

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 29 May 2012 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 29 May 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-20120529-en.mp3>
On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#may>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Jonathan Shea
Jian Zhang, APTLD, Co-Chair
Mirjana Tasic
Jonathan Shea
Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)
Dennis Jennings
Chris Dillon
Daniel Kalchev

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Gisella Gruber
Steve Sheng

Apologies:

Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Young-Eum Lee

Woman: ...is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening to everyone on today's JIG call on Tuesday, the 29th of May. We have Mirjana Tasic, Daniel Kalchev, Jonathan Shea, Chris Dillon, Edmon Chung.

From staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Steve Sheng and myself Gisella Gruber. Apologies today noted from Fahd Betayneh, Rafik Dammak, Young Um Lee, Dennis Jennings however Dennis may be able to join us within the next 15 to 20 minutes.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. We also are trying to get through to Jian Zhang and I will let you know as soon as she's joined us. Thank you, over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Gisella and thank you everyone for joining.

We - in our last conference call we sort of set out a schedule to talk a little bit more about the VIP project and the IDN variant TLDs and what we plan to do next on in this meeting.

And then in our next meeting right before Prague we'll spend a little bit more time on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs and to try to set the course for that topic in Prague and forward as well.

So today we're - have fairly light agenda to get an update from the VIP team - - I know Steve Sheng, thanks for joining us -- and then to talk a little bit about what we should plan to do at Prague and (apt) with on the topic.

Before I go to you Steve though I wanted to since Jonathan you're on the call I want to circle back to you. I know you put together a number of - some notes that we were looking to put forward as some comments into the process.

Given the new plan that came out I'm curious if you have any thoughts you'd want to bring up before I - I'll let - I let Steve give us some updates on that.

Jonathan Shea: Thank you Edmon. I'm Jonathan Shea. A while back I have put together some comments on the project plan, quick follow-up by the VIP Team.

Later on I noted that the VIP Team has revised the project plan. And as a result of that some of the comments are no longer required because the plan, the revised plans have actually somehow you directly addressed some of the comments.

So Edmon I recommend that we have a quick update from Steve on what the latest budget plan is like and then we can quickly discuss whether further action is required by the JIG.

Gisella Gruber-White: Edmon?

Man: (Unintelligible) has joined.

Edmon Chung: Yes?

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry to interrupt. Yes Dennis Jennings - it's Gisella. Dennis Jennings has joined. (Jane Sung) has joined and Avri Doria has joined. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: That's great.

(Jane Sung): Hi. Yes hi. Sorry for the delay. I did get trouble to dial in. Seems my name, they couldn't recognize my name or something, you know so they wouldn't put me in so...

Edmon Chung: Okay, no worries. Thanks for joining and thanks Dennis and Avri for joining as well. We just got a - the call underway. Actually I was trying to get Jane on the line. There was some technical difficulties there.

But in any case so I was - a fairly light agenda today talking about it updates from VIP and also for this group to consider our next steps and our activities on that topic in Prague and beyond.

So I circle back to Jonathan who put out some comments worth - some comments together. And we were going down the path of developing a statement.

Jonathan just mentioned that - and I think we agree that with the new plan in place some of the - those comments might not be needed further and but we might want to adjust them further on this.

But I was going to hand it over to Steve Sheng. But since Dennis you're on the call I guess either yourself or Steve...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: quick update on the VIP.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you Edmon. Steve do you want to take the update or would you like me to do so?

Steve Sheng: I can do that.

Dennis Jennings: Please do.

Steve Sheng: Yes. Good morning and good afternoon, good evening everyone. Thank you for giving us this opportunity to brief you on the variant issues project. Can you hear me all right?

Edmon Chung: Yes. I'm all clear.

Steve Sheng: Okay. We've circulated a presentation for the - for JIG Team just probably 20 minutes before. So I'm going to briefly talk over that slide. If you could open that slide, that'd be great.

Many of these updates are really not new to the JIG as the JIG has been working on IDN variance issue for a long time and produce some of the policy documents.

But this - so I'm just going to quickly go over through the background. And as Jonathan mentioned earlier you want to see a - the revised project plan so which I'll focus my time on that.

So I'm on Slide 2, just kind of quick recap why we're doing this project because there's a long-standing request from a number of IDN user communities that variant is an important issue. And the board tasked staff to develop an issues report I think was then 2010 out or - yes, in 2010 on the subject.

