

**Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
JIG WG Meeting
Monday 18 November 2013**

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.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Man: Again, for the transcript this is Joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN Working Group JIG meeting 1530 to 1630 on Monday, November 18 and let's hear (about) the...

Man: Maybe ask them how.

Edmon Chung: So good afternoon everyone. We're - I'm still missing my co-Chair, Young-Eum Lee from Korea. I haven't seen her this morning. But I'm guessing she might be on her way. But since we're about five minutes over so I guess we'll get started.

Everyone, you know, welcome to stay. Even if you're not in the working group this is an open session from the Joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN Working Group. Do we need to get the recording and stuff started or it's already - oh, it's already. Okay.

So I guess welcome everyone to the JIG, the Joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN Working Group. This is our meeting. It's an open meeting, as I mentioned. I

guess we'll start by - if I may ask everyone around the table to just briefly introduce who you are. And I guess we'll start from Han Chuan.

Han Chuan Lee: Hi. Welcome everybody. My name's Han Chuan Lee. I've recently joined ICANN as the Registry Services Senior Manager in (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Hello. I'm Chris Dillon and I'm from University College London.

Naela Sarras: Hello. I'm Naela Sarras and I also work on ICANN as the IDN TLD Manager.

Nicoleta Munteanu: Nicoleta Munteanu, ICANN staff, IDN Department.

Stephane Van Gelder: Stephane Van Gelder. Stephane Van Gelder Consulting. I'm here by sure chance.

Woman: Hi. I'm (unintelligible) for Ministry of ICT Thailand.

(Juan Rica Huta): (Juan Rica Huta) from (Etta) Ministry of ICT.

Edmon Chung: Since I didn't introduce myself. Edmon Chung, co-Chair for the JIG.

Bart Boswinkel: Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor, ICANN staff.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Andrei Kolesnikov in charge of .ru for Russian consideration; also the largest IDN so far. (Unintelligible).

Gabriella Schitteck: Gabriella Schitteck from the ccNSO Secretariat. I can also add that we have two remote participants. One called (Joseph) and the second (Paul Arlang).

Edmon Chung: Welcome. And those sitting not on the table, please, please do join us because we have plenty of room if you to come and join us. And please also briefly just do as a roll call and just briefly introduce.

Man: (Unintelligible), GNSO Council. Here as part of the audience.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Patrick Kildingson): (Patrick Kildingson). I work in .sc pre-delegation testing manager.

(Amar Jilong): (Amar Jilong) from (Connect). (Connect) is the IDN gTLD applicant. We have just assigned (RE) with ICANN.

Edmon Chung: Congratulations.

(Von Salo): Hello. My name is (Von Salo) of (Spania). I'm a law student. Took school - national school in Cordoba from Argentina. My partner here, she doesn't speak English. She's a (unintelligible) of mine and her name is (Camaleria) (unintelligible) University.

Edmon Chung: Welcome.

Jennifer Chung: I am Jennifer Chung for Asia.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And I need to get my slide back up. Something happened. Okay. Sorry about that. Oops. Okay. Here we go.

So as mentioned, this is a working group meeting but it's an open meeting. The - it's a pretty basic agenda as discussed on the phone - actually a phone conference the last time.

We're going to take a look at the - some of the next steps we need to do on the three issues that we have been working on in the last few years. Actually I think we have a number of newcomers I guess or people who swapped in.

I'll just give a brief background of the group itself. The J-I-G, the JIG was a - jointly chartered by the ccNSO and the GNSO for the purpose of studying

issues of common interest between the ccTLDs and gTLDs on IDNs, internationalized domain names.

And I have lost my slides again. Okay. Okay. There seem - okay. Let's keep going. I'll try my best to keep this on mine. But anyway, so the - it started - the group started working in 2010. We identified three issues of common interest between ccTLDs and gTLDs on IDN.

First one was the single character IDN TLDs. The other ones the IDN variant TLDs. And the third one is universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. I will - we'll kind of address those three topics in reverse order today.

We have pretty much completed a final report on both the universal acceptance as well as on the single character IDN TLDs. I guess we'll revisit whether there are next steps - for the meeting today is to see if there are next steps to work on.

