Edmon Chung:	So just let everyone know this is the JIG meeting, we're having a little bit of technical difficulties right now, and we're waiting for them to get sorted out and we'll get started shortly.
	Okay, just an update, we have a tie communications issue right now that we're working on. We do have remote participants, so we did want to get that up, before we get started, it should be another, I guess few minutes. Sorry for the delay.
Male:	Wendy, can you hear me? Wendy, are you there? Wendy.
Edmon Chung:	Okay, so the recording is started, is it? So we can -- I guess we can start.
Male:	Yes.
Edmon Chung:	Okay, thank you everyone for joining and apologies for the delays, and thank you for the patience of waiting. This is the JIG meeting, the Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Group meeting. So we're -- as discussed in our last meeting, actually conference call, today we're going to focus on IDN variant TLDs, a discussion especially in light of the proposed IDN variant studies.

And we're happy to have Dennis and his team here to talk to us a little bit about the -- the proposed studies, and what's happening next, and we're also happy to have Suzanne here with us, who will be giving us an update on the activities -- related activities from IETF.

I guess the bulk of the meeting we hope to talk a little bit more about is what each of us, or each of the groups would be doing and focusing and why don't we get started with Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you very much, indeed, and thank you for the invitation to join your meeting.

Edmon Chung: Apologies, Dennis, I forgot to do one very important thing. I wanted to go around the room just to -- around the table so -- for everyone just say who you are and where you're coming from just for the roll call, sorry about that, Dennis.

Han Chuan Lee: Hi, my name is Han Chuan from Singapore, Sgnic.

George Victor: Hello, I am George Victor from Egypt, IDN/ccTLD.

Bart Boswinkel: Bart Boswinkel, ICANN support staff.

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings here as project leader on the IDN Variant Issues project.

Sarmad Hussain: Sarmad Hussain from Pakistan.

Male 2:   (inaudible) from India.

Male 3:   (inaudible) from Sedec, India.

Steve Sheng: I'm Steve Sheng, ICANN support staff.

Male 4:   Hi, this is (inaudible) from CNIC, .cn.

Francisco Arias: Francisco Arias, ICANN staff.

Andrew Sullivan: Andrew Sullivan from Shinkuro.

Gary Karp: Gary Karp, .museum.

Ricardo Pedraza: Ricardo Pedraza, VeriSign.

Xiaodong Lee: Xiaodong Lee from CNIC.

Male 6:   (inaudible), VeriSign.

Suzanne Woolf: Suzanne Woolf, ISC and ICANN board.

Chris Disspain: Chris Disspain, ccNSO.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung, .asia.

Jen Chow: Jen Chow, APTLD.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Andrei Kolesnikov, .RU and .RF.

Gabriella Schittek: Gabriella Schittek, ccNSO, secretariat.

Kim Davies: Kim Davies, ICANN.

Edmon Chung: And if we can, if those around the room just maybe walk in front and just introduce --

Ron Chovetz: Ron Chovetz, ccNSO, ALAC liaison.

Sarah Won: Sarah Won, I'm (inaudible), I'm from (inaudible) China.

Rob Christie: Rob Christie from ShortSwitch.

Lyman Chapan: Lyman Chapan with the ccTLD Fast Track program.

Daniel Kalchev: Daniel Kalchev from registrar .BG.

Male 7:   (inaudible), registrar .BG.

Edmon Chung: Thank you so much and just a reminder for everyone before you speak just let us know who you are for the scribes and the recording. Dennis, now back to you, sorry about it.

Dennis Jennings:	Thank you, Dennis Jennings here. Thank you very for the invitation to join you again. I think we found the discussion on the telephone of the last meeting very helpful and very useful. But I'd just like to very briefly introduce the ICANN IDN Variant Issues Project, or some people are now calling it the IDN VIP, which I like.

But I emphasize it's the variant issues project. The goal of the project is to establish what are the issues. What is the problem to be solved? Not to solve it, but to identify the issues. And as you see up on the overhead projector there, it's -- the proposal is that there will be five study cases in Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, Indic and Latin on the individual issues.

The membership will be as listed DNS security policy linguistics registry operations and community representatives will be the membership of the teams as we envisage it. The outcome will be an issues report on general and the case specific issues by the 15th of December, that's our target.

