ICANN Cartagena Meeting
Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Group - JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 9 December 2010 at 0800 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: Please go ahead.

Edmon Chong: Morning, everyone. Welcome to the JIG meeting, the joint CCNSO and GNSO IDN group and we have three issues that were identified as issues of common interest.

One of which is the single character IDN TLDs, second one is IDN TLD variance, third one is the acceptance - universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. Earlier this week on Monday we gave a public update on what we're doing with single character IDN TLDs. We also mentioned that this group has been - has started to work on IDN TLD variance, the very thorny issue here.

And we observed in the - I think September or October that the board made a resolution for staff to move forward with a - to develop a work plan for IDN variance, so we suspended work on that, but I do hope that in this meeting, we'll get the work restarted.

Before I do that, I'll - I think we like to go around the room just to introduce who you are.

Keith Drasek: Keith Drasek with VeriSign.

Avri Doria: Avri Doria with the NCSG and Luleå University of Technology.

Glen de Saint Gery: the secretary to the GNSO.

(Yaomi Tatiar): (Yaomi Tatiar).

(Mary): (Unintelligible) (J.O.). Mary with (unintelligible).

(Ricardo Pizarasa): (Ricardo Pizarasa) from VeriSign.

(Onchin): (Onchin) from Phoenix.

Suzanne Wolf: (Jen Wolf), (ISC), ICANN Board of Directors, ARSAC, but here as an individual contributor to the (ITS).

(Assaf Ippenchong): (Asaf Ippenchong) from (dot) Asia.

(Yun Jung): (Yun Jung) from (N.P. delty).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Olaf Nordling: Olaf Nordling, ICANN staff.

(Idell Eldestjim): (Idell Eldestjim), and ICANN Board of Directors, 30 more hours and Google.

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings, ICANN Board Member for 29 hours, 59 minutes and 30 seconds.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) (Jalacini).

Patrick Jones: Patrick Jones, ICANN staff.

Karen Lentz: Karen Lentz, ICANN staff.

Craig Schwartz: Craig Schwartz, ICANN staff.

Edmon Chong: And who else is on the line with us today? Oh, one moment -

Man: ICANN staff.

Edmon Chong: And I understand there's -

Rafik Dammak: Yes? Rafik, University of Tokyo and GNSO Council for (unintelligible).

Edmon Chong: Thank you, Rafik. Anyone else on the line? In any case, let's get started. As I was mentioning, we're hoping to get the IDN variance, TLD variance issue restarted hopefully and so I guess I'll pass this to Tina to do.

Tina Dam: Sure, thanks Edmon.

Woman: Sorry, Tina, may I interrupt you and - when you talk, could you please say your name for the transcription purposes?

Tina Dam: Yes. Sorry, I just figured Edmon just said it, but my name is Tina Dam, ICANN staff, so thanks, Edmon, and of course I know you guys have been waiting, I understand that you've been waiting for awhile to get moving on variance.

So from the staff side, I can say that we obviously also want to get moving on this, it's an important topic and hopefully the (set of) proposals that we're about to come out with would help move it in a good direction.

So what we've been working on is this (study proposal) on situations where we know that variants are needed. So it's not intended to cover everything variant in the whole world. It's intended to cover a certain set of situations that

- where the community has expressed that there is a need. And of course, one of the ways to find that list is by looking at who has requested variants in this outside process and where have the public discussions been going on about variance.

So instead of following the whole world, we have distilled it down to those situations that we know, and then hopefully in solving those specific situations, it's going to be possible to over time, solve it broadly for everyone else.

The study proposal, first of all, is going to come out for public comments, so it's not like you can't see it. We're just working on the last pieces of it and it will come out for public comment so that the entire community have a chance to provide their input to it and yes, give their feedback on it.

Yes, but what it contains is a set of case studies, as in said, for different scripts and which really represent different types of variants. So the scripts that are in the current draft and probably will be in the one that's released are (Cyrillic), Chinese, Arabic, Latin and Indian scripts.

Those are the situations where staff have observed that variants are in common use and where we know that there is a common interest. And of course the goal with these case studies is to come with a issues report for each one of them that presents the policy issues, the technical issues, but also, more importantly, what we would like the different groups in these case studies to come up with is, which issues are of general nature and which are a specific variant issue native to that specific script.

Because in that way, the different groups can learn a little bit from each other and where there's overlap, things can be a more general solution and when there's specific issues to be solved, (unintelligible) can be put out to print.

So that's sort of like, overall, the intent. Now, of course we need this to fall into place with other work going on, and I'm not going to - sorry - I'm not going to pretend that I have a full overview of that in my head right now or in front of me, but I'll mention a couple of things and then, you know, of course if we want to discuss it here, I think that would be very helpful as well.

