

**ICANN Brussels Meeting
Joint ccNSO/GNSO Lunch
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 21 June 2010 at 1230 local**

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: This call will now go to be recorded. Please go ahead. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Welcome to everyone to our regular Joint CCNSO, GNSO Meeting. I appreciate all of you being here.

For any that may not know me, I'm Chuck Gomes, the current chair of the GNSO Council and (Chris) and I'll be sharing the leadership of our time together today.

The first thing I want to say, is that whenever you'd speak, please give your name. That will greatly help the transcribers in doing the transcript and it also helps any that might be participating remotely and also on the recording.

So, please remember to give your name when you speak, unless somebody's already given it in introducing you. So, that would be much appreciated.

We have two topics that are on the agenda today. The first one is synchronized name. Unfortunately, we were hoping that representatives from Taiwan and China could be here for this discussion, but they had conflicts.

But Andrei Kolesnikov from the Dot RU and Dot RF top level domains is here to give us a little intro to that, that hopefully, will spark some discussion.

And after that, (Chris) will take over the leadership and we'll talk about a topic that I think is of common interest to all of us and that's the DNS Search Topic.

So, without further adieu, let me turn it over to Andrei to give us a little introduction of synchronized names.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Thank you Chuck. Hello everybody. I'll try to be short, but it's a little intro of what's going on.

I'll start with a brief description of the issue that. The IBM table gets the list of characters available for administration and domain name, according to the registered policy.

It contains varying characters. Variant characters are characters with two or more representations that may appear, and usually are similar to each other.

Variants until this are identical to one another, except that the varying characters are substituted for one another from the field history.

And here we have cases now where in the fast track process, there was a decision of the Board on the second supposed implementation plan for synchronized ccTLDs, IDMs, saying about the (CMECWE) we're in delegations, so I shouldn't read this.

Whereas (CME) and (CWE) have a significant depths of experience with registrations string containing variants as domain names and second and lower levels aren't the principle with the delegation and management of domains that are expected to reflect earlier use simplified in traditional shelter.

Vendoring and can point to good management experience and good user acceptance. Let me put it like this.

However, the pre-history of this thing is pretty interesting. The - it appears in Mexico in similar sessions of ICANN and ones approaching the fast track solutions, there was a Work Team for - to deal with the issue.

And one of the tasks was to study the (subject of various mentioned) and in the field use strings to propose the solution of that.

And the team recommended that variants not be delegated as (COD) at this time, but the mechanisms to be tested to enable future user variants field use.

And it must be clearly stated, that there is no technical solution for that at the moment to manage variant field use. It was recommended that (D) names as a mechanism for a variant delegation be tested, this possible technical candidate.

In brief, a (D) name is a record or a delegation name record and it's defined in there. A (D) name record creates an alias for domain names and all its sub domains.

At the same time, the proposal for a new resource record referenced us to (D) names as it is made through (ITE)(IETF), as a solution for management of variant (COD)s.

I think it will take well. It will take at least some time to adopt this, but the difference between (D) name and (B) name should be managed that (D) names are just for bundled names, which provide the ability to map an entire tree of the DNS names place to another domain.

It means a (D) name be direct, exposed itself and it's the system is standard to the old name, while previously stated domains do not have fit direct with (unintelligible).

So, today we have a case where the Board basically improved the delegation of variants (COD)s to countries and at the same time, we have an enhanced registry recommendation to let them go. Well, as we try to implement a technical way of managing it.

Obviously, I don't have my own team recommending this issue. Of course, it would be better if there is a technical solution for these cases, but from the simple mathematical approach, the variants add complicity to the (COD)s and may reach disability, of course.

So, and it's not - it's bad that we don't have administrators - administrative recourse here to explain how to manage it, administer to, because there is no technical.

Chuck Gomes: Thank Andrei. Let me ask a few general questions, just to kind of help set the stage further.

With regard to the technical work that's going on, is that being done on the ITF or it is a special group within ICANN?

Andrei Kolesnikov: As far as I know, there was a submitted proposal to the - and there was a group of technical people. And it's basically initiated by the people who's dealing with variants as characters.

Chuck Gomes: And so, and that's for both (D) name and (B) name?

