

**JIG  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 14 June 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 14 June 2011 at 1200 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ijg-20110614-en.mp3>

Transcript will follow shortly.

**Attendees:**

Edmon Chung, RySG  
Rafik Dammak, NCSG  
Avri Doria, NCSG  
Wei Zhao, .cn

**ICANN Staff:**

Bart Boswinkel  
Dennis Jennings  
Kristina Nordström

**Apologies:**

Fahd Batayneh, .jo  
Sarmad Hussain, CLE-KICS, UET  
Jian Zhang, APTLD

Kristina Nordström: (Sabar), are you there?

Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Kristina Nordström: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Welcome, everybody, to today's JIG call on the 14 of June.

On the call today we have Edmon Chung, Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Wei Zhao and from staff Bart Boswinkel, Dennis Jennings and Kristina Nordström. Apologies from Sarmad Hussein, Fahd Batayney and Jian Zhang.

And may I please ask you to state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. And over to you, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And thank you, everyone, for joining the call. I again apologize for last week at - well last call actually that we had to cancel in short order.

But anyway so today I sent around a sort of a brief agenda with four items that I want to cover, first one being some preparations for our face-to-face session in Singapore and then three other items that were sent around the main list in the last few weeks, the liaison or observer for the VIP study team, the variance issues project. And thank you, Dennis, for being on the call as well.

The - some clarifications, I guess it's a brief report from staff about moving forward on the single-character IDN TLD implementation and also some comments that Avri sent around in terms - with regards to the (ITS) document that we talked about in our last call that - last - well four weeks ago which - the call - last call that happened.

So I guess unless anybody wants to add or take away something we'll move right to the first item. Okay.

So I was in - I think we scheduled a time on Monday for the face-to-face meeting in Singapore. That would be next Monday.

I was wondering what people had in mind. I had a brief chat with (Jane) and thought probably because we'll be spending the Saturday before with the VIP study teams -- I think that's - that will be one of the first meetings getting us

kick-started -- so I think a follow-up discussion on what this group should do might be a good topic.

And I - we brought up the issue of the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. I thought since it's a face-to-face meeting perhaps it's a good idea to get started on the stock-taking of the issues that this group should discuss on that particular topic and of course depending on the third item on today's agenda the - some - if any response on some further clarifications on single-character IDN TLD implementation so really covering all three issues of common interest that we identified for the Monday meeting with the variance issue leading off and if we time for the other two items.

So that's sort of what I have - had in mind. I wonder if anyone have any ideas or thoughts or - from it.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: The - one of the things I've been checking in preparation of the Singapore meetings, I've been checking the charges again of working groups. And there is one item regarding the JIG. And that's probably something that the JIG needs to consider, the GNSO council and the ccNSO council as well, that assuming the board will adopt the applicant guidebook in Singapore if you look at the charter that's one of the events that would close this working groups - this working group.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: So if this would happen on Monday it's - I think both the ccNSO, the GNSO and the JIG need to reconsider if the working group needs to continue maybe under a mandate charter or something else.

Edmon Chung: Good point. I guess given the situation and some of the things that we do, are continuing to do I would venture to say that at least we'll keep the Monday meeting. And even if the AGP get - the applicant guidebook gets - goes through I think we could probably have the Monday meeting and add this to the agenda and further discuss with GNSO and ccNSO.

Bart Boswinkel: That was a suggestion. That's why I raised it. So this is all scheduled and everything else. But yeah, by that time you would know.

And say - and I know there is a ccNSO, GNSO council lunch again on Monday. And maybe...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: This is a topic that could be raised there. The answer doesn't need to be definite at the time. But it's something to consider by the JIG as well.

Edmon Chung: Right. Thank you for bringing that up. Yes, that is - the current charter does have that as a natural close for the discussions here. I wonder if anyone wants to add to that discussion.

