

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 31 August 2010 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 31 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-ijg-20100831.mp3>

On page:

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

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung - Chair
Avri Doria
Rafik Dammak
David Gowen
Sarmad Hussain
Andrei Kolesnikov

ICANN Staff

Olof Nordling
Gabi Schitteck
Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordstrom
Glen de Saint G ery

Apologies:

Fahd Batayneh
Jian Zhang - co-chair

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. I'll do the roll call for you Edmon. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening everyone. This is the JIG call on August 31. And on the call we have Sarmad Hussain, Rafik Dammak, Edmon Chung, Avri Doria, David Gowans, and Andre Kolesnikov And we have apologies from Fahd Batayneh And Jian Zhang too I believe Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Glen de Saint Gery: And...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: She sent it into the list. I don't know whether people got her email.

Glen de Saint Gery: I will just have a look. It's probably somewhere along in my email.
And please may I remind you to say your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Edmon, over to you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Glen. So, thanks again for everyone taking time and joining the call. I guess - sent around a revised document earlier today. Again, apologize for it being so late that I sort of got it around. Hopefully, you have it with you or might have a chance to take a look at it. The changes that were incorporated included a number of items that were discussed last time. I'll just quickly go over it so people are aware. I sort of had it in the email as well.

But so, there were four main points that were changed. First of all, Olof's suggestion that - in the holding pattern part to - where there is an overlap to not allow such occurrences in the holding pattern approach. And then, Avri's suggestion on combining the Aspect 1 and 2. Those are from the previous version. So right now, it just says Aspect 1 and it incorporates the - sort of what constitutes an IDN variant, and what's sort of the framework for IDN Language Policy.

And then, we added two aspects which were discussed last time. The - and they're added as Aspects Number 4 and Number 5. And Number 4 being - we talked a little bit about the requirement for sort of the

behavior or the content of the zones that are directly managed by a TLD operator for an IDN variant TLD. And then Number 5 was that - was brought up by I believe by Sarmad about adding what process should there be in terms of the - when an IDN variant TLD needs to be added subsequent to the initial delegation of the primary IDN.

We also added the concept of base IDN, which is distinct from primary IDN. We had a discussion on this. There are certain scenarios in the Arabic. For example, Arabic script situation where you might want a primary IDN, which is the primary presentation or the string that is being presented, and then a base IDN for the generation of variants that - there are certain situations that may require that. But all in all, there largely the same for most situations. But, I guess it's good in terms of us to finding sort of a framework to be able to describe all different scenarios.

And then, I added - in the Version 1, the background session was really just a bunch of links. I added a number of write ups - a write up basically on the background, and quoting some of the - I guess some of the parts where I thought were important and should inform our discussion here. And then, I also added some additional write up for some of the aspects that we have sort of talked about.

So I guess with that, starting with the few changes that incorporate the discussion last time, is there - I just want to open up and see if I missed something that we talked about and was not reflected in what I said.

If anyone remembers.

Olof Nordling: Edmon, this is Olof here. Well first of all, kudos for great work on developing the paper. I think you turned all the stones. I think found a lot of good background material. I've got a little question - okay, starting from - we do it in Arabic to read it from back to front here, so the very last bullet point, I think there's - well, I agree with what you say, but I think the example doesn't include a rather necessary negation. So, it should say cannot be allowed to proceed separately.

Edmon Chung: Oh. Apologies. I changed the earlier part and missed changing the later part. That's my mistake. Thanks.

Olof Nordling: Okay. So, just to prove that I read the whole document all the way to the bitter end.

Edmon Chung: No, that's - thank you. I - it's an omission. There should be a cannot - yes. There should be a not (unintelligible) can be in the last sentence.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: So, through no particular comment, let's - I think we could probably resume where we left off. Last time, we talked about mainly on some issues and then Aspect 1, and sort of the basic framework of sort of a IDN Language Policy. Perhaps, we can start today with the discussion on Aspect 2, so following from last time.

I've actually - for Aspect 2, I have also added some description there. Aspect 2 again, for those who -if you don't have a document in front of you, was identified as the types of IDN variants with respect allocation and delegation properties. So, I think the Aspect itself is pretty self-

explanatory in a way, but really what I wanted to talk about is how a policy framework should look at the types of IDN variants.

