

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 28 September 2010 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 28 September 2010 at 1200 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jig-wg-20100928-en.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung - Chair
Avri Doria
Rafik Dammak
David Cohen
Sarmad Hussain

ICANN Staff

Olof Nordling
Gabi Schitteck
Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordstrom
Glen de Saint Géry
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Andrei Kolesnikov
Young-Eum Lee
Fahd Batayneh
Jian Zhang - co-chair

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening to everyone on today's JIG call on Tuesday, the 28th of September. We have Edmon Chung, Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Sarmad Hussain, David Cohen. From staff we have Gabi Schitteck, Glen de Saint Gery, Bart Boswinkel, Kristina Nordstrom, Olof Nordling, and myself Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies today from Andre Kolesnikov, Fahd Batayneh, and Jian Zhang. Thank you. Over to you, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And also, I think apologies from Young Eum Lee as well.

Gisella Gruber-White: That will be noted. Thank you, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes. So, I - as I mentioned in an email a little bit earlier, circulated the - I guess the summary from Bart about the public comments received for the single character IDN TLD. So, I think the idea is for this week to go through that, and you know discuss about I guess the public comments received, and consider some next steps, because this meeting was sort of postponed a couple of times because of the IGS and also because of the ccNSO meeting last week. So this is the public comments that's - and about three weeks ago - two and a half weeks ago, and so this is I think the suggestion. I - anyone have any question or - concerns or suggestions?

If not, then I think since we only circulated the summary a few hours ago, I think it's probably easiest if Bart can just quickly walk through it and then we'll - you know, if people have very I guess urgent questions, then just jump in during - as Bart walks us through, or else we can you know talk about our thoughts at the end.

Bart Boswinkel: Sure. Again if you have - thank you Edmon. This is Bart. Just a preliminary remark. It's one of the staff jobs to make this - to summarize the comments, and this is the way I do it normally. So, there is not really a structured approach to it. So, that's one.

Secondly if possible, I want to pose this as quickly as possible to formally close the public comment period on the initial report on the single character IDNs. So, let me take you though - say first explain what I've done, say based on - we received seven comments. I say two - or three I circulated to the list, and they need to be included because they were received after the public

comment period - forum was closed by staff, and this was in - after consulting the co-Chairs of the working group.

So, what I've done is look at the comments and summarize them and included them all - link them to the specific sections of the initial report; however as you can see, there were some very general comments, so I created a sub-section. It's called General Comments, and I've qualified the comments from the (Decrees and Law Society) and from the registry stakeholder group as a more general comment, because it's not specific. They were not specifically focused on the five issues, the working group, or the six -- sorry -- the six issues the working group has identified. So in the General Comments, you see the comments from the (Decrees Law Society) and the registry's stakeholder group.

What I've done - say, and so that's the summary of the comments submitted. And what I've also done - and this is tentative, and just - yes, so it's just my personal view on it, thinking through how the - what might be the consideration of the comments by the working group, so it's easier to discuss from a - and if you have any additional remarks or - please send them to the list so I can include them in the considerations of the comments.

So, this is what we got through the general comments. And most notably is they very much - especially the comments from the (Decrees and Law Society) is very much focused on DAG 4 for and the application of the new gTLD rules. And so the consideration comment is - the conservation of that comment is - first of all, the DAG 4 is not within the - or most importantly, the DAG 4 is not in the scope and mandate of the GAC working group. And so, any comments or any concerns relating to DAG 4 is not within the realm of the GAC itself, so there's no way the GAC could deal with these comments.

This is also based on the assumption that a - and that leads to - that was a note already from Edmon, that the GAC is building upon the - that for rules

and procedures potential - IDN PDP or ccPDP rules and procedures, and on the fast track IDN ccTLD rules and procedures. So, that...

Avri Doria: Can I - this is Avri. Can I ask a quick question? And I'm sorry about...

Bart Boswinkel: Avri, ask question, yes.

Avri Doria: I understand that we're building on the policies of the fast track and the new gTLD, but - and I don't have the charter in front of us, but where explicitly does it say that we are building on the DAG itself, which is fast implementation work? And, where does it say explicitly that if this group had something to say about the implementation, it is out of scope? Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: This was an assumption I made.

