

Transcription ICANN Singapore
Update on Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group (JIG)
Saturday 22 March 2014

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/#mar>

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

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you and welcome to the table Edmund Chung who's going to be talking to us about the longstanding work of the Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group short (unintelligible). Over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Jonathan. And it's longstanding and we're looking at closing it. So the - but I think it's a - I'd like to bring up before I talk a little bit about the updates there there is one of the - some from the session we just have right now the - some of the work for IDN TLDs is now going on into implementation. And we're probably going to meet some of this policy and implementation issue very soon.

Anyway so the JIG was formed a few years ago actually in 2009 believe it or not but so three items were identified as a common or issues of common interest between ccNSO and GNSO.

And they were single character IDN TLDs, IDN variant TLDs and universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

So the group actually produced initial and final reports that were accepted by both councils for number one and number three single character IDN TLDs and universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

For number two because of ongoing I guess implementation work at the ICANN staff team one no reports were produced. However there was one letter that was produced from the JIG which was also adopted by the respective councils and sent forward to the board and staff.

So in general I guess what we see right now is probably at a policy level that covers but ccNSO and GNSO. We're at a point where I think we've covered most of the issues that straddle between CC and G.

So at this point that's the reason why we are proposing to bring it to a close. And just specifically on each of them on the single character IDN TLDs it seems like we are going to need to part ways.

We are - they will probably still going to be follow-up work for its eventual implementation into the next round of new gTLDs which is - that was the final board - that was included in the board resolution in response to the report.

Also on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs that on a policy level the report has already highlighted a few the very limited scope on a policy level that that has implications. And therefore also I think, you know, it needs to move beyond policy into different discussion now. So the JIG I think has completed its work.

On the IDN variant TLD though there is ongoing work right now. And I just want to I guess highlight a couple of things that to the council one of which as I mentioned there was in a letter produced to the council which was adopted and sent over the board on the formation of what is called the label generation panels and the IDN variant TLD programs.

One particular item that we highlighted which is that those panels and the program in general should include expertise from the policy aspect of things as well.

That is currently a missing part at this point in the implementation phase because looking at the panels that are being formed especially the integration panel and the advisers to it which we in the process the council sort of alerted to the team that policy expertise should be also included in those panels or as advisors that hasn't materialized at this point. So I wanted to bring the council's attention to that.

The advisors and the integration panel very stacked on technical expertise and unit code and some language expertise as well which is probably correctly so.

However we did highlight the importance of policy and how policy integrates with - or gets into implementation.

And that is a void right now. So I want to highlight to the council. And maybe that's another thing that we need to look at.

The other thing is which would be more squarely on policy related is there are with the IDN variant TLD implementation there is a couple projects that is going to come out. It's called Project 7 and Project 8.

They are actually implementing how IDN variance would be delegated and allocated to new gTLD applicants and how that cool process works.

We don't - we haven't see the drafts yet but I imagine there will be aspects of policy versus - well policy and implementation on that as well.

So I think in general I think the JIG at a cross SO policy level working group I think we have and at least I hope we have completed at least this round of work. So we're looking to close it. And I understand there is a motion put forward to just that.

But on the other hand I think there are two items that one in that I think will probably need immediate attention by the council in terms of the makeup of the panels that are working on the IDN variant TLDs and the second one that will come up very soon which is the implementation of delegation and allocation of IDN variant TLDs.

That's - and those items we will - actually those items we'll have to take it separate from ccNSO. And I guess we're going to kind of part ways but and look into it also.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Edmon. (Chen)?

(Chen): Thank you Jonathan and thank you Edmon for the update.

I think Edmon as one of the co-chairs and (Jane) as the other co-chairs really deserve a round of applause in this room for the tremendous amount of work they put in this IDN.

So I will first of all to see I mean if we can offer them a round of applause for their work.

Yes actually Edmon brought a couple points I'd like to follow-up and echo and especially the council should first of all consider potentially to a point somebody or at least to have a liaison into this labor generation panel.

This particular admin has - I mean rightly pointed out as a advisor to sit - to oversee across multiple panels it seems to me personally very necessary with last week both Edmon and myself we were at the what we call now the CGP, the Chinese Generation Panel.

