

Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Group (JIG) TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 18th October 2011 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Group (JIG) meeting on Tuesday 18th October 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-20111018-en.mp3>

On page : <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

Attendees:

Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)
Jian Zhang, NomCom Appointee
Yung Lee

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Dennis Jennings
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Sarmad Hussein
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Jothan Frakes, IDN VIP (Observer)
June Seo, RySG
Sun XianTang, .cn

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the JIG call on the 18th of October. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Edmon Chung, Avri Doria and Jian Zhang. From staff we have Dennis Jennings, Bart Boswinkel and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

We have apologies from Sarmad Hussein. And I would like to remind you a lot please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, over to you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And thank you everyone for joining. I sent around a note just shortly before our meeting with the brief agenda. I guess we also got a quick update from Bart. I think he sent it in a little bit - I guess a few days before and also just sent it in as well.

So - but I guess, you know, I wonder if anyone has anything to add to the agenda? We basically wanted to get an update on the VIP work, talk a little bit about the arrangements for Dakar and get back to discussing the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

If not I guess since Dennis is here I wonder if you could talk a little bit about the update on the work at (unintelligible).

Dennis Jennings: Edmon, certainly, Dennis Jennings here. Yes as I hope you all know the six case study reports - the initial reports - have been posted for public comment. And the comment period is now open.

And we hope to get substantial comments both by email and also at the Dakar meeting. In addition the - what we're calling the integrated issues report coordination team has been formed. These are a number of consultants and a number of members of the various case studies that have been invited to form a coordination team to advise the VIP team on the integrated issues document.

The responsibility for the document will be taken by the VIP team based on the six case studies. And that work will start - it has started with some documents circulated. And there will be a closed working meeting on Saturday - this coming Saturday in Dakar. And then the team will report on Monday on where we are and how that session has moved forward.

The deadline for the integrated issues report is the 15th or 16th of December, which is quite a challenge but hopefully we'll be able to make that. The IDN VIP public session is now on a 12 o'clock - according to my diary - on Monday the 24th. And that in a nutshell is the update.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you, Dennis. I wonder if anyone have any questions? No? I have I guess a quick question.

Dennis Jennings: Sure.

Edmon Chung: When is the public comment until?

Dennis Jennings: I knew someone was going to ask me that. I don't have that off the top of my head. It's 30 days - it's sometime after Dakar I think. I'll look it up and send it to the list.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thanks. Because I guess, you know, that's an important date for the - for the collection of the comments and to produce the integrated report as well.

Dennis Jennings: Well it is indeed. And that remains the role of the six case study teams to review the comments and to feed a response back to the team. So the six case study teams still have that responsibility.

Edmon Chung: Oh okay that's...

Dennis Jennings: Well it's their case study report, Edmon, that's the important thing.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Dennis Jennings: Yes, so they get the comments and they can comment on the comments or summarize the comments and pass them onto the integrated issues team.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Dennis Jennings: We're not asking them to rewrite the report based on the comments but just to provide us feedback.

Edmon Chung: Right. And I guess - so the plan is to use the - an integrated report that would go out for I guess another round of public comments...

Dennis Jennings: Absolutely.

((Crosstalk))

Dennis Jennings: Absolutely, yes.

Edmon Chung: Oh okay.

Dennis Jennings: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Dennis Jennings: And the what then question I don't have a proper answer to yet. We're discussing the what then. How do we turn that issues report into a set of actions, are they operational matters, are they policy matters, how do we turn that issues report into actions that will progress the allocation and delegation of variant TLDs. And I don't have a good answer to that; we're working on that at the moment.

Edmon Chung: Okay. No I think that's a fair statement that the whole idea is to gather the information first and figure out how we can move forward.

Dennis Jennings: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So I guess with that I wanted to also open up the - a little bit of discussion here on how we see our work going forward on this particular subject. I took a quick look at the six study team reports and I find them to be quite - besides being quite interesting and talking a lot about the things that have been discussed for many years.

I feel that it seems like the approach that we have been - I mean, it doesn't conflict with the approach that us as a group - the JIG - was going down the path for about I guess it's been about a year ago by now when we start, you know, sort of - stopped working on the issue.

We - most of the - as, I guess, as expected most of the issues report focused on the language specific issues. There are a number of policy items that have been brought up and some questions asked.

I'm guessing that some further material will be created from the integrated report but I guess it will be based very much on the six study team reports as well. So it seems to me that it is probably a useful time to think about continuing on the work that we've done before.

