

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION**

Tuesday 10 January 2012 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 10 January 2012 at 1300 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-20120110-en.mp3>

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)
Chris Dillon
Jian Zhang, NomCom Appointee

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Sarmad Hussein
Fahd Batayneh, .jo

Nathalie Peregrine: Good afternoon and good evening. This is the (Jig) call on the 10th of January 2012. On the call today we have Edmon Chung, Avri Doria, Bart Boswinkel, Chris Disspain, (Ajane Jung). From staff we have myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We have apologies from (unintelligible), Sarmad Hussein and Rafik Dammak.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Nathalie and I also receive apologies from (Ian). So just thank you everyone for joining the - this call. (I) sent around a brief agenda for today, had a few items in it, but it should be fairly short on most of the items.

I see that Bart has already provided some update to it but I guess, you know, we can just quickly go through it anyway. So I guess just first item to - just a posting of the initial report. Sorry, I actually missed the announcement but I see that it went out late last week in terms of posting of the initial (part) of the (universal) sections of IDM TLDs, so thank you, Bart, for getting that set.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: When does it run until? Do you have the - when - now when does it - when does the - when does the comment end?

Bart Boswinkel: The comment period itself ends at the 7th of 8 - this is Bart for the - for transcription purposes. The comment period itself ends on the 7th of February but due to the new format, there is a reply period as well. And there is no link in between, so I've extended until early March but that doesn't mean that the working group couldn't continue and by the end of February, you know, review the comments received.

I've also included, if you look at the email, I've included a suggestion that in order to avoid, say, issues like the one we had with the board resolution, that the (goat has) informed the other SL and other AC chairs as a first step. And maybe because of, say, the broad impact of the topic, maybe even influenced external stakeholders inside the ITF but I - it's just a suggestion.

Edmon Chung: Well, that - those are good suggestions. In fact, I have also been in touch with the staff team that's looking on - at this issue, especially with a new gTLD

program being launched. I think it's going to cause important - you know, for a lot of things.

So - and I think actually in one of our discussions, Nathalie joined our call as well at one point. And I think as we progress, I think Nathalie - I'm sorry, not Nathalie, it was (Nadia).

Man: Naela.

Edmon Chung: Naela, right. And Karla will be joining us as well as we go down the path because there's some work that's being done as the new gTLD program as well there - as well.

So yes, I definitely think we should reach out to the (two SOs) and ITF and as (broad) as possible and (since to) get some feedback on how we deal with this particular issue.

Bart Boswinkel: So maybe that's (unintelligible) time, say - added to the (unintelligible) that we sort out who is going to do what, otherwise we lose a lot of time again.

Edmon Chung: Right. So, thank you Bart actually. I wonder - I guess between - I can initiate the - maybe myself and Avri can help initiate the note to the GNSO side and get the council as well as the stakeholder groups, make them aware of the - for the (unintelligible) being sought and also get some feedback on it.

I guess, (Jane), maybe you and maybe Bart can help out as well to connect with the ccNSO side and get...

Bart Boswinkel: That's a no brainer. I think (ASAC), ALAC and GAAC are more important to reach out. Say, the - because you've got ccGNSO members on the working group and GNSO members on the working group. These are the least problematic.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: It's the other SOs and ACs.

Edmon Chung: Good point. So I guess we'll start with, just a note to the chairs, to the respective chairs and seek their participation in sending this out to their members. And I guess hopefully it's an issue of interest.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I guess I'll get started and probably get - keep everyone in the loop on that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, or just use it as an (XM&I) term and report back next call on the status. That's easier. It's just an administrative...

Edmon Chung: Sure.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: (Sounds good).

Bart Boswinkel: And we'll initiate it today and then see where we're (headed).

Edmon Chung: Yes, so you said you were going to initiate it or...

Bart Boswinkel: No, we.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: I don't mind drafting a note, so...

Edmon Chung: Yes, if you can, please do. And you can feel free to keep me in the loop, me and (Jane) and (Lisa) and then we'll take...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and maybe with the cc to the (Jig) itself, and then say by the end of this week, we could send it - you or - and (Jane) can send it to the XOs and AC chairs. It's going to be very simple but just to inform that this is happening.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good. In looking at the link - the announcement link - that you sent me, it - it doesn't say when the comment period ends.

Bart Boswinkel: It should.

