
DURBAN – At-Large IDN Working Group
Wednesday, July 17, 2013 – 16:00 to 17:30
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

EDMON CHUNG:

This is Edmon here. We're running a little bit late. We're trying to get the presentation on and with all the other sessions, we're just waiting for people to trickle in. So please bear with us for a couple minutes – we'll get started. This is just for those who are – there is a call in the Adobe room setup, right? Okay. So just to let people know.

So, thank you everyone for joining. I guess let's get started. Do we need to start any recording or anything? Oh, so it's live now? Okay. All right. Thank you everyone for joining. This is Edmon Chung, IDN liaison from ALAC and also chairing the IDN working group. I guess before we start, let's just quickly go around the room, see who's here. And also, it's only the Adobe room, right? Are they able to speak up or...? Okay, and then whoever is on the call. Perhaps I – oh, why don't you help me out?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Edmon. Just to let people who are listening to us or watching us remotely, if you wish to be able to speak during the session, you will have to dial in, and I believe that the dial-in numbers have been provided on the page somewhere. If not, then Matt will be putting a link in the chat box of the Adigo and you'll be able to find the dial-in numbers. That's all. Back to you Edmon.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Olivier. And perhaps just quickly go around the table, starting from your side.

WENDY PROFIT: Wendy Profit, Registry Group.

KIM DAVIES: Kim Davies, ICANN staff.

ASMUS FREYTAG: Asmus Freytag, Consultant.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco, ICANN staff.

MATT ASHTIANI: Matt Ashtiani, ICANN staff.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Elect Chair.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon Chung here.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ALAC Member, Vice Chair of the IDN Working Group.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Evan Leibovitch, ALAC.

EDMON CHUNG: And if there's anyone who's on the call?

MATT ASHTIANI: No one has actually dialed in yet, but we have John Klensin in the remote participation room.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. Okay. So let's get started, even though we have a relatively small gathering here. A brief agenda was sent around and also just a presentation that is being put up. So, Matt, next slide.

So the idea is to spend our time talking a little bit about some of the work that is coming out from the JIG and the Variant TLD Project, and also the Trademark Clearinghouse. It seems like a couple of the key champions are not here, but we'll keep going and see. Hopefully Hong will join us for the Trademark Clearinghouse discussion. So that's the agenda that we put out. Any suggestions? If not, we'll jump right into it. Next slide.

So in terms of the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, a draft final report came out from the JIG, the Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Working Group. It's open for public comment and it will close on the 25th of July. Since I am

on a different capacity on that particular group, I guess Rinalia perhaps, I wonder if there is – I believe there's starting to be effort to put a response together on this.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you, Edmon. A draft response to the draft final report on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs has been circulated to the At-Large community. There were some comments of support from the Asia-Pacific Group, and the ALAC is expected to vote on this draft statement tomorrow. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you, Rinalia. Any further discussion on it necessary here? No? In that case, this was just the proposed recommendations slide. In the case of no further discussion, I guess we can jump right through it. Next slide.

Okay. So the other item that we have been working on is related to the IDN Variant TLD Program. There was a Board resolution that happened in Beijing as adopting two very important reports actually. One is the Label Generation Rules Report and one is the User Experience Report. These links are for everyone's easy reference to the reports.

And the ALAC, of course, drafted a statement which was sent to the Board. Next slide. And I was going to – just to bring it up, I think – actually before I do that, both this particular statement and the statement on the Trademark Clearinghouse has been sent to the Board and an effort to put together the ALAC IDN Working Group and the Board IDN Group, as well the staff implementing these has begun.

We started a dialog with the Board committee, and that is moving along. So part of what I was hoping to do today is perhaps just look back at the statement that we put out and see if there are any further details people want to add.

And then in terms of the Trademark Clearinghouse part, we received a response from the Board as well. And I was going to go through that a little bit.

Back to this statement. This is on the IDN Variant TLDs, the Board invited all the ACs and SOs to respond to the implementation of the IDN Variant TLDs and we put together a statement – the summary of which are six main points. It's in keeping with many of our previous comments to this in terms of introducing the IDN Variant TLDs as carefully. And it's important to maintain the security and stability in parts. That's sort of the first area.

The other one is – the second one – is to point out the importance of IDN Variant TLDs and how it is part of the consumer trust. Because for many implicated user communities, having the IDN Variant TLD enhances the user experience and consumer trust.

