

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 15 February 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 15 February 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-20110215-en.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo

Edmon Chung, RySG (Co-Chair)

Rafik Dammak, NCSG

Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)

Sarmad Hussein, National University of Computer & Emerging Sciences, Pakistan (Observer)

Wei Zhao, .cn (Observer)

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel

Olof Nordling

Kristina Nordstrom

Steve Sheng

Apologies:

Jian Zhang. APTLD

Kristina Nordstrom: Thank you. Okay hello everybody and welcome to this JIG working group call today on the 15th of February. On the call today we have Edmon Chung, Rafik Dammak, Fahd Batayneh, Sarmad Hussein, Avri Doria, and Wei Zhao. And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Olof Nordling, Kristina Nordstrom, and Steve Sheng.

Edmon Chung: Thank you.

Kristina Nordstrom: And I'm sorry. We have apologies from Jain. Otherwise, I have no apologies.

Edmon Chung: Okay. And yes, about - and my Co-Chair, she is in Hong Kong right now actually at the Africa meetings and part of the activities with the APTLD workshop, so she won't be able to join us today.

Okay, so I want to start off by apologizing. Last week, I mean the week before in our last meeting I had a bit of a situation and wasn't able to join the call, and I think Jain was having some trouble as well and we canceled the call at last minute. I really apologize for that. And I guess we'll get the work back on track.

Also in the last couple of weeks, I've been you know preparing the Africa meetings here in Hong Kong. For those of you who are coming, I hope you have a great stay here. But - so that has been tying things down.

But for today, I think one of the things that we want to get out of the way is the Single Character IDN TLD final draft. I'd like to, I guess as mentioned, start off by concluding the discussion on the staff response and the consolidated comments, and then move to a discussion. It seems like there isn't a lot to be discussed, but I think you know there are a couple of things that we probably want to cover in terms of how it should be - you know, the final report for the different Councils should be developed, so we'll start with that.

And then I understand that Steve Sheng is here with us today, and he'll be able to provide us with some updates on the IDN variant issue with Tina leaving ICANN, which is old news now. And he should be - he'll be able to provide us some update there and - which will open our discussion on the variant issue.

So I guess...

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Hi, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Just maybe a suggestion and this is more for Steve's convenience. As he's only the call for the update, maybe you could start with the update on say the Board initiative and what is happening so he can leave the call; otherwise, he has to stay on for the full hour almost.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Is that okay with you, Steve, because it's rather early for you as well, isn't it?

Steve Sheng: No worries. I have another call at 5:00. But yes, that'll be good.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So - but I'd like to get the comments thing out of the way first...

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Edmon Chung: ...because I don't - I just want to get that cleared and then we'll go to Steve if that's okay. I think in terms of the consolidated - the comments, it really is not - it has been circulated for some time now. I didn't see any particular issues with it. So I think Bart, I'm - you know, it is really cleared for you to have it posted so that we wrap up the comments period for the final report.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Anything you see you know, that we need to do further? Or you know if anybody on the call wants to bring up anything in terms of the consolidated

comments from the staff, which is really just a summary report of the comments that we received.

Bart Boswinkel: No. I don't have anything to add, so I'll post it and then the comments periods can be closed.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Edmon Chung: So with that out of the way, we'll come back - as I guess Bart suggested, we'll come back to a discussion about how we go about the final, final report. And before that, we'll get an update from Steve Sheng on the IDN variant issue. So Steve?

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Edmon. I want to - so since we met last, I want to start out saying that I am not taking on Tina's role. So with that, I think Naela is our IDN Manager for managing ccTLD fast track applications. And so the variant project, ICANN take the project very seriously even after Tina left. And so, we have a small team formed. Let me give you some - the initial members of the team.

We have Kim Davis who is our (unintelligible) Manager. We have Francisco, our Registry Liaison. Naela, which - our Manager for the IDN Fast Track. We also have (unintelligible), our Manager for Original Relationships, and myself. So we have a small team formed and we are - there are a couple things we do.