Edmon Chung: I don't know. I don't know if I'm looking at the right page but if I click on the announcement that you sent...

Bart Boswinkel: (That would have to be it).

Edmon Chung: It only shows comment period opens on (as well).

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and - you go to the comment box, see, and it's just - because I use a template and this is - pick up these new templates. Otherwise, I'll get back to them. Let me check.

Edmon Chung: So that's also what you see. So you're going to (get back) to them and see - and get it fixed.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: All right, cool. Any thoughts on...

Bart Boswinkel: No it - Edmond?

Edmon Chung: Please.

Bart Boswinkel: I just checked and there is - if you go to the announcement itself, there is a link (to CNS). If you click that one then you see the whole period.

Edmon Chung: Ah, okay. Got it.

Bart Boswinkel: There is a full description there of the (Witsam) questions.

Edmon Chung: Okay. That's good. Okay, that's good then. I guess this is probably a better link than the other one that we're going to follow there. Okay. So that's on the first item. I wonder if anyone has any sort of thoughts or suggestions as to I guess where we should send this out to because actually, you know, Avri and Chris, did you have any idea where to send this around to, please go crazy on this. Okay. So I guess we'll move on to the next item, which is the response, or the drafted response to the August - 11/11 board resolution on our - on the single (craft) of IDM TLDs.

So as we discussed last time actually, so the cNSO council resolved it and the ccNSO council is thinking of drafting their own response. So I do see that Bart sent an update on that. It's - the ccNSO letter's being drafted.

And I guess - I've been reaching out to (Stephan) and (Leslie) on the item as well. I think for the time being, the - so the GNSO resolution specified that - clearly that it requires a mutual approval from the two councils before it's being, you know, further action is being taken.

So that hasn't been achieved. I guess the current thinking is still to try to come to a mutual set of wording for the response. And so I guess we're waiting for the ccNSO to (sort of pull) stuff together and take a look at it. Bart, did you want to add to that?

Bart Boswinkel: No, I think this captures - is, I would say this captures it as far as I know, say, this small drafting group within the ccNSO council and that has - and the draft is now circulating. It covers the topic I've sa- I've mentioned in the email and hopefully this week it will be ready and that will be shared and forwarded with the ccNSO council at large and shared with the GNSO council.

Edmon Chung: Okay, and then...

Bart Boswinkel: So it should (be out) this week, early next week.

Edmon Chung: Okay. (Jane), I wonder if you wanted to add anything because I think you missed last call and - last time and whether you have anything to add in terms of the ccNSO council, the response on the item.

(Jane): Not really.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess that's the status right now. We'll wait to hear from the ccNSO drafting team and I guess we'll circulate to this (snif) as well, of course and then see if there is anything we want to add or - as it's being considered again by the two councils.

Okay, so the next three topics are somewhat related, on the - one of the issues of common interest that we identified, it's the (IDM) (variance) TLD issue. We see that the VIP has published an integrated report. Unfortunately (Dennis) couldn't join us to give us a quick walk through.

But I guess, I wonder how many peop- you know, if most have had the chance to read it. I can't say I have read - I have skimmed through it. I can't say I've read it in very much detail.

But a couple of things I guess I wanted to highlight. One is that this is a work from staff actually. I think that's actually probably a good way to describe it and so I think there is a - it is called the integrated report. It does introduce a

number of things that are in the study team reports that gives an interpretation of them and an attempt to integrate them.

Personally I think that, you know, at first glance it seems to be a reasonable approach. I think there are - a lot of work was put in place to try to pull together the six, you know, commonalities or the differences between the (study team) reports on the issue that we - the issues of IDN variance.

And - but I guess what I wanted to try to get a sense of this group is a couple things. One is whether we would consider this - putting together a set of responses to the integrated report. And the second item is, you know, how we should consider our own work on the topic going forward.

So I guess the first one first, what are people's thoughts on us taking a deeper look at the document and potentially putting a drafting and response on that?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Edmon Chung: Please Avri.

Avri Doria: A quick comment is I also have not read it. I think I would need to read it before I had an opinion on either subject.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Fair enough. I - just perhaps in the process point of view, you know, this group is - it's appropriate for this group to I guess send them through the public comment period on that item, or is it better for us to go back to our stakeholder group or groups and send in comments (through there) and this group would, in fact, (assuming that) (clear up) that work as we work on our part of the topics. Yes, I wonder if Avri or Chris or...