Third one is more directly in response to the user experience. A report which just identifies a number of issues and concerns that could happen when IDN Variant TLDs are implemented. So it is to, I guess, heighten the priority to ask ICANN to increase the priority on really preparing and outreaching to the affected communities, technical communities, and tell them about the implementation of IDN Variant and IDN Variant TLDs. Next slide.

And then the fourth item is sort of a more general statement. It's continuing from our previous statements already and the importance of IDN Variant TLDs and IDN, in general, to multilingualism.

And then the fifth one is an addition to it. This is also consistent with many of our previous statements, which is that in certain language communities may be a little bit more ready than others, and there should be ways to allow the more ready ones to be in the process faster or go through the process faster. And in this case specifically, on the Han script, which is more for Chinese but also has some relations with Japanese and Korean.

And finally I think that point six is probably the most important one. I guess important in terms of as an advice to ICANN and to the Board is as we go into the implementation of it, and to make sure that the LGR process remains accountable and transparent. There are identified some weaknesses in the processes, including the limitation on expertise, including some of the things that we've actually included in our earlier statements back when the LGR discussion was ongoing, which is the review mechanisms, or the lack of, and the inherent ways of how the two-panel system works.

One of which is I guess related to the weaknesses as well is a lot of it is dependent on the ICANN Public Comment Process. And how do we ensure that – we're depending on that particular process to ensure that the LGR process is in good shape. So how do we do better in those processes as well? I think that's sort of the summary of the statement that we issued. The Board has said that they want to interact with us. We haven't heard back from the Board yet. I don't know. Rinalia, if you

want to add anything at this point to highlight any part. And thank you for drafting this. There is a question in the room? Before I go there, I was just asking Rinalia if there was anything, any addition. That's fine then. The question? Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI:

Hello. We have a question from John Klensin. John writes, "First it is important to note that TLD Variants will enhance the use experience is a hypothesis, but by no means proven. Second, if domain labels that actually need variants are delegated and put into use without those variants, the user experience may get very confusing."

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Matt, and thank you John for the comment. That is actually consistent with the User Experience Report in many senses. Whether it improves user experience I guess remains to be seen. Part of the User Experience Report which identified some of the experiences coming from what has been implemented, the dot-China and dot-Taiwan TLDs, at least so far has been relatively good form at this point. So I think that comment is very important. And I think when the ALAC put together the statement, number one actually – both number one and number three I think, or number four – stresses the importance of the maintaining security and stability of the DNS and that point is well taken and understood.

Adding to that actually, staff has worked on a risk document, which analyzes some of the risk involved in the implementation of IDN Variant

and IDN Variant TLDs as well. And that's probably a good source of information for the community to take a look at as well.

With that, the question really is the Board has identified this document to say that they wanted to dialog with us further. I don't know whether – but they have not provided us with any questions or further feedback on it yet at this point. So I guess we'll just have to wait for them to provide us what their thinking is. So with that, I was hoping Hong would join us in time, but she hasn't yet. I guess we'll continue to push forward. Matt, next slide please.

So this is about the Trademark Clearinghouse and IDN Variants. ALAC put out a statement. It was led by Hong as I mentioned and with a lot of input from this working group. Next slide. Basically the summary of which summarizes three main points. We view that the TMCH Model needs to be more flexible and variants aware. That's number one. And if there is need, we are – the community's more than willing to support solutions and provide solutions for the TMCH.

The second point is that we do feel that, especially as the TMCH enters into service it is going to be serving IDN TLDs first. We feel strongly that it is important that the IDN Variant issue is addressed completely before it goes into service, and especially for sunrise and the trademark claims services that is being provided.

The third point is that we believe there needs to be a quick fix, if you will, and some interim mechanism to get solutions going because we want it to be in place for the IDN TLD launches and the TMCH launch. We understand that there could be additional staff requirements and we also highlight if the LGR process is of any relevance to the

implementation to the TMCH, though we don't necessarily hold that view completely. But if that is, then they should be considering expediting that process a little bit.

And finally, of course, we have received the IDN tables and the IDN registration rules and policies from all the new gTLD applicants. It is important to review those tables and policies and rules to get a better picture of – because there is a lot of talk about how complicated this could be. But a review of those tables, which is a finite set, could reveal perhaps a different view on the issue and we feel that is very important as a background at least to make a decision on where this calculation should be done in the whole scheme of the TMCH.

