ICANN Dakar Meeting

Joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN WG (JIG)- TRANSCRIPTION

Monday 24th October 2011 at 16:00 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: Excuse me. I like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Thank you and welcome everyone to the JIG Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group meeting here in ICANN Dakar.

I guess we'll start off with just having everyone say who they are as a roll call from the room perhaps Bart...

Bart Boswinkle: Bart Boswinkle, staff support.

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings, Project Leader on the IDN VIP Variant Issues project.

(Jen Jar):   (Jen Jar), co-chair of this working group.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here also co-chair of this working group from GNSO.

Cary Karp: Cary Karp, concerned citizen.

(Joe Waltman):   (Joe Waltman) from VeriSign.

Chuck Gomes: And Chuck Gomes from VeriSign.

Karla Valente: Karla from Telecom GG.

                    (Sam Rafel) will be from (Parma Pixel). It's a French registry.

(Pierre):   (Unintelligible) (Pierre) of (Esac).

(Andrew Sullivan): (Andrew Sullivan). I don't know what my (cad) is here but concerned citizen I
                    guess.

(Alex Suiss):   (Alex Suiss), (unintelligible) coordinator.

Edmon Chung: And thank you. For - perhaps those from the audience can just come quickly
                    and tell us who you are?

(Ronald Chapin): (Ronald Chapin), also a ESAC member.

(Gene Challow):   (Gene Challow) I'm the GNSO Counsel who made the (unintelligible) motion
                    previously but on the personal capacity.

(Roxanna Sequoia):   (Roxanna Sequoia), co-member of the (unintelligible) Working Group.

(Yallen):   This is (Yallen). I'm from CN.

(Anthony):   Hello everyone. This is (Anthony) from (Pitatonic).

Edmon Chung: I also see (Ian) from (Pitatonic), don't worry. And who else is on the phone?

(Chris Edello):   (Chris Edello) from University College London.

Edmon Chung: Thank you (Rafik). And so I guess let's get started for I usually get this started just remind everyone that the JIG is actually a joint working group between the ccNSO and GNSO.

And we have a mutual charter adopted by the both councils. And the purpose of the Working Group is to explore topics - issues of common interest between GTLDs and ccTLD G - IDN TLDs and ccIDN TLDs.

So in terms of the charter itself just to let everyone know it was originally intended for the JIG to work until the new GTLD applicant guidebook is adopted.

That happened in Singapore. Since then we have - the charter has been extended by the GNSO in their July meeting and by the ccNSO also in their August meeting.

So right now the JIG is - the charter extended to complete our work on three issues of common interest that we identified one which a single character IDN TLDs. The second one is IDN TLD variance and the third one being universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

So since March last year we've been having biweekly calls and have been having face to face meetings at every ICANN meeting.

And here we are in Dakar. So this is continuation of that work. And we're going to - one of the main works that we're - the group is working on right now is the - and initial report on the issue of universal acceptance of IDN TLDs we'll spend a bit of time on there. And we'll report what the group has been discussing.

We're coming - we're working on an initial report that should go for public comment soon.

Then we'll spend a bit of time on some follow-up work from single character IDN TLDs.

We observed that the board had had resolution on the final report. We'll consider some of, you know, our next steps on follow-up on that and finally come back to the IDN TLD variance.

The IP Working Group, the VIP study teams have produced a number of draft reports. And the work is going on very much as scheduled. So we are looking into considering what follow-on work to be done there.

So anything anyone wants to add before I go into the first topic?

If not I'll I guess start with the - this is one of the main topics that the group is considering at the moment, the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

In fact this similar topic was brought up in fact in the IN variant of the IP working groups as well as part of user expectation and, you know, IDN TLDs being able to be used in different - to meet different infrastructure and software.

So I think what the group itself is doing right now is to finalize the initial report. And the target is due to have it out published shortly after the ICANN Dakar meeting.

