JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 09 November 2010 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 09 NOvember 2010 at 1200 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jig-20101109-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Edmon Chung - Chair
Avri Doria
Rafik Dammak
Sarmad Hussain
Jian Zhang - co-chair

ICANN Staff
Olof Nordling
Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordstrom

Apologies:
Andrei Kolesnikov
Young-Eum Lee
Fahd Batayneh

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Kristina Nordstrom: Thank you. Okay, hello everyone and welcome to this call. On the line we
                     have Sarmad Hussain, Rafik Dammak, Jian Zhangh, Edmon Chung, and
                     from Staff Kristina Nordstrom and Bart Boswinkel.

Edmon Chung: Okay, thank you Kristina and welcome to the JIG call and I think, you know, a
                couple of us might be at the IETS Social. I just realized that's a - we sort of
                conflicted with that event.

But anyway I guess we'll push forward. I wanted to talk about a few things today, first of all to perhaps get a sense from Bart if we have any update on the Work Plan for IDN variance at the TLD.

And second, I sent around a first draft of the - a final report for the single character IDN TLD issue and would like to talk about that, and then finally to spend a little bit of time talking about some timing on the Cartagena meeting.

So I guess Jan or others, did you want to add any items or - in terms of the agenda?

Jian Zhangh: No, actually it sounds fine to me.

Edmon Chung: Okay, with that then yes, we'll hear from Bart to see if...

Bart Boswinkel: This is - I can be very brief. I haven't heard anything back yet. I've been trying I think four or five times over the last couple of weeks - no response. The only thing is what I've heard or what I've seen and it's probably as much as the Working Group has seen.

There was a discussion on an issue plan but - at the Board Meeting on the 28th of October, but no resolution or decision was made at the time. So my assumption, and this is only my private assumption, is people are still working on the plan. But unfortunately I don't have any feedback.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I guess that I'm just curious how we could try to get more information and also perhaps to ask around and say, you know, as much as we'd like to - I guess the whole point is not try to completely duplicate efforts and also not try to create things that might be conflicting each other. So that's the interest but I guess the question is really...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, as I understand that was - say that's the way I framed - say that was based on the call we had I think about four weeks ago as well, that's the way I framed the request for information.

The only thing what I could do - maybe this would help is send again this request to (Kurt) and (Tina) and include both you and Jan as Co-Chairs over the Working Group and see if that might help.

Edmon Chung: Okay, that - I think that would be useful and we'll try to just a little bit...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, then you'd know it if there is any response yes or no.

Jian Zhangh: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Okay, cool. And I guess at the same time I'd like to sort of ask those who are on the call whether, you know, you feel that we should continue to forge ahead because right now we're - we sort of were left hanging after moving the discussion forward a little bit, and the idea is to try to get an initial report out.

It really just talks about the policy aspects. We're not at this point making policy recommendations. This is for the IDN variance, IDN TLD variance issue.

So I just want to get a sense at least around the call today whether people feel that we should continue going forward if we still don't hear from the Staff Work Plan. I guess Rafik, Sarmad, Jan, your thoughts on that.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, may I add a suggestion to this?

Edmon Chung: Yes, sure.

Bart Boswinkel: If you look at say the timing right now we are a month away of Cartagena, say looking at the final report for the say single character variance is that the Working Group focuses on this one and note that say on variant management that we - that the group is still waiting for some feedback on what the plan is about and use the Cartagena meeting to focus on the variant management, because as far as I know (Tina) will be there and (Kurt) will be there as well.

And we could invite them for the Working Group session on Thursday morning.

Edmon Chung: Okay, I guess that seems to be reasonable and if we can get this document out the door before Cartagena we're using the - this meeting and next meeting and try to use the Cartagena meeting as - to really try to discuss in depth the IDN TLD variance issue. That seems to be a reasonable approach.

Sarmad Hussain: Hey, this is Sarmad. I have a couple of comments. First of all I think we are quite advanced as whether there were single character IDN TLDs we're concerned, so we should definitely first focus on trying to close that on the way.

