

**ICANN Prague Meeting
JIG WG- TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 07th August 2012 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

Attendees:

Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Chris Dillon
Sarmad Hussein
Jonathan Shea
Jal Chen
Jian Zhang, APTLD, Co-Chair
Mirjana Tasic
Daniel Kalchev

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)
Dennis Jennings

Coordinator: Go ahead. We're now recording.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Ricardo). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the JIG call on the 7 of August, 2012. On the call today we have Sarmad Hussein, (Tal Chen), Edmon Chung, Jonathan Shea and Chris Dillon. We have apologies from Fahd Batayneh, Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria and Dennis Jennings.

From staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Woman: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Sorry I was trying to find my unmute button. First of all I'll apologize for being in a relatively noisy place. I was hoping this would be a - slightly quieter but I guess not quite. So thank you for bearing with me. And thank you for joining the JIG call.

I sent along a fairly brief proposed agenda for the meeting. Hope we have - talk a little bit about the update on the VIP development and then we'll spend a little bit - hopefully today spend a little bit of time on the evolution of this particular group - this group itself.

I sent along some notes earlier about some thoughts that Jian and I had had a chat after our Prague meeting about the sort of - the role - the ongoing role of this group so I'd like to cover that.

And then depending on the time and looking at the people participating I'd like to get a start on developing the - as we talked about in the last few calls - to actually start work on the final report on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

So that's the proposed agenda. If anyone has any thoughts or anyone want to add or - to the agenda?

Jonathan Shea: No.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess we'll start off with the update from VIP. In terms of public information as far as I saw - I didn't see any particular update. Last we saw from Prague was a new working team being formed from volunteers from the community. And also in our JIG meeting we have asked for us to nominate a person into the new working group - and as an observer.

That process has been confirmed and completed as you see from the mailing list. Dennis has confirmed for - in fact for myself to join as a observer on the new VIP team.

I note that Dennis was unable to join this call but I wonder if Bart or Nathalie has any information on the progress or since Sarmad is on the call as well and others whether anyone has any update or additional information on the progress of the VIP work?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: I don't have any but I could check. Probably, say, I guess it's been reasonably quiet, as you said so - since Prague. So internally I haven't seen anything.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Bart. I wonder if anyone else on the call is with the team. I believe I understand that Sarmad is probably on the team. I wonder if you have any information you could share? I know that there is a meeting that is being proposed to be convened in LA later this month and also just before the Toronto meeting. But other than that I have no further information. I wonder if Sarmad or any other people on the call has any further information on that?

Sarmad Hussein: This is Sarmad. So, yes, that's all that I know as well as far as v 2.1 is concerned so that the VIP project divided into - the follow up work has been divided into multiple subjects. And based on the feedback from public comments I think there were three projects that were probably finalized to go

in the second phase and then there's more projects in the third phase perhaps.

So this is - again unofficially; it's not officially. I'm not part of VIP team. But they are planning to hold a meeting on 29 and 30 of August from what I understand. That's (all) for the 2.1 which is on the process of developing the language of the (label) generation rule which is another name for language table for all the different scripts. So that's - and then as you - as Edmon said - there's another follow up, (perhaps), meeting in Toronto.

Then the work on IDN p6 is also continuing. This is on user acceptance of IDN variants. And there was a plan which was submitted and publicly presented in Prague. And the project is now continuing based on that plan of talking and working with different stakeholders to find out what the gaps and challenges are.

And that's what the third project was concerning. I think that was on I think developing a structure for the table. And there's been, I think, a draft out - the language table. And I think there's a draft out as an RFC so that's within the IETF domain.

And I think that's all I know about it and one could obviously comment on it. There's probably a list for it, I'm not very sure about that so that's all I know about these three projects. So all these three projects are underway I think.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Sarmad. And I think, yeah, thank you for the update. That's generally my understanding as well. And as mentioned I - this particular group we are - we have been invited to be an observer on the group so I guess myself and also when Dennis has time to join the discussion here we'll give an update. And of course, Sarmad, I - and perhaps others are also on the team as well - I actually don't have information about the membership of the team - could help update the group as we move along as well.

So that sort of brings me - that whole process I guess sort of brings me to the second point that we wanted to raise is the sort of evolution of this group itself. Just to give a quick background when - I guess most of you are probably aware but in any case I'll give a quick background.

