

**ICANN
Transcription
Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group
Tuesday 13 November 2012 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN (JIG) Working Group on the Tuesday 13 November 2012 at 12:00 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-20121113-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Jian Zhang, NomCom Appointee, Co-Chair
Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Avri Doria, NCSG (Originally an ex-officio member as GNSO Council Chair)
Jonathan Shea, Observer
Daniel Kalchev, Observer
Mirjana Tasic, Observer

Apologies:

Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Christopher Dillon, IDN VIP
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Sarmad Hussein, Observer

ICANN staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Conference call is now being recorded.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you.

Julia Charvolen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the joint CCNSO, GNSO, IDN Working Group call on the 13th of November. On the call today we have Daniel Kalchev, Jonathan Shea, Edmon Chung, Jian Zhang.

We have apologies from Christopher Dillon, Young Eum Lee, Fahd Batayneh, Sarmad Hussein, and Rafik Dammak. From the staff we are waiting for Bart Boswinkel and you have myself, Julia Charvolen.

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

Edmon Chung: Thank you (Julia) and thank you all for joining the call so I had a brief - fairly brief agenda put out basically just to cover the - just to give everyone an update on the variance issues project related progress. And then trying to maybe slice today's call to follow-up on some of the discussions we had in Toronto and progressing on the final report on universal acceptance of IDN gTLDs. And that's pretty much it for today.

Before we get started though, I was sort of - well I was hoping that we would have a few more people who joined but in any case, just an update on the charter situation of the - this group.

So before we go into there just see if anyone has any agenda item to add. (Jane) you good with it?

Jian Zhang: Yes, I'm fine with it.

Edmond Chung: Okay, so I guess just to get started I wanted to update you on - I guess, about a year ago we asked the two Chartering Councils from the GNSO Council

and the CCNSO Council to extend our charter as well move along. A suggested timeline was put forward to have us wrap up our work by the end of this year.

The general direction however is to wrap up the three items that we have identified as issues of common interest between CCNSO and GNSO. So the idea is for us to complete those three items before we close or adjourn the Working Group.

It has since been, I guess apparent that that - all three items would require a longer period of time for the implementation -- especially through different staff teams.

So since - I guess, since Costa Rica we have been - we have done two things actually. One of which is to reduce the number of calls from a bi-weekly call to a monthly call.

The other thing is to start to think about this group as more on following up with the work in conjunction with the staff teams on all three items -- actually single character IDN gTLDs, variant gTLDs and universal acceptance of IDN gTLDs. All three items -- there are staff efforts looking in to the implementation so we are looking to turn this group really into support those efforts.

I have - at least from my side I have a work item to start talking to the GNSO Council on this and see if they have any problems or if there is any requirement for any resolution to continue.

I guess (Jane) and Bart will be considering whether any action needs to be taken on the CCNSO Council as well.

In Toronto I had a brief chat with Bart -- Bart unfortunately is not - hasn't joined us today yet and it seems like perhaps there really isn't any need for

any Council action at this point. And we would continue with the same objectives and mode of operation based on the current charter.

So that is the quick update on the charter situation so unless I hear objections from the GNSO that is going to be the case going forward. I don't know (Jane) if you wanted to add anything to that?

(Jane): No, I will stare, you know, when we talk to Bart -- ask if there is any action need to be done by both council. He seems - you know, he sounded quite clear, you know. At this point we just continue our work without, you know, changing our charter again.

Edmond Chung: So (Jonathan O'Daniel) I wonder if you have any thoughts or additions you want to add to this?

Man: Well mostly the same. I'm okay with what you already said, you and (Jane). So it's fine with me.

Edmond Chung: Okay. Thank you.

Jonathan Shea: (Jonathan) here. I'm okay too. I have no further comments.

Edmond Chung: Okay, thank you. So we'll continue to push on and I'll - I guess I'll quickly summarize this to the mailing list as well so other people on the call - not on the call can chime in if they wish to but at least that's the - that's what we intend to do

Okay, so coming to the agenda itself I was going to give a very brief update on the IDN variance gTLD projects. As you probably know a - one of the draft reports have been put out for public comment. Actually both - there are two reports that were put out for public comment.