We have, for a longtime, talked about - and it's died down lately, but we're bringing it back up. We've talked about an IDN lifecycle, which should be more of a technical document that looks at the entire cycle of an IDN so that that can be provided as input to these case studies so that they can, you know, so then we're sure that we have - and I'm not saying that there is any areas that we haven't covered, but should document and make sure that we have covered anything in, again, an entire lifecycle of an IDN.

And that goes both for registration and resolution, of course. The (FSAC) have recently talked about studying IDN variants a little bit closer. If they decide to forma group, and I don't know yet if they will, and I'll be honest that I have not followed if they had any meetings since we made a decision for or against that, but if they decide to do a group study on that, that would also go as input to these five different case studies.

Very easy to cross case study interaction between the teams and then of course work out of the JIG and other groups in the community who have been working actively on variants. Because we want to incorporate all of it, but we specifically want to form five teams that will focus on each one of these scripts.

So in terms of - in terms of forming these teams, I imagine that, you know, there was overlaps between all of these groups that I mentioned and I imagine that members from the JIG would obviously be interested in, you know, some of you would be interested in being on one of the five teams to make sure that we keep things, you know, closely coordinated.

So that's - that's overall the plan. I think for me, having lived through this for a little time, I think the most important thing is that we're not solving a general issue, we're solving specific issues. But I have five different ones. And the other important thing that I wills tress is the coordination and communication between the groups, yes, and those in the community who are actively involved in it is think is the most important thing, because when we see communication and coordination falling apart, then it's always resulting in, the issue gets more complicated and it feels like it's something that we can't solve.

But, so those are like, I think, the two main aspects of it. The next step from staff is going to be finishing the study proposal and releasing it for public comment. We did work towards, and we had hoped to do that at this meeting, and I'm really sorry to say that we just haven't been able to accomplish it, there's been too many other things going on, so I don't have a deadline from my management, so I really don't like to sit here and not be able to make a promise on a date, but I will say that it's high priority and something we're going to try to get done as quickly as possible so we can get this paper out.

So I think, you know, that's like, a lot of talking about plans and where we're headed, but I don't know if there's questions or comments on it? What'd you guys think about it.

Mm I've got a few questions. I'd like to open, if no one wants to ask. And I'll start with my few questions. You mentioned study - the study proposal and issue this report. Is it one thing or sequential...

Tina Dam: Sorry, yes.

Mm Let me ask all the questions and then answer with (unintelligible) faster.

Tina Dam: Oh.

Mm Sorry. That's number one, because they're pretty short questions. So that's number one and number two was, would you be open to, you know, is there any reason why you wouldn't circulate the document before the public comment to this group, this is convened for discussing this issues. Third question is, in terms of the (unintelligible) study, I guess all the time when we talk about IDN variants, we often talk about second level domains as well as - second level or the levels for registration versus top level domain.

Is there, you know, are - is it focused on particular or, you know, is it focused on TLDs is really more of my interest. You mentioned - the fourth one is, you mentioned lifecycle. Does that have any bearing with the domain lifecycle? And then the fifth one is, how do you think these (unintelligible) should interact and you mentioned coordination as an important point as aspect. I think definitely that is and I think if you are looking at, I guess, the (JPE) report, hopefully you'll find that we really take the body of work from different areas, you know, and use them for foundation. So coordination and communication is definitely important.

Tina Dam: Okay. I wrote them down, so that's how I remember them. This is Tina again. So first of all, yes, I'm sorry if I confused the terminology, but the study proposal, I don't know, I mean, so that's what we call it, but it's simply just the plan for doing these five case studies for everything that I just loosely explained. I guess, like a more detailed description of that. That's what we want to post for public comment and release a quickly as we can.

The issues report is the report that then will come out of these five case studies, so each one of them will come out with an issues report and they of course won't be coordinated.

Once we have the issues report, we can go to the solutions, right? So they - there are different things - so they are different things. Sorry. Circulating the study proposal before to the (JPE) before we release it for public comments?

You know, it's an idea that I'll take back. I don't know that I can sit and make the decision.

See, that's not - TLD versus second level, so top level versus second or lower level? This is intended for the top level and of course that's for the IDN gTLDs and the IDN ccTLDs both. It - there's no, you know, there's no difference between that, that will be the same solution.

The lifecycle? That - does this have to do with the domain lifecycle at all and it doesn't in the sense that, you know, you register a name and here's the registration period and then you can transfer it and there's all this stuff. That's not what I mean when I talk about the lifecycle. I talk about the whole registration process, but also the whole resolution process, too. What part of the system gets in touch with an IDN and is there any pieces of that that has a variant problem?

