

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 18 January 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 18 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-jig-20110118-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 – Chair RySG
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Avri Doria, NCSG
Rafik Dammak, NCSG

ICANN Staff

Olof Nordling
Bart Boswinkel

Kristina Nordstrom: Okay. Hello everyone and welcome to the JIG call today, the 18th of January. And on the line we have Fahd Batayneh, Avri Doria, Edmon Chung. And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel and Kristina Nordstrom. And we have no apologies. So over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And thank you everyone for joining the call. I circulated a brief agenda for today mainly focused on the single character IDN TLD final report that we - well the draft final report that we published in December and went out for public comment.

We extended the public comments last time and I guess it's great to see that we have a good number of comments coming back. I sent that link out. I

wonder if anyone wanted to bring any particular attention to any one of them before I guess I'd like to perhaps ask Bart to walk us through the summary analysis of the comments.

Hearing none, I guess perhaps we can start with Bart walking us through and then we'll head into a discussion of some of the items that Bart has. Does that work for you Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. That's fine with me Edmon. Okay. Let me run you quickly through what I've done say first the structure. I've included already a draft (XX) summary. So it's really a draft. But it's just to show will happen to the report if you include it.

The first is a real substantive section is introduction. It follows the same - the introduction itself follows the same structure as the overview of the interim - of the comments on the interim report. So first of all, when it was published; secondly, the main items in the draft final report so that's the Recommendations A through D.

Then a bit on say the - how I've included the comments. The second section is so it's more general comments. So they're not specifically aim at either one of the recommendations or one of the specifics in the report itself. And I've listed them according to the date received. So there is no preference; only the area for the comments.

And I've tried to summarize the comments and on especially the general aspects. So that's a summary of the comments itself. Then there is the draft consideration of comments so that just to say to initiate the discussion by the working group and based on say the previous - the conversation we had two weeks ago.

The third section that is specific comments under JIG implementation recommendations so that's Section 5 and 6 in the - oh sorry, so no sorry. This

is on the recommendations. So that's Section 4. And I've included a language in the draft final report and then the comments. And they all focus in my view on Recommendation D of the working groups.

So that was the case by case basis for analysis again listed in a big group but listed in principle according to the date received and included again the draft considerations of the comments. Then the four - and that should be Number 4 specific comments on aspects - other aspects of the report so that there was one comment on Section 1 on the introduction and background and there was one comment or two comments on or one comment on Section 6 suggested edits to the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook.

With regards to last one, I didn't feel very comfortable of inserting a comment there because I'm not too familiar with the new Applicant Guidebook. That's a bit out of my scope. So that's noted as there as also. This is with respect to the general structure of this document.

Are there any questions or remarks? No. Okay. Then I'll go into say the summary of the comments as it starts with Section 2. That's on Page 2 of the document.

Edmon, what do you want me to do? To read through the comments or...

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I think...

Bart Boswinkel: ...the way I summarized them or you want to focus on the consideration of the comments?

Edmon Chung: Right. I think it's probably best if you could just, you know, highlight the comment and then we can go into whether we need to respond and we can go that, you know, one by one.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Okay now, the general comment is - and that's - and I think that's what I wanted to include it. That most of - that all comments were in support of say the general idea of introducing single character IDN TLDs. And they support the efforts of the JIG and I think they also support the - say the amendments or the refinements of the JIG on the interim report. So that's more general - the more general statement.

There are however some general comments which are a bit out of scope of the recommendations itself but for within the JIG is - and that's specifically suggested by CNNIC and the Internet Society of China that say the introduction of IDN TLDs should be linked with a resolution of the variant management issues.

And so that's recorded as well. And if you then go into the draft consideration of the comments, again there is this general notes on the (all columns) through C support introduction of single character IDNs in general and you get (unintelligible) of the recommendations of the JIG.

And I - what I've included some commentated advice that single character IDN should be introduced after the IDN variant management issues included in the policy aspects has been resolved. And then in the view of the JIG, this recommendation is recommendable however not necessary as experienced with IDN ccTLD Fast Track has shown.