Much of this is talking about, you know, what ICANN could do in terms of making sure that well as IDN TLDs are being introduced whether software or, you know, infrastructure DNSs around the world, are they - and also other types of applications are ready for IDN TLDs.

So the report itself, a lot of the work has been to take a look at the background work so what has been done on the issue before.

So this issue is not new. It started from, you know, it was first more I guess and when during year 2000 when the first I guess expansion of the GTLDs were introduced where there were new GTLDs longer than three characters like .museum or .info was one of the first times that this was brought up.

And when we introduced IDN ccTLDs last year this same issue became, you know, was becoming apparent as well.

Some of the IDN ccTLDs are not being accepted by - from databases or, you know, having different problems with software around the world.

So it is that which made this issue a, I guess an (unintelligible) interest what used to be just a GTLD issue is now also a ccTLD issue as IDN ccTLDs are being introduced.

So as part of sort of the stock taking of the background information we looked back at a number of things that were done.

And then most importantly in August 2003 the SSAC report on support of new top-level domains.

And that was one of the - I guess that's six of the recommendations which we really, you know, the work would be somewhat built on these recommendations.

So SSAC at that time recommended that ICANN develop an advisory regarding support for new TLDs asked the GNSO to publicize it and then also recommended that IAB issue an informational RC, recommended that Internet infrastructure providers and Internet software application developers review and upgrade their software and infrastructure, recommended that a central repository of known compatible issues be maintained, and also recommended that ICANN examine the compatibility issues with the introduction during the introduction of new GTLDs in 2001.

So in terms of the action since then - that was a recommendation from 2003. Since then actually there has been quite some activity on the subject.

In response to the first recommendation of SSAC a TLD acceptance forum was created in October 2004. And a special Web site on universal acceptance of top level domains is being maintained at ICANN both of which however hasn't really been very active at this point. It was active for a short period of time but no longer is.

In terms of written recommendation on IAB for asking IAB to consider issuing an information RFC, that has actually been done. And it's RFC 30696. So, you know, that's part of what has been done already on the subject.

For the third and fourth item recommendations from the SSAC at that time to - for infrastructure providers and Internet software providers ICANN actually - sorry number three is the cut and paste problem. It shouldn't say that. It should say infrastructure developers should review and upgrade their infrastructure software.

ICANN actually put out a TLD verification tool in December of 2006 which was updated in March 2007.

I don't think at - what's I guess I wonder if anyone from ICANN staff would know how well it's deployed and how, you know, how many people have downloaded it or is using this verification tool.

And perhaps that's one...

Bart Boswinkle: Bart Boswinkle. I doubt whether the date is available but I will check.

Edmon Chung: Yes well I guess it'll be useful information as the groups considers these as well. But a lot of what has been done for is a little bit outdated I have to say which is the reason why we need to bring this up again.

And in terms of the fifth recommendation from SSAC I don't think it was implemented at all. SSAC recommended a - that a central repository of known problems be maintained. I don't - I couldn't find something like that. So perhaps this, you know, it's time we tried to do something to actually implement that.

So and on the fixed point actually it's really just in terms of the proof of concept study. Yes it was included in the Comprehensive Evaluation Report for the first round of proof concept.

So beyond the SSAC work that was done on the subject actually there have been other related works one of which most prominently is Mozilla's work on public suffix list.

This is a list maintained by the Mozilla group that has all of the TLDs. And it actually includes the second level registries that some, especially ccTLDs maintained as well and of course also IDN TLDs.

This is one of the areas - I'll come back to this later as well. This is one of the areas that perhaps would be interesting for this for ICANN and this group as well because this is a list that is implemented for Mozilla, for Google Chrome, and a number of other types of software which it pretty much dictates what TLDs are actually being accepted by the browsers.

One of the things that is interesting to note is that if you're not on the public suffix list, for example as a new you GTLD is being implemented as a IDN ccTLD for example when it's in the roots it doesn't work for like Google Chrome and it goes to search directly.

Even if you, you know, type the whole domain it goes to search directly because of this implementation of public suffix list.