And I'm not claiming that there is by saying that we need to have that, I'm just saying, I think that would be an appropriate thing to have documented and dealt with so that you can say that you considered it and there was no problems, or we considered it and here was a problem and it's solved this easy.

The (JPE) interaction, so I think that's really important and I think it's something that we would want to talk about here. For me there is at least two areas, one is (JPE) membership or members here being part of the different case studies where that would be relevant, right?

So they do need to be specific - specifically focused on those scripts, which means we will need experts within those individual scripts in each study.

So I'm sure there's some that are going to fall within that and some that are going to fall out, you know, outside that. And if you fall outside that, then, you know, I don't know, I think it's a (JPE) discussion on whether you want to

keep having the (JPE) meetings as some sort of coordination between what's going on, keeping track of it or if you want to, you know, close it down until the case studies are done and then reopen it, you know, there's like different models for that, but I think having (JPE) members being part of the case study teams will be good.

Of course, the reports from the (JPE) is something that all of the case study teams should receive, you know, as input. Here's something that already has been worked on in the community.

There was a couple of other reports that I - that would - we have existing from previous work that I think would be relevant so that each team will receive like, a package of, here's what was previously done.

You know, we haven't worked out all of the logistics on this, but I imagine that they would, you know, each team would get like, a briefing of, here's the history, some of course have lived through that and knows it a lot more than others.

But so I think there's like, a lot of things we can do creatively to make that work well.

Mm Thank you. Have any questions?

Avri Doria: (Questions), but if you're going to follow up to one of yours, I can wait.

Mm Yes, just quickly, because - on the last point, I think it seems like the teams are envisioned to be a staff developed team. I just want to, you know, generally in a (cusp) of a process, I think the (JPE) was created by the GNSO and (CCNSO, so, you know, if there are aspects of policy, perhaps, you know, that's the interaction perhaps needs to be there. I guess I have Avri and then -

Avri Doria: Unless of course Dennis was following up, what would you do (today)?

Dennis Jennings: Yes, I was, and the teams would be primarily community driven, how exactly we do that (unintelligible). The idea is that ICANN staff can coordinate and provide some expertise. Being on board, expertise (from) the community both to do active work and involuntary work and how we get that mix right is something that we're tossing around in there and don't have mechanisms - they haven't thought through the mechanisms. This would be very much community driven. Expertise would be community from the area - from the (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Thanks. Yes, just add a follow on to that, I think that, you know, the (JPE) remaining functional and looking at policy issues and sort of separate from anything that the staff would be doing, so I don't know that what the staff was doing would obviate the need for there to be a joint policy looking group.

The one question I had, and my attention may have flagged while you mentioned it, but assuming that any technical issues came through in all these studies and all of that, I don't quite understand, and especially since we have two of the leading (lights) from within IETF sitting in the room, I don't quite understand, other than having the people I both places, how we actually plan from an ICANN perspective to communicate any problems, requirements, issues of a technical nature to the appropriate place.

Probably the IETF, and I don't quite understand how we do that. It - at the moment it seems sort of haphazard. And, you know, we run into a friend in the hall and say, "By the way, have you heard that we've been having this problem?" Or one of us participates in a group and writes an email out of the blue saying we think there's an issue.

So I'm really curious to understand how that all works and as part of that, part of the stuff we talked about is, with some of the stuff that's going on with some of the things we've discussed, we think we've seen requirements for

things that the IETF should at least take a gander at and such and so I just - I've been confused for years as to how exactly we do that and is it only you?

Is it only the rest of us sort of when we get around to it? I don't understand how we do it.

Tina Dam: Okay, thanks, Avri. This is Tina again. So I guess I focus more on trying to have a discussion on the (JPE) and the interaction with that because we're in a policy forum. And so I didn't talk too much about the technical side, but one intent is certainly to have a (DFN) expertise technical expert who understand...

(Suzanne): Can I interrupt real briefly? This is (Suzanne) with a - kind of a point of order. I want to hear your answer to Avri's question, but I also want to point out that I had planned to talk for a few minutes about exactly the topic of what's currently been happening it the (EXT) - with the efforts of the relevant IETF working group to sort of grapple with all this, which doesn't exactly answer Avri's question, but I hope give it some background. So I'll defer, but we do have that kind of.

Tina Dam: Okay, great, this is Tina again. Yes, and mine was going to be really short, so it's probably a perfect segue into your presentation, (Suzanne). I was just going to say, the intent is to have those kind of experts on the team. Now, as (Sena) said, we're still sort of working around like, how to do that, but that would be the intent, so they have direct involvement in the case study and are not sitting outside and just randomly or by coincidence being...

