

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 31 January 2012 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 31 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-20120131-en.mp3>
On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#jan>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair

Chris Dillon

Jian Zhang, NomCom Appointee

Rafik Dammak, NCSG

Dennis Jennings

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel

Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Sarmad Hussein

Fahd Batayneh, .jo

Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)

Coordinator: You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you (Tonya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the JIG call held on the 31st of January, 2012. On the call today we have

Rafik Dammak, Dennis Jennings, Edmon Chung, Chris Dillon and Jian Zhang. From staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I only have apologies from Fahd Batayneh, Sarmad Hussein and Avri Doria.

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

Edmon Chung: Thank you and thank you everyone for joining the call. And I sent around a brief agenda for today. I wanted to I guess talk a little bit about a few updates and then some preparations for Costa Rica. So I guess we'll start off with that.

I just forwarded an email - I just realized that I haven't forwarded the draft ccNSO response to the board on the single character IDN TLD issue before so I actually just forwarded that out to the list so probably haven't had a chance to take a look at it.

But I wonder if Jian or Bart can maybe give a brief summary on that?

Jian Zhang: Bart, would you mind? Hello?

Edmon Chung: Do you...

Bart Boswinkel: You want me to do it?

Jian Zhang: Yes please would you mind?

Edmon Chung: Well, Jian or Bart...

Bart Boswinkel: Okay I can do it no problem at all...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: ...I was waiting for Jian.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay this is Bart. It's - this is - the proposed letters okay one is the ccNSO draft is the basic document. And that is reflecting the sense of the ccNSO Council at its meeting on the 22nd of December. So it's circulated among a small drafting team and then went to the ccNSO Council for comments.

And it has not been adopted. It will be on the agenda for the 20th of February which is the regular ccNSO Council meeting.

You know, because the JIG is a say joint working group and knowing that the - and realizing that the ccNSO Council didn't adopt the - say the draft letter but still wants to engage with the GNSO and wants to - in order to send a, yes, a letter to the board from both the ccNSO and GNSO Council a second draft was included that would reflect the, say, a decision of the GNSO Council to support this letter.

So that's basically it. And it was sent to Stephane van Gelder. And as far as I understand it will be discussed at the upcoming GNSO Council meeting on the 16th of February.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Bart. I wonder if anyone has any question on that. I guess - I guess I'll start off with one question is right now the draft is very ccNSO-centric. It basically describes the ccNSO Council, reiterates the support and so on.

I'm curious if the ccNSO Council is open for some edits to this such that the, you know, the letter would sound like it's coming from both councils so it would be sort of a joint thing.

Bart Boswinkel: To my understanding, say, the second letter, the draft - should reflect the views of both councils so it's not ccNSO-centric it focuses on some questions, say, these are - and which are also reflected...

Edmon Chung: Oh.

Bart Boswinkel: ...and the - say the - I think the statement itself is that both - should be both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils support the introduction of single character IDNs.

Edmon Chung: Okay so they are two letters. I - for some reason I thought it was one letter...

Bart Boswinkel: No, no there are two different letters.

Edmon Chung: An earlier draft...

Bart Boswinkel: Letter A is, say, that's why I'm saying, okay, one letter is just the ccNSO Council letter if the GNSO Council will not adopt it or for whatever reasons or cannot support it for whatever reason the ccNSO Council will send this letter.

The second letter reflects, say, it's an adjustment of the draft and it reflects both the opinion of the ccNSO and GNSO Council and it shouldn't be ccNSO-centric.

Edmon Chung: Right okay. So I apologize. I now get the full picture. And I guess in general my first reaction is that it's a - it covers the main items that were - that were drafted in our response, I guess, some of the issues of substance.

And it does appear to be paired down quite a bit in terms of the tone that I guess reflects the, you know, a lower urgency from ccNSO (point) which I guess it's fine; I guess that reflects the joint - if that reflects the joint sentiment, you know, after weighing the two sides of things.

But, you know, for me it seems like it's - it encapsulates at least the main aspects but with I guess less (teeth). But I wonder if any one else has had any - have had the chance to take a look at it and have any other thoughts or questions.