Dennis Jennings: Pardon me. That may be my phone. My apologies.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: Oh, sorry.

Dennis Jennings: My apologies Steve. I think that's my mobile phone.

Steve Sheng: Oh, no problem.

Dennis Jennings: Let me try and get rid of it. There we go. My apologies Steve.

Steve Sheng: No problem. So on Slide 4 the approach we take is first with the community studied the six cases. So we studied the Arabic Chinese (Surelic) (unintelligible) Greek and Latin.

And I think many of the members of the JIG were, you know, active participants in these studies so we really appreciate your effort.

Once the six study completed the representatives from each of the case studies was invited to form an integration team that integrate these issues either divide in the six case studies into one report. That was published I think in 2011 it was completed.

I'll just quickly go over the report. There's no commonly agreed definition of variance. And it was used to refer to a number of different concepts.

And so in this report we agree to address a terminology issue we recommend more specific terms.

So on Slide 6 so for example we separate, we tried to separate co-point variance and hosting variance where the hosting variance are, you know, based on relationship between hostings, for example their meaning to a language community.

But the co-point variance are based on the relationship between co-points. So for example a variant, a single point, the co-point is a variant of another co-point or sequence of co-points. So that's one big distinction.

Within a co-point variance we have those, you know, one and two which is one is called exchangeable variance where generally this is for example the simplified and traditional Chinese case where those people consider those exchangeable.

And the second - so that's number one. And then there's the other part is visually similar where this is, for example in the Arabic community where the co-points are obviously similar and confusing and they call that a variant.

So as you can see from this diagram on Slide 6 there's - again there's no commonly agreed definition. In the integrated report we tried to categorize them and propose specific terminology.

The - moving on to Slide 8, so the major themes of the report there's a tension between interest in creating greater functionality to address a range of potential variant cases.

And in many of these cases, you know it's - there's a user community demand. And there's also on the other hand the difficulty of meeting these objectives.

So that's a major theme for the report. It went into, you know, in greater detail what the next steps are.

So on Slide 9 the next steps, so after completing the issues reports and identifying the issues so that the VIP team produced a project proposal which was out for public comment very quickly the project proposal was first we do a set of feasibility studies.

So these feasibility studies include for example the feasibility of hosting variance, feasibility of - oh I can't remember the other two but it has to do with technical study of the new end variance and (non-new) end variance.

So those are the set of feasibility studies. And then after that the original plan was to reach a decision point on the types and states of variance to implement and then after that to implement the process.

So that's the original plan. And we put out for public comments earlier this year.

We've gotten some very helpful feedback from the community. So I'm on Slide 12. And these are types of feedback we've received through the public comment.

So there are some comments about expanding the scripts to include more scripts in the process.

And there's, you know some other comment referred to support variance to minimize user confusion and fraudulent use.

So while people agree that, you know, it's good to from a usability perspective to increase to give a support there and - but doing so must be in a way to minimize the user confusion and the potentially fraudulent uses.

Many of the - some of that comments seems to say that the co-point variance would really be a priority for hosting variance. And so we actually taken that comment aboard.

And the last two there a couple of individual community and so for example the Chinese community expressed their desire of, you know, the strong desire for the Chinese community activating these variance.

And finally advantages and disadvantages, disadvantage in script communities.

So we've taken those feedback both from the public comment and also in the public forum which were held in Costa Rica and produced a revised project plan.

At a high level the - we - the revised project plan focused on the issues that I - in the critical paths and re-prioritized other projects.

So before we were proposing to do six projects but we going to focus, you know, the three on the critical path for actually, you know, be able to activate some of the variance.

So the first project will be an IDN table format two. These projects I'll go over in detail in the latest slides.

The second is the creation and management process for the IDN table for the roots. And the third project is user experience, a study with active variance.

The revised - and so I'm on Slide 14 but let me go over - go into each of the project in detail and then coming back to this Slide 14.

So on Slide - on 13 the first project is a format for the IDN table specification.

This is not really dependent on having a variant in the root. But this is a necessary thing to be in place.

So the issue it's trying to address is today where registries submit IDN tables. They come into, you know, varied different formats and it - and it makes it difficult both in terms of for comparison to check for inconsistencies or for machine processing.