Avri Doria: Okay. So, I'd like to...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: So, if we...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...leave that as something that needs to be explored, if possible.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Yes. That's fine.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: That's why I made it explicit, my assumption. (Unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Sure. I guess - this is Edmon, I think we could...

Bart Boswinkel: ...move to discuss if they sense whether or not this should be - they could address specific implementation goals. That's the way I interpret what you say, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. And I was just asking for clarification, not trying to open the conversation now. To honor the, "If you have an urgent question," so I just wanted to put a place marker in.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I know - that's fine. What I'll do is I'll include that a - I'll note it, and maybe - yes Edmon, it's up to you whether you want to address that during this call or maybe...

Edmon Chung: Sure. Just a quick comment on that. I think this response is specifically to those couple of comments. And, the comments talked about issues that were outside of - that's relevant in a way that it it's outside of what we are talking about specifically, which is (these) single character IDNs and TLDs. There were comments about the - just generally, like in the special property rights section mechanism. So, that was why this - I guess sort of the response was developed that way.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. If I can add to that then, and then -- this is Avri again -- is that - in which case - you know, if they're out of scope because they're IPR and not this, if they're out of scope because of that, I think that's great to say so and be done with it. I think that putting in a blanket statement that they're out of scope because this group has nothing to say about the DAG might be problematic.

I have no problem - and in fact, I haven't read them yet, so I'm speaking just in terms of the blanket statement that this group cannot comment on anything that's in the DAG and has decided to rest itself on top of the DAG, which is of course shifting sand, as opposed to on top of the policies.

Edmon Chung: I think that's well taken. Perhaps Bart, as you go through it, you can highlight a little bit what the comment was as well, so it gives a little bit of context. And, I think - and so in terms of Avri's suggestion, these can...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Well, this...

Edmon Chung: ...just be the write-up below this.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. It - so, let me first - let me do this for - as Edmon suggested, say specifically, the (Decrees Law society) - what is the issues they're going to find with the draft. So, "The DAG finds the former irrelevant for single -- a typo -- character IDN gTLDs. And it is assumed that the relevant procedures set out in DAG 4 will be used to administer the application and dispute resolution process in relation to the introduction of single character IDN ccTLD."

"According to the submission, there is significant potential for dilution and erosion of intellectual property rights, consumer business, and right's owners to be misled due to the number of aspects identified in relation to the DAG Version 4; and therefore, a significant loss of faith and confidence in the DNS moving forward." So, that was the main thrust of the (Decrees and Law Society) comments.

The registry stakeholder group is, "Since by stated position on the GNSO final report on the introduction of new gTLDs for single or two character IDNs at all levels, single and two character (new labels) on the top level and second level of domain should not be (received). In general at the top level, requested strings should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis in the new gTLD process, depending on the script language, in order - and used in order to determine whether the string should be granted."

“And second moreover, the registry stakeholders group believes that the new gTLD string evaluation in dispute procedures in the Draft Applicant Guidebook should be applicable to IDN strings.”

And then the second - or the third argument is from the registry stakeholder group, it's more - they are supportive of a eventual release of single character IDNs when there is no remaining technical or policy issues that could result in stability and security problems, recognizing that the initial report is a contribution to the finalizations of policies that are still pending. So, that is - these are what I considered general comments.

And so - and then, there is an - a APTLD comment. “According to a APTLD, one (CGAK) character has the same expressive power and the same degree of meaning distinctiveness as an ASCII string with three letters. If single character IDNs would not be available, users of (CGAK) would be marginalized.” They - what I suggest as - in consideration of this comment, that the comment is noted and it will be taken into account. I think there's nothing more we can add to this one.

So, that was from the seven comments. Part of it - say the APTLD comment is also addressing some other points, but these were what I think are the general comments.

Yes, if you want to do it - pursue it in this way?

Edmon Chung: Yes. I think it works well. The - perhaps we can - and it might be a good idea after these, just stop and point at each particular issue and see if anyone has any comments.

So besides from Avri -- the clarification -- anyone want to add anything in the general part?

Bart Boswinkel: So just one thing, and I think Avri's point is taken. Say what I'll do is I'll amend the text to express clearer that we will not address a dispute resolution and intellectual property rights that is not within the scope of the GAC.

