ICANN Prague Meeting

JIG WG- TRANSCRIPTION

Monday 25th June 2012 at 16:00 local time

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

Edmon Chung: Welcome everyone. I was just told that the - I guess the remote participation room will take another about 10 minutes to get set up, so I'd -- if there's no, you know, violent objection, I will like to get - get it started - get our meeting started here first. And then we'll get connected whenever that's ready.

So thank you everyone for - for joining us. This is the JIG meeting - this is the Joint IDN Working Group between the ccNSO and GNSO, just as a very quick background.

I see some new faces that this is a group that was formed as a mutual charter between the ccNSO and the GNSO to look at issues of common interest about IDNs between ccTLDs and gTLDs.

So we've identified three particular issues of common interest. One is single character IDN/TLDs; the other is IDN Variant TLDs; and the third one is universal acceptance of IDN/TLDs.

Today as we have since this is sort of a working group meeting but an open one during the ICANN meeting, we are just - we're continuing the - the

discussion we had. We had a couple of preparation meetings prior to this one.

And the one with an update from the VIP team good to have (Dennis) here with us. We'll get an update from the VIP team on the IDN Variant TLD issue. And we'll - we'll go into discussion of how perhaps this group can continue to coordinate with VIP and what are the next steps.

The other issue that we'll spend some time on today is the universal acceptance of IDN/TLDs. We are happy that we - to have the staff team working on that here.

I think Kim you're - Kim will be giving us his update. Both updates were sort of provided during our last couple of meetings as well, but since we usually have a better attendance here at ICANN, I thank you both Dennis and Kim for repeating some of that so that it leads us into a discussion of some of the next steps that - that this group can do.

So before I jump into the - the - the actual agenda (Jane) did you want to add anything? Okay, if not, I - I'd like to do a quick roll call of sort of whose around the room and just mention who - who you are. So I'll start with Avri.

Avri Doria: Avri Doria, NCSG and (dotk, LLC).

(Ricardo Badrada):   (Ricardo Badrada) from (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible), ICANN staff and I'm actually on both the variant project and the TLDs.

(Chris):   (Chris), University of College in London.

Gabriella Schittek: Gabriella Schittek, ccNSO Secretary.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung from Dot Asian and also Co-Chair to Jake from the GNSO.

Ching Chiao: Ching Chiao from gTLD also the Co-Chair from ccNSO.

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings the consulting project leader on the IDN Variant issues program.

Man: (Unintelligible), ICANN staff.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes, VeriSign.

(Elise Garrett): (Elise Garrett), ICANN.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Kim Davies: Kim Davies from ICANN.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Andrei Kolesnikov, (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible), just an IDN enthusiastic.

Edmon Chung: Thanks, those around the table if you could introduce yourself or if you wish to or if you don't mind.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Okay, thank you all for being here. Dennis? Thank you - thank you everyone and I see Sarmad coming in. So I - I guess with that I'll - I'll jump right into the agenda. If we do have time by the end after the discussion, I was hoping as a

sort of an AOB to talk a little bit about the future of this working group as well and what we want to do.

So but before that I'll pass it to Dennis who'll give us an update; but I don't know where I should give this - who I should give this first.

Dennis Jennings: So -- are the slides available? I have them on my computer but it's a MAC and I don't have the download for PDF records.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Dennis Jennings: Sure, thank you. There we go.

Woman: That's okay, we'll work the room.

Dennis Jennings: Okay, it's not what I want. Yes, that's it; brilliant, excellent I can claim technical brilliance. It's gone. What did I do? It claims too much. It's got a feature. Okay, for the record this is Dennis Jennings, technician extraordinary. We just got the slides up.

So a quick update on the IDN Variant TLDs program. I'm going to use the same slide deck or almost the same slide deck that we'll be using on Thursday for the public presentation.

I'm going to flip through it rather quickly because don't want to take too much of your time. But encourage you to come to the Thursday session at Noon, 12 o'clock where we go through this in more detail and more detailed questions.

But here's the agenda, look at the program, present the projects in the programs to be completed in 2012-13, that's in fiscal year '13. Summary follow-on projects.

We're going to make some announcements on staff and consultants if we can on Thursday; remind you about the call for volunteers for P2.1 and take questions.