It seems that this generation panel not only the Chinese who need to be involved at this stage, as Edmon pointed out Project Number 7 and 8 is on the wait of getting the right scripts to be put into the variant, a list of the variants. Also now we are going to deal with the delegation part.

Now the issue is not only for the Chinese but the Japanese, the Korean even, the North Korean, the - I mean for the Vietnamese and for - and also for the Mongolian community.

So it's expanding the - what it is what set. It was set. So I was really hoping and as Edmon pointed out that the GNSO potentially can appoint if Edmon has the capacity and also still within to lead the GNSO at least can appoint somebody like Edmon can - to actually serve on this advisor, advisory role. And that's one.

The other point I would like to point out is actually one of the three items that the JIG has been assigned to do is the first item, the a single character IDN.

As Edmon pointed out and I mean many of us in this room have gone through the process from the 2008 GNSO, the 20 GNSO recommendations as opposed to the current or the up to date, the applicant guidebook the implementation is not in line what has been set out at least for this IDN one character project.

I'm not going to the - I mean the - I mean into the detail of. I mean so I'm simply put it this way.

Suppose that in 2008 or 2009 I mean the recommendation was said to have the new gTLD program to review on the case by case basis of the one or two or three characters of the IDN rather than just simply limit to two characters all above.

So it seems that we need to re-emphasize that on the policy level the recommendation by the GNSO really didn't get picked up I mean by the - I mean ICANN staff for their implementations. This is one very good example of that.

Let me stop here. I probably take too much of the time but let me stop here, just my points.

Jonathan Robinson: So we should move on but where do you - where would you like to pick that point up on implementation? Where are you expecting to pick that up (Chen)? Where is that going to taken up?

(Chen): Would you like me to maybe to emphasize that when we put the motion in front or are you suggesting that in one particular session that I should do...

Jonathan Robinson: Well I mean we have questions with ICANN staff from the - the main division for example. I'm just wondering where that needs to be raised.

But - because it's easiest enough to make that the point here and we get it and then the question is how do we take it forward to - Edmon do you have a thought?

Edmon Chung: I guess I'm not sure when we will actually come back and review what was in the policy and what got - eventually got into the AGB. I mean that's probably a bigger discussion. Probably this would fit into their as in kind of the review of what we set out as policies and what eventually got implemented.

There are a number of things, single characters, IDN TLDs one thing out of the IDN group. There are three or four items that were in the policy recommendations but eventually not implemented so...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay I got it. Thanks. I had - did someone want to respond specific to that point because I've got Mikey next in the queue?

Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is following right on behind what (Chen) and Edmon brought up.

The vastness of my ignorance about this is beyond description. And so when I hear you two saying we need some help from the GNSO on the policy side in terms of people volunteering my first question was what's the nature of the expertise that would be the most helpful?

But then (Chen) when you were talking I heard you say that maybe the option would be for us to endorse or nominate Edmon to fill that role. And that cheered me up a lot if that's really what you're hoping for.

So are these bodies that need a representative with deep policy expertise and that Edmon would be the person or a person that could fill that? Is that where you're headed?

(Chen): That was my suggestion. And it was not being discussed before we were seeing the need and from the generation panel. They're also calling for policy experts to serve as an advisory just to see across different generation panels. So that was...

Mikey O'Connor: So it's really two things. One is a few of these we need to talk about. And hopefully this goes in the no-brainer pile for me but hopefully endorse Edmon to be put forward on some of those.

But then you're in addition saying that there are other requirements for more policy participation in other panels. Is that right and if - or is it all one? And that's what I was trying to...

(Chen): Yes just to clarify I was suggesting that the councils should have a liaison or advisor on the - just across the different generation panel so that's...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

(Chen): ...just one thing (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: And Edmon I'm looking at you. Is this something you want to do because if it is then it falls off a no-brainer for me. But I just want to make sure this is something that aligns with your goals too.

Edmon Chung: Yes I - thank you Mikey. And yes I'm anxious to serve. And I think I'll probably - I hope I can do a good job there.

The problem - oh I shouldn't say a problem. But the situation there there is a process for at the ICANN staff team on the implementation of this generation set of generation panels.