That's the summary of a statement that has been out and the Board has given a brief response actually. Matt, if you could help go to the next slide. The Board provided a response basically saying that Variance appeared to be a very complex topic. Their view is that the current approach with variance and the TMCH is to leave it out of the TMCH and rely on registries to handle the variant issues. So basically they believe that the current direction is appropriate. As I mentioned, we have started a dialog with the Board committee on IDNs and especially on this particular topic. And we have identified to them that there – and I think they have received that information as well.

Their understanding that it would rely on the registries to handle the variants is actually somewhat – there's a gap between the actual implementation, because actually, for the trademark claims process, the reliance is not on registries but on registrars to handle the variant issues.

So in the current implementation it has introduced multiple points of the implementation as well. That is something that became clear in the dialog with the Board committee and with staff. And I think that part of that is being talked about in the ongoing discussion with the Board. So that perhaps is the extent of where we are.

Oh actually, in the dialog with the Board, SSAC also identified that a report may be coming out very soon on IDN variance and have asked us to wait for that document to come out before we proceed further without considerations on solutions or discussions. That is – I wouldn't talk about when it's expected, but it's expected soon.

Another item that was identified where there was sort of a gap between the Board's understanding is that, again, relying on registries to handle variant issues is actually not possible for the sunrise period as is being proposed right now at the TMCH process because the TMCH process only allows the allocation of names that are identical with the trademark and therefore variance, even if the registries want to implement the variant during sunrise, they are barred from doing that in the current TMCH proposal. Staff has responded in saying that, for lack of a better word, mistake perhaps is being handled, is being understood. And then a new draft of the TMCH process is being prepared and might handle that particular situation.

So with that, I guess I open to see if anyone has any further thoughts on this very brief response from the Board? Actually it was circulated to the IDN working group, the mailing list, a full response. There's a longer description behind. I can go to that, but this is the gist of it. The view is that the Board thinks that the current implementation is fine. There

needs to be no changes and asked us for more detailed information on it.

We have identified a couple of gaps between the Boards understanding so staff is working on updating that, and that's where we are right now. Rinalia, do you want to...? I just want to mention that Dev has joined us and also Naela, and Karen Lentz from staff have joined us in the meeting. Perhaps, if there are any thoughts please feel free to bring it up. But Matt, are you signaling that there is a question or comment?

MATT ASHTIANI:

Yes, I did. We have another question from John. But I think he meant TMCH but he wrote TCCH, but I may not know. I'll just read it. Okay, he said yes. He says that he has a small question about the Trademark Clearinghouse issue. "It is important to note in particular that some of the variant issues that are of interest to the trademark community, and one of the specific gaps, are forbidden to be considered under the LGR process."

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Matt and thank you John. I think, looking at Rinalia, we were both wondering whether John, you could identify, elaborate a little bit on that? I guess, as you type, if you are willing to elaborate as you type I'll just quickly talk about what some of the issues are, in terms of the implementation.

On the sunrise process, the TMCH would generate these files which is called SMD. I actually forgot the long – Signed Mark Data (SMD). And the SMD is going to pass to the registrant, which was passed to registry

for registration. Currently the idea is it needs to be an identical match. The preferred approach from ALAC is that the TMCH would handle IDN variance. Again, it was very important to distinguish between the IDN variance, which is a domain label variance, versus the trademark itself. But have that and include it in the SMD to be provided to the registrant, rights holder for registration, so that the registry can verify that information. I'm asked to slow down. Okay.

The trademark claims process, the current suggestion, is that for the handling of IDN variants, the current staff proposal is for the registrar. So first of all, the claims process is that when the registrant registers the names that collide with a trademark in the clearinghouse, a notice is sent to the registrant, and also sent to the rights holder. Right now the current proposal is such that the registrar is tasked to get that information from the trademark clearing house.

And in the case of IDN variance, the idea is that it would query the trademark clearinghouse for all the variants and of course the primary domain to see whether there are any matches in order to for it to work. So that's the background. Did John – was John able to elaborate? Okay. So, as we're waiting for the...

