

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 19 February 2013 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 19 February 2013 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-20130219-en.mp3>
On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#feb>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Edmon Chung, RySG, Co-Chair
Avri Doria, NCSG (Observer)
Chris Dillon
Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Sarmad Hussein
Daniel Kalchev

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Jonathan Shea
Mirjana Tasic
Minjung Park
Jian Zhang
Youg-eum Lee

Man: This call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.
This is the JIG call on the 19 of February, 2013. On the call today we have Sarmad Hussain, Fahd Batayneh, Daniel Kalchev, Chris Dillon, Edmon Chung, and Avri Doria.

We have apologies from Mirjana Tasic, Minjung Park, Jonathan Shea, and Jian Zhang

From staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and now over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Nathalie. This is Edmon. And so - thank you everyone for joining the call today. I sent around a - I apologize, I guess, for such a late sending in - sending in documents so late. But in any case I sent in an update on the staff final report on the universal acceptance of (unintelligible) TLDs.

And the plan is to sort of walk through that document for today and then also further discussion through the month and to next meeting and hopefully we'll be able to be in a position to fill it out for public comments for the Beijing meeting.

When I got on the call I heard we were having a brief discussion on the arrangements for Beijing so I guess perhaps we can start there first and come back to - walk through the document and talk about the sections of the document.

Does that work for people? Yes?

Man: Hi Edmon, hi all. I just told Daniel and say - while waiting for the others to join is - what we've done is we've arranged an extended meeting for Monday afternoon from 4 o'clock until quarter past - quarter to 6:00. So that's in the afternoon.

And say the first bit is - that's the proposal that this will be the open session for - and that we announce it as such and that the second part, say, after a small break, that will be a working group meeting.

Edmon Chung: Okay, based on what I understand from the other parts of the agenda, that's - that interferes kind of with the couple of sessions at the - at ALAC in (unintelligible) with it's talking about IDN as well.

So I was wondering if there is any flexibility or how we could coordinate this. I don't have the actual time in front of me but there is a IDN TLD discussion planned for - like, during that time. I don't know whether anyone on this call recalls what that time might be.

Man: I can check - I can ask (unintelligible) a large staff but...

Edmon Chung: Let me see. Sorry, I'm trying to dig through - but in any case, I guess the point is if you could take a look - 5:00 to 7:00 is the suggested time on Monday for the AP (Ralo) session on IDN gTLDs.

Man: That's the AP (Ralo) session or is it the at large or say - because I think if you would look through the agenda itself you will see a lot of conflicting sessions. Or we can change it around and say that AP (Ralo) will be invited for the second part of this session as the open session?

Edmon Chung: Okay, I guess we can try to work the two but I just want to flag that there is potentially a conflict and perhaps we want to take a look at it because there is going to be a - an overlap among people - well, including myself that needs to be there.

So I guess we will probably have to take this offline but - so - but I guess we'll - I'll...

Man: Yes, put it this way, this is probably - we can change it but going into the afternoon will we - pretty difficult Monday to say, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday is probably a - at least Tuesday and Wednesday is out of the question I would guess.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Man: But - yes, that leaves Thursday or Monday. Then you have the morning, say, that will overlap with the opening, etc.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So in any case, I guess we'll just have to figure out how some of us will be...

Man: Split in two.

Edmon Chung: Well - so we'll split ourselves into two. But any case, we should probably take this offline and see how we can (unintelligible). I understand there's constraints of the timetable anyway.

Man: Yes, and the good thing is - say, at least - as a principle, do you agree that we try to do it back to back, say, the opening session as discussed in the previous call and then, say, a working group session itself?

Edmon Chung: Yes, I think that is fine with me. In fact, generally I don't mind if people sticking around for the...

Man: No, but you invite them for the first session and then if they want to stay then they can stay but that's going to be a working session and the first one is going to be the reporting session.

Edmon Chung: Right.

Man: Yes. And this will give you ample of time so that's the good thing about it.

Edmon Chung: Yes, that works well.

Man: Yes, okay, we keep that structure in mind and then we see if we can...

Edmon Chung: Now (unintelligible) whether anyone else has any thoughts on that? Hearing none I guess that would be the approach. The exact time, we'll talk a little bit about that. I'll see if I can - is there a possibility of half an hour shifts.