I started by building on the IDN Implementation Working Team final report. In fact, that's the basis of most of the discussion of the (gist) anyway. So starting from there, in that report, there was a sort of a classification of Type 1 Variant and Type 2 Variant. Type 1, the report mentioned Type 1 Variants as visually identical, and Type 2 as being not visually identical, but considered equivalent otherwise.

When sort of looking deeper into the report, the report then does not really distinguish between any operative policies. Last time, this - I sort of used this term. I don't know whether - if anyone is not comfortable with this term, please bring it up again. I used the term operative policies saying that you know, something described as policy that can be implemented and can be operated upon.

When I'm looking at Type 1 and Type 2, it doesn't seem like it's being used, because in the report later on it says - most of the discussion then says either Type 1 or Type 2 - you know, the same operation - the same policy sort of is applied. Rather than sort of those type of Type 1 and Type 2, the report actually indicate - well, identified two other - another way of looking at the types of variant, which are called desired variant and undesired variant. So, the report then goes on to say what - how to do deal with a desired variant or an undesired variant in a policy manner.

So I think for our work here, it's probably better to expand or work on the classification of desired variant or undesired variant, which has implications towards whether they are put in the zone or - into the root

or not, and focus on that aspect and that view to sort of develop a kind of classification for the types.

And thereupon, we can further develop sort of a policy framework for dealing with IDN variants if we look at it in these types, which is - basically in the report, it says that for desired variants, they may be allocated and delegated. For undesired variants, they may be allocated but will not delegate it. So based on you know this - building on this framework, I think - you know, we can probably flesh it out a little bit more.

I wonder if I'm making sense. And, I think those who have participated in the IDN working team perhaps can add to this. I'm not sure if Sarmad is here and may want to add on what - whether this might make sense? You know to not use the Type 1, Type 2, but rather focus on the properties for which is described by desired variants and undesired variants.

Sarmad Hussain: Okay. I think Type 1 and Type 2 are labels more from a users perspective, and desired, undesired are perhaps more from a delegational perspective.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Sarmad Hussain: So you know obviously, you know I agree if you're talking about - so Type 1, Type 2 are just a notional kind of way to understand or actually make it explicit that variants are not necessarily things which are look same. Variants actually could be things which look very different to each other as well.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Sarmad Hussain: So, I think Type 1, Type 2 terminology was introduced to sort of make that distinction very explicit. And then desired, undesired is focused more on whether that particular variant -- whether it's Type 1 or Type 2 -- is needed by the users or should be delegated or not delegated. So again as I said, two different views.

Edmon Chung: Right. That's sort of what I got as well. So for our discussion here, it seems to me that it makes more sense to focus on desired and undesired sort of classifications.

Sarmad Hussain: Yes. Sure. Agreed.

Edmon Chung: So...

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question? This is Avri.

Edmon Chung: Please.

Avri Doria: Okay. First of all I want to check on something, and I think that perhaps this question is too (unintelligible), so I apologize. But, the equivalent -- and perhaps this is quoted somewhere and I just never noticed it before -- orthographic tends to just means sort of selling or a different form of visual, and I don't think goes necessarily as far as semantically equivalent. But perhaps I'm wrong on that, and I'm just trying to make sure that we've got terminology straight.

The other thing is it strikes me, and I'm just wondering, whether something maintaining both of these notions might not - and down the

road end up more helpful, and giving you sort of a matrix. And I'm (hand-weighting) on that not being really sure. But as they are two ways of looking at it that don't overlap, they might give us a sort of more controlled way of looking at various types of - that's a bad sentence, but various types of variants.

And in terms of not just having it be - because the other difference is one is somewhat objective and one is largely subjective and requires a policy - decision to say what category you fall in. And so, I'm just wondering whether there isn't some value in looking at keeping both and using them together as opposed to just jettisoning the first one? But, it's just a thought. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Avri, well first - your first question was on the use of orthographic. That is a direct quote from the report, so that's why I didn't change it. And you would see that I don't use that term in other parts of the document, precisely for the reason that you mentioned.

Avri Doria: Did they mean - I'd have to go back to the report. I read a while back. Did they make a - I keep reusing the same word in two different ways in a sentence. It's very difficult. Do they just suppose semantic equivalents with orthographic equivalents as being the same thing?

