to deal with and the other one is the development of the IDN table and what are the criteria. Did I get that correct as well? At one point you mentioned...

(Tina): I think - I don't know - I don't know if it's a policy rule to define the different types of variants but it certainly would be a policy rule to talk about what should be the rules for the different types of variants if any and if you want them to be different.

Another half of that is technical and that has to do with what kind of technical issues do we get into with these different types of variants. So could - I think it's again - it's like - I don't know if it's 50/50 but it certainly is shared to a certain extent.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Chris you had a question. Does anyone want to get in the queue?

Chris Disspain: No. I was saying - I was saying move on.

Bart Boswinkel: So this is Bart - just say to two items.

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart.

Edmon Chung: (Please go ahead).

Bart Boswinkel: There is a - I wanted to mention it at the end of this call but there is a JIG meeting scheduled in Brussels on Sunday the 20th from 6:00 to 7:00. So this

might offer an opportunity to have a more in depth discussion face to face about this topic. And secondly, (Tina) if you want to - to my knowledge you subscribe but if not, you can always forward what you want to send to this group to me and I'll get back on mute again.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. (Tina) it would be quite useful if you could join us on Sunday in Brussels to see if the time works. In fact I would go as far to say that if it doesn't then perhaps we'd want to think about a different time slot that works for you (Tina) for the JIG meeting.

(Tina): Yes. I'm really sorry to say that but I won't be able to join at that Sunday. I wish I could like an evening meeting or later. A meeting like that is always really good because, you know, and especially on the Sunday but I'm already fully booked. So I'm afraid I can't.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: If you maybe you can take a look into whether it's at this point possible to work the schedule such that (Tina) it's possible for (Tina) and also obviously taking into the consideration other people in the group as well.

(Tina): Yes. So let me take a look. Let me go talk to the ICANN staff that holds the schedule and let me go see and ask them to see if they can find some different slots for us. I know it's going to be tough but I'll see what staff - I have not (seen) them yet because I just came back from Moscow as well as Chris did. So let me - I'll put that in my calendar for today to see if I can have a chat with them on where we have room.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thanks.

(Tina): And then Edmon did you want to talk about one character as well?

Edmon Chung: Yes. Before I go there, it seems like myself, Chris and you have been dominating the discussion. I just want to make sure does anyone want to...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Does anyone have any questions before we spend a couple minutes on the single character one?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I tried to get a word in earlier but wasn't able.

Edmon Chung: Oops. Sorry.

Avri Doria: That's okay. You guys were doing quite well. I basically had one point and one question or concern. The one point I want to make is we're talking sort of like there's technical on one side and there's policy on the other and then coming up with 50-50 percentages or something like that.

I just want to point out that there are a lot more intricately interrelated and the requirements that the technologists work on should be policy driven. And so to say oh, there's the technology side and I've been following the discussion both in the IETF and elsewhere. So I just want to bring up that caution.

The other two things that I wanted to bring up is is one that I don't understand, and to what extent what is being done now as an expedition solution for Fast Track will up setting a precedent that other things will need to be forced within. And that also that the Board - I think it's really nice that the Board put together a committee to help with that.

But that the Board and that committee not make decisions before - and I don't know whether this group needs to request that there not be decisions before they've gone through the proper policy process. It is unfortunate that doing that end loaded might slow things down but that'll teach us to do it right in the future. Thanks.

Chris Disspain: Avri - Edmon, sorry. Avri, it's Chris. Thank you. I agree with you and I - as usually you've managed to put in three sentences what it took me seven paragraphs to say. But I agree. I think what you - I agree with everything that you said and especially the point about the technical input being - technical input that should be coming into the right area when the technical community and the policy community should be working together to actually solve the problem or to create the policy that works for everybody.

Edmon Chung: (Tina), did you want to respond to that?

(Tina): I'm sorry, can you ask the question again?

Edmon Chung: Avri, can you refresh the - very quickly and for (Tina), you have the comment and then the question, right.

(Tina): Well just the question. I mean I heard the comment but I'm not quite sure I got the question.

Edmon Chung: (Right).

Avri Doria: I guess the question was A, what extent of what you're doing now for Fast Track become precedent and B, can you assure this group that there won't be, you know, or what do we need to do to make sure that the Board does not make decisions before there's been a proper policy process? I'm not sure you have the...

(Tina): Oh.

Avri Doria: ...answer to that second one.

(Tina): I see. I see. Okay. Well so that's hard, right, because Fast Track also wasn't a bold policy development process. So I don't think that the Board felt like

they stepped in beyond the policy development bodies by adding this on to the Fast Track.

