

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 19 July 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 19 July 2011 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-20110719-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Jian Zhang, APTLD
Jothan Frakes, Individual
Avri Doria, NCSG
June Seo, RySG
Edmon Chung, .asia (Chair)
Sun XianTang, .cn

ICANN Staff:

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Bart Boswinkel
Dennis Jennings
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Andrei Kolesnikov

Coordinator: Please go ahead; the call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's JIG call on Tuesday the 19th of July we have Jian Zhang, Jothan Frakes, Avri Doria, Sun Xian Tang, June Seo and Edmon Chung. Apologies we have Fahd Batayneh, Dennis Jennings, Andrei Kolesnikov and Rafik Dammak.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Edmon. Hello Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Sorry I was - I put myself on mute. Thank you and thank you everyone for taking time to join the call. And my apologies for being a bit late today; I was stuck in a bit of traffic earlier on. But anyway so let's get the call under way.

I'm actually trying to bring up what I sent around in terms of the brief agenda. Okay here we go. So, yes, we - from last meeting we circulated a motion for the consideration of GNSO to extend the charter. I think that's in and I thank Rafik for making the motion and it has been seconded.

I have been responding to some inquiries about - to some clarifications on the motion which is basically to extend the charter of this group. And I guess the expectation is that the GNSO will meet on Thursday the 21st and to consider the motion and to hopefully we'll have it passed.

I have volunteered myself to be on the call in case there are further questions during the discussion and consideration. So - and on that particular topic we also heard from the VIP team in terms of our timelines. And I want to bring it up briefly. Unfortunately Dennis is not on the call. I see he's at - he's on vacation.

I wondered - I'm sorry, if anyone from the VIP team is actually on the call right now?

Jothan Frakes: Edmon, this is Jothan. And I'm the team coordinator for the Latin team.

Edmon Chung: Right, okay. I meant staff actually but thank you, Jothan. But anyway so on the topic Steve Shang from the VIP team actually sent a note to (Jane) and I and was just mentioning that we originally had the plan to start picking up the IDN variant TLD right after September, I mean, into September because the idea is that by end of September it's - the VIP would - the study teams - the six study teams would have their initial report into the sort of integrated team.

And so the JIG can utilize the initial report from the study teams and further consider the issues in parallel with the study group. So Steve's question was whether, you know, we should wait until the final report to come out in December to further consider our work.

I think - I guess my general thinking is that we probably should wait in terms of our own final reports and stuff. But I think by the time we meet - we hit late September we should probably have a good idea where the study teams and where the final report might be heading. So I think in terms of the timeframe I'm more inclined to try to work in parallel.

But I just want to bring this up and see if anyone has any thoughts about that. Regardless of that I think the motion at this point is flexible enough for us to take the issue whether we as a group finally decide to wait before we do anything or we do something in parallel and wait until the report comes out before we make any decisions.

Either way we would still be able to fit within the extension motion. But I did want to bring this up because this is some feedback from the VIP team. So I wonder if anyone wants to add to it at this point?

Jian Zhang: Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes, Jian.

Jian Zhang: This is Jian. Yes, this is Jian. I think I do agree with you that we could do the work parallel so in that case probably we don't mean to change our timeline right? Current working plan?

Edmon Chung: Yes, I think the - as I sort of mentioned over email I think we could continue with target at this point but if things changes dramatically between September and December from the VIP team I think at that point will probably have to make some adjustments.

But at this point it seems to me that given the many many things that have been discussed in IDNs in a way I think - somewhat confident that working in parallel would probably be more efficient and effective. Okay?

Jian Zhang: Okay, yes.

Edmon Chung: So - okay thank you. And well - so in that case will continue with emotion as it is. I think again - is Rafik on the call? In any case I think him for making the motion at the GNSO and we'll see how it goes.

After the GNSO I believe there will be a ccNSO Council meeting in August which this will be considered as well. So hopefully from the positive response from the GNSO we'll also get the formal extension from the ccNSO to move forward. This is really just a very - a process, you know, it's part of the process for this group to continue its work.

