Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting

Joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN Working Group (JIG) Meeting

Monday 15 October 2012 at 16:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by this is the Operator. I need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time and you may begin.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. So welcome everyone and thank you for joining the JIG Joint cCNSO, GNSO, IDN working group meeting here in ICANN Toronto.

So I guess we'll start off just everyone introducing briefly yourself and where you are coming from I guess and get started. Is it okay if I ask Steve to get us started and go around the table?

Steve Sheng: Steve Shen (Atkins), Staff.

Francisco Arias: Francisco Arias, Staff.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Minjum Park) from (Dot KI).

(Eva Mietta):   Hi I'm (Eva Mietta) from (Dot PL).

Woman: It's on when it is red, okay. My name is (unintelligible) I'm calling from (unintelligible) which has domains (Dot RS) and (Dot unintelligible), which one is IDN domain.

Jonathan Shea: I'm Jonathan Shea from (Bichai) Hong Kong.

(Drake):   I'm (Drake unintelligible) of (Dot RU).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings, Consultant Project Leader on the IBM Variant Utility Program. I am from Ireland and I apologize for not finding the room in time and being late.

(Chen Chung):   This is (Chen Chung) from (APHID) also the co-chair from CCSO.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung (Dot Asia) and the co-chair of this working group from the GNSO side. I take this opportunity to invite everyone to use the table, we have plenty of room and/or as we go through please introduce yourself as well.

Woman: I'm (Pom) from Sirius Canada.

Man: (Joseph) (unintelligible) Afilias, Canada.

(Christalin):   (Christalin) from Universe College, London.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Ricardo Botrasa):   (Ricardo Botrasa) from (unintelligible).

Man:　　　　　　　(Unintelligible) connected to the new IDN application.

Man:　　　　　　　And do you want to just...

(Duane Perry):　　My name is (Duane Perry), this is my colleague (Nina Hutsnik), we're with Corporation (Zuris) Company, we're currently assisting a number of our clients with ID and applications.

(Steve Melandin):　My name's (Steve Melandin), I'm from (Validias Limited) and we've got a few applications in place.

(Greg Maslin):　　I'm a Research Analyst at Tiger Global.

Man:　　　　　　　(Unintelligible) you're the last one.

Chuck Gomes:　　I'm Chuck Gomes from (Durasine).

Edmon Chung:　　Thank you everyone. So let's get started and I - actually this is a work meeting so some of the things that we have - we have been following through but I do see a number of new faces. So I guess I'll quickly talk about the background and then jump into the discussion.

　　　　　　　　　That is if I find my mouse first, there you go. Okay so just a quick background, JIG is the joint working group between the ccNSO and GNSO. We talk about interest - a common interest - topics of common interest between ccIDNC's and IDN GTLE's.

　　　　　　　　　We started since March of 2010, we had bi-weekly calls all the way through to Prague. Since Prague we've been having monthly calls. The three issues of common interest that we identified were single character IDN TLD's, IDN TLD variants and universal acceptance of IDN TLD's.

We have been holding face-to-face meetings since Brussels and here we are in Toronto. So in terms of the agenda we will - there are three main items. One of which, the first good to have Dennis Jennings with us here is having an update from the variant issues project or I guess it's now called the IDN Variant TLD Projects and we'll have an update there.

And then we'll - I'm hoping to spend the bulk of the time to talk about our draft for the universal acceptance of IDN TLD's. Currently there are four recommendations that have been proposed through the discussions we've had and we would like to get the feedback from everyone on those.

And then the third topic is kind of important as well. We wanted to talk a little bit about the next steps - since Prague (Jan) and I have been talking about this and on our calls we have been talking about this as well. This particular group was formed as an (ASHOC) group back in 2010.

We're seeing that all three items seems to require sort of a longer-term implementation process. So we'd like to think about whether we would go back to the two councils and ask for a - sort of a extension or conversion into a somewhat of a standing group because we're talking about a few years before this whole thing will be completed.

