

JIG TRANSCRIPTION

Tuesday 28 February 2012 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 28 February 2012 at 1300 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jig-20120228-en.mp3>
On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#feb>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Chris Dillon
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Sarmad Hussein
Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)
Sun XianTang, .cn

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Young Eum Lee

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Sam). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the JIG call on the 28th of February, 2012. On the call today we have Sarmad Hussein, Rafik Dammak, Edmon Chung, Sun Xian Tang, Avri Doria and Chris Dillon.

From staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We have apologies from Fahd Batayneh and Young- Eum Lee. 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.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Nathalie. This is Edmon. And thank you everyone for joining the JIG call. And it's good to have more people participating. This is one of the - this is one of the items actually that I'd like to talk about today as well.

But I sent around a fairly short proposed agenda with a few items on it talking about the universal acceptance issue, our - refreshing the participation here at the JIG which was started a couple meetings ago and our planning - our plans for the Costa Rica session and also an update on some VIP and on the previous issue on the single character IDN TLDs.

So I wonder if there's anyone who wants to add anything to the agenda or anything? Hearing none let's get started.

So the first item is to update the work on the universal acceptance. I guess most have seen the email from staff - from Nadia - from the new gTLD team who is also working on the issue.

So I wonder if anyone from - I guess Bart or anyone could update us on that? I see that there's a session being planned in Costa Rica. I guess the question is how we can participate and, you know, how we can sort of better join the efforts from the two ends.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. My guess - I mean, I know as much as you do from this. My guess is based on that email is that members of the JIG are kindly invited to participate in the roundtable and start to synchronize the activities under the - of the JIG with say the staff initiatives and see - and that's one of the purposes of having that roundtable.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So just to let people know it's scheduled for - sorry, I'm trying to pull up the email. It's planned For Wednesday...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...the 14th of March 12:40 noon to 2:00 pm.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: That's - at least that's the current plan. Do we know if it's intended to be sort of a - in a bigger room or a more - a smaller room and how we are sort of expecting the flow or the process?

Bart Boswinkel: Let me check with Nadia and let me send an email to the JIG list.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Yeah because I guess that would be helpful, I guess. And also of course we would further promote this to this group and to our respective supporting organizations, I suppose, and try to get some more people start to look into this issue.

I think all the ccTLDs that have started to see the issue and certainly on the gTLDs that have seen this issue are eager to, you know, to try to come together and have ICANN work on the subject.

Before I continue the - sort of this update and look at some - there's a couple of comments that we have received to date. I wonder if there's anyone who has any question about this and perhaps any thoughts on how this group could best interact with the staff initiatives really, you know, originating from the new gTLD development.

No thoughts or feedback that - should we, you know, should we - how should we I guess participate at the roundtable. Is it - is there anyone from this

group? Apparently - I wonder who - whether anyone is going to Costa Rica and will be able to participate there?

Chris Dillon: Edmon, this is Chris Dillon. And I will be going to Costa Rica and I am intending to attend that session.

Edmon Chung: That's great. Anyone else? Sarmad or Rafik?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'll be in Costa Rica. I don't know if I'll participate in this particular session but...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...I'll be in Costa Rica.

Edmon Chung: Would be good if you could.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I just haven't seen the schedule yet so I don't...

Edmon Chung: Yeah, neither have I so...

Avri Doria: ...have the faintest idea - what, yeah, I know so I have no idea what I'll be doing when and what conflicts with what and what I'm paid to attend to versus what I can attend.

Edmon Chung: Okay. But I guess the general sense is that I guess those - from this group is very much willing to participate in the roundtable. And we'd like to get a little bit more information. I do see the overview in the posting on the ICANN Website about it.

And I guess we'd like to get a sense of how we are doing this, is there a sort of agenda, are we doing presentations, you know, is the staff preparing a

bunch of presentations, you know, just I guess to get a sense of how the sessions is intended to be conducted and how we can participate in it.

And then also I guess the immediate question is whether the group has taken a look at the initial report that we have produced. And how it relates to - and integrates into the current plans from staff. So I guess those are the couple of main items, Bart, if you can bring to Nadia's attention or, you know, get a sense from her.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I will.

Edmon Chung: That would be good. Okay so I guess moving along I - on the same topic I see that last time we talked about moving the - the close of the comment period to March after the Costa Rica meeting. So far I see two comments coming in. One of which doesn't seem to be very relevant except some discussion about network neutrality.

