Transcription ICANN Dublin
GNSO session Saturday 17 October 2015
IDN Variants - Program Status update
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/group-activities/calendar#oct
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan: Let's move on then to the next session, which deals with the updates on the work of IDN Variance and the program status update. This is a reoccurring request just to keep the council briefed and knowledgeable about the work that's going on and I think we've got (unintelligible) here from ICANN staff. So welcome (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you and thank you again for giving us the opportunity to present the update on IDN program to GNSO. So I'll try to be brief. We'll have a more detailed presentation on this on Wednesday during the IDN program sessions. So please do come in those if you do need more detailed information.

                The work of IDN programs is largely divided into two - I guess two parts, one which is looking at IDN's at the top level and then we are also involved in a couple of projects, which deal with IDN's at the second level. At the top level the two major projects, one which deals with IDN (unintelligible) and their variance and the second one which basically implements the (unintelligible) process. Within the TLD program at the top level we have multiple projects going on.

                One is to develop the rules, which determine what are the valid and top-level domains within a particular script and whether any of those labels have variance or not. We are also developing a tool, which will allow there to do - to process this linguistic data mechanically and automatically and then we are also currently internally working on project which is looking at how to implement these variant top-level domains. At the second level we are

currently working at RDN implementation guidelines. These are second level RDN rules and also developing reference RDN tables or label generation tools as they're called. And, obviously, we continue to do outreach to the community. Next slide please.

As far as the label generation rules (unintelligible) project is concerned there has been ongoing work on developing guidelines to community based generation levels, which have been working to document the linguistic data and rules to define where the valid DLDs and their variance since the last update we've also added as the guidelines document and (RDR) proposal template for the communities to - which are finalizing their proposals and submitting those to ICANN, sorry. And MSR has been available since (unintelligible) no further change in that. Next slide please.

So we have now many communities which are active. Since last update (unintelligible) generation panel has been seated and (unintelligible) - sorry, we have (unintelligible) generational panel, which has been anti-generation panel, which has been seated. And we have now aid script communities which have been working to develop their rules.

Two of those communities (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) have actually finished their work and those LGR proposals were submitted (unintelligible) they were posted for public comment in (unintelligible) last month and they recently ended up the public comment period. These communities look at the public comments received and as a next step the final proposals will be submitted to the independent integration panel, which will evaluate these proposals and either integrate that into the first (unintelligible) of LGR or if the proposals generate more (unintelligible) they will (unintelligible). And in addition to the active communities we also have about six other communities which have (unintelligible) and we will be following up with those communities. Next slide please.

(Unintelligible) project, which is (unintelligible) as these generation panels are producing linguistic data this needs to be encoded in a form (unintelligible)

machines can process them. So we actually (unintelligible) machine readable specification that has actually been developed. What we are now doing is we are going to (unintelligible) and we are converting that specification into a formal RFC so that it can actually be - become a standard. And, again, this is - this machine readable form is hard to encode for people.

So when the generation panels are actually working or when people will be using this data what they're also doing is developing a toolset which will enable or assist the process and what this toolset is going to do is, first of all, allow generation panels to put in linguistic data into this online interface, which will automatically create the XML (unintelligible) file at the back and then it will allow people to use that label generation toolset or the XML file to determine whether the label they want is valid or - and if it's valid whether it's locatable or it should be locked.

So the first use case, which is to create an LGR of this use case was for the generation panels has been developed and the beta version is now available it has been made available to the generation panels so that they can develop their XML files. The use - the second use case, which is to use the LRGs to determine label validity and variance will be available later this year and then the third use case will be to manage LGRs is going to be available early next year. And, finally, once the project is matured we intend to release this as open source for the community to use as well. Next slide please.

This is just an update on the status of RDN country code top-level domains. There have been no new additions since the last update. Next slide please. Next slide.

And we also initiated the work on reference second level LGRs - label generation rules or IDN tables. What - so we are developing the RDN tables for the second level for various languages. These will be made available to the community and will be helpful in the process of pre-delegation testing and (unintelligible) and these are not going to be binding.

