

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 04 January 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 04 January 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-ijg-20110104-en.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung, (RySG), Co-Chair
Rafik Dammak, (NCSG)
Avri Doria, (NCSG)
Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Jian Zhang, APTLD, Co-Chair
Wei Zhao, .cn (Observer)

ICANN Staff

Olof Nordling
Gabi Schitteck
Bart Boswinkel

Apologies:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo

Kristina Nordstrom: Hello everyone and welcome to this JIG call on the 4th of January. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Edmon Chun, Avri Doria, Wei Zhao, Jian Zhang and from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Olof Nordling and Kristina Nordstrom and we have apologies from Fahd Batayneh.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Kristina, Edmon and so I'll - I sent around the brief agenda item on for today, basically to take a look at the public comments, what we received so far and there's some next steps.

The second item was to go through the documents that Avri sent along and what we need to do about it and then third item was to continue discussion on IDM variants based on the latest document that we had.

I just mentioned earlier before we started the recording that we have just an administrative thing that we wanted to talk about I guess which is the working group wiki, we realized that currently it's behind login.

I was wondering, I'd like to ask this as a - I think it will be a short discussion at the very beginning if people are okay with it and to sort of ask staff if that could be done and also others in the group, whether you feel strongly one way or other whether it should be open or not.

So I don't know whether Bart or Kristina can answer the question, whether.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I ask a question?

Edmon Chung: Please.

Avri Doria: It being behind, is that something you want to talk about now or put on to the schedule for later?

Edmon Chung: No, I think we can talk about it now.

Avri Doria: Okay. It's behind the login but those that want to add stuff to it but anybody can see it or it's behind a login for anybody to even see?

Edmon Chung: I think it's the latter at this point. Wendy is that the experience?

Wei Zhao: Hi, yeah, I'm totally fine with the login but after login the message is that the user is not authorized or matter is the report is authorized or open to anybody after people log in will be fine I think.

Edmon Chung: Well right now it's not even viewable if you're not logged in right?

Woman: No, it's not if you're not logged in.

Wei Zhao: If I login I still can't view the document because I'm not authorized.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, that's...

Man: Going back to Avri's question, Avri I think it's if you're not a member of this working group because Wendy was added later on so that needs to be included. If you're not a member of the working group you can't see what's on the wiki.

Avri Doria: Okay, this is Avri again, that doesn't seem right to me. I totally agree that we need the login to change stuff although anybody - well actually is this the new congruence or...

Bart Boswinkel: No it's not congruence yet.

Avri Doria: It's not the - okay, so on the old you know sometimes you have this intermediate space that allows anyone to mail to it and of course you have to call the mail but certainly for editing things on the wiki it makes sense to log in.

But I don't think this group is doing anything secret that we need to have a wiki that's not world viewable.

Edmon Chung: Right. So I guess what do other people think? I agree with Avri, I think it's probably best to keep the wiki, the viewable - at least viewable for the wiki and for edit we can you know require login and authorization, that's I think is a reasonable approach.

I wonder if anyone have any problems with it?

Jian Zhang: I'm okay with it, I agree with you.

Edmon Chung: So, thank you Jian, Bart, Kristina how do we...

Bart Boswinkel: Let us figure it out and we'll get back to you and if it's very easy we'll open it up so it's viewable for the external world.

Avri Doria: On the previous wiki it's one button.

Edmon Chung: Sorry Avri?

Avri Doria: I'm saying on the ST - the social time or whatever it's called wiki it's trivially easy to change it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, I think even if it's difficult to change it may take some more time but in principle it should be viewable for the outside world.

Avri Doria: It's just one button, just one set up button.

Edmon Chung: Okay cool, I think we have an approach there, so I guess Bart you will help us make something and just let us know I guess on the list say that it's been open.

Bart Boswinkel: And when it's completed so it's an action item for Kristina and me.

Edmon Chung: Cool, thanks. All right, so back to the original agenda, the first one is to take a look at the public comments for the single character IDN TLD and then consider some next steps.

Looking at the comments I think we only received one, I was expecting maybe two or three more.

Was wondering if you received any - your requests for late submissions.