MATT ASHTIANI:

Hi, this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. John has placed an elaboration into the chat. John writes, "At least from what I've been told by trademark specialists and some years ago, WIPO staff, to at least some trademark perspectives, sounded like strings and alternate spellings are very important. The LGR model and the VIP model overall concentrate strictly on character glyph level variants and excludes consideration of

anything else, including those types of strings. I can comment further on this if needed”.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Matt and thank you John. Now I think I understand where you’re coming from. I want to distinguish this from the trademark plus 50 kind of suggestion that is – well, the implementation that is now for the Trademark Clearinghouse, and we’re talking about IDN variants. A variant for IDN labels which is tied in with the LGR and in fact tied in with the IDN tables that has been submitted by the registry through the New gTLD program. If I understand your concern, John, that is not what we are suggesting.

Okay. Since Hong is not here, we’re almost coming to the end of this meeting. Because I was expecting for her to bring up some of the main items. In light of that, I don’t mind – I did identify a couple more items that were already circulated to the IDN Working Group mailing list.

The Board response that you’re seeing here actually has a few more specifics to it. So rather than go through all of the items that were circulated – actually, there were eight items that I circulated to the working group – I just want to highlight one of which I think is important to be brought up. Because from the Board response, it seems there is a big disconnect there.

Based on the Board response, it sort of imagines that an IDN variant as they are handled in the registry, or registrar for that matter, is that all the variants would be generated and stored in a database of some sort. That is not usually the case and that’s perhaps one of the biggest

misunderstandings. IDN variants often in the systems and for registries for sure, I think most of the IDN variants, they are not an addition – they don't trigger an additional transaction. It's one transaction and the IDN variants are created as a bundle and as an atomic set. So that idea that each variant is generated and created is one of the things that actually doesn't really quite happen in the registry system. I think that needs to be understood by, perhaps by the implementation thinking from the staff. That was just highlight that I wanted to make. Otherwise, the eight items are there.

We haven't been able to go through all of them with the Board committee yet. As I mentioned, the update is that the dialog has begun. We're waiting for a couple of documents to move forward, one of which is the SSAC. Patrik Fältström has mentioned that SSAC is working on a paper and possibly coming to a conclusion and we'll see on IDN variance and that would provide us with a better guidance to move forward on this. The other document is we've identified some sort of disconnect between the Board and implementation and staff has said that it will be updated and will likely possibly address some of the concerns and some of the issues. With Hong not here, I don't know whether there is anything we can further discuss on this topic to bring the discussion forward. Rinalia, did you have anything in mind to cover?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

I think I'll just share what I recall from the previous discussion that we had involving Board members. There were two things that, at least in my mind, were conclusions in terms of the issues. One of the issues is that there are registries who are offering IDN registrations and they do

not have variance management, and that is a problem for all TLD providers.

And the other part of it is the actual management – the actual variant solution itself, in terms of how it would be managed when you leave it at the registry level. And the suggestion that we look to the IDN tables as a solution on how to manage that is still in limbo. And earlier, when we looked at our statement, one of the longer-term recommendations was to suggest looking at those IDN tables. I think there may be some people in the room who have looked at those IDN tables and may have some preliminary thoughts in terms of how it could go. Could we perhaps have some thoughts on that?

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Rinalia. Edmon here as well. I see some discussion from staff and I guess the question is whether anyone from ICANN team would be willing to share some of the thoughts on whether there has been any study of the IDN tables that have been submitted and any conclusions to be drawn there, or preliminary views on that? Thank you Naela. It doesn't work? No, because you need to speak to a mic.

NAELA SARRAS:

This works. This is good. So Edmon, this came up kind of yesterday too, right? So this is acknowledging that all the applications had to turn in an IDN table and the same case in IDN TLDS and ccTLDS. So I'm sorry, I was talking about IDN tables in a separate conversation over there with Wendy. Compiling a lot of the end tables to come up with basically an informal LGR, is that what we're talking about here?

EDMON CHUNG: Rinalia can probably add to this. But I think what Rinalia is asking, part of the statement that ALAC put out is to, let's do a study of the received tables and how complicated or how simple they are, and that information could inform the Trademark Clearinghouse implementation as well because even if we rely on registries or registrars to implement this, as a whole we should probably get a sense of how complex or what to expect there.

NAELA SARRAS: Just a second. So this came up yesterday in the LGR context. Since it's really talking about TMCH – and from listening to Karen earlier in the last couple months trying to keep up with the TMCH because the variant TLDs keeps coming up as a topic here, and we keep getting pulled into it, but really it's a TMCH issue, so I'm going to let her speak to this. Because it is one of the options you guys looked at when you explained to me the options that were looked at or whatever, so I'll let you speak to this.