So that's the third item that I have on the agenda. Anyone want to add or if not I'll jump right in. And so the next item is really an update from Dennis on - my mouse keeps - on the IDN Variant Project. Thank you Dennis for joining us.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you very much indeed for the invitation, I appreciate being here. I'm going to speak very briefly because you have other items on your agenda and because there is a public session on Thursday at 9:15 for an hour where this information will be gone through.

And I really do hope that you will come to that session on Thursday and listen to what's being said and ask questions and so on. If you go to the schedule or as they say in this part of the world, schedule for Thursday at 9:15, you'll see the agenda of that session.

And if you click on some of the background documents you'll find there's an overview document there, which gives an overview of the program. We now call it a program - the IDN Variant TLD Program. So whoever has control of the mouse might do that because that document is well worth a quick read. It gives you an overview of the - of the whole program.

The key to the program is what we call the label generation rules. These are the rules that define what code points are permitted and what are the rules between code points for - that create individual variants resulting in labels - may be blocked or may be (unintelligible).

So that is essentially the key piece of technology that needs to be developed as it's never been done completely. It's been done in part for second level and for some of the ccTLD's and in some cases for some of the new IDN and GTLD's that are currently under evaluation.

But for the root, there is only one root and there needs to be a completely integrated LGR label generation rules that are unique and consistent and apply to every TLD, whether ccTLD or GTLD that uses IDN code points because there may be IDN variants.
So that's the key concept to grasp of the key piece of technology that needs to be developed. Where we are now, so if you actually click on program overview document, and you'll pull up a PDF and as I say that's the document that's really well worth reading.

Where we are now, there are three projects currently active. The first is to develop a tool that will manipulate the label generation rule (unintelligible). Some work is being done on that, some work is being published. There's not

much happening with that at the moment but if you're interested I don't actually know how to point you to that at the moment.

I don't think there's in that overview document actually. The second project is to define the procedure that will be used or the process that will be used to develop the LGR - the label generation rules. So before rushing in to try and do this we have to work out how it's going to be done.

And when we've agreed that procedure and the board has approved it, we'll then move into the next phase, which is actually populating the label generation rules, the repertoire and label generation rules for the root zone.

And the third project is on user experience with active variants. And this is a project to try and identify what are the issues that need to be addressed by people who are managing TLD, variant TLD's or creating Software that will access TLD's or whatever.

These are sort of guidelines and issues that will need to be addressed. The project leaders on the three projects are Kim Davies on Project One, the label generation rules. At two Francisco Arias and Naela Sarras on Project P2.1, that's the process of procedure. And Steve Shen on the user experience Project PE6.

The numbers makes - of the projects may seem a little bit strange but they're a hangover from the original series of projects. We decided not to create confusion by changing the project numbers and possibly we're creating confusion by not changing the project numbers anyway.

So where are we? Well, on - as I said on Project One there's a document that has been published looking for technical comment. On Project 2.1 the process or procedure, a document has been published for public comment. It's called "The Procedure to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules for IDNA Labels and the Root" and it's listed there on that as part of the background documentation for the session.

If you'll click on that you'll find the whole document. That document is the first draft, it's out for public comment and it's quite a tough document - technical document - tough document to read. The public comment period ends on Friday - Midnight on Friday but it's only the first draft. There will be a second draft coming out sometime in November, and that's the overview document.

And the third project, Project Six, the user experience project. A document is currently in internal review and I think Steve that is going to be published sometime next week for public comment? Excellent.

In terms of the label generation rules process, what is envisaged is a two-stage type of process with two sets of panels, what we call in the document the Primary Panels and the Secondary Panels. And the primary panels are made up of experts from the language script, writing system communities that use a Chinese or Arabic or a script instead of languages.

And we're probably going to change the title from Primary Panel to something like LGR Creation Panel. Their role is to look at the code points that are used in their writing systems and to propose for their script and writing systems the part of the set of label generation rules that they would like to see in the root.

This is passed to the Secondary Panel, we should probably call the Integration Panel and they are experts - independent experts contracted to ICANN - contracted because of the need to have a contractual relationship so that there are rules about how they behave, they have to be independent.