Edmon Chung: Right. I guess that the main point Avri was making is we shouldn't have a blanket statement that we are not allowed to talk to really or change - or suggest changes to the DAG. It's just the reason why we're not dealing with it is that it's out of scope of this charter, and not out of scope that we can't talk about the DAG, which is a moving document.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Okay, so what I've done - say the next one is I just focused on the six issues identified. So, the first issue was possible confusion with reserved single character ASCII TLD strings. I think there were - in my view there were two comments focusing on that one. One was from Chuck Warren. He had no - there was not affiliation I saw. I don't know him, but maybe you do.

And he said, "That comment where the question is raised in the initial report, assuming that a question is raised and discussed in our end working group final report May, '07. Over time, much has evolved at ICANN, including advance in the introduction in IDNs with the consideration of allocation of single character IDNs as TLDs. It is time to - for ICANN to recognize and establish a mechanism for the discussion and consideration of allocation of single letter ASCII as single letters, so ASCII as gTLDs in parallel, to avoid possible confusion." So, that was the first comment.

And the second one was from APTLD. "APTLD is aware that for alphabetic scripts such as Arabic, end of character IDNs might give rise to confusion with other strings. This should be further studied." And say the tentative consideration of a comment is both comments are noted. The issue of same confusion, whether between IDN and ASCII string, or within specific scripts,

will be further considered by the working group. So, that is Issue 1. Any questions/remarks?

Edmon Chung: Okay, hearing none, I ask folks - please go ahead.

Sarmad Hussain: This is Sarmad. I actually have a comment.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Sarmad Hussain: Okay. This APTLD comment, it's saying that Arabic - scripts like Arabic single character IDNs give rise to confusion with other strings, and this should be studied. And, I am actually not sure what part of confusion may arise? What kind of confusion they're referring to. Is it possible to sort of go back to them and ask them to elaborate any by it? I actually don't understand what the comment is referring to.

Edmon Chung: I think certainly we can ask them. And conveniently, (Jane) is the General Manager for APTLD, and unfortunately she's not here today. But, I will definitely seek some clarification from her.

What I do understand is that I guess the discussion was that (TTS) in our initial report, we sort of suggested to set aside Latin, Greek, Cyrillic as a setback - you know, requires really special consideration when you talk about IDNs - single character IDN TLDs, because they are so - basically so similar to ASCII TLDs - single character ASCII TLDs. And I guess what they wanted to note is that it might - Arabic - certain single character Arabic scripts - I mean, Arabic character IDN TLD might be similar to let's say an Indic single character IDN TLD, especially with alphabetic scripts.

So, between Indic scripts and Arabic scripts, or Nepalian, or some of these like...

Sarmad Hussain: Okay, so I think what we should - perhaps because the languages and because it's in other strings, not other scripts first of all. And then, so is it other strings within the same script, or is it other strings across scripts? Not clear.

The second thing is so they are talking about strings and not letters? So again, I think it's hard. The brevity obviously of the comment is making it a little hard to understand.

Edmon Chung: Right. So, I think this is definitely worth delving a little bit further into it. I'll ask (Jane) to elaborate a little bit more on this. But, I guess I'm curious if you or others have any thoughts about you know, the - whether there is a new special issue that we need to deal with in terms of these type of alphabetic scripts where across languages there might be confusion considerations? Or, do we feel that you know, the string confusion tests already in the processes are - should support it, because really, single character and multiple characters should go through a similar sort of evaluation?

Sarmad Hussain: Yes. And I think in this particular case, we should perhaps treat Greek and Cyrillic as separate from other scripts because they have a significant amount of overlap than Latin versus Arabic, and you know, all these other scripts. So, that sort of distinction also needs to come out from this; obviously if not in the comments then somewhere in other report as well.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Sarmad Hussain: So for example, if you're saying that - I'm not sure. Basically, we are saying that nothing can be confusable with single letter ASCII, right? And beyond that, there is no limitation.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Sarmad Hussain: Okay.

Edmon Chung: There was additional limitation in saying that - there was a suggestion that if it's Latin, Greek, or Cyrillic, then they would need special considerations. But it's similar to the handling of the two character IDN TLDs where the same description was there, in saying that you know, if...