Edmon Chung: I'm not sure. Sarmad, do you recall?

Sarmad Hussain: Actually I don't recall this either, but I am not sure whether we went all the way to semantic equivalents, because then that brings in a whole lot of other things.

Edmon Chung: Yes. I think so as well. I believe it was just really used as you know, this is the extent of what it was there to - it does go on to you know, just talk a little bit more about you know, there are cases like this and that, but - I think in the Annex. But, I don't think there was any - much additional discussion about...

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. Sorry for talking too much. But in some sense then, we have - even though if no one named it, a Type 3, which is anything beyond orthographic equivalent. Even though - I mean, people have constantly spoken on it, not in terms of being Type 3, but in terms of you know, there's identical, there's similar, and then there's the equivalent by virtue of some other property.

And, I don't know whether that's something, but we might want to not have in the report something that looks like we're just supposing semantic with orthographic. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Yes, Avri. I think that's a good point, and that sort of flows into your second question, you know how I want to look at this. Because, therein lies the - I guess my problem - a little bit problem with this (unintelligible) Type 2 and then Type 3 classification, because it could go on. And, it's also sort of my view that the view of Type 1, Type 2, as Sarmad just mentioned, is more on the user view. And also, it's when you develop an IDN Language Policy that - you know when you develop a policy as - let's say for example as a registry, or as a language community, that's when you look at the - you know, the Type 1, Type 2, or Type 3 type classification and design the policy around that.

But here in this discussion, I guess we're focused on not - ICANN shouldn't be developing these IDN policies, but rather you know looking at these IDN policies how we can act on it. And, that's sort of the reason I use operative ones instead of you know, just general. And the - on the operational level, I think it's really at - okay, given a language policy when ICANN implements it - takes an application and trying to implement it into the root, what should be done? Because if we do down the path of trying to define how you know, all the different types of variants in the linguistic or user point of view, that could be an endless - you know so, all the people in this room or you know in the whole ICANN community might not be covering all the situations for all the languages, so we will never get a good set there.

But, if we focus our efforts on you know, giving a language table, how do we then implement it into the root zone? It seems to me that would be a more fruitful discussion, and that's why I sort of say okay, let's - you know for this discussion, perhaps we should set aside Type 1 and Type 2, or that type of view, and then you know focus on the desired, undesired, which has implications, and allocation, and delegation.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. If I may perhaps contribute. Well, I believe that you're very right Edmon, and in the sense that we talk about variants. I think it's useful to stop where the possibility to produce a variant doesn't extend beyond what we - how you can do it with the help of a language table, a variant table; according to whatever you please. Other kinds of equivalents, that really opens up very widely and I'm not sure whether it's useful to call those variants.

So, I would rather go for - or would prefer a more stringent definition like you have in the Type 1 and Type 2 here, rather than saying that a

Type 3 would be a variant as well. I think a variant label is something that you can produce with variant characters from a variant table or language table, whatever you prefer. I mean, rather a restrictive view perhaps, but that's the way we used to do it in the GNSO IDN Working Group. That was sort of the concept which was used for variants at the time.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Olof Nordling: It (maybe a lot of course).

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. I think that is actually a good thing to do. I think you'd have to correct the wording here that lists semantically equivalent in the paragraph. And, it might be good to explicitly exclude those things before moving on. I think that you know, Olof is making an excellent point. That's one of the problems that I was having is the drift in the notion of variants to the so-called Type 3 that is not a variant type. So, I think that's a great suggestion and being explicit about that is a good thing.

Edmon Chung: That's a good idea Avri. I think you know, probably we should add some wording as to sort of suggest that we have looked into - somewhat into this and since we have looked it, we've sort of opened the lid and say - okay, let's close this lid now and you know, move on to more constructive discussion.

Is that - does that work for you in terms of - I think we probably could add a paragraph just saying what you just said in terms of okay, this path - you know about semantic - or you know, many other types of

variants may not be relevant for a policy discussion at this - at the ICANN scope.

Avri Doria: Yes. It's Avri again. I think that would make sense. That would work for me. I think you may still need - even with the stripped nomenclature of Type 1, Type 2 as defined by the IDN Working Group, you may need also to consider showing a linkage and a mapping between these - to your new categories since those are existing categories that people talk about and that are useful.