And we have been having face-to-face meetings at different ICANN meetings since Brussels. Well - in terms of the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, that is the more - most current document. It has just been finalized and it has been sent to the GNSO and I suppose shortly to the ccNSO Councils for their adoption.

And so I would like to spend a little bit of time just going through this so that people kind of know what this is about. I think we're hoping that this is an issue - especially with the new gTLDs coming this is an issue that will be of growing importance.

So far I kind of hate to say that there hasn't been as much momentum as we had hoped. But as we go into implementation hopefully that would change as well.

I wonder if there's the other plug because this one is well bent out of shape. I will try to plug it in. Is there a number one? Sorry for the interruptions. The projection keeps dying on me. Okay. Since they're working on that I guess I'll speak to it for the while and we'll go back to the slides if we can.

So this is an issue - this is not a new issue, if you will. I mean it's related to an old issue when new gTLDs were introduced back in 2000 especially when gTLDs that are longer than three characters were introduced at that time. Okay. Let's try again. (Okay).

So as I mentioned, this is not a completely new issue. But what is new however is that it became an issue of common interest between ccTLDs and gTLDs with the introduction of IDN ccTLDs through the IDN ccTLD fast track in 2010.

Since it wasn't a fully new issue, there was some - a report that was created by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on this issue and there were a number of measures already put in place at ICANN.

But just to illustrate what the issues are, this is the kind of issues. So a new IDN top-level domain is added but there are software or sort of interfaces that have lists of top-level domains that are not updated.

There was also the situation for example when you sign up for a particular Web site or sign up for a social network. You put in your email or a URL or your domain name and that database might not be taking, you know, might have a problem taking the information if it's an IDN TLD.

There's also of course different databases as well including search engines, how they respond or react to new IDN top-level domains that are being added and also those domains registered under those TLDs.

One of the reasons for the issue is that a lot of times the missed top-level domains for different programs are hard coded. There's also sometimes software use sort of a separate list that is not - that is not synchronized fully with the ICANN root system. So sometimes the IDN TLD that is being introduced is not fully updated in time.

There's also sometimes there are, you know, different types of checks done on domain names like the length of the top-level domain. And for IDN it will certainly be relatively longer. For those of you who has a little bit of the technology background you would know that the - an alphanumeric representation of a let's say a Chinese domain name would be more than four characters long. So that presents an issue itself as well.

And the - another type of issue that we see is like a spam or filters or even phishing filters that look at a domain or look at an email address and tries to interpret whether it might be a bad domain.

So these are some of the issues. And through the discussion the JIG report could put out four core recommendations for consideration. Again, this document has been finalized and I just, you know, bringing this up for the benefit of the audience (as well).

One of the key - I guess the first recommendation is to try to get the industry itself - our own act together. What I mean by that is that some of the registries and registrars - ICANN registry, registrars and themselves are - the systems do not support fully IDN TLDs.

For example, at a registrar they may be allowing IDN TLD registrations but when it comes to the name server records or the host - child host domain or the, you know, emails for the contact information, those fields might not support IDNs at this point. So this is the - one of the key recommendations is that before we go out and reach to the world we should get our own act together.

The second recommendation - second main recommendation is to hopefully try to gather more - I guess more support for this initiative to make it a strategic initiative for ICANN and sort of include it in - include it in the strategic way.

And then the third particular recommendation is to request for some more support for new IDN TLDs. We have one of the colleagues that are joining that just have a new IDN TLD. But if ICANN or the community can provide some information on hey, there are certain places where this might not work. You should be aware of it and your customers should be aware of it. And these are the issues. These are things that perhaps you can do.

ICANN has already done quite a bit of work on this area. But I guess the recommendation is to do a little bit more as well. The ICANN team has put together like a TLD verification code, which is great utility. I actually don't know where the, you know, how widespread use it is. So making that, you know, perhaps build something but spread it out as well. Let more people know that ICANN has done these things.

ICANN also has some materials that were produced on this issue. But again, these issues - these are more generic tools. But I guess the recommendation is to ask for ICANN to perhaps spend some effort to produce a material for new gTLDs or new ccTLDs - IDN ccTLDs that are coming onboard. And we'll be facing these issues immediately.