Sarmad Hussain: Right.

Edmon Chung: ...yes, by default, it's considered somewhat confusingly similar. Well, I shouldn't say that, but by default it would require some additional justification for the application to...

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. May I make a suggestion? What I've done - I've noted to say that what we got to this point, especially the APTLD comment, there is a need for clarification from the - regarding determination. And, we address it say as part and in the consideration of the next steps, what to do next. Say, whatever comes to - and part of that will be the discussion we're having right now.

Edmon Chung: Sure. That's fine with me. That sounds good. And, I think very brief would be fine.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And so, we - with what we - and maybe, that's what the next - say dealing with Issue 2 through 6 as well, say I'll run through the issues. Maybe there is some need for clarification we noted, and get back, and that will be part of the next steps discussion, how to handle and how to include them in the final report.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. So, are there any other questions/comments on Issue 1?

Edmon Chung: I actually have one question, but not directed to you Bart. Actually, it was directed to the group, and I don't think it needs to make its way into the comments. But, we - I sort of observed from the comment from Chuck the question about ASCII - a single character ASCII IDN - or I mean single character ASCII TLDs. And so does the group feel that we need to address this issue in any way, shape, or form, or do you think this is - we can just say that this is outside of the scope of this group?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. The ASCII issue?

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Avri Doria: Is that the question?

I think it's an IDN group, and I kind of like the - I mean, it's a default in the case of this question. I kind of like the way it's being put in the ccTLD PDP at the moment, that at least one character has to be an IDN. So now the question becomes if you're talking a - when you're talking - excluding ASCII, you're excluding just LDH or are you excluding any of the extended Latin, which happens to be with a diacritical mark, and therefore properly speaking, an IDN? I think that's the fuzzy space in the middle.

I think anything that's LDH is definitely out of scope, but I wonder whether those letters that aren't - characters that aren't an LDH but would be in extended Latin, and thus IDN, would be in scope is the fuzzy area I would ask about.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So, I guess the - for LDH, I think we can safely assume that it is out of scope and state it as such, as Avri mentioned. Of course to the extent of Latin, and that sort of relates to our discussion just now and their relation with Cyrillic and Greek characters. Those we probably need to address. I don't

want to spend too much time talking about it here yet. We'll come back to this when we talk about the final report.

But I guess you know the note is that for the LDH, we will state that it's sort of out of the scope; for the other ones, we'll have to address it. And some of the similarities between the scripts, we'll need to address as well.

Avri Doria: Right. This is Avri again. Yes, we might want to also say LDH or anything that looks like LDH. That would be taking one further step.

Edmon Chung: Right. And - but, that would already be a - yes. That's already a - one more step, and that's within our scope to say I guess that those that look like LDH is - you know, by default is also you know - there are - these strings are bad and should be reserved (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Cool. Okay Bart, we can go on to Issue 2 I think.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Issue 2. Again, there is a comment from Chuck Warren. "In the past, proposals have been submitted to ICANN that would address," - sorry. The Issue 2 is whether special financial consideration should be considered. "In the past, proposals have been submitted to ICANN that would address mechanism to address (surface) funds that were the results of such allocations, including contributing to capacity building and enhances participation mechanisms in ICANN's various processes."

I just noted that this comment is noted. I don't know if you want to add anything else.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. Sorry to be (raising) so much.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Avri Doria: As co-Chair of a group that is actually focusing on that, even though you know, the Board has told us, "Go away. We don't care," I think that that issue would be in scope for a different group but not us. And - I mean, not this group obviously. I'm in both, so us is us.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Avri Doria: But, that that would be you know the joint ALAC/GNSO group on support for a new gTLD applicant. And, that that, like IPR, would be out of scope for this group.

Edmon Chung: So all right. So, I guess Bart you can add that you know, sort of pointer to the groups that...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Avri, could you send me an email to that - the name of that group?

Avri Doria: Yes. Will do.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Thank you. So, I'll just - out of scope of the group. Okay. So, that was Issue 2.

Issue 3. The issue is whether due to the relatively small pool of possible names that special allocation methods should be considered. Again, it's a comment from Chuck Warren. "It may be necessary to adapt the proposed allocation mechanisms now proposed, which address conflicts of established rights in the string through trademark rights or established use. But it is possible that a proposed mechanism now under discussion through the DAG can be adjusted to address the allocation of the small number of ASCII single characters as gTLDs."

