

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 05 April 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 05 April 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-20110405-en.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Edmon Chung, RySG

Avri Doria, NCSG

Sarmad Hussain, CLE-KICS, UET

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel

Dennis Jennings

Kristina Nordström

Apologies:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo

Young-Eum Lee, .kr

Kristina Nordstrom: Okay hello everyone and welcome to this JIG call today on the 5th of April. On the call we have Edmon Chung, Avri Doria, Sarmad Hussain and from staff Kristina Nordstrom and we have apologies from Bart Boswinkel. Over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Kristina. And thank you everyone for joining the call. I sent a very brief agenda today as we're really following from the discussion from San Francisco and the couple of items that we've been working on for some time now.

The - so first of all the final report for single character IDN TLD I just before the San Francisco meeting sent around a - sort of a final draft and then Jane and I reached out to the ten members, five from GNSO and five from ccNSO respectively to make sure everybody is comfortable with the report.

And then added, you know, really just a couple of clarifications to the final draft and then sort of finalized it for the last call which went around. Since we didn't really receive any other further objections have at least on the GNSO side I've put it forward to the Council as discussed basically for what we were going to do. So it's being put before the GNSO Council for consideration in their upcoming council meeting actually just a couple days from now on the 7th of April.

It's on the agenda right now and I'll probably walk through the report. And there's also a proposed resolution to prove to the final report and pass it onto the Board.

As for the ccNSO side just starting to work with Jane to see what the next steps should be. As sort of - somewhat clarified in the final report as well it's sort of because of the ongoing work on the CN/ccTLD Fast Track as well as the IDN CC PDP.

The report would go into those processes rather than sort of somewhat standalone. So that's sort of the - we're trying to figure out what the best way is to present back to the Council to the ccNSO Council and unfortunately Jane is not - joined this call today. But, you know, I guess we'll keep everyone updated on how that would be proceeding.

So any questions on that item in terms of the final report for single character IDN TLDs? I think we pretty much have that wrapped up but any questions on the GNSO side or the ccNSO process going forward? Okay hearing none I guess we'll (unintelligible) with it.

So I think in general it's - it has been a pretty good process. I feel people are comfortable with the report. I don't think a significant change from previous general feeling about the subject. I think we made some progress and - well not only progress I think we made some additions to the implement-ability of it and hopefully we'll see it implemented.

We'll still go through the - the processes and if there - I guess going forward we'll continue to monitor it and if, you know, before implementation anything comes back may or may not do anything further on it.

So second item was going to give a pretty brief recap on the San Francisco meeting. I think some of you were there so please correct me if I characterize anything wrong. I think Avri, you didn't make it so, you know, I guess just as a quick recap most...

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry I'm barging in. This is Bart. It's hard early in the morning and I overslept a bit. I'm in the US.

Edmon Chung: Hi Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi.

Edmon Chung: Great to have you on. Great to have you on and thank you for joining. I was just giving a - sort of a wrap up on the single character IDN TLD part.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: And sort of moving onto a sort of recap from the San Francisco meeting.

Bart Boswinkel: And just...

Edmon Chung: So I think - yes

Bart Boswinkel: Just on say the single characters I'll see - you send it - it didn't make it to my knowledge to the ccNSO Council call next week but...

Edmon Chung: No.

Bart Boswinkel: ...what I'll do is I'll send a message that it has been submitted and so that's what I normally do and I will submit it as such to the ccNSO Council. Whether they will discuss it at the upcoming call is something else but then maybe they can discuss it at the next call. So that loop is closed as well.

Edmon Chung: Right. I had a brief chat with Jane. It seems like it's probably going to be the, you know, the next call rather than...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...the one that's coming up and we'll probably it somewhat as an agenda item. I'll make, you know, Jane and I will make ourselves - well Jane is of course on the Council - and to perhaps give a brief presentation about the whole thing and, you know, see how best to take it through because unlike the GNSO Council which - well I'm more familiar with in terms of process going forward.