And their role is to take these proposals for partial label generation rules and to integrate them, to add (unintelligible) to create the single set of rules for the root. And in that process to discover whether it is safe to take what has been proposed and if it is not considered safe by the expert panel or Integration Panel, to return it to the Primary Panel or Creation Panel for further considerations.

So we can see an iterative process there until the two panels have reached either deadlock, which we hope will never happen or mutually satisfied agreement on what's necessary and what can be permitted. And that process is additive and at some point the Secondary Panel or the Integration Panel will say, right we have enough to get started and that will passed over to ICANN for implementation.

That doesn't stop the work because there may be changes but there will certainly be new panels, new communities of scripts - (unintelligible) scripts and languages and they'll form panels and they'll make their proposals and so on and we can see that will continue on for some time.

The document outlines a number of considerations for this and they should be read carefully. The important compromise that has to be made is that in an ideal world it would be desirable to wait and do nothing until every code point and every rule has been created but that is going to take a long, long time.

So there is an element of first mover advantage here, where there is some overlap and - or may be some overlap between the rules. But to be practical we have to move forward and we heard when we did the issues report there's a lot of demand from those communities who consider themselves ready to move forward - let this process move as rapidly as possible.

So there's a tension there, just as there's going to be a tension between the primary panels who are making proposals and the integration panels who say, I'm sorry but for security and stability reason that won't fly, you're going to have to reconsider. So there is a tension between - at a higher level but those who want to move forward and the desire to be cautious and take our time and get everything right first.

And we've tried to find that balance and the experts who have written the document have tried to find that balance and that first draft is out for

comment. I urge you to read it - it's not an easy read but I urge you to read it because this is a really, really important piece of work. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. I wonder if anyone has any questions first? If...Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I just want - Dennis is right it's not an easy read but actually the approach itself is not to hard to follow when it gets into some of the linguistic and technical stuff it's a little bit tougher but to understand the approach I found not to hard. And as you know I'm not technical so.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Chuck and I actually echo that. I would encourage people to take a look at it, I guess the - for us then the next question for this group is to consider whether there are any next steps required on this particular issue at this particular time.

I have been - as an observer from this group to the various projects that are taking place. At this particular point I guess I'd like to alert from the GNSO and ccNSO members that down the road - currently they'll probably - we need to continue to observe what is being done but down the road there are possibilities where policies need to be considered. Whether they need to be updated or changed we don't know at this point.

We are talking about a - the two panels creating policies of what can get into the root and what cannot get into the root. And currently for the new GTLD process and the IDN ccTLD process the language tables are being submitted from the applicant to the - to ICANN.

This process would change that a little bit, not entirely because the language tables need to be there for second level registration as well but this - the (unintelligible) of these two - this mechanism would change somewhat the processes that are being used in terms of accepting IDN ccTLD's and IDN GTLD's.

So just would like to alert to members of GNSO and ccNSO that we should probably continue to keep an eye on it and also I guess the question may be back to Dennis and the group is, the timeframe and when we might - when might - when you see issue that might have policy impact or implications, whether you see that, you know, whether you think this - there might be a mechanism for us to continue to do things or start things in parallel so that we can get to the endpoint sooner.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you, Dennis here again. At this time as you said we don't think there are any new policy issues, we think that the existing policies - policy framework will work.

One of the things that we've committed to do is from time-to-time to identify issues as they arise and to publish them. Saying, here this is - we're not saying this is a policy issue but it's an issue that may need to be considered. We're certainly not saying that whatever we identify, the list of things have to go through a consensus policy but we just - we would be flagging things from time-to-time so that people who have an interest can look at those and can make their own decisions.

At this point I don't - we don't expect that there will be new policy requirements beyond those that have been established for the new GTLD program. So we expect it to be done on a cost recovery basis (unintelligible) pricing will be on a cost recovery basis. Exactly what that will be is an implementation issue that, you know, it's not my responsibility, that's a staff thing.

In terms of time scale, our goal is to try and get the ICANN board to approve the process for developing the LGR in Beijing so that we can kick off the actual building of the LGR at Beijing. That's our goal, you know, there's many a slip but that's the time scale.