Chris Disspain: Edmon, this is Chris speaking. I have been reading the reports slowly and to cut a long story short, I think that the latter approach, that actually taking it

back to our stakeholder groups and saying, "You know, what do you think on th- of this," I think that's likely to be an easier approach.

The thing is very, very long and, I mean, I certainly wasn't reading it thinking I really don't agree with that. But there are certain situations where (there's also a several) alternative solutions and that sort of thing.

And, you know, at that point stakeholder groups may be interested in saying, "Well, you know, we don't like the sound of that solution," or something like, you know, that.

Edmon Chung: Yes, that's sort of my first reaction as well, especially as a - I guess a joint group between ccLDs who might take fairly different - they (might) have a very different take on some of the solution parts of things.

Chris Disspain: Yes, it's even conceivable that a solution that is favored by one group be disliked by another. And then the fun starts.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Avri Doria: And this is Avri.

Edmon Chung: So - Avri please.

Avri Doria: On a procedural basis, I would think that if this group really had a large group of people actively participating, there'd be absolutely no problem with it sending in comments, questions, commentary, whatever, directly to a comment period, if the group was large and active and could reach consensus on those comments.

But otherwise, especially a small group as we've become, I think I agree that taking any issues - perhaps if there is something, after we've all read it and

there're more of us talking but that we did come up and comment. As I say, great, that would be fine I think to go directly.

And certainly if we had comments on things we didn't understand, then sending in something directly would not be (amiss). But I agree in general that taking any recommendation on how to react to it would be better done through the chartering organization.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you Avri and Chris. I guess I (would) agree and especially, Avri, you mentioned that I don't think at this point we want to try to say we represent, say, the joint opinions of the ccNSO and GNSO and that's - don't want to appear that way. So that's why, you know, when - that's the reason why I mentioned, where I mentioned earlier, whether it's appropriate for us to do that, to draft a comment coming from this group.

So especially with - as Avri, you mentioned, you know, this is small team that we have here. But I guess we can certainly ask the question and see if the councils are interested enough taking a deeper look and providing them with our thoughts.

So that might be the approach. So as - so I reach out to them about the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, I guess I can bring this issue up as well and get their response on that. Yes. Okay.

So yes, so I guess we'll go back to the charter organization and see what their thoughts are whether we should take this up. But in the meantime, I think it's a fairly important piece of work and that rolls into our (outlying) discussion on the next steps on IDN variance TLDs.

What I do think, and sort of like a comment to the integrated report, I think we should start looking at what, you know, based on that report, to pick out the areas that this group should work with and in particular I've had a brief discussion with Dennis on this as well, in particular I think what might be

useful for BIP or you know whatever the BIP becomes in the future as soon as the work is done on the actual solution and implementation I think one of the things that this group might do that is of value is to kind of identify - because the current report identifies potential solutions.

It doesn't recommend a particular solution, it talks about potential solutions or potential directions towards the solution. What might be useful in this group and especially on this subject might be to identify if we go down a certain particular path, whether policy development is required both on the GNSO side and the GCNSO side.

Because the (unintelligible) themselves as well as the integrated report just you know doesn't take into consideration whether some of the potential solutions might require a PDP for example or some positive development process.

We're up to what this group can do is take those scenarios and take a look at you know what direction might require - you know I guess take a look at the already existing PDP for example from the GSNO IDN working group and other GNSO recommendations.

See if that is already enough for - I guess which part is already enough and which part still needs work. I guess similar vein in terms of the CCNSO side as the CDP continues, we could sit and take a look at you know these potential solutions, these things that could already be dealt with, with certain CCNSO policies.

But you know if certain things you know need to be done, new policies need to be developed. So that's sort of my you know after quickly glancing through the document and wrapping my head around it that's sort of the idea right now.

I wonder what other people think, if that is - and in a briefer format is you know I think what this group can do is identify where policy development processes is already done for some parts of the solution and where policy development processes need to be initiated in the future if certain direction is taken.

Chris Chaplow: Edmon this is Chris again, one area I think that could be quite interesting from the policy point of view is the label generation rules in Section 4.2 because they give many scenarios for that and I think quite a few of them require policy.

Edmon Chung: Right, that's sort of the label generation rule. The way to approach it, how it's - it talks about looking at it as a whole script and sort of a meta or super set of all the variants being generated and so forth right?