Okay so that was Item Number 1. And Item to that I had in the proposed agenda was some follow-up on the IETF ordination that - we talked about that's, Avri, last time and you were going to try to draft something...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...and so I'll give the time to you.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. And I was bad; I didn't get that done. I got one of my two tasks done but I didn't get that one done. So it's still on my plate and I'll try to get it done real soon now.

Edmon Chung: No worries. But thank you for alerting us that - I think you probably - you didn't send it to the email list that you alluded me through IM that - we had this discussion and said that if the IETF working group is - the DNS

Extensions working group is considering this in Quebec City we would, you know, sort of move faster on this.

But since they are not going to talk about this in Quebec City in their upcoming meeting I guess we still have some time. So I, you know...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...we'll take our time and perhaps - I don't know, by next - the week after - our next meeting you think you would have the time to get them together?

Avri Doria: Sure.

Edmon Chung: I'm just...

Avri Doria: I know I said that once before and it turned out not to be true so I'll say it again and hope it's true this time. Yes, I think it's not that - it's not on their agenda as far as I can tell. I don't think the DNS extension is actually meeting at all. So, yes, but obviously I should get it done and, you know, we should get it through.

So I will definitely work on it. And just to be clear this is basically taking the comments that we had that said - or that I put through and then we discussed on the call that basically a recommendation that they should wait a bit for some of the output from - of case studies from VIP to look at beefing up their part of that part of the document before going forward to last call is essentially what I'm saying, correct?

Edmon Chung: Right that's...

Avri Doria: Okay, yes.

Edmon Chung: ...that's essentially what we discussed in Singapore...

Avri Doria: And that's...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And that's - I just wanted to make sure that when I thought about working on it late last night I had a moment's doubt which was probably just convenient to keep me from working. But I just wanted to make sure. Okay thanks. Yes, I'll have it next week. I even promise this time.

Edmon Chung: Cool. But actually thanks for drafting the motion and that was very helpful. And we'll look forward to your - for the draft.

Okay so I guess that brings us to the actual work item that we're working on in these few meetings which is the Item 3 that we identified which is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

As we discussed last time - well last few times - we were trying to sort of do a stock-taking around the group to try to identify some of the issues or items that this group should consider and should put out for public comments and perhaps in a way, quote, unquote, to get ICANN and the ICANN community working together towards this goal.

And as we discussed last time it seems like, you know, just a fully free-flow stock taking process was sort of coming to an end and I sort of drafted therefore a document. It's really a very rough draft on a - sort of an initial report somewhat like the format of the report that we have done before starting with a - some background information of related works and what has been happening.

And then with the second section considering some of the issues that we've identified. And then the third section being some preliminary thoughts about those, you know, how to address those issues that we identified.

I wanted to note that the third area really we haven't spent any time talking about it. I was just really repeating the second part and then just adding some initial thoughts to it for discussion.

But I think since I only sent this - well - apologies for that - only a few hours ago I'm guessing that not a lot of people have had the chance to take a look at it. So I was planning to perhaps walk through a little bit and just explain how I sort of tried to consolidate some of the discussion before and see if we're on the right track going forward.

So I guess at this point before I go on I wonder if anyone has any thoughts on this and whether I'm totally off or not? Okay. So hearing no one trying to stop me here.

Well okay so one thing I forget to mention I understand that Bart is still on vacation. We have one outstanding item trying to follow up from Bart about following up on the single character IDN TLD report and how staff is considering the implementation. There was some action on it and we're still waiting for Bart to come back to us. I suppose it would be back by our next meeting and hopefully we'll have some update from him on that.

So coming back to the issue that we're talking about, the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs if you can try to open the document that I sent earlier I'll sort of quickly walk through hopefully the first section and then the second section but first section about the background and see if I have included enough of the items that we have discussed and whether we want to add more.

So I just realized that my second paragraph it's not even finished. So the idea is really just to identify some of the work that has been done so the background. And I wanted to start off by saying that, you know, this whole

concept of a universal acceptance is not new, we are not considering something new.