EDMON CHUNG: So ask us first and then we'll come back to Karen.

ASMUS FREYTAG: I'm actually in the position that I have looked at these tables using a programmatic tool and in the process have maybe formed some informal conclusions about what is represented in them. It was last year, and if I remember correctly, you were looking at some geographic differences. There were, especially in terms of variance in particular, there were several models, there was a Chinese-based model that

looked like it was the same data regurgitated and I think at most two different formats, but it seemed clearly to be very much a repetition because my tool analyzed – it was going through all the tables and it analyzed how many new records to the variants it was adding in response to each new file it was processing. And after a very short time of processing, new files were just not adding any more new variants. That gives you an idea of how there is a certain repetition in there.

Then there was variance defined for the various Arabic tables, and the content was not quite as uniform in my recollection. And then there was a single variant that I found in one of the Cyrillic Tables. It may not have been one that was actually submitted but one that's in the IANA registry.

That gives us maybe some basic idea of the complexity of what's expressed in currently existing data. I don't know to what degree anybody's interested in or wants to fund any further detailed studies, but what I'm reporting is something that you can find out in about a week's worth of time. It's not rocket science really.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Asmus. And what is very interesting from what you just said is it's not that difficult to read them all in and understand the tables. For certain scripts or languages there are certain differences. There are certain scripts that have more uniformity. Is that a good summary?

ASMUS FREYTAG:

In essence. Now you've got to understand...

MATT ASHTIANI: I'm sorry. This is Matt Ashtiani from staff. Just a quick reminder, I don't mean to interrupt you, but can you please state your name before speaking? The remote participants are finding the discussion difficult to follow.

ASMUS FREYTAG: This is Asmus replying to Edmon. It is important to understand that when I was looking at things I was looking at it from a particular question to see whether any variants were defined that if applied to existing applications would indicate that the applications might be future collision if an LGR ever was developed. I did not look at it from precisely the perspective that your question implies, but I have been trying to give you my informal recollection along that direction. But as I was trying to indicate, it is relatively straightforward to conduct such a kind of research.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Asmus. Karen did you want to? This was Edmon, sorry.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you. This is Karen Lentz speaking. In answer to your question Edmon, we haven't reviewed the tables and applications for that particular purpose. Largely, in terms of what we do now, the IANA maintains this repository of practices that TLDs deposit their tables into and ICANN doesn't really have a review or substantive role in terms of that. So it's sort of been similar to that, but you're correct that it's a finite set and there could possibly be some analysis of what that group of data looks like as a set.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Karen. This is Edmon speaking. So, Kim.

KIM DAVIES: Just an additional comment. Kim Davies here.

EDMON CHUNG: That's Kim Davies.

KIM DAVIES: There is this project we call P1 informally, which is to create what's called an LGR tool. But essentially what that is is a universal table format. The work Asmus was just referring to, part of that was just surveying the current landscape of IDN tables that are out there and deployed to get a sense of the different methodologies and techniques used by existing registries.

So ultimately we hope, as a result of that project, to have a consistent way of representing these tables, and that in turn will provide us with a good mechanism to do these kinds of comparisons and analyses. So whilst we're not quite there yet, I think we're relatively close. And then if there's a benefit in doing some kind of systemic review, it should be a relatively straightforward effort.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: This is Rinalia. Kim, can you give a clearer indication of what is close?

KIM DAVIES:

We have a draft specification that's published. We believe it can represent all the tables that have been published to date, but we don't want to presuppose the outcome of the generation panels as part of the LGR. It could very well be that these generation panels have new requirements that we're not aware of, and until they meet we won't be confident about it.

So that specification is still in draft form. We expect it to be for some period so we can have feedback from those panels put back into the format if necessary. But we have a set of tools that operate on the current draft format. So directly to your question, I don't have a precise answer on soon. It really depends on how the generation panels function. But I think we have a relatively good handle on the existing corpus of tables. Independently of Asmus, I've also gone through an exercise of porting all the existing tables into this new format using code and found it relatively straightforward to do.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Kim. I guess that confirms one of the things that ALAC was putting out is that with the tables that have been submitted, it is possible to use the tables and generate the variance. And we're not talking about how well the tables are formed, whether there linguistically sound, not that at all. But based on the submitted tables, given the string, it's possible to read it in and generate variant labels. And that is a very important I think aspect and that's highly relevant to what we can expect on the TMCH, regardless of where this calculation is being made.