So when the JIG was formed almost two years ago there were - the IDN ccTLD Fast Track was not - has not been implemented yet at that point I believe. And also the gTLD process was not completed yet. There were a number of loose ends that we saw from the GNSO and the ccNSO.

That was also the first few times when the GNSO and the ccNSO met over lunch and previously over other types of meetings as well at ICANN. And we realized that there are certain issues that might have common interests between the ccNSO and GNSO on the specific topic of IDN TLDs. And that sort of culminated to the formation of this JIG group - (unintelligible) IDN group.

And it was formed as a ad hoc group to look into the areas of common interests. And after - in fact shortly after the chartering of the group the two co-chairs, myself and - myself from the GNSO and Jian from the ccNSO - and along with I think Bart was involved as well throughout our discussion and also the chair of the ccNSO and the chair of the GNSO convened to identify the, you know, the issues of common interest.

And we identified three. One of which is single character IDN TLDs, one of which is IDN variant TLDs and the third one was the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. So these three common - issues of common interest became the three points of discussions for this group.

So since then we have completed the - our initial report and final report for single character IDN TLDs. That was of course being looked at by the board and also from the staff implementation point of view. SSAC also looked at it and weighed in. And there were a few issues that SSAC identified to the staff

and the board for it to be completed before the implementation would take place.

So - and also the - since the chartering of the JIG the VIP was formed about a year and a half ago - if I'm not mistaken it was about a year and a half ago. And that group was sort of came out from a board sub committee on IDNs and eventually the VIP was formed led by staff and along with consultants and experts on the matter. And so that took on the issue of IDN variant TLDs.

And on the third issue, which is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, we simply - especially with the implementation of the new gTLD process, a - I guess a revival of the project that has been - that has been developing since the 2000 round of expansion of new gTLDs, has been, you know, sort of - there is new work that's being done by the staff team on the particular subject.

And it includes both IDN TLDs and ASCII TLDs for that matter. But it certainly includes the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs issue. So with that progress over the last couple of years Jian and I spent a little bit of time after our meeting in Prague to talk about the sort of - given the current situation, you know, since the JIG has been formed, you know, different groups have been - actually staff teams have been formed to look into those particular issues now what the role of the JIG would be going forward.

The couple of things that Jian and I are - was in sort of agreement is that I - one area is that we both felt that we shouldn't try to repeat or - how should I say - we shouldn't try to duplicate the work that is being done from the staff team. That's an important principle.

The other part is that I think, you know, both of us felt that there - the few issues are going to take a longer period of time and will require additional resource especially with the (unintelligible) working on it - additional resources to complete.

And it's - and - but at the same time it would be a useful thing for this group to continue as a support to the staff teams that are already on it. Because that allows the - that allows the GNSO and the ccNSO to keep abreast of this important topic. And whenever the - sort of whenever there are issues of - that relates to policy this group would be able to utilize - I mean, this group could be leveraged or utilized to feed that information back into the two councils.

And, you know, we can certainly engage in the discussion and engage in supporting staff from this angle and from input from the community and from the two SOs and provide that sort of bridging role.

So that led us to a sort of a realization or conclusion which I'd like to try to get people's opinion on is that this group perhaps the best way for this group to evolve is to move away from our current operation which is to try to generate our recommendations, you know, on these three topic as an initiator and create reports out of it.

Rather than doing that we would take on a role where we would move away from trying to create these - or initiate these reports but actually, you know, keep our - keep working with the two teams on - well, VIP and also the universal acceptance and also keeping an eye on the single character IDN TLD implementation and provide input when necessary.

Or when those teams come up with reports we can either respond as a group through the councils or report back to the councils our views about the issues. So that's sort of - where our head is. And that will probably take - the implementation of the whole - both the single character - the VIP - the variant TLD issues and also the continuing work on the universal acceptance is going to take probably the next two to three years to complete.

So the idea is to transform this group from a sort of a drafting of recommendations group to a - sort of a standing committee or group, if you will, continue with it as a joint group between the GNSO and ccNSO on these topics but convert it into a standing committee. And also for a longer period of time to follow up on these issues rather than to produce sort of a document or initiate - introduce it from us.