I think we'll - we should figure out what - how best to have the report as an input into the, you know, various ongoing things...

Bart Boswinkel: Oh that's fairly easy but I'll do it offline; I'll send you an email. But I think it's - so, you know, that's fairly easy and I'll inform you and Jane say over the next day or so.

Edmon Chung: All right that's great. That gives us a clear path - clearer path forward. So and I was saying, you know, I think, you know, we could wrap this topic...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Great. So now on the recap for San Francisco I think most of the time was spent on a communication with the - what is I guess called the IDN VIP, the IDN Variant Issues Project initiated by the Board and taken up as a staff team and the - I think the public comment period is ending tomorrow for the proposal of the five study teams.

I guess generally I think, you know, the response has been positive in terms of doing more work there. And as the - oh and also we got an update from Suzanne from - an update from the ITF and also Andrew Sullivan of the DNS-CNS extension working group at the ITF also joined us in San Francisco.

So we - the main sessions, you know, what areas each group might be most useful to talk about. I think the - the, you know, from my impression it became relatively clear it seems that in terms of the technical part, you know, sort of the idea of having sort of an alias or, you know, that type of technology the feeling around the room was that that, you know, would take its own course and it might take a long time.

And in terms of IDN variant TLDs really we should on our part and on the study team as well that our job is to look at it more as a policy issue and try to implement it with existing DNS technologies rather than to try to depend it on - or rely on new protocols or new technology. That seems to be at least in the discussion around the room seems to become more clear.

The other item that I guess the other take home I got is that it would be quite useful for us to continue with sort of - continue to liaise with the IDN VIP going forward and also to observe I guess their work and make sure we are - we're sort of in sync with the work that they're doing.

And I think there is also a - it's not fully, you know, clear yet but it seems to be a useful - didn't say distinction but a useful separation of work maybe that the (unintelligible) because they're more focused on language policy to focus

more on linguistic policy which would generate output which are, you know, what are IDN variants for various, you know, based on the linguistic requirements and conditions.

And for the JIG to focus on the policies and the implementation at the root, you know, how the allocation delegation would take place there upon once the IDN variants are identified as such and defined as such.

And so the IDN VIP would really go down the path of thinking about and exploring and also, you know, discussing the language policies - what are the requirements there, you know, how should that be done and then we would be able to focus more on really the ICANN policies.

Once that, you know, the output of that variant mechanism there would be different signs of variants and how they would be - and what process and policies are to put them in the (root) or handled at the ICANN level.

So that's sort of the impressions that I've gotten from San Francisco. And I - to me at least it gives us - seems to give us a pretty good framework to continue our work and to work with the - to work in sort of I guess in harmony with the IDN VIP work as it progress over the course of this year. So that's my quick recap for the San Francisco meeting.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon? This is Bart. May I add something from say my take on the discussion or on the meeting as well?

Edmon Chung: Please do.

Bart Boswinkel: So it's - say my - what I think if - for those who were not present at the meeting itself that what happened as well is that it became very clear or was made clear that for the time being say the IDN PDP on the cc side will go into hibernation until this working group has finished its - so the VIP working group project is closed.

So the issues are identified and then the IDN cc PDP will continue its work on the overall policy. So that was again an option and the was an option for this working group as well. But as Edmon said those present in the room were more inclined to move forward in the direction Edmon stated.

And I think what was made clear as well is that the variant issue project is actively looking - maybe not at this time but at least at some interfacing between this working group - between the JIG and the project itself and seeks active participation of the members of this group.

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings here Edmon. May I just briefly confirm that - thank you, Bart, for that message.

Edmon Chung: Please, go Dennis, go.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: Hi there.

Edmon Chung: Yes, so I wonder if Avri you have any questions or thoughts and (somewhat) if you want to add anything further on the comments?

Avri Doria: No questions.

