

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 30 March 2010at 1100 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 30 March 2010 at 1100 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.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you.

Good morning, afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the JIGs call. And on the call, we have (David Cohen), Rafik Dammak, Han Chuan Lee, Edmon Chung, Avri Doria, Chris Disspain, Chuck Gomes, Yeo Yee Ling, and (Jane Zang).

And for staff, we have Gabriella Schitteck, Kristina Nordstrom, Bart Boswinkel, Olof Nordling, and Glen de Saint Géry, myself. Have I left off anybody?

We are trying to phone out to Sarmad Hussain and (Fayid Batanek), but they're not answering their phones.

Thank you, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you, Glen. So I guess I'll get things started. First of all, thanks everyone for joining the call. The intent of the call is to get this - get the JIG started. It's the Joint IDN Group between the GNSO and ccNSO. It's been somewhat of a long time coming I would say.

But just before we do that, I was just wondering, I was hearing through, Glen, you mentioned people from staff. Is (Tina) also on the call? And is she expected to join the call sometime?

Glen de Saint Géry: She's not on the staff - she's not on the call at present, Edmon. And we have had no news from here, neither that she will...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: ...join the call or that she won't.

Edmon Chung: Okay. But she is - she's on the mailing list?

Glen de Saint Géry: She's on the mailing list, yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay. All right. So we - I guess let's get started and I'll say a few words and perhaps, (Jane), you can add to it.

So the...

(Jane Zang): Sure.

Edmon Chung: ...whole idea of the working group is to talk about any issues that are of common interest between gTLDs and ccTLDs on the topic of IDN TLDs. And over the last little while, we have identified a few issues that seem to be - seem to fall into that category.

Before this meeting, in fact, myself and (Jane) have had a call with Chuck and Chris, the chairs of the GNSO and ccNSO, to just briefly talk about what might be the items that should - could fall into the items of common interest. And we have some idea

on a few items and we'll touch on those today. And based on that, we'll - and get input from everyone and get the discussion started.

So that's pretty much where we are right now. I think the general process is that is to try to identify the issue and then come up with some positions, which then we would conceptually bring back to our respective councils and supporting organizations for actual adoption, so that's the general process or conceptual, the idea of the JIG. So that's - (Jane), you want to add anything?

(Jane Zang): No, that's (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Okay.

And in terms of just organizing, I think unless we get into a bit of a chaos, just jump in and say your name before and then just go ahead unless it becomes very chaotic and then we'll take a queue.

So myself and (Jane) are the co-chairs for the group. I think we'll try to get things organized a little bit. This time round, we don't really have an agenda except really just to identify the few things and see how we move forward on it. And so we'll start from there.

Anyone have any questions or thoughts on how we organize this?

Hearing none, we can jump right into the few issues. I did mention that we had a brief discussion with the two chairs of the separate, the respective SOs. And seems like we have identified - and also from the email correspondence that happened on this list earlier on.

So it seems like we have identified three items of common interest that we can - that the group can work on. So the first one is - and a couple of - the first two are

essentially items that are coming following up from the IDN implementation working team's report.

So the first one is the link - well, basically a single character IDN TLD and whether, you know, what types of policies or needs to be in place or, you know, whether they should be allowed or not. So that's the single character IDN TLDs. And that's the first topic.

The second topic, the variant management, essentially variant managed at the root - which means IDN TLD variants.

The third item (unintelligible) I would say that's of the policy development, but more of a policy promotion if you will, which is (unintelligible) acceptance of IDN TLDs.

We know that there are certain softwares or certain applications that may be - may have problems with dealing with IDN TLDs, which is similar or akin to dealing with longer TLDs that were introduced a few years back and that might have a further impact on IDNs that used to be more of a gTLD issue.

It's - with the introduction of IDN ccTLDs, that could become a cc issue as well. So if that seems to be an item that we can discuss on what we can do together as a joint group to promote or address.

So those are the three items. (Jane), do you want to add anything?

(Jane Zang): Not at this point. I couldn't think of anything else.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

So with that, I - you know, I guess I just really want to open to the floor in terms of are there (any other) items that you (unintelligible) are of interest or, you know, are there any items from this particular list that concerned with or basically any - in terms of the scope of the initial set of discussions for the group?