Avri Doria: One follow up remark. You said something at the beginning that always sort of makes the back of my neck have a little - I was just here talking to you about the policy stuff and of course I did mention the technical, and I think that we've seen in this group and elsewhere that the two have a - there's a fuzzy area in that there's a real interconnection between the policy, sort of, you know, trying to sort of have effect when there's an engineering decision

to be made, do you go right or do you go left, policy may be able to contribute and then of course the technology, sort of setting the (stage) for what is possible in policy to sort of indicate that their (unintelligible) is always a kneejerk reaction from me. Sorry.

Tina Dam: Okay, this is Tina again, so I'm just going to have to get feedback on that because I think -I think I have always been one of the individuals who have said, when it comes to IDN, policy and technical are so closely related and they're overlapped and it means that we need to keep our coordination close and that means that both areas are important.

But so let me say what I probably should have said is on these case study teams, we're looking at having one, community representation, (two), (unintelligible) representation, three, DNS or technical expertise representation, four, I can't count, it's too early in the morning - four, policy representation and five, operational, like registry operational experience representation.

So we did intend to have all of it in there. I was, you know, we're sitting here talking a little bit more informal and loosely about it, which means that (it helps) sometimes to hear that (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Thank you very much.

Edmon Chong: Okay. Thank you, Tina and Avri. I think that's going to be a good segue into (Suzanne)'s presentation. Thank you, (Suzanne), for joining us today and (unintelligible).

(Suzanne): So I do have a couple of slides here that I've asked Edmon to drive, largely as kind of a high point. More my speaking notes than anything else, but also for the archive and for folks who might not be here. I do want to emphasize again, I'm speaking today here as an individual contributor because actually I've been involved with a significant number of aspects of how ICANN and the

DNS is going to deal with IDN variants in various capacity - in variants capacity, but today I'm talking just about a particular piece of the - a particular piece of the technical work going on in IETF which has to do with DNS protocol.

Thought I'd start really quickly with - for folks who may not know, may not be familiar with how the IETF gets work done. I know that Avri has experience with the environment there, so she has seen the up close and personal in the IETF, the same sense that policy and - policy and technology are separate, it's the IETF concentrates on technical protocol work.

DNS is one of the important protocols of the internet has a couple of working groups in the IETF. Working groups in the IETF, like here, are made up of the people that are involved with deploying the protocol, making internet work that have problems and need to be solved.

So DNS has a couple of working groups, DNS EXT is the one we're concerned with here because it's about DNS protocol. There's also a DNS (OPS), which deals with best practices, with requirements, with other issues that are not quite protocol, but benefit from common thinking about how DNS works and it's deployed in the real world.

Rough overview of the process again and it's very, very hard to get all of this into one slide but at the high level, people will start talking about a problem. People who have a problem start talking about how it would benefit from a common solution across multiple vendors and user communities.

If you have a problem, you try to define what a solution would look like, what are the constraints, what are the limitations, what are the things you must have, what are the things it would be nice to have?

Do you want to change the behavior of the network to solve your problem? The right protocol specifications, if you decide that changing the protocol is

part of your solution, the implement in the real world, it's not really a standard in the IETF and many people who haven't worked in this environment don't know it, but it's not really an IETF standard until people have gone out and implemented it and tried it out in the real world and seen how it works.

There can be a specification, but it's not a standard until people have actually used it in the real world. So you implement in real software and you test and see if it solves your problem and often there are multiple iterations of that kind of process. There's a lot of detail in how things get from one stage of that cycle to another, but that's basically how you get something done in IETF.

See a couple of my colleague here who might want to add something to that description. Or not.

Man: I would.

(Suzanne): Sure.

Man: How long does this take to go from specification to testing to actual deployment throughout the - given there may be no motivation to implement a new protocol or change protocol?

(Suzanne): It depends. It can be quite short in relative terms, you know, on the same time scale that things can get you inched in the policy realms within ICANN, for instance.

But it can also, if you - you touched on a very, very important thing and one of the things - one of the reasons why I wanted to talk about this here is that when you're talking about a change in protocol to an (unintelligible) component like DNS and you're talking about perhaps something in clients, because where the volume is, is clients.

Servers there's so many hundreds of thousands or millions in the world. Client software that has to know how to use a new feature, many, many millions implemented by many vendors and many kinds of equipment.

DNS is one of those things that it's always there, it's a part of most of what goes on in the network in one sense or another. So one of the things we've actually looked at is are we really talking about - do we really have to talk about a change to client protocol because that takes many years to deploy widely.