A comment from the Chinese Domain Name Consortium. "The Chinese Domain Name Consortium agrees with the GAC's position that issues such

as character similarities, stability and security, and protection on geographic names shall be managed and resolved in the new gTLD program or IDN ccPDP where applicable.”

And, a comment from the APTLD, “APTLD is of the opinion that the allocation method, according to the (current) Class Application Guide Book, Version 4, takes into consideration the economic value of the strings. Devising additional methods is unlikely to improve it further, and will only address unnecessary complexity to the process.”

Again, consideration of comments. In my view, there is no additional argument, so I've said comments are noted. It's up to the working group to - if you want to add any other comments.

Questions?

Edmon Chung: Does anyone - I guess I'm interested to know if anyone has any thoughts on the geographic part of it. Does it come up again in another...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, there is an issue five is additional criteria where I...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: (Unintelligible) GTLD and IDN GTLDs.

Edmon Chung: Okay so perhaps we'll touch on that then. But I think that - I'd like to sort of ask a general question of people how you feel we should approach the - this particular issue or if any - in terms of whether our group needs to do anything rather than, you know, the (bag) has - is already dealing with such issues and there's no additional thing that adds to when you talk about a single (task) to (deal).

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Edmon Chung: Yes, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I think it's a fair (pit) that we should stay out of and call it (the scope).

Edmon Chung: You know I sort of for once agree completely. But I thought it would be prudent to raise it and you know...

Avri Doria: I think you raised it.

Edmon Chung: ...see if others thought that because it's a single character there needs to be additional consideration. I don't know. Maybe the character looks like the shape of (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: The other thing - this is Avri again. Sorry to speak so much. The only thing that could make it - but this is an ASCII consideration, is the fact of the single character that is standardized for use on license plates and such as that which we spoke of in our meeting.

But those are all ASCII as far as I know. Other than that, I can't see any reason why a single character would be that closely associated but I don't know for sure. Maybe on an Arab license plate there is an Arabic character that is a single character in the same way. But I don't know who would standardize it. So that would be the only issue if we were going to get into it but I think it's a real bear pit.

Edmon Chung: Well speaking of that, I mean, there are in the Chin- license plates in China there are actually Chinese characters that represent provinces I believe. But in - perhaps I don't know, maybe that's one of the things but I still don't see how it is, you know, even with those situations, it would still fall under the DAG of definition at this point I believe. So...

Avri Doria: Well that's - Avri again - that's where the issue about the DAG being a moving target would come in. If you're saying that it falls within the policies of the CCNSO and the GNSO and the recommendations of GAC in regards to, you know, nationally significant names, then you know, as far as I know, the DAG statement on it is still a controversial statement because some people think it's too strong and some people think it's too weak.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Avri Doria: So resting our case on DAG is something that I wouldn't be in favor of. Resting it on (case) - right.

Edmon Chung: Right I think - no. Yes, I think that you're quite right but I just want to point out that perhaps in terms of if we do write up something it would be pointing towards the ongoing discussion on the issue rather than what's in the DAG on this particular issue.

I think you're very right that, you know, I - some people think this issue maybe as settled but regardless of whether it's settled, this discussion needs to take place, you know, whenever the ongoing discussion is rather than in this particular group. Does that make sense?

Bart Boswinkel: Could - may I phrase it differently? As I understand it, this is not in particular a single character IBM issue.

Edmon Chung: Right. And also, Bart, I don't think what we just discussed here needs to be in this...

Bart Boswinkel: No, no that's why I said - I understand.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: That's why I said they - with moving forward, they - regarding every of these issues I think that was likely from the first issues is based on say what is in here, this is just the comments and it's just a stutter in the process.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: They - some of the discussions you were having is already addressing your considerations of the four next steps.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Man: Shall I move forward?

Edmon Chung: Please do.