So this is got - it - this could have some policy implications for ICANN - will not for ICANN but some coordination implications for ICANN as we look into a new IDN TLD swap.

Another fairly popular list that is seen being referenced quite a bit is from Wikipedia. There is a list of Internet top-level domains.

Continuing on, another relevant piece of work on the subject of universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, Mozilla again they have an IDN enabled TLD list.

So this is a another list that Mozilla maintains which dictates how IDNs are being presented to users depending on the policies that the TLD adopts.

So this has some implications on sort of acceptance or at least the perception of acceptance of IDN TLDs as well.

And then three other relevant I guess developments that the group identified, the ICANN IDN guidelines, the W3CIRI, the Internationalize Research of Identifiers Work as well as the EAIB international email addresses work.

So besides that I also because of some of the discussion that came out from Singapore and (sequently) also quoted the related work on unique authoritative root. I think that's relevant in a few ways including the public suffix list and, you know, this generally IDN TLD perception in different areas around the world. And just quoting the IAB RFC as well as the ICANN I guess standard in a way.

I don't know what ICANN ICP actually means. I'm just I need to dig back into that. And I wonder if anyone can help me. But this is sort of like an ICANN basic statement for the unique authoritative root (unintelligible).

And of course from the VIP Draft Study Team reports as well as the JIG discussion previously this topic seems to be coming up and up all the time.

We received a number of public comments that says for IDN TLDs one important thing is to make sure that it's actually, you know, people can actually use it and it's not being blocked by certain filters or certain applications are able to deal with IDN TLDs.

So and this was the amount of background work and related work that the group was able to identify. And then we looked into some of the policy aspects of this issue.

One of the things that we quickly realized is that perhaps policies being developed and enforced by ICANN may not be able to directly, you know, solve the issue of universal acceptance because, you know, ICANN has sort of authority over registries and for GTLDs registrars.

But, you know, how the ISPs or how the application developers, how they implement their systems ICANN probably doesn't have direct policy capable, you know, I mean authority over them.

So what ICANN and the ICANN community can do would - I think would be also useful as building on the SSAC recommendation as well what are those things?

And I guess that's why for the group we decided that, you know, beside sort of a "direct policies" we'd also look at a stock taking of the areas that ICANN and the community can perhaps focus their efforts on to make this or to promote this concept or promote the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

So with that we identified four areas of policy and coordination, basically four big questions which we are thinking about in the initial report which will go out for public comments and hoping for people to give us more feedback on it.

First of all whether there are actually policy aspects to be considered. Any ICANN policies that should be developed on, you know, to promote this.

Second of all which organization should ICANN work with and how do we identify them? Mozilla is often being brought up because of the public suffix list. And the IDN acceptance list is, you know, should ICANN or the ICANN community have a working relationship with lists like that as they emerge as industry standards.

Third area is which areas should ICANN focus their efforts on to exert, influence? You know, what should be done basically?

And number four is based on number three what types of work to, you know, to prioritize and for the ICANN staff and community to work on?

And with these four we further find it out to ask a few more questions. First one are there actual policy aspects that should be considered?

We identified two possible areas. One is budgeting that perhaps one of the policies is that ICANN should, you know, set aside budgets on specifically on this issue.

The second one is whether there are registry policies. And one of the - a potential possibility is that to require IDN TLDs themselves at least to commit to promoting it in their systems.

For example to set IDN TLDs as name servers, to set IDN TLDs in there Whois records for example.

These are, you know, these are policy aspects that ICANN can actually consider to in the first to promote universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

So these are the only two that we actually thought of in terms of actual policy. Yes Bart?

Bart Boswinkle: With regard to IDN ccTLDs just a procedural note that the - if you look at the way the IDN PDP is evolving especially on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO the policy remittal ICANN will be very limited because it will be the same as for the current ccTLDs. So it's a bit of a tricky area.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. It's always useful as a reminder there. And we do understand that, you know, ccTLDs have that special situation.

But it still, you know, not impossible for us to at least, you know, promote but Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Edmon and I'll comment on the GTLDs.