You know, as the number of TLDs is going to expand for the root zone this problem is like to be, going to be much worse.

So this project it would develop a specification for standard to for listing the allowed co-points and the label generation use. So this is really a format.

For example if you think of these - this is the XML format. And that would - all the other - all the IDN tables in the root will have to conform to this format. So that's project one.

Project two which is really the key of this - the critical piece of this is to determine a process for creating and maintaining IDN tables for the root zone.

So today we have IDN tables submitted by a registries. So each registry can submit whatever table they want.

And sometimes these tables could be inconsistent even for the same script.

So the question is before us is we need to determine the approach, a approach, a process for developing the - what we call here the co-point repertoire or the IDN table and the generation process for the root zone, so how those are determined.

And this project must be completed before any IDN variant TLDs may be implemented. So this is - this project is really on the critical path for determining those.

So just to give some example of that process what it needs to consider, so in the Integrated Issues Report I think it identifies a couple factors.

One factor is, you know, the comprehensiveness. The other is expertise, so for example whether it involves extra ruling.

So if a certain - a community comes forward and say, you know, this is our table and so what is the process to say okay, you know, okay this is the authoritative table and that there involve expert ruling. You know, what if people disagree.

There are then a couple of other cases where this may not be a big issue for some communities but it could be a big issue for other communities. So the goal again is to determine the approach to developing the co-point repertoire and the label generation process for the root zone.

So once that project completes depending on the outcome, you know, so once the process is completed you determine that, then the actual work what needs to be done, you know, even after to generating those and creating those tables.

And in these steps, you know, we understand some communities are farther along than others in coming up these. So that's Project 2.2.

Project 6 -- I'm on Slide 18 -- is to study the - examine the user experience implications of active variance.

So that they expected outcome of this is to recommend some rules or guidelines that TLDs should operate under in order to provide an acceptable user experience with regard to variant TLDs with including a profit policy of contractual provisions in making these rules effective.

So the other was, you know, operating a variant TLD would require some specific special rules. And because of its technical and user nature, additional rules may be imposed.

So this study is trying to come up to say, you know, what are those rules are. So that's the first objective.

The second objective is ICANN understand many of these are parts that guarantees a good user experience is not within the influence or remit of the ICANN.

So but I can tell that it's still necessary to point out some of these issues for the relevant communities to address.

So the second objective is to create a useful reference to educate some application developers and others affected by these changes.

So those are the outcome of Project 6. And in order to do that we do a study on the user experience implications when two or more variant TLDs are activated. So that's Project 6.

So let me go back to - bear with me to Slide 14 which with these projects, you know, we can look at the revised timeline.

So Project 1 is already ongoing. I think Project 6 is ongoing.

So Project 2.1 I think that's we're about to start, already started.

Those - Project 2.1 will probably take the longest time and it will (unintelligible) to - this is because the 2.1 we're thinking of taking an approach of the Integrated Issues Report where we invite community experts again, you know, to work together with ICANN in terms of defining this process as it is a quicker piece that needs community input.

So the goal is to have a - the approval in the ICANN I think Asia meeting of the agreed IDN table creation and Internet process (will root) on next spring. I believe that was Asia-Pacific meeting.

And then once these first three projects completed the results will be used for example 2.2 implementing the root IDN tables process.

So this follow-up project will be just to actually fill out those tables defined by Project 2.1 that conforms to the format of 2.1.

And depending on the study of Project 6 and Project 2.1 additional updates to the ICANN GTLD and CTD - ccTLD programs may be needed as well as, you know, ICANN operations. So those will be started, you know, as soon as the first three projects completed.

So we've listened to a community so this project change resulted in a reduction of a project budget, so before it was 2.8 million.

Now the project plan is 1.5 million. This still a significant amount of resource that ICANN is - that is allocating duty's importance and significance in nature.

And the change in timeline to the original project plan aims to change at the end of (fiscal) year 2004.

And, you know, coming from the public comments we've received, you know, we tried to work hard to make it to happen faster. And right now it's the beginning of (fiscal) year 2012, '14.

So that's a quick update and I'm happy to take questions. Before I do that Dennis you have anything to add?

Dennis Jennings: No Steve. Well done on the presentation. While just one thing. The budget is of course a budget proposal that...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Dennis Jennings: ...goes through the whole budget process. So there's no guarantee that that will be the figure that emerges. We might be larger. It's probably going to be a bit smaller but that's the submission that we're making. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Dennis. Over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes, thank you Steve and thank you Dennis. So I guess anyone have any questions on that?