It seems like, you know, some of the things that we're doing would continue through. Even though the - even if the applicant guidebook or the new gTLD program is to be approved some of the items that we are talking about seems to be - seems to continue to be relevant. So (unintelligible)...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. But it'd be still nice to have the discussion right now. I think it's - if you put it on the agenda for Monday afternoon I think it's fine so if people ask...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: About it.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Bart. Anyone want to add to that or any other thoughts, ideas, comments?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. It does seem like a good topic to stick as an upfront. Just, you know, take a snapshot of where we are and what it affects in terms of that.

I think there's great optimism in thinking we'll know Monday afternoon. But hey it's definitely worth having in there even if it's only to update that we still don't know and we're still waiting for white smoke.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good. Okay.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I think it's a fine agenda. And if we just add, you know, the agenda - the requisite agenda bash that sort of says hey we can change the agenda later if circumstances require it, it's great.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess with that I'll - after the call I'll send in maybe the few items that we just talked about so people can prepare.

And we might want to update the website a little bit if that's still possible. But I guess I'll work with Kristina on that.

Bart Boswinkel: It...

Kristina Nordström: Sure.

Edmon Chung: Yeah. All right so the second item is the liaison observer for the VIP study teams. I think, Rafik, you raised the issue I originally had. And Avri, you responded to that.

I originally had the idea of having sort of one person and was going to suggest myself to oversee all of them as observers. But I think Avri, if you were - I think it might be good to - if you're interested to be on one. And perhaps I'll I guess generally open the discussion here what others think since, you know, both of you are here.

I don't know, Rafik, if you have anything you wanted to add to that and what do you think about the suggestion and Avri, if you wanted to add, too.

Avri Doria: Yeah. This is Avri. I don't know. I can add something quickly.

Edmon Chung: Yes. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Even looking at the schedule when one sees three sets of parallel discussions I just don't see how one person could do...

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I didn't...

Avri Doria: All of them.

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I wasn't realize - I didn't realize that that was the general scheduling going forward as well. Perhaps since - I wonder if Dennis is still on the call. Is - if you are is that - going forward is that going to be the idea, that, you know, things will pretty much - it's likely that a lot of times that it will go in parallel?

Dennis Jennings: Well the - we have six case study teams and very awkward timing. So the best we could do and with the best - with the rooms we had available was the schedule them the way we have.

So yes I think at the ICANN public meetings there will be parallel sessions like that. And then each case study team will operate independently thereafter. But that doesn't mean there won't be clashes of scheduling.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So it is possible that they would clash. So Avri, as - I guess adding to the point it's probably a good idea to not have just one person so.

Dennis Jennings: Well I would recommend that. I think that would be very helpful. One person could cover from, you know, moving from meeting to meeting. But that wouldn't necessarily provide enough information. So it's really...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Dennis Jennings: Up to the JIG what you'd like to do. And just let us know.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I'm curious because in - Dennis, in your email you said a observer or an observer. I was wondering if it's possible to nominate two so that it - there could be alternate or when cases - in cases where there are clashes we could split up.

Dennis Jennings: Yes, absolutely. I - we'd have no difficulty with that. That was - I hadn't spotted that myself that I had said an observer, implying singular. But if people want to be closer to each of the case studies then obviously there should be more people involved. But it should be...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Dennis Jennings: Only one person in each case study. We don't want six people moving from case study to case study.

Edmon Chung: Sure, understood.

Dennis Jennings: Thanks.

Edmon Chung: So I guess so far I guess myself and Avri have put forward our names.

Avri Doria: And I think Rafik was putting himself forward too. Wasn't he? This is Avri.

Edmon Chung: That was what I was going to ask. I wasn't wondering - I wasn't sure whether, Rafik, you were just asking about it or you were interested in being part of or one of or more of the study teams.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Rafik here. In fact on the day I saw the announcement and I remember we made. So I wanted to ask how it's going there. But maybe if I can, I can volunteer for the Arabic case study.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Yes. I - well I guess it's only really the three of us at this point on this particular call. Is anyone else? I just want to make sure.