And we see that the Primary Panels or Creation Panels from the linguistic and writing system communities will form, will work, will interact with the

Secondary or Integration Panel and we see those coming on not all at once. There is a lot of effort involved to agree who should be on the panel, who should be represented and so on.

It's a lot of work for communities, which haven't done that much of this work so far. So we think there will be a, you know, in the second quarter of next calendar - next year that's after Beijing there will be a bit of proprietary work. And then in the third quarter, that's July to August, September that a number of panels will be up and working and working for say three to six to nine months and then go a bit dormant. And then other panels will come up maybe a couple of months later and so on.

But exactly how this is going to - what the timing is going to be and how people are going to be prepared and what physical things that will arise as the Primary or Creation Panels butt heads with the Security Integration people - we just don't know at this stage. It may turn out to be perfectly smooth, like everybody says, well, we're not going to be, you know, at least in the first cycle we're not going to be stupid, we're going to be very conservative. Do things that we know that are safe so they go quickly through the Integration Panel and worry about more edge cases or more difficult code points later on.

I don't know what approach is going to be taken so I don't know how long this is going to be. But I see a program of work for a number of years starting in June, July next year, all going well.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. I think that this is pretty much the extent we need to touch on - on this particular topic. I do want to I guess alert people to - do think about - I'm not - maybe I'm just a bit pessimistic but I'm not as convinced at this point that we might - we would have no policy implications.

There are technically driven policies and also administratively driven policies. So - and we all I guess from the GNSO side, we all know how this cost

recovery concept could be interesting. And this particular project we are spanning both the GTLD's and ccTLD's. So the cost recovery aspect of which would be certainly of interest to a GNSO side and possibly for the ccNSO side as well.

Dennis Jennings: Could I just ask my colleagues whether they have anything to add - anything I missed out that you want particularly to flag in this session. Francisco?

Francisco Arias: Nothing to add.

Dennis Jennings: Steve?

Steven Sheng: Just want to clarify a question. When you put technical policy or human policy up...

Edmon Chung: I should have said administrative. I - the difference is where - technically something needs to be put in place like a protocol kind of concept. The administrative would be, you know, a human side, which is like what is being said on the who is eventually between the two variants, you know, those types of things.

Steven Sheng: And that's because technically people aren't human, right?

Edmon Chung: Well I guess the difference there is - technical part is they might affect the security and stability and the administrative part is...

Dennis Jennings: One rule I think we can all agree on Edmon - when in the hole stop digging. It's an old (unintelligible).

Edmon Chunng: Moving on. So I guess the - this particular topic, we keep - we will keep updating the group and when I - at this point I don't think we need to alert he SO - basically the two councils at this point but at some later point if that need comes to play then we'll alert the members and - Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: I think it would be helpful if you kept the council informed. This is quite a significant step and I think it would be - it's desirable that the council understand the process that we're proposing and the timeline we're proposing. So that there aren't unnecessary delays and people at some stage say, oh my goodness I didn't know this was going on. That, you know...

Edmon Chung: Yes understood and that's precisely what we intend to do. Okay so on the next topic, moving on from the agenda is the universal acceptance of IDN TLD's. This is - I'm hoping to get some discussion and mainly just as a background.

We went through a initial report, which was published early this year. That intent was to do a little bit of stocktaking and to get some feedback from the community on the particular subject. For the initial report we sort of identified a few areas that we might want to get feedback from.

And especially whether there are policy aspects, number two, which organizations ICANN might want to work with, which areas to focus on and, you know, how to prioritize our efforts.

So we went out with the initial report and then the comments came back. One of the important realizations from the comments is that possibly - well two things happened. One is the comments coming back it seems like the issues are fairly broad that we're talking about and a good number of them are - will not have a policy impact to it.

So whether this group needs to continue to work on this issue is being considered or, you know, or not working on it is being considered. And the other thing that happened was that a staff team that focused on universal acceptance of TLD's was I guess revived in a way because of the new GTLD's. And they have started to work on a number of the issues and I know Francisco will give us an update on that.