Andrei Kolesnikov: No (D) name is a part of the ROC already.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. I thought that was the case. The other general question to kind of get discussion going and maybe (Chris) wants to ask something here too.

The - assuming that the technical work is completed, I'm guessing that the synchronized name or (B) name or (D) name or whatever happens down the road, once there is a technical procedure that's accepted, would apply to both - could apply to both gTLD's and ccTLDs, is that correct?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Of course, it's the same principle, the same issue. Thanks Chuck. (Chris) is saying...

(Chris): It might help if I give you a little bit of the known technical background as to how we ended up in the situation we currently find ourselves in.

Under the fast track process, it was - the rules say, one name per official language. And we were faced at the time with a specific issue with respect to (unintelligible), was that China actually had one language in two scripts, of course, Chinese is one language, but there is traditional Chinese script and simplified Chinese script.

So in order to try and deal with that, and because China wanted to have both a traditional language and a simplified Chinese GO, we slightly changed the wording of the rules to allow for there to be one name per script.

We then ended up in some long, long discussions with (unintelligible) and got the Chinese government about what that actually meant, because as far as we were concerned, what it meant was, that they ought to (IDS), ccTLDs, two separate delegations, one a traditional one and simplified.

And that when - if they wanted to tie them together for registrations in China, that's of course entirely a matter for them, but they were two separate and CL(D) delegations.

And that had some complications and difficulties for China and (unintelligible) and the Chinese government, but eventually we got to the point, where we

kind of agreed that that's the way it had to be. And, there some flexibility around the application process and thought.

Then what happened is, what always happens, which is, of course, one the applications get made, they would disappear into this black box that is unable to be talked about and the language does what it does. In this particular case, the ICANN staff did what they needed to do.

And one of the things that needs to happen, is that for the fast track process, is that as a technical independent tech community who assess everything. And during that assessment process, the technical community said, "That because the language totals that is being used has - I think, I've got this right, to wrap around, is simplified Chinese and - has traditional Chinese in it and a variance."

The - you could not delegate two separate IDNs, ccTLDs, using the current wording of the rules. Now, of course, in an open and transparent process, what would happen is, that somebody would come back to the people who put this whole thing together, and say, 'Oops, we've got a problem. How do we fix this?', and we would have fixed this simply by saying, "Well, we all know what we mean and we'll just change it."

But, unfortunately that didn't happen. And so, off went a whole group of people to come up with a way of fixing the problem that has led to the invention and creation or design of something called synchronized CLD, which frankly, I don't understand.

And which now, in fact, has significant members of the technical community saying, "Why didn't you just change the word that's in the rule?"

So, that's the non-technical background to why we have ended up where we have.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Chris).

Mike?

Mike Silber: Why can't we just change the rule now?

(Chris): I'm - I must say I thank you for asking me that question? I mean, I have no answer for that. My powers are great, but not that great.

I don't have a...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I saw a hand back there, but I don't know who it was. Did I see a hand? No? Okay.

Any other questions or comments on this?

Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Well, I guess having been following that whole process, I share a lot of -from - as (Chris) expressed as well.

But I think it is good that there's a solution, especially a situation maybe for because it is China's lost in a way. In terms of time, it is - it could be gTLDs gain.

Why I say that, is because before, a fully technical solution was accessible. As long as ICANN accepts the pride and traditional Chinese delegation for Dot. China, I would think we would be able to argue the same arrangement for new IDN ccTLDs.

Because in the case of fast track, if the wording was changed and it is allowed to be two different applications, two different delegations, that might, you know, pose as a very different challenge for CCLD.

So, you know, not changing it and having the synchronized IDN, ccTLDs work and we accept it, is actually a gain for the new GLTDs, I would have to say, and in a way, we thank the CCNSO for that.

Chuck Gomes: And I concur with Edmon. We do thank the CCNSO personally.

Edmon Chung: Okay, good.

(Chris): Thank you Chuck. Edmon and I - yes, of course, but let me - my concern is, really I think is this. Up until this point, when we have talked about variants and it's an intensely complicated hard to understand thing, but when talked about variants, we have been talking about variants in the context of a stream.