Man: I think issue four, there is issue whether it's due to the relatively shorter string it may be easier for users to make mistakes and that special policies should be considered. Again, there is one comment from (Chuck Warren). It is unclear that (maybe) typing. One character, in fact, leads to more errors than typing complex words or a combination words which is commonly done today at the second level. And again, this comment is noted. I don't know what to add anymore.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I'd like to add sort of a piece of information for everyone. I've been - (throughout) the process I've been trying to engage at least some of the people from the (unintelligible) community and this is one of the issues I think (Carrie) and (Tina) brought up when we were in Brussels as well.

Just to explore this a little bit further, making sure that we have covered the issue well, the - it's easy to address it this way which (Chuck) in his comments mentioned that, you know, more characters might lead to more errors. The issue from I guess this technical community is that it's a single

character and there are two single character TLDs being allocated then the likely of one error ending up with a TLD exists is the particular issue.

But even then, I think it's a very abstract - well I should say and it's a very mathematical understanding of the case (for them) and it doesn't really take into consideration though confusability that is already inherent in the system. So - but I'd like to make sure that people understand that it's not only about, you know, typing it incorrectly but also about typing it incorrectly and then ending up with something that actually exists which in mathematical models, yes, it would create a higher possibility then if it was a two character TLD in the same number - for a script with same number of alphabetic factors.

So that was the issue. But in the real practical sense, I think it really doesn't - it's not as typical as just a mathematical model and I don't see how, you know, allowing two single character names would create such an issue because, well, we'll jump back to the longer discussion when we talk about final report but it's definitely besides this - the comments from (Chuck Warren), I think we'll have to answer in a little bit more detail some of the issues that are being raised in the technical community.

Olof Nordling: Hi, this is Olof.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Olof Nordling: I'm saying something like this that, well, of course more key strokes, more errors are possible. But the relative importance of a single error when you have just one key stroke, of course it's much higher. So, well, actually it's (kept) both ways. If it's quantity of the mistake that matters or whether it's the quality of the mistake, so I agree with you. I mean, (Chuck Warren's) comment needs to be tempered by something of that nature.

(Doug): Is - this is (Doug). May I suggest the comment is noted and will be taken into consideration in the next version or in the discussion by the working group?

You take it seriously but say you don't address what is his concern or his statement in this report already. There's more procedure of process answer.

Edmon Chung: I think that works well.

Bart Boswinkel: (Okay done). Issue five. Any more - sorry - any more on issue four? Go to issue five. Issue five is whether additional criteria should be introduced to qualify a single (case) IDN TLD as an IDN ccTLD or an IDN GTLD. Comments. One is from (Yosef Yee). Generic geographic terms like dot country, dot state, dot street and they are equivalent in every other language which in combination would string a second level- second level may be mistaken as (CLD) some authorities of countries.

This may need extra attention for the policy. (APTLD) - single character IDN TLD should not be exempted from the current restrictions on similarity to geographic names and confused ability with the ASCII character sets, single character IDN TLDs that represents a geographic name, for example, and this is the Chinese example, in China should be subjected to additional restrictions as imposed by the (graph) application guidebook for geographical names. The Chinese domain name consortium is of the opinion that single character IDN TLDs should pose no confusing (or) meaningful similarity to IDN ccTLDs.

As a draft consideration of comments, the comments are noted, that the common distinction between IDN ccTLDs and IDN GLCDs should be maintained and it is assumed that under the current rules and procedures the current criteria a sufficient to qualify as string.

As noted above, it is assumed the rules and procedures for application of new GTLDs and IDN ccTLDs will apply fully to single character IDNs. As noted in the comment to date (that full) - as noted in the comment to date (that full), this includes restrictions for the applications of country and territory names under the new GTLD process.

That is what I have on issue five. Do you want me to repeat something or explain?

Edmon Chung: Bart, I guess based on the discussion we just had a little bit earlier, we should probably adjust it a little bit and saying, not just the (dat) four but point it out to the ongoing discussion on the topic.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Yes, so include that. And say because of the ongoing discussions on the topic it - this group will not touch upon it. There's no additional need. Okay.

Then issue number six, whether special policies are required to address usability of single character IDN TLDs given existing application environments. There is one comment from (Yosef Yee). It is suggested to initiate more outreach to application communities to bring more awareness and improve TLD/domain validation or related concerns in order to promote acceptability of IDNs and consideration of the comment is noted as indicated in the public announcement soliciting public comments and input to the universal acceptance of IDN TLD is considered one of the main topic areas of the (jake).