So background, you know the background. We've gone through this a number of times. The various issues project kicked off by a decision of the Board; six case studies developed reports and integrated issues report and a developed published just before Christmas at the end of the year and complete and finalize it in February of 2012.

And arising from that - that the report - the integrated issues report that identified a number of next steps which have been used to define the goals of this program.

The goals to define the process must be in place to enable the management of IDN Variant TLDs so the next step I've identified the issues now define the processes and hopefully implement IDNs at the end of the two stages involved in this program.

A point to note is the work is focused on exchangeable core point variance only. And that is because the advice we got was that whole string variance should not be prioritized at this time.

So based on that we've put out for public comment in March the original timeline which you remember looked like that and we got quite a bit of public comment. And these are the sort of headings that we synopsize the public comment on.

Expand the number of scripts that's implicit in what we do. There's a lot of support for variance TLDs that's implicit of what we do. Prioritization of cold point variance over whole string variance.

And there's - there are arguments made in the inter position's report that shows the difficulty of having any definitive definition of what a whole string variant is.

So rather than delay the program working on that if the advice in the community would defer that, prioritize cold point variance. Meet the individual community needs.

And I'm sure we'll hear more about that in the discussion and try not to advantage or disadvantage any particular script community, that's the feedback we got.

On the basis of that we revised the program plan and published a new one which is out for comment. This is some of the comments that we're now getting, some similar comments.

Some concern about meeting individual script community's needs, concern that ideally IDN variant TLDs will be delegated in the first batch of the new gTLD which I think is unlikely.

Although, if the GAC's idea of early warning is to take four months maybe new gTLDs program will be so delayed that we'll catch up. I shouldn't say things like, (unintelligible).

Collaboration with a technical language community which absolutely as seen as going on as what we're going to do is it's going to be based on a volunteer effort in a number of cases and get the terminology right.

One of the things you may have noticed in the new document that was published as we reverted to IDN tables rather than the label generation rule set.

And we're probably going to revert back because cold point repertoire and label generation rule set are more precise terms that were developed out of the integrated issue study.

And I think it's better to use those although that's a - that's a discussion we're having internally at the moment. So the revised project plan focuses on issues in the critical path.

Project 1 -- and we kept the same project numbering to avoid confusion, so the same numbering in this plan as it was in the original published plan focus on three projects in the program.

The table format two, the process - agreeing the process for creation and maintenance of the - the table for the rule set are labeled generation rule set for the route.

And to study the user experience with active variance to work out how one of the criteria to ensure an acceptable user experience when variance TLDs - IDN Variance TLDs are activated and to reprioritize the other projects.

So as a result of that the revised timeline which is not published and I think the public comment ends this week. Naela, can you -- what's the date for the end of public comment?

Naela Sarras: Well, the public comment ended last Friday.

Dennis Jennings: Sorry, it has ended and we're in the process of summarizing it, sorry. Yes, thank you. So we'll be summarizing the public comments and keep producing the user report.

But here is the timeline -- and as you can see we've prioritized the projects in green: Project 1, Project 2.1 and Project 6 as I've described. And that pulls forward the key decision to go - no-go decision to I think it's April of 2013

when all going well and assuming that there's no objections in the ICANN Board we move on to the next projects.

The projects to be completed are the IDN table format specification of the label generation rule set and the specification of the format of how that rule set is - is expressed that's where it started.

Kim Davies has published a document and it's being discussed and on the technical community. And we'll hear a bit more about that on Thursday. Project 2.1, the process of creating and maintaining the IDN tables for the route zone is the key technical project and it must be completed before any IDN variant TLDs maybe implemented with the key project that we have to develop. The follow-on project is of course to help fill the tables.

And the timeline for that and again we'll go through this in more detail Thursday -- basically this is just - the key to this timeline we'll consult in August with a team of volunteers post the first process in September for public comment.

Second ground of consultation we volunteer teams. Post the final draft process for public comment and publish the process in March of 2013. So that's our goals. If we get going, we should be able to complete this and finalize the agreed community - community-agreed process for the table or the label generation rule set for the route by March 2013 which should then be a key master.

The third project, Project 6 if we use our experience project looking at the implication of that and the key idea is that there must be a predictable reliable, predictable way of handling from the user's perspective interacting with variant TLDs that doesn't create additional user confusion.

And this project of course also has to be completed. The timeline for that is slightly quicker we think. There's a document that we'll be discussing - a

study proposal that we'll be discussing the second half of the meeting on Thursday which should then be published.