And as far as the variant discussion is concerned I'd like to sort of list or at least have a list in front of me on who else - which other groups or individuals are focusing on this area and it would also be interesting to find out how they are - view the - perhaps collaborating with each other and how we can actually join into that collaboration if you had one to talk about that aspect as a...

Edmon Chung: You mean for the IDN variant issue more?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay sure, we can, you know, one of the things actually in terms of the agenda, if people feel okay why don't we - because we're talking about

Cartagena now, why don't we move - jump to that and get a sense of what sort of activities we - we're planning for Cartagena first.

And I guess that sort of tries to answer your questions on that as well in terms of how we try to reach out more to the community to connect and I guess in some ways synchronize with the efforts on - especially on the IDN TLD variance issue.

Bart or Kristina, I think we are planning the Thursday morning as the Working Group meeting, and then we also are planning for a public session for Monday afternoon.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, both meetings as far as I know have been confirmed, say I know the meeting - the public meeting on Monday afternoon is confirmed and the Thursday morning meeting is - I haven't seen the latest schedule yet but I think it's very likely.

Kristina Nordstrom: Yes, they are both confirmed I think and the Monday afternoon is from 5:00 to 6:00 and Thursday is from 8:00 to 9:00 in the morning.

Olof Nordling: Hello, this is Olaf. Sorry for late arrival.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi Olaf.

Jian Zhangh: So the Monday - actually the Monday session is going to be public, you know, public session and Thursday morning it's going to be a - the Working Group, right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, you're right.

Jian Zhangh: Okay, so the Monday session is more like reporting, you know, to reach out to our Working Groups works, that kind of thing, right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Jian Zhangh: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Look, and I think we can also use that opportunity to - as someone suggested to try to reach out and let more people know about the work that we're working on and to really, you know, solicit some cooperation where appropriate.

I think that's definitely one area to - well one opportunity to reach out. I understand that it's right after the sort of more general IDN session. Is that so?

Bart Boswinkel: The - that was the intention.

Edmon Chung: The Monday one, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, the Monday afternoon and say when we started to organize it the intention was to have a say full-blown Monday afternoon with IDNs. Unfortunately the ccNSO has another major topic to discuss that is the delegation redelegations of ccTLDs in general.

And they need to discuss the report of that Working Group before they meet the GAC and they meet the GAC - the ccNSO meets the GAC on Tuesday afternoon. So they had to swap the IDN session with the delegation redelegation session.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: And Tuesday afternoon will be - I know - my understanding is sometimes during the meeting, I'm not sure which date, there will also be a review of the Fast Track process. And this includes I think if you look at the questions, a -

one of the topics for discussion is variance or synchronized TLDs and how to deal with it or how it is dealt with.

Jian Zhangh: My understanding - so Bart, my understanding is that's going to be on Tuesday afternoon, right, ccNSO session?

Bart Boswinkel: That is but that's specifically focused for the ccNSO.

Jian Zhangh: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: There will also be a more general public discussion but say as this is planned for Monday afternoon and the ccNSO has its own sessions on Monday, including Tech Day and the delegation, and to have it more focused for the ccNSO and the ccTLD community At-Large, it was included in the schedule for the general ccNSO meeting.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so one is the Monday afternoon session. I was curious whether the - our session would be right after the general IDN session. That's the public session.

Jian Zhangh: No.

Edmon Chung: And I think you were talking about the...

Jian Zhangh: That's my understanding.

Edmon Chung: Okay, and then partly we're talking about the...

Bart Boswinkel: And maybe talking about the...

Jian Zhangh: Yes, my understanding is adamant. My understanding is, you know, the general IDN session is going to be on Tuesday afternoon, but our session's going to be on Monday afternoon.

Bart Boswinkel: No, but the general - there is a general one so let me check for - now we're getting confused. See if there is a preliminary...

Jian Zhangh: Because actually I checked the last week. I think there is a IDN session on Tuesday afternoon in ccNSO meeting.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and...