And the fourth recommendation is a little bit broader to sort of recommend for the broader outreach and to especially to look into areas where ICANN can, you know, establish liaisons or engage beyond just the ICANN community itself.

We are registries, registrars and, you know, the - I guess people in the know what we need are the technology community at large to be - to understand

the issue. So this is an issue we think that will be amplified as new ccTLDs - IDN ccTLDs and of course new IDN gTLDs are being added.

And so that's sort of concludes the first part. This is the current document that has just been finalized a few days ago. And I take this opportunity also to welcome Young-Eum. Thank you for joining us - my co-Chair for the working group.

And I guess the next steps is to forward this set of recommendations to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. The JIG, as mentioned earlier on, is chartered to report back to the Councils and then the Councils would decide what to do with the final report.

So to I guess - and we'll like to spend a little bit of time to see if there are any follow up action that we want to do. But before that, just want to see if there are any questions of what was just brought up, either the issue itself or some of the recommendations. (Unintelligible). Andrei.

Andrei Kolesnikov: First of all I'd like to thank all the working group for the nice work. It's been a long time since group started. And it's a great report. I'd like to add some practical information to the table so we all understand where we are.

Of course this is a great document. It's directed towards the stakeholder groups. And I'd just like to do a just brief update of what's going on in this area.

First of all the IDNs are not supported properly. We should all know that even though we have new gTLDs and IDNs they're not supported by old applications, most popular applications. For example, Google does very poor job on this especially in Chrome (in name now).

Microsoft almost adopted IDN and all its applications except the public email services. Firefox is good. It's browser Firefox is doing pretty good in this area. Hey keep track on the new gTLDs as well as the IDNs.

Also it's - from our experience - we spend a lot of time in this issue in Russia. And from our experience that it's really hard to deal - like when each of us deals with this problem by itself, it's really hard to convince all the major vendors and software to support the (sync) so it's really not the combined effort.

And I think one of the recommendations - maybe not officially - not in the recommendation to the stakeholder groups but to say when Fadi opens the next ICANN meeting, he has to say a few words about it because it's a real problem.

You know, ICANN is delegating the new gTLDs. We got a bunch of ccTLDs with IDNs and it's just not working. Let's face it. It's a bit - it's a big problem, which should be addressed on the very high level.

When Fadi says this, he should address it to the particular companies, not abstract. It's like the real - there are real leaders of the market. We should hire all (unintelligible) awaiting until they implement this thing in the fall. So I think it's very important to have a collaborative attitude toward this problem. And this is a real problem unfortunately. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Andrei. And yes I guess that's part of the Recommendation B is to make it more a strategic item and hopefully it could go higher up in terms of a mind share of the issues.

I know that there are plenty of issues that we're dealing with here at ICANN. But this is - I do personally - at least I do think that it also is a part of the part of the consumer trust aspect of the - as new gTLDs or new IDN ccTLDs are

being added to the root. Because if consumers don't feel that they work, then, you know, there is a loss in the trust in the general system, so.

Any questions before we go into maybe discuss whether this group is - are there any - whether there are any follow up actions this group should do?

Man: Sorry. (Unintelligible). Just a question if I heard you correctly. The recommendations are more of - to - for ICANN to inform about the difficulties and to - then for future study planning. Is that correct? Because I mean as said, there are already quite severe difficulties when it comes to searching and when it comes to (risk).

And these problems should actually have been solved before the international domain names are getting out to the market. Otherwise they will face problems from the start. And there's not so much time left.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here again. So two parts. One part is yes as in the direction of the recommendations itself is of course on a future tense because, you know, the recommendation goes in and then it gets implemented. And of course we hope that it would be implemented as soon as possible.

One element is not just a - in sort of kind of support or materials kind of information type thing. The first recommendation hopefully has a little bit of a direct bite to it, which would request registries and registrars themselves, their own systems, to at least support it. Because before we go out and tell, you know, Chrome Browser or, you know, Microsoft to implement this, we better make sure that our own industry systems are fully supportive of the IDN TLDs. So that part is important.

My second part I don't know whether anyone from the staff might be able to help me is that there is ongoing work on this. It is not - at this point at least it's not - doesn't feel that it is a super high priority. But I understand that there is

continued work on this. I don't know whether Naela or the team can provide any updates on that.

