

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 11 June 2013 at 1100 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 11 June 2013 at 1100 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-20130611-en.mp3>
On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#jun>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Edmon Chung, Co-Chair
Avri Doria
Chris Dillon
Daniel Kalchev
Jonathan Shea

Apologies :

Sarmad Hussein
Minjung Park
Jian Zhang
Bart Boswinkel

ICANN Staff:

Nathalie Peregrine

Tim: Please go ahead. This afternoon's conference call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Tim Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.
This is JIG call on the 11th of June, 2013. On the call today we have Edmon Chung, Daniel Kalchev, Chris Dillon and Avri Doria. We have apologies from Jian Zhang, Sarmad Hussein, Minjung Park and Bart Boswinkel.

And from staff we have myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Nathalie and thank you everyone for joining the call. And I sent around a document earlier on and as we talked about it last call, this is a letter in response to the board resolution on IDN variance (LE) and basically towards councils for their consideration to (response aboard).

But apologize for sending it so late but we have - I'm not expecting you to make any particular further decisions on it today but we'll kind of talk about some of the points here.

So anyway, sent out a brief agenda earlier, an update on our draft final for universal acceptance, some preparations for their meeting and really during the call may need to talk about the draft (letter).

Anything from anyone? If not, so Bart sent a quick update just - well, as he was sending his apologies for not being (unintelligible), he sent - the draft report is supposed to go out tomorrow to be posted tomorrow for public comments and so I guess that's the update.

And once it goes out to (group) comment, we'll be I guess reaching out to invite the people from the community to respond to it. So that's the update. And thank Nathalie for loading. Jonathan, thank you for joining the call.

So the second item is in preparation for the Durbin meeting. Nathalie, I don't - I wonder if you know whether the session is set for the time or whether we have a time and date for our meeting yet and whether there are any further things we need to prepare.

Nathalie Peregrine: No, I don't think time and dates are finalized yet. I think it should be - we'll know very shortly.

Edmon Chung: Okay, so any action required from our side? I just want to be better prepared. Last time we had a little bit of mix up in the schedule (process).

Nathalie Peregrine: Actually no. I think it would make sense refer to Bart for any scheduling questions regarding these calls rather than me.

Edmond Chung: Okay. Okay. Yes, so I guess Jian and I will go up with Bart on this but like - I think likely we'll have the Monday afternoon slot again. And the plan is to come back to the issue on IDN variance (CLDs) during that session and see whether there are any follow ups on the universal acceptance items as well.

So that's number two and so in preparation for Durbin. Any questions there before we go to the letter? Okay, hearing none, I'll keep moving forward. And please feel free to jump in at any time.

Since I just sent the document around, we did talk a little bit about the few main items that I proposed last - during our last conference call and I just put them in writing.

It's a little bit long I know and I'm hoping to cut it down a little bit over the next couple of weeks but this is a first draft coming out, just the download of my thoughts.

So I guess I'll quickly walk through it and come back to discuss the particular points unless people have anything they want to raise immediately before I begin.

Okay, so hearing none - oh, and Nathalie just - thank you for the update. You mentioned that the (Jig) meeting is scheduled for Monday afternoon, 3:00 to 4:00 pm in Durbin right now.

So at this moment we don't see the other meetings yet so we don't know whether there could be any conflicts but that's at least a timeslot that we have (moved).

Okay, so back to the letter. As mentioned last time, I think a few key items that - about the letter is (we'll be) in the summary, the first one being that the whole process of IDN variance (to lead) in terms of the implementation, I want to highlight that it is a matter of policy and the ccNSO and GNSO should have purview over it as is it being implemented and as we progress.

Different elements of the program will continue to have an effect into the future, especially as we develop the (unintelligible) generation rule sets and some of the implementations for applications with variance.

So that's the one key point that we want to suggest back to the ccNSO and GNSO council that there - they should let the board understand that, you know, things like coming out - there's - the two (SOs) should have policy oversight of them.

And I have a little bit more describing what exactly they might be later in the document. The other main point is that the - oh, and by the way, this is very much focused - again, the board residents can ask for a response to the user experience report and its implementation by ICANN, more broadly, the IDN variant TLD.