The other one from the Registry Constituency I think is interesting and useful. I want to bring up one particular item. They sort of took a look at it and are seeing the many questions that we're asking suggests us to perhaps think about a sort of survey approach.

Because we have quite a number of items that we're seeking some response from so the suggestion is to try to put together a survey of sorts and get a better - tabulate a better, you know, results from what people think.

So I guess on that I'm curious what people think. Because even as we go through the public comment period that's probably something that we'd like to get started with. Of course that also relates to the staff work that is being done. I also see that staff has done some of that. But it doesn't seem to be as thorough as we have, you know, in terms of the issues that have been identified.

So I'm curious what people think in terms of the - the suggestion from the Registry Constituency, from the comments received in terms of getting a survey sort of format together to gauge - a better gauge the response from the community.

Anyone think it's a good idea, bad idea, willing to help with putting something together or? Nothing? I hear - somebody was trying to speak or. Okay so I guess the main question is whether we feel we should take up the - take up the work to try to put together a survey of sorts on the subject.

I guess - most of the questions we've already identified it's sort of a matter of formatting into something that we can do some multiple choices and then, you know, maybe some preformed questions. Any thoughts on that?

Avri.

Avri Doria: If I can? Surveys are hard. And, you know, I've been in a couple other groups now that are working on surveys. And for surveys to give you reliable information, A, you've got to make sure your questions are really clear and unambiguous. And I'm not saying ours (have) and I really haven't looked at it.

You need to decide on the methodology for the survey. And you need to make sure that you've got a reasonable sample of who you need the answers from responding otherwise you might have junk information or you might have information from junk.

And in either case you've done some work to give you something that can't be relied on. So while I think well thought out, well designed, well executed surveys are marvelous tools I just want to put that up front that if we're thinking about a survey and we want it to be useful we have to look at it as something that takes a lot of work and needs to be thought out carefully.
Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Avri. I think that's a very good point. In fact I very much agree with you. In fact some of the sort of working groups that have done surveys before I never felt it was very - the results were very compelling because both the sample size and, you know, the - kind of the tightness of the methodology is difficult in sort of a volunteer group like these.

So I guess that's very good that you pointed out. Maybe - I see that staff has tried to do something. Perhaps this - you know, instead of - two things. One, instead of us creating this survey maybe this is one of the things that we take from our initial group and say, you know, in a final report we sort of suggest that staff does a more, you know, more in depth survey with - that includes questions around these areas.

The other possibility is to of course work with the staff team now that is working on it and say hey these are some of the items that we have identified and perhaps you haven't covered in your survey. You know, are you interested in doing another round and, you know, having more input for it.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: May I suggest you put this - if I talk to Nadia and if we say to seek clarification on the session itself with staff - organized by staff - to put this on the agenda as well for the Wednesday afternoon whether it's useful and who should do it, etcetera.

Edmon Chung: Sure that seems to be good, you know, depending on what they have already planned this it's probably a good idea because this is an issue that does cover a broad spectrum of items.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. So raise it as an issue from the JIG for discussion.

Edmon Chung: Okay so you would help us connect with Nadia and follow up...

Bart Boswinkel: I will...

Edmon Chung: ...with - all right, okay cool. So any other thoughts on this issue so far as, you know, the - our initial report has been out for public comments. We've received a couple. I do - I understand that a number of groups are looking at it too and we would be expecting some more input.

But between now and then I guess we'll continue to see what's happening. And also this session at - in Costa Rica joint with the - with Nadia's team as well as our own meeting.

So let me see if that was the topic. Oh before we go there - before we go there I guess the second topic that I put up was the refreshing the participation here at the working group. I think Avri pointed out a couple meetings ago about the participation.

We have since - both the - on the GNSO side and on the ccNSO side have sent out a note to call for volunteers on this working group. I think it has just gone out not so long ago. And we are getting some feedback and some interest into joining.

I - just as a reminder we started the group with five official members from the GNSO and five from the ccNSO. I think at this - especially on the topics that we're talking about now both from this group we have suggested that we broaden that and we've each I guess went back to the - our SOs and asked for a little bit more participation.

And it seems like both of which are happy to do that. And we're receiving some response there. So that's an ongoing problem and I'm glad that we have a few more people join us today. And I know that I've talked to a few

people that are on the official list and they will try their best to come back to participate more actively.