First of all I think it's a good idea to encourage registry operators for IDN GTLDs to focus on this, to know it's a need and encourage them to do so.

But it seems to me that if a - if somebody's going to go to the expense and effort to offer a - an IDN GTLD if they want a viable business they should be marketing it. And part of that would be doing this I believe.

So I'm not sure that you need a policy to do that but I certainly would call it to their attention and let them know that this is a need.

Edmon Chung: The policy would be that as than IDN TLD you would have to in your systems like for your name server records at least for those two except IDN TLDs that that was the part that we identified.

So because right now there's no particular, you know, requirement for TLD operators to accept IDN TLDs as name server, you know, records or - and Whois contact information -- those kinds of things.

Chuck Gomes: So who would that party be directed toward? Would it be directed - is it main server operators in general or - and of course then you're getting into a realm that is beyond ICANN's authority, right in many cases?

Edmon Chung: Well at least this is - mainly this report is hopefully going on for public comments. And this is a question more than a, you know, this is the recommendation.

But the idea is perhaps that, you know, in the provisioning from the registry and the registrars that take registrations for IDN TLDs they should accept the IDN TLDs in, you know, other areas of the provisioning.

Because that in a way promotes this concept rather than, you know, they're just selling another name. But they had to do a little bit more to, you know, to accept name server records and others in IDN TLDs.

But this again this is a question now. Maybe the community really doesn't like it at all and - well this is not a recommendation that we would make.

(Joe Walton): You know, (Joe Walton). So just to clarify that point, you're not necessarily limiting this to an IDN TLD or ccTLD, but you would really want to have the support of name servers that are - they are using a IDN TLD accepted in any of the GTLDs or ccTLDs, the ones existing today.

So in .com we would want, you know, we wouldn't want to be able to support an IDN GTLD, you know, and - the IDN extension part in the GTLD as well as the secondary level string, right?

I mean so you want to fully internationalize the name server name. And it wouldn't be limited to just the TLDs.

I mean we have in .com we have, you know, .DD and .UK, and .US. I mean so that you have name server names in - used in the registry for .com today that stand a large number of other registries.

Edmon Chung: Right I mean that's the idea. But again, you know, it is just one of the possibilities to promote this concept that there are different aspects in your system even for TLD operators ourselves we might sort of forget that, you know, we actually have systems that might need to be updated to, you know, to support universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

I mean so feel free to jump in if you have questions. But this - these are the two (unintelligible) ones that we came up with. Oh (Andrew) please?

(Andrew Sullivan): So I don't want to horn in here since it's out of order so but I do have a question. I mean does this group have a feeling about public suffix.org and the fact that there's another entity out there that isn't ICANN that is publishing a list that says well no, these are the real TLDs?

Edmon Chung: So I move onto the next slide which is this is exactly the topic which is which organizations should ICANN work with on the issue and how we should identify it.

And public suffix list says one of them that we have identified, I mean Wikipedia has a very popular TLD list as well, a lot of reference, you know, it's referenced quite a lot.

So it's really a question to the community and, you know, whether the ICANN community think this - these efforts - I mean they were created for I guess for definitely in good faith. But as we add new TLDs specially new IDN TLDs

because IDN TLDs include both CC TLDs and GTLDs, you know, what are the types of things we should do?

Should ICANN have a, you know, a liaison with the public suffix list for example is definitely one of the questions.

(Andrew Sullivan): Or, you know, you could sponsor the drafting of an Internet draft this title public suffix.org considered harmful because of the way that that operates but perhaps I'm showing my bias here.

I do want to encourage you though to think hard about the implications of somebody publishing what they claim to be an operation - I mean the Wikipedia case is interesting but it's informational, right?

But the public suffix.org is - it claims to be an authoritative source of data by which you should make operational decisions in your software.

And I would suggest that there is a serious sort of techno-policy issue there that needs to be confronted.

Edmon Chung: (Patrick)?