Chuck Gomes: Edmon, this is Chuck. Regarding the single character top level domains, do I remember correctly that one of the issues if we go that direction that needs to be discussed is any possible special allocation methods for those. Is that correct?

Edmon Chung: I was reviewing the IDN implementation working group report and I think that the issue seems to be left open. In fact, this is one of the things that the reason why I asked whether (Tina) is on the call, it has this - it talks about that it doesn't seem to have a - any technical issues, but there needs to be some policy from the GNSO and ccNSO respectively, but there's no particular - and there are no particulars on that. So one of the first thing that we might want to do is to get some clarification on that in terms of - I guess from staff if possible what - you know, what staff feels needs to be a - included in the policy discussion.

So allocation method may be one of them, but if I recall correctly, that might be pertaining more to second level single characters rather than the top level. I may be wrong, but top level, there is a rather elaborate process already.

Is there required to be a completely different process? I'm not sure. That might be one of the things that staff had in mind, but it's not clear from - currently from the report.

Chris Disspain: Edmon, it's Chris. Can I just pick up on that point about single (unintelligible) we're going to talk about single characters, that's fine, let's do that.

It seems to me that there's a couple of things that arise by - arise in the discussion about single characters. The first is a practical point, which is that we need to get very clear about what our status is.

My understanding is that -- and I could be wrong about this, but my understanding is that the - there is a current existing policy about single characters, which is referenced specifically to single Latin characters.

And if we are to - our job would be presumably to come up with some recommendations to both the GNSO and the ccNSO with respect to single characters in the IDN world. (That's the starting point) because we can't - this group can't make policy. All this group can do is to make recommendations to the two SOs.

And on a more specific point to do with single characters themselves, it seems to me that there's a lot of work to be done about that because the first starting point has to be what do you mean by a character? Because at the moment there is no definition in the sense of - Latin is very easy because it's just any letter, but in the case of - certainly in the case of (expressive) languages and possibly in the case of Arabic, but certainly the (unintelligible) languages (unintelligible) languages, it's a different thing.

So if we're going to do this as work and I think - I don't - I'm not saying we shouldn't, but if we are going to, then we've actually got to do a lot of fairly heavy groundwork it seems to me to come up with some suggestions and recommendations about how we deal with single characters in the IDN world.

Edmon Chung: Sure. And I think you're quite right in terms of the recommendation part. This group wouldn't be creating any types of policies. We would be recommending it back to the respective SOs.

In terms of one character, sure, I think that is definitely a - an area that we can - we should include in the discussion. But I guess the other points are what other things we need to include is if a - if policies are being developed and that's sort of what I'm - I'd like to see if it's possible to get staff to get some clarification, because I guess not all of us - or at least on this group, not a lot of people were on that IDN implementation working team. So we might need a little bit more information.

In terms of what one character mean, it's definitely a good point. The easiest way I can think of it is that it's one Unicode code point and, of course, there's many different - other different ways to describe it, as you mentioned.

So that definitely should be one. But, again, that - what we may come up with is just as you mentioned as a set of recommendations and each SO might take it slightly differently. That's a possibility for sure.

Chuck Gomes: Well, Edmon, this is Chuck. Let's be careful because, I mean, let's not shy away too much from this group actually developing some concrete recommendations. We don't want this group to come back with things that the SOs have to start all over on and work.

Edmon Chung: Absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: So don't shy away from making policy recommendations. That's what the group's for. The SO's role is to review those and approve them or if they think changes need to be made they can come back to the JIG. But it's perfectly okay for this group to make policy recommendations.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Okay. I think that's a fair statement. And, in fact, the whole point of the group I guess is also to try to come up with some consistency - and because they are issues

of common interest, some consistency across the continuum of IDN TLDs, including gTLDs and ccTLDs. So that point is well taken.

With that, I wonder if I can sort of move it a little bit to staff and see if - how do we go about what I mentioned and sort of away to - as a starting point if you will for some sort of (SO)'s report because there must have been some discussions on this topic and resulting in that mentioning that there is a - seemingly no technical issue, but some policy issues to be considered.

And what those might be would provide a good starting point for this group to consider, especially in the - on the - impact on both issues of the single character TLD and the variant management, because both are similar cases based on the IDN implementation team working report.