And - because one of the things that I - the reason why I brought this up is we want to get a sense of perhaps from Avri and Rafik and also Jian because I think one of the things that is important for this group is to identify whether, you know, any policy development aspects need to be considered, you know, or sort of make a - some sort of a - in a way a judgment or a discussion at least on whether we're talking about, you know, whether we need to go back to - on the gTLD side whether we need to go back to GNSO for further policy development or we're really talking about policy implementation.

You know, where this group would be able to make some recommendations based on the GNSO new gTLD recommendations as well as the IDN working group.

So I guess in short my question really is I wonder if people have had a chance to take a look at those six study team reports already and whether, you know, people have - at this point have a strong feeling whether we're really looking at policy development or it is really consistent with the new gTLD recommendations and its - we're talking more about policy implementation.

So I wonder if Jian or Avri or Rafik, you have any thoughts on that?

Avri Doria: This is Avri just so you don't have complete silence facing you. I've only read the one on Latin so far and I don't have any thoughts yet on the need for policy stuff. But, you know, not having read the others, I mean, I really don't have an opinion yet. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Jian Zhang: This is Jian.

Edmon Chung: The Latin one is always straightforward.

Jian Zhang: Yes, this is Jian. Actually I have the same thought. I haven't - I got the same question actually I don't have the answer for your question but definitely I think it works to do a more investigation on that question.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess I'd like to make this one of the topics to be discussed in Dakar. I'm guessing, you know, as we - because as Dennis mentioned there will be a session before ours in Dakar. And, you know, I guess based on that we can, you know, better consider our work ahead.

But, you know, I guess between now and then I can probably send around again the work that we have done up until when we sort of left it off as the VIP is working on it. And, you know, let people get a sense, you know, probably, you know, review it again and see if there are any inconsistencies.

So far it seems like we're on the right track so I'd like - I think it's a good time to pick it up again. And so I guess between now and then I'll send some notes to the list as well and make this also a topic for Dakar.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Say just a question for clarification say the way you just presented the problem. In the sense of if the working group is of the opinion that it is dealing with policy aspects and not implementation aspects what would be the conclusion say from a GNSO perspective? Would the working group be ferried back to the GNSO Council? I'm just trying to understand.

Edmon Chung: Well that's the - I think when the JIG was formed this was discussed and I think this feeds into the cross constituency working process so working groups as well.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: The idea is that one of the job of the JIG would be to figure out whether anything that is conflicting with the original policy needs to be done or, you know, like whether the policy recommendations from the GNSO needs to be changed or whether substantially, you know, modified.

Or whether some, you know, fine tuning based without any conflicts to the original recommendations would be - would suffice. In the former case then,

you know, where substantial changes needs to be made then it needs to go back to the GNSO.

In the latter case where, you know, we think it's consistent with the recommendations then we would probably recommend some I guess fine tuning or further recommendations such that - so that it could be - it could then be implemented. That's - that is my understanding.

And for the ccNSO side the - I guess Jian can add to it but the idea is whether, you know, we would look at it and to figure out whether this is something that could be inserted into the fast track or not again without policy changes. And then also consider - and then take what we have discussed and put it into the - as input into the CC PDP.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes or it will go directly say - I would say for the ccNSO it would go back to the - that's the basic principal; it would go back - whatever the recommendations of the working group are they would go back to the councils and it's up to the councils whether or not to submit it either through the board as done with the single character or submitted to - in the case of the ccNSO submitted to the working group for the overall policy to consider it.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: Because say that's the whole thing I think we'd say and that's why it worked until now because - so the JIG reports back to the respective councils...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...and to nobody else.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: And I think - and that's something to consider as well say if the recommendation will be very diverging for both the CC and the GNSO it's something else to consider how to progress because that...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...about the single character - single character TLDs - IDN TLDs. The basic result is more or less the same for both.

Edmon Chung: Right. No I agree. And I think at least so far on the issue of, you know, on the remaining two issues it seems like we would likely come to a similar conclusion as well. I guess, you know...

Bart Boswinkel: It's something to consider for the - no this was just...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...a question for clarification to get my head around it. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Right. Okay so I guess, you know, that's - hopefully that clarifies it for you. And any other questions? If not we'll move to the...

((Crosstalk))

Dennis Jennings: Edmon, Dennis.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Dennis Jennings: Before we actually move on if I may? Dennis Jennings here again. One, we'd like to invite an observer from the JIG to participate in the integrated issues report coordination teamwork in particular if you would like to nominate

someone to observe on Saturday; it's an all-day meeting. It's entirely up to you but - and you don't have to decide now.

And secondly it'd be remiss of me if I didn't mention how grateful I am to the six case study teams, the team leaders and the host organizations for the enormous amount of work that was done. You're aware of it, Edmon, on the Chinese team, but extraordinary amount of work done in order to get those reports done on time and we're very appreciative of that.