Jian Zhangh: And that's why, you know, I send to you email said, you know, could we fit in that session because I thought it's going to be good because we'll also talk about IDN, and then your answer to me said - you replied to me said it's a very full session, you know, because they want to review the Fast Track so...

Bart Boswinkel: But I think Edmon is referring to a general public session on IDNs.

Jian Zhangh: Oh, okay.

Edmon Chung: Correct, so...

Bart Boswinkel: And so what we're talking about is specifically ccNSO session and...

Edmon Chung: Right, right, ccNSO session.

Bart Boswinkel: So that we talk - see if I can find in the - if there is a tentative schedule Monday. No, there is not really - let me get back to the Working Group on this one as soon as I know whether...

Edmon Chung: Okay, because I guess the reason why I think, you know, if it is then I think it works well. We'll try to keep the people in the room and follow on with our discussion.

But I guess coming back to Sarmad's question, besides this and perhaps Jan and I - myself and if you can help as well reach out to several of the groups that we know are working on this. What else do you think we should do on that front?

Bart Boswinkel: May I suggest say let me first check the schedule as a starting point and then take it offline with you and Jan how we can best, you know, seek people who want to participate and attend the sessions.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Sure, but I just - I think we'll have to circle back to it somewhat to see if, you know, this answers this question and it seems like an approach that works.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and this goes back to the question maybe that's something we can find out as well for this Working Group, going back to the question about which groups are - still are working on variant management, because it's getting more confusing every day.

Sarmad Hussain: Yes, I think - that was my initial comment as well that - so there is possible to be some discussion on it for the IDN ccPDP that is probably obviously the discussion with the GNSO.

We are discussing it as well. Are there any other groups who are discussing it and, you know, so it's probably a good idea to just have at least a list of groups or organizations who are involved in currently discussing this, maybe through email or something and then...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I think it's just an email to the list saying these groups are currently working on variant management.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: I'll look into that.

Edmon Chung: Thanks Bart. I see Avri also joined the call. Is that...?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Hi Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi.

Edmon Chung: I thought you were at IETS in that Social.

Avri Doria: No, I'm unfortunately not funded to the IETS this time, so I am in Rhode Island.

Edmon Chung: Oh, okay, so good to have you on. So I guess that's the - generally the - in terms of the things to be discussed, I guess for Monday afternoon it's much more of a report.

It's a public session. We'll talk about the things that we've - was done on single character IDN TLDs and as well as on IDN variance. And on the Thursday morning Work Group meeting as discussed a little bit earlier, we'll spend I guess most of the time talking about IDN TLD variance, especially with (Tina) and perhaps (Kurt) also there. So with that I need to...

Avri Doria: Do we know if they're available?

Edmon Chung: Sorry?

Avri Doria: Do we know that (Tina) and (Kurt) are available for this?

Bart Boswinkel: I'll check.

Avri Doria: ...but I don't - yes, because usually it's hard to get them.

Bart Boswinkel: To my knowledge (Tina) will be in Cartagena.

Edmon Chung: We will definitely invite them and I think the time slot we're trying to have it so that (Tina) can join, but we'll specifically try to invite them to come. Okay, so with that I wanted to move to the next item which was the - I sent around again - I apologize for sending around documents so late, but I'm - I think we'll - the idea is to hope to walk through it a little bit today and we can continue the discussion on the mailing list as well as in our next meeting.

But I did send out a first draft of a final report on single character IDN TLDs. This issue - I think I was trying to summarize it into a few policy recommendations on the subject and also trying to respond to the comments.

There was the report prepared by Bart earlier on but there are a few items that we said we would further consider and act on it. So - and also I tried to see if it might work well to make actual suggestions to the Applicant Guidebook.

And it would be suggested that it could be more easily implemented and incorporated. So in terms of the structure of the final report, the idea is introduction and I sort of split it up into five sections, the first one being introduction and background that would pretty much be the similar materials from the initial report, just what was discussed before on the subject.