We are now talking about variants in the context of language tables and so not just a variant of one application for a stream, where there are two different keys on a keyboard that mean the same thing.

That's fine. But now, we find ourselves in a situation where we appear to be heading down a road of accepting the concept that, if I put - and I'm, this would never happen, but if I put - if I had an English ASCII language table and I put Chinese into that language table as a variant, then technically under the current rules, I'm entitled to a synchronized let's say TLD, because of that language table.

And I'm not certain that's necessarily what we either want or...

Chuck Gomes: Edmon.

Edmon Chung: I understand that concern. I think it would be a corner case. Still things that we think it's generally the - that would be a somewhat of an abusive usage of it.

However, there is also one safeguard to it, is that I think in the current posed, this framework, you would be using the same tables for second level registration.

So, it - for lack of a better word, muck around with that language table, and you know, just for getting a particular...

There will be downstream issues for your whole registry as well. So...

(Chris): This is (Chris) again. Sure, but let's look at the new gTLD process. And let's say that I decide that I want to apply for Dot carpet, that I would also like Dot carpet in Arabic or Chinese.

That secures it for me, doesn't it, if I switch tables that says, "I've got ASCII in say, ASCII in - or let's say Arabic and Chinese." So two non-Latin scripts. That secures some of the synchronized ccTLDs situation. That secures that for me, doesn't it? So do we want that?

Edmon Chung: I guess this is, you know. You're taking it into a very extreme cases, right? But the issue is, that then, all the second level registrations would follow the same language table that you have created. So, if you think it - if a registry can come up with a solution that perfectly matches it, then perhaps yes. It's something that is viable.

I guess the other point in terms of question, is whether these language tables, there should be some sort of vetting going forward. I, you know, I just throw this out. I understand that it will be frowned upon quite a bit.

If we vet any - try to vet any language tables, but is that what you're trying to suggest?

(Chris): Let me know. I'm just drawing a picture of what may happen. And these things need to be thought about.

Kristina Rosette: I had thought, and maybe this should be into the variants. I thought there was language in the (unintelligible).

So I think they sort of had their name tags.

Chuck Gomes: And I think that's correct Kristina. The - when you said privately to me, I was thinking of vetted by the community, but there's a technical evaluation. Yes, you're correct.

Another question I have, and this may be a dumb question, but I'll ask it anyway and it may be one that I should have been aware of and haven't followed.

But, is the synchronized domain solution that's being used in the fast track a temporary solution until the permanent solution is approved?

Andrei Kolesnikov: Andrei. Yes, it's explicitly saying the special solution for those two applicants for the (unintelligible), because there is no technical solution that can be enforced on the institute and it's clearly stated in the board.

Chuck Gomes: And so, one permanent solution comes out. They would be required to migrate? No, they would be able to keep their synchronized solution? Okay. Got it.

And that, of course, could have implications if this permanent standard is not ready when new gTLDs are introduced, it could be a similar situation. So it's kind of good information for potential applicants to be aware of.

Any other questions or comments on the topic of synchronized names?

If not, I'll turn it over to (Chris) for our next topic.

(Chris): Thank you Chuck. We had the other topic on our list that's seems that we might be - we're talking about this - the DNS proposal.

The current status is that the (unintelligible) was issued and comments are being submitted. And I think, I'm not summarizing here, but I would guess that somewhere in the region of 92 to 95% of the comments say roughly the same thing.

And baseline for that - the baseline are the easiest ones to look at, simply because it's set out as a suggested way for all that's submitted to Chuck and Cheryl and I wrote to - and putting in as comment, we've said effectively that the way - we make no comment about whether this is a good idea or not, but the way forward is that you should set up a cross constituency working group and that working group should start by looking at if there's a problem and if there is a problem, what is the problem and what's the gap analysis and all of that stuff.

So, I understand that, the case of the GNSO council will be considering on Wednesday, the suggestion that we actually just go ahead and do that anyway.

The current situation is that the CCNSO council that we could - subject to the GNSO agreeing that we should set up a little charter drafting team, to draft a charter for that cross constituency working group. The (unintelligible) has agreed that they think that's a good idea, and even though, it's obviously the SOs that actually have to hold the working group, without the charter it would be including - (GALACC) it would also be including a security visibility advisory committee who have said to me that they would (unintelligible).