Okay, so that's - in terms of planning wise, I guess that's the idea. We would try to put a document out for public comment before Beijing, use that framework to invite people to come to an open - a public session during the Beijing meeting and hopefully given that it is in Beijing we'll have more people interested in IDN to go through the - some of the recommendations and also the subject matter itself as well, which should be of interest there for Beijing.

And hopefully with that - and the closed comments, we'll be able to have good input to complete this work and produce the recommendations.

So that's the plan and I guess we can now move to the substance of the discussion, which is the - walking through the final report. So before I walk through it I guess I wonder if anyone has any particular burning question about it or about the discussions that's happened as an overall - what the report itself and also the stuff in the report?

I note that I incorporated a bunch of thoughts that (Chris) helped - thanks, (Chris), for sending that to the list.

We didn't spend much time talking - discussing about it but I just try to incorporate or at least encapsulate the essence of which - I guess a quick question on whether it is - it reflects some of - you know, it reflects - is consistent with what you have in mind? And then we'll go back there later as we walk through in more details.

But I just want to get a sense whether it does generally encapsulate what you have in mind.

Man: Yes, thank you, Edmon. It does indeed. And the fact that it's actually under Section D rather than the originally suggested Section B I think it makes very little difference so that should be fine.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so anyone else? Any particular overarching thoughts before I go into section by section? Okay, hearing none I'll push forward.

So in terms of organization, the first part is maybe just a recap of what's happening and links to the initial report, the public comment, and the report that (unintelligible) helped produce a very brief description of the (unintelligible).

And then the first part of substance would be the summary of recommendation. I haven't edited much from the earlier version, which already takes - took into account the comments that were made in Toronto. The only edits that I made was we talked briefly about - we didn't want to particularly - sort of put a negative light on the staff work, that's not the case.

So I took out the word passive - I guess the point is to be even more proactive and go beyond what is done but not to say that's - say anything - not to imply anything negative of what has already been done.

So...

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. It's - looking at the summary of recommendations and the introduction, I think what is - say, it would be my suggestion that it's phrased that this is an advice or recommendation to both the ccNSO and GNSO council. Say, did JCOM not make these recommendations directly?

Edmon Chung: Good point. So I should have probably right before the four points, right under summary of recommendations, should have a paragraph or a sentence...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, explain this is advice or whatever you would say, recommendations for the - both - explain the mechanism how this will work, that - say, my experience is - say, people (unintelligible) and trust it and it clarifies the role of both councils for the external audience as well, can even put it in the introduction.

Edmon Chung: Right, yes, that's probably a good idea. In fact, that's - it's probably a better idea to put it in - probably a couple of sentences in the introduction, yes, that's - that makes more sense to me now.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: To put it in the - yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And then it's a - in fact, the summary or recommendation can be as it is because they adopted or not adopted by both Councils. And if they are adopted then it would be...

Edmon Chung: Yes, once they adopt it then they are the recommendations from the Council as well. I mean...

Bart Boswinkel: No, then they go from the Council. Then they are ccNSO, GNSO Council. So the JIG advises both Councils. So if they adopt it they are considered GNSO and ccNSO Council recommendations.

Edmon Chung: Right. Good point. So we'll add that description in the introduction.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So in terms of some of your recommendations, we've been through this for items for quite some time now, fairly straight forward.

The - to have registries and registrar support (unintelligible) IDN, universal acceptance of IDN TLDs in their own systems; B, to allocate specific budgets; C, to develop checklists and guidelines for registries and registrars; and D, some more specific prioritization and substance of work based on allocated budget for this.

So this is - those are the four items. Any thoughts, suggestions, objections? Okay, hearing none I'll keep going forward.

And also, you know, as usual I guess I'll - whatever we talk about today we'll kind of summarize any aspects of substance and either edit the document or send to the mailing list and have confirmation from the list before we publish anything else. So this is - so there's still opportunity to raise issues.

I do understand that this document was just sent about ten hours ago so - okay. So the second session is the - section is the background and related works. It's pretty much a wholesale, copied and pasted from the initial report.

So it's the same - exactly the same wording except I added a paragraph at the end to include a reference to the user experience report from the VIP, the Variant Issues Team. Because we refer to that in the - later on in the recommendations as well and I think there's quite a bit that's relevant to what we talk about as well.

And in the public comments we've received there has been - I believe there was one or two that did talk about that, variances was also an acceptance issue. So I thought it would be relevant.

So besides the last paragraph, everything was copied and pasted from the previous document, the initial report.