So with perhaps Jonathan I don't know whether you've had chance to take a look at the revised plan or if you have any immediate feedback on what Steve

was saying since you have been leading some efforts from us to put some comments together?

Jonathan Shea: Yes thank you Evan, Jonathan Shay. Yes I think with the revised project plan and (looking) that emphasis and priority are given to Project 1 and 2 I think these are very sensible changes.

But with Project 6 given that ICANN only speak for the Chinese community I think the utility of Project 6 is quite limited for the Chinese community understanding that they have been providing Chinese domain name registration services for quite a number of years and user experience is quite well understood.

So for the community I think the Project 6 will not add a lot of value. But it may be useful for the other scripts for the other languages and which I have no sufficient knowledge to comment on.

Overall I think I really welcome the changes make. And now the whole thing are more result oriented and I think we are moving in the right direction. So thank you.

Thank you Jonathan. Anyone any other comments before Steve, Dennis or Steve wants to respond to that? Anyone else?

Dennis Jennings: Dennis here Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Dennis Jennings: I think Jonathan's comment is very apt and I think he's probably right for the Chinese hand script communities.

However that experience would be very useful input particularly for those who may want to apply for Chinese variant TLDs in other parts of the world.

So I think that I look forward to the Chinese community providing input on the usability and user experience as part of the process. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. So hearing no other questions I have jot down a few of my own. So I guess I'll get it started. If anyone has any sort of comments please jump in and let me know you have a question.

I guess the - a few items. I'll start with one which I think Steve you mentioned in terms of 2.1 - yes 2.2 as well. But you mentioned the, engaging the community in that work much like the case study teams.

I wonder how that's progressing? And as you mentioned that has commenced as well. So I'm just curious how that's progressing and how that's being done?

Steve Sheng: Thank you Edmon for that question. So 2.1 the first step of that is to again solicit, you know, members of the community who are interested and who have the expertise.

So we're going to follow a very similar approach of the way we did recruiting the case studies, the experts in the case studies.

I think we have recently - let me think. We have board approval to go ahead Dennis is that correct?

Dennis Jennings: We have - we're in the process Steve. We have approval...

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Dennis Jennings: ...to publish this plan for public comment...

Steve Sheng: Right.

Dennis Jennings: ...with the board Variance Working Group and we're interacting with them on some more details. And we basically we hope to be able to launch at Prague subject to board Variant Working Group approval. I think that's the stage it's at the moment Steve.

Steve Sheng: Okay right. So I hope that answers your question Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes. So I guess we will - we could expect that the team will engage the community much like previously in the sort of an open call for participants.

And there'll be a process and a group will be formed to discuss how, you know, the - to participate and produce the report from the project. Is that a fair characterization?

Steve Sheng: Yes, yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay. And that hasn't happened, right? So we can...

Steve Sheng: No, no, no it hasn't happened.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...in the next little while?

Steve Sheng: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I see from my chat that may be (Jane) wanted to speak up. I don't know whether you - (Jane) are you able to unmute and did you want to say something?

(Jane Sung): Hello can you hear me?

Edmon Chung: We can hear you.

(Jane Sung): Hello? Hello?

Edmon Chung: Yes we can hear you. Yes.

(Jane Sung): Okay. I thought I'm muted. So anyway I yes, actually I just want to echo what Jonathan's comments.

Because actually at this point I think Chinese community still has a concern of the timeline because, you know, it's they actually they expect, you know, to be much faster than the current timeline to results if a. the variance issue because it's been so long, you know.

Everything's we start to discuss (unintelligible). But that's one more comments I want added.

Edmon Chung: Thank you (Jane). And I guess I'll echo that as well. As much as we are I guess not only the Chinese community, I think the IDN community as a whole has been, you know, waiting for this.

I think not - the Chinese community has been of course much more vocal on a number of these issues. But I'm pretty sure that from our colleagues from the Arabic region from the Indic region and some of the other European sort of languages are equally keen to see this happen. And...

Dennis Jennings: Edmon can - Dennis here. I wondered could I just respond gently do that?

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Dennis Jennings: Yes. First of all I fully understand the frustration and the perception that this has been going on a very long time. Indeed it has.