On top of that Jian and I have also reached out to the GAC in terms specifically on the universal acceptance issue and trying to get them to pay a little bit more attention to what we're working on. And also have been talking to some of the members from the SSAC on participating more especially given their, you know, recent report on the single character IDN TLD and their attention to our work.

You know, it would be great if - I've actually mentioned to Patrick it would be great if we could have more active participation as we go through so that we could anticipate some of the items.

That being said actually after some discussion with Patrick he somewhat agrees to - some really (unintelligible) the findings that we had in our single character IDN TLD report. They are a little bit more conservative in their recommendations at this point.

With that I guess I want to ask, you know, whether there are more things that we can try to do to get more people to participate. We'll try to use the roundtable as a way to get more people from the community to participate in this discussion as well.

Of course we also ourselves I believe have planned working group session in Costa Rica which will - I'll certainly, myself and Jian will try to advertise and get more people to participate there and continuing.

So that update. Since, Avri, you raised the issue first I guess see if you have any thoughts on how we can do more and any ideas or.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I have to unmute. No. I mean, I guess, you know, that has been a start; we'll see what happens with the roundtable. But no I don't know how you get people to participate.

Edmon Chung: Okay well we'll try our best and we'll try to get...

Avri Doria: Yeah because I think they switched me from being, you know, an observer to a participate which I guess that means I'll have to speak less - I'm kidding. But, you know, I don't really know. I think just keeping at (BFO)s. And they have to see that these are issues that they care about. If they care about there'll be lots of people I think.

If, you know, the people don't see that this is an important issue for one reason or another then they probably won't.

Edmon Chung: Well the interesting thing is that every time we bring it up people think it's an important issue and they trust us too much so they don't participate as much.

Avri Doria: Oh.

Edmon Chung: No it's actually the interesting thing about this IDN discussion actually last time Dennis was on I was - at the VIP integrated reports they're getting sort of a similar situation as well having a lot of participation interest to begin with and as we go along, you know, we're getting more silent participation than active participation. That seems to be the case of many IDN issues.

But we will continue to work on it.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think...

Edmon Chung: Yeah, Avri...

Avri Doria: Yeah, I don't know but I sometimes - and this is just looking at my own psychology. After looking at some of the stuff that happened, for example, with IDNs in the Fast Pass and what looked like arbitrary decisions made without any feedback, any evidence.

The inability of the GNSO to get various things like appeals for strings, string similarity especially how it feeds into perhaps what's been going on with the Fast Track and the total inability to get things listened to or get feedback or understand has led to a certain amount of utility belief that, you know, yeah what's going to happen is what's going to happen and what we say in these groups isn't going to make that much difference to what's going to happen.

Now, you know, I'll keep coming because one can't give into feelings of futility but at a certain point there may be, you know, if we can work hard on something and SSAC can say oh, you know, we need to be more conservative because so-and-so in the IETF got a memo from somebody in ICANN and it says really we should think about this for another year so let's not do anything and that's end of story why are we doing this?

So perhaps I said more than I should have when you asked the question. I wasn't thinking of bringing it up this way. But that is perhaps another reason is is this work actually going to produce a change in anything or will there always be some master of the universe that comes by and says, yeah, yeah, yeah, but, you know, for these magical secret reasons over here that we can't tell you about or that will be dealt with in the future; it doesn't really count what you said. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Avri. I don't know what to say.

Avri Doria: Yeah, sorry you should - I should have kept my mouth shut but you asked.

Edmon Chung: No, no, no I think it's, you know, you almost made me cry. And I'm - I guess I'm with you on all of the things you said and I'm especially with you that, you know, we'll keep trying. And that's what, you know, I guess I'm trying to work hard on and make our voices heard.

And I guess your mentioning about getting more people to participate is important. But it - I think you nailed the point in terms of the, you know, is it going to influence anything. So I guess on both fronts, you know, on - in fact on all three items that we have identified here there seems to be have been some - I guess direct - what word should I say - interference?

And I'd like to, you know, even though it's sometimes tough like that I think, you know, we should be on, you know, work for it especially now with the universal acceptance issue. We'd like to work closer with staff and see if that is possible.

And now, you know, seeing that there are at least a few more people who are willing to join us from the ccNSO and from the GNSO let's see if we can work more constructively together. And I don't know if anyone from some staff might want to add to this. No worries. Don't want to put anyone on the spot. But it is important for those who volunteer their time that stuff is being, you know, worked on, is being heard.