Chris Chaplow: Partly that but also actually how it should be done, you know whether expert panels are required. I think there are about five different suggestions being made there. It may be an interesting way of getting into the report because a lot of the beginning of it is talking about variants.

But I think it may be unlikely that we actually discover new sorts of variants, at this point of view it's probably just a matter of saying oh well yes, that's a good classification of all the variants that could exist.

And perhaps we don't want to recognize all of them, but you know this label generation stuff, that looks very interesting to me.

Edmon Chung: Right. Yeah, I think that's - I have a similar view as well. I mean reading the report seems like yeah, I think it's great working being done in terms of classifying and categorizing things.

I think the meat of it is the actual implementation. Speaking of label generation and using panels and stuff, I think at least for the GNSO part the

recommendations currently already point to you know for certain things already point to that direction.

Actually how those panels are being put together I sort of might consider that implementation you know work. Of course this whole thing about what's implementation and what's policy is completely different discussion.

But there are certain things that is already in the GNSO recommendations that self support it. That's sort of why I think it would be useful for everyone involved in this discussion to identify those things that have already been discussed, have already been incorporated into the parcel recommendations so we don't have to go back to it.

And focus on you know issues such as how do you apply for a variant whether that requires an actual policy, new set of policy recommendations from the CCNSO or GNSO.

So that's sort of - I agree very much, I think we should focus on the meat of which is you identified section 4 mainly, there's - I don't have it in front of me, I'm trying to bring it up.

Chris Chaplow: The five options are actually in section 4.2, but yes, I think the whole of section 4 is interesting reading. Also Section 7.

Edmon Chung: Right. So I guess the question is how we go about it. I wonder Chris if you - since you are going through it, I wonder if you could maybe help start the discussion off with you know maybe as you just identified some of the items.

Maybe you could help identify a set of bullet points that perhaps this group should take a deeper look, especially on China trying to figure out whether current policy recommendations already cover it or not.

And go through lists and perhaps we can start from there.

Chris Chaplow: I can certainly have a go at something like that. I mean off the top of my head, I think the two likely sections of the report where that sort of thing would be needed as I say are Section 4 with all that stuff on the label generation rules.

But Section 7 is actually even more interesting because that's very much talking about what's left to be done. So that could raise all sorts of stuff I would think.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So yeah, let's focus on 4.2 and 7 and you know we - the way I see it is that we start you know high, some of the issues, we can start the work as we observe the report being finalized.

Since I guess after the public comment period maybe there are some changes were made and then it will be finalized. But as that progresses we could start work on our side and if there is clarification that we needed, we could at that time decide whether we want to use the public comment period or we would just ask the BIP team.

Okay. So thank you for volunteering.

Chris Chaplow: Let's see where we get with it.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, so I guess we'll hear from you just if you have maybe a bunch of thoughts on Section 4.2 and 7 and we'll go from there on the mailing list.

Chris Chaplow: I mean I'm just naming those two sections because they really stick in my mind. It's (unintelligible) but there are other similar areas where you know at the moment it's actually not clear what's going to happen from now on and typically that means there are more - there is more than one way of going forward.

So I suppose whenever that happens we are likely to have opinions about one way being better than another for example.

So that could be worth doing.

Edmon Chung: Right. Okay, so I guess we're - we have a volunteer to help us get started on this topic and that's sort of the - that brings us to the end of the suggested agenda today.

I wonder if anyone has other things to add. And of course other people who think you know any thoughts on the IDN variant TLD issues please feel free to jump in.

Chris Chaplow: Again just Chris, briefly you know one thought that is going through my mind at the moment is whether there could be variant issues in scripts which actually the variant issue teams didn't look at.

So major scripts would be Hebrew and Thai and quite a lot of Indian scripts. That's one nagging feeling I have over this.

Edmon Chung: That's a very good question. I guess my first reaction is whether this is the group to do that. I guess looking at the charter organizations which is coming from the SOs, much more on the policy end and in fact as we - when we first took upon this particular issue the biggest question was you know whether we had the linguistic expertise to raise these type of issues.

WE could certainly raise this but I don't know how much we can take it. Not saying that it shouldn't be part of when we consider the things that shouldn't be part of our report you know.

But I wonder if that would be - that's probably not going to be I guess the meat of what we want to produce.

Chris Chaplow: No, I mean to be honest I think that is about the only comment I would make about variants now, you know just to say it is not inconceivable that there could be usages we are not aware of.