Bart Boswinkel: No, I haven't and the only exception was the ALAC statement but that was submitted in time and for the rest I didn't receive any.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Because I actually saw a few around, I wonder what happened to them. I guess my question on - in terms of process is whether we could you know - how we could incorporate them.

I'd like to follow up with them and try to incorporate them but I was wondering what - you know how we should go about this. Should I just follow up and I guess include Bart, yourself and Luke and get a sense of whether they are ready you know to submit and why there was a bit of silence?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, say it would be - say the question was, the first question is, is whether you still have the time to include them.

Say we had the date until the 30th of December because especially I think you as a chair wanted to have something to the GNSO council in two or three week's time.

Now so we can formally extend it and I think that will be the - knowing that some will come as say we can formally extend it say for another week knowing there are just one or two.

I think that's taking the high ground without pursuing individuals and then you can pre-warn them, say we're going to extend it, because if it's only two or three comments and it's more support so you don't need to redo the whole document itself, why not?

It provides more support or more criticism, doesn't matter but so yeah, we need to work our way through to get it to the council when you wanted to submit it.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I think I'll try and make a suggestion here to say that I think it's probably good to you know extend it for weeks, maybe to January 11 so a week from now and I'll guess I'll proactively myself and Jian will proactively reach out to the few that had actually submitted comments previously and had indicated.

In fact I've seen drafts around so I'm pretty sure that there were interested submit comments. So - but at the same time I think time-wise we can - there seems to be interesting suggestion from the one comment received from ALAC which I'd like to consider today and then we could decided to consider the other comments by our next meeting and have something you know I guess have something drafted in response to them by the end of the month so that we can provide some input into the GNSO as soon as possible as we sort of finalize the - well as staff finalizes the new gTLD process.

Does anyone have any problems or questions about extending it for a week and for myself and Jian as the chairs to sort of proactively reach out to the few parties that have indicated interest from the (unintelligible)?

Hearing none I guess, I wonder Bart if you can...

Bart Boswinkel: yeah, I will send a note and then make a...

Edmon Chung: Yeah, once you make that and then I'll use that note to reach out to the few constituencies that have seen some activity on this.

Bart Boswinkel: Yep, so it depends on when it will be posted, hopefully today if not tomorrow, but a week from posting. So if it's the 5th then we extend it to the 12th, and if it's today we extend it to the 11th.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, that's fine with me and I think once you send it out I'll use that to - okay. So I guess I'd like to spend a little bit of time talking about the substance of the comments from ALAC actually.

But I wanted to ask if - did Olof join the call?

Olof Nordling: Yeah, I'm here.

Edmon Chung: Hi Olof. I think last time we asked the question about you know the chances of this being in the new gTLD process and you know what might be the situation, I wonder if there was any...

Olof Nordling: Well as promised I forwarded that question to Kurt and to Tina and I haven't received any response on it and whether that's an easy answer to give is of course I think it's an easy question to raise, very difficult question.

I did look at the content myself and for one, I mean one clear - one advice that I saw was to have a check in during initial level reaction of risks or type of squatting and that's - I would say that implementable, it is site implementable of course.

One could try to do it, but it's wholly at odds with the structure of the application process as it is now, it's not at all incorporated and it would be very difficult to incorporate for the first round.

So well just to give you a little bit of sample of what kind of response you can get, I mean it would call for detailed analysis of each of the parts I would say but this was just one example where I know that I would be on the receiving end of that kind of suggestion.

And my advice on that would be not for a first round.

Edmon Chung: So on that particular response you're talking specifically about the string evaluation where it goes through an algorithm and it gets checked for visual similarity, is that the...

Olof Nordling: Some similarities, that's exactly what's happening in the initial evaluation. So - and we're sort of key squatting protection is not at all included in that.

Edmon Chung: Right, and part of the suggestion right now is to take that into consideration and that seems to be you know at least one potential area that could immediately raise a flag and might need to take this further.

Olof Nordling: I mean I would say that knowing that the question would come to me on that particular matter, I could say that well that's not anything that you could draft onto the process as it's conceived right now.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I understand that and in fact in sort of in response - I shouldn't say in response to that, and that's the reason why I want this to lead into our discussion and the suggestion or the comment from ALAC which seems to provide a suggestion that might help.