Naela Sarras: Yes. Hi. Thank you Edmon. This is Naela. So Han Chuan and I work in the same department that is I think eventually will house most of this work. And there's work that's been going on on this since 2006 or more. And I have to admit there isn't as much going on on it right now.

So it's interesting because I think we as staff when we talk about this work is we get stuck in what's within ICANN's (remit) and what's not. And I don't remember who suggested - was it you saying before even putting the IDNs out, you know, we should have resolved all these issues to make sure that they're - that it's ready.

But it's not really ICANN that can go and say, you know, Microsoft do this and Google do that. Right? I mean we can put out recommendations of what needs to be done but it's not really - it's constantly what platform - it's kind of what we're working - what we work on is what platforms do we need to present that, where we present this information.

So there's the bigger questions of how we work on this. But we have some efforts that are now going on. For example, the - one of the things that came out of the recently was a list - sort of the public (suffix) list that Edmon referred to and there's another list that is now - it's an email list that you subscribe to and it tells you all the new contracted TLDs.

So the minute they sign as a contracted TLD, they become listed on this list as a valid TLD that you should be aware of it they're user of the DNS. So there's - that effort goes towards that.

Yeah, Han, do you have more specific work that you're aware of that's going on there? I know it's something that we will focus on a lot more going forward especially with this input coming from the JIG work.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Thank you for the update. As mention, it is - at least at this point is it's not a - I guess not a high priority with staff. There's some concern or should I use the word concern but at some thinking about it whether it's within the scope of the staff.

Of course personally I think it is within the ICANN's (remit) to help in this. As I explained, I believe that this is somewhat at the heart of consumer trust as well because if the TLDs don't work, consumers feel that the system doesn't, you know, doesn't work.

So but again, this is - that's the reason why we have to generate - we're hoping to generate this report and push it through the two Councils to resolve and forward it to the Board is precisely to point out that hopefully to - if it gets adopted that this is something the community wants - would like ICANN to take a - some roles on.

I think in the report it also - the report itself is - has a little bit more detail of course. It explains there are certain things that ICANN doesn't play a direct role. Perhaps more of an outreach role. Sometimes more influencing others.

But overall this - at least this report tries to argue that this is something that ICANN should take on as new IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs are added to the (request going forward). Well Han Chuan.

Han Chuan Lee: Yeah. I think that, you know, the first issue should not just be the IDN level but it should be across all the TLD levels including the get gTLD that (being pushed out) as I think you mentioned before.

Even up to today but is your - even like names like .travel and all that. Those that are not longer than three characters are still not (unintelligible) (to the site) (unintelligible) in some forms (and I could miss). And can't put that, you

know, when you - something that's not even addressed. So I think this issue should not just be IDN. It's really more the entire program.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here again. Thank you Han Chuan. In fact in the report we have a paragraph that addresses this particular point as well. Two things to it. One is that yes, it is an issue of longer TLDs especially for gTLDs in that case.

What - part of the reason why this particular group has focused on IDN TLDs is because - so on one hand it is because it is now a common interest issue between ccTLDs and gTLDs.

The other part of that is that now ICANN has the whole TLD community ccs and gs that can help and have for lack of a better word have the interest or the alignment of interest to, you know, go out together to the larger technical community and say hey, this is something you should be aware of and implement into your systems and applications. So that's the reason why the slightly more focus on the IDN TLDs. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe, you know, this is Han Chuan say this working group was set up with a specific focus on IDN TLDs. And that's in the report as well. So there is an awareness of the broader issue but that will be out of the mandate of this working group.

Han Chuan Lee: Agree. Just that if you talk about ICANN staff then, you know, probably the IDN team will not be the appropriate team for you to come to about (unintelligible) because it's quite hard for ICANN as a whole to focus on (unintelligible) just (to put on) IDN but not to address the new gTLD itself. So I mean I just gTLD as well.

So I'm just thinking in the broader sense, yes, I agree that this team looks at IDN and, you know, we are looking at this in concerns of IDN. This issue should not - it is discussed here but I think it should not fall (flat but) escalate

it to an appropriate professional. But I know this (unintelligible) can be looked at together on IDN level and on the new gTLD level.

