

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 03 August 2010 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 03 August 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-20100803.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung - co-chair

Jian Zhang - co-chair

Avri Doria

Rafik Dammak

Young-Eum Lee

Fahd Batayneh

Ram Mohan

ICANN Staff

Olof Nordling

Bart Boswinkel

Kristina Nordstrom

Gabi Schitteck

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Sarmad Hussain

Terry Davis

Coordinator: We are now recording.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JIG on Tuesday, the 3rd of August.

We have Edmon Chung, Jian Zhang, Fahd Batayneh, Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Young Lee. From staff, we have Kristina Nordstrom, Gabi Schitteck,

Bart Boswinkel, Olof Nordling, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Terry Davis and Sarmad Hussain.

Now, if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Also, just to say that Young Lee has temporarily disconnected. Over to you, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Gisella. Again, thank you for joining the call. I guess I sent around a short note, just a little while back, to the list just to sort of set the sort of expectations for today.

In general, hopefully we could have a sort of open discussion on what the issue - you know, what are the issues we should, or perhaps even should not, get our hands into on this pretty complex and broad topic of IDN variants.

Before I get in there, I just want to say - I just want to thank Bart, who was the (public comment) for the (single character) IDN TLDs. I see that has been posted.

I was just checking it a little while ago that we haven't received any comments yet, but for everyone on the call, please feel free to spread the word. It would be good to know if we missed anything or if we're completely off track on certain items on that particular topic. Or even if we're, you know, we're right on target. So it would be nice to get some feedback from the community. So please - (thanks to Bart first) and please do help spread the word.

So, as we mentioned the last few times, I think while we are waiting for the public comments to come back from the initial report on the single character IDN TLDs, we'll spend this few meetings on the top - the second topic, which is IDN variants.

It seems to be an issue of complexity, so, I don't really have a lot prepared at this moment. But I wanted to open up a key aspect, which is really, what are the policy considerations that ICANN and the GNSO and ccNSO essentially should be dealing with. Perhaps just to get things started, here are some of the things that are on my mind.

First of all, that perhaps the scope of what we should focus on, understanding that, you know, a critical thing about IDN variants that is that for - it seems like it's a somewhat of a moving target, if you will. Or something that changes as we understand more issues from different languages. And also, it seems like it may differ from - the policies may differ from registry from registry, so from TLD to TLD.

That perhaps what the focus of the discussion, you know, might provide us with a little bit better focus is to focus on the root zone, because that's really the heart of the - that might be the heart of the issue, or something that ICANN can and as a policy body between ccNSO and GNSO is something that we can focus on, because if we venture too far into second level of TLD variants, that might, especially on a policy aspect, that might become an issue.

Another area that I'd like to start off by pointing out, perhaps, is that we do understand that there are plenty discussion that's, I would say, ongoing at the technical level as well about this issue or related issues. We - I think Avri sent along something to me, and I apologize for sort of forwarding it so late. I did forward it out just a little - just a few minutes back, on some of the discussions that are happening at the IETF.

And also, I then followed up with a bunch of links that I think are probably relevant material that have been discussed. They're sort of results of previous discussions on the same or relevant topic.

So, and I guess the point is that we probably should continue to monitor - well, I was going to say monitor, but continue to keep an eye on all those discussions that are sort of outside of here. But also, you know, try to figure out, you know, what really the policy aspect is.

I think in Brussels, we heard pretty loud and clear from (Tina) and maybe others, that in terms of the policy which some, you know, in some regards, might set the requirements, quote-unquote requirements, for the technical side, you know, the ball is really on our court between really, between GNSO and ccNSO to think about what the policy framework should be at least in the root zone. And from there, perhaps, you know, the technical bodies can, you know, take that as a set of requirements.

But I'd like to relate what I just said, what I said just a few minutes ago, and that, you know, understand once we talk about IDN policies, it's probably - it's very difficult to distinguish between the policy that's implemented at the second level, with the policy that's implemented at the top level, the root level.

So you know, I might - we might come back and forth on this issue again, but I'd like to see, if possible, to focus on the root zone, and see if we can make more headway, make more progress on that.

And then I think that another aspect that I think of, just throwing out a few items to hopefully stimulate some thoughts for discussion is how we could - this question has (recurringly) come back, on how we could sort of define an IDN variant.

Again, we specifically want to focus on the root zone, what the root zone - how the root zone should treat this issue, and rather than a specific policy, but having a framework for you know, how or what would be considered IDN variants and the root zone and how we should treat it, treat IDN variants in

the root zone, and what, you know, is it possible to have a general framework that would work for different policy.