So much of this is based on the user experience report. So one thing - the other main item is that there are - it's studied various implementations and there are various levels of implementation. And then it provided some recommendations on the (good) level and on the registry level and on other aspects.

One important note that I think the council should come back to ICANN is that to make sure that ICANN in terms with the policy and implementation, do not

reach beyond the scope, especially, this is especially true for the ccTLDs who reach beyond the scope and start dictating policies on the second level of registrations as such.

And that's one of the things that we talked about last time. And the third item is relating this back to - with the user experience, of course there were a number of challenges that were identified and so relating this back to the universal acceptance and ICANN's role in outreaching and to the broader community about the event of the IDN variance TLDs.

So - and then the document goes into a little bit more details on those three issues that (I sort of) mentioned before. The first one is policy and governance and I quoted that the key - some of the key descriptions in the report that clearly indicates that there's a need for policy decisions.

It talks about conservativeness in the linguistic community versus the technical community and really the decision that ICANN and the ICANN community needs to make. It's the balance between the two of them and that is a policy decision.

And in terms of exact policies that was made, I think there - I further talk about three areas more specifically, one of which is the implementation and the processes for making those rules should have transparency, accountability, you know, those kinds of things and should have a periodic review and the ccNSO and GNSO should be involved in those process- those reviews.

The second one is that each of the - yes, those should have also recommendations for their implementation. This is further talked about later in that in the GNSO side there is already a set of policy recommendations from the IDN working group.

But for the ccNSO, the IDN ccPDP did not provide policy recommendations for IDN variant TLDs yet. So there is a slight difference there but the point is that the SOs must provide those policy recommendations before they can be implemented by - adopted by board and implemented by staff.

And then the third item is that there are certain specific processes that are - that would be implemented, like how to apply for IDN variance TLDs, how to be viewed as and those kinds of things should be in those policy recommendations.

Okay, and I'll quickly run through the others as well and then I'll come back to discussions so you get a sense of what the whole document is about. Okay, and that second point is local community and experience.

The report itself had an extensive examination of process and the IDN (manuals) and scripts. And then for whatever reason, it - it's actually with that particular examination, it's pretty clear that the conclusion is that the different languages in the scripts have different specifications and different requirements.

And but then the report goes on to make a uniform recommendation at the end which is somewhat strange. And I brought that up in Beijing and I think the authors also indicated that that particular section should be optional and probably ICANN should touch on it.

And that's really the point that I wanted to emphasize on here. There were a set of recommendations for registries to implement and the authors of that report have clarified that that should be optional and not something as a requirement for registries.

And that's point number two, the main item - point number two. And then point number three really is a - the actual (unintelligible) that the two SOs need to look at.

In terms of the ccNSO, goes back to the IDS ccPDP final report that is I think being finalized right - in the next hour during the ccNSO call. It will be adopted but in that report, it doesn't talk about IDN variance and it just has a placeholder that says later on we need to do an IDN variance.

So this letter just says that there is further policy work to be done by the ccNSO in order to implement this. But for the GNSO side, it's a little bit different. We - I quoted back from the (SMs) report and the GNSO IDN working group which was incorporated into the final report on the (discussion) on new gTLDs.

And there were four pretty clear statements on some policy aspect of IDN variant TLDs and then I - I'm not going to repeat those but I then sort of reiterated them as three key aspects, one of which - the first one is that it's one - it's considered as one application.

The particular policy states that, you know, it's one application. Basically it's one application should act as (one string) except when it has a variance. But, you know, when it has variance then it's still considered one application.

The other one is to limit the confusion, that key reason for IDN variance. And a third one is language community input to this process that is - I mean, to the implementation process that leads to the incorporated.

So those are really the policy aspects. And then the fourth note - the fourth item is really tying back with the draft final (port) on universal assessment of IDN TLDs and that's a lot of the same targets are reflected, technical group to the registrants or, you know, the technical users or the (general) users are very similar for the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs and IDN variance TLDs as being described in the user experience report.

So just a note that, you know, the - there is importance there and ICANN devote some effort and prioritize that effort. So that's the letter that has been drafted.