And then a second section being the actual policy implementation recommendations and sort of summarizing four points. And the third section being the suggested edits.

I mentioned specific edits to the Applicant Guidebook where I think this would be inserted into. And then the fourth section would be basically just a repeat of the initial report just to archive it back in so that those are the policy aspects that we have considered.

And then the fifth area being the summary of the public comments received from the initial report and also some further response to those comments. So that's sort of the general structure.

Any comments on the general structure and then I guess the idea is to go section by section and to go through the document. But conceptually, structurally, does anyone have any thoughts, concerns?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe before - this is Bart. Before going into the say individual say there is more a process question I would say. According to say as my understanding of the charter is the Working Group will make recommendations to the Council.

So this means it needs to be adopted according to its own processes to the Council and I think - I don't know whether you want to include that so this is a recommendation of the Working Group to the ccNSO and GNSO Council.

Edmon Chung: Right. Actually speaking with - you're quite right. I completely - and it's really my fault. I completely forgot about the ccNSO side of implementation so I think that personally needs to be added in as the two sections where they were recommendations. We should add a first section on the ccNSO and...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's right. No, but I think that the procedural bit needs to be included as well.

Edmon Chung: Procedurally, yes. Right, and we should include it in the - right up front and in saying that this is intended to be - if this goes through the public comment period and things are okay, we'll finalize it and we would be - process wise we would be sending it to the two Councils respectively and then it's really up to the Council to then do whatever they want with it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that was my concern and say flowing from that before going into do you have say a - I assume you want to have it published yes as soon as possible, so that means probably late next week or even depending on the comments receive - we receive from the Working Group members, yes early next week.

Edmon Chung: In terms of timeframe I guess that might be a little bit too aggressive. I was thinking more that it would be published just right before the Cartagena meeting.

We - I'm - my feeling is that we would need one more meeting to finalize it which would be two weeks from now. So I guess my hope is that we would be able to have the meeting two weeks from now and then a few more days to finalize everything and be posted at the end of that week.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, so that means posting around the 25th or the 26th, so that's a couple of days before the meeting in Cartagena.

Edmon Chung: Right, that's - that would be my - that would be the idea.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and a second question is how long, say and that means, you know, probably you want to keep your public comment period open until I would say late December, so just before Christmas.

Edmon Chung: Yes. Yes, I think so. I guess depending on how - I'd like to set something for just before Christmas, however I think at the - when we get into Cartagena we might get a better sense of whether we need to extend it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, however so - but the earliest is mid-December.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Jian Zhangh: So actually how long do we need for public comments?

Bart Boswinkel: Depends on - I think the practice is at least 21 days.

Jian Zhangh: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: At least three weeks. Depends on the...

Jian Zhangh: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: I think that's very much - depends very much on say the topic itself and then yes, what you want say with the initial report we had a very, very long public comment period due to the yes, the summer holidays and everything else.

                 So moving forward that means - so I don't know when the GNSO Council meets after the Cartagena meeting. I assume some times early January.

Edmon Chung: I don't have the calendar, GNSO calendar here but I would - I don't know. There might actually be one before the end of the year because it meets every three weeks.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, but that's going to be very hard depending on say if you want to have a final recommendation.

Edmon Chung: Oh no, I don't think that would - yes, I don't think that would happen. It would take probably at least into January in terms of the timeframe to January for it to reach the Councils.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay and so probably we include that in the document as well so then you got the process laid out and everybody's aware of what is happening.

Edmon Chung: Good idea.

Bart Boswinkel: That's why I asked. Yes, okay.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess with that I'd - we can move into some of the meat of the document which are the core recommendations. I tried to summarize everything into four points.

I was looking - I was reviewing the policy aspects and the initial report and stuff, a lot of which we really just point back to existing - well other aspects of the gTLD and ccTLD processes.

So in terms of the four areas that I sort of structured around I - again I apologize. I was wildly biased on the GNSO side. I'll - will have to create the ccNSO side as well.