Who was next in the...

Man: It was (Harold) and then Avri.

(Harold): I noticed that the (unintelligible) over a few of the loops in the (unintelligible). For instance it's quite traditional that people come with (unintelligible) pulled them out of actually being committed to their solution because it turned out the software doesn't solve their problem.

It's the (unintelligible) to solve. Another thing about the problem statement...

(Suzanne): I have a couple more slides that will get into the specifics of how we - this problem there's an answer to this, but yes.

(Harold): Oh so people who have the problem aren't just very hard to talk to. So it's having the process work efficiently (unintelligible) dependence on having people with the problem who are willing to talk about the (unintelligible).

Man: Avri?

Avri Doria: I just wanted to give perhaps another bit of (unintelligible) to Dennis's question, IPV6 is a good example of how long things can take and I've been

the officer of protocol specifications and changes to protocol that have never seen deployment.

So it can be quite short if it's a small change and it can be 10, 20 years infinite for something major.

Man: Okay.

(Suzanne): Sure, and we can talk some more about this in a few minutes if we want to but if you go ahead to the next slide please. What I wanted to talk about was how questions - how the issues that have been discussed here fit into the context we've been talking about.

From the perspective of working on - of doing work in the EITF this to a great extent we can assume perhaps with more validity some days than others that what people mean when they're talking about variance is defined.

That doesn't mean I think as a matter of my overall assessment of the state of being that we completely defined what kinds of variants we're interested in or what kind of variant problems we have, to the contrary.

But (unintelligible) working with DNS, what a variant is is defined elsewhere. It's defined in policy, it's defined in language tables in terms of work that has already been done.

So the key question when we're looking at this from a DNS protocol perspective is people come to us and say we have these variants, we've defined what it takes to call something that. We want the DNS to treat these things as the same.

So the question in this very narrow specific technical sense what does it mean in the DNS to say two or more names are the same. And it turns out

that you have to rigorously take away things that are policy, like how you decide two or more names are variants of each other.

You also when you're talking about DNS because it's infrastructure, you have to take away the things that applications do like figure out what language and script you want to use.

But DNS transaction has a very, very little context so a lot of what you think of as an interaction in the network even though one of the things going on is the resolution of a domain name, the DNS piece of what has to happen in order for an application to do what you want, the DNS piece might be very, very small.

And the deep technical question here has to do not only with what do you mean by saying two or more things are the same, but has to do with which part of the answer is interesting and useful and important to put into DNS, into DNS transactions and infrastructure.

So we actually have a very narrow question that we have to form clearly before we can answer it here and it sounds like a narrow technical point to folks who many times if you're looking from the perspective of a policy discussion.

And the people who are experts in DNS protocol principally are happy to engage with this question. You do DNS protocol so that the DNS will be more useful, so that you can do more things with the internet.

But as protocol experts you need more input and Avri touched on this earlier (unintelligible), you need more input from the people in the field that have the problem in order to describe - to get a description of exactly what you need.

Next please. If you go back to the process overview I did, I said we start with defining a problem, people who have a problem start by describing it and

then describing what they would want a solution to look like, what the restraints and requirements are.

It has been very, very difficult within the strictly protocol oriented context to get to understanding the questions we're trying to ask.

The last year has included oh my God, it's been a year, has included a number of proposals to solve a problem in this space without a rigorous definition of what problems there might be that can be solved in the DNS.

So at a certain point and this took place largely in the EITF meeting in Anaheim which we had last spring, a couple of us got together and said what we first need is a (unintelligible) decision in order to sort through the initial possibilities before we start working on a solution.

So what we end up looking at is, is there a DNS problem, in the narrow sense I was just talking about here at all. Maybe what people want is impossible, not to be too flippant but I can't paint the DNS blue.

I might like to, it would be very interesting to see but there are certain questions to ask that are just not sensible to answer in the context of DNS protocol. How do applications do it, how do people figure out how they want to work around it?

Another possibility is that maybe what people really want when we get down to it, can be done with existing technology. There's a great deal of sophistication as far as for instance registry provisioning. There's a lot of guidance that can be given to applications, authors and protocol writers about how to work with the infrastructure.

How to work with the basic services. In addition depending on exactly what you mean by the same, there are some DNS constructs already in the protocol.

So in some senses what people may end up deciding is that for some problem some of the time we already know how to solve them. And because DNS is an infrastructure protocol where it can take a long time to deploy solutions even when we've clearly identified a problem and the poster child within DNS specifically is DNS Sec.

Because even with a compelling problem statement and a clear benefit it has taken a very long time to get to a standard that can be deployed. So the absolute insistence of particularly the working group chairs for DNS AXT with regards to this issue is if there's no new work, let's not do it.