Bart Boswinkel: No it's - I just wanted to say what I think was in the room at the time it was more up to - and we would use this opportunity or maybe the next call to discuss or that the JIG would use that opportunity to seek - and try to understand which option say either go across say move forward along the lines Edmon has just explained or would wait and start actively participating in the VIP and take the results from that working group and move forward on the basis of the results as the cc PDP will do.

There are just two models and it's - yes, it's up to the JIG to decide how they want to move forward.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: So that's more - yes it's more how do you see the - a question how do you see moving forward. Say there are good arguments for both I would say.

Edmon Chung: Right so I guess I don't know if some are - if - is on the call and also - since I hear a couple people join. I wonder if additional people have joined the call as well. I just want to make sure people...

Sarmad Hussein: Hi, this is Sarmad. I'm - still on the call. I'm on mute. But I just have - want to add that obviously the procedures and policies would be, you know, sometimes they're quite arbitrarily different for ccTLDs.

So but I'm still quite sure that if one defines a reasonably genetic framework and possible directions or possibilities in which genetic framework can be adopted that can be an equally useful exercise for ccTLDs as for gTLDs so I think that's (unintelligible) exercise for the troops.

Edmon Chung: Thank you so much. Yes I totally agree. I think, you know, some of the things that are being discussed should be equally useful for cc's and g's. As I sort of - actually when I was updating the ccNSO in San Francisco it's also - I also, you know, sort of stressed I guess...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...you know, so is also that, you know, they would take our work as input and suggestions. You know, they have their policy (unintelligible) ongoing because of the cc PDP. So, you know, and I think we should be able to produce useful work for that.

Okay so I guess, you know, speaking specifically as Bart mentioned one of the things that we should probably talk about before we move onto, you know, discussing some of the details about sort of trying to put together an initial report are I guess a couple of things. One is the general timeframe and looking to sort of synchronize with the IDN VIP.

And the other is, you know, what we do in the interim because I think (in theory) I think in the next month or so that the - that the idea is that the - in the next month or so the IDN VIP would ramp up and start to - start the discussions.

I think Bart and I had a quick discussion after the San Francisco meeting that it might be useful for us to wait a little bit in terms of, you know, just to observe how the IDN VIP is being formed and some of the initial discussions before we go down the path of sort of I guess finalizing our initial report

So I guess, you know, I wanted to open up, you know, for any discussion about first of all the general framework - I mean, the general timeframe which the IDN VIP is looking at which is to ramp up in April, I think to have a initial report in June or July or did I get it - during the interim but at the least the final report - the first final issues report to be done by the end of the year I think in December.

So my first reaction is that probably it would be a good idea for us to have a, you know, lay out a work plan that would be - that would have us in a similar timeframe.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. Can I ask a question about something I'm still not clear on and maybe I just missed it while you were talking? Between the VIP group and the interface to IETF and their requirements and JIG and the requirements that the IETF is working on is the VIP group seen by ICANN to be the interface to the technical group?

I know - I wasn't at Prague but certainly reading the initial minutes from Prague on the DNS extensions working group there certainly wasn't clarity on their part that this VIP group was the one that was going to be giving them useful requirements on the technical side and they seem to be having the same quandary that you've been talking to of do we wait for this group or do we keep working in parallel?

They seem to be opting for a keep working in parallel. And so I'm still not clear on the connection between what the VIP group is doing and feeding requirements in for, you know, the technical discussions on where our notions of synchrony and IETF notion of aliasing or whatever come together. So perhaps I'm missing it but I don't see it. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Avri. I guess so quickly, you know, my impression and since Dennis is on the call it'd be great for him to add as well. I also wasn't in Prague but from the discussions in San Francisco I think it was, you know, I think it seemed pretty clear that it would be worthwhile working in parallel in a way but in some, you know, didn't say harmony but with a - with liaisons or with communication between the group, you know, with regular communication between the groups and sort of liaisons working to - on the three areas.