So that is the current thinking from myself and Jian. Unfortunately she wasn't able to join us today. But I wonder if anyone from the group...

Nathalie Peregrine: Jian has joined the call as well as...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Oh that's great than. Jian, I wonder if you have - did you join early enough to hear what I was talking about in terms of the, you know, the evolution of this group and whether you want to add your thoughts about it?

Jian Zhang: Hi. Actually I joined in the middle of your, you know, your - what is that - I think it's well said. I don't have anything to add. I would like to hear if there's any comments from other group members. Hello?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, we can hear you. So whether group members or observers or - is - Bart, do you have any thoughts on that that would be - it will be most welcome.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Do you envision a change of charter for that matter?

Edmon Chung: Yes I do because the current charter basically spells out the creation of reports and, you know, going back to the two councils. I haven't looked at the charter for quite some time actually. But if I recall correctly - if I recall correctly that's - it is predicated on the production of a few reports based on those issues of common interest.

So rather than doing that I was, you know, I'd like to have it updated for such that this group would exist for a slightly longer period of time, say the next two years, with a reduced amount of work. That part, sorry, I forgot to mention earlier on. With reduced amount of work - reduced to the point where I think unless there is specific issue working on reduce it to a meeting during the ICANN meeting.

Because that - it seems to me that has been the - when we have the most people join us to - anyway. And to turn that into a group where we would support the staff teams and provide input and also to help follow up on the three issues that were identified.

So kind of yes but I apologize, I haven't looked at it specifically. Probably should have a slight adjustment there.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon. Edmon, if I understand you correctly what you try to - what you're suggesting together with Jian is more or less the creation of an umbrella for a pool of people who can, yeah, support, interact with the different, say, staff initiatives. Say, create, say, or, yeah, solidify the pool of people without the need to go out for a call for volunteers on and off and have the opportunity for both ccNSO, GNSO and maybe ALAC to act as a pool for the different staff initiatives.

Edmon Chung: Yes. The only thing I would add to that is within the framework of the existing issues of common interest that has been identified. So...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Say, the reason for framing it this way is, say, the question is whether you want to call it a working group because it comes with certain connotations or that you - in fact what you want is more or less just an email list and the opportunity that, say, through the email list we could organize meetings at ICANN events or if necessary in between the meetings. So it's more an administrative vehicle than anything else.

Edmon Chung: In the event that we would not be producing letters or recommendations to the two councils, yes, that would be the case. But I do envision that we would be in positions where we could produce - we could produce this - recommendations to the two councils. And so that's why I added on top of what, you know, besides just the administrative part.

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry, Edmon. Looking at it - and if you look at the - say, the single character report what you see as well, say, is that, say, if you look at the different recommendations - and maybe that's something to discuss further and to - how should I phrase it - to think through - if you look at the recommendations most of the time - or what I've seen now - the recommendations, say, at a high level are, say, are very common.

But if you look into the details they have to be adjusted for the respective SOs and - anyway. So the question is whether or not for these topics they should be driven by the respective SOs is an alternative way of looking at it.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon again. I think that's - well that's certainly an interesting topic of intellect for debate as well. But there is a particular element though is what I do see is that this group does perform a good function to bring the attention of the two councils to particular issues that is arising out of these topics.

And often these topics are of common interest although those interests may take, you know, the results of the - or the positions of the two councils might

be slightly different. They are still, you know, of common interest in that way.
So that's...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: ...issues themselves are of common interest because at the end of the day...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...we all talk about the same type of industry of course. But, say, so it's - maybe it's an idea to think through. Let me rephrase it, what is the timeline you had in - you and Jian had in mind before proposing, say, a change of charter or mandate of this group to the respective councils?

Edmon Chung: Well my hope is that we would be able to use the next couple of months to think through this and make initial proposals by Toronto. That's, at least, the target for me right now.

And in terms of the overall timeframe I think, you know, the reformed charter would take us through another two years because that's - the VIP at least anticipates about two years to complete - it's at least two years to complete its work.

And the other thing is the ongoing work on the single character implementation because SSAC identified a few areas which I assume ICANN staff is starting to work on. And we would follow up on that and also of course the universal acceptance one as well. So that's sort of what's on my mind.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: So, you know, in that way it's good to at least, say, from my end - I don't know how it works with the GNSO - but, say, is - and either Jian or I can do this - is at least pre warn, inform the ccNSO Council.