The proposal has been put on the web on the ICANN website for public comment, which closes on the 6th of April, so we're very keen to get public comment. It's a draft, obviously, at this stage for the project, and we want public comment, we want feedback, so that we can refine it, and have a proper project, a good project plan that's accepted by the community. And we're launching the project

at a public session on Wednesday of this week at 2:30 p.m. or 14:30 in the Elizabethan A-C room. So that is the project. That's what we're trying to do.

We're trying to, in the launch; we have a number of speakers, and Kim do you have the list of the speakers there that you might run through for us?

Kim Davies: I do. Introductions by Kurt Pritz and Francisco Arias, and then we have five experts of which four are in the room, so -- Dr. Hussain, Dr. Lee, Dr. Kokunai, Dr. Karp, and Irrenia DeNelio will be speaking.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you for that. The goal of the launch is to develop public awareness of the project, and to invite participation and to get as much participation from as many people with expertise in the ICANN community and in the language communities as possible involved in the project.

We've already learned from the discussions we've had already that calling one of the case studies Indic is far too broad, it's not a single script; it's a whole collection of many, many scripts, so we're probably going to refine that, and that's one of the things we'll discuss about on Wednesday.

The first task in the project will be to identify the people who come forward from the community to do the work. And so one of the things we'll be discussing on Wednesday is how to go about that. We're looking for a community-driven project; the team is to support the project, not to dictate the project, that we're looking for input from the community and volunteers from the community.

And how we collectively; we, the community collectively select the teams is an important first step. And then the next important step is how we support those teams to get the work done; so there's lots of open questions that we don't have answers to, and we'd like input on that, both at the meeting and in the public common forum is how we bring this project forward. That's really all I have to say at this session, Edmon thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. Chris, you were talking earlier that you might want to add, and I know you might need to leave soon.

Chris Disspain: Thanks, Edmon, thanks everyone and thanks Edmon and hi everyone. I'm time constrained, I'm afraid so that's why I get to get the microphone now. I just wanted to give you an update on where the ccNSO is with this particular issue of variants, because it has an effect on the JIG.

So the IDN policy development process Working Group one which is the Working Group that's concentrating on the actual IDN policy

rather than ccNSO bylaw change policy has reached a point where it's effectively completed its work, well almost anyway completed its work, with the exception of dealing with the variant issue. We -- this is a great initiative and we applaud it, it's solves for us a major problem, which is that you know -- there doesn't seem to be any understanding of what a variant actually is. So for us it's great.

And what we will do is we will effectively -- we will effectively suspend work on the IDN PDP on the policy side of the PDP, pending the outcome of this study. That when I say suspend work, what I mean the Working Group itself doesn't need to gather to discuss stuff, we're very happy to be involved in the thing.

And I would suggest that the JIG might want to take a similar view, which is cooperation in this particular study Group is a really sensible thing to do, and it may be counter productive to be having a separate set of discussions in the JIG, rather than just concentrating on putting effort into helping Dennis' Group get the study Group done -- study done rather, and then you know coming back to talking about the higher level issues, because we'll actually have some examples of what we think variants are, I'm guessing, I mean you know because its not how he solved the problem, Dennis, but it's how we -- its what is the problem.

Dennis Jennings: Don't try and take me down, we know what the problem is we hope.

Chris Disspain: That's what I mean, yes. So and that was what I wanted to say, I mean you know it's at the end of the day, it's the JIG's -- it's the JIG's call, but I think it would probably be a useful -- useful for you to be, you know as involved as possible in the study Group, and I would be -- be a little careful about doing a heap of work, because really we are going to wait for Dennis' Group to come back and report, do you want to use the microphone, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Bart Boswinkel.   There is one more issue but that's more procedural and it is because the JIG reports back to the ccNSO counsel and the GNSO counsel and if the JIG would continue and say the Working Group is in hibernation, then we have -- decisions of counsel has to deal with the recommendations of one Group, and need to feed that back into the Working Group, while there is no Working Group working. So it becomes very, very complex.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Chris, and thank you Bart. I think this is one of the subjects that specifically we're talking about today, and we started this discussion in our last conference call. At the first look at it, it seems to me at least that there may be areas that we can work in parallel, which would help the overall roll-out of IDN Variant TLDs in a more timely manner. So that might be something -- you know this is something that we are -- can be in here, especially this meeting hopefully to talk about.