Wei Zhao: Edmon? Sorry. Can I add something?

Edmon Chung: Please.

Wei Zhao: Yes. It's Wei. About the observer I have questions. The name of JIG to approve observer in each the IDN and the IP is to try to coordinate the - into single working groups their works with the JIG. And so that way don't doing the same work at the same time.

But as I know the - each working group has ICANN staff. Could they do the job because JIG has our own - we have our own target? We have our own works to do. So if, you know, each one take the VIP observer jobs they might running around and, you know, restrict their patience from JIG work. That's just a thought.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Well I guess a couple of things.

Dennis Jennings: Edmon, may -- Dennis here -- may I -- Dennis Jennings here -- may I come in and just explain a little bit for - this might...

Edmon Chung: Go ahead.

Dennis Jennings: Be helpful. Each of the case study teams will have a private email list. But the archives will be available publicly. And there's a general VIP mailing list that people can join for discussion and for updates.

The ICANN staff will be working with the case study coordinators to post periodic updates on the case study mailing list and on the general mailing list. So it will be possible to track without active participation. So it's entirely up to the JIG what you'd like to do.

Wei Zhao: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Right. Yeah. Thank you, Dennis. Yeah. And I think we - I think last time you mentioned that as well. So yeah, I think we're aware.

But in response to Wei, your thoughts, I think in terms of the JIG I think in the last few meetings that we talked about this issue I think there's a general interest to at least keep a sort of a liaison between the discussions. And I think that will not only help our discussion but it also at times could bring some of what we've discussed here into the discussion to the study teams as well. So I think, you know, it's generally a two-way thing.

But as an observer from what I understand generally we won't be speaking or participating in the level that we would be in this group as we're talking about things but really just observing. If at any point there are items to be brought up we will specifically bring it up.

But - so I think - I don't think it would - at least I don't seem to view that it will take away from some of the things that we are doing here. And the whole point of maintaining a somewhat parallel process is to try to get to the - I guess the endpoint sooner rather than later. And I think that continues to be the sort of overarching aim or idea for this sort of parallel discussion and for the observer and liaison to be - to exist.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I add?

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess I heard - I see that Avri, you would like to be on the Latin one. I don't know whether you would want to be on others as well. Rafik, you mentioned that you'd be interested to be on the Arabic one as an observer.

I - Avri, did you want to add? Did you want to be...

Avri Doria: Yeah. I wanted to add something.

Edmon Chung: Please, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: In terms of the observer first of all I am assuming that this is a (unintelligible) observer in JIG at the moment. I think this is a normal ICANN-ish sort of observer where they're not just silent bumps on the wall but they actually may contribute on occasion. Is that correct, Dennis?

Dennis Jennings: Yes. Formally they need the approval of the chair or the case study coordinator. But in practice observers as long as they don't dominate the meeting will be happy - I think the case study coordinator will be happy to have observers contribute fairly freely.

Avri Doria: Because...

Dennis Jennings: But it's up to the case study coordinator.

Avri Doria: Right, of course. And that's always the case in a group.

So in terms of having JIG members participate and just - not just rely on the passive it - then - and getting reports from staff there really is at least somewhat of a two - bidirectional thing.

I think the other part is if we do decide to get into any work with the - with, you know, the IETF and its case study exploration I think we may want to have some participation in actually doing stuff. So I actually think it's good that, you know, people who are active members whether observers or real members -- and I might be in trouble in JIG for overstepping observer status if that's what I am; I don't even remember -- is that they...

Man: Keep going.

Avri Doria: People - is that they...

Man: Keep going.

Avri Doria: Yeah, is that they need people that actually participate in this group so they can bring things back in a very active and content-full manner.

And so - yeah, so I'm fine doing Latin. I think we can double-up. I wasn't planning to volunteer for another one. I could. And the only other alphabet of the ones being talked there since they're not doing Hebrew that I have familiarity with is Greek, not that I know any Greek. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you, Avri. And I guess Dennis already quickly responded.