We will be executing the study that's proposed a draft report in September. Second public consultation in Toronto, provide the report and publish in January.

So these three projects should be finished by as I say April of 2013 and allow us to proceeds toward implementing the processes and in due course act of delegating and activating IDN variant TLDs.

The follow-on projects are Project 2.2 which is to take the process that's been designed in Project 2.1 and actually fill out the table according to that process whether that is the whole table or are focusing on particular scripts and communities that - that will come out of P2.1 and then you implement that and populate the - the table - the label generation rule set for the route zone in 2.2.

And that may go partly if we take a differential approach that - that allows some communities to proceed more rapidly and that will happen quite quickly - may happen quite quickly in 2013 for some communities.

And then of course we have the more administrative and possibly policy issues updating ICANN's processes and programs and updating ICANN's operations to cope with Variant TLD sets of variance in a - in a TLD set.

So a number of issues have already been identified and more I'm sure will be identified as we go through the project and we flagged a few of them here. Our general thinking is that these issues can be addressed within the current ccNSO and GNSO policy framework in ICANN's operational framework but we don't know that for certain, so there may be policy issues that arise here. And whether those are policy issues that need consensus policies or not. We don't know.

Our working principle is that the current policy framework would be sufficient but we'll have to see. The first is the - an IDN Variant TLD set and whether that's atomic - item. So the ethnicity of IDN variant TLD set what does that mean?

That means can you break them up? Are they a complete set? So once you have an IDN string and its variant it's there's an atomic indivisible satch. So if it's a challenge to one element in the satch one of the variance, then it's a challenge to the complete set ICANN is set to be broken up and what does that mean, that's an issue.

Are there conditions for delegating apart from the technical meeting, the technical requirements that will emerge from the program? One of the evaluation requirements and fees are obviously some issues there and presumably the policy framework of cost of recovery will apply there as well.

Ongoing fees for registries and registrars since we're talking about perhaps multiples here and more work, is that an issue. We think it may be. Requirements for registries and registrars, contractual and other requirements to ensure that whatever rules emerge in this program are implemented by registries and registrars.

Whois and rights' protection mechanism to protect rights which may or may not be infringed by it's string or it's variance which leads back to the first point it's this an atomic unit or not? And I'm sure there will be more issues

And one of the things that we will do as we identify issues is we'll try to encapsulate them and report them to the JIG - to ccNSO, the JIG, the GNSO and so on. So that everybody's aware of the issues as they develop.

Last thing I want to highlight - nearly the last thing I want to highlight is that as in the issues projects we are calling for volunteers for Projects 2.1. We're

looking for volunteers with expertise in DNS/IDNA, Unicode and specialty in linguistics to help us to work out the process for building these tables.

And we ideally like people who have an understanding of ICANN's rules and responsibilities including policy development. Although we don't think that's a key requirement but an understanding of market which this is all happening.

That call is being published, responses should be sent in by the 13th of July. The link is there and we're very keen that we have significant community involvement.

Although having said that, the responses already been so enthusiastic that I think our challenge is not going to be to fill the post but actually to find a way of - of discriminating in some way or selecting in some way - discriminating is not a good word -- finding the right balance between the enthusiasm and a manageable number of volunteers and we have yet sorted that out.

Probably at the order of two people from each community but again there is - there's a discussion to be had around that. So please if you are interested and I know I've talked to a lot of people who are very interested, please volunteer because it is critically important to the credibility of this process that this project is a community-driven process and is agreed by the community.

The session is on Thursday at 12 Noon, please attend and I'm now ready to take any questions.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. Any questions? Seeing no particular question. There's one please can you come to the mic, I think it's -- come to the mic?

(Jason Pollis):   Hi, (Jason Pollis). Have you already gathered a list of IDN strings and variance that are in demand by various ccTLDs and other gTLDs?

Dennis Jennings: Well, the information we have comes from the ccTLD fast track. So we know what IDNs have been asked for there and from the applications from the new gTLDs so that would provide an information base.

But as you know in the new gTLD program the - no variance will be delegated, the variance claimed it will be no good but it will be acted on until this program is delivered the processes that I'm talking about.