But that's - again that was - maybe I'm too bias what we got to IDN ccTLDs and then I could imagine that the JIG itself has another view. And the JIG also knows that some commentators refer to the introduction of single character IDNs at the second level and that's specifically ALAC in the view of the JIG. This is not a matter for the JIG but it is discussed and should be raised in other forum. So that's more a general note. So these are the - say the main aspects of the general comments.

Edmon Chung: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Are there any questions from you or do you want me to be very specific and read what is in the draft consideration so you can comment or you want to do it online so I can take them into - and prepare a next version?

Edmon Chung: No. I think I'd like to open up a little bit of a discussion here on a couple of aspects, one of which I think is a consistent message I guess from the - from CNNIC and ISC about the IDN variant management issue and the priority of which. That links a little bit to your statement about the IDN ccTLD Fast Track and the relationship there with the IDN variant management.

So I guess I'd like to open the question to group is first of all is on the IDN variant issue and how we would like to report on the comment that, you know, that they should be somewhat linked in terms of the IDN TLD launch or that sort of impacts obviously the single character IDN TLDs and the IDN variant management at the root.

My initial reaction though - I'll start with my initial reaction. I hope Avri you're a part or others could comment and provide your input as well. My initial reaction is perhaps we should - this is some - this is somewhat a mixture I guess of a implementation priority and policy in a way.

I wonder if this is something that we need - we should go back to GNSO and ccNSO and see if it is a, you know, an item of - that we should take on. Because on its own right now I think we can - I mean they are two distinct issues. And there's no particular reason aside from these comments that we would sort of bundle or I guess couple - bound them together at one go.

So my initial reaction is that we probably should go about both and obviously try to speed up on the IDN variant but really treat them as separate at this point. Product our report but at the same time ask whether we should work on how they would be related. I wonder if Avri your part have any...

Young-Eum Oee: This is Young-Eum Oee.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi Young-Eum Oee.

Edmon Chung: Hi Young-Eum Oee.

Young-Eum Oee: Hi.

Edmon Chung: Good to have you on.

Young-Eum Oee: Sorry as I am a bit late. I think that (CSD) single character issue and the variant issue are issues that we need to address before we can product a final report. And so I don't see why we can just let this statement stand as is and work with the variant management issue because I think it is - I mean (both) of the comments agree that the single character IDN should be introduced.

I mean they agree with the idea that the (single character) IDN should be introduced. And I don't agree with - just like to go out and say that although the IDN variant issue is not resolved we would just like to go ahead with the single character issue. I don't think that's been - that's the position that the JIG would like to take anyway.

And so since we are now going to talk about the variant issue - variant management issue, I mean as we go on, we might come out with some items that we might want to go back to our (unintelligible) talk a bit and then discuss. But as of now I don't think this issue would - should stop us from or I mean just stop us from the (single character) IDN issue. Because this is...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Young-Eum Oee: ...an issue that we are going to deal with anyway.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. I just want to clarify because you started off saying that we should do both issues, you know, have a (final) report together. I just want to make sure that I correct that. You actually are suggesting that there would be a final report for single character IDN TLDs separately and we can push that forward and get that wrapped up and then we, you know, have a separate report...

Young-Eum Oee: Oh.

Edmon Chung: ...for the IDN variant.

Young-Eum Oee: Oh. That - I'm sorry (unintelligible). I mean that is something that I have not had - that I did not have the final of (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess that is definitely one item we should discuss is whether, you know, we want to wrap up something and say we use this work and then we move on to IDN variant versus, you know, we need to sort of - for lack of a better word, suspend, you know, the single character until we complete the IDN variant discussion. Any thoughts from Avri or...

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Avri Doria: If I can comment.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I'm not sure I understand. I mean I think the issue of variant is important. I thought it was on the list of (unintelligible) going to work on. I'm not sure I understand why the issue is any different with single character than it is with any idea.

The issue obviously needs to be solved. And there needs to be at the very least a policy decision on how to handle it even if there isn't a fully technical decision and people decide they don't want to wait for a full technical decision before, you know, going ahead with IDN.