(Patrick Sullivan): Personally I do not understand how strong text link and an (architected) board has the rights for people to draw that conclusion that (Andrew) just explained. So I don't understand why the discussion is taking place in this room in the first place.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Well I guess the reason why it's taking place is because the public suffix list is quite broadly being used at this point. And it does affect the I guess user experience and the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

Mozilla, Firefox and, you know, Google Chrome has been using it so...

(Patrick Sullivan): In that case I think the answer to the question is that ICANN should contact those people that actually use that and ask them why they're doing it.

Edmon Chung: It could be a good, you know, a recommendation. That might come out as a recommendation from the group.

At this point we're identifying the issues and asking the questions. So and thank you for the input I think that - (Steve)?

(Steve): Jothan Frakes who I think was part of the Mozilla project is posting some comments on the Adobe chat room. I'm just quoting him. He said public suffix was originally initially created to help to identify the apex of a cookie.

And there's a distinct misunderstanding of what the - what that voluntary public suffix project is.

It exists in the absence of any other (confirmation) that tell them (unintelligible) in a comprehensive list on the competent comprehensive list from this reading now his comments.

Edmon Chung: Thank you (Steven). And thank you Jothan for the intervention. In fact we Jothan actively participates in this discussion as well and has helped us identify by list. And, you know, I think it's definitely an issue that should be talked about.

And we'd like to get more input from the community about how ICANN should interact with it. And so I think it definitely was created out of good faith and, you know, it's doing some good work there.

But, you know, how it interacts with ICANN policies and ICANN community is something that should be discussed. (Patrick)?

(Patrick Sullivan): Yes what - now we've heard (Steve) saying - (Patrick Sullivan) here - is that there is a service that is missing for the root that we all believe in.

And in that case that should - that I think is something that should be explored.

Edmon Chung: Sorry you mean a service from the root...

(Patrick Sullivan): What I heard was that public suffix for the (work) is providing a service that the browser vendors cannot find anywhere else.

So I think what I hear already during these four minutes when I've been confused and are less confused is that a little bit more investigation has to be done while this is going on in instead of running to conclusions a little bit too fast that maybe I read between the lines on the slides.

Edmon Chung: Well so these are more questions than trying to answers (sic) at this point. And one of the - a good - that's a good feedback that, you know, there may be some services that the root or IANNA or ICANN could provide.

You know, and the reason why there's the public suffix list might be there's a void of that service so running short on time so I'll keep pushing ahead.

So these are - it's elaborating on, you know, what organizations and how we interact with them.

And then the third area is what areas ICANN and the ICANN community can prioritize their efforts on, influence like browsers, DNS Lookup tools, network infrastructure, network management, security tools, registries, registrar systems, you know, where, how should we prioritize, what else should be included?

This is a stop taking from the working group but are there other areas that we should look into?

And of course what types of output ICANN should focus on like the repository which SSAC has recommended but was never quite put together, a repository of known compatible issues with different software or infrastructure and how to coordinate and maintain the work.

This - these are the questions that we want to put out to the community and get more feedback before the group considers a recommendations.

So with that I wonder if anyone has any questions on - this is the state of which the initial report for universal acceptance of IDN TLDs is at.

We've, you know, identified four areas and basically elaborated a little bit more on it and now looking to ask the community about what further, you know, what - did we miss anything before we consider the recommendations? (Any) - Bart okay.

Bart Boswinkle: This may just because I've not been paying attention but are all of these items in the initial JIG mandate or is - or are we spilling out into new territory post the date of our actual conclusion?

Edmon Chung: Well the JIG identified three areas of common interest between ccTLDs and GTLDs one of which is universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. So these are all part of the discussion on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

Bart Boswinkle: But I mean at this point you're just embroidering that concept as you think might be worth our consideration, right?

Edmon Chung: Correct.

Okay hearing no questions I'll move on to the next topic which is single character IDN TLDs. We had some discussion on in our conference calls about this.