And one possible scenario is of course is to focus all our efforts in the studies and then you know come back and re-convene, that's one possible scenario. There's another possible scenario is you know we see some distinct items that we can -- that's worthwhile to work on in parallel, so just --

Chris Disspain: And as I said, that's -- ultimately that's your call, just -- but just be aware that from the ccTLD point of view the -- there is a cc body in PDP running, and I wouldn't want your work to come out where there's no vessel in the cc to take it, and then have to come and revisit that work later and then maybe not agree with it, because of what Dennis has done. I don't mean that to sound the way it sounded, Dennis, but you know what I mean.

So I understand there may be some specific topics that you want to deal with, I'm just saying what we're losing right now, because we really don't have any choice, is we're losing the -- we don't have a repository for your -- because we want to wait for -- we want to wait for Dennis' work.

Edmon Chung: Time-wise, I think it's about similar timeframe that we're looking at anyway, towards the end of the year, you know as the report comes out, so I think it seems to me that it might work well.

Okay, so I guess -- I'd like to move on, and I guess then with Suzanne for an update on the IETF work, and then I'll come back

to the update on the JIG, and then some thoughts actually on the particular issue that Chris mentioned about is you know how we might see the division of work. So Suzanne?

Suzanne Woolf: Sure, I don't -- yeah, I don't need the monitor down, because I have to admit I did not prepare slides, I did not think I would be in this meeting, I thought I was going to be even more stuck in another meeting, because as usual everybody is tripled booked around here. So my apologies for that.

I'm going to note a couple things to start with. First of all, I'm speaking here as an individual contributor in the IETF, and I'm also going to note that the Chair of DNSSEC Working Group is Andrew Sullivan down the table from me, so I'm going to defer to him on a couple of specific points.

When I talked to -- I'm trying to reckon how many people that are here now, were in this session when I spoke in Cartagena, but briefly the work going on in the IETF in the DNS EXT Working Group which is where DNS protocol issues and problems are considered. And what we're doing there is kind of the flip side of what Dennis described as the problem statement for the variant project that ICANN is doing, that's oriented on policy and user experience and the human side, and as I understood what I've heard about this.

The flip side of what we're doing is trying to figure out in the context of the DNS protocol, whether and what kind of issue there is where some modification to the DNS might assist with supporting IDN Variants. That very much over simplifies the issue that has to be sort of -- sort of deconstructed, and that's frankly one of the -- one of the challenges there, but at the high level, that's what we're trying to do.

There is a problem statement document that exists largely because people had started to propose technologies, without having any real basis for figuring out whether those technologies would solve the problems people actually have in this space. So we've been working on the problem statement; that effort has been going on for a while, and we would like to wind it up soon, but again, I'll defer to my Chair on that.

But the current status, I actually just this afternoon, shipped a revision to the problem statement document which I will send you the -- I'll send the URL so you can put it to the mailing list, but we do need further comment on that, and when DNS EXT meets at the IETF in two weeks that will be a major topic.

There is also an informal session and Dennis and Kim's team set up for later this week, Thursday, that's an opportunity to talk informally about what the set of issues that is being discussed here and in Dennis' project, looks like to the DNS protocol people, you know at this very -- the very low level. So that's sort of the high level and if Andrew has anything to add.

Andrew Sullivan:

Andrew Sullivan. So the -- and I am speaking with my DNS EXT's Working Group hat on, the important thing to get from what Suzanne was saying is that from the IETF point of view, we only know that there's work to be done if people are saying on the mailing list, or showing up at meetings and saying, hey, there's still work to be done here. So if we don't get feedback on the draft that Suzanne and Xiaodong have been working on, then we will think that you know everything's done, and we're just going to go ahead and publish that document and think that that is the statement of the problem that we need to solve.