So for the variant project, we - the background is the Board, in its (unintelligible) meeting in September asked the (unintelligible) CEO to develop an issues report identifying what needs to be done with the evaluation - possible delegation allocation in the operation of IDN gTLD containing variant characters.

So we are developing a plan for the issues report, and the plan is to conduct five case studies to study these (scrut) - study the variant issue of the language - that language, and kind of language script. Like language by language, because before we trying to arrive at the - a universal solution, and that hasn't yielded a successful conclusion.

So the five cases that we are studying are Chinese, Arabic, Latin, Indic, and Cyrillic. So within each of these studies, we want to investigate a set of issues that needs to be resolved to facilitate a user's experience for the IDN Variant TLDs. And from the five case studies and a issues report will be created.

As you might have heard in Cartagena, and you know I think many of you have worked on the IDN variant issue long - for a long time. This is a complex issue, and the ICANN staff is really looking for the community to drive this project. So what do I mean? What do I mean by that?

Within each case, we're going to form a study team that's composed of, for example, you know community representatives with linguistic expertise, you know (unintelligible) expertise, and also since the variant issue touches on the registry operation. So, we're going to have a community expertise on registry operations then finally on policy.

So we're going to try to form a case study team for each script, and this study (instead of) you know, the issues that come up. And after that at the end, we will you know put all the issues together and do the issues report.

That's what I have so far planned. Any questions?

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I wonder if there's a - at least a conceptual timeframe for how this - you see this pan out?

Steve Sheng: Yes. So we are under the plan that by next week a report will be - a draft proposal will be published for public comment. The timeline is trying to form the study teams by April. And we hope to have the case studies completed by September of this year and the issues report no later than Africa meeting I think, of this year. So that's the committed time that I have, (subject) to a public consultation.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Does anyone else have any questions? If not, I have a second question.

Okay. And the second question is in terms of the study teams, how do you envision those being formed?

Steve Sheng: How do I envision those formed? So I'm not sure I understand your question.

Edmon Chung: Yes. So how would you pull in the people? Is it going to be basically staff nominated? Will you be calling for GNSO participation? ccNSO participation? ALAC/GAC participation kind of thing? Or how do you envision the constitution of those teams?

Steve Sheng: That is a good and very important detail that you know, has to be worked out. Right now, my understanding is the Board is going to have a variant group and they're going to give some guidance on how that's to be done.

So clearly, if you have - I think currently is - you know, the staff started to gather names for the people that we know that in the past have engaged on this issue, and you know we have to gather this for every script. You know obviously we're looking for experts. And if you have some names who would want to join the project, you know send me an email and I'll forward it along to the working team.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Cool.

I seem to have all the questions. I wonder if anyone else has a question before I ask the third one?

Okay. Moving on.

Steve Sheng: This is a (verbal) introduction. We'll get you a copy of the draft report for your comments shortly. We're finalizing the report - the draft proposal.

Bart Boswinkel: Steve, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Go ahead, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Now just regarding your last remark, Steve you can send it to me and I will forward it to the group.

Steve Sheng: Okay. Sure. That will be (better).

Edmon Chung: Okay. So my sort of third question is at this point, how do you see us - sort of this group working in parallel with the studies and the work there? I - we had a very brief discussion with Tina in Cartagena, but I'd like to get a sense from you and the new team I guess how you see the continued interaction?

Steve Sheng: So that's an excellent question. That question you know myself has been thinking very hard, so I'm very glad you asked that question. I would - you know, I would welcome you know the - your thoughts on the role of the JIG's working group. Perhaps - so there are two things. One thing is you know there are various initiatives everywhere working on variants. You know, there is the JIG working group. There's some language-specific initiatives and there's you know obviously IETF work.

One thing the past has told us, it's not anything is - the group you know works a lot of information, but the information needs to be shared. So one thing we need - want to do is at least to facilitate the sharing of the information.