So anyone from staff can perhaps suggest or discuss how we can go about this?

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. And I don't think I can, but let's - what you - what I perceive that you are asking for is to give some kind of deeper explanation of what has come out of this IDN implementation team. And I wasn't part of that exercise, so maybe you would like to really ask - or I could ask, you know, if (Tina) could be available for the next call or if you have, well, the specific questions. I've heard you saying that okay, the management (unintelligible) seem to be no technical issues.

I don't know if that's necessarily true at all. But as I think Chris mentioned, certainly a policy issue that this is in a certain sense uncharted policy territory when it comes to the single character IDN character, whatever a character means. But there clearly is a policy, which prohibits single character Latin TLDs at the time being.

So - well, I don't know if that's really helpful, but I think you're asking for some - well, more information about the inner workings and the outcome, how did the outcome come about when it comes to variants and such.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Either of you could put down those questions for (Tina) to respond by mail or I could ask (Tina) to be present at the next call, whenever that will be.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Olof, can I - Edmon, if you don't mind, I just want to respond to that.

Edmon Chung: Go ahead.

Man: I think - talking very - talking really specifically here about single characters because I think therein is a different issue, but I'll - we'll get to that in a minute.

But in respect to single characters, I think it would be very helpful if we had a briefing session with whoever the relevant people are and it may be (Tina) and others to get an understanding of what is thought to be the current situation.

You can argue all sorts of ways. You can argue that the current policy applies specifically to any characters and therefore it doesn't apply to anything else. You can argue that it's a policy that simply says a single character is not allowed and therefore it doesn't matter whether it's fixed graphic or Arabic or whatever.

And we need to get clear I think on what the current belief - what would currently believe to be the case so that we can move forward from there because if this as an example the - it's believed that the current policy prohibits single characters in whatever script they may be, then that is one thing.

And that means a change of policy where if we decide that we should allow single characters. And if on the other hand it is - that the current situation is that there is

no policy in respect to single characters, anything other than Latin, then that's a different situation, which is the situation that we have to make some policy.

And those two things need a different approach. So I think we do need to get some clarification from whoever the right people are about what they think the current situation actually is in respect to...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...can I add something to that?

Edmon Chung: Please, go ahead.

Woman: I think one other interpretation is that this is a policy based on a technical rule that there can't be any single character names in the DNS and have nothing necessarily to do with whether it's ASCII or not.

And it's just that there was a technical limitation that was accepted in as a policy limitation to some extent. So it may even be that you don't need a policy so much as an interpretation.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...I may be wrong, but my understanding is when they made that policy for a single character, at that time they didn't have this IDN issue yet, so my understanding is the policies for a single character is just for Latin language.

As far as I know, they don't have any concern regarding this IDN single character. But I think we just don't have policies for a single - for IDN single character.

Chris Disspain: (Jane), it's Chris.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: But that might be so, but the problem - there is a challenge with that. And that is that in Cyrillic, for example, it's a different script, but it has single characters in precisely the same way that Latin has single characters.

And so therefore if there is a technical problem (unintelligible) I don't whether there is or isn't, but if there is a technical problem, we might - we may find ourselves in the situation where what we are actually saying is that there is one policy for certain scripts and another policy for...

Woman: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: ...for other scripts. But I don't think it's - you can't - I don't think you can take a general approach and simply say it's only with respect to Latin.

Woman: Mm-hm.

Chris Disspain: And it's why I say that I think we need to be briefed and informed by the technical community if indeed it is their problem so to speak that - as to what the problem actually is.

Woman: Chris...

((Crosstalk))

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad. Can I...

Edmon Chung: Please.

Sarmad Hussain: (Unintelligible).
Hello?

Edmon Chung: Go ahead. Who is that? Sorry, I didn't catch the name.

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad Hussain. I'm just (unintelligible) to join this group and I was added to this group.

I actually was part of the IDN implementation support group (unintelligible) starting this policy. And I think that all of the comments have been whether this was a technical issue or not.

So apparently there is no technical issue in having a single character (field). The only thing was that when this being discussed, two characters were obviously reserved for country codes.

And three block characters were for the gTLDs. There was no policy, which was there to decide who would get and what would be the application process or whether there should be gTLDs or ccTLDs or whatever (they called for a) single character TLDs.