One already closed and that's on Project 2.1 which is the Label Generation Rule Sets. And that particular project has proposing a sort of two panel or two

step process to create root level language or script tables for variance generation.

And the first the - what is called a primary panel would be primarily tasked to provide a proposal for variance mapping tables based on linguistic and community work.

And then a secondary panel would check the validity and check for the security and stability concerns at the root and put that in place. And sort of the idea is that once it is in place the table would be shared by all IDN gTLDs in that particular language or script. That's the - that's for Project 2.1. The other project, I think Project 6 is about the user experience. Also a document was put out for public comments. I don't remember when it closes but let me see. Does anyone know off the top of their head?

So I - I'll dig it up again but I guess the - that will be put out - that is being put out for public comments as well. It talks about the issues and things that the program - IDN variant gTLDs should try to address in terms of user expectation.

So that's really the update from the - I guess, the VIP related projects. I wonder if there are any questions or thoughts. And at this particular point I don't think we need to do anything yet but once the final report on 2.1 - Project 2.1 is being put out I think we will need to do a more thorough study on whether it has any policy impact for IDN gTLD process and IDN ccTLD process.

And if so we would need to report back to the two Councils on the issue. Because this is a set of rules that would be applicable to both IDN gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs so basically IDN ccTLDs would be bound by these policies that are put in place. So I don't see a huge challenge at this point but I guess it is this group's responsibility to do a more in-depth study on whether it has any policy impact back to the two Councils.

So that I think is expected later - early next year. And we will certainly be keeping an eye out for it. So any - please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Don't know - I'm just - I was a bit late. I'm sorry.

Edmond Chung: Hi Bart. Good to have you join. Was just - I actually started the meeting with a brief recap of the charter moving forward. And I guess we -- (Jane) and myself and yourself -- had a very brief chat in Toronto and the agreement, I guess, at this point there is no need to go back to the Council for any particular action. We would continue to work on three issues and follow through with them.

And that's - that would be sort of the mode of operation going forward at least until we hear further.

Bart Boswinkel: It's my understanding is that say at least complete the final report on universal acceptance and then say - because that will be closed to Beijing.

Edmond Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: And then revisit it again at the Beijing meeting.

Edmond Chung: Sure. That's a good addition. In fact that is correct. That is certainly one of the elements is that we will continue to go back to the Council where - especially during the ICANN meetings and Beijing would be the next stop and to see at that time whether it's necessary or appropriate for any actions to be taken regarding the charter.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmond Chung: Okay. So then I gave a brief update on the VIP related projects. So I was wondering if (Jonathan) or Danny or (Jane) had any questions on those?

Okay, I guess hearing none. I will continue forward. So I - the only other item on the agenda was to discuss the final report on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

So I updated the first draft which was (unintelligible) around in September. And so last month in the Toronto meeting with a pretty fruitful discussion, I think. We covered mainly the first recommendation -- Recommendation A -- and a little bit of Recommendation B.

So I updated A and added the sort of description behind it so - on why the particular recommendation. And so just to quickly recap the Recommendation A was to - originally it was written as to make it a requirement for IDN PCTLDs and gTLDs to support universal acceptance in their own systems.

After this discussion in Toronto I guess the sort of consensus is to try to make it more of a recommendation sort of more of a recommend than - or suggest rather than a requirement.

The other main change is to instead of that being an input - suggesting that being an input into the policy processes either for the GNSO or the CCNSO is to turn that into a recommendation for updating the ICANN IDN guidelines which are essentially included in both processes. And that seems to be more appropriate place for this to be included.

And of course added in terms of some description of the proposed recommendations in Section 4 as you - if you open the document to take a look -- in Section 4 there is a more detailed description of why the particular recommendation.

And the main discussion is basically that this - most of to - to point out that a lot of the issues concerning universal acceptance is really outside the remit of

ICANN but this particular item is perhaps the only one that is more directly under ICANN's purview.

And one of the important aspect is that we've identified that in order for other outreach efforts to be effective it is important, sort of that our home turf is covered. That is, you know, our own registries and registrar systems are properly supporting universal acceptance IDN TLDs.