With that, really, you know, I want to just open wide up and say, you know, what are some of the things that are in people's mind on this particular issue and what we should include. Okay, one other thing is that I think the similar process where we could create a document, or we would try to create a document, sort of stop taking all the issues and maybe some preliminary thoughts, and throw it out for comments. And then, you know, further work on the issue.

So, with that, I you know, sort of want to open it up, wide open, and say you know, what is in your mind? What should, or even should not, this group cover?

(Jane), did you want to add anything?

Jian Zhang: Not at this point. Actually, I'm still thinking.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart Boswinkel.

Edmon Chung: Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: May I add something in your broad brush picture you just painted? Say one of - say in parallel to the work in this working group, the ccNSO has an IDN PDP running. One of the main topics in that PDP and that will be addressed between now and (unintelligible) as well, is the whole issue of - and that needs to be addressed, is the management of variants.

So you know, it's - I mean, during the Brussels meeting, there was a session or workshop on the PDP and there were some people from the technical community in that room as well. And one of the points we've been waiting on

is some guidance from the technical community because you don't want to develop policy if the technical issues aren't resolved.

And we found out that we, just a reaffirmation of what you just said, the technical community is waiting for policy guidelines or guidance to resolve some of the issues and better define it. So we are more or less waiting for each other.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri, if I could add something?

Edmon Chung: Please, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, I mean the reason I sent - and this follows on to what Bart Boswinkel was just saying. The reason I forwarded that (portion) to the document in the IETF (DNS) Extensions working group, which I tend to follow, is that the end result of that for now a requirements document is being written, and I guess it's a collaborate between (of) (Stan Mick) and (unintelligible), that's talking about the requirements. The working group is going further, trying to understand the requirements, and what they mean in a technical sense, not a policy political sense because for the IETF to work on it, it all needs to be that.

But the reason I thought that this group might be interested in looking at that document, and perhaps even commenting on it in one way or another, is to make sure that their statement, also requirement, does indeed match what the policy makers in ICANN -- be it ccNSO, GNSO, you know (or), whomever, feel are being taken into account. And you know there is, you know, this is kind of like the moment to make sure that the technical community has a viable and correct understanding.

Now of course, that means we have to also understand what it means to us, is it just a ccNSO requirement? Is it also a GNSO requirement? Is it just an

IDN requirement as some people say? Or you know, it is just a national requirement and not a (unintelligible), there's been many things said about it.

And is it just when you get down to it, and this is the question that's being talked about in the (ICS) and I don't know that that's a question for this group, is this just an IDN requirement?

So, once you do see the (equivilentries) you know, as the solution to variants, well, to the IETF, that's a general solution that could be useable for many things. So I just wanted to make sure that while they were talking requirements and we were talking policy, you know, that we saw each other's work. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Right, absolutely, Avri and do I hear correctly that we have a volunteer to help us, you know, keep us, at least this group, updated on the focus there?

Avri Doria: That - if that was a - of course I've already started doing it, so yes. I mean I'm going to continue following the group in the IETF no matter what. I'm not an active member of the (DNS) extension by any means. I was always just a looker on name-droppers before the group started this move to re-chartering with this as one of their, with whatever we want to call them, (equivilentries), (unintelligible), you know, whatever, before they got into it.

But yes, certainly I'm willing to continue reporting on what's going on.

Edmon Chung: Yes, and (personally), I'm looking on this as well. So yes, definitely. But we - you know, it's great to have you help us with it. And I think the suggestion that at perhaps the right time, and you know, with the right context, we should be commenting on that work. I think that's very useful and I think that's probably a good thing.

And as we, and especially talked about sort of how we approach this, at least in my mind, we would try to compile an initial report again to stop-take all the

issues. There should definitely be a section on specifically looking into the - there's a (work plan at) IETF and so, yes. That I think is very useful.

I see on my screen that Ram Mohan has also joined. I just want to make sure of that.

Ram Mohan: That's right. I've just been quiet because I didn't want to interrupt the flow of conversation. I joined about a few minutes late, but thanks.

Edmon Chung: No worries. So, yes, I don't know if Ram Mohan, you caught most of the opening that I had...

Ram Mohan: I did.

Edmon Chung: ...(team leads). Okay. So, we're just trying to, you know, open up for a, you know, anybody who has any thoughts on what are some of the things that we should, and also, some of the things that we should not touch on in this group and any thoughts anyone else?