So basically they - the committee had said that they will reserve single character until this community feedback on how to deal with them and the main constraint is that they will be limited and that we don't really know how they will play out.

So technically there is no issue. But it's actually a policy issue. And then the second thing that it's equally (unintelligible) for other languages as well, so so far single language, single character TLDs are not basically allowed for not only Latin, but all other scripts, so they're also applicable to IDNs.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I add another minute?

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay.

I think perhaps I didn't make my point as clearly as I hoped I would. For example, I do not think that Cyrillic characters are single characters in the same sense that LDH ASCII characters are because they're not represented by a single character in the DNS. So they are not single characters.

They may look like single characters, but they are not, so they're not in the same sense. And what I was saying is that the limitation may have been just on a single character in the DNS as opposed to visually a single character. And so...

Man: Mm-hm.

Avri Doria: ...only LDH are single characters. Everything else is not.

Edmon Chung: All right, okay. This is Edmon again. I think, Sarmad, thank you for bringing that up. And I think it's important to have someone - some continuity from that group because just to Chris and Avri's point, I just want to read out a little bit of the report itself. It does say specifically that - on Page 6 of that report that - of the final report, there seem to be no technical reasons for restricting one character IDN TLD labels.

And further on in the recommendation on 6, I just want to give it to everyone so that we have a common background. On Page 8, the recommendation 3 specifically says that - 3.1 says the team does not recommendation the banning of one character gTLDs. And 3.2 is the team recommends that further ramifications of this issue be addressed by policy bodies such as the ccNSO and gNSO.

And sort of that's where we are in terms of the general policy recommendation -- well, implementation...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...based on that report. And...

Man: But Edmon, Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Please.

Man: Edmon, just, sorry, just let me (unintelligible) otherwise I'll get confused. I understand exactly what you're saying, but is it right that that report does not include a definition of what a character actually is.

Edmon Chung: No, I take that point. I think that's a good point. And if we are dealing with it, we will have to address that particular issue I think, so.

Man: Hi.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Could I just (add a bit), that in the discussions in the group when we were talking about the characters, especially when we were talking about characters, which are not LDH, obviously it was very clear (to everybody) that we are talking about more than one character as far as (unintelligible) is concerned and to LDH, but it was (unintelligible) applicable to all languages and (unintelligible) character, which we were talking about in a particular script.

And sometimes that means (unintelligible) because sometimes a character is - in a particular script is (unintelligible) character and a composite character, so it was not

even limited to one (unintelligible) because actually sometimes multiple (unintelligible) points (unintelligible) a single character, so that was the context of that remark.

Man: Hm.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Hi. If I may add, if you look at (unintelligible) this has a section on measuring the (unintelligible) length and they recommend using the Unicode standard definition of what is (character).

So in the report, they have already recommended one definition of a (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: That is true.

So basically that particular recommendation would be simply to look at it as a Unicode code point as how we define single or two or three characters.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...doesn't that automatically mean, Edmon, that there are no single characters in IDN on that basis?

Edmon Chung: I don't understand. So one Unicode code point would be one character.

Man: No, that's not true.

Man: No, that's not right.

Man: If you look at - yeah, in some language (unintelligible) you would need two or more Unicode points to represent one character.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Man: Right.

Edmon Chung: Sorry, (Antoine), I'm browsing through the report again. Where exactly is that?

(Antoine): Page 6, somewhere in the middle part, near the middle. The first bullet point if you'll notice, it says measuring the (strings) length.

Edmon Chung: Right.

(Antoine): Okay.

In that paragraph, in that section, the last paragraph mentions how they recommend a definition of a single length.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so using Annex 29, so...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Right. There's a Unicode standard for - Unicode Standard Annex #29, which is - which was actually recommended by the implementation working team in terms of defining the length of a - of an IDN label. So we can probably use that as a starting point as well.

Chuck Gomes: Edmon, this is Chuck. I want to back up a little bit on process because it - I think it - the discussion is really good, but I think it'd be very helpful on this call, which I think

is essentially a kickoff meeting, even though the group has met some online and before, to map out where you need to go and what tools are needed.

For example, is the group going to use a wiki? Has that been established? And then to map out, you know, how does the group want to tackle the three issues that have been identified?