Sorry for taking quite some time. Hopefully you're not all lost. So any comments, thoughts? I know I just sent it out shortly before. I wonder if anyone has any thoughts or response, anything to add or think some of them are not appropriate at this point.

Jonathan Shea: Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yes, (Jonathan), please go ahead.

Jonathan Shea: What are the recommended steps for GNSO and ccNSO in relation to - I mean, I relation to this letter? Do we...

Edmon Chung: So that seems (pretty clear). Sorry, please go ahead.

Jonathan Shea: Okay, I'm not sure whether the next steps are clear in the letter as it is now for the ccNSO and GNSO. There are some recommendations in the four major titles in the letter.

But, for example, do you want them to set up a working group to go through the recommendations in the letter or do you think they would just consider the input per (order) in this letter and write their own response in - as a feedback to the request or input from these organizations?

Edmon Chung: That's a good point. I actually haven't thought through it specifically. I was thinking that this could be just adopted and passed on to the board. But that might not be appropriate. So what you might need is a - is sort of an appendix for their consideration in terms of a letter to the board. Is that what you're - would that be something useful?

Jonathan Shea: Yes, I would think one option is, as you said, we put our recommended positions or recommendations as an appendix but in the body of the letter you may say we welcome them to consider positively our recommendations and (unintelligible) we recommend.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Right. Yes, actually that's a very good point. Two things - one, this letter itself, I totally understand what you're talking about and I think we probably need some - a little bit of reorganization such that we can - we don't have to repeat everything but we can isolate things that just go directly to the board and then have a shorter, a much shorter letter, at the beginning just to, you know, state a few things for the two counsels to consider.

The other item is that in terms of specific steps, my - what I envision is the council would, you know, consider a letter adopted or not, and pass it on to the board, but in terms of actual work, the council for - they probably have different work to do.

ccNSO, for example, would likely go back to the IDN ccPDP and work on the recommendations for IDN variance. The GNSO would probably not have to do that but just rely on the previous recommendations and I guess reiterate it to the board and staff for their implementation.

The - and then there is one common element that I think is important, is that whatever is being put in place, I think the two councils should ask the staff and board to make sure that the two councils - actually two SOs are kept in the loop in a kind of (view) or a kind of a governance process as this whole IDN variant TLD program is being implemented.

It's a long term thing and it's one of the things that is implemented for both gTLDs and ccTLDs so it's somewhat new in a way and they'll probably want

a process to have a periodic review which we've never had something like that before.

And right now, the reports did not talk about that process at all. So I think in terms of the immediate action plus the letter itself and in terms of the action that needs to be taken by the councils then and board and staff, those are the two areas. Does that clarify, (Jonathan)? And...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Shea: ...very clearly our expectation on what the GNSO and the ccNSO should do in the same way or differently for the two different (unintelligible). Yes, thank you for what you have said. Yes.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And I think I'll need to shuffle the letter a bit so that it comes out more clear and have at least a clear section where the two councils can consider it to just rip it out and pass on to the board as from them and potentially add or minus something on their end. That, I think, would - we would have done our job.

Jonathan Shea: Yes, Edmond.

Edmond Chung: So (Chris), (Daniel), Avri, any thoughts?

Man: Hello Edmond. This is something which it's not related to what (Jonathan) was just speaking about but on Page 3, at the bottom, you've got the section, (worn) application, that one, just above limit confusion. But you've got (worn) application and there's this concept of primary IDN in there.

And I just did a quick check as we - as you were speaking and just noticed that that expression is not used in the 2.1 report on the label generation rules and it's a very interesting concept. But I'm just wondering, is that a concept that comes from practice, is really my question?

Edmond Chung: Thank you. That's a good - that's a very good question. Yes, that's probably where it came from and I need to look back at what is being used but it's likely the apply first string or something, is probably the official description. So - but I'll update that. It's probably the applied for IDN gTLD string or something like that.

Man: You could imagine in some situations where it might be much easier to have a concept like that as primary IDN rather than have a situation where all forms have equal status, you see.