And it would also be that their intention to ask for outside help from people like OR can maybe some (unintelligible). Where (unintelligible), we can chat

about that on Wednesday and that Chuck's already sent a note out that there are some people who are already volunteering the requests that you end up agreeing.

So, I would like very much for us to be able to at least, on Thursday morning, that we have quorum and we do agree to announce that it, I guess who it should be actually be brought into existence.

So that's where we are on that side of things. And I think...

But I thought it was quite interesting because I didn't really hear anyone suggesting there should be, anything, you know, something that maybe could happen with...

Well, anyway that's the introduction. We - questions, topics...

Chuck Gomes: Well, I did actually - I actually heard at least (Dan Komisky)'s speak in support of the GSNO search, for the reason that it would provide smaller ccTLDs with resources and that sort of thing, probably gone out today.

So, I would just ask the question of anybody, that what's been - you know, other than the cost of the GSNO search, which, I don't know, when you really consider it's probably marginal overall, in my opinion.

What really is the down side to establishing some sense of functionality...(unintelligible).

Man: That's a good question. I'll even...

Chuck Gomes: I won't pretend to understand all the technical aspects of it. The experience that I have, is that it could be more and more into operational type activities.

So to the extent that they could assist in coordinating or you know, facilitating somehow, perhaps such a function is one thing, but to continue down, you know, pushing more and more into operational areas.

(Chris): I think that's right. I mean, the way that I look at it, is to say, okay, it's been raised. So, should there be a DNS search is a question? The next question is, and if there should be a DNS search, should it be run by whatever it may be?

But we have processes for doing these sorts of questions. And we're pretty good at it really, and if we are allowed the space to use our processes to come up with solutions, we can do that.

Though, it's not a question of - I'm not saying they're shouldn't be a DNS search, I'm simply - I have no idea. I'm simply saying that we have a process that we can use to look at this sensibly and with a community led consensus opinion.

Well then, if - I mean, if that happens to be yes, then it's going to give it a massive amount of credibility and get it set up on the right foot.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Andrei then I'll pick up after you.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Yes, just I'll repeat my mantra. In order to make any decisions, we need initial data. You're missing the data, text, instances, problems, list them for if they are under like security restrictions, they are under security restrictions and only limited to a number of people that can actually list, but also accepted by them.

We don't see them yet.

Chuck Gomes: And that sounds like an element of the charter or a possible element of the charter. Right? And so, yes.

Woman: Not just the incidence, but what the current system of security is lacking.

Chuck Gomes: Now are you also going to volunteer to draft a charter? (Chris) is right in what he said. We have quite a few volunteers from the GSNO already that would like to be involved in that.

And these kind of things, plus really the documents that are out there already including the ICANN paper and follow-up papers provide good elements for developing that charter.

Other comments or questions?

Alan Greenberg: I guess. It's Alan Greenberg. I guess I have little - less interest in the particular listed instances, although if they are around this, fine. Because even if we're doing this as a purely preventive reason, that's not a bad reason for doing it.

What is important is what are we going to gain over this that we don't...

Man: (Unintelligible) representing (unintelligible). I have a comment or a question that's more in the wider context, is that as regards to the security aspects in general.

So, and the procedure how to deal with that. We have been faced with some experience that from ICANN's side, we all are approaching us, you know, with regards to specific security items regarding GNS and we are dealing badly, if not now, really.

We realize that the - it was not a problem which we only were faced with. It's a problem which covered also the GNSO problem and (unintelligible), as well.

So we didn't know about how ICANN is going to deal with that in the - to communicate here on the community and the - the community which is dealing with that.

So, it may have been that those that of us have begun to different entities, different parts of the communities, but separately, so nobody knew about who was approached and then, so it could arise that different responses have been given independently.

So my question is, how do to deal with that? I - from my experience, what I understand is, we have processes here in the community in the ICANN community to deal with that.

We have entities. We have working teams. We have bodies to dealing with that. But, it seems to be that this is - it seems to be a little bit bypassed, you know, in this context.

So, I would like also to raise the question, how to deal with that confusion? Maybe in the context of the working team or...?