You know, it was exposed in the original 2000 rounds and also felt in the 2004 round. But I think the introduction of IDN ccTLDs and the upcoming introduction of new gTLDs it's going to further sort of expose this issue and therefore I think this is definitely something of common interest between the ccTLD and gTLDs. And so does sort of sets the stage for the discussion.

In terms of some background work from our discussion, and again thank you Jothan for bringing it up last time as well, I have sort of identified five areas where it's sort of relevant previous work. The first one being within ICANN there was a universal acceptance of all TLDs started in 2003, 2004. And the actions sort of culminated to a TLD verification tool which was being put out in 2006 and 2007. Thereupon there hasn't been much further activity.

The second item was the - that we identified as the public suffix list which we started in 2006 and have been developing really into almost like a industry standard as Jothan has - presented to us last time and being used in various areas. And it's currently being maintained by Mozilla as a sort of a public community project.

The third area that we found is that, you know, I guess with many things on the Internet today there is also lists on Wikipedia that in some ways have some relevance to what's happening here. And I think that's also a list that is often being referred to maybe not as much technically but at least, you know, very much referred to when people look up for information.

And then another I think relevant item that - with this discussion that we're having is the Mozilla sort of what is called the white list, the IDN white list. And it's something that was started in 2005 when a number of concerns surfaced about fishing and some confusable characters utilizing IDN

characters. And I think that list also determines the level of support for IDN TLDs as well.

And finally I think I know this was brought up briefly in Singapore and it was dismissed quickly but I still think it is relevant sort of prior work. And that's about the unique authoritative routes at ICANN.

I still think, you know, some of the things if we consider what ICANN should do going forward in terms of - for lack of a better word - enforcing this perspective or enforcing this quote unquote policy of unique authoritative route this is something that is relevant as we try to talk about universal acceptance of IDN TLDs because, you know, universal acceptance really means universal acceptance of this unique authoritative route at ICANN.

So these were the five areas that I have identified as sort of background works that we would continue to refer to as we consider what we should do or, you know, the policy, you know, the sort of the standpoint that we would sort of stand by. So I wonder if anyone has any thoughts or I should take something out or there are other areas that I really, you know, we should reference as background and related prior works?

Jothan Frakes: Edmon...

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Jothan Frakes: This is Jothan Frakes speaking.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Jothan Frakes: I found a resource at the W3C that's very helpful as well. I'll forward that by email to the list.

Edmon Chung: Okay so W3C and that's - could you quickly elaborate perhaps as we...

Jothan Frakes: So essentially they have an entire background on the resolution of paths. They talk about the URL and the domain itself and then they also go into some detail about everything beyond the slash as well as far as how the URIs are represented.

So it goes a little bit beyond our scope but it does talk about domain names in good depth. And it also identifies what each of the different browsers does as a behavior. I think it's a good basis document for what we're doing.

Edmon Chung: That's great. That definitely sounds like something that we should at least sort of include, you know, in our report as something relevant to what we're discussing.

Jothan Frakes: Yes the key things to take away from it...

Edmon Chung: Do they talk...

Jothan Frakes: Sorry?

Edmon Chung: No please go ahead.

Jothan Frakes: Oh the key thing to take away from it is the behavior of each of the browser softwares is slightly different from each of the others with respect to how and when it will expose Unicode or the A-level in what circumstances. So it's a good read. I'll forward that over to you for distribution to the list.

Edmon Chung: Right. And you're talking about like the difference between Firefox with the white list mechanism whereas in I guess in - I think in IE as well which is almost...

Jothan Frakes: Well so for IE it works a little differently. It looks at the character sets and scripts that your browser and operating system are configured...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Jothan Frakes: ...and it uses those as a white list.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Jothan Frakes: And it also uses it as a white list in the presence of mixed script in the URL as well.

Edmon Chung: Right. Yes that's certainly useful when we, you know, try to come up with, you know, what ICANN should do and what types of materials we should put together and, you know, what they should include. And, you know, I guess TLD operators really should need to know that, you know, these browsers work differently. Cool.

Anything else? Avri or - sorry, I, you know, I keep apologizing but you see to usually have some thoughts or (tune), I don't know whether you have any thoughts.

Avri Doria: I'm thoughtless at the moment.