In our discussion we identified issues, especially with alphabetic script, single character IDN TLDs where specially because it's a single key stroke and the possibility of a sort of a false positive if you will because of an intended or unintended typo situation.

That is continuing and continues to be an issue raised by the - especially (unintelligible) community for alphabetic scripts. For non-alphabetic scripts I would like to you know highlight that, that's not an issue.

What the - not sure if everyone looked at the ALAC statement but what the ALAC statement suggests is that a IDN evaluation panel be put together and conceptually that would fall into extended evaluation, I mean IDN evaluation panel would be called upon at an extended valuation.

And I think what is interesting to me to see is that this seems to be a pretty good suggestion and that perhaps this could be used to address the issue where - for alphabetic single character IDN TLDs that it be pushed into an extended evaluation.

And the IDN evaluation panel could be utilized for the - for such evaluations and the suggestion actually also covers the ccTLD side where this type of consideration could be potentially taken into consideration.

So I wonder what others think you know in terms of I guess two things, one is you know the concept of proposing an IDN evaluation panel and you know whether this could help us solve the issue.

Olof Nordling: Olof here again, first of all what I mentioned before was the proximity of the keyboard kind of type of squatting which is - and this is largely different from it.

Here you have - well if let me ask you the question back, I mean if there would be by the panel, because there is a panel, string similarity panel is there to identify strings and to make education of such during initial evaluation.

If there's a finding that there is a striking similarity, confusing similarity between well two strings alphabetically for example, would - are you proposing then that there would be another panel that could - would enter into some kind of review of that during the - an extended evaluation?

Edmon Chung: At this point Olof, no, I don't think that's what I'm suggesting. I do see the context of the suggestion in the ALAC statement. I guess the answer to your question is no, I don't - I think at least for the gTLD process I am pretty - I understand that you know if it's considered a visually similar then it's out.

The discussion of whether that - you know it should go somewhere else I think it's not within what we're discussing here and so no, that's why I sort of suggested as an extended evaluation, the question here that we're considering is that if it does pass through the visual similarity, we might still want to consider whether you know a keyboard layout issue that was - the crux of the response from the technical community could be addressed by the evaluation panel.

So it's - I'm not sure whether I'm making sense for most people but I think Olof you understand what I'm saying. So no, I'm not trying to suggest that particular discussion about string similarity and then further evaluation if found to be similar to take place.

But the reverse, if it's not found to be similar then still if it's an alphabetic single character IDN TLD it should still need a further evaluation on whether other types of confusing statements.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, for example I mean there are - there is always the check whether it would be visually similar to two letter ASCII combination.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Olof Nordling: Which is a non-starter.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, and I don't think we're trying to solve that. I understand that the ALAC statement tries to suggest a resolution for the - you know for the Bulgarian situation.

I don't think that's what we're talking about right now. I guess what I'm talking about in this group is in the case where if it passes through you know with - if it's okay with the string similarity so there is no - I mean visual similarity for alphabetic single character IDN TLDs we should still pass it through an

extended evaluation process so that the issue of the keyboard layout which was brought up could be dealt with there.

Does that make sense?

Jian Zhang: This is Jian, I joined a bit late. I'm kind of concerned that this group is discussing yet another evaluation panel with regard to this issue. I'm wondering if there isn't any way of incorporating this issue with the evaluation string, evaluation panel that was incorporated in the new gTLD process.

Or are you kind of accepting the idea that ideas need to be definitely - especially single character IDN?

Edmon Chung: I think that's a good question Jian, just to give you a context, I don't know when you joined but this discussion was sparked by the comment from ALAC that we received in the comment period.

Jian Zhang: Yes, I am looking at that document. I mean - go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Sorry, please go ahead first.

Jian Zhang: Oh, I mean I am looking at this document but I mean I'm just wondering that this is - I'm thinking this is one comment, this is not a comment that - I mean I'm just worried about how much weight we need to give to this suggestion or whatever.

I mean I don't know, I mean if this is a statement, a joint statement by the general community, not just ALAC but with the ITF and all the other groups then maybe we should give it much more weight.