And I - well so far - so basically I guess my question to Dennis is if we have myself for all the teams in terms of the mailing list and Avri for Latin and Greek and then also Rafik for Arabic would that be too much or is that something I would - if you think it's okay then I'll suggest to the list and see if the - if there are any other problems on the list.

Dennis Jennings: I think that's fine. I think that's fine.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you, Dennis. So I guess for the time being that's - I'll suggest that to the list and see if we are okay with it. If so I guess by the Monday - I

guess we can confirm on the Monday meeting and going forward can at least for the time being set it up as such.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. One last comment. Obviously if there's someone who knows Greek and, you know, because I really think it's best if one person does one. It's just that I'm willing to cover another if need be but...

Edmon Chung: I guess we'll send it around the list and see if anyone jumps up.

Dennis Jennings: Edmon, Dennis here, Dennis Jennings here. The case study meetings are starting on Saturday as you know so if you could let me have the names you're putting forward by Friday lunchtime or so on so I can email the case study coordinators and advise them.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess I'll suggest it to the list first. And unless we hear a lot of issues then I'll have that passed to you on Friday. And we'll still cover it briefly on Monday just to, you know, so that there's a little bit more time for those who want to weigh in on the item.

Dennis Jennings: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Does that work?

Dennis Jennings: That works. And Edmon, would you excuse me now. I think I need to go and pack.

Edmon Chung: All right.

Woman: Have a good...

Dennis Jennings: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: They...

Dennis Jennings: Thank you very much indeed. Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Bye. Okay. So that is Item Number 2. Item Number 3 I have is the questions that Bart sent along. I guess some really probably not questions but a suggested way forward from staff in terms of the single-character IDN TLD implementation. I - Bart sent it around and I sent it again today.

Bart, I wonder if you have any, you know, I guess anything you wanted to add or background because one of the things I'm not so sure is that you said - you asked - they didn't - don't seem to be questions. Seems like they are I guess some way forward steps, you know, moving forward on it.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. The only - say - in this sense I haven't been involved in the substantial discussions of this item.

This is part probably from the new gTLD implementation team. This came up say after the board Istanbul meeting when (Curt) raised these issues and say that the policy staff thought it would be very useful if the JIG got involved in these questions, issues for clarifications as well.

I don't know and I think this is probably more a procedural answer than anything else. I think it might be useful if those people who are involved in the implementation directly contact -- excuse me -- directly contact the JIG to sit down and to answer precisely those questions you have about the substance of the note.

Edmon Chung: Sure. But it seems like the note suggests a way forward from forming a staff implementation team much like the IRTF.

So and then the, there are some items that were listed for that team to consider, so I wasn't sure what that (Jake) should respond to, that's the part I was a little bit confused about is this already put into action?

Is this being presented to the board, has already been put to the action and (Jake) is being sort of, (Jake) should participate in that implementation team or is this some sort of a draft or a proposal for forming that team and looking for some feedback from us at this point. That's the part I'm not quite sure.

Bart Boswinkel: I think as it is say my understanding, but this is just my understanding, this is an invitation to participate in say a type of implementation team like this situation.

I don't know how this was done under the applicant guidebook say to the ITRP I think you called it, that's, so I that's too much focus on say the new GTLD process.

But what I could do, and I think that's the best way forward, is that I get back again to Kurt and to maybe one or two others like Steve Sheng who have been involved to ask what role they foresee for members of the (Jake), or to (Jake) itself and how to move forward with this.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So okay I just want to get one thing clear is that I want to make sure this is not waiting for us to respond in any fashion because I wasn't sure from your note it seems like we were supposed to respond or something and then I read it and you know, I wasn't sure.

Bart Boswinkel: On the other hand except maybe it's say what we've say what we as policy staff ensured through this say channeling it through the councils is that the (Jake) gets involved directly with the implementation staff.