That said, you know I thought about this issue but I haven't crystallized my idea yet, so I really welcome your suggestions and the group's suggestion on how to interact with the - with these case study teams and the issues project. Perhaps when we have the report - you know when you have the report in your hand, the proposals, and maybe you can you know think more and provide more input to us. That will be really appreciated.

Because I mean we (are a new working group). We can use you know the working group's (help) that works on these issues within ICANN. So...

Edmon Chung: Yes. I think that's great, and I truly appreciate the interaction and the interest to continue with (it), and we look forward to the document. I think just I guess as a starter, if you're not already on the mailing list, it would be nice if you are on. And as we get along with the discussions and documents come out, if you can take a look and provide your thoughts and you know how they intertwine with the work - with the two bodies of work.

We have our in-house - I should say intelligence into the ITF work from Avri. I'll volunteer to do that at this point, and I know that in terms of documents, Suzanne Woolf is also a quite follower that we're provide - we're creating. So we do - I do understand that that's very important and that's defiantly an area that we need to keep up.

So - and speaking of - if you can be on the mailing list, and you know even more often if possible to be on the call. And if this time becomes really tough, perhaps it's time we consider adjusting the time for this call as well. So - because I think your participation as we...

Man: Hello?

Edmon Chung: ...discuss the IDN variant issue will be important.

Man: Hello?

Edmon Chung: Yes?

Man: Hello?

Edmon Chung: Steve, did you want to add anything?

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I add a belated question?

Edmon Chung: Please.

Avri Doria: I'm slow this morning, and I apologize, and it may have been covered (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: No worries. And maybe I'm just clicking to fast pushing ahead.

Avri Doria: No. No. No. You gave me plenty of time, but I just couldn't think that fast. With this report coming out in September, and I guess the most hopeful and optimistic of us thinking that September may end up a starting date for new gTLD applications in the best of all possible worlds, how - and this maybe is not a question so much for Steve as for Olof, who I understand is also on the call.

How does this dove tail and fit in with any gTLD application realities?

Steve Sheng: Sorry. I was dropped off, but I'm back on.

Avri Doria: Okay. Should I repeat my question or...

Edmon Chung: So Avri, why don't you repeat it.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes, I was asking with the report intend - and again, apologies for last minute questions.

Steve Sheng: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: With the report coming out in September, with the most hopeful of us hoping that you know, new gTLDs could still start up around September timeframe - that looks like the earliest possible at this point. Maybe it could even be earlier. How does this work and the new gTLD application launch fit with each other?

And as I was saying, maybe this was as much a question for Olof as it was for you Steve. But I'm just wondering how that's being dealt with, and this may have already been covered. And if it was, I apologize for having lost it. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Avri. Your - if I understand correctly, your question is how does this work fit in the timeframe for the new gTLD program? Is that the question?

Avri Doria: That's a big part of it. The other part of it is assuming this work is not - you know, yes. That's the question. Never mind.

Steve Sheng: So right now to - in the Applicant Guidebook it says applicants applying for strings that are - that indicate the variants and the balance will be evaluated. The strings will be evaluated and will be allocated, but will not be delegated. So that's what the - for new gTLDs - in the Guidebook, that's regarding IDN variants.

I will say that will not change until - you know, until the issues project make otherwise different recommendation.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Does that answer your question Avri? Actually you know I guess adding to that, there's another piece of information. I think in terms of the process, it's the - as the new gTLD comes in, you can apply for IDNs, and you know you can also apply for those with variants and it - at this point, and as far as the Applicant Guidebook - well the latest version is concerned, the variants are going to be held - sort of reserved in a way.

Steve Sheng: Right.

Edmon Chung: And when a policy for delegating them exists, which is what this whole exercise I think ultimately wants to lead to, then that will kick in.

And I think it gives us probably another four to six months for all the evaluation, the contract, and even you know four to six months or nine months, or a little bit longer before we actually see it - them being delegated. And hopefully, I think -- you know with the big H -- that we'll be closer than on this process so that we will - you know by the time they actually name the - the applicant gTLD gets delegated, we'll be much closer to - or even there in terms of the variants.