But let's talk about the GNSO side and see if we have - or generally what is required for us. But in terms of the four areas I summarized into the - it was A, B, C, D.

A was to - just to reiterate the - that go back - really to go back to the GNSO policy recommendation in the final report for the new gTLD, however it does say that single character IDN TLDs should be implemented but could be allowed and - but to reiterate that and to announce - to assert that it should be implemented.

And then B is the definition of a single character. I think that has often come up as a question and I think it seems like this is a useful anchor for talking about this.

And then C is a slight adjustment from the initial report actually so I think, you know, we probably should talk about this. It's a slight adjustment based on some of the response that was gotten.

And in the original GNSO policy recommendations as we said that single character IDN TLDs should be analyzed on a case by case, but no further description.

What we're suggesting here is that actually following somewhat the idea of what was being implemented for two character IDN TLDs to sort of split it up a little bit and say for non-alphabetic script, single character IDNs, they would be more generally accessible. And then for alphabetic script ones, which seems to have much more confusion possibilities with, like ASCII and Latin strings.

So to sort of spit it up into two - the two writing systems of the world and make that as a recor- policy recommendation. And then for D to really - just to restate a lot of the findings from the initial report that many of the restrictions including, like, geographic names, similarity, (consit) resolutions and all those kinds of things should, you know, we could depend on the existing processes.

So those were the four items in terms of actual policy recommendations that I thought would be summarized from all the stuff that we talked about. Any...

Man: Edmon, while you are on - talking about it, just a recap of the previous point you make. There is the first and so far only GNSO council meeting that's announced. It was 6th of January next year.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Man: Now going back it's probably too early for the recommendations.

Edmon Chung: (Right). So back to the four points. (Reese), (Summer), Rafik, (James) - I - you - I don't know whether you've had the chance to take a look at the document but in terms of your - my description if you have the chance to look at it.

Sarmad Hussain: Right. This is Sarmad. I have a couple of comments. First of one, going back to your previous point on the structure of the document, let me (again)...

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Sarmad Hussain: ...general comment and then I'll come back to these four points.

Edmon Chung: Sure.

Sarmad Hussain: In the - I would, you know, it's probably another way of structuring this would be to - after giving the background then going to the discussion of how the (unintelligible) would - are being made and what are the discussion points. And then eventually going into the conclusion based on the discussion points. And then after the conclu- after the (deciems) then making the recommendations.

So in that context, I would probably suggest to reconsidering structuring it in such a way that you have section one where it is and then perhaps bringing in section five and any other discussion which have - which we want to document in this report because that's (trim) discussion. And then this one, that discussion, follow that with section - let's see I think two and four.

And then finally section three and then a similar extra section added for maybe some recommendations for the IDN ccTLD process as well in case there are certain things we need to say about that process.

So restructuring it in a way that we show - have the background first then the discussion and then the (de fields). At this point the structure goes into the (CMs) first and then maybe the discussion afterwards. So that's one way of looking, you know, that's another way of looking at it.

So that's a comment on the structure.

Edmon Chung: Okay now I think that's a good suggestion. I think I went with it in sort of the concept of having, well, with the (stress test) more like an appendix then anything but I think what you said might make better sense to lay out the whole discussion.

But so I think session four is the bulk of the discussion that we had for the initial report. So perhaps it would be one, four, five. Five being the response to the public comments. So one, four, five, two, three. And then add IDN ccTLD stuff. So I think that's probably...

Man: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...makes better sense, yes.

Man: Okay.

Edmon Chung: That's good.

Man: All right. Okay and I have one more comment. So now going to the first section which you were asking about, so this is - the comment I want to - the point I want to raise is with the respect to point C which is - so this is - I'm comfortable with making it - (script) the (description) into two groups - alphabetic scripts and then un-alphabetic scripts.

And the reason I'm comfortable with that is because these are really - the scripts get on with the (writing) into these two categories. There're actually more then two categories of scripts. So there are - obviously on one end you have the CGAK kind of scripts which are (goggly) ideographic and on the other you have very (unintelligible) alphabetic scripts and you also have in the middle (unintelligible) there I think.