But if there is we need to define clearly what new technology we need and exactly what it needs to do at a boring level of technical detail that only interests specialists and people who have registries and registrars and clients and names and websites and so on.

But down at the boring level of detail somebody has to think about it. Next please. So I have to apologize, the URL on that is cut off but we can go ahead and do a follow up mail message.

I'm the principle editor of the problem statement draft that we've been working on, we just rechartered, that's actually now on charter.

The term we've been using for this set of issues we're trying to look at is aliasing rather than anything to do with variant because variant is a language and human and user oriented notion.

We looked very hard for a word to use instead that would be used to signal we were talking strictly in the protocol context but aliasing seems to be what stuck.

We need more information about what behavior people want, this goes very directly to Avri's question and (Harold)'s supporting comments. So we can figure out if we need to add new features to DNS to support it.

I have to say again I have to emphasize very clearly I don't know how much this is (unintelligible) about what's been going on in the DNS context in EITF and as far as protocol.

There have been a number of proposals put forward as I said but there is no commitment to any particular proposal to developing it through the rest of that process cycle we just discussed until we figure out if there's a meaningful problem that people in the world have that will be solved by this given more work.

And that's what I had, I wanted to just sort of bring any update and frankly I was hoping that we would be able to discuss or get some idea how to move forward with exactly the question Avri asked.

Because the DNS protocol experts do not know what the problem space really looks like here.

Man: Okay (Suzanne), Tina?

Tina Dam: So to your discussion (Suzanne) we have a little bit of time. My next session starts here in ten minutes, so I think I completely obviously agree with you. And I think that these five study groups their issues report are supposed to contain these kinds of problem statements.

So some of them may have problems and others may not have problems but once they define the problem then you know if there is one then I think that would be the input that you're seeking to the EITF, is that right?

I mean hopefully that's the way we can play it out?

(Suzanne): There's certainly some overlap there. We have to be careful that's what actually happens I guess is the short answer. That for instance part of what that project does is participate both with - and I'm choosing the word participate very carefully, participates in this process within EITF.

Tina Dam: And I didn't mean to just sit in the study groups and then flow it over the wall to the EITF. I know exactly how horrible it is to throw something over the wall that's not what was thought. So again the coordination.

(Suzanne): Well and the other thing I have to point out not as a - just as something that would have to be dealt with, the intention with this - with the problem statement document was that you have a fairly short fuse at this point after people have gone around basically in circles for a while.

What I'm hearing here is that people have been going around and have heard before, have a strong sense of these are people that have been going around in complementary circles, we might be on the verge of finally getting into - at least start going around in the same circles.

So one of the things that may have to happen and I say this with deep reluctance is push back on some of the timelines that people were expecting for the current instance of how we do this draft and how we do this problem statement.

Man: We're running short of time, I think everyone's trying to run - I wanted to talk about - a little bit about - spend a couple minutes about roadmap and process forward, Avri?

Avri Doria: That proceeds right into roadmap, I just wanted to indicate that the issues report by itself would probably not be enough to be a problem statement. It would need the community and whatever that went into reviewing that, not just send.

I know that's obvious but I'm picky and wanted to mention it, thanks.

(Suzanne): But also the problem statement doesn't have to wait on the issues report, they can be complementary and I think that's what I hope will happen.

Woman: Yes, as the co-chair actually I got a question, I'm not very clear about the roadmap. So that is good to provide study proposal and then we're going to form five working group for each script.

And then for some kind of level we're going to get IETF getting involved and then what's next? I'm quite confused.

Woman: Okay so then when the five groups, one for each script have been formed they would start conducting the work that would lead into those issues reports. I think at the point in time where that is done it's necessary to regroup and look at where we're at and what kind of issues came out of that but certainly if there is problems to be solved then that is the point in time where we need to get the solutions on the table.

And depending on what the issues are it could be either that we go to the IETF and ask them to solve a certain problem because it needs to be solved technically or it could be that we're figuring out that there's not a problem that needs to be solved technically or we already have a technical solution for it like (Suzanne) said.

And so I think at the point in time where that is done there is a need to regroup, to get the solutions done. Of course the - sorry - of course the very end of it is you know unless there's problems that we can't solve then the very end of it is to get incident to the gTLD program and into the nccTLD fast track or whatever the IDN sees the gTLD process is at the time, the mechanism for getting these variants.

Unless it turns out that it's something that we can't do. But certainly that's the very final outcome obviously. You look confused.

Woman: Well basically where we've been to provide separate solutions for each particular script, we're not going to provide solutions for universal, right?