So, it may also be necessary if not following the matrix view, and I understand why not doing that. But, at least show the relationship so that we don't end up with an apples and rocks comparison at the end in terms of - you know when we were talking about Type 1 and Type 2, and you're talking about you know, these other forms of differentiation and we don't know how they map to each other.

Edmon Chung: Ah, I see. That's a good point. I'll - I have note here. I agree with that. I think it will definitely add value to it.

But, I do want to point out also a couple of things. Actually, this Type 1, Type 2 is not from the GNSO Working Group, just so that you are clear.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Edmon Chung: It's from the IDN Working Team that was (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes. Sorry I used working group instead of team.

Edmon Chung: That's okay. And, the other thing is that the desired variants and undesired variants, that classification was also in the work team report. So, I'm really just building on that view on that. In fact, the report actually later just builds on the desired variant and undesired variant view as well, because that's when - you know that's the operative part.

Okay. So building on that in the working team final report, it identified the desired variants and undesired variants. And, it's - basically, it says that (a) desired variants are those that may be allocated and also may be delegated. Whereas undesired variants may be allocated but will not be delegated. I was looking at it a little bit more deeply and thought that perhaps splitting it into three types might be more useful.

The first one being that it will be allocated and delegated together with the primary IDN. That I sort of took the nomenclature from the CDNC document calling it a preferred IDN variant. And then the second type being that it will be allocated and - but may be delegated. So, it's not automatic - it's not delegated with the primary, but it may be delegated later. So - and again, using the CDNC nomenclature, calling them reserved IDN variants. And then the third type being blocked IDN variants, and these ones would be unallocated and not allowed for further application.

So - and this sort of - I felt that this might be a better description. Because then as you can see in my write up, the preferred IDN variant are generally desired variants, that reserved IDN variants seem to be either desired or undesired variants, so it could be in that type as well. And then blocked IDN variants. So then by distinguishing these three

types, then we can - as an ICANN perspective, you would immediately understand whether this should be delegated together with the primary, or whether this would be optional, and the applicant could apply or activate to delegate it at a later time. And the third type being that you know it's just simply blocked. You know, it cannot be allocated and cannot be - it's not available for further activation.

Does that make sense with you?

Sarmad Hussain: I'm not sure what everybody else feels but I think limiting it to just the desired variants from guidance efficient and undesirable variants should always be blocked. So what I'm saying is that...should not - the undesired variants should not be resolved.

Edmon Chung: Okay, but in the IDN Working Team - the Working Team final report, it says that undesired variants may be allocated but will not be delegated. That's the part in fact, you know, Sarmad, you can elaborate on that what the thinking was in terms of that recommendation.

Sarmad Hussain: Actually reserved to me means that it is something which may eventually be a lot of - which may become live at a later stage, whereas blocked is something which is dead forever.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Sarmad Hussain: So the way I understand these three levels is preferred is something which will be live immediately. If one is not sure about something, one can keep it in a limbo state so it's not live right now but may become live.

For it not to become live it come on but it doesn't work so that's reserved. And if one is sure that this is something which is not needed, one actually goes and blocks it which means very - well there is no chance of making it live again.

So the difference between reserved and blocked is that a reserved - both are - the similarities both are not live and they will not resolve, either one, neither reserved nor blocked.

But the reserved one may resolve at a later stage but blocked will never be able to be resolved, even at a later stage.

Edmon Chung: Right, yes. I think - that makes a lot of sense and it now seems to me that perhaps I read it a little bit - I had a bit - a mistake in reading it. So what you're saying is really - and I read now the report again then there is this scenario where something is allocated but cannot ever be delegated.

Sarmad Hussain: Exactly.

Edmon Chung: What I'm asking if - so maybe there should be a fourth type. What - why - should describe four types, the first type being preferred which is allocated and delegated, you know, just right off the bat.

The second one - it's allocated, it's not delegated but it could be delegated. The third one - it's allocated but can never be delegated and cannot be estimated. And the fourth one is not allocated and never delegated.

Sarmad Hussain: See, that fourth one is not a category because that is true for all the strings which have not applied for it so far. So all the strings currently are allocated.