But before I go to Francisco I did want to bring us to the four recommendations that - even though - so summarizing from the initial report and the comments received we are proposing, you know, and in the last few calls we talked about this. We're proposing a few recommendations and proposing sort of closing this with a final report from the group that really has a couple recommendations for further work and if - in - where the work would be with the staff team.

And then the main sort of recommendation would be that (unintelligible) impact is to propose a recommendation that IDN TLD operators themselves would support universal acceptance of IDN TLD's in their own systems. That means the name servers, the contact information and those kind of things. I'll jump into each of them very quickly and come back for discussion.

Recommendation A is really, you know, to require IDN TLD operators themselves - IDN GTLD's and IDN ccTLD's and their respective - well for GTLD their accredited registrars as well. At least for the name servers, would accept, you know, other IDN TLD's and make sure their systems are in place. And for GTLD's, email addresses and who is contacts should support universal acceptance. So this is recommendation A.

Recommendation B is more I guess of a general statement but I'd like to get into a discussion of, you know, how we go about doing it. Is to ask for some allocation of specific budget for this advocacy of universal acceptance. Right now ICANN is doing a little bit of it. I - I'm not sure I see a lot specific allocation on the budget and stuff but I don't know whether, you know, whether this recommendation is doable or how useful it is as a recommendation.

But it has implications and recommendation C and D. C is to, in addition to what the staff team has so far created, which are materials of, you know, general materials of universal acceptance. Recommendation C is, that came

from the earlier discussions of the group and also through the initial report is specific checklists or guidelines for new IDN TLD's, whether they're GTLD's or ccTLD's, alerting them to some of the potential issues that they would face when they implement an IDN TLD. So this is in addition a recommendation for staff to work on it or perhaps the question is who to work on it as well.

And then recommendation D is a little bit broader. Basically to direct efforts - staff to do something beyond what its currently doing but before we get into the discussion that's - I guess this is where I'd like to see if Francisco can give us an update on the staff team work on this particular topic as well.

Francisco Arias: Sure thing, thank you. Hello everyone, this is Francisco Arias, I work in the (unintelligible) liaison team in the (unintelligible) side. I have to confess that I am a new member of the TLD acceptance (unintelligible) so apologies in advance if I don't have all the answers to your questions.

So as Edmon mentioned we have a (unintelligible) team in (unintelligible) TLD acceptance and this is focused not only on IDN TLD's but also on TLD's. So both ICANN IDN's and both (unintelligible) so it's all encompassed in this project.

A lot of the project is to raise awareness about them and diversity of the remains and work together with the different actors involved in the issue about the (unintelligible) excuse me - I read the issues, for example the lack of IDN support. You know, improper logic to check for domain and I know that I'm saying domain but only the TLD or of course most of the issues that we have seen are related to the TLD's.

For example checking that (unintelligible) of the TLD's, they'll still want to check that they, you know, at least are three or less (unintelligible) or reliance on a (unintelligible) of TLD's, which is not seriously obeyed. Those are the kind of issues that we have seen.

So one of the - let me mention some of the recent activities that we have been doing on this project. First of all we have been collecting input from various ICANN stakeholders, TLD proprietors and users on the issues that they've seen. I'm still putting together recommendations on the issue written in various languages so they are available for many people.

We have also identified possible organizations to work on improving their TLD education libraries. One of these - we some years we produce some - what should I say, pilot or (beta) at the most, code, so people could use to check for TLD's that will be in a way that would be the preferred way, which is checking their source of the data their DNS, their (roots).

So we are thinking on improving these set of libraries and make it available for anyone to use in a open source space. We have also been working, you know, to find the events that would be the most suitable to do - called rich activities to get the people that will need to change things in order for the issues to disappear. For example the education developers, browser developers, all the applications.

What else can I say here? We have a session on this project or should I say in the issue, the TLD acceptance. This went by from 10:00 to 11:00, we hope in this session to engage principally the new ETLD's so the applicants for ETLD's, we will have to make them aware of the issues that they may encounter when they have their TLD events will be delegated.

So we have a good relation with them and work together to - in the solution to the problems. And the session is of course open to anyone and you are more than welcome to be there. We will have presentations from - and participation from several people from the - both sides the application and a browser vendor in this case and a (unintelligible) list and I believe also a current detail list and (unintelligible) list, excuse me.