So this project has been going down about a year and is making steady progress. And I think - I hope that that gives confidence that while it still may seem frustratingly slow progress is being made and the project will deliver.

I think you have to emphasize the need for caution and care and ICANN's responsibility in this regard.

And you'll have seen the Internet Architecture Board make statements about what code points are permissible in the root which indicates that some of the community is even more extremely cautious than this project is being.

And we're trying to steer a line between the demand and the, not unreasonable frustration with the - with delays as they're perceived and the technical advice and caution.

All I can offer is that we are making steady progress and it is our firm intent to continue making steady progress as best we can with the support of the community.

So I do understand the frustration but I just appealing to you to understand that we are marching through as best we can in a quite complicated situation with a number of opposing radically different views on this whole process.
Thanks Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes thank you Dennis. And I think we all understand and appreciate the progress we've made in the last year or so.

So we are - I'm hoping that and I'm pretty sure that this group that gathered here is wholly supportive and wants to contribute to the process as we go along.

That being said I wanted to clarify and one thing. There's - that it's important to in this whole process it's really important to clearly identify what the variant

- IDN variant TLD issues are and what issues might be part of it but not be confused and take us into a different path.

Some of the things that you just mentioned about the co-points that is relevant to IDNs for sure.

But regardless of which ones - which code points we need to the task at hand is, you know, it's - we'd be much more fruitful if we focus on task at hand which is the IDN variant issues and scope it that way.

And one of the things that I think is very positive in that is seeing that the visual similarity part is being - will be taken away I understand that's an important part of the whole TLD process both for IDN ccTLDs and for new gTLDs. So that has its place.

But, you know, confusing it with the variance issues if - (you) often less useful than useful.

So that comment - and then I had a couple of clarification sort of questions as well one of which is I guess to Dennis or Steve is whether you see any policy changes or development requirement is in your - I guess in both the original project plan and in the new revised plan there hasn't been any budget in terms of time for if down the road there are any policy change requirements from the GNSO or ccNSO to actually put this in place and how you see that happening?

Dennis Jennings: Steve do you want to answer that or would you like me to?

Steve Sheng: Please go ahead.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you Edmon for the question. This is something that we're actively working on at the moment and consulting internally with the ICANN policy staff.

Our current thinking is that we don't see major policy, new policy issues. We think that they're covered by existing policies but we're consulting on that internally first of all.

At one level of course if there are they'll have to be dealt with by the ccNSO and the GNSO. And that will if it happens include some significant time delays.

And so it at one level we hope that won't be the case. At the moment we don't think it is but we'll be consulting very carefully as I say first internally and then with the ccNSO and GNSO if necessary just to make sure.

But my current thinking, best thinking is that the existing policies are broad enough to cover what we're trying to do and they're really operational matters rather than policy matters.

But it's a very good question and I don't really have a firm answer. Thanks Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. And I guess the reason why I brought this up is because this - the making of this group is specifically to look into those areas where certain policy recommendations or further work might be alerted to the two charting organizations which is the GNSO and ccNSO for...

Dennis Jennings: Indeed Edmon.

Edmon Chung: ...so...

Dennis Jennings: Dennis here again. Indeed and I think that's where the JIG can be most helpful by looking at that, at the project from that perspective and giving us a heads up if you think there are policy issues there.

Edmon Chung: Right. That's exactly where I wanted to lead the question and also throw it back to my colleagues here on the group is I think, you know, I've been saying this all along anyway.

But I think it's our next step in terms of the JIG should probably be start to walk down that path.

And I'm happy to hear that Dennis that your team has also started the process in terms of figuring out whether the policy side needs any changes or amendments or clarifications even if I know changes need to be made.

Off the top of my head -- and I've also been saying this a few times -- I know this is jumping way ahead but off the top of my head there are at least a couple that we might want to take a good look at one of which is in terms of the cost recovery or the fee structures for a more direct way to talk about it on that and how that plays with both the GNSO new GTLD process and the IDN ccTLD process.

Because I think that has a - an element that might need to be looked into because we, you know, eventually if we are talking about what we're talking about here which is the IDN variant TLDs we are potentially looking at even if not new policy, a clarification of how the existing policies would cover the cases of variance would be useful to at least on the G side to circle back to the GNSO.

Because I think that's certainly an issue that is a lot of people would I guess would pay attention to.