Avri Doria: Which section are in, please? I'm just reading this thing for the first time this morning. So I really have no idea where we're at or what's going on but thank you. That was Avri.

Edmon Chung: No worries. Sorry I didn't quite - Avri, were you asking a question? You said you only received it this morning, and yes, I only sent it.

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm asking where we're at? I'm in the process of just trying to read this thing while we're approving it. So please, I just lost track of where you are.

Edmon Chung: Okay, not a problem. We're not - first of all, we're not looking at, you know, approving it in this meeting. And in terms of where we are, then we're in Section 2, which is the background. And I was just explaining that that is - the bulk of that was copied and pasted from the initial report.

It shows as a red line for this report because it is - because the early version, I only had a placeholder saying that I would cut and paste this portion from the initial report.

So it's showing as a red line. But 95% of it is copied from the initial report. And then I added one paragraph at the end of this section to give reference to the user experience report from the VIP team that just came out about a month ago.

Does that answer your question?

Avri Doria: Okay, yes. So you're just saying we have to acknowledge that report, not that we're in any way committing to...

Edmon Chung: No, yes, I - you look at that particular paragraph, I just said, you know, it identified certain issues. I - yes, I specifically stayed away from endorsing or not endorsing that particular report.

So any questions on Section 2 in terms of background (unintelligible) works? It pretty much gives a very (unintelligible) review and a number of links back to older documents on this subject. I hope it's a good read for anyone who wants to take up some history on this topic.

Okay. Hearing no further comments or thoughts I'll keep moving on. Again, this is still up for discussion within this group for the next month or so. I don't expect to put this out until after our next meeting in March and probably about a - sometime before Beijing be posted out and we - we'll have the public comments that go beyond Beijing.

Okay. So the third section is the - it goes a little more into the recommendations in terms of what action we suggest to be taken. In pre - in the previous document that we produced, which is (unintelligible) single character IDN TLD, we - this section was split between the ccNSO and GNSO.

The nature of this particular subject, I thought it would be fine just to have one section because it's something that's more general and recommendations are more general as well.

So it's intended to be - specific actions to be taken but we're not trying to specify what ICANN and the ICANN staff team should do. I - we outline some further particulars for the recommendation and that's pretty much it.

So it's split into Recommendation A which we're suggesting that the IDN guidelines be updated to reflect this idea, that's just based on the discussion we had in Toronto, that's probably the place where it best fits. In terms of Recommendation B, this whole report should go into a - as sort of input for the next round of (unintelligible) strategic plan, discussion, consideration from ICANN.

And then for Recommendation C and D there are certain - the recommendations for - to be taken into input for the universal acceptance program, which ICANN is already - essentially has revived since the new gTLD program.

So Section 3 is basically just talks about these three aspects; Recommendation A to put in IDN guidelines, Recommendation B as input into the budget process, Recommendation C and D as input into the ICANN staff universal acceptance team.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: From a structural point of view I find it bit awkward to read it this way because the way I read it right now is as if these are the recommendations again.

But say either you link it with the Section 1 as a suggested paths of implementation, etc., per recommendation or in a discussion of the proposed recommendations because this is where the full recommendations sit and then you link it there as, say, a kind of implementation, suggestion, or whatsoever.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe (unintelligible) I don't know.

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible) from the earlier report which worked better this way but, yes, you're right. I think it's somehow - because of the background it suddenly seems out of context.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Here. So I guess what we can do is to combine three and four and just place these paragraphs into - insert it right after the discussion in Section 4 - to the relevant portions.

Bart Boswinkel: And maybe - depends a bit - say, you've got the introduction. Then you've got the summary recommendations. Then you've got a - say, discussion of proposed recommendations, say the summaries - the summary. And then combine that with the implementation.

Then as the final paragraph put something in, like, background and - how is it called, related work. I think - if you look from a structural point of view in reading it, in a way parts of the background and related works is very nice as an introduction into the topic itself. So that could go into the introduction. And so it's not your procedural introduction but it's also a substantive introduction.

And then background and related work, yes, it's very good to understand the context and what is happening in, say - in the context areas but, say, focus from introduction and process into the proper recommendations and their implementations. I think this section paragraph distracts from reading it.

Edmon Chung: You mean Section 2?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it should be - don't misunderstand me, it should be included but maybe put it as the final paragraph.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so Section 3 and Sections 4 would...

Bart Boswinkel: Become Section 2.