But this is from one of the constituencies and I'm wondering how I mean - how heavily we should weight this in.

Edmon Chung: Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think that it being from one of the advisory committees I think it's something that we have to give serious regard.

That doesn't mean we have to do what they say or that but it's not just like a single person comment, it's a whole advisory committee's comment.

So I think we have to treat it with a certain amount of weight there. I agree with you in that you know I hate seeing yet another you know review panel and especially since you know we've seen that review panels have this cloak of secrecy about them that it makes them inaccessible to people.

So that makes it especially horrible that we would add another review panel. So I don't know that we need to necessarily follow the solution but certainly the problem is more that we have to figure out a way to solve or at least...

Jian Zhang: Yes, I completely agree with Avri, I'm not suggesting that this is just one person or one small group's comment. I know that the - and I've had a lot of weight and this is a joint statement.

I mean this is a statement that was agreed on and voted on so I know that I mean we should give it some consideration but I'm getting the sense - feeling that we're making a bit too willing to just completely accept.

Am I making myself clear?

Edmon Chung: Yep, I'm very clear about that. I guess we're bringing this up for discussion, I think your suggestion about string evaluation panel is it's interesting too, I guess as Olof or as - think about you know maybe answer this is whether you know Olof you mentioned that the string is (unintelligible) to currently, as it's currently sort of chartered.

It's looking at the visible similarity and the initial review. Is there possibility of tasking it for evaluation of you know what we mentioned and then extended evaluation process such that it's easier to be integrated into the new gTLD process.

What are your thoughts on that?

Olof Nordling: My thoughts would be what you can imagine is in order to perhaps tweak the script for the string similarity panel in some way.

For the initial evaluation, I see the scope for extended evaluation only takes place if the applicant so requests.

And who would request what in that case? I mean I can see it if you have sort of an - if you're stopped for a reason, we can't pass through with that particular string for that reason because of well visual similarity with for example two letter ASCII.

Or something like that, but just continue seeing how the extended evaluation would come about in the case that you describe, it sounds more like that would be in the action process, a string similarity would be action which is (unintelligible) case.

Edmon Chung: That's a very good point. I thought of it the other way around, you pointed out a very good point. I guess in that case I guess I'd like to ask the group whether you know perhaps the other way to go about this is that if we I guess force.

Because I think the idea is that we want to force all alphabetic script single character IDN TLD applications to go through a further check, at least that's the consistent comment from the technical community that I've gotten.

And if that is the case then our suggestion would be to ask the initial evaluation to fail anything that has that - in an alphabetic script for single character IDN TLD.

And request it - and you know there upon the application would need to request for an extended evaluation.

Would that be - would that make more sense, Olof or others?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. I'm looking at the suggestion and this is - let me first ask if you look at the suggestion I think based on the interpretation and discussion right now we take it a long way from the IDN evaluation panel suggestion from ALAC.

That's one, whether say the issue itself needs to be addressed and how it needs to be addressed is something for further discussion in my view by the working group.

But say the solution but ALAC of introducing another IDN evaluation panel to take care of it for the new gTLD process is probably a bridge too far.

So if you look at the suggestion of ALAC regarding the IDN ccTLDs, first of all I note two things, first of all it's a bit out of scope because it also deals with two character IDNs.

But that's a very formal response, the second bit of it, especially say referring to for instance the Bulgarian, it is already taken care of precisely for this type of confusion in the technical evaluation committee or step.

So that's the outside panel, so again this is adding a layer on top of already existing evaluation.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Did somebody want to - sorry.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe what is a suggestion is that we need to do it anyway if we're going to extend the comment period is that Olof and I prepare say staff interpretation of this and send it around to the group for further discussion.

Because I don't - unless you disagree with my observation that we're moving away from their interpretation or from their suggestion.

Edmon Chung: I guess I agree and well I was trying to attack it and - or for two issues, the first one was my earlier - our earlier question to Olof in our last meeting about you know what's staff's response and on the suggestion.

And I admit that I have sort of confused in a way or try to integrate it into the ALAC suggestion here.

So yes, I think Bart what you're suggesting does make sense but if somebody wants to speak?

