

**JIG  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 03 April 2012 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 03 April 2012 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-20120403-en.mp3>  
On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#apr>  
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

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

ICANN Staff:

Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo  
Chris Dillon  
Bart Boswinkel

Coordinator: We're now recording.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Ricardo). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the JIG call on the 3rd of April 2012. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Jian Zhang, Jonathan Shea, Edmon Chung and Avri Doria. From staff we have myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Fahd Batayneh and Chris Dillon.

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 thank you all for joining the call. Great to have new volunteer joined. Good to have you on, Jonathan.

And I guess I sent along a fairly brief agenda mainly to look into the next steps on the universal acceptance item that we've identified and collected comments for.

But sort of before that I wanted to raise one issue and probably Jian can help me out here. In terms of the new volunteers that we have sort of - sort of gotten from - to participate in the group as we discussed this a few meetings before to hope to drive a little bit more participation.

I was wondering because I saw the note that the ccNSO still has to approve the additional volunteers. I don't know where the - you know, where we are with that and how we get that going. Because I just realized that they're not added today. And perhaps that speaks to why many of them aren't able to join us yet.

So I was wondering, Jian, if you know what the next steps need to be in order to get them onto the list?

Jian Zhang: My understanding is that we need a formal approval from ccNSO Council probably at the next ccNSO Council meeting.

Edmon Chung: Would you know when that is going to be?

Jian Zhang: I'm not sure. I'll go back and check.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Yeah, because - well that would be useful and so we can formally add them in. I understand that the GNSO side has also been working to rally a

few more volunteers. And we should be expecting a list from them shortly as well. So it would be good to have all of them formally added to the mailing list and hopefully we'll be able to drive more participation.

Okay so I guess with that the next is on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs so a few items there. But before I go there I wonder if anyone thinks there needs to be any other items added to today's short agenda?

Okay hearing none I'll push forward. So we - the public comment period closed on March 23. And we received - let's see a total of six comments coming in. We - in our last couple of meetings we already took a look at the - from the Registry Constituency and from the ALAC some of that notes. We're glad that the extension brought a few more comments in. I think they're constructive.

One of the - I don't know whether you guy have the list in front of you but one of which came from Chris Chaplow. And it seems like they - he provided a link and the link goes back to the ALAC statement. So I'm kind of wondering whether he provided a wrong link and was intending to provide a different link.

So I guess my question is to Nathalie. Should we - or what's the next step in this? How do we get back to Chris perhaps asking whether that is the link he was intending to provide? And also what's the next step in terms of - from staff on the reply and sort of the - sort of the consolidation of the comments?

Nathalie Peregrine: Sorry, Edmon. Bart would be the man to ask about those next steps. That is not my domain at all.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Nathalie Peregrine: What we can do however is take notes of these questions and ask him at the end of this conference call.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So that will be useful. So I guess two items. If you can help forward the note to Bart. Is one on Chris Chaplow's comments how do we reach out - back to him to ask whether he might have accidentally provided a wrong link and to provide the link he's looking for, that's one. The second is to look at what the next step should be in terms of having a report on the public comments.

Nathalie Peregrine: No problem, thus noted.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Okay so with that I guess I wonder if anyone has any comments or thoughts on the - on the comments received? Have anyone had a chance to take a look at them? Okay hearing silence.

I guess just to I guess quickly I'll provide a summary of what I, you know, from what I read. I think in general there is the feedback seems to be that this is a topic that is of importance for the community and for ICANN to spend some effort on.

I think the one of most substance is probably from the Registry Constituency and for us to consider some - taking this - taking a - maybe a survey as a next step - survey approach as a next step.

And then also I guess from - there's a comment coming from (Joseph E.) and I think that's quite constructive in terms of some of the things that we can perhaps do as well. So in general that's sort of the feeling that I got.

I guess it was the initial report that went out is a - it was probably a good starting point. However we probably need to do a little bit more work in fleshing out some more things before the community would be able to provide more - will be able to get a more concrete input from the community.

So that's sort of my feeling from the comments received. Any response or thoughts to that?

Okay hearing none I'll - I guess I'll continue to move forward on this. And the next item is just a quick update from the public session that was held in Costa Rica.

So there was a public session that was held in Costa Rica on universal acceptance. It was led by the staff team that is working on the issue. We had a number of speakers talk about some of the experience from registries both IDN ccTLD registries and also gTLD registries on the issue.