Woman: Yeah that's right. And it's quite possible that some of them will have the same solutions and the same issue overlaps between them but the intent is instead of trying to solve the whole world which we've tried a few times and didn't seem like it's going anywhere to look at them individually and see if that's an easier thing to do.

Man: Okay we'll go Dennis first then (Harold), or (Harold) then Dennis.

(Harold): One my hopes speaking personally out of all this, if the - for certain categories they come to the conclusion that there is no problem here that is worth solving with a technical fix.

In particular that's speaking very close to home. I think that the best solution for the internet in the (unintelligible) scripts. I think the study groups that have this is one fifth only makes it much more possible to - I hope to reach a conclusion that is valid for that script.

And so if we try to address everything in the world we obviously can't reach a conclusion that is valid for just a single script.

So that's why I have greater hopes for this version of the attempt to move ahead than the previous version.

Man: Dennis?

Dennis Jennings: As you know I'm no expert at all but it seems to me that as the issues are identified, it may turn out there's some common issues like (unintelligible) issues. Those issues may be amenable to rigorous specifications.

And it may turn out that there's a common set of things that can be specified that could be implemented in a technical solution.

It might turn out that that technical solution takes so long that that's not actually a really safe way of addressing it. But the other issues that can be turned into a strength that could be implemented with registry policy areas, in the registry policy area.

The fact is I don't think we've any coherent views of the set of issues, the set of requirements and the set of solutions.

So the proposal is first of all let's get the issues on the table and start working from there. Some issues may be simple, may lead quickly to the specifications or requirements, may lead quickly to an implementation, may be done for one set of scripts or one whole set of scripts.

I don't know and I don't hear anybody knocking on my door saying Dennis, it's really dreadfully easy, you just need to do this, this and this.

Well of course I just chaired the board working group, I didn't do anything about (unintelligible).

Man: Okay, appreciate it. On that and actually you know the JIG when we first convened, one of the things that we were hoping to do was to get some for lack of a better word sort of like an issues report from staff. We understood that Tina was very tied up so we're very excited actually about the board requesting a set of issues report on this issue so that we can build on top.

And I guess to (Jane)'s question is that that's one of the things in terms of the roadmap and process this is sort of the group to discuss you know how - of course in coordination with Tina how the work should interact and with the staff work.

And actually with the IETF work and hopefully at least the aspirations of when the JIG was formed was to try to play a role in this particular topic.

So I know we're running out of time but just going back to a couple of things that Dan said besides thanking you two to make this presentation, I think this was greatly helpful for the discussion here at the JIG.

You mentioned about whether DNS is a problem at all, you know I think that's definitely a very important question as we go through the policies. I think another thing is I'm glad that aliasing is used and there's a certain word for it because when we talk about variants, just the word variant I think is creating a lot of confusion itself.

And in the JIG what we're trying to say is sort of IDN variant and try to give it a particular definition so that it's not just a general variant in an everyday language type of sense.

So that was one of the things that we hoped to do and I think the issues as we go through the issues report and also the studies that that would clarify a lot of things as well.

So I think those are definitely important aspects. So I think we're at the top of the hour, but I think it's a great, very constructive discussion. There's a question there.

(Jolie): Actually it's not a question, I call the graph to your attention, yes, so there is really appreciate you see there's a five working groups going to be focused on the case study.

And there is one thing people might already take on is there is some community which has working on the variants issue years ago so they have quite a large experience and some of them have the application already.

So they might even though I'm not an expert they might have the solution not only for the (unintelligible) but for the solution policies solution as well so I think we might while those scripts move on, not holding back with all the five study groups together.

That's my suggestion.

Man: Thank you (Jolie). Dennis?

Dennis Jennings: Absolutely, that's why there are separate groups. One of the models is that we try to involve those groups that have already done work and try and get leaders out of those groups to participate in the project.

I don't remember if Tina mentioned but this is going to be a funded project, I can't commit to what level of funding and so on and all that stuff, but there's going to be money not only for the staff coordination support but also for expertise.

This is not to reinvent the wheel, this is to start bringing people together. If there are already solutions out there we (unintelligible) issues report will cut to the chase as quickly as possible. Cut to the chase, English expression, get to the point as quickly as possible.

Man: Thank you. We are running out of time but I think this room is open so we can run for a few more minutes if everyone is okay with it. So (Harold) and then...

(Harold): One of the things that I hope we can get done very quickly is to provide a model example of what does an answer look like? So let's get the first report out and let us capture the existing wisdom.

We have identified the - implicitly which scripts we have the most likelihood of existing management to capture. So I really hope this can be done very quickly.

Thank you.