So that, you know, IETF with the focus obviously on future technology and the VIP focus very much on the linguistic issues that need to be dealt with what IDN variants really are. And then the (group) would really focus on more I guess quote-unquote policy technical kind of things that ICANN does in terms of process. So that's my take on it but I, you know, probably Dennis can add to it.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you. Dennis Jennings here. To address Avri's question directly the VIP is not a formal channel of communication between anybody and anybody else. The VIP - the project hopes to come out with a statement of the

linguistic requirements and the user expectations and so on which will drive further work.

The goal in liaising with the IETF with simply to open that channel to make sure that the IETF folks, DNSx folks knew exactly what we were up to and the timeframe we were working on and visa-versa if there was anything come out of the IETF work.

My impression from what I've heard of Prague is that the DNSx work have concluded that there isn't any work for them to do at this time and they're now reflecting whether they will wrap up the current work and await development. And so - but I'm not quite clear on what that situation is.

From the project point of view it's very important that we have open communication and support from the IETF - the technical folks and can bounce ideas off them. And I think we established that in San Francisco - a channel of open communication.

Thanks Edmond - Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thanks Dennis. Avri does that sort of...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay this is Avri. I guess I have trouble (unintelligible) with that that they seem to be still trying to understand the requirements an, you know, trying to figure out whether they'll get anything useful from ICANN and basically they're still (unintelligible) document that they're looking into finalizing or, you know, taking further.

And so, okay, I guess it is what it is; I'll continue trying to understand it. But I don't see from their minutes that they're saying they're not moving forward on anything. It seems like they're still trying to understand what if anything needs

to be moved forward on. And as I say I just reading the minutes I wasn't at the meeting.

Edmon Chung: Right. This is Edmon. Avri I think - I would probably categorize it this way is I think the VIP would work on stuff not necessarily - the issue is that the VIP would work on the IDN language policies and it's not necessarily becomes the directly the requirements for the IETF work.

And I don't think the VIP is chartered to actually do that. But what - the results from the VIP may become, you know, it's not a will become but may become some input into the IETF work. So I think that - at least for me that seems to be - become more clear as we went down the discussion.

And same with our discussions here, you know, some of the things that we talk about may eventually become a possibility, you know, may turn into a useful requirement for the IETF to consider but that's not the aim for either the VIP or the JIG.

And at the same time on the reverse we are not depending on the work of the IETF in terms of figuring out a way to potentially implement the policy as policy for IDN variants. So that's sort of my take on it.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Edmon Chung: I wonder...

Avri Doria: As I say it may just be me. I see an incredible disconnect between the two and I still have no notion of how that disconnect gets removed. We have one group of people at the technical level trying to figure out the requirements for something and whether there are and we have another group figuring out what the policies are without knowing what technical implications those will have.

And I really don't see - and it's probably just me - probably the early morning and I'm just being dumb. But I just see a disconnect there and I don't see us doing on either side other than Suzanne basically being in the middle trying to understand both sides - you know, what we're doing about it. But as I say I'll keep trying to understand.

Edmon Chung: Yes I think...

Avri Doria: So I guess I'll bring up a question...

Bart Boswinkel: Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Say, that is precisely one of the reasons why the overall policy or the IDN CCP will go into hibernation because what say in the overall policy we want to avoid is that we start addressing issues it might not be an issue and that we forget issues and we hope that the VIP comes up with issues before we go on moving forward in defining policies.

Avri Doria: Okay so the VIP is supposed to be the method by which the disconnect is closed.

Bart Boswinkel: That's in my view at least because...

Avri Doria: And yet I don't see the IETF effort using that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes at least that's my understanding. It is the attempt - and maybe stronger than an attempt but at this stage it's the attempt to identify what issues surround the whole issue of say the policy topic of variants and the technical...

Avri Doria: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...topic of variants. And until now I have, say, from my perspective of being the issue manager of the PDP I don't have a clear understanding of what are the issues with variants. So what type of policy do you...

Avri Doria: So...