Edmon Chung: I have Sebastien and (Andrew) or did you want to jump right into that.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, this very question about the presentation just general question. Looking at the list of applications - gTLD applications of the 15 applications in average script, 11 of them have IDN variance and I mean cold point exchange variance, not just general variance.

I'm just wondering what's happening in other scripts like Sara Lake and China as one, do we have any variance in there too?

Dennis Jennings: I don't have that information. I haven't - I haven't looked at that from that perspective, so I - I can't answer the question. Has anyone had time on the team to look at the applications and the variance?

I don't think we've got to it but thank you for the reminder. We will look at that.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. Actually I guess I missed part of it but you were talking about the new gTLD, the IDN of ones, which ones have variance. I think that's a very interesting aspect and I think that - that gives us real live data of what we're - what we need to handle.

Edmon Chung: (Andrew).

(Andrew Sullivan): (Andrew Sullivan), I was actually just going to ask why we think it's relevant what people are claiming? Because of course what we were saying was that -

that you have to develop the process by which you define those rules and the - in a rule toward variance, before you know whether a variance is there or not.

So I'm just -- three of these now have asserted that, you know, that there are these things that are variance. And I - I - I'm extremely nervous about that assertion. So I'd like to know why we think that's important.

Dennis Jennings: Well, let me pick that up because you're absolutely right. There maybe an assertion that this is a variant by the applicant but we do not know -- we ICANN and we this team do not know the best correct assertion.

And we will not that it's a correct assertion until we've done P2.1 to develop the process. And then P2.2 to fill out the label generation rule set, then we will have the tools that ICANN must have to be able to actually say, yes we agree -- we ICANN agree -- we the community who have built this process and these tables agree that that is a variant.

Until we've done that we can't answer that question. Is that the point you're trying to make (Andrew)?

(Andrew Sullivan): Yes.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis and (Andrew). I guess what was raised, you know, I guess in response to (Andrew)'s question as well I think why there is relevance is perhaps because also that maybe you cannot use that as a user expectation but at least when you -- after we create the tables and after we create the - the process we could use this as a reference to check back and see, you know, whether they reconcile.

And if they do or not, may not be a particular, we can't draw any conclusion at this point yet but there's a definitely good reference. Dennis?

Dennis Jennings: But to fair we expect that all these applications will be made by knowledgeable and responsible people who will then be contributing to the processes and to filling out the tables.

So we do expect that there will be consistency to this. Although I'm just flagging that we don't have the tool to check it so we - we can't - we ICANN we have a responsibility for what is a variant and what is not in the route are not able to say to these applicants we agree that that is a variant or not.

But the positive thing is that if people are being responsible and participate it is likely that those will emerge through this process as variant but not certain.

Edmon Chung: There is some implications as well -- this is Edmon again -- because there currently is - as far as I read the applicant guide book, what is identified there even though we cannot assert it yet what are considered in this sort of consent and consideration.

So the longer we take to - to complete our work the longer it still will be considered contention set. So it is being used in a way currently already. So with that, hope there's any further clarification question.

I'd like to move into a little bit of discussion of how we could continue to support from the JIG how we can continue to support the VIP work. My -- I guess my first question is sort of -- you - Dennis you mentioned that - that you have received more than enough -- well, I shouldn't say that -- a lot of volunteers already.

But I think from the JIG we'd like to encourage more people to - to apply so that you have an even better full of people to select from. But also, one of the things that perhaps we can get - get your sense from is - is whether it is

useful to have an observer from the JIG at the - the new phase of the VIP work.

Previously I guess myself has been acting as a - as an observer and in the previous stages from the JIG. I wonder if that's an area we could explore.

Dennis Jennings: Dennis here again for the record. Yes, I think we on the team and I think the JIG found it useful that observer role. If you did find it useful and you would find it I think useful again to have an observer role in this program, then please make that request.

I'm, you know, I'm or we considered -- I'm not authorized to say yes or no on the fly like this. But yes I think that's - that's - that's a good idea to make that request and we'll come back to you promptly.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis for that prompt preliminary response. With that, you know, I'd like to open to - to other work group members and team members. And see if there is any thoughts on that whether that - that seems to make sense within reporting to and from the - the - the VIP and see if there's any comments or thoughts on that continuing, or at least us suggesting to the VIP that - that's continued. Okay, seeing no particular objection I'll - I'll this for to listen anyway just as a suggestion and - and perhaps we'll put forward a - a suggestion to - to the - the VIP on that.