So that's at least one of them. And I think, you know, for the group I'd like to try to get the group started on thinking and looking into how this - as this goes along what the policy implications are.

And that's I guess where this group can be most effective if in fact there are things that in terms of policy the need to be done, then we should flag it, bring it back to the respective SOs and have them being - have that work being - been done.

So I guess with that I wonder if anyone else has any thought on that, whether that makes sense or not?

Well looking at the time we're almost at the top of the hour. Hearing no further thoughts on that at least for now I'd like to get a quick sense of what the IP team's plans are for Prague and see if there any coordination we should have in terms of the activities that are planned for product?

Dennis Jennings: Steve do you want to...

Edmon Chung: People are...

Dennis Jennings: ...update people on our plans for Prague?

Steve Sheng: So the plans for Prague obvious we'll, you know, try to kick off 2.1, you know, by recruiting community, you know, community experts. So that's something concrete and tangible.

We will have a public session in Prague. I don't remember off the top of my head which day was it, maybe on Wednesday or Thursday...

Dennis Jennings: Well currently Steve it's scheduled Monday the 25th at 2 o'clock...

Steve Sheng: Oh okay.

Dennis Jennings: ...but that may have changed, you know?

Steve Sheng: Okay. Yes.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry Gisella here, confirmed for Monday.

Dennis Jennings: Okay.

Steve Sheng: Oh Monday okay, yes. Scheduling is always difficult. That we will be going through, you know, providing this update which is I think is similar to this presentation that we present to the JIG. So the JIG - so you have a preview of what we're presenting.

The other thing we may be looking for community input is so on Projects 6 our user experience which is a project that I am personally leading and responsible for.

That we have a - we're going to produce a study outline and a report outline, a study proposal for community feedback.

So I think Jonathan mentioned earlier that, you know, that the Chinese community have vast experience.

So I was wondering, you know, to the (GIG) in general and to Jonathan specifically if you would be able to provide some comment and feedback to help us?

Edmon Chung: Jonathan did you want to respond quickly?

Jonathan Shea: Yes thank you Edmon. Thank you Steve. Yes Steve I think since last - (know) when the outline comes out and we will have a look at it and try to give some comments.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Jonathan. So we will share it is soon as it's ready to the whole VIP community. And thank you in advance for that.

So those are the couple things I can think of for now.

Edmon Chung: Okay thank you Steve. And so Gisella (unintelligible) I just want to check to make sure that - I (know) we are also scheduling a meeting for this (GIG).

I Hope that doesn't conflict with the session, the VIP session. Do we know what that times are and whether it's a conflict?

Dennis Jennings: Dennis here.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry Edmon. It's Gisella here. (Barb) has had to leave the call. What I'll do is I'll look up the VIP session and the GIG and I'll send a quick email to the mailing list to advise on times.

Dennis Jennings: Good.

Edmon Chung: Okay. That'll be useful. And I guess if it currently conflicts then I know it's very difficult in terms of schedule. I hope they don't is my comment I guess.

And with that I guess I'll - I'd like to also invite the VIP team to the meeting. And if Dennis or Steve if you could bring some of the initial feedback from the policy staff on, you know, their thoughts on this.

You alluded to some of it but if we can have a little bit more in Prague where so we can talk about it. And that will help us plan our next steps for the GIG in support of the VIP work as we go forward as well.

Dennis Jennings: Happy to do that. We'll present what we have at that time.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. With that we are past the top of the hour. So I wonder if anyone has any further comments before we close this?

Hearing none so as mentioned last time and if - laid out last time this meeting we were talking about the VIP work.

The next meeting just before Prague we'll go back to the subject on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. And I believe the time of the meeting is moved out about 1-1/2 hours.

So 13 (unintelligible) UTC instead of 1200 UTC. Gisella am I correct?

Gisella Gruber-White: Gisella here for the transcript. Yes correct Edmon. On Tuesday the 12th of June GIG meeting will be at 1330 UTC due to the ccNSO council call being at 1200 UTC.

I will send an email...

Edmon Chung: Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: ...out to the mailing list this evening just to confirm the time.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And so we'll we also have invited the staff team that's working on universal acceptance TLDs to join us and also prepare for our activities in Prague.

So with that thank you everyone for joining and I'll talk to everyone in two week's time.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you everyone.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

END