Avri Doria: I have another question. Just - so this issues process does not in any sense include reviewing what is a variant? We all have that as already codified so that when people are applying and they're calling something a variant, we have no doubt as to what is and what isn't one.

Edmon Chung: I think Steve probably can answer that. (I'd like to probably ask) a little bit as well. Steve?

Steve Sheng: So I guess one of the goals with the issues report is to create a commonly understand glossary of terms and to ensure that such terms are accurately - ensure those terms are accurate and really vetted with the appropriate technical and (unintelligible) communities.

So you know, I think - you know, determine what is and what is not a variant is - would be the scope for the issuance report. But obviously, you know some communities have moved you know along - you know, have a good definition of variant. And you know then for those communities, their task will be really this - (write) the relevant documents on what is a variant.

But in other communities, you know the issue may not be so well defines, so - but we do think - you know, create a commonly understood glossary of terms is very important, and understanding you know the issue is the other (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Right. And I guess adding to that as well. I think if we recall - I know it's been some time since we've been first discussed this, but in the draft documents that we have here, we also wanted to touch on this issue on a more techno-policy end, and I think that's really where the biggest overlap is going to be in terms of the issues report and what this group is doing.

And I think we - when we discussed it, we tried to take on an approach which is more a techno-policy implementation kind of view - world view of what a variant is rather than a sort of language-specific view if you will.

So I think that's - Avri, what you mention is at the heart of the issue, and definitely that's something we need to figure out. And once we have a definition of which end - to me, I think the most important thing is to determine - it really doesn't matter you know, whether something is a variant or not. It could be different cultures that define different things.

But at the end of the day, it really boils down to what is automatically delegated and what requires additional steps to be delegated, and what doesn't get delegated and it's only reserved. I think in terms of policy, that's the - the ultimate goal is to create those few sets. And I guess our goal is that once those - at least the way I see it right now is that once we've - once the

linguistic communities decide (on only) those three sets, then it can follow whatever the implementation policy should follow, and that's where I think the JIG - we are producing - we'll try to - or at least - in my hope right now, that's what we're trying to achieve.

Avri Doria: Okay. If I can comment. I think what is sort of giving me pause, or what I'm having trouble you know reconciling is sort of the chicken and egg problem we hopefully have. Of course, it's possible we won't have it. But is that - basically what we're saying is for the new gTLD process, what is a variant is pretty much up to the applicant.

And - because we sort of - and then I'm saying - but in that case, I'm not really sure how - unless this is terminated in time. As you say, an extra four months here, an extra four months there, you know we may have our definitions on what predictable basis then those who are going to do said allocations, or reservations, or what have you, make their decisions.

And I'm not really looking for an answer at this point, because I think I understand where we're at. I'm just saying that seems to be sort of a fuzzy space at the moment in terms of if I can apply for a variant. But there's no defined, you know strict code of high definition of variant, and somebody is going to adjudicate my application for a variant based upon you know, something that is not yet in existence. There is a space for discomfort at the very least. And that's what I was really trying to zero in on.

Edmon Chung: So I completely agree with what you're saying, and I think you're right on. It's that right now, the process is that the applicant - we I guess "trust" the applicant to provide it and contentions that are going to be based on those. And I guess what you - you know one of the - I guess abusive way to do it is that - you know to cover everything and say, "These are variants, okay. You later will have to figure it out with your IDN policies. But now I'm going to put everything under the sun as variants." And you know now every one that's in contention is (me), right? That's one of the...

Avri Doria: I didn't even go that far, but yes.

Edmon Chung: I mean, yes. That's the abuse way, but yes. That I guess is a potential issue. But at this point, that is the - as far as I can see, that's so far the process, and hopefully we'll find a solution. And hopefully, applicants will be behaving themselves, for lack of a better way to describe it.