Edmon Chung: Well, but it wouldn't be blocked because it could be a situation where it's not allocated to the Registry but it is just simply blocked like...

Sarmad Hussain: So what I'm saying is that allocated and delegated are not two independent variables, so it has - one has to apply and then the delegation of that. So for us it has to be allocated before it can actually be delegated.

So you cannot have an unallocated and delegate it as a loss of value. That's what I'm saying. Before one doesn't typically...

Edmon Chung: So is it - am I correct to understand that there is no such thing as an unallocated IDN variant? So - because if it's an IDN variant or a TLD then it's always allocated.

The only issue we should look at is whether it's immediately delegated, optionally delegated later or can never be delegated.

Sarmad Hussain: Exactly. So those are the three variations.

Edmon Chung: I'm comfortable with that classification. It seems to make a lot of sense to me. Anyone have any thoughts or...?

Olof Nordling: Olof again. Well I think that makes sense. I think that. I'm just sitting and figuring who decides? Who sort of - as I understand it desired or

undesired - that's wholly up to the applicant to specify whether it is desired or undesired.

So from that perspective I found it - if it's wholly up to the applicant to actually put forward something as preferred, reserved and blocked, well it wouldn't make sense like just was mentioned to have reserved something that's undesired perhaps.

But I'm not really sure where do you see in the process that the notion of preferred, reserved and blocked comes about. Is it sort of the preference expressed for - from the applicant or is there some vetting process or is it just here where the policy would actually apply, and according to some nifty rules still to be developed would be able to identify as preferred, reserved, blocked or whatever - well some kind of rules that would put the one or the other perhaps in opposition to what actually the applicant has requested.

Is that the whole idea or is this something that's decided somewhere else? Those three...

Edmon Chung: Yes, I think that's a very good point and that sort of brings me back to really Aspect 1. And I think the - I sort of brought this up but I think this is probably the right time slot but it - is that - what you mention is that if we depend solely on the applicant and the applicant would create a kind of language policy which would - which could be for lack of a better word gamed or abused in order to try to get an additional TLD, you - to put it in the worst cases, right?

I think that the - probably the best way is to look at it in a sense that we - the - who decides is really - it's dependent on the - the way I see it is that it depends on - and which policy.

And if the IDN language policy is a combination of the IDN language tables and the IDN variant tables, and one critical element to sort of - to I guess guard somewhat against the abuse of usage of such things are two things.

One, that the Registry must be using, which is currently true anyway - the Registry must be using that same language policy for a second level registration.

So if something I guess abusive is being used that, you know, that doesn't, you know, that wouldn't work for the second level registrations anyway. And the second point being that I think all through the - even the IDN gTLD or the GNSO Working Group, we talked about the importance of some engagement to get a, you know, sanity check from language communities.

And I think, you know, even in the fast track process there is sort of like a sanity check already. I think that those two together and then a framework for what a IDN language policy should look like, and then the IDN variants being, you know, a product of that rather than, you know, okay I want this string as well and then I think it's a preferred variant by the applicant then, you know, that would fail the test from - described in Aspect 1.

Olof Nordling: Okay, fine. I just - actually I just was aiming at is this something that the preferred, reserved or blocked - is this something that's requested

by the applicant, allotted in the allocation process, or just plain de facto status notice for the variants in question? It was rather where in the process does this get defined?

Sarmad Hussain: Okay hi, this is Sarmad. I just want to probably add and that is that there are two steps involved here. The first step is determining of - so given an application the first step is determining whether all the variants are actually variants or not or is there any abuse in it.

And that's a first step before this decision. Once it is decided that there are X amount of variants returned legitimate and they are going to be given to the applicant, then as a second step I think that's - from what my understanding is, that the - categorizing these legitimate variants into desired or undesired is probably a business decision from the applicant themselves, and it's quite arbitrary.

There is no - there's - so it could be a, you know, any kind of argument and that other one come - may be coming from a business and not from a linguistic angle at all actually.

So that's a second stage and it's reasonably arbitrary and actually it's defined by the applicant themselves, not by, you know, not by any algorithm - not in any algorithmic way.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I add something which is...?