We know that there's a - there was a board resolution. Just want to let, you know, those who weren't fully aware of the work, you know, in early last year we had an initial report went out for public comment and then a summary of that and then we drafted a final report towards the end of last year, 2010. We eventually published the final report.

We passed it over to the GNSO and ccNSO councils both of which approved the report to be sent to the board and eventually so the final report was sent to the board with recommendations to allow single character IDN TLDs.

So in August the board made resolution on single character IDN TLDs requesting more advice from the SSAC, more advice from the GAC, more advice from the ALAC.

I was sort of wondering whether we should add RSAC to it too since we are listing all the advisory committees but some further information from them and to direct staff to consult with additional knowledgeable parties on the subject.

And the fifth one is a particular one that I think in the working group we had some further discussion on is to basically put off the implementation of single character IDN TLDs after the first round, the first GTLD application round.

And also this is one fun item and the either item being to - and in conclusion of IDN ccTLD policy work so basically tying together IDN GTLDs and IDN ccTLDs.

So in terms of next steps one of the things that we talked about in the group is to of course continue to follow-up with staff on the implementation of the

recommendations from the group and also to consider drafting a response to the board resolution.

Just before I go further into that we also had a discussion of if we do draft something we would probably pass it back to the two councils, the ccNSO and the GNSO councils for them to consider, you know, acting on any kind of response or statement.

And this seems to be the right approach because we are chartered by the two councils and we're not chartered to create statements directly back to the board resolution.

So a couple of areas that we think is important perhaps to point out and one of which there was a pretty long rationale on the resolution of why some of the things were resolved.

One area was not - there wasn't a rational provided on why the delegation of single character IDN TLDs were made after the first round.

There was no particular rational there. Perhaps we'd like asked the board for some clarification of why? It specifically says, you know, after the first round.

The other one is both the GNSO and the ccNSO has pretty much repeatedly stated that each of the IDN ccTLD and IDN GTLDs should go in their own pace and, you know, one shouldn't have to wait for the other.

The board resolution changes - changed that specifically saying that, you know, anything would have to wait for the ccTLD policy work to be done, IDN TLD.

So that's a reverse or I shouldn't say reversal but in conflict of what some of the stated ccNSO and GNSO policy principles were.

So I guess these are two areas that perhaps we are considering to draft something for to I guess ask board for in a way re-consideration and some rationale on their resolution. I see that Chuck is - wants to add.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Edmon. Correct me if I'm wrong and I might very well be but I thought the board's rationale for that motion was one of the weakest I've ever seen.

I think you ought to ask them to give a rationale that really makes sense. And now if somebody is aware of rationale that's better than what they said I'd welcome to hear it.

But this thing has been looked at and looked at for years going clear back to the reserve NAN Working Group and the GNSO PDP for new GTLDs. And every answers come up the same and they say let's kick it down the road again.

Again I'm open to hearing a rationale that makes sense. But that was a waste of my time reading it unless I missed something.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Chuck. And I, you know, I'd like to say I remain neutrality as chair, co-chair. (James) please?

(James): I'd like to support Chuck on this. I think this issue has been trashed again and again from 2007 to now. That's four years.

And the fact that (the resolution) (unintelligible) can still (came) about this stress (test) now of constructing almost every possible group and (unintelligible) organization the (unintelligible) committee within the ICANN, this is ridiculous to me.

That is what we have public forum for - I mean sorry, public consultation for. And this issue has been in public consultation for again and again at least three times in the last five years.

I - if that's a board resolution I think there's something seriously wrong with the rationale behind it. And if that's a staff recommendation then I'd like to talk to staff who crafted that resolution.

Edmon Chung: Well at this point it is a board resolution. Whether it was drafted by the staff, I'm (not sure) most of the resolutions are drafted by the staff.

But do I hear, you know, more volunteers to help me draft a response that is perhaps stronger from this group?

I wonder if Avri wants to weigh in on this point as well?

Avri Doria: No. I'm sorry I'm late but I was just catching up with what topic you are actually talking but it was finally explained to me what topic.