If that document doesn't -- if the draft doesn't say now, here is the set of stuff that reflects the problems that you think you have, then we're going to be working on the wrong problem, and we're going to come back with a solution that doesn't solve any of the things that you need solved. So it's sort of super critical that we hear sort of now, or in the next couple of weeks, you know you've missed something, or you've covered something. I don't need text.

I don't need you to tell me here is all the stuff that's wrong with what you've done. I don't even need that much, but if you just sort of scan it and say oh, wow, there's really big hole, you've missed something really important, it would be super important to hear that now, because once I -- you know once the IETF machine gets moving, it tends to just kind of roll along in its weird internal process. So I'm --

Suzanne Woolf: Kind of like ICANN.

Andrew Sullivan: Well, I'm just nervous that you know that we're missing something really important. We've been -- we've been trying for about a year now to get a lot of info; we've been going around, we've been having special sessions at IETF meetings, and I have often felt like we have not been talking to the right people. Maybe this is the room that you know we needed to be talking to, I don't know, but you know I'm begging you, please, if you have something to say about what we think we're talking about and we've got it wrong, now would be a really good time to know it.

                       Because I can -- you know I can make this go longer, I can collect more information, but once we've published the document, that's going to be the marching orders for my Working Group and we're going to go ahead and build something on that basis. And I really, really hate to build stuff that is useless. I want to build something that's actually useful; because I don't want to do all that work for nothing. I'm lazy.

Suzanne Woolf: Yeah, what he said. Yeah, and one of the things we've noticed in the course of having this conversation in various venues is that there's a way in which the interest -- generally a representative within the ICANN process and the way that the IETF works,

EN

people don't -- these are not groups and the concern is they generally overlap very well, so we've been sort of trying to find our feet as far as Andrew says, making sure that the right people are being solicited for input, which is you know why I and Xiaodong have been working on the document, why Andrew is here, you know in this meeting, and these meetings with the project this week.

And I think as the document editor, I'm happy to keep working on it, as long as it seems the substantive work on it is getting done. The situation I really don't want to be in, I don't think any of us wants to be in is where we might eventually get more useful input so we're not -- we're going to stop moving on trying to close the work item.

So as Andrew says, we don't need your final input, we don't need a comprehensive analysis, but it would be really helpful if when we send the URL to the document to this Group, that people that have opinions express them, and let us have that input.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Suzanne, and we're sort of informal liaison to that work. Avery is unfortunately not here with us today, but she has mentioned that she would draft something for consideration for the Group to send over to that particular document. I wonder what's the -- is there sort of a timeline that we're looking at?

Andrew Sullivan:	Yeah, I guess this is working. This is Andrew again. We are meeting, in fact the reason we're having a DNS Extension session in the Prague meeting in like two weeks is because of that draft, that's the only reason we ended up having the meeting.

So you know we've been going on this for about a year, and what happens with groups of engineers is if you don't let them go, they'll start to build stuff anyway. So I want to -- you know I want us to be building the stuff that solves the problem, and not some random thing that some DNS guy thought was a good idea. Because we'll build something that's really fun for us, not something that's useful for anyone and that will be less -- less valuable.

So it's like in the next couple of weeks would be really helpful, especially if it's just you know -- we've got issues with this, we don't have -- like what we're going to say about it yet, but we've got some issues, I'm warning you now, even that will give me you know sort of a procedural way to sort of stop work and say okay, I'm waiting for more input. I just need -- you know I just need a little bit of -- a nudge or something that tells me you know there really is some concern, or we just haven't analyzed it yet, but we're going to, that would be very, very helpful. |
| Edmon Chung: | Thank you Andrew. I guess I'll just open up for -- if anyone want to add first, because I understand that a lot of people have time constraints here, before I give a sort of update of what the JIG is working on in relation to this, and how we see us working together. |

Anyone want to add to what -- you know ask Dennis, Suzanne or Andrew -- well, seeing none -- oh, Dennis, please.

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings again. To Suzanne and to Andrew, what are the time scales are we looking at if there is a problem statement that we can give you that can -- that there is a technical solution to address that problem statement? What sort of time scales are there between stating the problem and it being an implementable solution in the DNS?

My impression is that there's a significant gap and that if one is looking for a short term solution, then modification to the DNS protocol are not a short term solution, but I'd like clarification on that.