Do them one at a time sequentially or whatever approach. I'm not advocating one way or another, but I think it'd be very helpful at the end of this meeting if they're not only - if it's - the tools are going to be set up, the meeting logistics are agreed to or at least a plan for developing those is determined and a general approach to covering the three topics are dealt with.

Otherwise it's going to be real easy to be jumping around and be harder to capitalize on the collaboration that's needed in all three areas.

Edmon Chung: Great point, Chuck. Of course, we already just started jumping into the interesting stuff, but that's a very good point. I think we should definitely try to do that.

Before we do that, because we did get to this particular discussion, did anyone want to add before we take I guess Chuck's suggestion in - for - at least for this meeting to try to figure out some of the logistics for going forward?

Okay.

Chris Disspain: Edmon, it's Chris. I need to say this now because I'm going to have to go in about five minutes time because I have to get another call. But I just wanted to - I'm very happy to - for this discussion to be about logistics and how we're going to organize it all. That's very important. We need to get our systems fully in place before we start delving into the detail.

But I just want to go back a step. In the same way that I think we need a briefing on the situation with respect to single characters, I also think it's critically important so that we get some sort of understanding of where we stand with variants because there's a danger with variants that we're going to end up duplicating work or doing work that perhaps shouldn't necessarily be doing.

My understanding is that there is a technical group at the moment that's working on variants. (There)'s - a report's being published and there's more work being done, et cetera.

So I think it's critical that this joint working group gets absolutely clear about what if any role we have in respect to variants. Otherwise there's a danger of us going off on a discussion that will confuse and not be necessarily very helpful.

So I just wanted to say that before I had to leave the call.

Edmon Chung: That's - those are very good points. In fact, I'm - I think at least myself and I believe (Jane) is on the same page with that as well. We need to get a grasp, a strong grasp of what - where things are.

And that's sort of why I asked if (Tina) could join the call today because I think she is driving a lot of this and we - you're absolutely right. We should build on other people's work and not duplicate or try to, you know, create different pieces of work.

And so, yes, both - for both the issue on variant and the issue on single character, we should get a brief, which I think Olof touched on. And we definitely would need probably (Tina) to either come on the call next time or give us some update, a clear update on where things are on the mailing list.

Chris Disspain: Well, I think that's right, Edmon, but I think it needs to be both. I think it would be really helpful if we could get a statement of position for want of a better term, you

know, both with respect to (that stuff), what's the relevant staff view on single character and variants, and then have the relevant staff, be it (Tina) and/or others on a subsequent call once we've had a chance to have a look at that statement of where we - where they currently are so that we can ask questions and get really clear.

Edmon Chung: (Right).

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart.

So I think if we look at the first two topics, say the staff count of the single characters and variants, so I will ask (Tina) to prepare say a brief note, send this around as soon as possible. And then on the call afterwards, maybe she could even update it or give a presentation because some of these topics are really in flux, and take questions from this group. And based on that, the group can then talk about the way to move forward. Is that an approach?

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Man: Sounds fine to me, Bart.

Woman: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: So and then say so I'll ask (Tina) to do - to send these out as soon as possible. So hopefully in the - over the next two weeks, and based on that, we - what we can do as staff as well, set up a (Google) for say in three or four weeks so we can have the first discussion with her on this topic so it can sink in and we can schedule the call in to make it more practical.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah?

Edmon Chung: So with that, we can move into what Chuck suggested in terms of a few housekeeping issues for the remainder of the call to really get things started in terms of the - whether we - let's - I would suggest just talking quickly about how we deal with the three issues, identified items.

My feeling right now is that because it's not a very extensive list, I think we can handle it in parallel so that in each particular meeting and as we go along, we would have updates on each of those three rather than try to split up or handle it one at a time. I believe it might seem - it seems possible to handle it in parallel and set out meetings to talk about (unintelligible) in the particular meeting.

Does that make sense to others?

Man: Edmon, just a suggestion, I think you are right, especially leading up to say the first call including (Tina), but depending on say the depth of the issues involved, maybe the group should determine at that stage how it wants to proceed.

Edmon Chung: Fair. That's a fair statement. I think that's definitely where we should take - if it becomes a, you know, pretty big project on its own, then perhaps we should - on a particular issue, we might want to have a dedicated subgroup.