So it might be useful following up on that invitation that maybe even you directly get in touch with Kurt following this invitation.

Edmon Chung: I'm more than happy to do that.

Bart Boswinkel: Because then you got, say because of, because the council's forwarded it through to (Jake) so that in that essence you got the backing of both councils to get directly involved.

Edmon Chung: Right. Okay. So...

Bart Boswinkel: And that makes it easier because if I get in between, say you know more about the new GTLD implementation or applicant guidebook than I do.

Man: Maybe Avri does even more so.

Bart Boswinkel: That's something else. But at least far more than I do.

Edmon Chung: So I'm sorry but so what should be the next steps? The next steps is you would connect with Kurt and that team and see...

Bart Boswinkel: I would, if say I advise or you or the (Jake), based on the e-mail that I sent you because that was both on the GNSO/CCNSO council...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...that you refer to that e-mail and say refer to the councils, get directly in touch with Kurt.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: And if you want to cc me that's fine.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess that's, thank you for the suggestion, it seems to make sense I guess myself and (Jane) will just step forward and say you know, and proactively reach out to Kurt...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...and sort of with respond to that and see if we can even maybe meet up in Singapore.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Because that's, and that yeah follows from getting the council's involved and they've mandated you to step up.

Edmon Chung: To continue. Right. Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: So anything anyone else, whether the substance of the document or the suggested process. No one? Okay. So hearing none I guess we'll get back to the councils and suggest a way forward so and then given that there is no objection or you know some...

Bart Boswinkel: Well Edmon I think you don't need to go back to the council, just copy them in, and this is because they asked you to do it.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: So going back is creating another loop.

Edmon Chung: Right. You're right. So I'll just move right ahead to connect with Kurt directly and keep everyone on the loop so...

Bart Boswinkel: Or copy them in and then it's fine.

Edmon Chung: Right. Sounds good. Okay. And I'll keep everyone, I'll keep this a group (Jake) list in the loop as well so everyone can see it moving forward.

So that brings me to, sorry my computer...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) the note I sent.

Edmon Chung: Yes. So the last item B the note that Avri sent around I had a quick look, perhaps Avri you, if you want to briefly talk about it and we'll go into talking about what the next steps should be from this group.

Avri Doria: Sure. By the way I went and looked and I am just an observer so I apologize if I contribute, talk too much. Also just looking at our group members it seems like we should have lots of character sets, or at least a bunch of them covered inside the group.

So okay to the note I sent, I basically read through it again and I think this is very similar to what I said before I wrote the note, just the note was sort of trying to be somewhat more coherent than I am when I just talk.

So there are various points in it and I think each of these points could lead to an activity if the group desired. The first one was basically I don't know to what extent people understand that at the moment there is no technical solution, no pure, simple if everybody just adopted this protocol or this you know method of working or this new, you know feature it would work, that solution doesn't exist yet.

And so I think that's a very important part of framing that and you know I knew it going into reading the draft again probably from reading earlier drafts and such, but it always kind of hits me strongly that we're talking about policy in an area where there isn't a set of solutions.

Normally when we're doing the policy work or looking then there's maybe technical solution A, B and C and various ways of going about it and we're using policy as a method to pick which one meets the real needs of you know users, registrants and everyone else. So that just was an important thing.

Then it talks about the way that there are administrative methods that registries have for dealing with the problem. I don't consider myself the least knowledgeable person, though there's a lot about what goes on inside registries and registrars that I do not know and do not understand.

And I think that's probably true for a lot of us, so perhaps somebody actually giving a coherent, a description of what it is that's done, how it is that the problem is solvable, is that solution scalable, are the people that are doing it now you know I guess if it's in various you know Chinese and perhaps Korean, I don't know, characters and such do they have a solution that's working for them and is scalable and is something that's shareable so that other people can understand it?