I think there's always the view that, you know, oh it's not everyone has participated in the working group so it doesn't represent everyone's opinion from the community. But I think the process that's put in place is still relevant and we'll continue to work on it.

So with that said anything else anyone want to add? If not I'll move onto the third item. And our own session in Costa Rica I wonder if that is set and what the time is. Nathalie or Bart, would you have information on that?

Am I speaking to myself or - have I got dropped off?

- Chris Dillon: Perhaps people are on mute.
- Avri Doria: Here - no, hear, yeah.
- Edmon Chung: Okay. Nathalie or Bart? Did we all - did the previous discussion disgusted you guys too much and you left or...
- Bart Boswinkel: No we're still here. I'm still here at least.
- Edmon Chung: Oh okay sorry. No, no so I was just wondering what the session for - our own workgroup session - do we have a set time for Costa Rica?
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes it - I think it's on Monday afternoon - late in the afternoon. But I'll send the details to the working group.
- Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you. And in terms of the subject to talk about I guess I suggest we come back to the - take a look at the universal acceptance issue and a little bit of preparation for the Wednesday meeting.

And also since we will have more - usually we get a little bit more participation at our face to face meeting. And I'll definitely try to invite more people to come especially since the - we do have a report from the - from SSAC on the single character IDN TLDs.

Perhaps I'll try (our) best to invite Patrick or someone from the SSAC to our session and have a more interactive discussion with them on some of the items and see if we are actually, you know, in sync and whether there are additional work that this group can do to actually bring this to fruition.

And of course so we'll - my - I guess my suggestion is to touch on all three subjects. The second one was with SSAC and then the VIP. I believe the - I'm not - actually I don't know whether the VIP will have a session in Costa

Rica. I wonder if anyone knows about that? Bart or Nathalie, would you know if...

Bart Boswinkel: I'm sorry - I don't know.

Edmon Chung: You don't know. And I don't think Dennis is on the call with us today, right? No. But Dennis did send in their - the notice that the final report came out. So I guess we - I'll try to invite Dennis to the - to our Monday meeting as well so we can get a sense of what the next steps the VIP is going to take and see if this group could start to pick up some work again and produce some work that - in parallel in support of getting variants, you know, implemented.

Since I see, Sarmad, you're here and I believe you've been participating in the SSAC and also the VIP as well I was just wondering whether you wanted to add to the discussion we just had and that's the fourth and fifth item for - I've set up for today anyway - and whether you have any thoughts on the single character what the SSAC view are and how we could support that work and also the VIP side as well.

Sarmad Hussein: All right - right. So I think one of the things which I would very strongly support hearing the discussion today is that you do call SSAC to present their report on single character IDNs and also share the, you know, learn about their perspective on what things are and how this will be dependant on some of the other work which is currently going on especially the IDN VIP kind of work and I think clear up some of the perhaps gaps which I think do exist in our understanding.

And I think - so I definitely endorse that part. I think it will really help. So that's one thing. There is obviously this IDN VIP roadmap which has been published by the IDN VIP group. And that's a significant amount of work. And I think there is value in talking to Dennis as well and seeing what this group can do or how this group can help.

Because, you know, we - what's happening is there is also going to be work in development of language tables and bringing communities together. And when we're bringing communities together there is this - I definitely see this overlap between GNSO and ccNSO constituencies.

And, you know, this particular group is exactly what that overlap is in the context of IDNs. So I think there is - there's definitely a role to - you know, for JIG to play in that whole process just by the very fact that it actually brings the two communities together.

So I think there should be some discussion on what role the JIG should play or ccNSO and GNSO platforms should play in the VIP project as well. I think that's about it from my end. I think (unintelligible) session in Costa Rica should be very good to address some of the concerns which have been (unintelligible) about the feedback which was received by SSAC.

And, you know, I think there is some - there is some - definitely some need for some face to face interaction in that context.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Sarmad. And yes we'll certainly try to - and hopefully you could join us for the Monday afternoon session as well as you're probably one that has been participating in both sides most (oftenly). And we'll try to get Patrick and others from the SSAC to join us.

In terms of the...

Sarmad Hussein: Right.