I think we would have to be terribly unlucky for that to be the case but you know until other - these other major scripts have been considered we can't completely rule it out.

But I think that's almost all I would have to say about variants. You know as I said earlier I think there are other sections of that report that are more interesting in that sense.

Edmon Chung: Well we do have Avri on the call in here. If I remember correctly you know Hebrew.

Avri Doria: No, my interest was just pieces to go check out because yeah, I do know Hebrew.

Edmon Chung: So you might get a sense of whether the teams - I mean the classifications that everything completely miss the point of Hebrew or it would be - it would fit nicely into some of the categories.

Avri Doria: I'll take a look at it. As I said I haven't even cracked it yet to look at it, so I have no basis on which to speak but my interested has been piqued.

Edmon Chung: Cool, at least we'll have Hebrew as a testing case and you know there are still a lot of other things possible. So I guess at least we have a couple of action items coming from this meeting.

So it's working from Chris and Avri on - Chris on the general items and Avri on the Hebrew (unintelligible). Okay, I guess with that...

Avri Doria: I can recommend one thing if we want to give ourselves homework is that we read the thing before our next meeting.

Edmon Chung: Oh yes, I thought I was implicit, that everyone should...

Avri Doria: It wasn't explicit that there's sort of an action item, at least for me I know I have to. But perhaps if it's recommended as an action item coming out of this is that you know we try as much as possible in our copious free time to actually get the thing read.

Because I'm sure I'm among the people who aren't on the call but are members of this, I'm not the only one that hasn't read it yet.

Edmon Chung: No. and I'll send a note to the list as well on the specific items and get everyone to take a look at it as we consider our next steps on our hour.

Avri Doria: Can I bring up another thing which is I know it's at the end and I don't think we have time to talk about it because I know I have to leave for another call.

But we really have to figure out with the low attendance we have at calls and the few people commenting we may have to at some point take a look at the viability of taking on more tasks as time goes on, on a group that doesn't seem to have a strong level of participation at the moment.

So perhaps we need to go back to our respective chartering clubs and say hey, you know we need more people to participate.

Edmon Chung: That's a very good question, we do get a better attendance and participation at the face to face meetings. And that's one of the things - reasons why I continue to work hard with staff to try to at least schedule in some time while we're at the face to face meetings.

But I think Avri as you mentioned that's probably the best way to go and we'll go back to the chartering organizations and try to get more interest and get the volunteers, at least the main members, I guess the quote unquote voting members to participate a little bit more.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I mean...

((crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Avri?

Avri Doria: I was going to say I have to get off now but I speak a lot, but I'm just an observer from the GNSO, I'm not even a voting member as it were. So really we need those folks to participate to be viable in terms of making any recommendations or anything.

I've got to leave, bye.

Edmon Chung: Okay, by Avri. I guess with that, that's certainly an action item, I guess Jane and I need to work on that and improve on that as well.

Chris Chaplow: I mean also this is just a comment from Chris but I mean it's - on the plus side these calls are really useful because you know I've just been reading several long ICANN reports.

And it is really nice to have the opportunity just to bring bits from them with people who know about them. It makes a huge difference, I mean it's fascinating stuff but it can be quite lonely sometimes.

Edmon Chung: Well we hope to be less lonely, I guess that's Avri's point.

Chris Chaplow: The calls are a solution. It's always worth when advertising something here, to give the sort of you know why would you want to do this? And for me that's

quite - that's certainly one of the reasons, is to talk to other people, gradually to understand things as they develop.

And it's probably particularly important for newish people.

Edmon Chung: Well we need to try to find more people like you.

Chris Chaplow: Flattery will get you everywhere.

Edmon Chung: Okay so I guess we're at the top of the hour and hearing no further items being brought up, I think we'll close the call and we'll hopefully see a bit more action on the mailing list, but I guess next call should be two weeks from now.

ON that particular item, just looking at the calendar right now, that's the Chinese New Year so some might have some problems. But I guess we'll go back to the list of if we need to reschedule.

But for now I guess we'll target for it to be two weeks from now.

Man: Thanks Edmon.

Woman: Then probably Chris will be even more lonely.

Man: Bye bye.

Edmon Chung: Bye, thank you everyone for joining, thank you for your time, happy new year again.

Chris Chaplow: Goodbye everybody.

Woman: Thank you.

END