Then the next point, Point 3 was about the weakest part of that draft is the case studies discussion. Now that all fits in with the work that ICANN is embarking on and that we're getting involved in at least as observers.

So my point in this one is that document really needs the case studies section strengthened and I don't think the document should be published before then and that's not me speaking as an observer in (Jake) but me speaking as an IATF participant, I look at that and say it's not ready yet and so that's something that I would certainly flag in that environment and I'm suggesting it here too.

Okay yes, the fourth point is perhaps somewhat esoteric is that remembering when working with the IATF that there's a different view of what a domain name is and one it's a character legible string of characters and in another it's a name, it has a meaning, it has marks associated with it, it's got political sensitivities associated with it.

It's got all of that baggage that a name or word has, whereas in an IATF of context and it's the way I always describe it is the fact that if the word is a

happy coincidence but what counts is that it's a readable set of strings and not digits.

Okay. The other point is that there are complexities in that some of the solutions that may have worked or may have been close to working when put in the same environment with (DNS SEC) and it's requirements on keeping keys and keeping track of stuff it gets hard.

So that's a complication, I don't know that those are solvable, I'm not even sure that I fully understand them because my knowledge on (DNS SEC) is relatively shallow, you know I understand the buzz words and the top part of it but I do not understand the mechanism, you know beyond protocol exchanges.

Okay yes, the seventh point was that you know, anything that does get deployed, I mean it goes to the discussion item we have, you know, in the meeting about the universal acceptance of IDM, that means people got to put in even once there's a method people have to do the work to deploy that and you know.

So even when there is a solution that could take a couple years to figure out, if one can indeed be figured out, and then how long does it take to get deployed, so that's again something we have to have an awareness of in coming up with policies and so, and that's about it other than the part I said at the end there about I don't think it's ready as an informational (RSV) until the case study is stronger.

I don't think they need the full level case study that ICANN needs because it's thinking policy not technology. But I think the first part of the case study where they describe the situation in some sense, and of course I don't know how that's going to work yet, might actually be useful content.

So they may not have to wait for the end of the ICANN process where you know there's a lot of work that gets done up front, things get pretty much set in terms of what they look like and then most projects have incredibly long tails while everybody's dotting I's, crossing T's and nailing down the bits of political variance on issues.

So you know I think they might be able to take the contribution they need from the first part of the project but I think they need that content, so that's about it.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Avri and, thank you very much actually and I think that a very quick take away in terms of action forward it seems like what you are pointing towards is that we should communicate with the group, the (DNS EXT) working group and say these kind of things that you know wait a little bit, I don't have to wait for the whole thing but there are some valuable input that we could provide to you and that you know without which we don't think it's ready.

That's sort of the general direction that you're suggesting right, and then I have a few more questions and observation but I just want to clarify that, that sort of...

Avri Doria: Yeah I think that would, this is Avri again, I think that would be a useful thing for us to say is that you know, yeah.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I have a few observations and questions but I'd like to ask if (unintelligible) or anyone else on the call have any questions or clarifications or comments or thoughts first.

Hearing none I, well I guess I'll get us started anyway. So again thank you Avri for summarizing everything but I think there's, it's first of all I think it's really important to probably distinguish between aliasing and a variance, IDN variant and what I mean is that there are, there could be cases where a, there

are IDN variants to be aliased but there could be also cases where their IDN variants that should not be aliased or you know, depending on the linguistic policies.

And that brings me to the second item which Avri you mentioned in terms of the string a semantic meaning versus just a string of code points and that has a lot of relevance there because I think when we talk about an IDN variance in the, you know in what we're talking about here as ICANN and some of the policy discussion that is the semantic part is certainly an important consideration, semantic and linguistic you know, all the baggage that comes with that.

But in terms of ultimately the IATF side while the requirements may, or should have this in the background perhaps in, you know an alias sort of a technology or a protocol it is probably right to, you know to look at it in a sense of code points and you know a string of code points.