The suggestion made will be considered in the context of the working group discussions of that topic area. That was all.

Edmon Chung: Okay thank you Bart. I guess the last couple are fairly straightforward especially with - we did already discuss about the geographic ones. I have a comment in general. Bart, I'm just wondering would you categorize the comments being supportive of having single character IDN TLDs or are there any comments you feel are - would be sort of against opening it up.

Bart Boswinkel: I think with the exception of - but that's a special case of the - of - in general I would say that they're supportive.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: The only exception...

Edmon Chung: Is the queens (then) one?

Bart Boswinkel: The queens (then round). But that's not focused so much on the single character as (hopefully) not the DNS.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: And say this is the underlying debate on created - creation of new GTL- particularly new GTDs.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Do you...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: So this is...

Edmon Chung: Do you...

Bart Boswinkel: (Go ahead).

Edmon Chung: I guess do you feel that it's appropriate to add something of that sort in the report or I guess in your report on the comments, just summarizing what the general community feeling is or the direction we should take? Or you think it's not (fair)?

(Doug): Sorry to interrupt but I think the (APP) in the comment was also not supportive of (single) character. And they were saying that it wouldn't increase confusion or the confusion of other things.

Bart Boswinkel: I have the (ITL) the (APP TLDs) comment there so...

(Doug): It's 2-1.

Bart Boswinkel: So he's supportive but again we could ask (Jane).

Edmon Chung: Yes, perhaps we could ask for clarification on that. I have the impression that they were supportive as well but that's a good point. We'll ask for clarification before we make that assumption and try to summarize that.

Bart Boswinkel: Let me check with the (AP TLD) comments.

Man: So Bart you will take that and...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: (Unintelligible). Sorry Edmon. Yes, I've just looked up the comments and it's included in this one already that this is the (AP TLD) comment. We believe that single character IDNs is important to various stakeholders within the Asia Pacific region, for example, the Chinese, Japanese and Korean (inter) communities.

(JD clare) or one (say DK) character has the same expressive power, the same (liguo) meaning distinctiveness as ASCII strings with three letters. These stakeholders will be significantly modularized if single character IDNs would not be available.

So I think turning it around, they strongly support the creation of single letter IDNs or single character IDNs.

Man: Actually I would sort of look at it at the level, so there is a level where we (talk) at more senior level LDH characters and that sort of scope for this - at this time. And then we're looking at single characters which are for alphabetic

kind of scripts. And for that I think if the TLD's comment in the context of Arabic in issue - under issue number one, again, needs more clarification but, you know, the initial reading it sort of says that, you know, it doesn't look - from the initial reading it doesn't look positive unless like this is out of context and we are - we're reading it out of context.

And I could (believe) that in the case of (CJKs) they are ready clearly for single characters. So we could sort of keep all the three levels as distinct rather than if you lump them together then, you know, one argument cannot report it to the other script.

So if you take a script and - alphabetic scripts are quite different from each others in this context.

Edmon Chung: I think that's a fair statement. Would it make sense or would it work perhaps in sort of summarizing that there is, you know, we - generally the community is supportive of ID- single character IDN ccTLDs especially for non-alphabetic scripts. You know, are some concerns being raised for alphabetic scripts or something like that towards that direction? Does that work for you?

Man: Actually it may be a good idea if you were to go back to (AP TLD) to ask whether they - there comment for (alphabet) does it sort of (put forth) or just caution us and support both single character? Or are they not supporting the single character? So just clarification and then you can come back and perhaps (decode it). Unless if (DLD) commented in favor of single character then (it would work). It's over the (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon? Edmon, this is Bart. May I say if you re- would rephrase it in terms of, say, based on the comments we see that the community at large is supportive of the work of the (jake) and wants it to continue but there needs - there also raise some issues that still need to be addressed.

Edmon Chung: That seems a little bit vague.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I know it's vague but...

Edmon Chung: I know. I'd like to have, you know, if there is an identified issue, you know, between non-alphabetic and alphabetic, then it's actually a good thing to state it. And if there is - from what I see at least I don't think it's so out of context that we say that there is, you know, support from the community to actually have single character IN TLDs.