If not I guess that's the update. And I guess we have done our work in highlighting the items. And it's up to the two councils to decide how to make the response back to the board. So I guess we'll continue to observe.

And at least on my side I'll be speaking - I'll be chatting it up with some of the councilors at the GNSO Council. And I'm sure Jian would be connecting with the ccNSO councilors about this.

Okay so moving on it's - and first of all thank you, Dennis, for joining us today. I guess we continue to observe the work on IDN VIP and we'll star to plan our work around it once we - once we see a final - the report being finalized I understand it's now going through the public comment.

But since, Dennis, you're here I wonder if you could give your - okay to give a brief update?

Dennis Jennings: Certainly Edmon. Dennis Jennings here. The report - the integrated issues report was published on the 23rd of December; not the most convenient date for lots of people. But we were determined to get it out before the holidays.

And the public comment closed yesterday, January the 30th, although I see there are a couple of comments in today on January 31; one from ALAC and one about the zero width non-joiner highlighting a very important security issue.

I'm rather disappointed at the number of comments. And I'm not obviously criticizing anybody who made a comment. But I think there are more people

that I would have hoped to have made comments. And that is a bit of a concern for me.

So I'm trying to work out how we might address that at the Costa Rica meeting with a more extensive presentation, consultation and discussion session. And I'm discussing that with the ICANN team today at our call later today to see if there's agreement that we should have such a session.

We will be producing over the next few days a final - draft final version of the report - or a final version of the report for submission to the board. But I am concerned that we really haven't heard all the voices that possibly we should have heard given the - both the complexity and the importance of the IDN variant issues for TLDs and the risks if - particularly of a very poor user experience if we get this wrong.

Current reactions I know vary from - we really need to do this for the end users to we really mustn't do this because it's far too dangerous from some of the technical people. And I don't know where we lie - where we'll end up that spectrum where the board will end up. So I think it's really very important to have a more extensive discussion in Costa Rica. And any input and suggestions that the JIG might have on that would be very welcomed by me.

Thanks, Edmon. That's all I have to say at the moment.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Dennis. And welcome to the IDN world and IDN club. That's how things usually go, a lot of interest to begin with and struggling to get participation as you go on.

((Crosstalk))

Dennis Jennings: Dennis here. It's very complex. And as some of the issues that we've highlighted are complex and some of the next step solutions have significant implications that I really would like the community to discuss.

And certainly moving forward is very much going to be a community project, not an - I mean, ICANN may provide support, leadership and funding but it's going to have to be a community project so the interest of the community is really critical to move this forward.

Thanks again, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes, thank you, Dennis. And I certainly agree with you and have been trying very hard to garner more participation in many IDN related issues and the variants issue being one of the more, you know, one of the more tricky ones and really need participation as you mentioned.

I think, you know, I guess, you know, I've always been trying to, you know, reach as many people as possible and to try to work together. And I'm just (relating) due to our next two topics which I think are related and was brought up last time when we had the call we started talking about this group.

And I guess in general as well the interest level of participating in IDN discussions we really need to try to drive that a little bit more. And I guess, you know, it's a - it's an ongoing challenge. But probably we - at least myself I'd like for us to, you know, join forces to try to get some - get the participation.

And we're certainly open to give our thoughts from this group. And from our last discussion we had thought that it would be more appropriate for our respective constituencies to give response to these types of public comment processes both in the matter of process because we are a joint charter group where, you know, everything should go back to the councils as well as for a bandwidth issue because we ourselves are running out of volunteers to help out.

So that I guess is the - my initial response. I wonder if anyone has any additional thoughts on that? And perhaps if Dennis - it's okay we'll - if you're open to it would like to talk a little bit more about, you know, maybe doing more things together in Costa Rica to drive more interest and participation.

So anyone have any questions or thoughts about the VIP work so far?

Chris Dillon: This is Chris Dillon. And it's not really to add to what either Dennis or you, Edmon, have just said. But, you know, just to agree with it completely that, you know, it is surprising how few comments there were.

And, you know, the idea of doing perhaps a presentation or some other activities in Costa Rica to try and to get people into what is a very long report. I think if it were, you know, I think if there were a good presentation, you know, it could help to make it more accessible.