I could probably volunteer to help you but I'd have - but I'm leaving soon I mean tomorrow so but I can help you if that's what you're looking for me to say.

Edmon Chung: Well I think it's, you know, at least I'm not hearing anyone objecting to us responding first of all.

I'd like to get a sense of, you know, we had a very brief discussion during the call that, you know, this should go back to the council and the council should send it to the board.

You know, does anyone feel (or need), you know, this - that think that this is the right process to go about?

Man: I think you have to do that because they're your charting organizations. But obviously time is of the essence on this thing too.

So, you know, the sooner you get it back to then the more likely they can respond.

Edmon Chung: So I guess for us the target would be to again I'll just quickly. The target would try to be the meeting right after Dakar for the GNSO at least.

And then we'll try to look at the ccNSO council calendar as well and probably be meeting after to present it and present the motion for the two councils to consider.

Dennis?

Dennis Jennings: I regret that I haven't read the rationale so I can't comment on the rationale whether it's good, bad, or indifferent. And I will now. I think after (over heating) the discussion I will read it and see whether I might venture an opinion.

But I wanted to comment on the consideration. That's just a very formal process. And the only grounds for reconsideration as I understood it -- and I went through two re-considerations when I was on the board so I may not remember correctly -- but it seems the only grassroot reconsideration is that the board did not consider material that it had or should have had at the time.

And therefore reconsideration is a very weak way of challenging - it isn't a challenge unless there is - the board did not continue - consider information it should have had. And that probably doesn't apply in this situation.

So I'm suggesting that reconsideration may not be in any way an avenue and you may have to look at other avenues. That's my only point. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. I think that's a good point. I think I was using reconsideration in a broader context rather than. But that's a good point. I'll try not to use that word and spell it the other way.

Bart Boswinkle: Just another point maybe to make it more clear we say there is the opportunity for the JIG to update the CC community on Tuesday or Wednesday with working group updates.

If you want to raise this and have support through the ccGNSO council it might be useful to raise this point already at the ccTLD meeting itself.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. We'll - yes (Jane) and I will certainly bring this (up).

Chuck Gomes: And probably you should do it in the GNSO meeting on Wednesday as well. The - hopefully there'll be a session at - a point in time where that could be brought up or at least give them a heads up.

And, you know, it could be - I appreciate Dennis's input on reconsideration and is more likely right on that. He's looked at that pretty closely in a couple cases.

But the, you know, it could be a simple matter of asking them to please provide a rationale that provides some rationale. Sorry for the redundancy but I don't think it did.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Chuck. And we did have, you know, VI now so Cary.

Cary Karp: Since the core of this is (some) procedure if the JIG which is designated by the two SOs is going to be referring something back to them is this group (queried)?

And in looking around the table it's a lot of interest. But is this the JIG that's going to be reporting to the front office?

Edmon Chung: Right. Before we send any documents at least previously before we send any initial report or a final report, you know, before we publish anything we would make sure that it's queried.

Right now there's five official members from GNSO and five official members from ccNSO. And so, you know, ten person. But, you know, observers and, you know, participants are absolutely welcome.

So I think we have five minutes left for the third item that we wanted to cover. And we do have some next steps on the single character IDN TLDs.

So IDN variant TLDs just to update everyone so we initially started down the work. We created a couple of initial - well draft - started drafting the initial reports.

And then work was suspended because there was a board resolution on the subject and which led to the creation of the IDN VIP.

We started work in Cartagena not so much working on the draft but working on liaisoning with the IDN VIP study teams and being - having observers on the IDN and IT study teams as well as now looking to observe - being an observer on the IDN VIP Coordination Team.

So this is sort of the progress. And I guess when we start to consider next steps and one of the things that the group will continue to participate in the IDN VIP work I think as they go through this process.

And the other one is I think it might be time - once we get the initial report for the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs out the idea is to come back and talk about the IDN variance issue and consider the case reports and also identify, you know, take a look at the reports so far and take a look at the GNSO and ccNSO policy recommendation so far on the G site, the of course, the IDN working group that was formed for the new GTLD process and see if there

are any changes in the policy that is requirement - required or policy implementation recommendations would suffice.