And really what we're talking about in the technical level is you know two domain names, two domain strings that would be sort of aliased together and made consistent through the tree, that being a requirement, but that doesn't mean that you know all IDN variance would be handled that way, it's just that it is potentially one of the ways to handle it.

And if the IDN language policies for that particular language or script dictates that that is the thing to do then that, at that point then that could be used, that technology can be used.

And that brings me to the final part where you said you didn't quite understand the administrative sort of solution, I guess that's interesting because I, at least from the point of view of Chinese for example I think an administrative process would handle most of the situations because most of the situations may not or does not necessarily call for a fully aliased, screw the tree kind of implementation.

So that's, you know probably made it really complex for anyone to understand but that's sort of my thoughts in response to the few points that Avri mentioned and I think, I definitely think that and agree with Avri that we should sort of draft something together towards that direction that you suggested.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I actually think I understood, I don't think we have enough time at this point to get into discussion, but I think some of these things are good discussions because I never had the concept before of some things might be aliased but perhaps in a limited sense, and you don't actually need to alias the whole tree and such.

And so you know I think there's a lot more to be explored there but obviously, or at least for me to understand, you know the full point you're making but I don't see us having time now.

Edmon Chung: Right. Well we have a few more minutes but I think the, you know in looking at the document and stuff I think we should definitely, we should definitely get back to (Suzanne) and (Andrew) and say yes we, you know we think there is something we can offer over here and ask them not to rush to conclusion there.

And I think the, as you mentioned, that the case studies are a good input material for it, so ask them to wait for a little while, and I also you know, agree with you that you know, they don't have to wait for all of them and especially I do believe that once we clarify, at least in my mind I think it's most important to clarify that there are IDN variant policies and aliased, you know technology.

And they don't have to be, you know, they're not equivalent in a way, you know, I don't know what word to use, they're not congruent I guess is

probably the word, they're not congruent, they have a relationship and sometimes they are, you know they are the same.

But there are, and when you talk about semantic meaning or the linguistic aspect of the strings versus the code point, string of code point thing that might really be the crux of the issue and I think perhaps, at least at this point of my view is that on the IATF side the focus, as you mentioned.

And that's really what they are interested in anyway, is to focus on you know once the policies identify two strings to be aliased as IDN variance what can be done technically in terms of protocol, that might be the, you know the crystallization of the requirement or the issue that we'd like them to look into.

But you know that's just my quick response at this time after looking at the document and your thoughts Avri. I don't know if you want to add to that or anyone else? Hearing none well maybe we had everyone fully confused by now.

So anyway, no I think we're making some headway so I guess with that I'd like to, I'd like to suggest, and I'll put this to the (unintelligible) as well, I'd like to suggest that perhaps I guess myself and (Jane) will sort of take this particular discussion and send it over to (Suzanne) and (Andrew) and say, you know we would, this is sort of our initial thinking.

And we'll spend a little bit of time in the next few meetings, including our face-to-face meeting to talk about a, to start to work together a sort of I guess wordings, a set of what we think and respond as a group in hopefully the next I would guess month or two.

Does that make sense? Am I still on?

Avri Doria: Yeah you're still on.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Avri Doria: I'm getting ready (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: All right so I guess we're pretty much at the top of the hour now anyway so and I think most would need to move to the next call.

So with that as I just recap you know I'll send a few things out, one is the, an e-mail to (Suzanne) and (Andrew) on the IATF stuff and the other is to Kurt on the single character IDN TLD implementation, and thirdly the people who'll be, we're putting at observers or suggesting as observers on the VIP team, and fourthly the agenda for our face-to-face meeting next Monday. Okay. With that anyone else have any items they want to bring up?

Avri Doria: Happy travels to everyone.

Edmon Chung: All right. Safe travels everyone. Thank you for joining.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Take care. Bye. See you everyone in Singapore.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Kristina Nordström: Thank you very much. That's all for today.

Man: Okay. Bye Kristina.

Kristina Nordström: Bye.

END