So an applicant may be able to use their own tables, but if they use these tables these will be - the process will be much faster to get them through (PDD) and (RSAP). So at this time as per the process which was finalized to develop them we are - the guidelines have been developed to make these tables - these guidelines will be presented on Wednesday and also released for public comments soon after ICANN 54. Based on these guidelines the IDN tables will be developed and they'll (unintelligible) stability review. Based on those reviews these tables will be finalized and, again, released for public comment and after incorporating the public comments they will be published. They are being done in two batches.

The first batch is going to be available, I think, in March next year and the second batch is going to be available in May next year. And these languages for which these are being developed are being chosen based on the current request for RDN tables through the new GTLD program. Next slide please.

And we've also started review of the RDN implementation guidelines. These guidelines are available - sorry, applicable at second level. There was a call for experts, which was released on 20 July based on nominations. We have now a working group. We were waiting for CCNSO to send in their nominations. Those have also been done now very recently and the group is going to have their first meeting during ICANN 54 Wednesday morning. Next slide.

And we continue to obviously update the community on the work we've been doing through various interactions and these are some details. So thank you very much and if there are any questioned I'm happy to answer them.

Jonathan: Thanks (Unintelligible). It does feel like you're making - is progress faster than it has been before? It feels like its sort of coming to a head now anyway.

Man: Yes, so there a couple of things now coming together. The (Unintelligible) work, of course. We have the first communities which have actually finished their (LDR) proposal. It's been a significant effort, for example, for Arabic

team. It's taken them about 20 months to finish this work. So it's been actually hard for them. Armenian was a simpler case. It took them about six months to finish, but - so we are certainly obviously very excited. It's finally coming together and we should have (unintelligible) of the (LGR). We've also seen very good progress from Chinese, Japanese and Korean communities. They're making good progress and they'll be meeting very actively during ICANN 54 as well. So many things coming together.

Jonathan: Questions or comments? Any points that this raises? Go ahead (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, first of all I want to congratulate you. It looks like there's a really good progress going on. One quick question. You mentioned the difference between the rules on the TLDs and the second level. My own opinion - and I've expressed it in the past also as a part of the - I was a part of some of these committees - that the biggest problem is actually the second level. Because variance, if we don't take care of them the right way, are going to create very problematic fishing and farming issues.

                 My question - you had a slide on the rules for second level and what you're doing with the new GTLDs and so on. What I'm trying - it wasn't clear for me - maybe it was there, but I'm trying to understand whether this tool that you're providing and the LGR tables are going to be part of a policy that is required from the registries to actually implement. Because if it won't, we're going to see some real problems.

Man: So as far as how these tables will - well what should be applied at second level, especially in the context of (unintelligible) of labels. That work needs to be taken up by the RDN implementations guidelines working group, which is very recently, as I shared with you has been formed.

                 So that's the right platform to have the discussion and we have six nominees from GNSO on that group and I hope those relevant questions will be actually raised and we will get some concrete, I guess, mechanism to deal with this

issue. But that's the right forum for it. As far as the linguistic data and second level (LGR)s are concerned the language level tables will be available and we will certainly be developing these tables (unintelligible) stability. Considerations are - will be taken care of in that process, but as I said those tables are not going to be binding on second level. They're only reference (LGR)s. Eventually (unintelligible) are - have to decide for themselves how - what their second level policies are going to be.

Man: This here may be a question to the council. So what you're saying is it's not going to be binding? I think that's - we're talking about different problems here on the council and this is a huge problem. I'm not sure if the people here really understand. This can create so many fishing problems online for the IDN community that we're - it's going to be a mess. You know, we're still going to have a lot of acceptance of IDNs, but once it's going to pick up and it will pick up, in my opinion, it's going to be a mess.

So maybe if it's not - can be forced this way maybe the council can take this issue and - maybe it's a question here whether this is possible to have PDP and decide on a policy that actually requires registries to implement these rules from the point of security. This is really a significant issue that I think we should consider as part of the PDP process of the council. Thanks.