Edmon Chung: Okay but you think we sort of covered the relevant items? Do you think anything should be taken out? Because when we talked a little bit about the authoritative route issue you were one of those that was quick to say, you know, we should stay away from it a little bit.

Avri Doria: Yes, no I do tend to stay away from those particularly thorny political issues at the moment. But I really haven't had a chance to read and think about it so I'm just listening now and I'm being slow. But, sorry.

Edmon Chung: Okay, no worries. And again I apologize that this came out a few hours ago. I guess I - this meeting sort of - was sort of my deadline to, you know, to work

out something. And we'll - again we'll still have our next couple of meetings to consider and further discuss the issues.

So in terms of the background if that's - if I don't hear further, you know, please feel free to add, you know, send, you know, comments in the mailing list as well. But I will take Jothan's suggestion and we'll, you know, I'll wait for Jothan - you can send it to the mailing list as well the W3C items.

And if you can summarize in a few bullet points, you know, some of the key assets that you just mentioned that would be really useful as well. Is that okay Jothan?

Jothan Frakes: Oh yes. In fact I'm typing it right now. I muted to type it right now.

Edmon Chung: All right cool. Thanks a lot. So I guess with that I'll move onto Section 2 which are some of the items that were identified in our last few meetings when we were discussing this issue.

I - again I, you know, I suppose start the session by generally addressing that there is ongoing work from different areas. And the other item that we - I wanted to bring out was that we had a brief discussion about, you know, what the policy implementations - I mean, policy implications would be. There doesn't seem to be a lot but there might be something relevant.

As I was preparing the document a couple came out as well. I'll come back to that as we, you know, talk about the items themselves. But in general I think what we felt was appropriate was to consider items that are policy as well as items that perhaps the ICANN and ICANN community coordination or some sort of role might be - ICANN might be able to play.

And to also consider those items as well and not just be restricted to very ICANN enforcement policy kind of area. So I mean, to just clarify that a little

bit more it's really about, you know, covering both policies where ICANN can enforce but also policies in a way that doesn't directly solve the issue.

Because, you know, we really need application providers and for structure providers to ensure that there is universal acceptance and not a policy that ICANN can directly enforce. But it can certainly and directly try to influence in terms of the adoption. So that's sort of the premise of the discussion.

Okay and in terms of identifying the issues I sort of grouped it into four areas. And in sort of an - I guess simpler issue - simpler English the first item is really whether there are policies that ICANN should be implement itself. The second one being, you know, who ICANN should work with or, you know, how we could identify who to work with.

The third one is which areas ICANN should focus its efforts on and, you know, really how to prioritize. And the fourth area is what types of work ICANN could do, you know, the type of work that the ICANN staff and ICANN community can work on. So I sort of grouped it into these four areas.

And the first question is really whether there are any policies to be implemented. I guess I asked a couple of, you know, times and we sort of didn't come across it.

But I - as I was preparing this document I sort of came across a couple of potential areas which is budgeting, you know, is this work important enough that ICANN really should budget some, you know, have some allocation from the budget on really addressing universal acceptance of IDN - of IDN TLDs because, you know, we've seen this universal acceptance of TLD work that is being done a few years ago; it sort of came and went.

I'm not sure whether it made an impact, you know, how it did and all those kind of things. The question is whether it - we should recommend that ICANN take it on and budget it as an item. So this is one of the areas that I, you

know, sort of want to bring up and raise today and perhaps get some feedback.

And the other one is whether ICANN can make it a policy for, you know, those IDN ccTLDs and gTLDs, you know, at least the registries to embrace this concept at least of accepting, you know, whatever systems that these registries operate would support - well would support the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

So I'll sort of stop here and see if I get some feedback on the two items that - and whether they could be or should be considered policy aspects on this issue; one is budgeting and the other is some kind of commitment from IDN ccTLD and IDN gTLD registry operators. Any thoughts?

Jothan Frakes: Well, Edmon, that was a lot of questions in one right?

Edmon Chung: Yes...

Jothan Frakes: It's Jothan again.