So the reason for that work I guess is to identify whether, you know, policy work needs to be done at the GNSO and needs to go back to the GNSO and we could start getting that together.

If, you know, we think about the original idea working group and the GNSO recommendations for new GTLDs already suffice then, you know, we could look into what implementation recommendations should be made.

I don't know if at this point sorry I'm putting you on the table Dennis but you want to add anything in terms of the VIP work?

Dennis Jennings: Well there was a presentation earlier today in the public session which I hope many of you got to. And because we're short on time let me just highlight a few things if I may.

The six case studies reports are out for public comment. And the public comment closes on 14th of November.

So I think that's the first suggestion I would make to you that this is the way you can add significant value by reviewing both those issues that are identified and commenting on them.

Secondly the Coordination Team has been formed and met on Saturday Edmon, as you said.

And there's an integrated issues report, a consolidated report of the 16 case studies is the target for publication for comment on the 15th of December. It's actually a pretty short amount of time when we try and look at the issues there and see whether there are common issues or special issues and how we frame that as a single issues report.

The idea is that'll go out for public comment, comments will be back, the report revised and available in time for the ICANN board meeting in Costa Rica.

We are beginning to discuss a third phase which we're tentatively calling the Implementation Phase or the - I don't know if that's the right - Implementation Advisory Phase or whatever it is.

And at this stage we don't know how much technical work or policy work is required in order to implement any recommendations or implementations that will come up.

So we don't have any sense yet of the timeline for that third - for completion of that third phase. Because at one level it might be no. They might say look there are only technical problems to be looked at. There are only policy problems and we'll suspend this until we have some policy input.

At the other level it might be much clearer what the implementation paths are. And we might be able to make recommendations much, much more quickly. But I just don't know at this point.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Sure I want to try to tie the last two topics together here and ask a question.

Is there any indication -- it may be too early to fully determine -- that there any variant issues with single character IDN TLDs? Because if there are that's okay because there's already a procedure for handling.

And if there are then you defer it until the solutions are provided. People could apply but they wouldn't be issued or something like that. But anyway go ahead Cary?

Cary Karp: And if there are in the sense that we initially have been using the term then they will definitely manifest it in a single character space.

I mean the discussion has been can we do this variant thing by comparing one core point with another?

And people have said not really because the issues - there also issues attached to full labels compared with each other.

But if a label and a character are identical then any issues that anybody might find they're going to come slamming into the single character TLD space.

Chuck Gomes: But there's already a plan for handling those if there are so it wouldn't - you would necessarily conclude from that that you needed to delay them until the second round or something like that. It could be handled like other variant issues right?

Cary Karp: I conclude that it probably will be strategically ill-advised to raise that aspect of the question.

If we're looking for a straight answer to what we think is a straight question what you're doing is making the question less straightforward, the issue less straightforward. And that will require investigation so...

Chuck Gomes: And I think you were right there. I was more asking that internally so that we have - we anticipate anything that might occur there.

Edmon Chung: Dennis?

Dennis Jennings: I think the guidebook is quite clear. If there are variance - if there's a claim for variance then they will be noted and reserved.

So if there's a character, a single character asked for and there's a variant of that character or set a variance of that character it will be noted and blocked and reserved but not allocated to the requester.

That's the current position. And therefore we were right into the variant issues because that may not make any sense for the applicant. It might make sense.

Edmon Chung: So on this topic I just want to make clear that the variant issues, there's no special variant issue specific for single characters.

So whether single character do have this ten characters we have the variant issue. So that makes it two separate items for discussion.

With that I think we're the top of the hour. We're just a few minutes over. Wonder if anyone has any additional thing to add?

If not I'll close this session. And all those who are participating, you know, feel free to just send myself or (Jane) an email. And we definitely welcome participants and observers from around the community.

Okay thank you.

END