Edmon Chung: Invert it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and background and related works is the new Section 3 because then it's almost like - the summary of recommendations is almost like an executive summary.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So you mean for the current Section 3 to become Section 2.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: And then the current Section 2 to become Section 3.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, unless - it seems to me but I find that - say, it distracts from the flow of the document, Section 2. And the reason is you've got, say, now this Section 3 ICANN policy coordination considerations, that - it's linked with the recommendations itself so it's more in the discussion area as suggestions for implementation.

And then if you - and the - because it's such a long piece, the background and related work. And it is important to understand the context of universal acceptance but it - people are - say, the people on the Council's probably will be distracted from what's going on for what they are expected to do.

Edmon Chung: Right. I agree and that's why there's a summary of recommendations. Then I think it - yes, as you mentioned, probably makes sense to put the - sort of the actions that we are seeking higher up as well because - that is certainly the case that most people would read, the first page or - and then jump - maybe jump to the end kind of thing.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So I think that makes sense. I wonder if anyone else has any thoughts or comments on that? Besides the flow, which if you move this section up to two, any thoughts or comments on the substance of which - of the three

actions to be taken? Okay. Hearing none I'll - (unintelligible) so far it makes sense.

Moving on to Section 4 then - again, I just want to note that we're not approving the document immediately right now. We're walking through and I - you know, once you have the chance to read through it more thoroughly please feel free to bring issues to the mailing list. And we also have planned for one more meeting next month to go through this before we finalize it for public comments.

Okay, so Section 4 is four subsections to discuss a little bit more about what we mean and about the recommendations and why we've made those recommendations.

So the first one is - the first recommendation, Recommendation A, is for IDN TLD operators, including registries and registrars, to support the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs in their own systems.

We - I have as mentioned, we - the key point here is that there are registries and registrars that themselves don't support IDN TLDs in their systems. They do support the IDN TLDs that they are running for some of the ccTLDs. But like...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Sorry, I think that was unintended unless somebody caught what was being said.

Nathalie Peregrine: Hi, Edmon. This is Nathalie, the Operator's looking into it.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess nobody caught what was said in - relevant to the context of what we were talking about, anyway.

As I was saying, so Recommendation A, the point is that some registries and registrars don't support IDN TLDs, especially other IDN TLDs in their own systems and registrars even though - for example, they accept certain IDN registrations they don't accept them in the mainframe records, (unintelligible) hosts, or contact information, those - and I think that's - the main point is that we should have a way to recommend TLD operators to at least do that.

Because it's sort of like, you know, us eating our own medicine as we go out to outreach and ask others to do so. So that's the discussion on A. Any thoughts or comments, suggestions? Okay. Hearing none I'll keep going forward.

So B is the allocation of budgets for this particular subject because so far we've seen from the ICANN staff team some information on materials and toolkits but I guess some - the recommendation is to put a little bit more focus and have a line item in - a sort of focus in this (unintelligible) plan and budget.

The suggestion based on our discussion - I guess from Toronto and subsequent discussions, to focus on the subject of consumer trust, especially under the current competition, consumer trust and consumer choice banner. There are different items under that and to add a point of universal acceptance under that and provide it with a little bit more focus on the effort.

And there is a suggestion that we focus on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs rather than just TLDs because that more clearly aligns interest between the IDN and ccTLD and gTLDs. But that is not necessarily so because (unintelligible) are being created as well although there are less acceptance issues.

But I guess the point is that because the IDN adoption is also a - one of the aspects that ICANN, you know - it's part of the - what ICANN is looking to be. So I guess the suggestion - at least from this group, is to focus on IDN, you know, these - we need to kind of leave the door open for it to be looked at.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chung: Yes, and I meant generic as not generic gTLDs but general.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I don't know whether you are aware but, say, the strategic planning process will change as of this year and I wouldn't be surprised that they say consumer trust is one of the four pillars - will not return because that was very much a part of the strategic planning process of - that we - that ICANN used to have.

And if you look at it - say, if you look at the announcement there is also a change in scope and methodology of the future strategic planning or future strategic plan itself.

So maybe not so much as identifying it but, say, the - say, so that's related to the first sentence of Section B.

Edmon Chung: Okay, I am aware but I haven't actually read much of it.

Bart Boswinkel: No, there isn't much into it but what will change is there will be a five-year strategic plan, it will go into the mission, vision, etc. And it will not - probably - but that's my guess, it will not revisit the four different pillars because that was very much a thing of the previous CEO, that was...