But I'm not sure I understand why there's a greater problem with single character than with IDN in general and therefore I don't see any reason why we would hold up IDN single character while we engage in the longer process of figuring out, you know, what to do about variant in general. But maybe I'm missing something. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: No. Thank you Avri. So I'm sort of though at a very similar mindset. You know, it seems to me that this is an issue that is - believe the IDN variant issue is certainly an issue that's larger in a way. When I mean larger, it's that it's not specific to single character IDN TLDs.

So, you know, I take that as similar, you know, similar in a way to other issues that we have sort of, you know, came across previously and said, you know, like there's been confusion issues, you know, other types of issues which are, you know, a set of larger issues for new gTLDs that is not specific to single character ones.

And I'm inclined to go that way. So but I wanted to add is that perhaps - that comes back to my question earlier which is whether we want to, you know, just produce these two reports, give it to staff and, you know, they would prioritize and create the implementation plan for it.

Or we want to go back and say, you know, whether these things need to be tied together and, you know, because one of the - I think one of the comments event suggested that IDN variants be in place before even IDN gTLDs, let alone single character IDN gTLDs be, you know, be ready to go.

So I guess my - currently the feeling is probably on single character IDN TLD. My inclination is to say, you know, we should continue to progress, forge ahead and these - and sort of group these issues under the ones which are, you know, have - should be - definitely should be discussed but not specific to single character IDN TLDs.

The only difference here is that it is relevant to the JIG. Previously we said, you know, this is not the forum. You know, it should be talked about elsewhere. But I think the position is probably just specific to single character IDN and we will be working on it and we hear the comment clear that we should prioritize that and move faster on our work on IDN variants for the TLD. Does that make sense?

Avri - perhaps Young-Eum Oee, you mentioned that you're not fully sure yet. So I'll, you know, that's sort of my inclination right now. I guess I'll send it to the list and, you know, have others weigh in as well and perhaps you can think about - consider it a little bit more and respond on the list as well.

Somebody was going to speak. Was it Avri or Young-Eum Oee or...

Avri Doria: Yeah. I was. I guess I was going to say that yeah, I agree with you. This is Avri. That yeah, I agree with you. We're obviously not saying that there are no IDNs until variants are solved. It seems like that one - I take the notion that's included that things resolved on a case by case basis is perhaps part of that case has to, you know - I do think we have to solve the variant as soon as possible at least at a basic policy level.

And I don't know why we shouldn't be offering a solution. We're not going to solve the technical problem here. And the technical problem's not going to get solve in the short timeframe. You know, what exists exists and what doesn't doesn't.

So we're going to have to make a policy determination or somebody is. And a joint group between ccNSO and GNSO doing that seems as good a place to make a policy recommendation as any no matter how many groups, you know, and the effort should be coordinated and I hope they will. But making a recommendation on that seems reasonable.

Two documents, one documents, I've never really cared. But, you know, if we're done with single character recommendations and we see nothing special about single character against multi character other than, you know, that would change the variant thing, I'd say go with what we've got.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you Avri. With that, I want to tangent off slightly further on this issue because I understand that (Tina) has moved on from ICANN and actually Olaf mentioned to me that - I apologize if I don't speak the name correctly. Is it (Nayla) or...

Bart Boswinkel: (Niala). She's from...

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: She's originally from Palestine.

Edmon Chung: Oh. So I understand (Niala) will be the IDN person...

Bart Boswinkel: No. She's managing the Fast Track process.

Edmon Chung: Ah, I see.

Bart Boswinkel: So to my knowledge - Olaf are you on the call? I thought I heard him. No, he's not. To my knowledge she's - because (Tina) was managing the Fast Track process. That was one of her jobs. And (Niala) she used to work in the - for IANA - for the IANA function. And she moved on to the IDN Fast Track process.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: And I don't know - I don't know if she will take on the other roles and responsibilities of (Tina) regarding the IDN. So I can find out.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Because I think it's...

Young-Eum Oee: Edmon. Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Sorry. Please go ahead.