With that I'd move to another part which I - I'm hoping we would have some discussion is -- Dennis if you could move back to one of the slides about the - the other issues. I think two - one more, yes, this particular one.

I think this - this identified issues you mentioned atomicity, fees, Whois, right's protection, mechanisms, this is I guess for the JIG this might be a very good set of items that we could potentially start looking into in I guess in parallel with the VIP work.

These are certainly issues that touch on pol- ccNSO and GNSO policies. One of the things that the JIG is sort of designed to do is to focus on the policy aspects of these issues.

So I'd like to open it up to working group members or anyone around the table actually to my sort of suggestion maybe that the group start to take this preliminary list on board and look into whether there is policy implications and whether there are need for GNSO or ccNSO policy recommendations, updates or you know clarifications to existing policy recommendations.

So - and you know they include the fees, the registry record for our requirements, WHOIS, rights protection mechanism, I think Dennis first of all thank you for the team for coming up with this list.

Perhaps this form is a beginning of a checklist for us to check back with the two SOs to make sure whether they are you know have policy implications.

So I wonder if anyone has any thoughts or? I was hoping either Chuck or Avri or you know with their much more experience on the GNSO process to offer any thoughts or - Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: May I make a suggestion that we use this list on the upcoming say the first call too so that it can sink in and people can rethink what it has as implications before doing this on the fly.

Man: Sure, but if - you know if anyone here has any initial thoughts then we might be somewhat?

Man: So Dennis I have, question about the first point there and I guess I'm trying to understand whether that's a technical issue which would be handled by IETF or is that something which we need to answer here and develop as a requirement?

So I'm talking about the automaticity of IDNs, it also relates to the concept of having a fundamental label, it also has implications on what are the different states a variant may have.

And also has implications on whether these states actually can change over time. So I guess the question is what's the right forum to answer some of these questions?

Man: Dennis?

Dennis Jennings: Yes, Dennis here again, thank you Sarmad, it's - we're a bit schizophrenic about this list because I'm not sure that we know enough about some of these issues in terms of answering some of the questions that would arise in order to consider whether there's a policy issue here.

So I think more work needs to be done on this particular one. We have come up with a repertoire and the label generation rule set before running along on policies on a hypothetical situation where we may find that it's not possible to do anything else but to consider a variant set as an autonomic unit for technical reasons.

Now right, so on the other hand we don't want to wait so long that a policy issue arises late and has to be considered and will delay the program because we're aware of the anxiety that people want to move on with this program.

And yet on the other hand we don't want to encourage too much policy work too soon in case the technical work says well whatever you say about policy, you know the dynamics of aircraft wings is what holds the aircraft up.

And you can't do anything about it, so I don't know where we are on this, so that's why we're flagging the list of issues, we're not encouraging lots of

policy work because I think when you look at these we don't have enough specific answers on the technical side to give guidance.

And that just responding to what you said Sarmad.

Edmon Chung: I have Chuck next but just a very short comment on this, I think you know that's part of what I sort of raised is that we'd like to for this group to consider whether looking at any graphs that that particular bullet point is due to be struck out and this is not something we could consider at this point.

But you know there might be some that you know for example the evaluation process, the fees, you know if there is a variant TLD delegated that certainly needs some kind of process and perhaps that's an area that's more clear cut.

But anyway, Chuck, and then I'll come back to this one.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Edmon, just looking at your list first of all I think Dennis is right, we don't have enough information on most of these cases to really get too specific in terms of what's needed or even start to develop policy.

If I look at the first one you know that looks like maybe more a technical issue, although maybe not. But until we know more it's - how do we tell, maybe it's both.

Conditions for delegating I assume that relates to ccTLDs, am I correct? Delegating IDN variants, although I guess it would relate to gTLDs eventually if someone applied for a gTLD variant or wanted to implement one so I guess it does apply to both doesn't it.

As you can tell I'm thinking out loud as I go. Evaluation requirements and fee, that's - there's a third category I think, you've got technical policy or both, then you've got implementation details.

And I think that evaluation requirements and fee probably is an implementation topic, once you know what kind of costs are involved to make this thing happen.

Very much like the new gTLD process, ongoing fees for registries and registrars is similar, I think the same category as the previous one. Requirements for registries and registrars, that sounds like it could be a policy issue because to make some of these things happen and require adoption across all registries and registrars, you're going to need a consensus policy.