And therefore this recommendation is important and today actually, you know, some quick look around we see that registries and registrars their systems - whether it's, you know, whether the web-based system or the more intimate EPP or registration systems -- some of them do not readily support IDN TLDs for things like name server record, (unintelligible) host or contact email addresses.

So these are at least some of the areas that we would recommend the community to implement in order for our other outreach efforts on this particular topic to be effective.

So three main items from this one is change it from - changed from required to recommend. Second one is to move it to recommending, updates the ICANN IDN guidelines and the third is the description that I just mentioned in terms of the rational for the recommendation.

So that was basically summarizing the discussions from Toronto. Any thoughts, additions, agreement, objections from anyone?

Jonathan Shea: Edmond, (Jonathan).

Edmond Chung: Yes.

Jonathan Shea: I have no further comments.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you (Jonathan). So I guess with that I - I'll consider at least this to be where we have our - we'll continue to try to solicit feedback from some mailing list.

So moving on to Recommendation B -- Recommendation B is to have the - to ask ICANN to allocate specific budget in - for the advocacy of universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. I have since gone and actually some feedback as in a couple of things.

One is that not only the budget but also the strategic plan -- we should probably make the recommendation for the budget and the strategic plan. And the other one is the latter part of the description may be unnecessary. We sort of said, you know, beyond the passive development of information, materials and tool kit -- it seems to shine a negative light on the work on - from the staff.

That's not the intent so from the recommendations we should probably strike that out and from the description part I - we should explain further that so far the work has been more about materials - sort of the work has been - that has been supported has been more of creating these materials for application developers and those type of purposes.

But there hasn't been as much proactive outreach and this is specifically - this recommendation is to address that particular issues.

And then I also - there was a very brief discussion in Toronto but I've expanded it a little bit more so, so I was hoping to - for this to be sort of the discussion of today which is in Section 4 if you take a look at - under B -- the sort of fleshing out a little bit the recommendation is to, I guess identify a couple things.

One is that to start off by saying that internationalization has been identified as a - sort of a key strategic direction of ICANN and we believe that universal acceptance of IDN TLDs should be one of the important pillars.

And then the recommendation is fleshed out a little bit more for it to be included in the strategic plan in the future under sort of a particular umbrella which is called Competition Consumers Trust and Consumer Choice.

And then for the budget process to add this as a core organization activity -- right now there are two core organization activities. One is the new gTLD process one the other is IDN program.

I guess this particular item perhaps could be the - the argument is that this requires a item on its own and then there is a rationale provided for why we focus a little bit more on IDNs. It doesn't mean that IDNs is the only issue at - longer ask gTLDs are - presents an issue as well but the special thing about it being IDN gTLDs is that it turns this issue into a community wide concern that covers both gTLDs and newly created IDN ccTLDs.

So those were the sort of rationale that were put forward and as I mentioned just now I received a suggestion that we included this - include the explanation of why previous efforts have not been enough -- why we think it hasn't been enough and that it justifies more - a special focus on it.

And as I mentioned that's the part where we think, you know, a - so far we've seen more passive type of working being done. You know, I think more proactive work needs to be done and the way to get focus on particular issue would be to make that suggestion. So that's for B.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yes, please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Just - the way I understand the strategic objective - excuse me, of internationalization it's more about ICANN as a corporation and not so much on the internationalization on the DNS as such.

So it - so you run the risk of confusion if you - if the Working Group would try to include it in internationalization. I think today from what I know, I think putting it under the heading or strategic pillar of Consumer Competition and Consumer Trust is a very good one because at the end of the day it's not about universal acceptance.

It's also about the acceptance of the global community of new gTLDs in particular - and in particular IDN gTLDs and that for competition and compute - and consumer trust and choice.

So maybe as a suggestion is to strengthen the argument under the consumer - under the strategic pillar and turn it into a strategic priority there and then strike the bit on internationalization.

Edmon Chung: Okay. No, I think it was a little bit of stretch -- the reason why it was put there, I believe -- I forgot who it was -- the confusion was created by justifying moving the IDN gTLD applications forward in the new gTLD process and related to internationalization.

I, at that time, when I heard that I thought it was sort of a stretch as well myself and I guess I agree with you Bart with that. Just mentioning that the confusion has been sort of made a little bit...