Young-Eum Oee: I'm sorry. (It's) Young-Eum Oee. I just would like to say that one of the reasons why I - that I don't have a specific reason is that actually I do have a reason and I do have an opinion. But in issues like this when - and actually my opinion is in agreement with Avri and you and probably Bart because I think what he meant in saying that although this is recommendable, I think it's not necessary as this again Fast Track.

But with something like this I would like to go back to the (unintelligible) and just make sure that there are no problems there before we go - before we go on. I mean personally I would like to see it. I don't think there's any that should be - that should have a (unintelligible) - I mean that should be bogged down by the variant issue.

That's what - that's my personal opinion. But because I am (unintelligible) and so I'd just like to make sure that there is no - there are no problems with this issue in terms of the (ccNSO).

Edmon Chung: Okay. Yeah. That...

Young-Eum Oee: That's why I said...

Edmon Chung: ...would be very useful actually if you can bring it back and get a sense there as well. So I guess - and thank you for putting this in Young-Eum Oee. So Bart I think one of the things - the reason why I brought the issue of (Tina) and (Niala) up is because for the IDN variants issue when we're talking in Cartagena as well there was this pending staff study that needs to be done and was proposed at that time.

But since (Tina) has left, I was wondering, you know, who would be filling the void and when we would see that happening. You probably don't have the answer for it but...

Bart Boswinkel: No. If I would know it, I would tell you.

Edmon Chung: I understand. But I wonder if you could help...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Yeah, no it's very clear to say it's not just for this working group. It's for the IDN, PDP and other issues as well. The whole variant management issue is - yeah, put it this way, it is hovering over the market and it needs to land sometime.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess I gather that we are not sure yet. Again, I go back to what was discussed last few times is that we would forge ahead. I just - because we have been working on the single character ones and I would really want to complete this so that, you know, I guess to get something out the door.

Bart Boswinkel: It's - may I make a suggestion based on say your discussion I've already say - I've changed it a little bit say what's in the draft recommendations. Say in the view of the - so I'll spell out what I have written out. In the view of the JIG, this is recommendable; however in the view - however the JIG - however the variant management issue is not specific to single character IDN TLDs or the introduction of single character IDN TLDs. And yeah. Now the question is should be resolved in the broader context or something like that?

Edmon Chung: Well I think we probably shouldn't say it whether it's recommendable or not. I - we probably should say that it is to acknowledge that it is certainly an important issue. We probably should report that it doesn't seem to be specific to...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...the single character issue but it is definitely related to our work on IDN variants and we will definitely take that into consideration as we consider it - well, talk about the IDN variants.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. And the question is...

Edmon Chung: Is that (more clear)?

Bart Boswinkel: ...and maybe - and we'll report so to the Councils or to the respective Councils.

Edmon Chung: Right. Right. Right.

Bart Boswinkel: Because then you got it - say you got it more addressed procedurally and say - and it's more into the next phase. Because I think we, you know, we try to here work on something that is moving constantly say this whole variant management and to take a stand in this report already is probably - you get bogged down by it.

Edmon Chung: Right. Right. I totally agree. So I guess, yeah, that's the direction we (unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: So I'll change it...

Edmon Chung: In the - yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: On the item about the ccTLD Fast Track, I'm not sure what we're - I'm not sure whether we were - we...

Bart Boswinkel: I should just write it.

Edmon Chung: ...should include that.

Bart Boswinkel: It's...

Edmon Chung: I think - personally I think if - with what was just said, we probably...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...it doesn't have to ask that if people are okay with that. I'm specifically talking about Bart's suggestion to point towards the IDN ccTLD Fast Track that, you know, one can be introduced without IDN variant. I guess at this point I'm not comfortable trying to make that statement.

Bart Boswinkel: No. And it's in the logic where the group is heading now say this is an important issue or the acknowledgement this is an important issue. But it's not specific to single character IDN - introduction of IDN TLDs. That's another route. And then you don't need to refer to any other experiences at all in my view.

Edmon Chung: No. Yeah, I think...

Bart Boswinkel: So I've already deleted that part of the sentence.

Edmon Chung: Okay, cool. Does anyone have other concerns, questions on the general comments? If not I guess, Bart, why don't we move in - onto the specific comments and...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: We can have similar - you can, you know, just walk us through them...