Man: Yeah, it's because I think the sense of say that's my sense of this call is we - say we did - the group has determined say the - or it's - the activities, the main focus of the activities.

Now we need to drill down a bit more, say what does it really want to do, and in order to understand this, we need to understand the scope of these three different themes.

Edmon Chung: Right.

And in the meantime as we scope it out, we could probably process it in parallel. But as it, you know, if it becomes apparent that it's better to sort of have a subgroup, then we'll move to that mode.

Man: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Does that make sense for everyone else?

Woman: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And Edmon, this is Chuck again.

You don't necessarily have to do - and I'm not advocating one way or the other, but you don't necessarily have to divide into (unintelligible) just decide for meeting or two that you will focus on one particular topic - because you need to go into depth there, like we were kind of tending to do today with regard to the single character issue. So a subgroup certainly is one option, but it's not the only option.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you, Chuck. That's a good idea, too.

I would guess that at this point, again, it seems to me to make sense that we can - as we are scoping it out, we would - we could move - probably move as a group and process in parallel.

And once we figure further things out, we could have sort of - we should - we could somehow, well, get people more focused on one or two issues. That's a very good idea, so that we could be a little bit more efficient and effective on the discussions.

In terms of some technical setup like wiki and, in fact, a summary or minutes of the meeting, do we - how would we - is it possible to get staff support in setting those up?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it should be no problem all.

Edmon Chung: Wiki and I think that's probably a good idea because then we can maintain a set of both and as well as where a sort of summary of where we are so far.

In terms of minutes or summary, is that also a possibility?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Great. And...

Bart Boswinkel: To my understanding it is. That's why you have so many staff on this call.

Edmon Chung: So I would ask the same question is would it be Glen or Gaby or you, Bart, or who would we work with?

Bart Boswinkel: Let me sort this out because this is in that sense an experiment for us as well in the sense that we have ccNSO and GNSO staff working together.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I'm taking notes.

Man: Yeah.

Woman: I'm taking notes. And as far as I know, this is going to be transcribed, so I don't think there's a real need for minutes. But I'm taking notes and I'm happy to check them. But I do think we'll stick to the transcripts and the records otherwise.

Edmon Chung: Right.

So, yeah, I don't think we need any formal minutes, but just a few points on sort of when we meet, just a simple summary I think would suffice and we can put it on the wiki and...

Man: Oh, and use the email lists to distribute them and maybe what is a good point, what we find very useful say within the cc working groups is because all of these calls all recorded that you have transcript at least say high level action or high level, you know, summary of agenda points and action items.

Edmon Chung: And decisions made.

Man: Yeah.

Man: Yeah. Right.

Man: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Edmon, backing up a step with - you mentioned a wiki. The - this is Chuck again.

The - you know, I - on a different - totally different list than the gNSO, Rafik had mentioned another tool. I don't know if you want to explore another tool besides a wiki or not, but I'll leave that up to Rafik whether he wants to even bring that topic up.

But I haven't had a chance to check it out yet. But I just throw that out, again, not advocating one way or the other because I haven't used the other tool that he mentioned.

But wikis certainly do have their limitations. And if there's a better tool, maybe this group would like to experiment with that. But, Rafik, I'll leave that up to you if you're still on the call.

Edmon Chung: True. I think we're definitely open. Rafik (unintelligible)...

Chris Disspain: Edmon - sorry to interrupt, Edmon, it's Chris. I need to go, so I just want to say thanks everybody and goodbye and I'll look forward to the next call.

Edmon Chung: Okay, thank you, Chris.

Chris Disspain: Thanks guys.

Woman: Thank you, dear.

Man: Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Rafik, did you want to bring up the tool or just quickly?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

So it's called (Isalpad). It's a (road to) real-time collaboration, everything. So everybody can when he edits or his or her contribution will be (unintelligible) and so it's more easy to keep the track or - of anything and contributions.

Man: Rafik, is it like Adobe? Is it a tool along the lines of Adobe Connect?

Rafik Dammak: So when someone make edit, so it will be - the updates will be in real-time. And so it's more easy to see the change, not like Adobe Connect when I think Adobe Connect, they have to upload each time, I'm not sure.