Edmon Chung: Certainly. In fact we took the opportunity in Prague to - already raised it a little bit during the ccNSO meeting. But it would be good to bring it to the attention of the Council - the ccNSO Council as well that we're looking into this and would - probably looking at providing some additional thoughts into it in Toronto.

Okay so I was wondering - I was hoping if anyone else from the group would have any thoughts or ideas on this - taking this path forward?

Jonathan Shea: Edmon, I'm Jonathan.

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Jonathan Shea: I just have a question. Just have a question - not so much a comment. And you may be aware of the formation of transliterated (unintelligible) domain working group under the APTLD Association. And that working group was - or has been working on providing some comments in relation to the applications of transliterated (unintelligible) domains in some of the new gTLD applications.

While this is only happening within the ccTLD membership base with the involvement of some of the gTLDs because they are also the associate members of APTLD and - it just popped up in my head whether this is the sort of thing the JIG would like to, you know, be a bridge from the CC community to the GNSO just to, you know, keep both sides synchronized in - on some of these issues.

But just as a question. I don't have a concrete - I don't have a frame about this sort of thing at this point in time. So just raises as a possible issue that the JIG can consider.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Edmon again. I think that's a great example. Don't want to touch on the subject matter itself for now. But I think you brought up a pretty good point is when the JIG was first formed one of the whole idea is that there were some - there were a lot of discussion or back and forth between the GNSO and ccNSO on these subjects and therefore the JIG was formed sort of as a bridge as well.

So I think it is probably a good idea that this, you know, the JIG can help bridge that. And also input into the - because there is a ccNSO and GNSO lunch that is now being somewhat formalized for the ICANN meeting on the Monday.

And we can, you know, for the past - besides the last one - for the past year or so some of the topics that are discussed as the JIG has been a part of the agenda for that meeting as well. So this could be one of those things.

Specifically on the subject matter though - and for any matter - any subject for that matter actually - perhaps it might need a little bit more vetting from the general CC community. And then, you know, which is what I guess the Council's role could be in a way or just the chair, you know, to - identify these issues and see if this group should take on the issue.

And perhaps - when I say take on is since - if we do evolve the group into more of a standing team then we could then instead of when we take on a common issue - common interest now we would be in the mode of creating kind of report. We would then be able to act as you mentioned as a bridge and provide that to the GNSO Council. That's sort of - I think in terms of the process, the structure - that is the whole idea.

I guess when Jian and I talked about this - the evolution of this group that's precisely the types of things that we'd like - we think that this group could create value for.

Jonathan Shea: Thank you, Edmon. So, Edmon, do you think with this particular issue some immediate action is required or maybe we will just - we just leave it for now because, as you said, the JIG is considering changing its charter anyway.

Edmon Chung: I guess it's a - probably a good question for Jian. And how she sees it and perhaps how she sees whether this group can play a role in - even in the interim I don't think anything is really stopping us from taking it. But if we do then we should report back to the two councils about it. And that would in fact sort of satisfy some of the bridging part that you mentioned.

But, Jian, I wonder if you have any thoughts on the particular subject?

Jian Zhang: I think for this particular subject for now I think to keep things simple probably, you know, at this point I would suggest, you know, to still separate, you know, to, you know, to working group. But I think later on I think I agree with Jonathan so probably, you know, some joint (offer) could be done later on. But at this stage I think, you know, probably - because that working group is particularly - you know, try to make comments on transliterating top level domain.

And also we're trying to produce a comment from APTLD, you know, very, you know, timing manner. So I think at this stage probably, you know, just keep two, you know, working groups separated.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Xian. And I tend to agree with you. And I think, as I mentioned to Jonathan, and - is probably - it would be good for the CC community to bring it up to the ccNSO Council or the ccNSO community in general and see if that's really something that the ccTLDs in general would like to take on

because right now, as I understand it, it's coming from APTLD and APTLD initiatives.

Once we get a sense from the general CC community that this is an issue that would take - that the CC community is interested to take on then I think for sure this is certainly an issue that the GNSO and the gTLD community would be interested in so it would immediately become an issue of common interest.