Bart Boswinkel: And I think nothing would stop you from doing this.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. (Uam) and then Andrei, you want to speak as well? (Uam) first.

(Uam): Just a short note. It's like, you know, ICANN is like making, you know, there are products of ICANN. It's called the TLDs. Look. Consider it as a product. Okay. So there are like ASCII products and IDN products. And they differ from each other. They work differently. And it's not good. So it is within the scope of ICANN including the top management and all the stakeholder groups to make these things (equal) working and acceptable.

Woman: That's exactly what I was going to say. As long as ICANN has decided to adopt the IDNs into the new gTLD framework, it automatically means that universal acceptance and interoperability and all that should work. And ICANN should try to make it work. And so it is (unintelligible) ICANN.

And with regard to the IDN although there still are some problems and - and we're seeing not more - I mean I'd like to see more encouragement about this but I guess not.

But I (vermetly) and this is something that we discussed in - back in KR is that IDNs is the - in the Internet work - in the future Internet world IDNs is the - one of the most important mechanisms to ensure the diversity of various cultures. And so I think this is something that should be firmly believed in and very strongly pursued.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. I guess the next question is really whether - this group has completed the report. The report will now go to the two Councils. The question is whether - well hopefully they will adopt it. I'm positive. I think after,

you know, some discussion with different people, I'm positive that they would accept it.

So the question is whether this group should or is the right group to follow up on seeing through some of the implementation of the recommendations.

Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Edmon. This is Chris Dillon speaking. I think it's, you know, obviously really very clear listening to various people talking about, you know, the work in this report.

I think it's, you know, it is already a very, very important issue (unintelligible) and universal acceptance. And I could actually like it to become more important from now on. So the short answer to that question to me I mean really much the - we need to continue to be involved in this area. It is just so important. This is the - this would be a terrible time to stop.

And just after that because we've, you know, we've talked a little about IDNs and specifically I feel that consistency in the use of variants is also an aspect which is part of universal acceptance, you know, because basically it's variants are not working consistently (somewhere) and that actually affects things in a very similar way to some of these issues we've been talking about.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Chris. That's sort of - okay. And just please, please go to the mic as we have somebody remotely participating as well. But as he's walking, this is probably a good segue into the other issue of common interest, which is IDN variant TLDs. But please.

(Fahad Nasi): Hi. My name is (Fahad Nasi) and I work with CORE on (unintelligible). I'm not familiar with your working group and what you guys do but just listening to the conversation here I got a sense that we've accepted the fact there are two classes of TLDs, the IDNs and the others.

We can't just say that's nice for ICANN to do something when we all take the same (application see). And to get to a discriminatory treatment is unacceptable. It is not we will not - you know, it's nice for ICANN to do this or that. They have to. It is not a choice because they will fail. They will not be as successful as they could be otherwise.

So for us to sit her and just casually say well, you know, we'll just have these recommendations and so forth to me is appalling.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. I see that.

(Fahad Nasi): I'm sorry. I don't understand why everybody is tolerating these two classes. And we have the IDNs and we have the other ones. The other ones are fine. Microsoft, Firefox, email, all of those, they don't have to work. Nobody's forcing them to work. Nobody's encouraging them to work. It's sort of a ground up operation.

Naela Sarras: Okay. I'm sorry. I think it's what I said that should give the wrong foot here. So no, nobody's saying there's two classes, right. It's...

(Fahad Nasi): But acting on it.

Naela Sarras: No, no, no. The ASCII ones aren't fine either. A lot of...

(Fahad Nasi): No, no, no. This question...

((Crosstalk))

Naela Sarras: ...ASCII ones even ICANN - when did we - when was it that we sent you something in .asia email because of our own internal system failure? We couldn't even send an email to Edmon for his .asia address. It's just truly ASCII address. Right.

(Fahad Nasi): Okay.

Naela Sarras: So we're not in any way saying those - the ASCII ones which are really important and then all of us, you know, and then there's the IDN. Not in any way.

If anything, IDN were fast tracked so they can go into the (root zone) faster than everybody else.

(Fahad Nasi): Yeah. But (with this it's not helping them).