Woman: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thanks. It seems to me that that is the way it would go is that people in their applications or perhaps in a, you know, post application request of

some form or other and, you know, that has yet to be designed as it were - a piece of process yet to be designed, would basically be the one requesting these.

But I think that therefore there probably is an equivalent process or judgment somewhere on would this be a question? Would this be a criteria upon which an application might be judged?

Would this be something similar to a Registry request that later might be judged? So I have a feeling that it really comes in on both sides of the equation on it's something requested by an applicant or a Registry, and it's something that is approved by someone or something else within a process.

Now that's just off the top of my head but that would seem to be how it would have to flow process wise.

Edmon Chung: Yes Avri, I think it sounds sensible to me as well and Sarmad, I think I generally agree and - I guess with both Avri and you in terms of Step 1 and Step 2.

The only thing I want to mention is that in terms of Step 2, between Step 1 and Step 2 you mentioned that Step 2 is really business consideration, which variant to be activated.

I - speaking from the - I guess from a Chinese perspective that would really not be the case. I would see that there are certain - which is why I defined a type of preferred variant based on the CDNC which is it has to be, you know, included because, you know, if you want - I'll take Chinese for a specific example.

If you have a - let's say traditional Chinese you must also have the simplified Chinese or else you are essentially in violation of the IDN language policies based on the CDNC language tables.

So it - therein lies the - something in between I guess Step 1 and Step 2. In a lot of the cases where it's a reserved variant, so it's optional to the applicant whether or not to have it delegated, that's, you know, I guess what you mentioned by Step 2.

And yes that's - I think that's agreeable. That's a business consideration and - but Step 1 I guess involves not only identify the - identifying all - the whole set of IDN variants but also a subset of that IDN variants that are - that needs to be preferred variants and must be included for delegation and that algorithmic. Does that make sense?

Sarmad Hussain: So what I was actually saying was that the - these two are - these two processes are separate from each other. So the first part may actually be algorithmic and that's okay.

But the second process basically is use that - whatever the parameters for deciding in the first step was, having taken into consideration. Then now we have a set of X variants which are legitimate and based on the rules, X different variants - it's now up to the person who's requesting to decide which one to put in which category basically.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Sarmad Hussain: So what I am probably trying to understanding is that you're saying that it - the choice is not as free where there are certain...

Edmon Chung: Well I guess what I'm saying is that in Step 2 they - an applicant should not be able to designate a variant as, you know, preferred, reserved or blocked. Those three types should be algorithmic.

What in Step 2 the applicant should be able to do is to decide if it's a reserved one, which is optional for the applicant whether to - based on the IDN language policy, those are the ones that can be optionally activated.

Then those ones it would be Step 2 and those are the business consideration and the applicant can choose. But in Step 1 it would already have identified those three by algorithmic - it would already have identified those three types and, you know, they would be three subsets, you know, combining to become the whole set.

And then out of which the reserved variants part is the one that would go into Step 2. That's sort of how I see it.

Olof Nordling: Edmon, Olof here.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Olof Nordling: It sounds like I like that. It sounds like we're starting to discussing a flow chart and yes, that - perhaps that's a helpful next step to clarify what comes first, the chicken or the egg?

Edmon Chung: Right. Yes, that's a good way to categorize it. It's sort of like - I mean to describe it as in a flow chart. So in Step 1 and as Avri says, you know,

there is an evaluation process which would include, you know, whether the whole application is good for lack of a better word, sorry.

Then that's an evaluation process and through which it also, you know, the language tables and everything that that needs to be checked and the whole set of IDN variants are created, because that's when you allocate everything.

And then out of which comes Step 2 is then the, you know, after the allocation of everything then this Step 2 is the delegation part. Step 1 does further identify which ones you can't - which ones you can then activate in Step 2, right.

And then that might require, you know, a sort of another round of evaluation should that need to happen as Avri mentioned.

Sarmad Hussain: Right. This is Sarmad again. Sorry I got dropped off. So I really like this - I think this is really good that actually the two-step process we were talking about is actually allocation and delegation, so I really do endorse it.

So there is an allocation set which verifies where the variant - have variants and so on and so forth. And then there's a delegation step which is - tells that once those strings which are allocated, what level of priority should they be delegated.

Some right now or maybe at a later stage or never, so those were the three categories, right?