Avri Doria: Yeah, so this just - this is Avri, I think that as I say I think we are bound on a course, we are taking it seriously, not that that's not a problem. I don't know that we need to respond to this very quickly and I think it's a totally reasonable response to say yes, there's an issue there but you know the working group did not agree with the proposal, but you know suggested solving it in this way.

But the second issue that got compounded in it is you know the review of the contentious decision by technical committees and so on which of course wasn't one of the things that was being asked comment for as far as I know in this particular document.

And it was just something that you know because that is a sort of critical sore issue at the moment, you know got worse today.

But you know so that one is basically out of scope for this group as much as I agree with you Edmon that they're not being an appeals mechanism to pronouncements from on high about something not being acceptable or not - is a problem.

It's not a problem that we need to deal with at this point because it's out of scope for this particular response whereas the first part of their issue in terms of how do these things get dealt with and is there actually a problem here that is not being dealt with.

Which I'm not quite sure I understand yet and I guess it's me being dumb early in the morning but I'm not sure where - what exactly the problem that's being solved is in the first part.

In other words because no one's saying that the single character IDN is prohibited, you know therefore - so I'm confused about what they see is the problem.

But the second to last sentence of the problem statement does seem out of scope as much as I agree with their sentiment that something bad is going on that needs to be fixed.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Avri. Just to I guess come back, I first of all apologize for making these convoluted discussions, but just to give a - take a step back, the discussion started when I was asking Olof whether our - this group's suggestion in our final report seems implementable and Olof pointed out one point which is that in our recommendations we're asking - at this point we're asking for the initial evaluation, a string evaluation panel to take into consideration keyboard layout typos, related typos for single character IDN TLDs that are in an alphabetic script.

That was one thing that Olof singled out in saying that this might present an issue for it being integrated into the existing you know concept of the initial evaluation which only takes into consideration visual similarity.

So that was the...

Avri Doria: Is the keyboard layout, this is Avri again, is that sort of a form? First of all I've got two more questions, again being dumb again, one is, isn't that a form of visual? Keyboard layout is - I'm looking at it or I guess it's I'm not looking at it and I type wrong.

But is it when you're talking keyboard it's certainly not oral, it's a visual representation between the symbol and what I see on a keyboard.

So that I'm not sure why that would necessarily be excluded, so perhaps it expands the expertise required in that panel. You know understanding of layouts, but the other thing is isn't there a way when all strings are announced at least on G side and I suppose that being the case that doesn't happen on C side at the moment in the backtrack.

But when strings are proposed, people look at them and someone can raise the flag for the visual evaluation committee and I know I used the wrong name but I'm having trouble with the right name at the moment to sort of say hey folks, there's a keyboard issue here that we should pay attention to.

So that comment does happen before the initial evaluation or not, I forget whether there's a comment period where all strings have been you know published and in the G and everybody can look at them and raise flags.

But also I don't see why that isn't a visual issue.

Edmon Chung: That's an interesting observation. I guess at least for the first part, for the later part that you mentioned, I do believe that there's - once the applications

come in it's - you know the strings are being published before the initial evaluation takes place.

And certainly the comments could alert the issue to the panel. That seems to be you know maybe one of the ways to address the issue or to explain what we mean by that we have taken this into consideration and this is how we see it happen.

And I guess the earlier question was whether this could be considered visual similarity.

Avri Doria: I don't touch type. Well I sort of touch type but I look at the keyboard.

Edmon Chung: I'm - yes, please.

Jian Zhang: I mean I generally agree with what Avri said but I think we should go back to what Bart says, has suggested and discuss whether it would be necessary for us to - I mean how seriously we should consider this and so we should have Bart or someone else come up with an outline or - of the issues.

And then how we deal with it I think is - and is the next step and I think we're just jumping into the next step before the first one.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I think that's a good observation. So I guess perhaps really the next step in this is well we are extending the comment period and Bart your suggestion that staff provide some input along those lines I think would be a good one.

Once we have that clarified then I guess the group can use that as the basis for considering the solutions. I guess I apologize for jumping the gun in a way and trying to jump and put possible solutions.

But I still think it's a constructive discussion that we just had, I think we explored a few possibilities. Bart does that - I guess Bart and Olof, does that make sense?