Bart Boswinkel: And maybe - to capture it maybe it's almost pedantic but it's - this is about the internationalization of the DNS and not...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...so much as internationalization as the key strategic objective of ICANN because as I said...

Edmon Chung: No.

Bart Boswinkel: ...that's more focused on ICANN as an institution corporation.

Edmon Chung: Agreed. Agreed. And in fact I think what you mentioned is a good point. In fact we should probably focus our emphasis on competition, consumer trust and consumer choice...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...that will probably be even more beneficial for the, you know, the - more stronger for the recommendation...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...than to try to take, you know, confuse the matter. And I agree with that. Any thoughts from some others?

Jian Zhang: Hi, this is Jian.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Jian Zhang: Yeah, actually I agree with you. I think, you know, Bart has addressed confusion really well. Just some information I did make comments in last week's (unintelligible) during the gTLD session. I made a comment about universal acceptance because Fadi was there and a lot of the Board ICANN members are there.

So I mentioned our work - JIG's work on universal acceptance. Also ask, you know, to ICANN to consider to allocate, you know, the budget on this project

and also allocate the resource and also consider what kind of role ICANN could play because this definitely universal - IDN universal acceptance is - should be community-wide effort.

I think the message has been passed, you know, loud and clear. Just a quick update.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And I apologize if you hear crying noise; that would be my little daughter that just was born about a week or so ago. And apologies for - if it's becoming a nuisance.

But anyway...

Jian Zhang: Never got chance to congratulate you, Edmon.

Man: Congratulations, Edmon.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Thank you. So, yeah, thanks, Jian, for doing that. I think the - I think I missed that particular session. I was in Baku for one and a half day for a couple things. But because of the reason that I just mentioned I was there for a very short time.

So that's, I think, the main - that's it for Recommendation B as well. If there is no further than I'll start to move to C. Okay hearing no further discussion on Recommendation B, again, that's - we'll continue to circulate this and see if there's any further discussion in - on the mailing list.

For Recommendation C and Recommendation D we actually haven't really started working on sort of the details of the recommendation. But for Recommendation C the main concept is to ask for ICANN to help coordinate

the development of a - sort of a checklist or guide for new IDN TLDs including new gTLDs and new IDN ccTLDs to this particular issue.

So far ICANN has created a lot of materials and even toolkits for application providers on sort of how to do universal acceptance. What has been missing is for new gTLDs or new IDN ccTLDs coming in to make them aware of the potential issues like the browser not supporting it for a period of time, some of the databases out there that is not supporting IDN TLDs and, you know, how - and some of the sort of things that registry operators should look out for and do.

So that, I think, is certainly through the discussion - previous discussions of this group - has been one of the items that was raised I think a few times and seems to be something that is of high value for the community itself. And in fact perhaps I should add registrars to this - to the audience for this particular piece of work as well.

So again I haven't written anything there yet because I was hoping to get a bit more input on what should be there. But the idea is to ask ICANN staff team to work on and perhaps with the support from the previous new IDN - previous new gTLDs and new IDN ccTLDs on completing a set of sort of checklist or guidelines for the newcomers. So any thoughts on what we should cover here?

I guess just to add to that is that the idea is not for this group to try to create the checklist but make a recommendation for the staff team, which has been formed, to look into this matter and also indicate the, you know, that perhaps involving the earlier new gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs in the process to create this checklist would be useful.

Any thoughts, discussions, ideas?

Woman: Hello? (Unintelligible) speaking. Hello? Can you hear me?

Edmon Chung: Yes, go ahead.

Woman: I will strongly support the Recommendation C because when we introduced our IDN we had a lot of (unintelligible) things we had to cope concerning (unintelligible) registrars and registrants. And it will be most helpful thing for any new gTLD or ccTLD to have such kind of guide or track or whatever to know what the future will bring to them.

Edmon Chung: Right. I was wondering, actually, as you brought this up perhaps in our write up for this, even though we're not going to create the full checklist...

Woman: No, no, I understand.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I understand.

Edmon Chung: But perhaps providing some examples might be useful for staff to get started as well. So I wonder if perhaps you can share...

Woman: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...some of the items and I can include it in the document.