Edmon Chung: Okay let's go back to the first question then. Just budgeting - is that perhaps is, you know, we'll focus on budgeting and say, you know, is that a - do we think this is sort of like an ICANN policy consideration to set aside budgets for this type of work? Is this appropriate as, you know, something that we should at least ask the community or this is not policy at all; this, you know, put it somewhere else.

Jothan Frakes: Well this is Jothan again. My personal opinion is that this is some important work that, you know, I would request budget for if they haven't already planned some budget.

Much of what we would do with respect to universal acceptance overlaps with the new gTLD program to some extent because there are many shared

considerations that software developers and other areas are going to need to pay attention to.

But that said there are some specialized things that folks within the IDN community will have to focus on such as, you know, code points, supported characters, I mean, it's a long list. But they're not considerations that are necessarily present for strings that are going to work in the A-Z space. But I think that budget would be helpful for this so I'd answer yes to that.

Edmon Chung: Okay. And I agree very much. And the reason why I came across this budget is I was looking at the new gTLD communications plan and there's nothing there to talk about even remotely about this issue.

So I thought, you know, this is something perhaps we really should raise, you know, as sort of a flag and say, you know, we need some resource allocation, you know, on this particular item and that's why I sort of raised it as whether, you know, this should be something characterized or categorized as some sort of ICANN policy.

Jothan Frakes: Well, Edmon, if I could nuance that. I think that there's different categories of universal acceptance. You know, I think that there are certain things that we could do that have a very small consumer base. And there are certain things we can do to have a very large consumer base.

And what I mean by that is that, you know, the software development community are a small number of the overall population of the Earth that have a significant impact on, you know, how software will work.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Jothan Frakes: But an even smaller subset of those are going to be the actual TLD administrators themselves. And I think that, you know, for example one means of universal acceptance might be having some staff member or some

role at ICANN that we could suggest might be in charge of connecting those two communities together.

And maybe that's a way without using outreach of the overall TLD program. It may be better to really focus that energy. And that might be something that's attractive as a budgetary consideration for ICANN. Just a thought I'd throw out there.

Edmon Chung: Right, right. I think that, yes, that's very useful. In fact, you know, I was thinking - because I was sort of brain-dumping some of the issues. And I think that that is something definitely in terms of sort of which areas ICANN should focus its efforts on and, you know, what actual actions ICANN should take. And that's sort of what I identified as three and four.

But I guess overall some budgetary consideration seems to, you know, at least this is - again I come back to the intent of this initial report is to put some initial thoughts around, you know, what we think might make sense and throw it out to the community and ask for, you know, feedback from the community through the public comments period.

So, you know, it's - at least so far from this discussion it seems like raising a flag on budgeting for this area might make sense. Okay thank you.

So that brings me to the second question in terms of policy and whether - and that's whether we should consider it a sort of a general policy that ICANN in a way should get the commitment from IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs that at least in their own systems, you know, when we talk about universal acceptability of course ICANN is unable to enforce other systems.

But at least for registries especially IDN TLD registries perhaps there are some commitments that ICANN can ask for commitments from the new IDN ccTLD and IDN gTLD registries. And sort of the examples are that, you know,

their system at least whatever system they use should embrace universal acceptability of IDN TLDs. Does anyone have any thoughts or...

Jothan Frakes: Well, Edmon, you triggered - this is - if folks aren't used to my voice in a small group here it's Jothan again.

Edmon Chung: No go ahead.

Jothan Frakes: The thing that's missing in the URLs I think is also the document of the current IDN guidelines, I think 2.2...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Jothan Frakes: ...that identify, you know, identify your code page and also, you know, you're saying by including here that things that are not included here are not accepted. And that's going to be something that helps the development community understand what characters or are not legal if they're writing more specific software.

But that's probably a helpful guideline to include as a URL. Let me dig that up and send it to the list as well.

Edmon Chung: Okay so this is something including on, you know, some of the things that - in terms of to-dos if we create a guideline of some sort and to include that. But also I guess it is also relevant in terms of the background work. And I suppose we should also include this in the discussion of the background work as well in Section 1.