I'm hearing not much. You know, (I have some notes to) (unintelligible) I guess stimulate some debate, if you will. There has always been a concept whereby that IDN variant sort of policies are so different, it's, you know, it's really impossible to have a, if you will, a superset.

But the challenge for the root zone, perhaps, is precisely that, because we will have to handle policies for gTLDs as well as for ccTLDs. And in so doing, we probably as ICANN we should probably also think about some consistency across the sort of continuum.

What do people think about the possibility of creating at least a framework of what a policy could look like for the root zone? What I mean by that is that, you know, we could ultimately come up with a framework which says, okay, IDN variant policy should include these elements, and these optional

elements. And then this is what ICANN and IANA should do when they receive such an application.

Is that so impossible to have a framework that's that predictable and that can cover most, if not all languages? By in large, should say all languages that at least we know of. Am I being too cryptic? Anyone have any idea about...?

The reason why I asked this question is obviously I - if we can do that, it would be a great goal for this group to be able to create such a monster, if you will, which is a framework or a superset of policy elements, such that ICANN can deal with. ICANN and IANA can deal with IDN variants at the TLD level.

Ram Mohan: Edmon, this is Ram Mohan.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Ram Mohan: The only thing that comes to my mind, the only observation I'd like to make is that you're in somewhat new territory here in the sense of impacting how the root zone gets worked on. I don't think there is actually any, as far as I know, any good mechanism that ensures that let's say we as a group come together, have consensus, and say this is what should be done.

I don't think there is, at best, the folks who manage IANA might take it as (advice), but I'm not sure there is any real method to ensure that they do what we ask them to do.

It doesn't mean that the work is not valid, but it's just an observation that, as I listen to you speak about creating policies for management at the root level, I just think about a lot of the other folks who sometimes exercise a somewhat proprietary perspective about what happens at the root level. I'm not talking only about ICANN here, of course.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Yes, I think that's really a good, sort of an - I think a focal point. I think from the GNSO, looking at the whole gTLD process, we're quite familiar with the possible difference between policy recommendations and implementation. But nevertheless, I think at least at this point, it seems to me that it's a meaningful attempt or goal for this group, you know, given that we do have the perspectives from the GNSO and ccNSO to try to see if, you know, there's a general framework that might work for ICANN, you know, perhaps for the Board to also consider when hit with an IDN variants in a TLD situation. We observe the situation with (unintelligible) on the (unintelligible).

And you know, I would sort of say somewhat in a - I think it was handled well in a sort of ad-hoc question, but it did it's job over, you know, as we move forward in gTLDs and also new IDN ccTLDs, you know, if we can really come up with a policy framework that's consistent and predictable, that's probably a worthwhile attempt.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram Mohan. Yes, I don't disagree that it's a worthwhile attempt. I'm simply pointing out that some of the work might end up - we might do good work and it may get ignored. That's true in general anyway.

The other thing - a completely tangential point that I wanted to make was one of the criticisms that has been leveled against the work that policy working groups on IDN and of any kind of IDNs inside the ICANN area, one of the criticisms they consistently endure is that the people making those decisions are insufficiently aware of the technical limitations, and the technical what's possible and what's not possible, technically. And so they end up building policy statements that are divorced from reality.

So the link that Avri sent and that you sent out along with Avri, I think that that's important to get a background on, because the work that (Suzanne Wolf) is doing at (ATF) in the (DNS extensions) working group, I think that's critical because it's trying to address this enduring myth of (D-name, B-name), you know, various technology mechanisms that theoretically

automatically (aliased) resources on the (DNS). But practically speaking, do not do the job in a complete manner.

And I think that it's important for us, who are participating in this working group, to be quite familiar with the technical underpinnings, or to at least have enough people in the group who are familiar with that, so that when we start making policy, start moving towards policy discussions, it's balanced by the feasibility of actually doing some of these things.

Edmon Chung: I think that that's a great point. So far, especially from some of the interactions so far within the group, I think we have a pretty good mix at this point. Perhaps as we go further, I mean Ram Mohan, your presence obviously adds to that as well. And I think as we go down, I hope to, you know, this is a topic of, I would think, of great interest that as we go down the discussion, and as we put out some preliminary stuff, we should be able to generate much more interest and participation. I don't expect it to be a very short process on this particular topic.

Actually, Ram Mohan, when you mentioned it, a sort of thought came to mind. This is - I've been kind of grappling with this concept for quite some time. I'd like to open up for, you know, other people's thoughts and comments on, specifically on technical side and policy side and you know, whether they're divorced and what needs to be done.