Andrew Sullivan: Right, so this is Andrew again. The -- the short answer to your question is if any protocol change is required in order to solve your problem, then you're out of luck, because there's no way to guarantee, this is a really central issue in the DNS, we simply cannot you know reboot the internet.

And the only thing that you can do in the DNS is say here we're got this extension, and hope that people are using it, right? Every single computer in the World is using the DNS today, and if what we have to do is deploy something across the entire internet before

EN

it works, then the effective deployment time for that is infinity. It will never happen.

If however, the answer is we have something that works along with the DNS, and for people who want the feature, they can use it, but for people who don't care about the feature, it doesn't affect them, that's a different story. That's very much like what we did with IDNA, right? People who want IDNA, they have to have an IDNA enabled application; they have to have a browser that speaks IDNA or something like that. But if you want to use Netscape version one, because you don't believe in this IDNA nonsense, you go ahead and do it, it just doesn't work for you, and you don't care.

So part of the question and this is really one of the problems that we've had in the Working Group in the IETF Working Group, we don't know what kind of requirement there is for this. Is this something that really has to work for everybody immediately out of the gate? Because if that's what the requirement is, then what we have to say is we need a new DNS, we need a DNS version two and the time scale for that is probably 25 years.

If the answer is no, no, we want something that can work more or less, and we're willing to put up with a lot of compromises in order to get something that works pretty well most of the time, sort of; then the answer is you know well you can do that fairly quickly. And that -- that trade off is a policy question. It's a question for people about what kind of life you want to you know live with.

That's something that as a protocol guy, I simply cannot answer, I just don't know what the trade off is.

So I need information from user groups; I need information from operators, I need that kind of information to be able to say where is the pain; why is it bad -- one answer is just do everything with a plain old delegation today, you can to that tomorrow, we can turn on right now, it's already working in some places.

So there are a lot of different trade offs, but we hear for instance for that particular example, no that's too costly, it's got too many moving parts, we can't work that way. So it's those trade offs that we really need to understand in order to deploy something that's going to be useful.

If you let the protocol engineers do it, they'll make you a nice fancy protocol that doesn't solve your problem. But to answer your question directly, there's a really huge range here, and part of the answer to your question is going to come out of this needs analysis.

Suzanne Woolf: Can I add to that. In my day job, I work for an implementer of DNS protocol that actually ships software that people are expected to use; and yeah, the key thing is that there is a range of possibilities here, and the protocol people can't decide for the users, what are the worthy trade offs. We can lay them out, if we have enough information to form them, we lay them out in the

problem statement, and we say you can have this, but it will take this long, you can have something that gets you 80% there in half the time, that's not our decision to make, but we got -- that's what we have to do as far as any of the requirements. And that's what we need the input for.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Suzanne. Dennis, did you want --

Dennis Jennings: No, just to say thank you.

Edmon Chung: So I see no further urgency, urgent -- no waving hands. I want to step back a little bit. I know there are people around the room, that's probably first joining this meeting. I apologize for jumping right into it, because I know that a few people are time constrained, so we jumped right into the discussion, but I'm going to you know take one step back first, and talk a little bit about what the JIG is about.

So for those of you who just joined us, or just joined in this -- this meeting, JIG is actually Joint ccNSO and GNSO IDN Working Group, and we were formed by a mutual Charter between the GNSO and the ccNSO; we're one of the first cross-community Working Groups.

And we were formed to focus on issues of common interest about IDNs between the ccNSO and the GNSO. So we started bi-weekly calls in March about a year ago now, we identified three issues of common interest.

First of all, single character IDN TLDs; second is IDN TLD Variants, which we have spent a little bit of time talking about just now; and third of all is a Universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. And we had a face-to-face meeting in Brussels, as well as in Cartagena. We had a public session in Cartagena focused on single character IDN TLDs, we're -- well we're having the face-to-face meeting here now in San Francisco, this is the JIG meeting, and just quickly on single character IDN TLDs.