Edmon Chung: Right. That sounds good. Okay, that is essentially, you know, I'm looking at the document. That's essentially Aspect 3 which is what to do with the above information and that's where it talks about allocation and delegation.

So it seems like we can incorporate what we just discussed in a better form in this Aspect 3, which Aspect 3 is really just how we operate, you know, the Step 1, Step 2 I think would be - it would be. I can add to that. I don't know whether I need to further...

Sarmad Hussain: Okay, this is Sarmad again. I have a question. Did we - are we having any discussion on - so what are again further details within the allocation and delegation steps?

Is that something which is left to a panel of experts or is that something which is left to the applicant? You know, that's what we were discussing. I'm sorry I missed a bit of the conversation when I got knocked off.

Edmon Chung: So no, we should discuss it now. What do you have in mind in terms of - you mean after the delegation what should be done in, you know, in the second level like as a Registry this is the things...?

Sarmad Hussain: No, I'm actually talking about this allocation and delegation process itself. So allocation is obviously going to be based on variant analysis by some external team of experts who are going to sit and know this, right?

Edmon Chung: Right.

Sarmad Hussain: What we were discussing was that how is delegation going to be?
So is that what we - that's what was the decision, the delegation...?

Edmon Chung: Okay, right. Right, okay. So that you - yes, you might have missed that part. I guess the one part that I think I wanted after that is that in the allocation process or Step 1, besides allocation the expert should also, you know, sort of confirm the set of IDN variants as you mentioned and also which type they belong to.

You know, the preferred or reserved or blocked, so that whole thing is type - Step 1. And then now in Step 2 in the delegation process, then for the ones that are preferred that is automatically included in the initial delegation.

It will be delegated and for the reserved ones the applicant then have a - have an option to activate them for the delegated. And in that process then we need another sort of a service - Registry service.

I, you know, might be sort of like in our set but not exactly. Well we don't know yet but there needs to be a process created such that for the ones that are reserved variants and the applicant can then go through Step 2 to have it delegated. We have not talked about the details of that process.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. My - just to suggest say for the next conference call that say based on the categorization and process definition we now introduced, we visit every step to determine which types of decisions and policies are needed around these steps to reach these different states.

And I'm saying this because I'd say I'm not sure but maybe we should check whether these different steps apply across the board, so between IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs or should they be distinguished, because I can imagine around say the delegation process for new gTLDs will be - is quite different than the delegation process for IDN ccTLDs or ccTLDs in general.

Edmon Chung: Right, you're very right. I think there is where, you know, we - what we just talked about I guess somewhat is we identified this box that needs to fill in. But this process may be different between cc's and g's.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, but I think what the Working Group now unearth is a very good framework to look at the different steps dealing with IDN variants across the board.

And now we need to take a follow up step by using this framework and see first of all if - what are the suggested rules and decisions around each of these steps, and the next one is maybe even further do they apply across the board or are they different for the - say the gTLDs and ccTLDs?

So that's two more steps before you end up in a reasonable presentable document I would say.

Edmon Chung: Right. I think that's a very good suggestion and I think as you - and I agree with each of the steps and then in fact some of the elements that we talked about.

We should identify, you know, whether it applies, you know, how it - whether and how it applies to cc's and whether and how it applies to g

and, you know, whether or not they are consistent across the field - across the board, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and at least we have - I think this Working Group has unearthed a reasonable framework to discuss the whole issue about how to deal with variants in a structured manner.

Edmon Chung: Yes, I'm quite excited about it. But we are at the top of the hour now and I think we had a really constructive discussion today. I think we will continue this in two weeks' time.

I'll revise the document based on the stuff we talked about hopefully earlier next time. But also by next meeting I think we will have completed the public comment period for the initial report for the single character IDN TLD.

So I'd like to - for our next meeting in two weeks' time we'll - I think we'll touch on that, think about what needs to be the next steps for that as well, and also continue the discussion here on the IDN variants.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. You say in preparation of that meeting I'll see - I'll try to draft an overview of all the comments and we'll send it to the Working Group.

Edmon Chung: That will be great.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So any items people want to raise before we close the call? If not then thanks everyone for your time and I'll talk to all of you in two weeks.

Olof Nordling: Thanks Edmon.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Edmon. Bye-bye.

END