So this is pretty much what I have for an update. Is there any questions, I'd be happy to try to answer?

Edmon Chung: Thank you Francisco. So I guess the - first of all any questions to Francisco before we jump back to sort of the discussion of the recommendations because as I guess listening from Francisco and the understanding from the group is correct that a lot of the efforts are directed towards general outreach and awareness.

I guess some of the recommendations here is much more focused on what we can do with the group here - that groups here, so. Any questions for Francisco before? Well I'll need to find that mouse - right there you go.

Okay Francisco then, in that case then I want to jump back and talk about the four recommendations that have been proposed, I guess one by one and see - and try to get some feedback on them.

So the recommendation A is to - the idea - this is the only one that has really policy impact. Currently there's no real requirement from ICANN to TLD's to accept, you know, to embrace this type of thing. This is to explicitly say, of course registries might already accept them but this would be to explicitly require.

And for GTLD's that would probably implicate the accredited registrars as well and for ccTLD's that would be much less and it would really be almost just talking about the name servers that is - that are accepted for registrations. And for GTLD's it would implicate the who is, sort of email addresses that I collected as well to allow - to make sure that universal acceptance of IDN TLD's is accepted there.

This is a, I guess a recommendation that we go back to the two councils for consideration. Any thoughts? I see Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: I'm trying to understand how this procedure would work. There are two issues I think. If the JIG would send this, this would be if I understand it correctly this would be a advice to the respective councils to launch a PDP to remit this as a requirement.

Edmon Chung: So potentially it would be PDP or if the council's believe it does not have policy development implication but policy implementation implication, that might be a different case.

Bart Boswinkel: What is the distinction because I don't understand that this thing should say (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Okay, so I guess for the G side I guess we can - we can also in the process of finalizing this report take a look at the new GTLD recommendations and see whether this violates any of that. If it doesn't violate and it improves on certain of the security, you know, stability parts then I would say this could be passed immediately to staff for adjustment of the process, you know, implementation part.

For the ccNSO side I guess that is also the case. If we look at the fast track policy document, which is the IDNC report, I guess. If it doesn't violate, which I would doubt it would violate then we can throw it directly into implementation. Since the - I would guess but I, you know, of course...

Bart Boswinkel: Because there is say, now I am to, I know a bit about how the cc policy stuff works. So this - you have two issues here from the cc side. One is that say, this would go beyond ICANN's remit to deal with ccTLD's.

It's you - you ask IDN ccTLD's to do something, which is beyond the policy scope of what is, say in the relation between ICANN and the ccTLD's. Say well good work but that's just an advice to do these things best practice and be (unintelligible) best practice for IDN ccTLD's.

But that's a complete different type of recommendation than saying this should be a requirement because if you do it in the format of a requirement you almost - and that checking needs to be done with regards to the new GTLD's or to the GTLD's but for the ccTLD's the requirement would go into policy and that's out of scope.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. The - I guess the question then is for example the IDN ccTLD fast track process currently requires a - let's say a language table. It requires a certain element - certain number of elements to be in place and certain technical requirements for the thing to be done as well.

So that and you'd think that that would not cover this part and therefore we would need a PDP, that's the idea, right?

Bart Boswinkel: No it's - if you suggested PDP to do this it will be considered out of scope, that's the issue.

Edmon Chung: So let me try to understand this a little bit. Is that, you know, current IDN fast track or in the future the IDN ccPDP anyway would have a number of requirements that the cc - IDN ccTLD will need to meet?

Man: Correct.

Edmon Chung: So and this - conceptually this could be one of them or why - I guess the question is where does - perhaps I'll let Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yes Andre (unintelligible). Current and faster implementation requirements based on - including requirements based on the RFC compliance to the certain (unintelligible) basically because you can't (unintelligible) IDN with a complaint to the IDN, RFC, you know, IDN requirement in coding tables and things.

So in the technical part of it it is a requirement I believe because you cannot run the TLD without the standard compliance. So it's a requirement to the standard client. There is an option to - but it anyway it looks (unintelligible) here because like requirement for ID until (unintelligible) to support universal acceptance.