To distinguish again, two categories that becomes realistically perhaps incorrect. So that's one comment on that. And the second is that I think that in two categories I am not sure what particular advantage we get in our discussion.

Because if we are saying that we are going to look at the confusability of what is being proposed to - against what is already there, two character ccTLDs or in the - sorry, yes two character ccTLDs (a last key) or for that matter, any other ASCII or non-ASCII strings that are generally approved.

And so thought - also sort of referring to point B as well. Then why do we need to make a distinction between alphabetic and non-alphabetic scripts? It's the same thing. You apply for a single IDN ccTLD, you see whether it gets confusable with something which already exists or whether it'll get off two characters ASCII, whether it's confusable with something (with key) one doesn't exist and then move on.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Man: So again, summarizing, the distinction between alphabetic and all the alphabetic scripts is probably not necessary I think.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So the previous discussion we had was actually a lot based on the - what was done for two character IDN TLDs. The - if you look at the implementation for the - at least for the gTLD side, two character IDN TLD approach such that because single character ASCII and two character ASCII are pretty much reserved, there - the implementation for two character IDN gTLDs was that basically not to say that it's disallowed but that if it is in Latin, Greek or Cyrillic then it would be sort of considered by default to be con- potentially confusable. And then I guess the applicant will have to provide some additional justification and go through some extend- evaluation for the process.

So the idea was to extend the same structure for single character IDN gTLDs. I guess we could potentially just adopt exactly the same line. I was sort of suggesting an alphabetic, non-alphabetic because there are - you mentioned the phonetic sort of scripts as well. I was getting - of course I'm personally not a linguist but was doing some research myself and asking people about it.

There's some, you know, of course there are - it's - it depends on where you stand in this linguistic debate. But overall I guess the concept was to try to do it so that it's alphabetic and non-alphabetic but if you feel that that's probably not a good line to draw then perhaps we could move it back to what's the two factor one had. Would that...

Man: Okay so I didn't - so - but even I'm saying alphabetic and non-alphabetic is not a good business. It's not multi (litic), only bilinguistic, so but I'm okay with that kind of argument if you give that something concrete in terms of implementation.

                But I don't see what we're getting (specialty) out from this reasoning as far as implementation laws. These (unintelligible) and (recommend).

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Man: So that - so...

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess there's one...

Man: ...that's why I...

Edmon Chung: Sorry. Please go ahead first.

Man: Okay, so I, you know, so I don't see the motivation of this distinction between alphabetic and non-alphabetic. And that's why I'm raising it, because that motivation is not coming out clearly in terms of how it's going to impact the

implementation of IDNs. So that line - you know, one could be (lying) along those lines if there were some complete implications of that division.

So that's - and then - so, yes, I would probably leave with your comment that one could devise a generic way of dealing with it as we've done for, you know. So both can be (right) and one can always say that there is - we have to be (motivated) issue generally and then obviously confusability with the single and two character ASCII TLDs.

And those are really the two conditions we need to look at irrespective of which script we are talking about, right?

Edmon Chung: Right. Okay. So I'll - let me try to explain sort of background. It's my fault. I sort of jumped ahead myself. But so there was - I had a - I really should bring this conversation to the mailing list as well. Right after the call I'll, you know, or, you know, shortly after I'll try to send some - a correspondence that I have had the chance to have with a number of technical people talking about this issue.

And one of the things the reason why I sort of came around suggesting this was because there was this continued concern about a single character sort of TLD being a single stroke - a single key stroke for a keyboard. And therein lies why the suggestion for alphabetic script versus non-alphabetic because non-alphabetic scripts in most cases, to enter one character, it would require more then on keystroke.

And (unintelligible) the argument was that the - a single keystroke causing an error that would end up to - going to a different domain and that was an argument and that's - that was there - that was the motivation behind alphabetic scripts and non-scripts. Where do we want to take is completely separate but I actually should apologize for not bringing this into discussion before making this suggestion. But that being said, so that was the original motivation.