Edmon Chung: Absolutely. I've been somewhat as a silent observer for all the groups as well. And I share in that thanks note to all the coordinators and the hosts.

I guess on your question in terms of having an observer I'd - at this point I'm thinking of nominating myself but of course I wonder if anyone else is interested in the job and, you know, have any thoughts on that?

Hearing none I'll send a note to the mailing list and see if anyone else is interested and see how we could coordinate this...

Bart Boswinkel: Thanks Edmon.

Edmon Chung: ...in the next few days. And I guess, you know, if there comes a point where we need to make a selection of some sort later on in any case because of the time - short time from now until Saturday I'll at least make myself available for Saturday to - as a starter. And then if we have somebody else we'll let you know after - probably after Dakar.

Bart Boswinkel: Good, thank you very much.

Edmon Chung: Okay and I guess with that we'll move to the second item which is the arrangements in Dakar. I did get Bart's email - I just - as you realized I just cut and pasted the brief agenda I had from last time. I realize that there is

only one session scheduled. And I think Bart was suggesting that we make it the same session. I think that's probably - that's probably fine.

And the time for - I wonder if Bart or Nathalie has the information.

Bart Boswinkel: It's at four o'clock.

Edmon Chung: It's at four o'clock on the Monday right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So a little bit after the VIP session.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Is it in the same room or...

Bart Boswinkel: No it's another room.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: That was the difference because some of the sessions changed around, what a week ago and now it's - so this is the latest according to the schedule.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Now what I'll do is - and it's available so I'll send a note to the JIG where the meeting room is.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess - I'd like to get a sense of, you know, what people think. But the - one of the things that I'd like to do at the session at least is to go through the - what we have so far on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. That's probably the main item and we'll spend some time.

And hopefully - and I guess at the meeting and also prior I'll try to drive more people to be interested to come and talk about this issue. I think looking at the VIP study team reports this seems to be an issue that is brought up for, you know, every single one of these study teams have some discussion on this and did identify this as an issue.

I think, you know, it would be useful if we can get a little bit more input from people about this. I was planning to I guess do a short presentation on it to get people started on questions or suggestions and also to invite Jothan to - I don't know whether Jothan is going to be there yet but I sent a note to him because he has been working on this topic for some time and to have him make a short presentation at the session as well. So this is one of the topics.

And then I think we should also put the two, as I mentioned just now, we should also schedule a short discussion on what we should plan to do for the IDN variant issue. And also since we have a face to face meeting I think it might be a good idea to use it to bring up the issue of the single character IDN TLDs and whether as a group we think we wanted to further respond to the board resolution and what our thoughts are or to add to that.

And so I think for this particular meeting we'd like to touch on all three subjects at once so that - and also to let - actually let more people know about the work here and see if we can, you know, drive a little bit more participation as well. So that's sort of the idea. I wonder if anyone has any thoughts about it?

I know, Jian, you mentioned - you asked about single character issue and whether we should do some work on that. I wonder if you want to add anything to that?

Jian Zhang: Yes, actually I'm just wondering what would be the next step for a single character. Probably we should talk about it in the Dakar face to face meeting.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So...

Jian Zhang: Although I'm not sure, you know, you said that, you know, reasonable to ask board, you know, the rationale, you know, why it will go to the second round for gTLDs. I think if, you know, variants could be reserved case by - based on case by case, you know, I, you know, I couldn't see why the single character issue couldn't be.

Edmon Chung: Right. That's actually interesting, you know, point. I certainly observed that, you know, board resolution with interest. I wonder if anyone else have any thoughts on that. And, you know, and where that came about. And on top of that I recognize that the board sort of made a decision to in a way overturn what that GNSO and ccNSO has been saying all along which is that the IDN gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs would not, you know, would go at their own pace and not be tied together.

On this issue, however, the board has - it seems like it has overturned the GNSO and ccNSO in saying that this is something that needs to be put together. So it seems like there, you know, we probably should think about how - whether we should further respond to it. I wonder if Avri or Rafik has any thoughts to add on that?

Hearing none I guess, you know, we'll put it as a agenda item for Dakar...

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I was speaking - I was speaking on mute.

Edmon Chung: Oh. Okay Avri.

Avri Doria: I just wanted to basically support the notion that it is always appropriate especially when the board goes in a different direction than a recommendation or seems to be going back on a previous decision to question them further about why.

So I certainly support, you know, the notion that, you know, a better answer on why they did this, why they thought it was important, A, to link them. Though personally I've never been opposed to the linking but I know the GNSO and ccNSO did go on a D-linked policy.