But I don't know. That's such a hard question. And I guess it really should go to the Board because it's - I just really hesitate into answering anything on behalf of the Board. That's really not...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: No one's asking you to. No one's asking you to (Tina). That would be very unfair.

Cary Karp: This is Cary. Can I comment on this?

((Crosstalk))

Cary Karp: Okay. One of the reasons we are struggling with all of this is that the entire policy making discussion for the past ten years has attached to top-level domains. Character repertoires that are suitable for top-level domains to implement how they're supposed to document this, that kind of stuff.

Now we're talking about the root of the DNS. And the protocol constraints that attach to the available character repertoire in the root zone differs from the top-level zones. So we're - we are writing precedent as we go along.

Every single thing that we do is a first time ever doing it and I don't think we can treat this the way we would treat a TLD situation where there's a well understood practice and we're racing forward in certain regards that may prove imprudent. So no such thing is precedent. Everything we do by virtue of the fact that it's first time ever in the history of the Internet is (precedential).

Chris Disspain: Yes. I agree with that completely.

Edmon Chung: Well, thank you Cary. I think probably (Tina) won't have an answer for that at this point. But looking at the time we're slightly over. I wonder (Tina) if you would be able to join us in two weeks time. If so, we'll wrap this session on variants and talk about the single character IDN next time.

Chris Disspain: Good idea.

(Tina): I'll go ahead and give it a try on that. What - I have two - one comment and one question. One question is are the calls being recorded or archived or are they just sort of like whoever's on them can listen to them/

Edmon Chung: Yes. They're recorded.

(Tina): Okay. Because I was just thinking maybe I could (listen) to like the previous one and then it would be easier for me also to be in the next one. So I'll try to be in the next one. Just so you know, if there's anything else that comes up in my schedule that has a higher priority, then I'm going to have to take that instead.

And it's not because we don't think that the JIG is important. It's simply just that there's so much IDN work going on and we have to our core stations and that was how it was done.

So I apologize (beforehand) if it's not possible for me to join it.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: That's okay. And in terms of what we are - I guess at least in my perspective what we are hoping to get then from you is whether or not the - and why there needs to be additional policy discussion whether the (DAG) can handle single character IDN TLDs and what needs to be added to it. The other part is whether the Fast Track process needs to add anything to it for single

character. And then whether the IDN ccPDP what needs to be added to that to consider a single character IDN TLDs.

And basically what positive recommendations need to be changed or added in order to handle it. Those are some of the main questions so that this group can actually start the work. Because I think we all read the report from the implementation team that data - that certain policy aspect needs to be considered before single character IDN TLDs could be allowed.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: ...what those policy aspects were.

Cary Karp: Cary, just one very quick interjection here. Unless you can come up with the name of a - with a country that identifies itself uniquely with a single character from the discussion of single character TLD labels is absolutely irrelevant to the Fast Track. In fact it's development of the CC space.

Chris Disspain: Cary I agree with that subject -- it's Chris -- subject then to one point, which is what you mean by character.

Cary Karp: In the - if we were using just one grand mono spacing font what's called a U-label or one element or one squiggle label as it would appear in the...

Chris Disspain: So one...

Cary Karp: ...U-label space.

Chris Disspain: ...one - just as an example then one Chinese character, which may actually equate to six letters or three.

Cary Karp: Yes. Yes. Right. I'm not talking about the A-labels. I'm not talking about the ASCII encoding.

Chris Disspain: Okay.

Cary Karp: I'm talking about what is displayed on a screen...

Chris Disspain: I understand.

Cary Karp: ...what a - what a user who doesn't understand any of this would say it is a character.

Chris Disspain: Right. I understand totally.

Cary Karp: And the question - and it's not rhetorical. I think it's fundamental. It's is there a government on the planet that identifies the name of it's country in that manner. And if the answer is no, it's not going to be a Fast Track issue.

Chris Disspain: Yes. I accept that. I think it's - I mean it's a discussion to be had but I think the fundamental base point you've made is a very valid point.

Edmon Chung: That's good. So (Tina), so you - we gave you a preview of what's next. Actually everyone gave a preview about what next meeting would be about. I think it would be great if you can join us and that is one area we want to cover in our next meeting.

Jian, did you want to add anything before we close the call or, you know, really anyone who wants to add anything before we close the call.

Jian Zhang: No.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Edmon.

(Tina): Edmon.

Edmon Chung: So thanks everyone. I think it was a very good meeting. And talk to everyone in two weeks time.

Man: Cheers.

Man: Okay. Bye bye.

Man: Bye bye.

Man: Bye bye.

END