Man: Just wanted to make a comment, I'm very new to this topic, I'm not an expert in these technical matters but I just wanted to say that I'm very encouraged by what I've seen here today in terms of the interaction.

You know this is a very important topic obviously so I just wanted to mention that. I'm encouraged by the interaction that I've seen today, I just want to encourage the group you know to continue working and I think the road ahead may be difficult but we've got the right people involved here.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Just want to update some information, draw attention of the people who are interested in IDN and hopefully this is helpful as far as I'm aware that (unintelligible), the tiny domain name converting will provide public comments on (tech five) published today or tomorrow, pretty soon.

And to basically wish ICANN to mean adoption of (unintelligible) delegation of tiny domain names that says (Harold) (unintelligible) different analysis on different -0 further script so this is focused on tiny script.

So there will be detailed information now you have in their comments or documents, things not as forthright to talk on behalf of CDNC but I think it's better to pay attention to their comments, their supplements.

And that would be very helpful.

Man: Thank you, definitely and the JIG we've been very good at bringing together the work from other floors and I think CDNC is definitely a very important part of that.

That actually - there was one thing I forgot to mention when I was responding to (Suzanne), the reason why I really like that you mention it as aliasing is because sometimes - and I think Avri pointed out as well and I think I want the people around the table to understand, the problem statement for the IETF work may or may not coincide you know totally with what we're talking about here as variants.

And that's - you know in a protocol sense and what it's saying in the DNS so you know perhaps resolve to the same address or resource it may not be the same thing that we want as an IDN variant.

And I think (Suzanne) wanted to add to that.

(Suzanne): Yeah I do, this is (Suzanne). I just wanted to - yeah, it's in fact one of the key points that keeps coming up as I move across the different groups and concerns and interests that are playing into how we talk about these things.

In order to work together on these complementary aspects of these issues, particularly when you talk about registry operators who have businesses to run and you talk about policy concerns at the high level and you talk about the technical questions for protocol specialists, one of the things we have been lacking is a common set of terms and a common language for talking about any - for talking about this.

And again that's something that I think we can do partly in the context of the problem statement for the protocol aspect. But that's also something that needs to come out of the staff effort we've been talking about and community.

Because without consistent language you end up spending more than half your time talking about each other and that has in fact been a deep problem in the variants.

Man: Adding to that one of the things that this group talked about in terms of IDN variants is to identify that as a - we call IDN variant a policy issue and I'm glad that you know if I'm correctly phrasing this is that the IDN variant, if there is an IDN variant policy it may make use of the aliasing technology in the future.

That's sort of the hierarchy that we're thinking about.

(Suzanne): And there may or may not be a need depending on the policy requirements, there may or may not be a need for dedicated aliasing technology. As somebody who's been working in the protocol area for 15 years that we're happy to do work that will serve a purpose.

And we really are not that interested in work that won't.

Man: It's about the same here, but - no, I'm kidding.

Lyman Chapin: It's probably worth pointing out, I don't think....

Woman: Who are you Lyman?

Lyman Chapin: Oh sorry, Lyman Chapin and this is almost more for the record than anything else, but to amplify something that (Suzanne) said earlier in her presentation when the issue of variants and different ways of identifying the same node in the DNS inverted tree hierarchy a lot of people assumed that if DNS were

designed in such a way that each node in the tree, you know the familiar root at the top tree and so forth.

If the DNS as an architecture supported multiple labels for the same node a lot of people assume that there simply wouldn't be a problem. For those of you I understand you that different people have different technical backgrounds.

But anyone who's familiar with different kinds of file systems, different computer operating systems used, there's a really good example of an operating system that supports this multiple labels for the same node in the structure, Multix.

And Multix you know there is no issue, you can have as many labels for the same node in the file system as you like. The important point I think that's just been made Edmon in your exchange with (Suzanne) is that even if that facility were available in DNS which it is not, DNS does not support multiple labels for the same node in the tree.

Even if it did there might still be a need for work in the EITF because the policy requirement might turn out to not be satisfied by simply having two labels that point to the same node.

So I think a lot of people have assumed you know have made the assumption that oh if the DNS just supported this everything would be fine and all the problems would go away.

And I think what you just made very clear is that that's - you know may or may not be the case and we won't know until we've dealt with the policy issues.

Man: Thank you, and vice versa in terms of the policy. That means a lot of work ahead for us and so with that, with no more questions, I thank you everyone

for joining the JIG session today. I think we had a very constructive discussion.

Hopefully - it's actually open for other observers to join the mailing list so I don't know if anyone wants to join to observe the mailing list you're more than welcome to.

So just send me or (Jane) an email and we'll add you in, you want the last word? Thank you everyone.

END