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Naela Sarras: But what you have - but you have...

Edmon Chung: I think...

Naela Sarras: ...when we work on these TLD acceptance issues to - with Han Chuan's point, so there's common issues that all of the TLD acceptance is (unintelligible). And then there's special considerations that we need to also take into account for IDNs. That's all we're saying. We're not saying IDNs are different or we give them a different treatment. No, not at all.

So maybe the - I don't know, these big five issues that are - that apply to all TLDs and then there's these other couple considerations for IDNs. That's all we're saying here and I think that's all the points that Han Chuan and myself were trying to make.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And apologize for jumping in here but I think - wanted to clarify a couple things. First of all, I don't think there is a suggestion as Naela has mentioned. There's no suggestion that they are being treated less well. What in fact the reverse we're asking ICANN to do more work for us on IDN TLDs. So just to - this is actually part of the recommendation.

And why? Because certain applications do not consistently support IDNs yet. And IDN applicants like yourself should get a little bit - a little - we're hoping to recommend that IDN applicants like yourself could get a little bit more support especially as you launch because there will be some issues from your customers who might be facing this issues. Actually this is what the recommendations are about. So just want to make that clarification. Okay.

So I guess any other items people want to bring up because I wanted to segue because we talk about - I think Chris mentioned a very important part, which is to have these IDN TLDs and IDNs work consistently around. And one of the - one of the issues is about IDN variants and especially IDN variant TLDs.

And I think that has some implications on Arabic script TLDs as well and obviously from - I'm more familiar with Chinese and certainly has an impact on Chinese TLDs.

This particular issue was identified as an issue of common interest between ccNSO and GNSO. However, the JIG actually has not produced a report on this. The reason being when we were starting to work on it, ICANN staff team - actually the Board IDN Working Group came - put together what is called the VIP project, Variant Issues Project.

The - and then there is the IDN Variant TLD Program Project. Especially I highlight two particular that is ongoing and I guess the more critical ones as from what I see going forward in the next few months. One is the label generation rules that is being produced.

That is the rules for what IDN TLD labels - what IDN TLD strings could be added and also what variant - IDN variants - a couple of the main names could be added based on a - I guess a primary applied for IDN TLD. That's the label generation rule set. And then another project which talks about the

implementation process, which is implementing into the root, into the IANA database and such.

So the question to the group is or actually I'll bring it up directly is I've been thinking about this in the last little while is that perhaps there might be a reason for this group to further the work from universal acceptance and focus more on the user experience study that came out from the variant issues and see whether there are certain user experience requirements or, you know, user experience sort of parameters that are useful as recommendations for implementation bearing in mind also that the consistency across I guess IDN ccTLDs IDN gTLDs and perhaps even second level IDN as well.

So I'll sort of bring up that issue first to see if that might be an area that this group would look into before I, you know, talk further. The question really is whether - we haven't done anything on IDN variant TLDs because that's - because the staff team has been driving the work and we have been responding and that work has been - is coming into fruition.

There might be an area of focus on user experience that we can build on the universal acceptance work that might be useful. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: May I give you - say this is an example from another working group, which is called the DSSA, the DNS Stability Security Analysis Working Group. That's again a joint working group. And during their work you saw that the Board risk framework management - Risk Management Framework Working Group started its activities.

Now what you see is and what you described is a way of dealing it with. This working group went into hibernation around August 2012 when they produced their first Phase 1 working group report.

And afterwards they haven't done anything up till very recently and they sent a letter to both Council - all the participating support - all the, yeah,

participating organizations so that the GNSO, ccNSO, At Large, NRO in recognizing; say one of the risks of continuing our work is that we have two diverging views under one roof, that being the ICANN (unintelligible) or the ICANN Stakeholder Group.

And that's a bit of say depends on how the IDN Working Group will go forward - the JIG will go forward that you have a ICANN staff driven initiative and at the same time you have an IDN driven initiative, which will be overlapped and it will have some coordinating, yeah, it will cost a lot to (grow then) both efforts. So that's a risk.

And so going back to the DSSA notifying this risk, they went back to the Councils and asked to, you know, in fact to close the working group. And if needed be you can always revamp it and but at least the mandate has to change anyway. So that's an example how it works when they raise you have two parallel tracks of dealing with the issue and without say constantly moving.