We went through a process of an initial report public comment period for that, summarized the comments, incorporated it into its final draft -- final draft, final report which went out for public comments late last year as well, that is now complete. And we have drafted a final -- final, final report which will go to the respective councils, essentially takes the existing work from various policy development processes, the GNSO IDN Working Group, it took work from the IDN C, the IDN fast track -- the Group that created the fast track. It also took work from the IDN implementation team, and we've created a final report incorporating the public comments and the responses to the public comments we've received from the initial and draft final reports.

And we put out a number of implementation recommendations, and I think the key focus is that we -- we are recommending that single character IDN TLDs should be allowed and we have some specific sort of operative evaluations that we would suggest to void or mitigate against certain issues. And they were incorporated also in suggested -- in a form of suggested changes, suggested edits to the IDN ccTLD fast track implementation plan as well as for the gTLDs in the new gTLD applicant guidebook, so it comes in forms of suggested edits.

So please take -- take a look at it, it was posted as well. The next steps for that one is that once we finalize it, we will pass this back to the ccNSO and the GNSO respectively, and then it will be up to the ccNSO and the GNSO separately to consider further actions, of course, our recommendations would be for them to adopt the final report, and pass it on to -- to staff for staff and board, for implementation, that's the idea.

Now back to the discussion of today, it's the IDN Variant TLDs. And so just as a background to let -- get everybody updated, we did start work on initial report mid of last year, and then we suspended work, as -- well actually Chris mentioned that was -- when we first heard of the board resolution that request staff to create studies on IDN Variants on the TLD level, we suspended work, and we waited for the staff to update us.

We had an update in Cartagena. We had updates a month ago as well, and today I think one of the most important parts is talk to

Dennis and the team that's working on the IDN Variant studies. So and just to let everyone know, we did identify when we were creating the draft from the JIG, we did identify a number of policy aspects including what a TLD Variant is, number one. And number two, the types of TLD -- IDN Variants, but we were focusing more on the allocation and delegation properties versus the linguistic properties, if you will.

And also policy operators and once they are determined to be certain types, what then should be done with them, and then the requirements for the TLD operator, as well as when additional IDN TLD Variants would be added, what subsequent processes should be in place.

These are -- these were originally the policy aspects that were identified in our last meeting which Dennis and the team participated in, I guess Dennis asked us to take a look at the current proposed studies and do sort of a little bit of a comparison and see where -- how the different work would fit together. So this actually I haven't quite sent it around to the team.

As everyone realized, I just sent this out a couple hours ago, but I personally did look at the -- the Variant studies, the VIP issues project. And I you know looked at the eight points that were identified in terms of the goals, the first two being the -- I guess the first part which is expected to be completed by the end of the year, and then also points three to eight, which I guess depending on the

first -- the results of the first investigation, the project will then know how we would proceed.

So looking at that, I was looking at sort of like a comparison and just put out here, looking at the policy aspects that the JIG identified, and the eight points that the variant studies identified, it seems to me, at least, that there are a few significant differences, and the reason why I think we'll be able to work in parallel and hopefully get things rolling -- get IDN Variants implemented more quickly.

From the JIG -- and I want to highlight one main sort of goal -- difference in goal, which actually the JIG identified an issue early on in our -- in our discussion is that we don't have the language expertise around the table, and therefore you know I guess you know we quote, unquote, avoided that issue, and we're very happy that you know Dennis and the team is now picking up that issue because that was definitely an area that was difficult to pull together expertise for.

So the biggest difference I wanted to highlight that I seem to find is that when we look at Variants in the JIG side where -- with the expertise in terms of policies and process, I think what we wanted to do was to identify the IDN Variants according to the allocation and delegation properties, and then what should be done there, whereas the staff -- the Variant studies would look very much into the linguistic and cultural properties, and what you know how IDN Variants would be generated, and you know what -- what would be

an appropriate IDN table, for example, and the -- so in essence I would sort of almost like what the IDN Variant policies would -- from the studies would become input into the -- what JIG would be creating.

And I just want to let everybody know a little bit more what we mean by IDN Variants according to allocation and delegation properties.

During our discussion, we identified four sort of types which we call four types, based on the allocation and delegation properties, so some of them are allocated and delegated together with the primary IDN, that which we are currently calling preferred IDN Variants, and the other -- the second one is allocated and delegated upon activation, that's what is reserved and activated IDN Variants. And then we have those that are allocated but not delegated, and that's a reserved and not activated IDN Variants, and also blocked Variants, that's not allocated and not -- and cannot be delegated.