Bart Boswinkel: I will.

Edmon Chung: Maybe we'll come to...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Some of these.

Bart Boswinkel: So the specific and - the specific comments are in fact to Section 1 is most comments are dealing with the requested - say with Recommendation D and the other ones around specific or sections in - other sections in the report.

So what I'll do is just for the ease of it I'll read Recommendation D so everybody's aware of what it says. Say recommend - the - makes the following recommendations regarding the implementation of singular-character IDN TLDs in the Recommendation D.

Requested single-character IDN TLD strings should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis in the new gTLD process depending on the script and language. Single-character IDN TLDs should be acceptable but must not be confusingly similar to single- or two-character ASCII TLDs. For alphabetic script single-character IDN TLDs other technical aspects of confusability may be taken into consideration such as likelihood of user script relevance to keyboard layouts. So that's Recommendation D.

And the way I've read all the comments, they all focus on Recommendation D. And they are a bit diverse I would say.

I think the - first of all is the acknowledgment or the support for the suggestion to do - to evaluate and analyze the IDN TLD strings on a case-by-case basis. So that's one. And so that's recorded.

But then you will see that, yeah, each of the commentators or most of them - most of the comments look at specific aspects of this analysis. So let me first go to one we discussed on the previous call. That was the statement of the ALAC.

ALAC believes that an IDN evaluation panel could be established to review applications for single-character or two-character IDNs. The IDN evaluation panel should be composed of relevant individual experts and community representative. The IDN evaluation panel could also assist with the review of contentious IDN ccTLDs. So that's one.

What I'll do now is note the consideration of this comment say with regard to the suggestion to an IDN evaluation panel to review applications for single-character or two-character IDNS. The working group notes that the discussions in these areas are taking place in other ICANN fora and have not been concluded to date and therefore should be raised there.

So the evaluation panel - introduction of the evaluation panel -- that's - maybe should be clarified -- is more or less part of say the whole new gTLD process and the Fast Track process. And because it's broader than just single-character and has - and the script - and the issues raised by ALAC are not limited to single-character IDNs I thought I might suggest that say the more procedural approach to refer them to the other fora to introduce such a panel. So that's one.

Are there any comments or questions on this aspect of the ALAC comment?

Edmon Chung: Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah?

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I actually interest to do - I think - generally I think, you know, the direction that - in terms of summary is quite accurate. But the - there's only one thing I sort of wanted to ask the group is this concept of IDN evaluation panel perhaps, you know, goes with the earlier discussion And perhaps - my question is whether we should go and ask the SOs, the CCNSO and the GNSO, whether this is yet another topic that this group should talk about.

So in terms of responding we take - we acknowledge it. It is definitely outside of the scope of this specific issue. But I guess we can probably go one step further and say, you know, to go back to the SOs and say is this something we need to look at.

Does that make sense to others? Hearing no objection I guess some...

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, it - this is Bart. I'll put on my hat, say what I know from the Fast Track and from the IDN ccTLD PDP.

I think evaluation panel and how the processes are structured is very much dependent on if you talk about the IDN ccTLD process or the new gTLD process. And trying to merge, say, either, say, I'm scared that you might end up with very, very high-level recommendations which only will hold up both processes.

And if, say, in preparation of this paper this morning I'll look back again at the charter I think this working group, say what is - what might be found, there are other topics which are already acknowledged as common work items which are more fruitful.

Edmon Chung: Bart, actually I fully agree with you. I'm just suggesting - in fact we probably - if we are going to communicate back to the councils we should, you know, say that and also including here.

But the only reason why I'm, you know, suggesting this is to - as they - as a response to ALAC. Because this is something coming from ALAC I'd like to be, you know, really not just seem like we're just missing it and it's being discussed some - elsewhere but actually take it and - to - back to the councils and say, you know, this is something that came up, this is what we think and you should really look into it.

That's sort of where my head was. Does that make sense to you?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I'm thinking how to say without - with - because if you would raise it but this is more the - say if you would raise it at the council level is - it's -- let me rephrase it -- it's a bit about management of expectations.