Edmon Chung: Yeah. And if you can help as well that would be great. In terms of the...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...VIP side of - and yes I think that's - that is exactly what I'd like to get Dennis and the team to share and to figure out how we could play a role especially - not just bringing the community together. I guess this group, the JIG itself, is - because it's from the Councils it's I guess focused a little bit more on policy, you know, things that would affect policy.

I'm sure everything does in a way. But one of the things that at least from my point of view is going to be important is as the VIP goes down its path in exploring the different options and different approaches I think at least one of the things that the JIG probably could play a role is to identify if a policy development process needs to take place before, you know, it can, you know, goes further or some kind of clarification on what the GNSO recommendations already have or not.

Well at least in my very perhaps purist thinking of that the policy should be developed from the GNSO and then implemented. But anyway I guess the JIG's role is probably to identify those issues, you know, as the VIP goes on its work.

If it goes into a - an area where oh that it's, you know, especially if it, you know, it's contra to what the GNSO policies have or the ccNSO policies then we should definitely identify it and do work in parallel because it requires a policy change we need to go through that process.

So I wonder if - what others think. You know, that is at least one of the things that I think this group should pay attention to. Okay hearing...

Chris Dillon: Edmon, this is Chris Dillon.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Chris Dillon: I was reading the proposed project plan and I wasn't reading it with the thoughts of - ideas that you've just been talking about to be honest; I wasn't

thinking of that from a policy point of view. But actually that plan is very detailed; it outlines all sorts of work and they even have suggested timeframes for quite a few of them.

And so, you know, to cut a long story short it's a very short document; I think it's about 10 pages or something like that. But the time to encourage people to look at that is now because one suspects that it's hot off the press and they may be receptive to comments at this stage if policy is involved. I suspect it may be but as I say I wasn't really reading it with that sort of approach. Very substantial and very detailed.

Edmon Chung: Well thank you, Chris. That's a good point. And I will - I will admit that I haven't read it so I should - I'm sorry, I should have but I haven't. And that's very useful to know. And since we have Avri here, you know, it would be very useful since you were chairing the GNSO you probably - you were chairing when we passed the GNSO recommendations, right? So you probably have the best knowledge of it...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah, I most definitely was chair when the recommendations were passed.

Edmon Chung: So perhaps, you know, if you could spend some time looking at that and see if there are deviations from those recommendations because once there are - once we identify that, you know, there needs to be then we need to let the VIP know as well because if in parallel some policy needs to change I think they should know.

Of course again going back to the earlier frustration we had wonder if that's needed or not. But at least we should still insist that it is.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I mean, at some point certainly doing a look back and see how things, you know, settled against them. But I don't - it has to go back to some of

those earlier subgroups and look at some of the - what really happened in a sense is some of the relevant decisions and such happened in some subgroups.

And the reports of those subgroups were folded into the final gTLD recommendations but didn't necessarily have point bulleted, you know, in the 20 recommendations and then the various implementation guidelines - didn't actually get brought up and reflected at that point; they were just part of the overall report and indications.

And it's in those gray-ish areas of was that a recommendation or was that just a report of a subgroup upon which future recommendations were made is where does it coordinate, does it fit, does it not fit. But I think it's definitely worthwhile doing.

I don't know that it'll be, you know, give us conclusive like there was no policy or, you know, and there's two conditions you get. One there was no policy recommendation on Issue X and therefore was - were the implementers therefore free to do whatever they needed to do or should they have come back for a policy recommendation.

And then the second category, which is much harder to find because the staff was good and careful in terms of out and out recommendations is was the actual policy recommendation made transgressed in any way. And why you can find some indications where you might have a leg to argue on that maybe they were, maybe they weren't that is a much harder thing. But it's definitely a worthwhile effort especially in this particular sub-area.

Edmon Chung: Yes and based on what you just said and that's exactly why, you know, it would be great if you could spend a little bit of time there. And I certainly was a - you know, had participated in those subgroups - I think all of which that related to IDNs at least.

And I, you know, I'll certainly think of it as well but it would be very useful if you took a look from your perspective on how we should look at some of the - the project plans; the actual steps the VIP is taking and whether it at least in our view that it needs to go back to - could go back to the GNSO.

And I guess on the ccNSO side the discussion is still ongoing. And perhaps we, you know, there are things that we should alert them. So on that front I wonder, Bart, if you know - I should know but for some reason I didn't see a lot of action on the CC PDP it seems; but where they are with the work and how that - how the VIP work would flow into the IDN CC PDP.