Edmon Chung: I think - so that's useful to know. And in that case I wonder if, Bart, you could help make suggestion...

Bart Boswinkel: I will help revise this section a bit because it's also a (unintelligible) adjusting the language a bit that you say - you make it a universal acceptance is a strategic objective or priority and then that means it will trickle down into the budget one way or the other.

Edmon Chung: That's the idea of the discussion.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, yes.

Edmon Chung: And I was utilizing what was there before for the last few years.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, but that will clear and that's very clear as to the announcement itself.

The second thing is - but this is again, say, from past experience, I think what we got to - whether to focus on IDN ccTLD or IDN TLDs or IDN - or TLDs in general, my advice would be to focus on IDN TLDs and include a note that you're aware that it's a broader issue, not just new - not just gTLDs or new gTLDs but also for some ccTLDs.

But that's outside the scope of the working group. It protects you from - yes, from outsiders who want to use it to question the mandate of the working group.

Edmon Chung: Right. That's a good point. So we should probably add...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, there's changing the argument around a little bit that you just used. You say, you were aware - and put this in a note but we're focusing on IDN TLDs because - yes, that's the scope of the working group.

Edmon Chung: Right, that's good. So I wonder if I could perhaps have your help to edit...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, there's some standard - yes. Yes, there's standard phraseology for it by now.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Bart Boswinkel: That was my comment, sorry.

Edmon Chung: So for the discussion for B, any further thoughts?

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. Can I ask something?

Edmon Chung: Please, go ahead.

Avri Doria: On this - yes, I guess ICANN can go back and forth about what's its strategic goal and what's its not. I'm assuming though that the consumer trust would still be identified as an important goal at ICANN even if we demote it. I'm not sure quite how.

Bart Boswinkel: I would say my advice would be that - say, the JIG and with it the Councils is name it as a strategic objective whether it's included in the strategic plan as such doesn't matter. But that - the Councils should make - say, should ensure that it remains something over - strategic objective, whatever - yes, however you want to call it. So do not refer back to the strategic plan but basically that as a statement.

Avri Doria: Yes, okay. I don't even know we have to use the word strategic because that might end up problematic to people.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, make it very clear, say, this is important and this is - yes. And say, my comment was try to avoid any confusion about this because this is a change in - the strategic planning process itself will change and probably the substance of it as well and the way it...

Avri Doria: Yes, ICANN strategy is kind of like sands in an hourglass.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: So it (unintelligible) or it just shifts? Depends on how you see it, right. So yes, I guess I understood Bart's point and Avri, you - it's a good point you mention and it's good to clarify that's the case.

You know, at least in our discussion, I mean, that remains an important thing but we just don't want to tie ourselves to a history that might be - not the history would be revised, it's just that we don't want to tie to something of the past so that it continues to be relevant even with new descriptions or whatever that comes ahead of us. That's the idea, right, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: That's absolutely.

Edmon Chung: So anything else on B? If not moving on to C, that's the recommendation - a specific recommendation for a set of (unintelligible) and guidelines to be produced.

The idea is fairly simple but it's - it probably will require some work from the staff team to collect and consolidate the experience from earlier launches of gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs and to consolidate it into the four registries and perhaps registrars and, you know, basically, you know, these are the things that you need to be aware, some of the (unintelligible) or some of the major obstacles you might see.

These are some of the lists you might want to get yourself to be on. And, you know, these are perhaps some of the best practices that, you know, some registrants comes and - and questions, why are TLDs not working, how best to respond, you know, those kind of things.

So that's a specific sort of recommendation for a piece of work to be produced. Because right now what has been produced are materials for a more general audience that there are certain issues but nothing has been produced specifically for registry and registrars and getting themselves into this.

So that's C. I wonder if anyone has any thoughts, comments, suggestions? Is what is written enough or should we provide even more? I was going to give a reference, I forgot to do that, I apologize.

I am supposed to include the names (unintelligible). I think she provided some examples of things like that and I'll reference back to that, thank you for providing some pointers.

So if I could include that as pointer, I did see - I believe Korea also has produced something over there in Korean. I don't know how useful that might be but at least we can also incorporate that as a link. These are some of the things that registries have produced in the past and, you know, might be a starting point for staff team to take a look as they go into that process.

So hearing no further questions or comments...