Because one of the biggest worries is that with variant tables, are they going to be able to be – with those tables submitted, are we going to be able to generate a variance based on certain labels? So that was I think useful dialog. I don't know, since again, Hong hasn't joined us – and thank you [Salmat] for joining us – whether you might have any thoughts on this or anyone around the room at this point? In that case, we probably could wrap this up early, and we'll have to depend on – because I understand that we need to prepare some points back to the Board, but we're waiting for the two documents, one from SSAC and one from Karen. With those we'll probably be able to better form our further response to the Board. And also, because Hong is really championing this effort I wouldn't want to delve too deep onto that without her participation. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Edmon. Just to make clear and to keep a transparent process, the ALAC IDN Working Group has met with the Board IDN Working Group and several members of staff on Monday evening. I wanted to read to the record the action items which were at the time – drafted at the time.

The first one was that the SSAC was to try to reach consensus on a statement that they're about to release, a report that they're about to release or a piece of advice, SSAC, and try and see if that could be available no later than Thursday morning. So we will only find out tomorrow whether they will have reached consensus or not on this.

Edmon is – and I think that's what you just related to Edmon, or alluded to, you were to write the detailed issues that the ALAC is concerned

with and send them to the group. That's your piece of homework. And I guess we'll help you out on this a bit. Staff is to organize a small meeting with Patrik on Friday morning – Patrik Fältström, on Friday morning – and he will be able to share some of the findings of some of the points that were made in the report. That's of course, if the report has found consensus in the SSAC. And that will be just, actually in this room early on at 8:00 in the morning.

It's not a compulsory meeting for everyone to attend. Really, it's more informational than anything else. Apparently the report is actually quite a thick chunk, so it's always good to have the ability to discuss it with the chair of the group that is drafting it.

Finally, there will be a follow-up conference call of the full group of IDN Working Group, Board Working Group, and staff I gather, as a follow-up in a few weeks, to see where we can go from there. The reason for all this is the concern that both Cherine Chalaby and myself have in the amount of correspondence that is going back and forth. And perhaps speaking to each other more often is a way to get things to move faster, but also in a cautious fashion.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Just in the spirit of transparency that Olivier related earlier, the meeting that occurred between the ALAC IDN Working Group and the Board Variance Working Group also included members from the New gTLD pProgram committee staff who's dealing with IDN variance, as well as TMCH, as well as SSAC. So, it was a lot of people and it was quite constructive. We're looking forward to further engagements to that we can come to a workable solution on the areas of difference. Thank you.

NAELA SARRAS:

I have a question. So the statement that came from ALAC on the 29th of June, 30th of June, around that time, this is the latest statement. We took it to be the response to Board asking for guidance. It is? Okay.

So some of the staff here are working on the variance project, and that's what we're considering to be the input that the Board asked for, right? And you said something about there'll be further addition to this advice that will come later? Do you expect that statement to be amended or a whole new statement?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Naela. I will clarify. That statement that the ALAC issued is in response to the Board request for guidance on the User Experience Report. And we gave a more comprehensive or higher level overview response on IDN Variant TLD implementation. From our meeting the other night, my understanding is that the Board wanted to have dialog on some of the things that we raised in that statement, which is separate from the statement on TMCH. So what we're saying is, we would like to know from the Board in terms of what they would like to discuss from that particular statement.

NAELA SARRAS:

So as we are working on the project that is supposed to incorporate this input coming from the communities, the input was due on July 1st and we sort of established an informal extension until July 28th, knowing that some of the communities are working here on these responses. Are we being – do we expect further input from that statement or do we

need to take the statement that came in as the input and that's what we process going forward into the projects?

EDMON CHONG:

I think in terms of the current position, without the response from Board – in the informal discussion, the Board raised that they might have a few questions. But, because we haven't seen them yet, there's no way to address them. But for the time being, I think we are pretty comfortable, confident with the current version. And unfortunately, as like many things, you probably have to work with something that's a moving target. But, for the time being we're pretty comfortable with the advice that was in that document.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

In case you would like further clarification or elaboration on the points, because it was just mainly general points, we'd be happy to provide that. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

With that, I think we have come to a conclusion, unless anyone else wants to speak up? Okay. Thank you John for the suggestion. We'll take it up. So with that, thank you everyone for joining, and we have a very fun dolphin night I heard, that's coming up. So get ready for that.

[END OF AUDIO]