Edmon Chung: I guess here's a suggestion. Perhaps you can send some links to the tool so we can check it out. And especially I guess myself and (Jane) and probably Glen, Gaby, and Bart will work with you and check out whether the tool works well and then, you know - decide whether the tools works well and then, you know, decide whether to adopt it for the group and whether we use the wiki as well or not or - is that - does that work?

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

(Terry): Yeah, Chuck, this is (Terry). Just for the minutes, I joined about ten minutes ago. I overslept.

Chuck Gomes: Overslept past 4:00 am, huh?

(Terry): Yeah. Yeah.

Man: Maybe that is the issue for (Tina) as well.

Man: I'm sure it was.

Edmon Chung: So speaking of that, then why don't we talk a little bit about the meeting times and how we want to arrange this. In my mind, it seems like at this point maybe like a two-week, you know, every other - meeting on every other - start with every other

week might be a good frequency. Does anyone have any suggestions to make it further apart or more frequent?

Bart Boswinkel: Initially I think that the basic - this is Bart, sorry.

I think the basic point is I don't know about the availability of (Tina) and she's the one who needs to fill in the two issues or the two themes of single character and variant management. And that will take some time, so I suggest to take the first call in three weeks.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So...

Bart Boswinkel: And then maybe depending on that, then we can set the frequency. As we just discussed, it's also dependent on say what this group identifies as issues and how it wants to progress. So that's probably the second agenda point for the first upcoming is call again process, but how do - does the group want to approach the different themes.

(Jane Zang): How about - this is (Jane). How about this?

Man: Yeah?

(Jane Zang): We just don't wait for, you know, for three weeks. We probably could send emails to (Tina), list our questions regarding the working group have - the work the working group has done and our - probably our concerns and the, you know, sort of questions we have. And then we'll see.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Jane Zang): It depends on - just as you said, it depends on her availability. We could see, you know, how soon we could, you know, get, you know, some background on that. And then we'll set that for the next meeting.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Say, (Jan), say - I agree. Say, my idea was that say after this call was finished, at least today, I will send a note to (Tina) say with the outcome of this call and ask her to produce a note for this group on the two activities, so within a reasonable time frame. And in the meantime based on that, we can ask - or the group can ask (Tina) questions and even now can start asking questions.

But so that at least she has a couple of say some days and you've got Easter coming up as well, she has some time to get - prepare a proper brief for this working group.

Edmon Chung: So...

Woman: (Sure).

Edmon Chung: ...this is Edmon.

So I think if I got you correctly, Bart, you're saying that yes, if (Tina) can come turn around and provide a input earlier, we could try to set up an earlier call again, but right now what you're seeing is probably around a three-week window is a...

Bart Boswinkel: Is a reasonable time frame. So without stressing because all of our - we do sit - we sit in on other working groups as well, so we need to get this geared up. And you want to prepare this properly.

Edmon Chung: Understood.

I personally don't have a big issue with that, but I agree with (Jane) in that if we get it earlier, then we could schedule our next call earlier.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: But I guess at this point, we can say, you know, two to three weeks is the general window. About time-wise, I - personally I'm okay with having a time that's more amenable for folks in - you know, in Pacific time frame.

But in general, do we want to have different times or do we have - want to have, you know, the same time - just around the same time right now. Is - I think a Doodle went out and this was the time that was developed.

Chuck Gomes: Edmon, this is Chuck again. One question is was that time - were people responding to that as a one-time meeting or as a regular time? So it could be if that wasn't clear, you may want to do a Doodle that explores an ongoing time frame, make people are clear on that. Now if that was already clear, then that may not be needed.

Woman: It was just for this meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks. Useful, I appreciate that.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

It's - it seems to be a little bit difficult to make any particular decision on this - over this call. It seems especially with a pending item to really get work started. The response from - compiled by (Tina) and staff would be quite important so we know where - what our starting points need to be.

I guess, you know, I guess we would like for it to happen sooner. Just want to let Bart know that if (Tina) is willing or could turn around that earlier, it would be much appreciated and...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah. Oh, that's very clear, yeah.

No, I just wanted to be - make it as realistic as possible, say is - and it's again worth scheduling as well. Say if we start scheduling, I think that is our role as staff as well to say after today send out some Doodles and probably on a revolving basis so people share the burden of the unworldly hours because you're dealing with people both in say Australia and on the US West Coast.