I think, you know, my feeling is that I'd like to use the information that was collected from there as input into - as, you know, in addition to the comments we received from the initial report for our next steps. I believe they should have transcription so we should have the transcript for that session. And we can pull some information out of there for us to consider on the next steps.

Does that make sense? If it does perhaps you can just say it does so that's not just me talking. Anyone?

Jonathan Shea: Sounds good to me.

Edmon Chung: Okay, Jian, you...

Rafik Dammak: Edmon, we are listening to you so...

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I assume that makes sense. So as Bart is working on summarizing the comments received I guess we'll see if we can include some of the comments and thoughts that (are) collected in that - in the Costa Rica session into this as well.

So that brings me to sort of the next steps on this issue and to consider what we should do next. On that topic I guess my first couple of questions is - to this group is, one, how we think we should work together with the staff efforts that is now restarting, you know, since we started the discussion.

And the second one is what we can do together and whether, you know, a survey type of approach that was suggested by the Registry Constituency is perhaps the right way to go about and to work with staff on that. Any thoughts on that?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Just because I don't want you to feel like no one else is talking and because...

Edmon Chung: Thank you.

Avri Doria: ...I decided I should really speak a lot less because I'm always the one that's speaking. But anyhow we've entered an age of surveys. And while I agree that they're useful I'm beginning to worry about whether we're not approaching a survey fatigue sometimes within ICANN.

So it seems appropriate certainly to work with staff. In terms of those doing a survey what kind, approaching whom is a very open issue and how you make sure that you've got a population that - responding to the survey that's actually sufficiently inclusive. So I guess I'm saying I don't see another way at the moment; it is the way we've adopted lately. But I'm not sure how useful it is.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Avri. That's a good point. I guess I don't think - I'm actually pretty - I'm not - at this point I'm not siding each way but I'd like to hear what others

think maybe, you know, from Jonathan or Rafik or Jian whether you think it's a better idea to reformat what we had into a sort of survey and try to get the information in or we think we understand the issue enough to push forward to a next step. And perhaps suggest a survey to be done by staff rather than coming from us.

Jonathan Shea: Edmon, Jonathan.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Jonathan Shea: I think it depends on - also on the time available for this exercise if we still have sufficient time then a survey would be more appropriate. But if we are running out of time then given that the group has collected sufficient information then maybe we can just go ahead with proposing something.

Edmon Chung: Okay. On this particular item I don't think we're really in a very big time crunch. But as we move forward we are hearing more and more concerns especially from IDN ccTLDs that these type of issues are creeping up and becoming a, you know, becoming a bigger problem that we would like ICANN to, you know, act on.

So I don't think we're pressed in terms of any kind of deadline. But this issue certainly is sort of, you know, emerging as more and more important as IDN ccTLDs are being promoted.

Any thought from - Jian, what - do you think, you know, what's your feeling on whether, you know, we identified a number of items, you know, for example things that ICANN should take some action in even including in terms of a policy or implementation kind of arena where we would ask for them to implement some measures for at least existing registries and registrars that offer IDNs to support universal acceptance of IDNs with their systems.

So my feeling is, you know, given Avri's suggestion and comments perhaps we could try for a draft - still go for a draft final report with some of the recommendations going forward. And then passing some of the more open issues over to - then passing that over to the staff team which has been, you know, reignited anyway so that they could take on that part. Do people think that makes sense?

Because for this group perhaps us identifying some key - being from the, you know, ccNSO and GNSO perhaps our role is more to point out some of the policy related issues and some issue that staff can follow up on rather than us actually doing that work especially given that now that there is a staff team that is being actively pursuing this.

Jian Zhang: Edmon, this is Jian. I think that's essentially a better approach, that makes sense actually.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Jian Zhang: Hello? Yeah. Because (unintelligible) have some open issues with staff (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Okay, thank you. And what do - I guess, Avri, do you think perhaps taking that approach might make more sense? Is it, you know, good to - because perhaps one of the concerns that I also have is whether this group would come up with a, you know, the right set of stuff for survey.

It might be even better for us to summarize what we already have identified and pass it onto staff and have them do that type of survey and highlight a few key recommendations rather than getting into the details.

Jonathan Shea: I agree.

Avri Doria: Okay this is Avri. Oh sorry, I'll back off. I thought you had stopped, sorry.