I guess we'd like to get a - Bart I guess you suggested the - I'm not sure whether you were suggesting that some comments come from the staff but at least it's some sort of summary from the staff describing the issue.

Bart Boswinkel: I was just focusing on say the at large comment itself and what is suggested there. And say what you say I think we need to be careful because then you run into implementation, maybe that's an implementation question.

Whether the suggestions and the recommendations in the draft final report should be checked on implementation because that's another I would say another exercise.

And this goes back to the question you raised or Olof raised with Konstantinos which I think we're talking about two separate things.

Say the first one is evaluating the comments from ALAC and the other statements as we always do with public comments received and send that to the working group and see whether you agree with the analysis of the comments and the implementation of possible changes to the final report.

So that's one type of evaluation review of the comments. A second one is - and that's linked in the discussion as well is on the implementation on the possibilities of implementation, of some of the recommendations and the impact.

For instance the one on say the final report the working group noted the possible confusion with single key strokes and now is the question whether is the new keystroke, is that a separate type of confusion or is it something that as we said visual confusion?

That's another type of analysis I would say. Maybe Olof, you agree or disagree?

Olof Nordling: I both agree. No, no, actually it's - they are two different well pieces really. Yeah, and I can say - tell Avri right away that the kind of visual confusion that people confuse well when it's proximity on the keyboard, for example having happened to strike an S instead of a D on a QWERTY keyboard just because they're close to each other, that kind of check would not be considered visual confusability.

Just to make that abundantly clear, it's not covered at all for the time being, and besides it's not - well it's much more generic aspect than IDN. I mean this is a generic question really.

Edmon Chung: Okay, Olof I guess I wonder if you can maybe put in a short note to this list about you know highlighting the item that you brought up earlier.

So we can you know take it on and consider it.

Olof Nordling: Sure, yes.

Edmon Chung: That's great.

Bart Boswinkel: And I'll do say the staff comments on the paper as I did before, just as easy.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess that is as far as we felt we could go for single character item.

We'll extend the public comment period, we'll recapture the few groups that I've seen some draft comments on and see if they ran out of time and if so are interested in putting in comments.

And I guess when we - you know before we reconvene we should get a better - a more complete set of comments and then we would be about a week from the - when we close the comments finally, I wonder if that is enough time Bart for you to draft a sort of I guess summary from staff.

Bart Boswinkel: Depends on the volume of comments you anticipate, if they submit.

Edmon Chung: I'd anticipate about two (unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: Even if it's one but it's a 20 page document.

Edmon Chung: True, I understand. Doesn't look like it though, it's probably you know one or two.

Bart Boswinkel: Let's say this one is reasonably straight forward, if they're like this if it doesn't work I'll let you know.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess at least the hope or the target is to try to have that by our next meeting so that we can consider it and see how we move forward.

But regardless we should have a set of comments by our next meeting two weeks from now and we can enter into you know sort of finalizing our discussions here.

And at the same time Olof will have a - you know we'll all be able to take a look at the notes from Olof and consider what adjustments we might want to make in the final report.

All right, we're running a little bit short on time but I still would like to raise the issue, the two remaining - the two issues that I want to talk about today.

I guess we're running out of time considering the IDN variance today but again I point people to the draft that we had so far and we'll pick it up.

I'd like to suggest that because we have the next week open I'll start to put in some thoughts and start - try to start discussion on the mailing list on the IDN variance and how I see it sort of moving forward.

And try to take it there. Now for the ITS document which is the - what Avri brought up, I took a look at it, I apologize, I haven't responded on the list but took a look at it.

It seems like a - actually Avri you mentioned it in your note as well, something that points to further discussion in Beijing IETF, the Beijing IETF happened so I wonder if there's any updates there Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I actually had a talk with - I exchanged email with (Suzanne) and we're going to talk. As you know I wasn't in Beijing and so I'm going to talk - now she said that she's going to ask to be added to this list and start participating more or less actively.

So I think that's probably a good thing for that bit of liaison. And of course if she does that my role as a carrier of information back and forth when we actually have the offer of the document hanging in the group with us probably you know becomes less critical.