Man: Okay, can I add an argument - another argument then? What you're then trying to distinguishing is (one) which is more then one keystroke but that (ultimately) depends on the input method. So you can actually have perhaps in an even CJK kind of context a single keystroke. All depends on really your input method.

And even for ASCII you can have multiple keystrokes or for example if you're using your mobile phone, you actually have to press a key three times to press a C.

Edmon Chung: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Man: So, so...

Edmon Chung: No, that's exactly the same argument I gave in that correspondence as well. And I think the - yes, that's why in terms of describing it, it was that it's not disallowed. So alphabetic scripts are not disallowed but there are a few more tests to, you know, refresh that. It's not creating I guess security to the Internet.

That seems to be a recurring theme in terms of the worry for single character non-single character alphabetic script TLDs because from all the discussions I've had the chance to have with technical techs which on this issue - well, well people here at the ITS.

And so that is recur- a recurrent item that's brought up. But again, I think, you know, we did put out the public comments and unfortunately the - they didn't, you know, respond specifically on this issue. And I think our, you know, our job here really is to, you know, see where we feel more - most comfortable in

making the recommendation and so - but that's sort of the original - the genesis of why alphabetic and the non-alphabetic.

So I'm interested to know, though, Sarmad, what you feel - now you did mention that, you know, the keystroke issue is not just, you know, it doesn't really hold. But also I just want to get a sense in terms of if we don't try to talk about non-alphabetic versus alphabetic, would you be comfortable adopting sort of what a two-character IDN GLD section and - is doing where it sort of identifies Latin, Greek and Cyrillic as - again, it's not that it's disallowed.

It's just that there mi- there are additional tests for it to make sure before it is allowed. Sarmad, (are you on the phone)?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So perhaps - it seems to me we may - we may have to take this really to the linguist because I think I should bring in the - some of the arguments but (brought by) the technical people and to really bring that into discussion before we move forward on this. So I - as I mentioned right up front as well, I think C is definitely one - an important part of the recommendations and to also make it implementable for staff in some ways as well.

But I think we'll be close to what we can talk about live on this issue at this meeting, so - and unless - I wonder if there are any other comments around the four items that were identified in terms of actual policy recommendation. Could I - and whether we missed anything that needs to be...

Olof Nordling: Olaf here. Just a quick comment Edmon about recommendation D. I think that's superfluous because it goes without saying that unless otherwise stated here, or all other requirements and restrictions and so on would apply. So...

Edmon Chung: It does. The only reason why I sort of kept it in is that almost all of the comments received was pointing one or the other way in those types of issues and therefore I didn't - I think I...

Olof Nordling: Yes, well for clarification, the problem is when we start making a list, that it can be seen as exhaustive. So I think you may need to make it sort of a very general - all other restrictions, (clarifications) and so - would be applicable or something. And I think (clearly) but not limited - (unintelligible) do it right...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Yes I did. Yes, I picked the ones that were addressing...

Olof Nordling: ...so I'm - okay, maybe a lot a (latter) point. It was just trying to save in (cabaly).

Edmon Chung: No, I actually - well, I was - when I was writing it I agree with you. I picked the few examples specifically for - because they were raised in the public comment period.

Olof Nordling: Right.

Edmon Chung: But I guess, you know, I guess others - wonder if others have any thoughts on...

Olof Nordling: But I mean, this is - becomes two different things whether you talk about G or ccTLD strings again. That's...

Edmon Chung: Right. Right.

Olof Nordling: Yes. That's all.

Edmon Chung: That's very true.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: What do others think? I mean, should we reiterate this given that, you know, most of the comments are on these types of issues or you think, you know, it's really redundant and better to not have it?