Now you know this is going to sound unbelievable but maybe because of the technical work that's done that's not a terribly complicated policy issue, some people think I'm being naïve and I sometimes have a tendency to do that.

But I do think that's probably a policy issue of some degree of it anyway. WHOIS output, that's kind of being worked already in the various WHOIS things that are going on, now some of that work may need to be tweaked, with regard to IDN variants.

But you know the - I hope that the foundation for that is being set once we know the details of the variants, we're going to have to go back and probably revisit that and see if any tweaks are necessary.

Why it's protection mechanisms, again I may be wrong on this but I think the foundation set for that, it may have to be clarified with regard to whatever comes out of variants.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Chuck Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussein: So it's at least for me firstly it's hard to disassociate the first item from all the rest in the list. The questions I raised on statuses, the end of statuses has actually begin several of the items on the list here.

So I think it's an economic issue which has to be solved. I don't think we can separate it out with that easily.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Sarmad and with that and on Chuck's point about the requirements registries and registrars that sort of I think is a good segue into our next topic which is universal acceptance.

Because that might be one of the things that we want to encourage a policy for. With that I move to jump right to (Tim) who will give us an update. I know we're running short in time but (unintelligible) moving.

I don't know if someone needs to flip a switch somewhere but I've plugged into this monitor cable up here. Please bear with us while we get hooked up. Okay we do have a question from the Adobe Connect room. Can't quite get exactly what it says.

But I'll read it out see if anyone understands it better than I do. One of the issues would be clear instructions on how IDN dot IDN gTLDs would be handled for registrants as currently there is much confusion.

I'm not quite sure that the question - so the person who's online if you can elaborate a little bit. But (Chris), you want to take a pass?

(Chris): I mean I'm guessing that it's stuff about second level IDNs and third level IDNs and whether there are any differences between the top level ones and other levels.

Edmon Chung: So Dennis you want to...

Dennis Jennings: If I may, just to emphasize that this program is all about the top level. But the experience that's developed in this top level particularly in user experience

and user acceptability may provide considerable amount of guidance to registries at second and lower levels.

But formally this project is only about the top level.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis, now I move to (Tim).

(Tim): Thanks Edmon. So I'm going to explain to you some work that's being done within ICANN on universal acceptance of all TLDs. For those that aren't aware within the stakeholder relations group of ICANN they've been driving an effort to improve ICANN's contribution to this particular field.

Given that that group is not actually here, I've drawn the short straw to present this slide deck to you.

Now the slide actually says universal acceptance of all TLDs but really what it's about is ensuring that software on the internet, universally accepts all domains, so it's not really just from that perspective at least it's not just IDN TLDs, although I know that's (unintelligible) and it's not even just TLDs.

But you know if you enter a valid domain name into a piece of software it should work. It's really that simple. And to be clear the notion of driving universal acceptance, it's not so much about policy, we're not talking about what TLDs should be allowed or not allowed.

Whether it's ccTLDs or gTLDs, what we're saying is that once a domain name is in the root, once it's in the DNS, obviously it's got through the policy hurdles by that point.

Once a domain name exists it should work. Just to illustrate some of the usability problems, you can run into on a day to day basis, on the left we have an illustration of a piece of software where you know if you enter example.com it gets hyperlinked that becomes clickable.

But if you enter a number of other domain names, be it new word gTLD, IDNs or even ASCII based representation of IDNs you don't have similar amount of luck.

Then on the right we have an illustration of actually entering in a fully valid domain name, but again in a recently created TLD.

So if you type in registry dot sx and then at least when your snapshot was taken a few weeks ago Google's web browser won't even take you there.

But then it will strangely enough present you with a prompt saying did you mean to go to this website?

So both of these are illustrations of software that is trying to intelligently detect what are the TLD and what is not?

And failing in the process. Here's another example of another approach that is problematic which is a form for a US Bank, the (unintelligible) for an email address and whatever reason they have a drop down box that forces you to select a TLD and no surprise to anyone here but that list is woefully deficient in terms of the entire 313 TLDs introduced right now.

Some of the causes that we see for these kinds of problems, obviously there's improper logic and software for checking for valid domains. You know whatever reason the software developer has chosen an approach but the approach doesn't suit the actual circumstances.