Man: Thanks (Unintelligible). If anyone would like to respond to that point that there should be some policy development work. I'll go to Edmon and then if you feel you'd like to respond maybe it's something we can add to that list on the wraps-ups. At least an open item, (Mary) and Marika (unintelligible). Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Hello? Is it on? Okay, Edmon Chung here. So, actually, on what you're just mentioning I have three comments, but on that particular point I actually have a different understanding of how the IDN implementation guidelines work. I think they're binding. I'm actually pretty sure it's on all the - it's in all the registry agreements.

So that's - you know, and that's also a reason why I think the council should pay attention to what's going to come out of that working group because that has, you know, registry agreement implications directly and so that has been one of the things that I've been bringing up and making sure that it - that particular document actually has policy implementation - policy implementation relation - interaction. So that's actually a very important document. In fact, it's not only GTLDs, it has implications on CCTLDs as well. All the IDN CCTLD process - the process requires that the IDN CCTLD abide by the IDN implementation guidelines as well. That's the only - actually that's the only document I think, as I recall, that - besides the RFCs that ICANN has a real kind of compliance kind of thing with CCTLD.

So that's, I think, a very important document. My other two comments, one is on - also on the second level development. (Unintelligible) you mentioned that there - on the PDT and (RSEF). I wonder if you have done any studies of - on previous RSEF and PDT and whether, you know, whether the implementation so far has been relatively consistent or they're all over the map a little bit. Because that feeds back into (unintelligible) question about, you know, if all the registries have, you know, hugely varying policies that are implemented that actually creates different types of confusion as well.

So I'm just curious what is the situation like and what do you think, you know, how that's implemented. And also whether in the future the - with the standardized LGR are we looking at a possibility of not needing an (RSEF) because I think that's - currently I still think that's overly - an over requirement from the ICANN perspective.

And my last comment is on my - coming back to (P7) you probably, you know, I - you skipped it through very quickly. I don't - do we have a road map or a timeline at this point? I missed your slide as well so those two (unintelligible) questions.

Man: So to respond to the first comment regarding the tables - (unintelligible) tables we've been getting at second level. So they've definitely not been

consistent. There is a reasonable variation within the same language, for example and that is one of the reasons, obviously, we are also eager to get this work completed soon and make it available for the community so that there's at least some reference, which is available for people to view and then eventually decide whether they want to follow that recommendation or have their own version. But if they - the idea is that if they take the reference or stay within the references (unintelligible) it will have some variation in itself, but if they stay within the reference - the (RSEF) process will become relatively simpler because the table evaluation will not be done because that's already been done if they're using the reference - pre-defined reference.

Coming to the second question on (P7) implementation I had basically updated the council last time as well that there is internal work going on. That work is being directly - currently guided by the board ID and working group. We've looked at - currently what the requirements or issues or gaps in some cases as well as current operational procedures internal to ICANN are concerned. We've also looked at the possible technical implications, which can be done for top-level domains and how diverse the current practices are, which can somehow reflect on how (unintelligible) will be implemented.

And we've also identified other technical gaps, which perhaps need to be bridged. At this time we've been tasked by the board ID and working group to identify risks and also identify how those risks are going to be addressed and as soon as - I think they're now coming to a stage where we are probably going to be concluding that internally and then coming out to the community with more details and with, I guess queries about items which are - which require community input and also start internal exercise of translating our, I guess, works of art into operational details.

So there is work going on internally, as I said, we've not come out to the community because it is something which is not at this time being discussed at the community level, but internally with board ID and working group.

Therefore, (unintelligible) not being able to share those details with the community in more detail.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So on the talk of the standard LGR for second level, I think the hope is to not require (RSEF) at all in the future if somebody abides by that. Because from what I understand for new GTLDs there's a cost involve in (RSEF) and let's say the new GTLD wants to do 100 languages. We're talking about 100s of thousands of dollars. That doesn't make sense at all. You know, to - if a new GTLD wants to embrace IDN that kind of cost it doesn't make sense at all. I think, you know, if there's a set of standard LGRs they shouldn't require (RSEF) when it's some other type of mechanism should be in place to make that happen rather than - that's why there's a huge implication actually on implementation and policy there as well.