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad. So I think that there are a few kinds of issues here which would perhaps be distinguished from each other and clearly separated out. One is the issue - one is a linguistic issue.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Sarmad Hussain: One is security and stability issue, the variant and confusability and those kinds of things. And the (curd) and actually these other meta (meva) issues which include geographic names and IT. So apparently they're all mixed in. And think these are three different levels of issues perhaps going to be handled by three different committees. And they should be sort of separated out into (three) (unintelligible) categories.

Edmon Chung: So to view it as sort of three areas - one is linguistic, the second one is security and stability and third is the geographic names, the - well, reserved means part of things.

Sarmad Hussain: I.e. and all those other things, yes. And by the way, prospect (focus) for example, already get with these - into these categories so there's a separate process when you apply for IDNC to clearly (in prospect) right now. You would go to a separate process for linguistic issue. It goes to a separate process for (scalability) and stability issues. And then obviously there are IP kinds of things but those things perhaps do not apply for IDN ccTLDs.

Edmon Chung: So allow me to try to under- we're at the top of the hour actually so I'll try to make this observation and try to wrap up, but - so you're suggesting that in

terms of the recommendations we would split it up into these three areas to suggest sort of things or you're suggesting that in one particular recommendation we would suggest to split them into three - these three areas where perhaps evaluation panels would be taking care of each?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes, I would imagine that - so point C says that the request will be analyzed so it is actually talking about the process. And when you're analyzing something you're actually analyzing it from three different perspectives. That's what I'm saying. You're not just analyzing it from a single perspective.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Let's - in fact, with that I think we're close to the end of this meeting but can I ask (Bart) to - I - to see if he can find out - actually I was trying to figure out for two character IDN TLDs, there was this mention about if it's Latin, Greek or Cyrillic, then it's in, you know, special conditions need to be met.

And then there was some comparison mechanisms further on but nothing specific in terms of the actual evaluation what would be allowed, what would not be allowed is available. I was wondering or - Olaf or (Mark), would you be able to figure out for us what the conditions are and what the process would be for two character IDN TLDs and perhaps that could help (sort of) enlighten our discussion here too.

Man: Edmon, are you referring to specifically to two character IDN gTLDs?

Edmon Chung: Yes, two character gTLDs because ccTTLDs that's not (Robin).

Man: Oh okay. I will sort out with Olaf who's going to do it. I know he's going to.

Edmon Chung: Okay. That will be really useful. I can't seem to find it except in Section 2.2.1.3.2, Part 3, 3.2.

Man: Yes.

Edmon Chung: That's very long, you know. That's the only way - place where I can find description about it but then it doesn't go further to describe how - if something needs sort of the - sort of evaluation of special case consideration what would be done. So getting a sense of that would help us here to try to make some recommendations on what to do if we, you know, try to isolate certain cases where it would need further evaluation and what that might look like.

Man: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Okay cool. So again, I think we're over the hour now. But I think we - we're (at) good progress. I'll bring - as I mentioned as - I'll bring that alphabetic, non-alphabetic discussion to the list shortly. And we can further discuss it for the next couple weeks until our next meeting which will be two weeks from now.

    We'll also bring in the ccNSO part. Again, I apologize deeply not - for maybe (stepping) on that but if - I wonder if anyone has any thoughts, comments before we close. If not, thank you everyone for your time and we'll continue a discussion on the mailing list and we'll talk again in two weeks.

Man: Okay. Thank you Edmon. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Thank you. Hey Edmon. Hello?

Edmon Chung: Yes. Yes, yes.

Woman: Are you still there?

Edmon Chung: I'm still here.

Woman: Okay, so you're...

Edmon Chung: I'm still here.

Woman: ...going to make some modification and then we're going to have another meeting in two weeks - a fair conclusion?

Edmon Chung: Yes, and we'll try to use the mailing list for some discussion as well.

Woman: Okay. Actually at the very last, I kind of got lost what their main concern is.

Edmon Chung: Why don't we meet up in Beijing in the next couple days and I'll (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, sure. Okay.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Woman: Okay then, talk to you later.

Edmon Chung: All right.

Woman: Okay, bye.

Edmon Chung: Take care. Bye.

END