Bart Boswinkel: ...want me to resolve?

Avri Doria: Okay. And who do we have - is it the VIP group that's working in detail on Suzanne's IETF document to make sure that it says things that are relevant or is that kind of irrelevant to us at the moment until, you know, we've sort of done our VIP studies and have come to a point of thinking we understand something and then we would look at - or they would look at Suzanne's document?

Because they've got a document on the table; they're looking at it. I don't see anybody on the ICANN side looking at that document and saying oh these are the kinds of things they're looking at; this is the kind of information they need. Now maybe VIP is doing that I just don't know but I didn't see that when I read their, you know, their treatise for what they were going to do.

I didn't see that particular bit of connectivity that, you know, as part of their work they were going to be, you know, looking at this document and making sure that it did things that made sense from what they were picking up. So as I say I expect it's just me but I just don't see it at the moment; I don't see how we're - anything we're doing is actually closing the gap.

Dennis Jennings: Well, Edmon, Dennis here. May I make a comment?

Edmon Chung: Yes please do. I was going to ask you to do it.

Dennis Jennings: Well the VIP and the community input to the VIP is supposed to define what the problem - what the problem is, what the user expectation is, what the issues are. And if we're successful in that - if the community is successful in that it will create issue's papers which will then be input to any possible technical work in the DNSx or the IETF and any policy work on how to address those issues from a perspective of policy.

Now the VIP is only starting; we don't have a document. We don't know what the user expectation are; we don't know what the requirements are; we don't know what the issues are. So yes there is a disconnect and that will only be filled at least from the perspective of the VIP - the Variant Issues Project - when the community has worked on the issues and produced the issue's report.

And the target for at least a first cut of that is the end of the year which by the way looks increasingly aggressive given the complexity of the problems that even now are beginning to turn up.

So to answer your question, Avri, the output from the VIP would be input to any further IETF DNSx work if there is any; if there's anything they believe that can - that can technically be done and input to the policy work on what policy decisions are required to address the issue. Thanks Edmon.

Avri Doria: Okay and as far as I can tell the IETF is not going to wait for it. So - okay...

Dennis Jennings: Well, yes but...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I understand, thanks.

Dennis Jennings: I think they're not going to wait; I think they're going to put this on the back burner and say look we don't have a real problem statement, we don't know what to do so we're not going to do any work. That's my expectation.

Avri Doria: Okay that's - maybe I'm misreading their minutes but that's not what I see them saying.

Dennis Jennings: Sure, okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Avri, Avri and Dennis might it be useful say for - because I think this is a very principle discussion just to invite somebody for - from the DNS Extensions working group next week maybe to share or ask him to what they will do? Because say we have this communication - open communication in San Francisco and they had the meeting afterwards and this is the first meeting and just to clarify that point of view on how they move forward.

Dennis Jennings: I think that's very wise.

Avri Doria: I think that would probably be a great idea. I mean, as I said I've read Suzanne's draft and I'm following it but certainly it'd be good even if it was - because, you know, Thomas Norton attended that meeting and so Suzanne was there, of course Andrew was there, Paul Dixie was there, you know, they're all quoted in the DNS Extension group's meeting report.

So, yes, getting any one of those people to sort of come in and give their perspective beyond what one can read in the status report would probably be a really good idea.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, because otherwise we're just guessing what is happening there.

Avri Doria: Not really, we can read their report.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Avri Doria: It's not really a guess, you know.

Bart Boswinkel: So that's an excellent...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I'll put on that action item for the next call.

Edmon Chung: Yes that's - I think that's a good idea. And that this is probably a good call to utilize, I mean, two weeks from now, our next call would probably good to place. Which also sort of brings me to the discussion about our own timing and I think Dennis perhaps you might want to add but I think it might probably make sense for us to sort of observe the development of the VIP as well.

We could use next meeting to connect the three areas and make sure, you know, we're somewhat on the same page going forward. And, you know, as an idea. And then there upon the VIP - the work teams should hopefully be put together and then we can observe some of it as we then go along.