And, you know, as you say, you know, if there is anything that, you know, this group can do to raise the interest I think that's - can only be to the good. But basically I'm just completely agreeing with everything you just said.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you, Chris. Dennis here. If I may comment, Edmon, on your next topic, which is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. One of the real concerns is about the user experience and the lack of applications and standards for applications that are - allow the use of IDN TLDs let alone deal with the complexity of IDN variant TLDs.

And that is a concern that I think may be helped by more work on what you call the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

Edmon Chung: Right, I think, you know, that's right on. In fact one of the things that we identified as well as we observed the IP discussion was precisely that...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...added actually into the initial report that we put out for public comments. So I'm hoping that we'll gather - because sorry for jumping ahead, you know, I guess we'll merge the few topics that I have on the agenda.

So I've also been speaking with the ICANN team on the new gTLD side who are looking at the universal acceptance issue as well. And perhaps to join forces because the issue is a rather real one for more people, you know, even for ASCII.

On one side it's an issue even for ASCII TLDs. And also it's an issue for IDN ccTLDs. So I'm hoping that we have the best bet on gathering the most participation with a topic like that.

And speaking of which I have - from our last call I've - last conference call - I have started connecting with GAC and the GNSO Council and SSAC to get them to see if they're interested to weigh in on the issue and get their participation at a earlier stage.

So, you know, on that particular item I'm sure that's, you know, there is a pretty good room for us to work together on a joint session at a face to face meeting because I think that's probably - for our experience at least we get a bit better participation during our - during face to face meetings especially when we can - we can, you know, get those who are there to just, you know, step in and give some thoughts and comments on what we're talking about.

So I guess from the (unintelligible) work and jumping onto all of the few items I'm - I'd like to I guess propose that - a couple things, you know, one of which is to probably extend the public comment period for our initial report on universal acceptance until - in fact for - until after to close after the Costa Rica meeting.

That would allow us to, you know - that would allow us to have a working document to present there and try to get the input there. And, you know, hopefully to get more response then.

And I wonder if that might be something that we can work together on, you know, with the VIP work and make it a session that spans something that might be of interest to more people so that we at least get their attention first and hopefully get more feedback from. I wonder...

((Crosstalk))

Dennis Jennings: Edmon, Denis here...

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Dennis Jennings: I think it would be very useful to have myself or some others participate in a universal acceptance session and to highlight that this is also critical for IDN variants TLDs and even more complex of course. So let me think about that and maybe we'll exchange some emails.

I'm anxious first of all to have - to get agreement from the ICANN team on the sort of presentations on the variant issues report that I'm hoping will be agreed. And if I can get that done certainly I'll then come back to you, Edmon, to work with you to see how we participate together on universal acceptance.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. On...

Edmon Chung: Please, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: On universal acceptance yesterday I had a conversation with Nadia Sokalova and she is now the ICANN staff person leading, say, the universal acceptance of TLDs in general. And I suggested that she would be subscribed to this list as well to the JIG and maybe she can join at a future

call in order to, yes, create some, you know, cooperation with that team as well.

Edmon Chung: Yes. Yes, I've - thanks, Bart. And I've been trying to reach out to Karla and Nadia as well so thanks a lot for...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes and my understanding is that Nadia is the project leader of that team so that's - that makes it easier.

Edmon Chung: Okay sounds good. And I guess since we're on this topic so let's - I wonder if we I guess the two suggestions; one is to extend the public comment period until after the Costa Rica meeting. And second is to try to have a public session on the topic and hopefully joint with, as you mentioned, the new gTLD work and the VIP work.

So, Jian or Chris or Rafik, others?

Chris Dillon: This is Chris Dillon. Yes, I think, you know, I think that it's certainly important to - I mean, I agree completely. I think the - I think we should learn from, you know, learn the lesson basically. I think the public comment period should be extended until after Costa Rica.

Now and there also should be a public session. Whether that session should be amalgamated either with the VIP or one of the other meetings, you know, obviously you have to talk to people for that to be decided. But, I mean, both of those decisions to have the session and to extend the comment period sound good.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Chris. So I guess to Bart and Nathalie how do we start the preparations for ICANN Costa Rica? And regardless of whether we sort of have a joint one would like to start exploring to have a slot for Costa Rica.