A very fundamental concept of IDN variants is, you know, a kind of positive statement here. Is it possible to say that we accept that IDN variants are technically and physically different domains, but we would define them as one and the same by policy? Is that in itself an oxymoron?

Ram Mohan: I'm not going to quibble with the general principles. This is Ram Mohan. I think the general principle is about right. The place where we have had grief so many times is because variants are poorly defined and as a result of that, this well meaning policy statement, which I would actually support with a clear

definition attached to it, it gets bastardized or diluted along the way. What's, you know, what is a variant is yet to be actually decided, or accepted universally.

Edmon Chung: That's a very good point, which sort of brings me to another question, again, that on this particular topic that has been, you know, debated through, back and forth. In terms of defining what a variant is, it seems to me that all the words in the world probably would not work. But is it possible to define it by creating a framework and saying if you fit these things and it is - the variant was created based on these few things then it is a variant rather than describing what a variant is to have certain sort of tests saying, you know, do you meet these - this framework. Is that - is that a better road than trying to just say define the variant and put a - paragraphs together?

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. I don't want to monopolize the conversation. My perspective on variants has evolved over time. I'm now at the position where I think a single uniform definition is going to be hard. I think what you're proposing, Edmon, is a more sane way to look at it where we do it on a major language group by major language group basis where there is a - where the empirical examples actually define what treatment is appropriate rather than a one-size fits all.

Avri Doria: This is Avri; can I ask a question?

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I think when you're talking about the specifics that make lots of sense. But I'm wondering if there aren't a couple of sort of - and perhaps semi-abstract but a set of conditions that would underlie any of the specific definitions of variant.

And that - and that they can't all just be totally isolated definitions that have nothing to do with each other. I think there has to be at least some abstract definition and some set of basic conditions that anything would need to meet

to be considered a variance otherwise there's no reason to have a word called variant I think. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Avri, I think that's sort of precisely what I wanted to say in a rather convoluted way. I think, you know, both you and I are - and Ram - are trying to find the right words just to make sure we don't distort the discussion.

But I think it seems to me that this is a possible direction where we would define if you condition based on the empirical information that we have and use that as a framework to test whether, you know, we should consider this a variant and if this is a variant how we should deal with it at ICANN.

So with that, you know, perhaps, you know, I can add to say that I - if that seems like an interesting direction one of the things that I'm actually eager to and would be happy to do is try to compile, you know, some of these basic conditions.

And of course off the top of my head I have a few and I'll try to just throw it out and get the discussion started here. For me it seems like a few critical components is the use of a or a set of tables of characters, and then plus the second one would be a set of algorithms that are consistent, you know, applied throughout a policy.

And then, you know, a variant is a result of those - of the - what is being submitted or applied for. And then based on those tables and algorithms it comes out with an output. This is a very, very crude framework but it seems to me that we can probably add a little bit more meat to it. So I just throw this bare bones out to see if there are any comments or thoughts on it.

No?

Ram Mohan: Sorry, this is Ram. I'm trying to digest what you said and I think...

Edmon Chung: So what I'm trying to throw out is that, you know, can we start at least with a skeleton (mess), that's okay, in order to be a variant it needs to be a - something that has a set of tables, a set of algorithms and you put something as an input in which is string, okay, a TLD string in this case and that out comes a variant string. And that has to be consistent, you know, the same algorithms - the same input yields the same output based on the tables and the outcomes.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Is that a possible starting point for defining a variant?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. That's a very sort of already jumping to a technical definition which is okay. Is there no prior to that policy statement or policy definition - I don't mean policy statement - but definition from policy language defining a variant?

I think that one makes sense in terms of technical but that doesn't still say anything about its use or its why or it's anything. And I'm wondering does a definition need that as well as, you know, the ability to take something from one table and, you know, bi-directionally move from one table to the other according to some algorithm which I think is a good, you know, technical but that also doesn't restrict it too much because, you know, other things may do that too.

But I think it's good but I wonder whether we need something else?

Ram Mohan: This is Ram. I'm not sure the definition that Edmon proposed is sufficient. I think it's kind of a - it feels to me like it's a necessary prerequisite for defining for a tight definition of variance and therefore it's a step in the right direction. But it feels like more is needed because the rule that Edmon suggested could be used rather generically for something that is not a variant also.

And I think we - so we need something that brackets the definition to say - so that it specifically applies only to variant. Now to what you were saying, Avri, about the policy definition of a variant; I think that is the - that is the crux of the problem.