Edmon Chung: Good, good question. So...

Bart Boswinkel: If you...

Edmon Chung: Probably could...

Bart Boswinkel: Start raising...

Edmon Chung: Directed...

Bart Boswinkel: This issue with the councils it's...

Edmon Chung: No. I get your point.

Bart Boswinkel: You might...

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I think...

Bart Boswinkel: The expectation that say it will be addressed this way.

Edmon Chung: No. I get your point, Bart. So perhaps we could deal with it like we deal with the JAS issue last time and say, you know, they - well (unintelligible) will, you know, probably - we would sort of...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: And just let the (CCPDPE) know that, you know, we came across this. And perhaps, you know, we would initiate a note to - actually for gTLD it would be initiating a note to the staff...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Saying, you know, this is something that we got and which might be relevant.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: That...

Edmon Chung: All-included. Yeah. I think that would probably work.

Bart Boswinkel: That might work.

Edmon Chung: Does anyone else have thoughts or...

Avri Doria: No. It sounds great.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: So you're just saying you're good?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Okay. That's cool.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. So that was - say that was a specific aspect of ALAC. Then I have one from Hiro Hotta (HKIC) and APTLD, the - that the case-by-case analysis should also apply to the IDN ccTLD prospect process and as a result respective editorial revisions to the IDN ccTLD fast track implementation path should also be added in Section 5 of the final report. Please note, say, in order to understand it the case-by-case analysis is - say, is limited or the recommendation is limited to the new gTLD process.

So let me go into the suggested consideration of the comments. Say with regard to the comments that the case-by-case analysis should also - to the - apply to the IDN Fast Track process it is the understanding of the JIG that the suggested analysis is already implemented in the Fast Track process as part of the technical evaluation of the string. To the extent the Fast Track will include single characters - character IDNs the - this or the analysis should apply or remain to apply as well.

So this is on the - let me - IDN should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis in - depending on the script and language for confusability. Confusion is limited to single- or two-character ASCII TLDs.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: I think that approach is - makes a lot of sense.

Bart Boswinkel: What I'll do is I'll make sure and I'll check with (Niala) that is - that it is currently the case so there is no discrepancy in what the JIG is saying and what is actually happening. But as far as I know this evaluation is taking place.

Edmon Chung: Right. Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. The only thing I might add that you might want to, you know, quote chapter and verse or at least give reference to chapter and versus so - up where it's mentioned so that...

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Yeah, good idea. Refer to implementation plans. I'll do it in the next version.

Okay. So the next bit of specific comments were from ISC and (unintelligible). That's more or less similar. And that deals with the issue that single Chinese characters and coupled with or even with APTLD, that single Chinese characters and possibly Arabic characters -- but (Clyde) you might be helpful there -- can be used as geographic -- how did they phrase it -- used as acronyms to refer to geographical names or other specific noun phrases. And so this adds to the confusion.

And so what I've inserted - what I've suggested there is the JIG notes the comments that some single Chinese characters and possibly in other scripts as well are used as acronyms to refer to geographical names or other specific noun phrases.

Regarding this issue the JIG reiterates its view that other restrictions, qualifications and requirements for ASCII and two-or-more character IDN TLD strings should be equally - should equally apply to single-character IDN TLD strings including but not limited to considerations of geographical names, similarity and confusability, intellectual property rights, etcetera. The working group notes that discussions regarding the restrictions, qualification,

requirements for IDN TLD strings in general are taking place in other ICANN fora and have not been concluded to date and therefore it should be raised there.

Again the - my underlying thinking was that it's single character or single Chinese characters may raise this issue but it's not specific for single characters. So the comment or the suggested evaluations, etcetera, do apply and limitations do apply to this specific aspect as well as was already suggested by the JIG.

Edmon Chung: Right. So yeah, I'm comfortable with taking that position. It seems to be consistent with how we deal with this type of comments. Others have anything to add?

Avri Doria: Great. It's Avri. Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Okay. But...

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Then we - so this concluded the - in my view the comments on Recommendation D. And then we go into specific comments and other aspects of the report. And there is one on Section 1, Introduction and Background.