(Chris Dillon): Edmon, it's (Chris Dillon) here. Can I - I think this is actually such an important part of this because, you know, you're stressing drawing on and consolidating experience and, you know, different organizations scattered around, you know, have probably produced - that is really useful.

And I almost wonder whether there may be a case for having a corner perhaps in one of the ICANN wikis where we can just make lists of useful things, of things that have been done all over the place. And maybe they are in Korean or some other language but just - we need somewhere a list of useful things that could be recycled.

Edmon Chung: Thanks, (Chris). That is certainly the part of the suggestion and I guess if I got your comment accurately you're suggesting not only for ICANN to consolidate a sort of a guideline based on the consolidated experience but also a sort of - a repository kind of list for everything else that people have done.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, so there are two reasons for doing it. One is that it would help - if ICANN is writing things and then ICANN knows - you know, will need to know what's already being done because knowing that stuff will really make things much quicker.

But it's one of those lists that you might as well make it public because, you know, it will also help anybody else who's interested in this stuff. So by creating a list of what is being done you're helping both ICANN and any other organization that wants to write stuff. It's just creating this central pool of resources, that's really the idea.

Edmon Chung: That's - I think that's a good idea and as you mentioned it's - part of what we're asking ICANN to do is to collect that list and then they could consolidate and sort of integrate into a useful guideline.

But that's - those - that particular list would be the - would be raw materials for eventually what needs to be produced. And that list itself would be a valuable list to have.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, and it would also be a list that you would want to continue to work on over a long period of time. So if people - ideally people would get into - I won't just write something, I'll have a look what's being done and then I'll write something.

And so the idea of just being somewhere where people could look and - you know, perhaps not even take all of the detail but this particular document covered these particular areas although we are going to do it slightly differently. It's just that sort of approach.

Edmon Chung: Good idea. I wonder if I could get you to volunteer to help edit that.

(Chris Dillon): I would - yes, I'm quite a - yes, I enjoy squirreling things like that away. I would certainly be happy to be a coordinator of such a list and, you know, also to do my best to publicize that.

Edmon Chung: I'm not - I didn't mean that to start to creating lists. I mean to encapsulate your idea into what has been written under the - in this document.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, but well - well, actually both things are quite fine. I mean I'm happy to explain that idea more clearly.

Edmon Chung: And we could give a few examples of that as you look around. You know, there's the one from (Mary Anne) is a good starting point, that's one of them. I can find you the one from Korea.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, yes.

Edmon Chung: And we can then put that as examples into (unintelligible), if you could help suggest the edits to...

(Chris Dillon): Yes, I'm happy to be involved in things like that, both the short term and the longer term.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Could I please make a comment on this?

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I think the idea of having something set up with examples is really good. And in fact, if you're doing it for various groups you may even want to develop a way of doing it in multiple scripts and languages.

I think we have to be really careful though to make sure that it is billed as just - as sets of examples of what others have done and not try to call it guidelines or even the best case sand such. Because if we do that then all of

a sudden we're saying that it needs to somehow be blessed by someone as indeed a best case or what have you.

So I think the idea of a place for examples and, you know, experiential anecdotes and indications is great. But we have to make sure that it remains that and doesn't get any liabilities as it were for having suggested things that may not be understood well enough or may not work well enough in other situations, thanks.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, so needs to be some sort of...

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Avri. I want to make sure - that's well taken. But I want to make sure you're not - because the suggestion is also for ICANN to actually do produce a checklist for new TLD - IDN TLD operators. We probably could stay away from the word best practice and not say best in whatever.

But I think what would be of value is to actually view something that consolidates a - you know, a checklist for the new gTLDs that comes from ICANN staff based on the consolidated stuff.

I'm not sure whether you're disputing that recommendation as well or are you just saying that this particular list, we just need some disclaimer to make sure...

Avri Doria: When we get into things that are checklists that look like ICANN implementation requirements then we also have to make sure that we've taken care of the policy, analytical part, of each and every one of those, make sure they're scrubbed of anything that would have either a policy implication for people's operations or a policy presumption that either the ccNSO or the GNSO has made a policy recommendation that brings out this particular implementation issue.

So I think if we're asking staff to do a checklist that comes out of an implementation requirement type of thing we're going into worrisome territory, thanks.

Edmon Chung: Okay, before you take that further, that's not the case. We're not saying this is a checklist that staff uses to evaluate the registry. We're saying that to produce a set of checklists for registry use to do their stuff, like when - let's say, I don't know - dot-catholic in Chinese is delegated they would get a - you know, then we can send them this list and say, now you've got this new IDN TLD. These are some of the things that you should know.