Avri Doria: Well, I wasn't just thinking of the applicant's misbehavior. And I guess I don't immediately go there, which is probably a deficiency in me after six years in ICANN. But more, I was thinking of the requirement in gTLD that the processes be objective and known up front.

Edmon Chung: Sure.

Avri Doria: And that here, we basically have to accept the notion that they're not quite.

Edmon Chung: So there are currently some working definitions. I mean, there's no universally accepted definition of what is a variant. You know, in drafting this report, you know, that's one of the things that, you know, we are aware. And so there are definitions, for example, the RSC 3010 and 47, and I think that definition's also in use by the IDN implementation team.

So those are the starting definitions we use in this report. So it's - so, you know, there's no universally accepted definitions that, you know, from a starting point. You know, we do start from somewhere and that's where we start, the two definitions I mentioned.

With regards to, you know, different applicants, you know, those are real possibilities that we have to think of. Right now the policy is, you know, each registry or applicant submits their own language tables.

So one way, you know, they could gain the system is by, you know, adding things in the language table and maybe that's one of the issues that (needs) to come out from issuance (support).

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon? This is Bart. May I may a procedural suggestion that we continue this discussion in two weeks when the report is available as well? You know, we - because then there is, I think, a more in depth discussion possible when everybody has the report in front of them or the...

Edmon Chung: Yes. I think that makes sense.

Bart Boswinkel: And...

Edmon Chung: But before I close this, I'd like to ask if anybody else has any questions. Hearing none, I guess that's - I thank Steve for making this presentation and updating us and thank you (Steve Borg) for interjecting here. I think it's a natural wrap on this particular subject here.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes and so...

Edmon Chung: ...we come back to hopefully in 15 to 20 minutes about our work on this issue. But right now I'd like to move to looking at how we want to complete our work with the single character IDN TLD.

Man: Okay thank you.

Edmon Chung: So...

Man: Okay thanks (Steve).

(Steve): Thanks. I'm going to drop off now.

Edmon Chung: All right. Thanks (Steve). All right. So in terms of single character, I think the - at least the - a pretty clear next step is to try to produce a an - a final, final report based on the comments received. From what I see and from the consolidated report, I think we're pretty close.

It seems that most of the issues that were brought up, we have in one - you know, one way or the other, addressed. I really don't see any (particular) new issue that was brought up that we have not covered.

So I think the first step is probably into integrate the - this summary report into the final report as one additional section that, you know, we're taking this into consideration and these are the comments that were received and to eventually compile a final report that will be presented to the respective councils.

So does that make sense for people? I - there is one issue that I think is outstanding that I want to spend about the next little while talking about which is the issue raised by Olof actually about how to implement this. But other than that, I think most of the items that were raised in these comments seem to, in fact, confirm that we have covered the stuff that we need to.

What do people think about that? Any thoughts, questions? Because I think as the - what I'm trying to suggest here is that we take the, you know, take - I guess proceed in the manner where we would try to edit the final report and then present it to the var- you know, to the respective councils. That is the suggestion for the next step.

Okay so I - hearing no particular concerns with it, I come back to one of the, I guess, key things that I want to talk about in terms of editing the final report which follows a - the discussion we had I think a couple - few meetings back with - especially with Olof in terms of the implementive - I don't know whether this is a real word - but implementability of what we are suggesting.

And Olof specifically mentioned that in the current - well not for the - not so much actually for the IDN ccTLDs but for the IDN gTLDs, the - there is a situation whereby the initial evaluation does not provide a way for an evaluation on confusability caused by anything else then visual confusion.

So I understand that Avri did make a argument that anything could be visual in a way if we talk about keyboards because we might be, you know, keying it differently because we can see it (right) but I think that's probably, you know, we probably need a better argument.

And so I sort of open this question to see if we want to try to tackle this and make some edits in a way such that it could be something that is implementable because what we had suggested right now, I think the key point is we suggest it right now is that for the gTLD process to take into consideration other technical aspects of confusability such as keyboard layouts and that seems to be a - going to be a challenge for the new gTLD process. Does anyone have any...