Different communities consider, you know, what is a variant in very different ways. And we have I think an interesting choice to make. One is to arrive at a single consistent policy definition of what is a variant or the other is to say here are general - here is general framework, these sets of principals if you will normally or often constitute a variant but, you know, language communities really have the final say in it.

I think we have an interesting fork in the road there to take.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, if I could respond. I think I completely agree with you. I think very often you and I are saying almost the same thing in different words. I think in my case I would have probably described it as there's a set of attributes that may or may not be included in what one defines as a variant.

And, yes, the policy decision, I mean, the policy definition does not need to be a unitary this is a variant for all people, for all times and all places but that there's a general set of attributes not all of which need to be there but at least some of which need to be there in anything called a variant. And if we...

Ram Mohan: I like that...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Yes, I really like that framing of it. Not all required but at least one is necessary for a string, for a label to be considered a variant or TLD label to be considered a variant.

Edmon Chung: I'm literally trying to job down some notes here.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: It seems like it is a good direction. I hear somebody wants to...

Olof Nordling: Oh it was just Olof. I just wanted to throw in...

Edmon Chung: Oh please go ahead.

Olof Nordling: ...a statement of support for what Ram said. I think it's rather risky to start using the expression algorithm because algorithm can be very many things and can convert the string into absolutely anything depending on the algorithm. So I'm not sure whether that's the right choice of expression in the case.

Edmon Chung: Okay. And thanks Olof. I think I agree with probably using instead of attribute seems to be emerging as a good set of words to try to describe it then. So in that case I'm - I think, you know, the - it seems to me that - sorry - let me restart.

When I threw out the original thought I was trying to see if it is possible to think of it in a way that is quote/unquote technical; technical in the sense that it's a structured framework where you test things against. And rather than trying to create broad statements of trying to define what a variant is or is not.

That seems to be something that, you know, might work. So I think we'll definitely try to state more of these potential attributes and perhaps that's, you know, that's really one of the things that the devils are in, you know, what types - what set of attributes should or should not be there when considering a variant.

And the other thing that might be important and I jump ahead here is that once we get to that point we might want to think about what the type of variants there are and how we define the different types of variants.

And if we have a - in the case we have a super set of the types of variants that we need to handle then we can actually have a policy recommendation on, you know, for ICANN especially in the TLD level at the (root zone), this is what we will do with this type of variant and this is what we will do if this is (fit) is this type of variant. Does that make sense for people? Is that the direction that this group should attempt to take?

Avri Doria: Hi this is Avri. I feel like I'm talking too much and filling too much space.

Edmon Chung: No we're all doing that.

Avri Doria: I think that that's close to what I would think of. I think at this point we might still be at the point of not this is what we would do but this is what we believe we need to support this kind of variant. And...

Edmon Chung: Oh right, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...is still one step further that's the one that includes what's technically possible, what's possible through management and manual (unintelligible) exactly what we'll do is down the road but what we need to be able to do and that might have been what you meant and I'm just playing with words in which case I apologize. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: No I actually agree. I think, you know, around the same what we do is really what we'd like to see happen; is this the type of variant that happens. Okay so I'm trying to jot down some notes and if what I - when I started out the discussion I was hoping that throwing out these ideas and really what I'm

driving at is the sort of end of the discussion between now and sort of next meeting.

I'll try to create a document that addresses a number of these issues. And then in a structure that could then, you know, we can further discuss on it and to add.

And I agree that the very crude structure that I, you know, I threw out is - still requires a lot meat on bones but, you know, I think what I'd like to try is to - well at least it seems like this is a structure that is possible then I'd like to try to create, you know, put out the skeleton and then keep adding meat to it and with the understanding that it might not hold ultimately and we might have to change the structure all together but at least to try to put meat on it in the next few meetings as we go about this discussion.

So that's the idea. And really with that I don't - the notes that I've prepared to try to stimulate the discussion today is pretty much exhausted. So - and of course I've done most of the talking actually - Avri or Ram you mentioned trying to dominate the discussion but really trying to stimulate more discussion here.

But if people, you know, anyone has any thoughts on other things that we need to include as we go, you know, at least on a base level even if you think it's in the details I'm, you know, it'd be - it might be useful to just bring it up. (Jane) did you want to add anything?

Jian Zhang: No I'm fine now.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Jian Zhang: Hello?

Edmon Chung: Yes we hear you. Well in that case I think, you know, we're probably done for today. I think between now - the next meeting is scheduled for actually next week instead of two weeks from now is that correct? Gisella or Bart do you remember...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes it is in two weeks. That would be a ccNSO Council call at the same time.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So that was the reason to have the call next week at this time.