So there's a comment from Hiro Hotta in APTLD. And the comment is the term letters is not properly defined. It apparently means ASCII letters.

So this refers to a text from the Reserve Names Working Group. So what I've said today - what I've said in the draft consideration of comment is the reference sections in the draft final report is a direct quote from the Reserved Names Working Group final report and can therefore not be changed. This being said the point is well-taken and is that (unintelligible) letters and ASCII letters are not properly defined.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Yeah. I think you've - you've covered that. I mean our language for talking about this stuff when that group was running was still very much in formation...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Avri Doria: So much more precise since then. That's one of the first times we were actually tackling a lot of these issues. So I think - yeah, I think you answer it.

Bart Boswinkel: I know you can't change what's in another report.

Avri Doria: We were still learning back then.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Okay. So any other one? So that was a specific comment on this one. But it's good to note.

And there is another one. And I was not very comfortable in answering this one.

So that's the comment on Section 6, suggested edits to the new gTLD application guidebook so there is - and it refers to language in the draft final report. The - and what we said is the following edits are suggested for Module 2, Section 22132, String Requirements Part 334N2.1. It is visually similar -- and there it comes -- it is visually similar to any one-character ASCII label and then what is stricken is in any script.

And the comment from Hiro Hotta is the background of this editing proposal is unclear. It seems reasonable that the visual similarity to any label in any script not only in ASCII should be avoided as the original sentence means.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: And this is...

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I - thank you, Bart. I wanted to add to this.

I took a look back at the section too long to be repeated. But - so why I was there and why I suggested striking out in any script is because in that specific section it is talking about two-character IDN TLDs. And it's saying that two-character IDN TLDs should not be visually similar to any one-character label in, you know, in any script, any one-character string in any script.

And that, when it was designed in the applicant guidebook, that - the premise was that all single-character TLDs including IDN and ASCII were reserved and not allowed. So - but if we say that two-character IDN TLDs cannot be similar to any one-character string that would eliminate some things that shouldn't be eliminated because we're now opening up single-character IDN TLDs.

So what - and what should have been done is that two-character IDN TLDs should not be similar to single-character IDN TLDs that are being applied for or are already (unintelligible) existing. And that rule is already covered somewhere else. That's, you know, covered but in terms of contention set and as well as existing TLDs.

So that was why the in any script was stricken out. I don't know whether I'm...

Avri Doria: I could see...

Edmon Chung: Making sense.

Avri Doria: It's Avri.

Edmon Chung: Avri, please.

Avri Doria: I'm saying I'm confused.

Man: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So let me try this again. So the current applicant guidebook...

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Sorry.

Bart Boswinkel: Could I suggest that you, say, try to formulate the answer in, say, for this one...

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Because this is so deep into the new gTLD process? I could ask somebody else from staff. But...

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I just, you know, at least in the sense is that this was written with the premise that single-character IDN TLDs would never happen - would not happen when it was written. So, you know, it included any script.

But in order for single-character IDN TLDs to happen you have to, you know, restrict it to only similar to one-character ASCII.

I'll write it up. I think...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: You know, it's probably...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Convolved at this point. But...

Avri Doria: Sorry. I have to go. I will follow up on email. I have...

Edmon Chung: Yeah. We're at the top of the hour as well. But after I draft it, we probably should circulate to Olaf and make sure, you know, we've got some feedback from there as well because he's obviously much more into the whole applicant guidebook than anyone here. So I'll draft a comment on this and circulate.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I...

Edmon Chung: And also in - we - in terms of time we're at the top of the hour. I guess the next step would be, Bart, you would make the edits. And then we'll circulate to the group.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And I'll...

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: I can do that very quickly. And say what I'll do is I'll leave this section open so this can be filled in, say, over the week when we have time to discuss. And so the rest is reasonably easy for me to do.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess with that I thank everyone for joining the call today. We are at the top of the hour so we'll wrap up. And we'll continue the discussion on the mailing list. And we'll reconvene in two-weeks time.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

Woman: Thanks. Bye everyone.

END