(Chris): Amongst other things, were you asking how to deal with the fact that you would - you received a lesser asking for information than you don't know that anybody else has received that letter? Is that part of it?

Because, we, I mean, again it's a question of making sure that your colleagues are aware of what's going on, with publishing your response or whatever.

A right point, I don't -- pose that despite the claim that the top 20 have been spoken to about this issue, those of us who are in the top 20, have not been spoken to about this issue.

And so, we don't understand where this information is actually...And as to your question as to how to deal with it, I actually don't know the answer.

But, work together and come up with solutions.

In this context you could come up with a- or it's - for me, it's clearly a question right. I could answer that okay. I'm of the opinion there are different entities, different part of the community are attached to that problem, but let's stick together, let's talk together and that's the answer of why we want to set up this working group across the level.

(Leslie Counter): (Leslie Counter) .uk, as well as those 20 registries that didn't know about this, and said it was (unintelligible).

I guess, for me, the push back again, the ICANN ascertain, that this should somehow become an element of the ICANN, was mostly because it was a top plan initiative.

It's an incredibly unusual approach in - so I guess, not only for us, did it not seem to be very well based on analysis and evaluation of information, but it was because it was top down that we felt we could not give thought.

It also seemed to put the DNS into a silo, rather than saying, "Okay, this is an element of other computer emergencies, response work that's going on in a whole load of places", so how can we engage with that, rather than duplicate that with our own little DNS camps?

And for us, in terms of ICANN taking on that role, we thought it was premature to assert that that should be the case - (unintelligible), and conversely analyze (unintelligible) to join together and that was where we were coming from, that perhaps if we can form into a group, which we would certainly support, that may be the answer, but we haven't gone through that process yet.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you that's...

(Chris): That's the second time that's been asked to that. Yes sir.

(Jerry): Part of the things that should come out of your working group, (unintelligible), to receive information from the service, not - it won't be an open ended side line that we should be - that we participate (unintelligible).

(Chris): Thanks (Jerry). That's true, but I think we need to be clear here that that's a way down the track. The working group is not assuming that this - it won't assume in its charter that there should be a DNSO.

But if we've got to that point, then we would be looking at what its role should be and so on. But yes.

Chuck Gomes: Sure, I think the point you wanted to point is, one ICANN (unintelligible), touched by rules and engagement.

(Chris): Yes, you've got it - that would be an issue.

(Jamie Webland): It seems to me that the -- (Jamie Webland), GNSO. It seems to me that the main objections against the GNSO, are not based on merit, but on process.

So, we are not - I think that behind - I feel that there is a strong consensus that the merit is there for GNSO to be in place. Who would be the - if it will be an ICANN initiative or sponsored by ICANN, this is another thing, but I - unless I'm wrong, it's - there is a consensus that something is to be done in respect security of GNSO and assert - would enhance this security.

Chuck Gomes: (Dave) you're next. Okay. I just wanted to - I would say that this is slightly different (Jamie). I think you're right in what you said, but we're not at a point, I think, where we have enough information to judge the merit.

That's one of the - several people have made comments like that. So, but you're absolutely right that there's a process concern.

We talked about this - we had our regular board dinner meeting last night with the GNSO. And we had different topics at each table. The table I was at, was an open table, so we could talk about anything we wanted to.

And doing a search was one of the topics that came up. And (Doug Brent) was there, who is, of course, behind part of that coming out.

And one of the things we discussed was, is that, if the process - if it had been handled differently, in terms of process, we would be in a differ - a very different place today.

Even as simple, and I may be simplifying it too much here, even as simple as if they had put this document to the CCNSO and the GNSO and the SSAC and the ALACC, etc., and gotten some feedback and then responded to that and so forth, and involved the community, we probably wouldn't have even had the deal with the process issues like we're dealing with today.

But again, I say, there's a lot more information we need to actually judge the merit.

I think in our letter that we sent, we mentioned that the intent looks good, but we need some more information, we need to work together as - to accomplish that.

But...

Andrei Kolesnikov: I think you - what I wanted to say, but I'm Andrei, I just wanted to say, we have already (unintelligible). But for example, so there are a lot of - there's a

lot companies that we (unintelligible), for example, (unintelligible), but there are issues based on activities that are currently in place.