They might not work here, they might not work here, and you might want to talk to these guys because they maintain a suffix list. It's not used for ICANN to evaluate the registry but it's used by the registry to do their stuff.

Avri Doria: Then it becomes something even more problematic because then it's ICANN - unless it's stated, here, go look there at some useful stuff - unless it's stated as that then you're actually giving staff a sort of implementation requirements on the internals of how someone's going to do their registry, which is even more problematic I would think.

So I think the idea of having all kinds of information available - I think staff getting any new registry a point or two, here's a place where we keep all kinds of interesting problems and solutions that others have found useful to them, your mileage may vary, please feel free to pursue it, look through it, talk to people, I think that's great.

As soon as there's any impression of staff saying, you ought to do this in your registry or even the appearance of you ought to do this in your registry, then it has even more policy implications and problems because then it becomes an internal sort of subsidiary issue and thus is even more policy laden.

So as I say, yes, it's good to give history, references, recommendations of things to read, recommendations of people to talk to, but certainly not anything that even comes close to a checklist with any sort of normative character. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Okay, thanks for that input. I get the point about it being normative. I guess what we need to qualify this - what I was calling checklist, I guess the point is to highlight a few items that registries should take note of.

It's not intended to be - it's not intended to be instructional but I think, you know, there are many registries that - at least the newcomers are getting to that I've talked to in the past six months to a year, they have no idea that this thing might not work so many places.

And I think that's the important part, that's - what is important is that we could have some resource that helps summarize that perhaps the better way to describe this is to - if we have a repository - everything that has been done before but also a little bit of a summary of what those - the broad strokes are. And that's what I'm referring to.

Would that - does that ease your worry? Because in my mind it's - it should have nothing to do with or reflect on how good or bad a registry is doing or they ought to do this or that or not.

But more so as a sort of, you know, summarize stuff that they've - you're getting - you're running this new gTLD and these are some of the things you might need to know on this particular subject.

Avri Doria: As long as it's purely reference and capacity building and has absolutely no normative character to it I don't see a problem with it advising a caution because it's so easy when you start things, checklists for example.

A checklist has a normative assumption to it. You've got to check off everything or you've got to check off a number or you've got to do this. And so a checklist - and that's - that was actually the word that sort of raised my normative flag.

And sure, I think capacity building, education, boy, have you bought yourself a load of trouble, here's the kinds of things you can do, you know, please consider - or what have you, let's educate you, let us, you know - what have you, wonderful. But as soon as it has anything that smacks of normative then we have to get into a policy to decide what can be normative.

Edmon Chung: Good point. And I guess in that case we should really get away from using the word checklist or guides and probably just use words like summary or - and have a note specifically to say that it's - you know, we're not suggesting anything normative.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

Edmon Chung: And I think that should address your issue. The substance of which - and having some place with some summarized information on this subject for new gTLDs - IDN TLDs, I think are - is very useful and I hope it remains in the recommendation is really what I'm saying.

Okay, so we're just over the top of the hour. We're running out of time for this week. We'll reconvene in about a month's time when hopefully people have a little bit more time to read through it. And we'll go back and start on D I guess, come back to C a little bit as well and some of the other ones if we have other comments.

But before I close I just want to make sure - (Chris), you have volunteered for something that's bigger than probably what you originally thought about because of all of the changes that Avri just mentioned. I just want to make sure that you got what Avri raised and sort of where I - what we suggested.

(Chris Dillon): Yes, that wasn't - I mean I was viewing anything policy related as being something that would be done elsewhere. I mean what I was really thinking about was some kind of resource library but exactly what the scope of that is I think we'll need to discuss on the list.

But I'll email the list with a few suggestions now. I'm just wondering when that's going to be. It may be early next week.

Edmon Chung: It sounds good. In that case, anyone else have any burning issues before we close? Hearing none, thank you everyone for your time. It's been a very constructive meeting.

The exact - do we have an exact date of the next?

Bart Boswinkel: We should but we'll send it to the list.

Edmon Chung: Okay, that would be good. Probably around the same time of the month. And then hopefully right after we'll be able to put out the document for public comment in time for Beijing. Thank you everyone.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, bye-bye.

Avri Doria: Goodbye.

Edmon Chung: Goodbye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Operator. You may now stop the recording. Bye-bye.

END