One of the reasons why the working group was noting this especially after 1-1/2 year and I think this is noteworthy for the JIG as well is the first year - and this working group has been going on since from 2011 until August 2012 with biweekly calls, almost the pattern the JIG had.

And at the end it became very difficult to get enough volunteers on each of the calls to do work. And at a certain point in time, and especially when they went into hibernation after such a long time, the feeling was we will not get the right volunteers and are we going to have the right volunteers anymore. We don't have the critical mass to do the work.

And what they said is well, is doing say if we want to do different work or we want to continue our work, we need different kind of volunteers. So that's something say you see parallel developments in say with other cross community working groups and that's something maybe to consider as well.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. I think that's a very valid question and very useful example and experience. I was in the DSSA as well and I can - I very much agree with the observation there.

So I guess I don't know whether anyone wants to speak up on this. But this is an area - again, this is an area that we've identified that the group really hasn't quite done any work on it and it's because there is work done on by the staff team.

The question is whether at this point there are any I guess for lack of a better word missing parts where it's appropriate for this group to take on. If we - if there's identified that there is a, you know, a gap between what is being implemented by staff right now and what I guess the community or the policies that we've put together once that presents itself as a potential area that we will work on.

But at this particular moment unless anyone wants to bring up anything, it seems to me that we don't have enough people around to start the discussion. But I do want to bring this up.

At the GNSO Council working sessions Ching Chiao, one of the Councilors, brought up an issue, which appears to be an area that perhaps the staff team has not or may not be in a position to work on.

And that is the issue of when a IDN TLD application goes through evaluation whether it's IDN ccTLD or IDN gTLD, at the point of delegation. There's also there needs to be a process to then evaluate whether the variants should go in and, you know, what that process is being dealt with in a particular project.

But what the requirements are is not - hasn't been discussed in the community. So whether that could be an area is something that was brought up, so. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: I'm now putting on my ccNSO hat a little bit. I think say the whole discussion, and as you know, you've been partial of the IDN PDP - IDN ccPDP, sorry, is there is a placeholder in the IDN ccPDP regarding the variants.

The reason why it's there is because at the time the working group noted yes, there is ongoing developments and at a certain point we need to revisit what is all (unintelligible). So we didn't want to preempt on the outcome of the technical admmissive organizational discussions by already talking about the policy.

Now the question is, and because this is a PDP therefore a policy development process, whether the JIG, yeah, they could advise in that area or whether it's more a matter of - at the time when it's clear that the ccNSO Council opens up again and asks for volunteers and there is a time when people who are interested step in.

So say because this is where in a way the roads split because now we're talking about (real) adjusting the policies, et cetera, at least on the cc side. And I don't know to what extent that would be necessary for the gTLD side. But I think a joint group is very difficult to do it that way.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. But I did want - the reason why I thought this conversation - Chris' sort of intervention was a good segue into this conversation is that there is a level of consistency that might be important for IDN, especially IDN variant and IDN variant TLDs.

So I understand that work hasn't been done. But, you know, that layer of consistency might, you know, might be something that is common interest, so. So Chris.

Chris Dillon: Hello. Yes. This is Chris Dillon speaking. Yes, there's been a lot of work done at the top level of gTLDs but, you know, that leaves quite a few other parts of

the tree where, you know, particularly the second level where, you know - well the second level if it's actually delegated out.

So but it's still in some way all of these things have got to in some way be consistent to have a good user experience. So that seems to be the hole.

Bart Boswinkel: And say and that's where say you'll see a divergence between the gTLD and ccTLDs. At the end of the day the ccTLDs or the ccNSO has no influence with the exception of say making recommendations or whatever. But they could look at what is happening in the gTLD space.

But the cc, you know, this is where it stops. If they don't any in fact or are not able to set any rules or recommendations on second level.

Edmon Chung: Naela.

Naela Sarras: Thank you Edmon. So you (ran) about that list you put at the beginning where you have, you know, identified the current projects that are going right now under the variant program. Project 7 is focused solely on how to develop the part that is going to deal with the requirements are.