But be also, you know, why put it off. I mean, I expect I know the answer; it's a love of the status quo and not changing anything. But basically to force them to, you know, go further into their opinion is always a good thing. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess, you know, we'll make this a discussion item. And if, you know, it seems like at least at this point people are interested and we'll probably draft - maybe draft, you know, a statement from the group, you know.

The question which I think, you know, we might need to discuss is if we do draft something how it's conveyed to the board might be an interesting thing. You know, if we talk about process we probably should pass that statement back to the respective councils and let the respective councils decide what to do. At least that seems to be what the process should be. I wonder if anyone have any thoughts on that?

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. That does seem to be what the chartering organizations are demanding now; a very strict military style hierarchy that one cannot talk to the board without talking to them first. So, yes, we'll probably have to obey that. I think it's a horrible trend but, you know, I do see that as something that the two chartering organizations might require.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Well at least that, you know, it'll take longer but at least, you know, we have a process path to go through. We'll talk a little bit more about it and probably on some of the substance on if we do draft a statement what items should be included and such. I guess we can defer that to Dakar.

And - because I'll probably help jot - put some notes together comparing the board resolution and some of the recommendations from us and also from previous recommendations.

Avri Doria: Right. This is Avri, if I can actually say something further on it that's just occurred to me?

I think that, you know, while I think this group should be able to express its opinion directly I think that if we're going through the two councils, you know, I think we need to decide whether we want to recommend not only that they ask a question as to why but we also want to, you know, consider whether we want to put on the table a request from those councils that the decision be reconsidered, which is a much more formal thing and definitely something that would need to come from either the G or C Council.

Edmon Chung: I think that's certainly a good idea. And I think we - and I just - I'm thinking out loud here. Perhaps we might want to, you know, make a recommendation which has two parts where, you know, it's basically responding to the statements and the resolution and additional part on reconsidering that.

That allows us to, you know, not sort of - it allows us to decouple the two. I can imagine there might be people who are more worried about reconsidering it. But I think we should certainly bring that issue up. Okay.

So with that I guess I'll - in the next couple days I'll send out a sort of agenda for Dakar. I wonder if - Bart and Nathalie, I wonder if the agenda could be updated. I wonder if it's too late to update the schedule that's posted as well...

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: ...I'll draft something so that it could be posted there so people know what exactly we'll be discussing.

Bart Boswinkel: We could try.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I'll ask Kristina.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So with that I'll move to the last item which is to continue the discussion on the initial report for universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. I just reviewed the document that we had so far. I think in the previous discussion we've pretty much gone through - pretty much gone through everything.

At this point most of it is really questions out to the community and hopefully we would receive some comments back to continue. I don't know, you know, whether - where I guess where we should continue the discussion because it seems like we've exhausted the stock-taking of the issues, we've - I've, you know, listed out a number of items that were collected from previous discussions and a number of questions.

You know, basically the - split out into items that seems to be more related to policy and then a number of items where ICANN could focus its efforts on to exert its influence. And then, you know, how ICANN and the ICANN community could take this subject further.

Because a lot of - this issue itself is - from all the discussions at least it appears to not be something that could be fully mandated by ICANN policies but ICANN certainly, as an organization and as the community, can work on, you know, focusing its efforts on helping this cause.

So I - with that I, you know, I was thinking we could close, you know, sooner than the one-hour. But I wonder if anyone have any thoughts on it because I think going forward my somewhat - I think, you know, there are some items

which I still need to sort of write out more nicely if you will rather than just point forms.

And - but before that I'd like to go into Dakar and maybe make - just present what we have so far and get some input and then finalize it for a formal round of public comments. At least so far that's the - that's where my head is. I wonder if anyone have any thoughts or think this direction is okay?

Hearing none or if anyone is on mute trying to speak? Well hearing none then I guess we'll push ahead, you know, with that approach which is we'll gather some further information from the Dakar meeting. And then shortly after Dakar we'll look to finalize this and put it out for public comments.

And with that I think we...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Hello?

Jian Zhang: This is Jian, I'm sorry, I joined in late.

Edmon Chung: Oh.

Jian Zhang: I just wanted to say that what you had just said sounds good.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you. And are you going to be in Dakar as well?

Jian Zhang: Uh-huh.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So well I guess we'll close early then because that's the end of the agenda unless anyone have anything else they want to bring up? Jian?

Jian Zhang: It sounds good to me. So we're going to meet in the Monday afternoon, right, in Dakar?

Edmon Chung: Yes. Okay so if that's the case then thank you everyone for joining. Safe travels. See you in Dakar.

Avri Doria: Safe travels.

Bart Boswinkel: See you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye, bye.

Edmon Chung: Bye.

Jian Zhang: Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Tim), you may now stop the recordings.

END