Bart Boswinkel: Say, we've already scheduled a slot on the Monday afternoon for the JIG. There's a regular face to face meeting. So that's one. A joint meeting - yes, say a more public meeting that would be probably on Wednesday or Thursday I think, yes, we can always try. But you have already...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: ...a slot on Monday afternoon.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess at least we'll have our own slot. Whether we use it to deal with our working group issues or focus just on universal acceptance we can decide a little bit later...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...once we get a sense of whether we might have a joint session.

Bart Boswinkel: And say...

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: ...with regard to extending the public comment period I'll send a note to Web admin to change it and so that's reasonably simple to extend it and send a note to the - yes, if you can send a note to the GNSO and ALAC I can take care of the CC list.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess the idea is probably to have it maybe a week or a week and a half after the ICANN meeting if you could have it around that timeframe. So I guess I'll take - I don't - I'll take a look at the calendar and suggest a date and send it to the list shortly after the call. Okay.

That brings me actually we've covered most of the items. That brings me to the one issue about sort of renewing the participation at this working group.

And I've just started in our last call - last conference call Avri mentioned, you know, the participation has dropped quite a bit.

We do have a new person, Chris, thank you for joining us. But it has dropped a little bit so - quite a bit. So I've started discussing with Stephane to refresh the participation from the GNSO side.

The - I guess as a reminder to everyone the formal charter of the group has it such that we have five sort of a voting, if you will, voting members, official members from the GNSO and five from the ccNSO.

In the past most of the documents I individually tried to at least get those five to take a look at the document and consent to before we publish things and put it out. And - but the - I guess the participation rate of the five members haven't been stellar.

So I've started talking with Stephane about potentially refreshing it and either, you know, getting them to participate more or sending new people to take their place. So that - hopefully I'll have a bit more update next time.

And also in the beginning the ccNSO was a little bit concerned with too much participation I guess making it, you know, the discussions not balanced as well.

So - but I guess things have changed a little bit so I'd like to get a sense that, you know, the councils are comfortable with us keep taking on observers and participants even though sort of I guess the quote, unquote voting members would still be maintained at five so that we have a - some - how should I say - some equity between ccNSO and GNSO sort of weight.

So I wonder, Jian, if - or Bart, if you could maybe take a look at the ccNSO side and see if there's a possibly of refreshing the participation from at least the five core members and the sentiment of us being able to take on more

observers like Chris, at least for now, to help drive more awareness and participation here.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, will do.

Edmon Chung: Okay. With that I guess we are at the end of what I prepared. And in terms of action items we're extending the public comment period. I think we'll wait for another little while for the VIP work to be done finalized before we start working on, you know, deciding on the work on variant TLDs.

And I guess that's it unless anyone wants to bring up other issues. If not thank you everyone for your time. I think we'll go back to the two-week cycle so - and thanks, everyone for their flexibility because last week was the Chinese New Year.

And that also explains that it has been - we haven't had the chance to get more people to respond to the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs part especially from the Chinese community. And, you know, I guess it's a good - it's good to extend the time as well.

So if we go back to the two-week cycle our next meeting would be on Valentine's Day. Would that be a problem?

Bart Boswinkel: No.

Edmon Chung: I guess we'll keep the Valentine's Day and we have a date. So - at least for now unless, you know, we struggle to do that with getting participation. Anyway so hearing no further urgent issues thank you everyone for joining the call and thank you for taking the time.

Dennis Jennings: And, Edmon, may I wish you a very Happy Chinese New Year. A very important festival...

Edmon Chung: Oh thank you.

Dennis Jennings: ...in your part of the world.

Edmon Chung: And Jian as well.

Dennis Jennings: And Jian as well. Indeed, indeed. And indeed everybody. Happy New Year.

Edmon Chung: It's the Year of the Dragon.

Dennis Jennings: Yes I know, may the dragon be with you or something. Okay bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, bye.

Chris Dillon: Good-bye.

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

END