And we're fully cognizant of the ccNSO policies as in (stuck) variants and it's waiting for the output of the variant work. And one of the mandates of the variant program is what we - we are working on rules for the whole root, right, for Gs and Cs and everybody.

So what we envision will happen in the next few months is that we're going to start putting together a document with what the requirements are going to look like for the input - for the implementation and what would be required of the requester, what we be required of ICANN, what guidelines does everybody have to follow, et cetera, and put those out for public comment. So that's where we expect to get the community input on that.

So I think that - so I wanted to put that out there that it's not solely staff work right now. We're trying to define the pieces. And we're using parts from like this. I expect to have a Board discussion on this tomorrow during the Wednesday afternoon session to just get a sense of where the community stands on this, what they think the process will look like.

And we expect to put something out and get input on it. But yeah, so this is - to Bart's point, we really understand. We know that we're not doing this just for the gTLD process, right. So this is for both worlds. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Naela. On your point, I guess I'm just thinking - kind of thinking aloud here now. So a report or a proposal I guess for Project 7 is forthcoming. Is there any estimate time? The reason why I ask this is this might be a good opportunity for actually answering the question about refreshing our call for volunteers on and responding to the proposal from staff as well. So...

Bart Boswinkel: Just say the example would be as I say. This working had a call for refreshment some time ago. And I think it worked for the - very well for universal acceptance part.

So you could do it for the IDN variant part or you could go say maybe start with another vehicle on specific working group - cross community working group focusing on the IDN variant part and say and revisit the mandate of this working group or create another one. Because it's the - say my concern - my bottom line concern is like with the universal acceptance. Everybody in this room understands it's an important issue - very important issue but it doesn't have the traction in the community.

So and maybe it's time to say look, there are some important issues and it needs to be done but we need to revamp it and maybe revisit the way we've structured it currently to make it more impactful. So that was - that's why my intervention just around the DSSA as well to how the DSSA did it.

And it's - and I think there is a role for both Councils here to see how they are able to make this work. Like with regard to one of the points you raised earlier on is follow up on the implementation of recommendations that is in principle it is my view an issue for the Councils themselves. They adopted - they send the recommendations to the ICANN Board that has to follow up with the recommendations to the community as well.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. And I think that's a pretty good summary of some of the things that I wanted to cover. And this leads us into the - really the conversation. I just want to quickly mention - I know we're running out of time.

So we also have the single character IDN TLDs. We came up with a report. It wasn't implemented. The Board had a resolution to put a hold on it until next round. So there isn't really anything to do at this point I think.

So it really comes down to the question of whether this group should sort of wrap up its work and go back to the Council. There are certain items that this group identified and discovered that might need further work on.

But the question is whether this is the group and, you know, whether it becomes another group, whether it gets re-chartered or another completely group or two groups are being, you know, created to tackle the acceptance issue and one on variants. That is, you know, that's something that needs to take place.

I apologize we ran out of time today. But I think we should wrap, you know, have a wrap up discussion. But, you know, an hour from now there's the GNSO - half an hour from now the GNSO and ccNSO Council meeting where this will be brought up as well. I'll probably bring a similar summary that I guess Bart and I just had in terms of where we are in the work of this working group and see where the two Councils - how they feel.

And then from there I guess Young-Eum and myself will talk a little bit more probably with Bart and - to see, you know, what proposal to bring to this group. And, you know, if winding it up is the right way to do, then we still probably should, you know, convene and just do that. Yes.

So with that, apologize I've already run four minutes over time.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: We do? We have still some more time. I didn't...

Man: Yeah, we do.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Man: (Why not)?

Edmon Chung: All right. Anyone have any other items they want to raise?

Man: On this one?

Edmon Chung: Or follow up on what I guess Bart and I just put out and as in - Chris (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Hello. This is Chris Dillon speaking. Yes, I'm totally happy with there being an analysis on what is the best way of making more of this very important area. So I honestly don't know what others (myself). But I hope that some of the people that will pick this up will, you know, you know, will have (unintelligible) point in the way where these things are starting to get more clout in the community.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Chris. Any other business we want to bring? If not, anyone from remote? I have been - apologize I haven't seen your raise your hands. Okay. So thank you everyone for joining.

END