And the integration panel has been appointed. There are five persons on it and three additional advisors have been appointed as well.

And all of them - well most of them are unit code experts or language experts or technical experts.

But at least from the roster right now I don't see anybody who has more expertise on the policy side of things which I think we - if - the next question then is how could we bring this up to the staff team and perhaps from the council make a suggestion going forward? And that's really what I'm proposing and I guess...

(Chen): Right so my suggestion, sorry to jump in quickly. So the one potential on value is that during the wrap up on Thursday we can bring this up and officially.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes let me make a process point. Yes I mean so the way this works as far as I can see it is when and if there are suggestions like (Chen)'s very good suggestion here the intention is that those are picked up by Lars and Marika. They're keeping a close track on what we might call action items.

Those are then collectively hovered up on the Thursday wrap-up session and we'll take an action item.

So that strikes me as the way. So it's on the table. As you rightly point out Mikey this seems like a no-brainer. But actually in the interim there'll also be an opportunity to discuss this potentially with staff on the way through our weekend sessions and then we sort of vacuum it up in the final event in the wrap-up session so you've got it.

Any other comments or questions? (Mary)?

(Mary):

Thanks (Jonathon). And not necessarily on the last point but just for the council and the community so that this may be a relatively uncharted territory for some folks as Edmon says on the variance project there is a staff project going on on that. And a lot of the expertise that's been requested has been on the technical side.

Generally speaking however there's still going to be an opportunity for the community to contribute because each of these LGR panels and the plan is for LGR panels in 17 different languages if I'm not mistaken.

So even if you're not a linguistics expert in, you know, Arabic or Chinese or something each of these panels is going to come out with recommendations that will go to public comment.

And then all of these 17 will then be looked at by the integration panel that Edmon and (Chen) mentioned. And there'll be opportunities to contribute there.

On the universal acceptance point there is going to be a community session on Monday that the JIG is co-sponsoring. And that is a more general discussion because the question there is what is the proper role for ICANN in ensuring universal acceptance not just of IDNs but of all TLDs which is an issue that goes beyond ICANN and involves the technical community and the industry.

And the ICANN staff managing that project are really looking for community input and suggestion. So there's a Monday session on that and I believe ALAC is also having a discussion on that on the IDN side of things on Wednesday. So please look out for those on the schedule.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Mary). John are you still in the queue?

John Berard: Yes this is John Berard. In asking Edmund to take on this responsibility are we breaking new ground? Is this the first time the council has done such a thing or is there a history of this kind of thing?

Jonathan Robinson: Good question. I don't know is the short answer. I mean I was seeing it as a perspective GNSO liaison but yes I mean not - well as opposed to a council liaison. But - and it may be new ground. I don't know if anyone's got any comment or thought on that. But it doesn't feel particularly ground-breaking. It's just making sure that we're keeping a close eye on things through the cycle.

And I supposed on issue, one general issue that this highlighted to me was as in our oversight the management function is this theme, this continuous theme of notwithstanding the work that's going on, the policy and implementation working group is to keep a continuous eye on within our own working groups and within our - from our own supervisory perspective on implementation. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I think that the - one way to think of this is that in the Implementation Review Team concept that's being implemented now the notion is that a member or members of the Working Group that produce the original policy should participate in an Implementation Review Team as the policy's being implemented.

And certainly that could be a vehicle for it for this to happen. And this gets back to my point earlier that the implementation process is very green and very untested and somewhat unreliable.

And I think the points that (Chen) makes echo some of the experiences that I've had in other policies where my ignorance isn't quite so vast where the policymaking group comes up with a bunch of ideas. They work very hard and they come up with a policy.

And then the implementation loses the track. And so to the extent that we can inject members of the policy making group like Edmon into that process to bring it back on track it's not groundbreaking at all. It's actually quite mundane.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so that seems like a natural point to close the session. I mean I just echo (Chen)'s strengths to Edmon. I mean Edmon's carried this torch in so many ways but in a leadership role and a practical role sometimes on his own.

And so, you know, it was fully appropriate that we gave him the round of applause and thanks. So thank you Edmon. Thanks for coming today and thanks for all fo your hard work to date.

All right we can stop the recording on that session.