Okay. Thank you. And so back to the question is - and I guess Avri, I wonder what your thoughts are, you know, whether it's appropriate that we recommend we sort of - well at least we look into the appropriateness of having policies to - for IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLD registries on this issue?

Avri Doria: Yes, I mean, it's certainly appropriate to look into whether we should have policies. In some cases I'm not sure that the issue extends all the way to a policy and really may just be a recommendation of an action or something and doesn't go as far as policy but maybe, you know, I'm confusing myself when I think of policy as something requiring a PDP.

So, you know, I - at this point I'm not sure that I see things where there's actual PDPs that are required though I agree it would certainly be worth considering. You know, but at this point I'm not sure that I see them. But certainly it's worth going through the topics.

It's certainly worth going through budgetary issues, it's certainly going through looking at possible incentives that could be granted in various places and to whom one does those. So certainly it seems a topic worth diving deeper into.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Okay thank you. I guess I'll move to the second item and I'll just, you know, let everyone know as we go through this, you know, if you have - if some other issues come to mind please bring it up because I think we're still trying to go through a sort of stock-taking process to really bring out all the issues. The reason why I sort of drafted this document is to hopefully stimulate those thoughts and if I'm missing something or off from any particular issue.

So moving forward I'll cover Number 2 and I see that we're closing in on the top of the hour. But, you know, I'll quickly talk about the second item which is, you know, which organizations - well the idea is to identify which organizations ICANN should work on - work with on these issues and really how ICANN and the ICANN community can identify these organizations and, you know, how we do it.

You know, right now I guess we have sort of a few of them that we can identify. But how do we continue to do that because one of the things that we said in our couple of sessions earlier is, you know, that this work we probably

in terms of the ICANN and ICANN community we couldn't take it on our - totally on our own and we need to coordinate with other organizations.

And so I sort of split it up into two areas. One area is really the industry or related organizations. And the other area are - is the - is those areas where there's emerging sort of industry standards. And the first one being, you know, organizations such as IDNSTC which is an initiative started by VeriSign and it's I guess gathering momentum again.

And, you know, perhaps some of the RARs, ISP associations, IT sort of organizations as well this is sort of from the industry and related organizations area. But the main question is how we might be able to identify this.

And then the second one is emerging industry standards which is of course the public suffix list which is really emerging as an industry standard and also, you know, obviously the Wikipedia TLD list which I see a lot of reference to as well.

So I guess - I know it's a bunch of questions but I'll mix it up and say, you know, what people think and, you know, how we could identify this and how we could really maintain a list of this and, you know, what I'm really asking is what kind of a mechanism and process we could even consider putting in place or whether, you know, this is the right question at all.

Any thoughts at least on what other organizations or areas we should coordinate with.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'm about to cutoff because I have another call. But one thing I suggest we look at - and I'm not sure it fits in here - is those groups, loose organizations, that actually do free and open source and such because a lot of the needs will be not only at the registry level but at the various application levels within Linux, within all of that.

And just to make sure that everything is covered up and down the stack it may be worth talking to some of those organizations that take responsibility for free software whether it's the - the developing group or one of the distributor, you know, and such other groups. So that would be a category I would look into.

Also not just with, you know, ISPs or registries themselves but there are various groups that, you know, are putting out perhaps registry software that - or some of the packages for instance that are free and open source and getting those people interested in it especially if they are populations of developers and free software providers from, you know, IDN zones and places where alternate scripts and languages are the norm.

So that would be one suggestion that I - one category that I would think we would want to think about. Thanks. And as I say I'm going to drop off because...

Edmon Chung: Oh, before you go - before you go...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...do you have a couple of examples? Because I think that's useful for people to wrap their head around. Do you have examples of these groups?

Avri Doria: Well I'd have to get the names. But for example thinking about Linux which is so pervasive and then perhaps thinking about Ubuntu, one of the distributors in Africa and one that is very pervasive used by a lot of NGOs around the world. And those are the kinds of people who, you know, may have the ability to put some people on taking these available software packages.

In terms of the registry service provider software people I don't have the names for you but, you know, I'd have to do a little research. I know they're

there but I haven't paid enough attention to necessarily come out with the names. So that - as I say that's something worth looking into but...