Edmon Chung: Right, okay. So Gisella please send out the reminder and make sure people know that we have shifted it one week ahead of time. So between now and then I'll try to...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Next Tuesday, correct.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Yes. So between now and then I'll try to summarize some of the things we've talked about today and I actually think - I actually don't think I might have an actual document out but I'll try to draft an email where - what the structure of an initial report might look like and see if, you know, get people to start punching holes in it.

And in the meantime I think, you know, Avri it would be useful if, you know, there are any progress in the (ITF) side on the issue to bring it up. And, Bart, you - earlier on you mentioned that the ccPDP. So I sort of assume that you would bring that, you know, as that progressed you'd bring those respective - again I'm actually also on that mailing list and...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, no I will...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: But anyway - but it would be useful, Bart, if you could be the one shepherding it back to us that would be useful.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon - Edmon...

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: ...maybe just a suggestion before going into a structure to move forward is because I know there are a lot of people on the list but - who haven't attended the calls. If someone could identify all the aspects as we did at the start of this call; try to capture that in one document because I think from that point of starting there some issues will emerge.

And we have say a kind of record of the issues emerging before going into say identifying specific issues for this working group. Because I think this working group will sit in the context of the - the output of this working group will be in a certain context which needs to be recorded as well.

And if something changes in the context and that's probably what Avri is referring to is around what she's doing we need to revisit it again. But we need to capture that as well.

Edmon Chung: Yes, that's very well said. And we'll definitely need to keep that in mind and make sure that we capture the sort of essence and the context of the discussion and also make sure that others in this group are well aware. So...

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe - and this is a suggestion - fortunate for me but I'm on holidays as of tomorrow but if that could be the starting point and we (unintelligible) that

aspects document next week and share it on the list that would be a better starting point before going into a structure to - for a issues report.

Edmon Chung: That's actually a good idea. That's very useful because I was trying to grapple my mind around what I would try to produce to stimulate the discussion. I think sort of putting it out in aspects are, you know, probably a good idea. I'll - I think I'll try to take a first stab at it and perhaps with of course myself and (Jane) will take a look at it and certainly circulate to everyone and see if that's something that might work.

Again, it might completely fall flat and we'll have to start over but, you know, this topic I think we'll need to spend quite some time to try to come around with it. We'd like for it ultimately to be in the new TLD process obviously but I don't think we're at the level of the urgency of like the VI working group - I shouldn't say urgency - it is urgent but we're not under that type of - at least that's not the intent of under that type of timeline. Okay.

Ram Mohan: Edmon, one of the - this is Ram. Not to throw a cat among the pigeons but one of the things that might - I wonder whether it would be useful for this working group to think about is in the absence of clear and specific policy guidelines and advice and that is backed by technical reality is there a good holding place that we can provide advice to ICANN on?

Because if you look at the new gTLD process there is - it seems to be somewhat uneducated about how to handle and what to do, I mean, it's kind of - everything just goes into limbo and that causes a great deal of stress and uncertainty.

And I'm wondering whether it's worthwhile for this working group to consider working on some sort of a holding spot that says until dah, dah, dah, here is what should be done with variants. I'm not sure if it's already part of a plan but it feels like that may alleviate some of the extreme stress that is caused in some language communities.

Edmon Chung: That's a good idea, Ram, it wasn't I would say until you spoke of it. I think at least in my part from the briefings that (Tina) provided us. There are lots of activities that staff is working on to address those type of issues. But, you know, I think your point is very valid and I think, you know, it's probably a good thing to at least in the interim provide that type of policy advice.

What do other people think about that? Avri? Bart? Olof? (Jane)?

Avri Doria: I'm sorry - this is Avri. My attention had wandered to the Adobe screen of my next meeting which starts in four minutes so I apologize, I did not...

Edmon Chung: No worries. So I'll try to take silence as consent to at least try to come up with a holding position that Ram mentioned and, you know, that - sort of included in the scope of what we should talk about. That's one of the aspects of the aspects document.

Avri Doria: Sounds good. I'm hanging up so I can dial into my next phone call. Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Okay so that's really a wrap. I think I'll thank everyone for joining the call if there's no other question, comments, thoughts. Again always can use the mailing list. And we've - we are having another call one week from now. And in between I'll try to generate some sort of aspect document and we'll try to use that as the structure of discussion next time. All right? Thank you everyone.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Jian Zhang: Bye.

END