Perhaps they had a notion of what they thought were valid TLDs but didn't quite think it through fully. Clearly and again of interest to this group lack of IDNA support.

If you want to be able to adequately support IDN domain names you need to have some notion of IDN support in your software. Another point is that software may have already had all these deficiencies corrected but we see significant install basis.

Edmon Chung: Apologies for cutting this short, but because we're running out of time I - if you could perhaps focus a little bit on the next steps, what the team is looking to do and then that leads into some of the discussions of how perhaps the JIG can coordinate.

Because you mentioned one particular thing which is that it is not just an IDN TLD issue, but what it - what IDN TLDs does do is that it makes it a common interest issue between ccNSO and GNSO and that's the reason why we're focusing it on it here.

And we can get the support from the ccTLDs to help in the outreach and in the awareness. So apologies for jumping in but that might be a direction.

(Tim):   Sure, no problem, I'm always happy to speak less. So the activities that we've done today on this topic, there's a section on the ICANN website on this particular issue, provides some information about the topic.

We've also created a TLD verification tool, probably not the best terminology there but essentially what it is is some reference card that implementers that want to implement checks the right way can take a look and either use that card if it's applicable to their situation.

Or be inspired on how they might want to do it. Now this work was done about five years ago. It does need to be updated and the topic of future work possibly one of those areas is to invest some more resources into improving that code.

It's open source and it's posted on our hub so we welcome third party contributions to that. We've been doing consultations such as this one, with (unintelligible) stakeholders.

And we've developed some technical recommendations in terms of how implementers might want to address the problem. But going forward some of the ideas that have been discussed and I'd stress that it's mostly at the ideas phase, there hasn't really been significant work since Costa Rica on this by the team, is what - performing some kind of outreach campaign and what would that look like, you know?

We have actually prepared a fact sheet for distribution here but due to the vagaries of printing it's not ready yet, but we expect some time this week it will be ready for dissemination to take a look at and obviously to the broader ICANN community.

I mentioned improving those verification libraries, I think above and beyond improving them right now data and actually support IDN our current recommendation is if you need to check TLDs get this slide ready, if you need to spoil IDNs there's a whole bunch of other libraries.

But maybe we benefit from those merging together. We want to have good information and educational materials so the community can point to some kind of mutual resource that advise us how to support this correctly.

And primarily you know we're looking for suggestions from you. You know we certainly don't have a monopoly on what the right approach is here and any advice, experiences that you've had trying to convince or support those that wish to support domains correctly, they can help feed into our work and better prioritize what ICANN can do and what this team can do.

You know we only have limited resources and if we can tie to that is most usefully as possible and be very useful for us to have.

I'll skip this because it's not really tied to the JIG but we have an email address that goes to the team. And they will receive emails to them with suggestions.

But equally going to take notes on any suggestions you might have here or throughout the week.

So thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you (Tim), any particular questions, can someone help flip to my - I guess the other swing? Should be connected, but just need to - so any - if not I guess one of the things that we want to start the discussion on is perhaps as you mentioned some of the suggestions of what staff perhaps the team can help do.

That's one of the things that from the discussion previously we are looking at coming up with some suggestions for further work by the staff team and so we'd like to get a sense of how we can help should any work be coordinated and you know how - what can - you know basically from the work that has already been done, anything that could be summarized or crystallized for you.

The - sorry - this is mine but I'm jumping back and forth so it would be very difficult for you to - unfortunately for the online to take a look at but we did - the JIG did put out an initial report on the subject, public comments were received and there's a number of - a report on the comments as well.

Generally supporting the direction and also has a number of suggestions of what the JIG should do. So I'll - one of the things I wanted to start some discussion on and I know we're running out of time but part of the plan is to as we in the last few discussions at the conference calls is to look at coming - working on a final report from this group.

And focusing on the policy aspects, whereas suggesting through the work for the staff team from some of the comments that we've received in the public comments.

And I know (Tim) you mentioned that there is not policy aspects to this issue but at least from the discussions at the JIG we found one particular policy that is relevant to registries and registrars and that is the - it's own - the requirement for registries and registrars to accept IDN TLDs or universal acceptance of TLDs.

What I mean by that is registries and registrars have taken contact information or to either WHOIS, the registrar provides WHOIS and stuff, they themselves when they collect an email address for example, does that system support universal acceptance of TLDs?