Well it is already there but it's only common sense, I mean kind of like it's there. We're talking about the IDN's so it's like I supported IDN as a registry and I'm not compliant to universal acceptance. It sounds a little bit weird.

Edmon Chung: That is a case though but I'll let Chuck - back to you.

Chuck Gomes: Oh I just - Chuck Gomes. I had another idea and what about using the IDN guidelines? Now the implications for those I think are different for cc's than they are for G's, I'm not sure. But - and I'll come back to the GNSO issue - maybe I'll say it right now.

With regard to the GNSO I think and I'll have to go back and look at this specifically but I think if you want enforcement Edmon, that you're going to need a PDP to make it a consensus policy. Otherwise it becomes a best practice or something.

So if you really want it to have some teeth you probably need the PDP to do that. Now my opinion, I'm usually wrong on these kind of things because I'm to optimistic - it should be a EPDP but I think to make it enforceable on the G side you would need a PDP unless you could get it into the IDN guidelines.

And all of us as GTLD registries and registrars are required to follow the IDN guidelines. Now the problem is if, you know, some of this doesn't just apply to IDN. So it doesn't solve the problem on the (unintelligible) side and a lot of the strings on the (unintelligible) side and a lot of the strings on the (unintelligible) side for new GTLD's will have the same problem.

Edmon Chung: So thank you Chuck. And I do want to - in the initial report - I just want to alert people. In the initial report we did identify a - both in RFC and in ICANN standard that speaks about this. So it is not a - it's not out of the technical realm to require - make it a requirement technically.

So there is RFC and I'm trying to pull it up. Because of the discussions back in 2000 when the first round was formed there was a follow up work by ICANN staff and then, you know, with - in coordination with IETF as well. So there is a - sorry - there is an RFC - RFC 3696, which talks about this and also another RFC that talks about the - of single authoritative root, you know, which implies some of this as well.

So it's not completely outside of the realm. The other part is that I think a - for the GNSO side a PDP might be useful and perhaps that way we can add back, you know, the (unintelligible) part of it because today I'm pretty sure that not all registrars are uncompliant. I mean, they accept - they don't necessarily accept all the TLD's in the email address or example or name servers and those kind of things.

Bart Boswinkel: Isn't that the way - if - say when I was (unintelligible) I checked the (unintelligible) again and if you look at the (unintelligible) of the JIG itself it's very clear there is an issue and that needs to be identified.

The next step is that the JIG would advise the councils methodology to resolve it and this could be either PDP but at least say, this is an issue, why it is an issue and say it's resolution and then say, these are different methodologies ranging from best practice to a PDP.

Because then you offer some options and it's not to the JIG who - you could say this is a requirement but I think you will have some people sending in the trenches to fight it but at least offer them an option and it's the choice of the councils to move forward.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart and I think that's great input and certainly that's something that, you know, specifically I think what the JIG (unintelligible) report can say is, you know, to identify this as the recommendation that the council's look into it, we've identified these issues. And then later for the whole document there would be more description on each particular recommendation I guess. And that there we can talk about on the GNSO side, certain possibilities on the ccNSO certain possibilities and leave it - basically leave it at that but this is, you know, identify this as one of the items.

Bart Boswinkel: And then I - and then get - say, I would - and that's another word of advice is better to use the word requirement is something else because that comes with a range of baggage.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Man: Sorry I'm not a member of this JIG but I may misunderstand the scope of this working group but the (unintelligible) here are not only for the IDN operators. (unintelligible) operators should accept some names of (unintelligible) in IDN (unintelligible) or who is email (unintelligible).

    The first line, the requirement for IDN TLD, could it be IDN (unintelligible) or we have folks from just IDN TLD?

Edmon Chung: Thank you (unintelligible). I just work for this particular group - we were chartered and formed to look into the issues of IDN gTLD's and ccTLD's specifically. So anything outside of IDN gTLD and ccTLD would be out of scope, however it doesn't bar us from in the description of our recommendations to say that this is - this have implications for (unintelligible) TLD's as well and perhaps it's a good practice to take a look at when the councils consider this matter to consider both IDN and (unintelligible) TLD.