Avri Doria: I have one thing I want to add.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Avri Doria: I did not say that anything could not...

Edmon Chung: No, okay. Sorry

Avri Doria: ...be visual and I wouldn't want to be left on record...

Edmon Chung: I missed out. Sorry. Sorry.

Avri Doria: ...as saying that anything could be sp- I was thinking that, you know, again the edges of what is and what isn't might be a little fuzzier then we think and

that possibly, you know, that some keyboard issues or others might enter the issue that it is more complicated than it appears on first viewing. I certainly do not mean to say that anything could be defined as visual.

Edmon Chung: No, Avri I apologize. I was saying that a little bit...

Avri Doria: You were just testing to see if I was listening.

Edmon Chung: I apologize for mischaracterizing it. But I think here is - you know, I guess I'd like to throw out an idea. And the basic idea is really that we probably should, just looking back at the new gTLD process because it - unlike this IDN ccTLD process which does have a more thorough technical evaluation in terms of the string, (that's really) your point.

I think what we can do is that we can suggest that this is part of the technical evaluation and that the remaining issues could be dealt with in terms of the objection process because, you know, if the - if it's - you know, it's no different than a typo (squat) issue that we are trying to describe.

But it is just more amplified in our situation. So my - or after thinking about Olof's discussion previously my inclination is to keep sort of the general approach but in terms of specific suggestions to - input into the technical evaluation and the objection process that this is a typo (squat) is a, you know, essential weight to that - to suggest that a typo (squat) would be a potential thing to consider in terms of the confusability - I mean, objection process.

That's the idea. I don't know if people have any thoughts, feedback, support, think it's totally wild.

Avri Doria: I (have to stop again). I seem to be talking as much as ever.

Edmon Chung: Please.

Edmon Chung: I think that definitely would work. I think the only thing that needs to be defined by those, again, looking at the objections is whether we want to make that a consideration that they can, you know, in giving them guidance. Do we give them guidance that says and, you know, the ty- I have trouble calling it the typo (squat) because, again, we're doing it from the malicious angle as opposed to just the pure confusability angle.

But the typo confusion perhaps is something that they can consider in the objection process. And I'm not quite sure indeed how all the guidance to objection panels is being made and where all of that is being reviewed. But, indeed, I think you're right. I don't think we have to burden the technical process with it.

One of the intents that the GNSO and, you know, I assume it - well, if it's still going on in the GCNSO, is that the rules that can't be defined, you know, within the GNSO, if we can't define it strictly because it's not practical or because we don't know, that's where the objection process comes in.

So the solution seems good but what it does is it moves the problem to the guidance that is given to the objection panels. And I admit that I don't quite understand how that guidance is given and to what degree that guidance is both public and reviewed and transparent and all that good stuff because I don't think I've seen the drafts of guidance to objection councils or objection committees or whatever they're properly called. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Right. Well I guess with that I'd like to see if I can venture to ask Olof. I understand you probably don't have an answer right now but I'd like to broach the question. If we have this discussion, if you (unintelligible) back and if this is the - a suggestion, what do you think about that? And also Avri's question about whether you can enlighten us on - in terms of the objection process?

If - how do we provide some input through to the guidance of that objection process? And when or how - where will we eventually see that (kind) of (unintelligible)?

Olof Nordling: First of all, (yes), there are two comments because one should remember that if we take the objection of confusability or (unintelligible) objection as it goes, well, standing to object will have an existing top level domain operator or somebody representing him or her.

(It) limits the applicability as it's written right now of the same similarly objection to take care of what you want to take care of because this will be a - well a limit.

Secondly, well since in this particular case it's (wide) but it has been appointed and, of course, they will draw on a huge experience in second level domain rulings about string similarity.

So that will be - that's the main device, rather - or rather, that's the main competence that they do have. Whether there will be any more detailed guidance to that particular panel is beyond me actually. I don't know if that's - there're any plans to that effect.

Avri Doria: Okay, so Olof, a quick question.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Avri Doria: If I could just...