Edmon Chung: Right. Thanks. That's great. And if you can do that little bit of research and send it to the list, you know, or something if it comes to your mind, you know, just send it in. That will help us further develop this draft.

Avri Doria: But also as a general category I'd recommend that people on the group...

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...might know better than I who within their, you know, script and language group is doing, you know, thought support for applications that would need to be modified to work with IDNs once they're available and working.

Edmon Chung: Right. And this whole idea is to get the list started and then, you know, we'll try to get feedback from the community to add to it.

Avri Doria: Sure thing. Okay I'm dropping off now because I got...

Edmon Chung: All right.

Avri Doria: ...the JAS call.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Thank you, Avri.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Any further thoughts on this? Of course we're - this is not the end of the discussion for these items. The idea is I'll take the feedback today and incorporate it to another draft and continue through the document and through the discussion for probably the next couple of meetings as well and of course through the mailing list as well.

But I guess we'll...

Jothan Frakes: Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yes, Jothan, please.

Jothan Frakes: Edmon, Jothan. I'm sorry to dominate with so many comments. I think there's a - sort of an ad hoc software development group that crosses the registries that meets at the ICANN meetings.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Jothan Frakes: That is being driven by one of the registries and, you know, has participants from across a lot of the ccTLDs and other gTLDs.

Edmon Chung: Right. Do they have - I'm not sure - it's more of an informal group at this point.

Jothan Frakes: It is an informal group; it is an informal group, I would agree with that. And, you know, I think there's possibly probably two or three other similar groups all sort of outside of each other's orbit that...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Jothan Frakes: ...you know, if there was universal acceptance that there would probably - or universal acceptability that there'd have to be some - they'd have to be brought to alignment to some extent.

Edmon Chung: Right. It would be useful if you, you know, if you could identify them or, you know - and send...

Jothan Frakes: Right.

Edmon Chung: ...a note to the list and we'll try to incorporate it into the document and, you know...

Jothan Frakes: That sounds good. That sounds good. And, you know, I'd comment that my efforts with the (Missoula) Foundation on the public suffix list it does have a trickle-out affect to different, you know, the impact with different software. However I agree with what Avri said about, you know, getting the operating system and other people involved; having someplace for them to go is going to be very helpful...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Jothan Frakes: ...with universal acceptability. All right thank you; sorry to go beyond the hour.

Edmon Chung: No, no not at all.

June Seo: Edmon, this is June at VeriSign. I think Jothan was reporting to a IDN STC is the meeting IDN Software Developer consortia meeting. And we have the charter document - I would not call it charter because it's really informal.

We have discussion points and a much larger portion of the discussion points are talking about universal acceptance of IDN not only top level but also in second level and so on in (unintelligible) applications such as Web-based email and email and email server and certain and so on.

So I will be able to share the document with this group so that we can incorporate any wording from that document because we - the sole proposal - the (SCC) would be universal acceptance of IDN so same way as the domain names are being used and accepted.

Edmon Chung: Right, yes, I think that is the kind of, you know, work that I think, you know, we definitely want to support and coordinate as the ICANN community as a

whole. And therefore, you know, absolutely and this is one of the - I guess IDN STC of course is the first one that comes to mind.

And I think one of, you know, related to this discussion is - I think as we talk about it as an ICANN-wide initiative, you know, we would like to have the participation from ICANN staff as well as, you know, ICANN - other parts of ICANN community as well. So, you know, definitely that's - the IDN STC is one of the key organizations that we should include and recommend that ICANN continues to work with.

Okay so I guess we're well past the hour. So unless somebody has something urgent or something to bring up or else we'll close this meeting. And I'll update - I'll hope to see the - some of the items being sent to the mailing list and I'll try to update this document and circulate it before our next meeting which is two weeks from now. And we'll circulate another proposed agenda which we'll also try to get an update from Bart when he's back from vacation on the follow up on the single character IDN TLDs as well.

Any further things people need to add? If not then thank you for your time and we'll wrap the session here.

Jothan Frakes: Thank you everyone. Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Thank you.

Jian Zhang: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Bye.

END