Okay so it seems we have exhausted this particular recommendation. I'll move to the next one, we have a couple minutes left, I'll, you know, see how much we can do. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, no go to B. I think you're already going to B - to the - I'm sorry the budget one. There we go, okay I wanted to alert those that don't know that the budget process is going to change this year significantly.

And so I'm just alerting you if you don't already know that they're going to try and get more detail at least in terms of projects to the community in the fall, you know, between now and the end of the year.

And so that's going to be - that's a lot earlier than we've had that kind of detail before. So what I'm suggesting and I don't' know whether it's people in this group or if its going to be staff that will make sure that it's in there or whatever.

But be aware that you're going to need to make sure this gets into the budget a lot earlier than you have needed to in the past. Now in this particular - I think they'll send out - they'll probably be sending out to constituencies and stakeholder groups and SO's and so forth needs, probably in the next month or so if they're able to get that done that quickly.

It's not going to be - the revised process isn't going to be fully implemented right away because it's dependent on a lot of things but they're going to be working towards that goal. And so I'm just alerting you that make sure you watch for this and get it in really early in the process because as most of you know that the reason for some of the changes and they're not totally approved but I think they're pretty well to be expected is is that we get the detail in the past in May and you comment if something's not there it's almost - by the time they respond and everything it's to late to get any changes.

So they're trying to move it all up a lot earlier so that there is time for a good input and response to the input and so forth. So just be aware that this is one that in the next couple months you need to be aware of and make sure that it gets in.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Chuck. By the time we finalize the document probably it's beyond that timeframe but what - initially we're thinking it would be the - probably the next iteration but that's good idea perhaps. And in our next call we should identify this and see if we want to express this to the two councils earlier and have them identify this, you know, at least flag it to more formally.

But I guess to ask that is - around this is also already know this so - Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Edmon. Just a clarifying question, so this recommendation is requesting ICANN to allocate a specific budget, right? It's not - it's asking ICANN to provide budget, right?

Edmon Chung: Correct.

Steve Sheng: Okay, all right.

Edmon Chung: Sorry, I missed the most important word, which is ICANN.

Steve Sheng: Wasn't sure it could be you're asking TLD, IDN TLD also to provide some funds. So okay, that clarifies (unintelligible) is good. In that case this report needs to be finalized and, you know, go through the appropriate process and when it comes for ICANN implementation, you know, that's where the budgeting comes next.

Edmon Chung: Yes thank you Steve and that's why I said, you know, the amount of time it will be next iteration that we're talking about - Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: If you look at it say, at the end of the day both the GNSO and the ccNSO
                   council have to submit that request because that's the way the process is run.
                   So that sets the timeframe (unintelligible) as well.

Edmon Chung: Right, so by the time we finish this those two councils - the two councils
                   consider the report, after they consider the report they would consider acting
                   on the report for further stuff and that's when this will eventually get there. But
                   that doesn't stop us from, you know, telling staff about this, that it's just not
                   formal yet, right?

                   So that - I guess we are over - at the top of the hour now and we ran out of
                   time but I did want to generally just point out I - in terms of the next steps for
                   this particular document my personal hope is that in the next few months
                   because we're having monthly calls now.

                   So in the next few months to complete it by January of next year and to put it
                   out for public comment by then and through Beijing and to have a wider - and
                   try to have a public session in Beijing. We did have a pretty successful public
                   session for single character IDN TLD's, it eventually was not fully adopted
                   yet.

                   But we would like to probably have a public session at the ICANN Beijing
                   meeting to get really more feedback on the recommendations. We'll refine the
                   recommendations from now til then and that's sort of the plan.
                   With that we didn't really go through all the parts of the agenda but anyway I'll
                   - whoever's not already on the mailing list and would like to be just talk to
                   myself or (Jane) here and we'll - at this point and after the extension from the
                   councils we are more than welcoming additional observers whoever's
                   interested to be on the list.

                   So (Jane) do you have anything to add before we close? If not then thank you
                   everyone for your time.

END