So, yeah, one way or the other, that's my experience at least in some of the cc working groups. If you don't revolve, then it's going to be very difficult for some of them, some people to attend regularly.

So maybe that's a suggestion moving forward and we send out the Doodle probably for three weeks to make it definite because then it's easier to schedule as well for everybody. Two weeks is rather quick I would say to start scheduling for the whole group.

Edmon Chung: Right.

So in that case, why don't we just try to set up a call in three weeks time.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Then - and in - and try to set up a time where it's - it works for everyone so we can come back to that time, you know, for a few times going forward. Does that make sense?

Bart Boswinkel: Go on a revolving basis. We can do...

Edmon Chung: (Yeah).

Bart Boswinkel: ...either way, because that's the easiest way. If you have a date, then you figure out the time.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Gabriella Schitteck: ...this is Gaby. What about that I - I'll make a Doodle and I suggest two - like two times at different times that are convenient or inconvenient for whatever - whoever.

Man: (Yeah).

Gabriella Schitteck: And you can just fill in and we check.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...give a few more times I guess or...

Man: (Yeah).

Edmon Chung: ...what do people think?

Man: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...not just two slots, maybe like three or four slots and we'll get a sense what time works best.

I'm - I think in the - at least in the next little while, we'll probably need more staff to help out on getting things started. So I'm perfectly fine with having times that are, you know, easier for staff to join.

Man: Much appreciated.

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And, Bart, what time is your time now?

Bart Boswinkel: My time is 2:00 pm. So that's fine. But I know say this is for US West Coast, this is pretty early. So you - so this - when we started at 1:00 pm, it's minus nine, so that's right in the middle of the night. And if you move forward, it's going to be very difficult for you.

Woman: Mm-hm.

Bart Boswinkel: So I'm more concerned by other staff than myself.

Edmon Chung: But, really, (Jane) and Han Chuan will - and others, probably Rafik also, how comfortable are you guys in the middle of the night?

Man: Well, if it is - if it's around midnight, I'm sure it's okay, but if it goes down really early morning, like 3:00 am, 4:00 am, then it might be a little bit difficult.

Woman: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, and then you have the same problem with Chris because Chris is, again, two or three hours ahead.

Woman: Yeah.

Man: Right.

Man: So...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: I think the best way is to just set out some alternative slots and do you once say once we have the upcoming call in three weeks, then every two weeks another call?

Edmon Chung: I think that should be a good idea to start with.

Woman: (Yeah).

Bart Boswinkel: So leading up to Brussels and then again try to organize already a face-to-face meeting in Brussels so we can organize a room in time.

Edmon Chung: Good idea.

Bart Boswinkel: And based on that see where we are in Brussels and based on that when we move forward. And that can be determined in Brussels.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Man: Yeah.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Edmon, this is Chuck. I want to let you know that I don't plan - I'm not planning to continue to be active on the JIG. We have a lot of good, well-qualified people from

the GNSO on the group. And so I don't think I need to continue. They will do a good job of working on the group.

Certainly, though, I do want to let you know that if I can be assistance - of assistance as chair of the gNSO, I'm ready and available, so just let me know whatever you might need in terms of support from me, whether it be attending a call or something else.

So, again, there are at least five people from the GNSO besides me on the group and they're all well qualified. So I'm going to let you and (Jane) and the other people in the group do your thing without my interference.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Chuck. And, in fact, you have provided much input already useful for us to get things started. And thanks to that.

And I think definitely from my side, I'll update the council as well when we meet on the progress here in the group and you will continue to be on the mailing list, so get a peripheral sense of where things are headed.

Chuck Gomes: Correct.

Edmon Chung: So I guess with that we're - we've gone for about an hour and I think we have had a pretty constructive session and laying out some action items going forward.

Does anyone want to bring up any particular issue before we close?

If not, we can take it back to the mailing list and we'll wait for Bart and (Tina) for the update and also I think - is it Gaby that will send out the Doodle for the next calls?

Gabriella Schitteck: Yes, I'll do that.

Edmon Chung: All right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, everyone, and goodnight, good evening, good morning.

Man: Whatever. Night, day.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Okay, thank you.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Goodbye.

Man: Goodbye.

END