Edmon Chung: Yes, Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: It could just be that they'll be given the guidebook and said, "Read this and make it consistent."

Olof Nordling: Well, they will most certainly have access to the guidebook but it's - I think if - it's a bit the other way around that - well, they've been selected because they have this particular expertise in the application of the notion of confusing similarity.

So but from that perspective I'm just saying that, well, there may be additional advice perhaps of the (nature) you mentioned that can be provided to them but it's - I'm unaware of any such plans. Let's put it like that.

Avri Doria: Okay, so we're not giving them any constraints on the definition. It's up to them. It's (wypor) we trust you. You figure it out and let us know.

Olof Nordling: That's - well, at least - not being really very much into the loop on the objection process but more in depth involved in that and not being in discussion or having been in discussion with the particular panel provider here on this.

I've - I can only tell you that I'm not aware of any particular additional guidance that will be given beyond, of course, obviously the applicant guidebook.

Edmon Chung: Okay. No, I think that's good feedback. There's - I want to go back to your point one. You mentioned that it depends on an existing TLD holder or actually not only that but also an applicant as well. So I do think actually it does cover what we want to avoid because ultimately it - a, (unintelligible) word - I'm using typo (squat) again so it's a typo confusability.

It only affects the situation if there is something to be, you know, confused with and you - if you mistype something that it would get somewhere. If it doesn't - if that ultimate place doesn't exist, it's a, you know, it's a not found, an NX domain and so nobody's harmed in a way.

So I think ultimately it is exactly, you know, the type of protection that we needed in place. We - you know there's - it's not different then two, three, four character domains. So whereas, you know, if we want to cover everything, of course, then it doesn't.

But the ultimate test is really is it ends up going somewhere else that should be. So I don't know...

Olof Nordling: I just wanted to highlight that those who have standing to object - so to file an objection..

Edmon Chung: Right.

Olof Nordling: ...are those with a - on top level domain.

Edmon Chung: Right. Right. And as we progress, I mean, there will be more and more and their - and in the first round, I think the applicants also have the ability to do that, right?

Olof Nordling: That's not as it's written right now.

Edmon Chung: So what happens if the applicant's view of that it is but it's not identified as a contention (set)?

Olof Nordling: That's where there are - they don't have a standing as it's written right now.

Edmon Chung: That's interesting. So...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: I just wanted to highlight it if that's one you - what you want to achieve.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Sure.

Olof Nordling: You have to...

Edmon Chung: But this seems to be, you know, something that is beyond what this group is talking about. This is the situation where if, for whatever reason, to applications are not identified as contention sets, neither of them can raise an - you know, if they themselves feel that they are in conflict, neither of them would be able to raise an objection. Is that the case?

Olof Nordling: That's...

Edmon Chung: Have we...

Olof Nordling: Yes. That's now - let - I mean, come on. Let's read it again and see so that are not reflecting some older version on this particular - but that's how it's been for quite some time. Of course, they can lodge other objections, by community objections against each other and such. That's perfectly doable.

But in the case of confusing similarity or similarity - in string similarity, I have to look it up really but just to say that, okay, the final version is exactly like this but I believe it to be the case.

Edmon Chung: Okay. No, I - it'll be useful to - if you can, I think it's - it is definitely related to what we're talking about here and it probably has a, you know, bigger implication because it just seems to be something that could be of interest for other cases as well, so.

Olof Nordling: Yes I'll double check. I could almost do it immediately now but, well, all right. We've got a few minutes left.

Edmon Chung: No, take your time. I (hope that)...

Olof Nordling: So - yes.

Edmon Chung: I think we're...

Olof Nordling: I'll get back to you on this.

Edmon Chung: That'll be great. Please, you know, just I guess send it to the mailing list and we'll follow up from there. We're almost at the top of the hour. I think in terms of the single character IDN (CLD), so at the - my suggestion is to go ahead with producing the final, final report by incorporating these consolidated comments.