Edmon Chung: No, no thank you, Jonathan...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...but, Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Yeah, I think sort of I think that's better. I think the first part of what you say is that we should using whatever consultations we do within our separate SOs and what have you come up with our set of answers. And if there are options put those out. And, you know, do that.

In terms of whether there's - in terms of how to take it forward - in terms of how to fold it into other work, in terms of how to implement stuff or what have you I think leaving it to staff, asking them to certainly, you know, consult back with us if they're going to do surveys just to see that they're understanding. But I don't even think we should go to so far as to suggest that they do a survey if that's what ends up best.

You know, as I say I certainly have survey fatigue. Any time I see another survey come through on my email I say yeah, right, I'm going to spend time doing that as opposed to reading something or doing something. And so I know I've almost stopped taking them anymore because I've just had it with surveys and I don't see what comes out the other side.

So certainly us doing our work, us packaging it with reasoning and consultations and stuff seems like what we should be doing. If surveys is what staff decides they need to do to take it forward then, you know, bless them and, you know, just ask them to check back in with the - at least with the SOs before they do surveys to make - if that's what they're going to do to make sure that they make sense and that they reflect what the SOs have by then approved.

Edmon Chung: Good, thank you - thank you, Avri. Yes, I think we're not going to prescribe exactly what, you know, staff go do some surveys. But perhaps just to collect stuff that we have received and thoughts that we have put in and say hey these are some of the issues and some of the thinking around this topic survey is one possibility.

You might want to do a bit more work on these few areas. So that is sort of, you know, I think that makes more sense, as you mentioned. We don't need to prescribe a particular path forward.

So I guess with that then it seems like the way forward might actually be simpler than what I started with thinking when we started the meeting, which is good.

So in that case I guess our next step would be to wait for Bart - wait for Bart's summary on the comments and then start working on a draft final report that would outline some of the - a few recommendations that we will have back to the Council and back to - which then goes back to staff on this issue.

Okay so that - with that I guess that's the...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...of the discussion.

Avri Doria: This is Avri speaking.

Edmon Chung: Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Can I make one recommendation about how we do that? Once we get that report one of the things that I think I have found most satisfying as a commenter when I've made comments and also as a working group member when we've received comments is to actually take each comment, discuss it

within the group, decide if it changes, you know, anything and write up a reason as to why or why not that comment is being reflected in the final report or how it's being reflected.

So I do recommend, you know, having just made it easier in terms of surveys that we take the hard path through the - or the long path or the what have you through the comments and not do like we see in some groups - has everybody read the comments? Any changes we should make? No? Okay let's go on. That we don't take that kind of short path but we really do work through them.

And I haven't looked at them yet, I mean, there could be none worth working through or there could be massive numbers. I confess I haven't looked at them yet. So - in fact I tend to be lazy and wait for the staff person synthesis before I actually do look at them often.

So that's one of the things that I recommend is that we take the hard path through the comments and not the easy path through the comments.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, thank you, Avri. In fact that has been the case for a previous...

Avri Doria: Yeah, we did that there.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Because, you know, if you look - yeah, if we look back at the single character initial report and the final report there were a public comment period for both of them. And each comment we actually respond to specifically, you know, after - in the final report I think it's all included in the final report so each comment was, well, some comments were sort of lumped together and then a particular response to that and how, you know, why - how it relates to the final report. So, yes, I certainly agree with that approach.

And especially given that, you know, we're not looking at hundreds of comments then I certainly think it makes a lot of sense to respond specifically one by one and that has been the approach before as well. And I think this is the appropriate approach going forward as well.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, I probably should have just said we should do what we did before and not what other groups have been doing.

Edmon Chung: Cool. Okay so it seems like we have a pretty clear path forward. Nathalie, we'll depend on you to help us get to Bart and, you know, get some response on this - following up with the comments part.

Nathalie Peregrine: Sure, no problem.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And so the last part that I wanted to cover was the variant issues project and next steps on that. I was hoping - somewhat hoping that Dennis would join our call. He hasn't joined so I guess just to update everyone there is a public comment period still going on for the variant issues project plan.

The VIP team has issued a project plan with eight projects that will take us another two years to go through without a, you know, without really an implementation deadline - an implementation path. So I guess personally I'm a little bit concerned with that. And I encourage others on this group to respond in the various capacities on that issue.

My question perhaps is whether it's appropriate for this group to respond to the public comment period. We have generally resisted doing that in the past because we rely on the other - our other halves to do that because anything that this group creates needs to go through the two councils theoretically - well I shouldn't say theoretically I should say in a formal process that should be the case. And that's the reason why we've never responded to public comment periods.