So barring that comment from (AC) TLD and I think, you know, if we categorize it into alphabetic and non-alphabetic we would definitely be able to address that so we have a more clear direction forward. And also I guess the question is perhaps we can ask a little bit of clarification from (Jane) about that issue and see, you know, how we could express this. Does that make sense?

Bart Boswinkel: I could ask to do that because if possible I want to have, say, I'll include, say, the comments (that) were made about the te- the comments text today as - and preferably once you probably should as soon as possible on the Web site and then the working group can continue its work based on say the initial report.

Edmon Chung: Sure. I understand that and fully support that. So I guess I'm comfortable leaving it with you. If you feel more comfortable with a more generic statement then feel free to do that but if we have a little bit more ammunition then I think, you know, it's good to let say the community know that, you know, that is the assumption we're going ahead of - with - and that's sort of the feeling that we're getting from the community.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. I'll include something. I'll send it around and - to the chair so you feel comfortable and then we publish it possibly by the end of this week.

Edmon Chung: Cool.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So we're almost the top of the hour. So I have a - one particular question - well two particular questions and one's just generally asked and so as people can respond. One which is from the public comments that we've heard, do we think there are any additional issues that we need to take on?

We have identified the six - at least to me it seems like - it seems to have been pretty okay so is there even with the general part, there - I don't seen any new issues being brought up.

The other one is how you feel we could move forward. I think then - to me it seems like the next step is the addressing of the final report and the final report would make actual recommendations on how to deal with those six. There were some sort of rudimentary few options on different issues on how we would tackle it but in - I guess in the final report we will have one set of recommendations in a way that that staff can actually implement.

So do people think there are - from - you know, any discussion or now you've thought out any additional issues that we need to take on and the second one is the way forward with the final report. Does that work for you guys?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: For - so - for - sorry. I think - but this is just a suggestion - I think it would be helpful if say whether it's an issue or not but at least in the final report, they - the discussion this working group is having on the links with the continued

works, say, on the DAG and the one Avri mentioned and maybe other working groups would be captured.

So if something changes there, then it means it may need to be revisited because it's a kind of - we build a - the working group is building its recommendations on a very weak fundament- funda- or a weak basis which is shifting over time.

And maybe that should be captured as an issue or as a general clause or condition.

Edmon Chung: That's a good point. I don't - I'm not sure whether it would be classified as an issue. We should probably make it more clear either in the background or some sort of overarching sort of statement for the final report, you know, as they - the sort of set of assumptions that we have for the whole discussion.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, because if one of these assumptions changes, the whole structure might change.

Edmon Chung: Sure. And we shou- we could probably - that's a good point and if there comes a point where certain sort of "solutions" are dependent on those then we should specifically identify them and list them out so that I guess in the future when staff is implementing it and something changed substantially in one particular item then we know that whole item needs to be rediscussed.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Okay.

Edmon Chung: Is Avri still there are you already dropped off for the other call? I guess she already dropped off for the other call.

Woman: Edmon, Avri's already on the other call.

Edmon Chung: Okay so anything else? People think there are issues that we've missed or - and does it - does the sort of way forward make sense? All right, well, we'll take silence as that it makes sense and...

Bart Boswinkel: I have just one more point and I'm not sure but this is more for the call in dealing with the variant management issue. Is this working group aware of the board resolution from this weekend on variant management?

Edmon Chung: I am and that's also the reason why I wanted to, you know, leave it for another week before we come back to that particular topic.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: I think I would like people - thank you for bringing it up. Please do, for those who don't have - don't - haven't seen it yet, please take a look at - perhaps, Bart, if you...

Bart Boswinkel: I will send it to all...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: If you can just send it around - yes, then everybody can take a look at it. And I guess because of the (phoning) of the meetings, next week we'll have another meeting to catch up the schedule. And for next week I'd like to spend I guess half of the time on this particular - I'm thinking half of time on the variant issue and perhaps right around that time to decide one of two things - whether we (serially) do this or we start splitting up into subgroups to deal with the two different issues. That's for next week.

Man: Okay.

Edmon Chung: All right. So thank you everyone for taking your time and joining the call. And I think we can wrap it here and (I think close).

Man: Okay. Thank you.

Man: Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Bye.

END