Woman: We made a kind of investigation when we started to introduce our IDN ccTLD. But it is a little bit out of date, let's say. It is, oh, maybe two years or something like this. But I can provide it. Although this document is on our Website. I can send you the link and you will see if it is useful for something or not.

Edmon Chung: That would be useful. Please do...

Woman: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...send it to the list. There's a..

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah, yeah, I will send the link to the list. Or if there is no link on our Website I have the document in (unintelligible) somewhere I will find it. Let me write it down, okay? I'll send it to the list. But you should keep in mind that it is pretty old, maybe three years or something like this, all the things are not up to date let's say.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Woman: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...never change though so...

Woman: Yes, you are right. Yes.

Edmon Chung: So, yeah, that will be very useful.

Woman: Yeah, thank you.

Edmon Chung: You can contribute to the mailing list.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Say just a suggestion is, say, based on what you - what we just heard is include something in, say, with a reference to the experience of some of the IDN ccTLDs and include links or whatsoever that say in consultation prepare something in that sense is that, say, frame it as a learning experience and based on the experience, say, from those who've already been introduced that such a checklist should be developed which includes topics that, say, high level topics as in the link or in the document and details to be worked out.

Edmon Chung: Right, that would be actually you made a very good point. I think perhaps not just - what was just said - I think there are multiple IDN ccTLDs that were launched. And they probably have some study or post...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: They all have the experience, yeah.

Edmon Chung: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: ...and you yourself you have some of these experience from the past as well.

Edmon Chung: Correct. So we should...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...do some collection. And we should try to summarize a little bit in terms of the framework. That's the part, I think, is very useful. Maybe the high level topics that these are, you know, five or four of the things but without the meat but have a bit of a skeleton so that...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...that also supports the staff work.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah and in the sense of noting this is the experience and then based on that experience advise ICANN or the community to develop a checklist for future use and maintain that checklist.

Edmon Chung: Yeah. Any other thoughts? In that case, actually, I guess what we can try to broaden a little bit is at least to perhaps go back to the working group members - I know quite a number of the working group members did go through this particular process. So at least we should be able to collect the experience at least from the working group as a starter.

I don't think we need to make an exhaustive study. And that could be sort of left to the staff team to work out what the full scope needs to be. But at least we could go around this working group and try to obtain some experience from like China, (unintelligible) from Korea, from - and perhaps from some of the new gTLDs that were launched before as well, of course from DotAsia and others that are from the GNSO on this working group.

So I will - I guess I will take on this particular task. And if we can - I'll try to ask for people to send in any reports or documents that they have created in the past for this issue into the mailing list and go from there.

Okay so I guess C is a work in progress. And we have a pretty good path at least to collect some data before we move into fleshing out the details of the recommendation. We have about 10 minutes left. I guess I'll touch on Recommendation D as well.

Recommendation D is slightly more general but there is one particular item that was raised in our previous discussion that I think is worth highlighting. And I was planning to spend more of the write-up on that particular issue.

So D really is about the general concept and following up from B that this issue should be further studied by the staff team and - with the participation from the community and especially on what types of things ICANN can do to proactively go out to reach out to the world at large.

And one particular item that was brought up I think worth noting from this particular group is there have been attempts to create lists of TLDs whether it was the public suffix list or software hardcoded lists.

The fact that these lists exist one of the, I think, very enlightening point that was made was that these lists may be providing certain services that IANA and ICANN has not been providing which perhaps IANA or ICANN can provide in the future.

And this includes some of the features of, for example, the public suffix list which provides a little bit more information on the TLDs rather than just the TLD itself. And these are information that, perhaps, that might be collected through ICANN and provided to IANA.

It might be in a form of a flat file, it might be in the form - whatever, a kind of service that would avoid the - not avoid but at least encourage the technical community to take the authoritative list from ICANN rather than to depend on some third party list which runs the - runs the issue of being out of sync of the root.

So that's - that, I think, is a worthwhile aspect to highlight and provide as input to the staff team as they continue to create - to look into the issue. So generally, as in the - to do a bit further studies we talked about potentially doing surveys. I know there are reservations about surveys as well. But we could probably touch on it in the discussion because that was brought up in the feedback we've gotten.