But for this - for the time being it's probably best for the APTLD and the APTLD members to bring it to the attention of the CCs first and then come from there. That's sort of my - how I see it.

Jonathan Shea: Thank you, Edmon and Jian. I understand and I agree with the approach. So maybe I will discuss it - Jian, afterwards on whether there is a need and if yes how we bring this up to the ccNSO first, yeah. So thank you, Edmon, thank you, Jian.

Edmon Chung: Well, actually, thank you, Jonathan, for bring this up. But these are some of the things that, you know, as we would evolve, as the whole IDN implementation involves these are things that will come up. And that's precisely, I guess, the reason - when Jian and I talked about is that, you know, there might be issues that come and go and there might be issues that we want to take on from the group over time. And that's why there is the - sort of the evolution of the group as well.

I wonder if anyone else on the call have thoughts about the direction that we're suggesting? While I'm - since I'm not hearing any objection to the direction I think for the time being I'll take that as a - let's move it towards that direction. There are a couple of action items with that. Jian and I - and we'll take a look at the existing charter and see if, you know, what type of adjustments we might want to make and then bring it back to the group and - for the group to consider.

So I guess I'm not asking for this group to form a consensus on the issue at this point. But at least I'm, you know, I'm not hearing strong objections to it so I guess Jian and I will start the ball rolling by looking at the charter and see where we want to make the adjustment and bring it back to the group for further discussion.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: May I suggest you take the immediate step by, say, based on the conversation of today write down what the intended purpose of, say, of the future JIG would be because based on that one a comparison - what is needed is easier.

Edmon Chung: Certainly. I guess that would be the first step, yes, you're right. So we'll probably - I'll probably summarize some of the things that the dialogue that just happened and send to the list and we'll go from there.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah because that makes it easier both, say, both for the Council because changing a charter is probably end of - it's the end of the stage of changing the nature of the working group. But to have a good idea of where the working group is headed, say, a restatement of purpose is probably the first step.

Edmon Chung: Sure. But I'm not sure that the purpose has changed. It's just the mode of working has changed. The purpose is still pretty much the same but the mode of work would be to support the...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...staff team.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe the choice of words of purpose is wrong but at least a method of working and...

Edmon Chung: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: ...timeline because if you look at it, say, there was the mission of - that these - a timeline associated with the JIG, etcetera. That's going to change.

Edmon Chung: Yeah. Yeah. So certainly. And, yes, and we'll summarize that and we'll - to the list and we'll go from there. Okay so that's sort of - that brings me to the last item that I've identified for the meeting. And that's the continuing of our work in this current working mode to come to a - to draft the final report on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

We spent quite a bit of time in the last few meetings talking about the direction this would take. Just to reiterate very quickly that we will probably focus on the really - the only two items that we've identified that have some policy impact and provide a bit of recommendation there.

We would collect all the things that we have on further studies and further action that needs to be taken and provide that as input to the staff team that's working on it. So that's the direction of the final report.

I - we're - I don't - I guess for the remainder of the time here I was wondering if besides all the things that we have mentioned in previous meetings whether anyone has any additional aspects that they want to bring to the - to this topic on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs before Jian and I go back and start drafting the first framework for this based on what has been discussed?
Anyone?

Jonathan Shea: No, not from me.

Edmon Chung: So hearing none I guess that brings us to the end of the meeting in fact unless anyone has any particular item that they want to bring up. We have from the couple of discussions we'll work on, as Bart mentioned, the sort of the - I'll summarize the direction that we're looking to take this group into the future.

And then another thread to get started on the - get the first framework or the first draft of the final report on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs together and - to send to the list.

Okay hearing no other questions, suggestions, comments? I guess that brings us to the end of the meeting. Jian, do you - anything else you want to add?

Jian Zhang: No I'm fine.

Edmon Chung: Okay so I guess with that thank you, everyone, for joining the call. We end it earlier than the top of the hour. And I guess it's a - should be a good thing as we move forward. We'd like to do less to support the work with the, you know, I guess work smarter rather than harder. Thank you, everyone, for bearing with me the noise that is probably coming through my mic anyway.

So thank you, everyone.

Jonathan Shea: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Good bye.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Bye now.

Nathalie Peregrine: (Ricardo), please stop the recordings. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye-bye.

END