And by making this adjustment to the suggestion rather than for the initial evaluation of string confusability to push it to the objection process and the technical evaluation process now.

So I guess in terms of this one, if people feel that this is an approach that makes sense, then I'll produce a next draft, you know, in this direction.

Avri Doria: Can I intercede just quickly?

Edmon Chung: Please.

Avri Doria: The book just says it's subject to objection by an existing GTLD operator or by another GTLD applicant in the current application round.

Olof Nordling: That's what I found as well so sorry for confusing everything but...

Avri Doria: I was not sure of that but thanks.

Olof Nordling: ...by the (that) I sent earlier. So it's - that constraint doesn't exist. So thanks for talking it out. I was - you beat me by five seconds Avri.

Avri Doria: That's because you were talking and I was looking.

Edmon Chung: That was good. Then I think, you know, it seems like we have a pretty good approach in that and I guess I look forward to wrapping this - (clearly) wrapping this up. Anyone else have any comments before I move on to the next topic which I'll spend two minutes on?

Hearing none, so I'll - as I mentioned, I'll come up with a draft for the final report on the (unintelligible). I'll use the next two minutes to talk a little bit, I guess, we've left the IDN variance item off for quite a long time. I'm pretty glad to have (Steve) on the call today and have a better vision of what's going to happen.

So I think in terms of our document, I have it in front of me, that's why I have the benefit there if you have (so of grade two) but we identified five areas of policy aspects originally. Number one was what was considered IDN variant. Number two is the types of IDN variants for - with respect to the allocation delegation policy - properties.

Number three is the policy oper- policy for number two essentially, so what happens next? And then number four was requirements for zones managed by ITLD operator off of an IDN variant TLD.

And then number five was adding IDN variant TLDs. So out of the five, it seems that based on the studies, number one is something that we might want to reconsider and perhaps even remove and say, you know, this is - we - not entirely remove but we remove a lot of the discussion and leave it open because it's a lot more language dependent on what would be considered an IDN variant.

And move or merge that discussion into the studies from staff and board. And concentrate on number two, three and four and five which is, you know, once a - it is a variant and we can sort of identify the groups of - or the types of

variants that in terms of their delegation, that allocation properties, then we can work on those, you know.

That would be a policy set I think this group would be best positioned to tackle. And then so we can do this in parallel. I was...

Bart Boswinkel:: Edmon? This Bart again.

Edmon Chung: Yes. What?

Bart Boswinkel: Say it - may I suggest that, say, for the next call we recirculate the last version of the IDN variant document again to the whole group so everybody's got the latest version, we ensure this.

And at the same time, hopefully I'll get a copy from the project plan so we can really see what needs to happen. So it's - the next call is purely about IDN variants.

Edmon Chung: Good. I think that's - I thank you for the suggestion. I would add one thing to it. I can't promise but I'll try. What I was trying to do is exactly what I suggested just now, is you pull out some of the things from number one, which is sort of define what an IDN variant is and produce a document, you know, so people can compare what we had before and sort of what (you're) suggestion.

Barb Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: And then also we would...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Because I think what is, say, from the - in order to move forward I think one of the decisions in front of this working group is how to interact, if interact at all,

with this IDN variant project. That - probably that's the first decision you want to make before - to go into too many details.

Edmon Chung: Yes, I think that's precisely what I wanted to suggest and I just went about it in a more convoluted way. Thank you for crystallizing it for me. So does anyone have any questions, thoughts before we close and - in terms of what we just said?

Okay. Hearing none, then I'll mention I guess next week we'll have a couple more drafts, one on the final report - not next week, the week after - two weeks from now, the two documents hopefully. I'll work my best to produce them.

And that will be the meeting - the final meeting for San Francisco. And so next week, the next meeting two weeks from now, we'll talk about those two documents and our work in San Francisco.

So I guess that is - that wraps up today's session. Thank you everyone for joining. You know, thank you for your time. I think we had a really constructive meeting today.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye everyone.

Woman: Bye.

END