But also to focus our discussion on highlighting the fact that perhaps ICANN should look into whether there are certain features or services that could be provided from IANA or ICANN a little bit beyond just - just the root list in the DNS and whether that might be - that might attract more usage directly from the authoritative source rather than to depend on third party lists so - and that helps in the cause for universal acceptance as well.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Say to what extent - just to clarify it's more a matter of - if I understand you correctly - if I understand you correctly this is part of what I would call the strategic project or strategic program of universal acceptance for ICANN.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: Why not include it under the heading of B as a separate item?

Edmon Chung: I actually - I've thought about that but I thought it was provide a little bit better clarity for B if it focused just, you know, that's the high level thing. And then because D I wanted to spend a little bit more sort of wording around what I just said in terms of the potentially there are services that perhaps ICANN should look into.

That would avoid people using those third party lists and, you know, avoid the synchronization issue. That would venture a little bit further from B and that's why I thought it would be better to highlight it as a separate recommendation.

Bart Boswinkel: So if you turn B, say, what they - in that sense the way I understand B is to elevate it into a strategic item - universal acceptance.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: So currently it's part of the Ops plan but it's not very - it's not highlighted a strategic priority.

Edmon Chung: Right and in fact - and when I read both the strategic plan and the budget no mentioning of it at all in...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: ...either of the plans.

Bart Boswinkel: And say as such knowing how it works if you elevate it into a, say, universal acceptance of TLDs and in particular IDN TLDs then say normally what would happen is because it becomes a strategic priority or a strategic goal if it's accepted as such then different things flow from it. This is one then you got the current initiatives, say, by staff included there as well.

So it's a bit of a umbrella or container for all different kinds of initiatives. And, say, like A is different because that's specifically aimed at the - as a recommendation for the IDN ccTLDs and TLDs in general to accept it so that's a different audience.

Now take C as well although you could argue C is already part of B as well. So B - so C and D are specifically part of, say, the strategic umbrella or under the strategic umbrella.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Well C probably is a little bit more urgent. And actually as you were talking through it I kind of - starting to agree more that we should lump C into D and just make the description of B a little bit longer to include it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: We just need to make sure that it doesn't confuse the matter.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: And - but C I think could still be independent because that needs to be done faster before B is in place.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Even without B I think C should be there.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, no but, say, I'm very clear, say, C is a bit, say, A is very much aimed - it depends a bit who's the audience.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: At the end of the day this is (unintelligible) for. You could argue - with C you could argue both ways. But...

Edmon Chung: Sure.

Bart Boswinkel: ...and maybe it's - maybe that's something else with that, say, for the next (unintelligible) you could assign already priorities to it.

Edmon Chung: Sure. I guess what I did agree was that without B D would never get done anyway because it's, you know, it would just continue to do what it does. And what I wanted - what we wanted to suggest from D requires kind of B as in the elevated priority of this particular work item. So I think it probably makes sense to lump that in.

But I guess C and A are things that even if they're - if this issue is not prioritized perhaps they could be delivered kind of thing.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, and even independent of ICANN if necessary.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Okay that is certainly very useful. So I guess this is - this is somewhat of a - sort of a change in the flow. But we have sort of run out of time as well. I wonder if anyone has any immediate thoughts on what was just said and on the - and on Recommendation D before we close?

Hearing no particular suggestion I guess I will at least move forward as was just discussed and as Bart suggested to move really D into B and provide a little bit more description of what I mentioned earlier on and produce that as a next - as the next draft and send that along into the mailing list to be discussed.

Okay...

Woman: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Jian, did you have any thing before we close?

Jian Zhang: No it's okay for me.

Edmon Chung: Okay in that case we'll - we will meet again in - as we move to a monthly schedule now we'll meet again in a month's time. I forgot the actual dates; I wonder, Bart, if you have it?

Bart Boswinkel: No, not - no.

Edmon Chung: No but we'll announce it but it'll be about a month from now on the call again. But before that and hopefully earlier before that I will turn around a new version of the document. We've heard from the discussion earlier that we'll start to collect some of the experience for Recommendation C.

And thank you, everyone, for your time. Talk to you again next time.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

Edmon Chung: Bye.

Jian Zhang: Bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye.

END