Bart Boswinkel: Just before this call the working group on the overall policy reconvened after a considerable time. And it's moving slowly. And we will have a meeting in Costa Rica and do a presentation for the ccNSO community.

With regard to your second question some time ago the working group dealing with the overall policy has already decided that it will not wait for the variant issue project or the results of its work but will put in a placeholder to revisit policy aspects at a later stage. So it will not start discussing it because nobody knows how long it will take.

Edmon Chung: So what does that mean? The - so the CC PDP is pushing forward right? And...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: ...will not wait for the variant issue that was...

Edmon Chung: Right and it would just leave it blank for that...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: As a placeholder to revisit the policy once the - there is more clarity.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Okay. Do you see any possibility where, you know, let's say a - I'm sure there - one particular - potential part where it has some interaction with other parts is for example I'm sure, you know, when you apply or, you know, apply for a variant perhaps, you know, there might be fees being considered, you know, or what that process might be.

That is one of the things that, you know, off the top of my mind that's always going to be one of the...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: In that sense the CC world is very simple. If you look at the policy itself fees and their consideration are not part of it. So as - because IDN ccTLDs are considered ccTLDs and for delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs there is no fee or contract. The policy and say the remit of the ccNSO is it cannot deal with contracts and/or fees; it is not considered under the policy itself.

Edmon Chung: Okay yeah I do remember very clearly. I guess - I think it's always a question the GNSO side likes to...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes but that's...

Edmon Chung: ...bring up.

Bart Boswinkel: ...a separate discussion.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So, yeah, I guess in that case then in terms of VIP work it seems that it would just - the CC PDP even though it couldn't wait in a sense it would wait for it before it talks about variance it's just that it won't wait for it for the continuation of discussion of other items.

Bart Boswinkel: It goes back to probably the discussion that the JIG had with the VIP projects as well is it will not preempt on the outcomes of that issues project although that is more...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...new gTLD related; it is - it might be significant for a variant discussion around ccTLDs as well - IDN ccTLDs. But, yeah, it - there are other issues to discuss and hopefully within, you know, a couple of weeks, months, this part of the CC PDP will be closed. And it will be revisited again the policy once the issues become clearer.

Edmon Chung: Okay. It's certainly one of the things that - just like in the single character IDN TLDs I think one of the things that perhaps on the issue of (unintelligible) one of the things that at least the ccNSO and GNSO can think about is where some of the things might - or should be considered together. And I think that would at least be a useful exercise to be undertaken in this group because we have participation from both sides.

Okay so I guess with that we've pretty much covered most of the things. Oh one more thing; the Item 4 that I identified was the update on the letter to the Board regarding single character IDN TLDs. I guess as we updated the ccNSO has drafted a previous - well had drafted a version.

I guess - I think at least it encapsulates most of the items that were identified albeit maybe in the less - less - how should I say - strong manner. But, you know, at least it was approved by the ccNSO and was approved by the GNSO.

And I believe I - I was traveling in the last few days so I believe I saw the note already being sent to...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...the Board.

Bart Boswinkel: Leslie sent the note on behalf of the GNSO and the ccNSO after some discussion with Stephane to Steve Crocker.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: It was actually sent.

Edmon Chung: Okay. And so I guess we'll continue to observe how - what the next steps are from the Board and from the staff team in terms of the implementation. And of course we'll invite the SSAC to talk a little bit about it as well.

But anyway that sort of brings me to the end of what I had in mind. I wonder if anyone has any other items that they would like to bring up? Hearing none just as a recap Bart will help reach out to Nadia on the joint session in Costa Rica on Wednesday and get a little bit more information there. And I'll - in terms of our own session on Monday in Costa Rica I'll - Jian and I will try to invite the SSAC and - SSAC to talk about the single character IDN TLD issue and also try to invite Dennis and the VIP team to talk about the variant issue.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Just one thing Nathalie kindly sent a note said the session on JIG on Monday is from 4:00 pm until 5:00 pm local time. I'll reconfirm this by email and send out the venue as well.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. That will be great. And hope to see most of you there in Costa Rica. So with that let's wrap up this meeting. It is at the top of the hour now.

And thank you, everyone, for joining and taking the time. See you all in Costa Rica.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

Avri Doria: Good travels all.

Edmon Chung: Bye.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Chris Dillon: Good-bye, Edmon.

END