That itself is a potential requirement for registries and registrars to at least accept all the TLDs that ICANN - you know in the ICANN root.

So for example with the new gTLDs added a registrar in their system should you know should not disallow that to be an email for contact for example.

So that's certainly at least one of the areas that we have identified that is relevant because I guess at least our own registries and registrars should support universal acceptance.

Please.

(Wally):   Sorry, (Wally) from (Finick), since Edmon just mentioned the email, yes, we had a talk - we had a panel discussion about the universal TLD especially for IDN TLD in Costa Rica and after that actually I think the email address would support the IDN should be a big issue and we should consider it later.

Actually the SMTB extension for IDN email address has published - extension has been published in March and the standard for the (unintelligible) was published in August.

But as far as I noticed of that, few mail service support the IDN TLD I mean for the new address. I think more and more people will use the native language of the mail address so it is easy to remember, compared with the ASCII mail address.

Especially for those native languages not English, so that's my suggestion.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Any other comments, suggestions, thoughts? If not we have run out of time I believe and...

(Wally):   Edmon, I'm sorry, another suggestion for the VIP, I'm sorry I didn't reveal earlier but I think it's not too late. Actually...

Edmon Chung: If it's specific on the VIP then we can wait on Thursday at VIP meeting I guess, right and if you have suggestion for the JIG to follow up on the VIP then bring it here.

(Wally):   Okay, if the time isn't up I will take about one minute about it. Okay, we noticed - the new gTLD application has been published and we noticed that some of the - most of the members for Chinese domain name, I'm sorry I mentioned Chinese domain name again because about 75% of the application for IDN is for Chinese domain name.

That most of the applicants applied for simplified, pure simplified or pure traditional ones because they are waiting for the adherence policy to make sure that if it will be peer delegated or not.

And some other applicants applied for both traditional and simplified because I think they are not - they are still waiting for the policy, they don't know what kind of policy it will be.

So they applied it both so I just wondered if there are - now there are two kinds of application, one is for pure simplified or pure traditional and another is for both traditional and simplified so I'm not sure if it will influence our work on the variants.

Dennis Jennings: I guess that's addressed to me, Dennis Jennings here. I guess I have to be a little formal because I have no rights or responsibilities or knowledge of the gTLD program and the application.

So anything I say has no way, you know I'm not authorized to say anything and I don't know enough to say anything.

But I do understand that what you say is correct, that there have been a number of applications for a simplified Chinese string, a number of applications for a traditional and in one case two separate applications, one for a traditional and one for a simplified.

Which if one were to use the what we understand as the existing tables in - from - so basically if I see the NC in relation to the fast track payer, would be considered variants.

Now I can't comment on how the gTLD team are going to deal with that. But it is certainly going to inform us of the sort of issues that ICANN will have to address and the sort of tools that ICANN will need, must have out of the gTLD program.

It also says there is a mismatch in timing, that really the IDN variant TLD program should have been started and completed a number of years ago.

But as a good friend of mine says, disarming simplicity, we are where we are, which of course is a nonsense statement.

And there's nothing much we can do about it. I - speaking personally I think the new gTLD evaluation team will find a way of dealing with this but I'm not authorized to say that.

Edmon Chung: I think that's a very good question that you raised but again we're running out of time. And - but this might be one of the cases where perhaps the JIG can look into whether there is actually a policy for doing that.

I don't know whether - if we have Chuck here, I don't know whether you want to add or if there's anything you want to respond to.

Chuck Gomes: You're probably talking about some of our applications, right? I think - I don't know either how it would be handled, certainly one of the things that is encouraged in the guidebook is that applicants you know work together to resolve any situation.

So in the case where two strings were applied for separately, one in simplified for example and one in traditional that would be variants of each other.

The two applicants could reach some sort of an agreement, maybe let one go and one not, you're already aware that I can tell by watching you.

And of course if it's the same applicant that's probably a fairly easy negotiation. The - how they would handle it beyond that I better not guess at, I think I'm going to take Dennis's position on that.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And with that I'll - I guess I'll close the session and hopefully for those of you who are not yet on the JIG mailing list and you're interested, please just you know drop me an email or tell me immediately.

We're quite open to have more participation in our discussions. I think hopefully you will get more coming out of the group. So thank you everyone and...

Man: Thank you Edmon for the opportunity, thank you.

END