The other quick follow up is the (P7) - the product seven in terms of implementation. One of the key questions is in the study so far do you foresee possibility for a PDP that needs to happen before the implementation can happen? Is there - are there going to be policy implications. I think that's the most - the thing that most concerns like (unintelligible) the council and the GNSO.

Man: Right. So at this time what we've identified is just implementation of policy. There's certain steps which need to be defined and we've not, you know, that's - again, that's based on internal discussions there is no clear, I think, policy which is required. It's more of a policy implementation, but certainly in many of those steps we need public or community consultation. So it's not something which will be totally done internally or can be done internally. There are questions where there are multiple options, but, again, I'm not sure at this time that any of that is actually policy development. But - there's no clear cut identification of policy development this time.

Man: Yes, so that feels - thanks Edmon. I mean I think that's (unintelligible) - I think that feels, to me, like a really important distinction (unintelligible) one moment (unintelligible) because my understanding is you're going to have a session in the main agenda in the next few days - right? You're going to be running a session on idea and implementation and all of this work?

Man: So, again, as I said this is still internal so we've not been able to discuss this with the community because we are...

Man: Do you have any sessions here at ICANN 54?

Man: Oh yes. So there are two sessions on Wednesday.

Man: Yes, so the question is which is the right forum? Because as you rightly drew us to, Edmon, and you responded to some extent - for the purposes of this forum this is about are there policy implications - is there policy work we should be commissioning and if so - I mean it's very useful to have these updates because it makes the council aware of the framework and the work in which things are being done, but nevertheless, actually you really want this to reach a wider audience. Right? This is a little detailed for this audience because from the perspective of this - from the councils should the GNSO be initiating or doing policy development work, which I know you touched on. I want to go to (Ruben)'s first here before I come back to you.

Man: And the same point just that (unintelligible) - very shortly, I'm a little confused because on what exactly - so Edmon said one thing is that the idea and implementation guidelines are going to require the registries to actually implement it. And you were saying is that it's not. So I'm confused. So are these LGR and tables - are these going to be - right. A part of - sorry…

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Sorry, okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay, but is that going to be a part of it?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: So, yes, as Edmon is saying there are two different projects we are talking about. One is the RDN implementation guidelines and the second one (unintelligible) project is reference second level LGR tables. The second project, the LGR tables or IDN tables, are reference only. As far as how these tables should be used, how (unintelligible) should be defined, how (unintelligible) should be addressed around second level labels. All that discussion is relevant to the IDN implementation guidelines working group discussions and what they eventually proposed become contractually binding to registries and also I think registrars. So those - so it's up to them - the IDN implementation guidelines working group to decide how they want to (unintelligible) that data into a binding or a non-binding relationship.

Man: Okay.

Man: Okay, thanks. So let's give (Ruben) a chance and then I think we should probably bring this discussion to an end.

(Ruben):   I'd like to respond to (unintelligible) and get him more confused than he is already. Because that contract obligation are binding on some (unintelligible) but they're not on others depending on how they specify it. They're (unintelligible) during contract negotiation and there is one issue with the contract that I don't know if the GNSO council has would ever (unintelligible) policy with that because IDN is actually described in the contract. So if a consensus policy would best - that could be possibly conflicting if what is already in the contract. Well - which I would like because I don't like what ICANN (unintelligible) chose as policy because they actually made policy when they wrote the contract.

So I am - I would like to reverse that if that's possible, but I don't know what that is because like other consensus policy - such a (unintelligible) policy would actually be in conflict with binding contract. So I really don't know how farther we can go with this and (unintelligible) a mess and I don't see if we can really solve that.

Jonathan: Thanks (Ruben). All right, I think we'll leave it at this point. (Unintelligible) the update. I think encourage people with a detailed requirement to go to the IDN sessions on Wednesday and if there, you know, talk by all means offline with (Ruben) and others if there are policy points that we need to think about bringing up in the council raised by this discussion then let's do that.

Okay, thank you very much (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you.