And we would somewhat, as I mentioned, the idea - the proposal is to work somewhat in sync with the VIP work teams as we move forward perhaps to, you know, a little bit later in a way so in sync as in not at the same time but slightly after when, you know, things happen there and we can incorporate that direction and thinking and work into our discussion.

So to me at least that seems to make a lot of sense. I don't know whether Dennis, you want to add in terms of the timeframe and how you see that and also whether in two weeks time you would be able to join - I guess we'll ask you first and then sort to ask Suzanne or Andrew or others from the DNSx group.

Dennis Jennings: Well I would certainly try and join. Let me just check my diary while I'm talking. In terms of timescale by the end of the month we would hope to have a lot of information out there at soliciting volunteers to participate in the VIP case studies.

So you should see in about two weeks time you should see a flurry of activity all going well where we start inviting people to volunteer to participate and start forming the case study teams.

Edmon Chung: So that would be - looking at the calendar right now that would be the 19th of April. And when we, you know, after that - if we use that meeting to focus on the (unintelligible) the three sides of - three areas and, you know, get a sense. And then by May 3 we probably would have a much better idea of the work from IDN - that would be starting at the IDN VIP.

And at that time for JIG we probably can plan the - our work for the remainder of the year. Does that...

Dennis Jennings: That sounds about right.

Edmon Chung: ...make sense for everyone?

Edmon Chung: Yes. Avri, any thoughts or anyone else?

Avri Doria: On the timeframe no.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So, you know, I guess in that case we can probably end short and wrap it here because I think that probably the next - as mentioned in - we'll send out the invitation, keep everyone in the loop and - to get people for the next call. And we have, you know, the - and then from there the call in May we'll really get organized about this work.

Avri Doria: Okay. I have one other question. Is it of any value to this group, you know, not worrying about what the VIP group is doing - to at some point either do it on our own or get Suzanne to walk us through her current IETF requirements document to see - I mean, because one of the parts of that is even should we have the same terminology? Are we talking the same language about this stuff?

And perhaps that's something we also want to wait on the VIP group to sort of do. But I'm wondering does this group at some point want to walk through Suzanne's Draft 02 or get her to walk us through it or are we fine? I'm just curious. I know I keep harping on the same...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...but I'm - low I'm sorry.

Edmon Chung: I think that's probably a good suggestion for our next meeting and, you know, include it as part of the agenda. So we have that covered beyond just a general process kind of discussion. Also we can talk a little bit about the substance, you know, that - I think this particular subject matter is always useful to touch on the substance so that we know, you know, what we're really talking about.

So, yes, Avri, I think that's a good suggestion for inclusion in the agenda for the next meeting.

Avri Doria: Okay great. And it'd be great if we could get Suzanne to do it but even if we can't, you know, I think some of us have probably read it and we can sort of, you know, do the next best thing but obviously if we've got Suzanne to help us do it that's best.

Bart Boswinkel: So it almost - and it points to the - to invite Suzanne because you don't want too many people - because she will know - I assume she's part of that discussion - she was part of that discussion...

Avri Doria: Oh yes...

Bart Boswinkel: ...in Prague as well.

Avri Doria: Yes in fact she had the last word on that...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: So it's very easy...

Avri Doria: ...input.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes so it's very easy. We invite Suzanne and we ask her to first of all give an update on what happened in Prague and how - say how this interaction is moving forward and then explain her document.

Avri Doria: That would be great.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good. Sounds like we have a pretty good plan for the next couple meetings. And I guess unless anyone wants to bring up anything else I think we - it's a good - natural stop to wrap here for today. Hearing...

Dennis Jennings: Edmon, thank you very much indeed. I'm going to sign off.

Edmon Chung: All right...

Avri Doria: Okay thank you.

Edmon Chung: ...yes, thank you everyone for your time.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay thank you. Bye-bye.

END