What do other people think about this issue and is that still our position that we, you know, we would rely on everyone else - everyone to comment on it themselves? And we will continue to observe the progress there.

Jonathan Shea: Edmon, Jonathan here.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, please go ahead.

Jonathan Shea: I do not see any conflict or any reasons not for this group to provide comments to the VIP project plan. But given that I'm new to the group I am not 100% sure whether there are overlaps or, you know, sort of conflicting interest which would prevent us from giving comments.

Edmon Chung: Okay thank you for that. We have discussed this a little bit in the past about other, you know, when their other reports came out. One of the key issue is that this group is a joint group formed by the GNSO and ccNSO Council.

Our output needs to reflect the - I guess opinions of the two, you know, ultimately it should reflect - I shouldn't say that. Any official statement I guess from this group perhaps is more appropriate to go through back - go back to those our two parent organizations - sort of chartering organizations for them to eventually issue. That presents a challenge for us in terms of creating our statement or our opinions on particular subjects. So it's more of a process whether it's appropriate or not.

I'm - that was the - I guess Bart was more - has a bit more opinion on this as well. I wonder if Avri, Rafik or Jian has any thoughts on this particular item? No? If not Jonathan did I answer your question or you still think, you know, perhaps we could look into this and this is important enough that this group should make some comments?

Jonathan Shea: I understand the background after your explanation, Edmon. And I also realize that there may be overlapping membership between the VIP project

team and the JIG. And as such it may seem to be quite redundant if we submit our comments - unless the membership are quite different.

Edmon Chung: Well on this particular subject the VIP project plan was created completely from the staff team. I don't believe there was any overlap in terms of membership at least not from the community side of things on this project plan part.

Jonathan Shea: I see, I see. In that case if we have sufficient time to draft something and if we have sufficient time to draft something and to have them approved by the respective parent group, GNSO and ccNSO, then I really think it is good to - for this group to give comments given that the work are so closely related.

Edmon Chung: Okay. That's - I think that's probably, you know, good idea. But we will probably miss the, you know, in order to - for us to be able to go back to the two councils we're going to definitely miss the public comment period window. That doesn't mean that we cannot still issue a statement and have the two councils look at it and approve it and send it on to the VIP team.

So given that you brought this up I wonder if you are willing to take a stab at, you know, volunteering to put some thoughts together on some items what, you know, how we should respond. Certainly, as I mentioned, my personal view is, you know, that the project plan needs to have a clearer direction towards implementation because right now there's no, you know, it seems like the light at the end of the tunnel has suddenly disappeared.

So, Jonathan, do I hear a volunteer to put a few - at least a few notes - viewpoints together for the group to take it forward maybe at the mailing list and try to draft a simple response?

Jonathan Shea: Yes, I think I can try to put some points together for the whole group to elaborate on.

Edmon Chung: That will be very useful. What do others think? Avri, Rafik, Jian, do you think we should take this on or kill it before we start working further on it? Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah...

Edmon Chung: You know I would want to pick on you.

Avri Doria: Yeah, because I'm always willing to speak. It definitely seems worth doing it and worth having had somebody volunteered to do it and having them agreed to that volunteering I certainly wouldn't argue that it's something that's irrelevant and should be thrown out so yeah. And I appreciate somebody being willing to take the task on.

Edmon Chung: Jian are we good to...

Jian Zhang: I agree.

Edmon Chung: Okay so I guess it's great to have Jonathan, you help out on this. And perhaps you can put some thoughts together and send it to the list. I know you haven't been formally added into yet. I think that's just a matter of process. But if you send back to the list I'll make sure it's - to the thread that you got this meeting note from I'll make sure that it goes into the list.

Jonathan Shea: Will do, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Okay with that that's sort of the end of the - what I have in mind for this - today's meeting.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: If there's no other items then thank you everyone for joining and thank you for your time. And we'll reconvene in two week's time. And in the meanwhile we'll

have I guess Bart update us on the mailing list and also Jonathan to update us.

Jonathan Shea: Yes.

Edmon Chung: All right.

Avri Doria: Okay. Bye.

Edmon Chung: Thanks everyone.

Jonathan Shea: And happy Easter everyone.

Edmon Chung: Happy Easter. Good-bye.

Jonathan Shea: Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Good-bye. (Ricardo), you may now stop the recording. Thank you very much.

END