So you could have one primary one and then all the variant forms refer back to the primary one. It's a very, very interesting concept. I'm not sure - I'm just not sure...

Edmond Chung: I'm looking at the user experience report and it does use the term primary...

Man: Story. Yes, I was looking at the P2.1. The P2.1 report doesn't use it but it's interesting it did come out of the P6 report.

Edmond Chung: Yes, it does - it is in the P6 and again, I - this particular - the board resolution specifically asks for focusing on the P6 which is the user's experience report. And that's why...

Man: Yes, and I would certainly say that that would be a very interesting concept for the P2.1 as well. And possibly for different reasons because it may be in the P6 report just for convenience of holding things together but I could really imagine the P2.1 situation. There could be huge advantages to actually designating one particular form as being primary.

Edmond Chung: Sure. Sorry, I think we're (tangential) off but I did want to respond to that quickly because the LGR is a little bit different, though, because we don't

really talk about the (apply for) string because we are only talking about the tables and the relationship between variant characters.

And, you know, I think it probably - it might call it base character or something. But it may be different. And I - that might be the reason why the terms are confused.

Man: Yes. Yes, indeed. I think it's rather an interesting area. It maybe needs a bit more thought.

Edmond Chung: Okay. Well, thank you for that comment but since it is being used in the user experience, I...

Man: Yes. Yes, it is the...

Edmond Chung: Avri, Daniel?

Daniel Kalchev: I don't have a comment for now. Not yet.

Edmond Chung: Okay. And again, we're not - this is the first time this is being - you might not have a lot of time to read through it anyway. Please do take a read and send in the comments. I will be structurally moving the things as (Jonathan) mentioned, but the substance of which hopefully please do comment. Avri, any thoughts for now?

Avri Doria: Not at this point. No.

Edmond Chung: Okay, in that case, I guess we're done for the day. I mean, I guess we'll move this conversation to the mainly list and hopefully once you have some time to read through it, you will have some more comments and thoughts.

Well, in that case, I think we're done for today. And we have scheduled another call two weeks from now hopefully to finalize this so that we have a version that we can send to the key councils before July 1st.

And I don't think either of the councils will be able to immediately turn it around to the board. So I have already sent a, you know, a note saying that they might want to send it into the board saying that we need a little bit more time maybe until Durbin.

I think that will be a reasonable request and given - and also given that there is a - for those of you that don't know and might be interested - there is a Webinar on IDN variant TLDs, this particular issue, coming up on the 27th.

I don't know the details but you should be able to search it on the ICANN Web site. So we were - I think it made more sense to finalize everything after we've heard from the staff on the latest and therefore also ask the councils to ask the board for a little more time. So...

Avri Doria: Can I have a question?

Edmon Chung: Oh, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, sorry. I finally got myself unmuted and now I'm talking.

Edmon Chung: Good. Great.

Avri Doria: So in terms of this letter, would you like it to be co-signed by both of the SOs? Is that a correct understanding?

Edmond Chung: That would be the optimal...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...would be the easiest if you tried to somehow get a - and perhaps once you've done your next version, sending each of them an early draft saying the group is still tweaking the language, however - and giving them early warning on it, at least the chair, and to try and get it signed in Durbin.

Because if you're going to do it, that's probably the most effective way to pull it off than - you know, what you can probably do an hour or two of running back and forth in Durbin would take you weeks of running back and forth on email lists and scheduled phone calls and everything else.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Yes, that is the plan. And thank you for bringing it up and I guess you're volunteering for an open (SO).

Avri Doria: You know, maybe.

Edmon Chung: And, no, no, no. I think that's a really good suggestion and in fact, that's the direction - have already had some (comments from) both chairs and vice-chairs of the councils and both of them - both of the councils are aware that this is on its way.

Avri Doria: Oh, I guess I missed that. Sorry.

Edmon Chung: All right, so with that, I guess hope to, you know, hear more comments on the substance of the letter on the mailing list and we'll reconvene in two weeks' time.

Man: Thank you Edmond.

Edmon Chung: Thank you everyone.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Man: Thank you. Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tim). You may now stop the recording. Thank you.

Man: Thank you all. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

END