(Chris): But the - I want to be controversial with this. Now, I don't want to be controversial, but it - think of this. What Rod actually said among other things in our regular with the DNSO spoken, that it's a collaborative moment. There are issues as registries, etc., etc.

And he said this morning, I said that because I believe it to be true. Well, if I was trying to stop and new gTLD process, I wouldn't be using that right now.

Okay, how can you possibly contemplate putting those new names into the registry, into the names for DNS with - who knows how many new registries, until you have this supposed problem sorted out?

So surely, you know, you can't, can you? I mean, it doesn't make sense.

So we don't know if there is a problem. We don't know what the problem is and we certainly need to find out, but it's - as somebody said, I think, it was Wendy Seltzer said in the DNSO session this morning, how do you - you know, how do we stop the scare mongering, because that's not going to affect, that people don't necessarily always think of at the time.

(Adrian)?

(Kozadrian Kindress): Thanks (Kozadrian Kindress). I wanted to add another three words, I think, maybe more than three once I've finished saying them.

Is not only, if I wanted to stop the new gTLD process, but also...

Andrei Kolesnikov: I'm sorry. I mean, I agree. I wasn't singling gTLD out.

(Kozadrian Kindress): No, just really trying to say, that it's not just our problem, our being GSNO thing.

Andrei Kolesnikov Correct. Correct. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I don't mind (Adrian) getting his speaking assignment first. I get next your yellow tee shirt for every time it happen.

(Kozadrian Kindress): Hey, I guess - I agree with the issues that process wasn't followed. I would not want to be in a position a year from now, after some major DNS disaster, that perhaps could have been prevented if we had done something earlier that we had slowed it during process.

That doesn't alter the fact that I think (unintelligible) to make sure that the satisfaction of our stakeholders, that we're doing this in a reasonable fashion. That's really the measure, the issue of getting people involved in the necessities that there's another point.

Which is, do you know what a DNS search would do? What it would stop? What it would make better?

On the outside, it may well be the most fantastic thing anyone's ever suggested, but I actually, at this stage, have no idea in respect to the DNS. I know what searches do, in respect to DNS.

What - that's what - that's why we need this as...

(Leslie Counter): My previous intervention, was in fact, let's understand what it is we're going to get and then if we, feel that there's something that we're missing that we want, let's move heaven and earth to try to do something quickly to make sure we're not in an embarrassing situation here.

Chuck Gomes: And just to follow up quickly, (Les), if you'll forgive me a second, Alan at the same time, you wouldn't want to be in a situation where we jumped too quickly into something and did it poorly either.

Is that correct?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. There's not an awful lot of option for me to say yes. I'd prefer if we jumped too quickly and did it incorrectly. So, thank you for wording the question like that.

(Leslie Counter): (Leslie Counter) for the U.K. again. Can I just kind of move this conversation around, as opposed to talking about process looking back going forward, because I think almost everyone hopes in this room also has a focus on DNS security and stability. There's many people who can agree that that is important, right?

The issue here, is that how we can all come together and say, "How we can improve that? How we can work together to improve that?"

As to that conversation, DNS may or may not be one of the initiatives.

Alan Greenberg: I was just saying, that I wouldn't say that - we have processes. The community has processes and the right processes to charge this kind of - and I would say, the same.

And even the slowest process is begun, we can make it put in the right track from now on.

Chuck Gomes: (Chris)?

(Chris): So we're going hopefully, we're - we need (unintelligible) as quickly and safely as possible.

Does anybody want to talk about anything else at all? If not, we can just kind of buzz around for the next 20 minutes and talk to each other and have...

Are there any other issues anybody wants to talk about?

Chuck Gomes: Well thank you very much. You know, it wasn't a long discussion, but I think it was - from my prospective, it was very valuable to talk about these two topics.

So thanks to each of you for being here. And look forward to continuing our relationship and working together, and particular, now just one reminder.

The only thing, we're talking about forming right now, is a charter drafting team. We're not talking about forming the working group.

So I think everybody's clear on that, but I just want to make sure. So, thank you very much. Have a good afternoon and you may stop the recording.

END