So this is the types of IDN variants that the JIG was going down the path of thinking about, so it's very much policy-oriented and what we want to do on these issues rather than I think the studies that were proposed which will look into the language-specific issues and different languages and comparison of language. So what I guess -- what I was trying to say is that regardless of what the language policy spit out, it would fall in -- you know the Variants somehow would fall into one of these types and then from

there on, I think the JIG discussion can focus on how we deal with, once that's being -- being passed along.

So the idea of the next steps is to try to at least complete the discussion in light of the proposed IDN Variant studies, and today the discussion is really more of whether you know the -- Dennis' team feels that's -- that's -- or agrees to sort of the concept and see what we can do and we'll focus more on the implementation sort of -- well, I should say delega -- allocation, delegation framework, and look to work on the initial report after -- you know through this year.

So that's really the update from me about the Working Group so far, and what we're thinking of. As I said the comparison I did myself, I haven't quite passed it around yet, but that's the initial thinking. I wonder if Andrew has a question.

Andrew Sullivan: I just -- this is Andrew Sullivan. I just want to make sure that I understood what you are saying. What I think I understood you saying is that you think it's possible to analyze the IDN -- to analyze IDN Variants in terms of how you would publish that DNS data, irrespective of what the language involved was.

And that's a mere, sort of technical question of you know if you had these two preferred -- you know if you had a preferred Variant, what would be the rules by which those things would go through, and that's sort of irrespective of what language tables are involved

or anything, and then the idea is that the language table portion is what the studies are going to be. Is that a fair summary of what you were saying?

Edmon Chung: Yep.

Andrew Sullivan: Okay, good.

Edmon Chung: That's very fair, but instead of technically, it would be more administrative.

Andrew Sullivan: Sorry, that's what I guess what I meant, technique in the sort of simple sense of here are the steps.

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings again. I think that's a very reasonable set of assumptions. I just caution that the -- the language studies may come up with a different set of models between allocated, delegated, reserved and blocked. But it all seems very reasonable, but just that caveat that out of this may come a different requirement.

Edmon Chung:	Thank you Dennis. We were -- when we were discussing that, we were thinking of you know, there's only delegation, allocation, so you can delegate or not delegate, allocate or not allocate. So the permutation of which is somewhat limited, that's why we were thinking of okay, so to quote, unquote, avoid the situation of thinking about the language tables, what could be done, because when we had this discussion in the Group, the situation was that we don't really have all the language expertise, and we think that you know the language tables should be done by the community outside and it's not by this JIG Group.
	So instead of that we looked at you know whether it's going to be in the zone, whether it's going to be allocated, that's -- utilizing that permutation created these types and hopefully, but I take your point, and I do believe that we need to take that -- we need to constantly go back and see whether this is a correct assumption.
Dennis Jennings:	Yes, thank you, Dennis Jennings again. But I think that as I say, those are fair assumptions. One of the interesting things I think is going to be the whole dispute resolution mechanisms, when you have allocated, delegated, reserved and blocked.
	Conceptually, I don't know if this will arise, but there could be a dispute over a reserved Variant, and a need to subsequently allocate and delegate what was previously thought of reserved or even blocked, and I haven't got my head around this, so I'm just -- pardon me, there's a conceptual problem here that may arise out of

the -- the needs of the language communities. It would be interesting to have your thoughts on that in due course.

Edmon Chung: Actually, I think we sort of touched on that in one of the discussions we had earlier on, when we were talking about this, and it's sort of like when there is an overlap and somebody wants to pull it out from one set. I think that -- again, that point, I think that would be number four or number five in the policy aspects that we would define. And I think that could also be irrespective, somewhat irrespective of language, because regardless of how you created the overlap, there still needs to be a dispute you know resolution process, and so -- anyone else want to add? No. There's a discussion --

Andrew Sullivan: This is Andrew Sullivan. Terry just asked me whether -- what this means is that sameness turns out to be a question of if you have two things that are supposed to be aliases for one another and they go into the policy thing, do they come out the same way. And that would be an algorhythm by which you could determine whether two things are supposed to be equivalent to one another.