But I haven't had a chance to go further. I don't know, were you in Beijing? I think you were.

Edmon Chung: I was but I don't actually think it was discussed. A small group sort of split off and started discussing it but I didn't join that small breakout group.

Avri Doria: That happens so often. So I do plan to talk to (Suzanne), we're trying to find the time this week to chat and then I'll write that up. In fact but as I say, you know once you get more involved with the group that may also be a big help.

But basically at this point she has not - one of the things I said is that you know there's a possibility that the document had been updated. It hadn't been updated, the one I posted there is the latest.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so I guess it's great news that (Suzanne) is willing to participate here. I think you know I guess not only on the IETF issue as we finalize this one, she'd be an asset to the discussion.

So I wonder if it's okay that I guess myself and Jian actually invite her to join and get that process started unless staff has already received a request.

Bart Boswinkel: We haven't received a request yet.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so I guess Avri I'll - you know I'll proactively reach out and - okay. We're pretty much at the top of the hour. As much as I'd actually like to get started on the IDN variance topic I guess I'll have to defer that to the mailing list.

So as I mentioned, we were at 03, we had a briefing from Tina in our Cartagena meeting about what the approach staff is looking at in terms of the work plan.

So we will - and last week - last meeting we discussed approaching it in a pure policy implementation side of things such that the - not on the language policy but on policy for implementing IDN variance as ICANN will - and because the staff work plan will be focused on the language policies.

And split into five study teams, so I guess we'll continue on that point. But I wonder you know seeing Tina note that she's leaving ICANN I was wondering if Bart or Olof have any indication on you know where we now head, you know who would be the right person to ask in terms of what were briefed on.

And that staff would put out a proposal for the five studies to be done. How do we follow up with that and where do we go now with Tina leaving?

I don't know whether Olof or Bart has idea on that.

Olof Nordling: Olof here and it's too early to tell. I mean the executive team in Marina Del Rey is trying to sort that out, who will take on what.

So I don't - at least I don't know but okay as soon as we get wind of how the succession will be handled we'll notify you.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, that would be very useful I think if you could just notify the - just send a note to the mailing list so you know we know how to follow up.

And it will be great, whoever it is to perhaps join the discussion here if I guess we'll be asking for more questions as we go forward anyway.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Edmon Chung: So just before we close actually I - there's one more item just want to let everybody know and in our Cartagena meeting, face to face meeting a few of the board members joined.

I mentioned it last time as well, and they're quite interested in continuing a - you know looking to the discussions that we're having, especially as they consider this a very important topic on IDN variance.

And I think one of the things that we talked about then and also I've since followed up on it and what we'll likely try to do is to have sort of a session in our next face to face meetings or you know our next few face to face meetings, however long it will take to complete the work.

So that you know we can consider you know - we can share notes I guess with the board on the issue of IDN variants. So that's just an update for everyone.

And with that we're over the top of the hour and I wonder if there's anything people want to add? Jian?

Jian Zhang: Actually I'm just wondering what our next steps for the variance issue from our side?

Edmon Chung: from our side as mentioned last time I think you know it seems like the staff at least from what we hear from Tina, staff is focusing the efforts for the work plan on the five language groups and the language policy that should be taken into consideration.

A large part of our document that was drafted in September and October last year has to deal with the - you know how the process for which - you know something after the language policy is done.

There are some parts of it which include the language policy. And so in our last meeting we talked about looking to the document we have now, taking out the parts where it's specific to language policies and still keep the actual framework for handling situations where variance need to be considered in a sort of meta-policy if you will.

You know what - how ICANN would deal with this and that we can continue on because as the studies for the language specific - the policies are done you know we can - I think this group can contribute in the actual policy process.

Not policy process, the process part of the policy, you know how ICANN would deal with it. So I think you know if we focus on that we can refine the document and put out something that the community can consider.

So that's sort of the next step that I see in it, we've run out of time so you know I take some of the things that I wanted to go over on the mailing list and we can discuss there and take this item up in our next meeting.

Jian Zhang: Okay.

Edmon Chung: All right, so that I guess we will wrap this session, thank you everyone for joining and happy New Year everyone.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

END