I don't know if that's actually what you intended to say, but that was what I took from it, and so this is actually a useful side discussion, but I don't think it bears directly on what -- but I didn't want to be rude and sort of talk on the side, but that's all it was.

Edmon Chung:

I apologize, I didn't quite get that, but since you said it's a tangent of -- it seems to me what you're saying is more related to -- to what the language policy spit out, so -- and that's to be determined, which is the -- what the Variant studies are working on.

So I guess we sort of exhausted the room here, but I think it you know first -- I guess the first question is, if we feel that this seems to be reasonable, perhaps the JIG would continue some work and to flush it out a little bit more, so that we can see you know how much or how little overlap there might be, or you know how -- how we might be able to -- to work together.

So at this point, it seems to me to make sense that we would go in parallel in this direction, but I want to get a sense from Dennis, and see where your head is at this point.

Dennis Jennings:

Thank you, Dennis Jennings here again. Well, I'd be the last person to say to anybody stop doing work. I mean we need more work, not less. So just with the caveat that I raised, and that Chris raised earlier, yes, I think you should get on with -- get on with the work. But I'd also like to both invite you and appeal to you that you participate in the -- in the IDN VIP -- I like that --

Edmon Chung:

Do I get to be a VIP?

Dennis Jennings: Yes, Variant Issues Project, because we really need the expertise, and we really need the community to -- to buy into this, because that's where the expertise is. And anything that you can bring to it, we'd be very grateful if you did.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Dennis. And definitely, I think -- I guess two things. One personally I would be more than happy to -- to participate in the Variant studies in the VIP. And also I think in terms of JIG, perhaps there could be formally or informally, a kind of liaison into the Group as well. That might be a useful thing to do.

Dennis Jennings: I'm quite happy with that. Yes, apparently, Bart reminds me, Dennis Jennings here. I'm already the liaison between -- at least the one way. So of course, yes, we'll work as closely as possible together.

Edmon Chung: Now, with that, I guess one of the things I want to -- to wrap up with is perhaps think a little bit about the timeline. The proposed timeline seems to drive towards a first set of documents by the end of this year. Perhaps, that would be an appropriate target for us to also come up with our first -- well, set of documents by the end of the year. So that would help sync the initiatives, the work.

Dennis Jennings: I don't mean to hog the microphone, but just to respond to that, we envisage that the five study cases will produce reports, common issues and specific issues, and a final report that will integrate all those into a general report on common issues. That's assuming that that is the right approach. It may turn out that one or other of the case studies takes much longer or much shorter than another for perhaps good reasons. And we may look at, if we can separate those things, a differential term time scale.

But our general model at the moment is that there would be the five case studies, they produce the five reports, and then there'd be a common issues report as well by the end of the year. But that could be subject to change if it was necessary.

Jen Chow: This is Jen Chow, actually just for clarification, for the initial report, are you going to just you know study on the first two items, or the total in all, eight items, thank you.

Dennis Jennings: The first two, I mean we're looking for the problem statement. I mean all the feedback we're getting is that you cannot really solve the problem unless you define the problem. So this is an issues project, that's why the "I" is there in the VIP. Variant Issues Project, to try and define what the problem is. Because without that we're going to spin a lot of wheels, and do a lot of work, that may not solve the problem.

Edmon Chung: So I'm just conscious about the time, and I know we started late as well. So I guess with that, and it seems to match very well with what we might be doing.

We also identified a number of policy aspects, I think also five, which we will have an initial report out you know just to describe what -- what that is, and hopefully we can consolidate it by the end of the year to sort of a final report on this, that -- and then we'll be somewhat in sync at that point.

So I'm looking around the room, I wonder if Wendy did get to join us on the phone. I just know that Wendy was trying to join us. No?

Female: She tells me that she's on the line.

Edmon Chung: Oh, okay, but anyway so I was wondering if she might have any questions, before we wrap, but does anyone have any urgent questions?

If not, thank you very much for joining the session. Sorry for running a little bit late, we had some technical difficulties to start with, and so thank you everyone.

[End of Transcript]