

ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
October 5, 2010
7:00 am CT

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good day, whatever. Today's attendees are Edmon Chong, David Cohen, Rafik Dammak, and Avri Doria. And from Staff we have Bart Boswinkel and Gabriella Schittek, and we have apologies from Sarmad Hussein.

Olaf Kolkman: And Olaf is here - just joined.

Gisella Gruber-White: Oh, hello Olaf.

Edmon Chong: Okay, thank you. Thank you everyone for joining the - today's call. So last week we were talking about the public comments from the single character IDN TLD initial report.

I guess it's probably what I wanted to cover in the - I guess the first half of the call is to just talk a little bit about what the next steps we have that we should take and, you know, how I guess we move forward to it.

And then the - sort of the - trying to see if we have time for the second half to get back to the other topic of our discussion, which was the IDN variants. We

know that in the recent Board resolution there was a specific discussion about IDN variants that I think we should take a look at that and restart the discussion from there.

So I guess starting with the single character IDN TLD, Bart, is the - was the summary of comments posted?

Bart Boswinkel: I'm in the process of posting it so it will be posted this week definitely.

Edmon Chong: Okay, so yes, would that - that was basically the main part of what we had the discussion last week. So from there I was wondering if - how I guess we could proceed.

The first real question sort of wanted to ask around is we put out the initial report with a set of really aspects or issues that we have identified - the six issues that we've identified.

I guess the question is really, you know, based on all the feedback do we think there - or anything that we missed that we'd want to add? Hearing no particular input.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is me.

Edmon Chong: Please.

Bart Boswinkel: Bart. I think just for the record that say the group agreed last call to include a section on say the relevant discussions going on in - within the ICANN arena in the other four.

So it is - and say based on an assumption of the outcome of those discussions that the - some of the issues have been identified. If something will go in the other direction or is not closed and - or is not applicable in those other four or to the single character, they may need to revisit the issues and again the recommendations.

Edmon Chong: Sure. So that would be I guess an additional - wouldn't say disclaimer but...

Bart Boswinkel: No, it's disclaimer or assumption.

Edmon Chong: Yes, that would be the - closer to the very beginning of the final report I guess.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chong: Cool. So I guess other than that do people think, you know, the - that it's good to follow the six issues and really just draft policy recommendations specifically for it?

It's - right now there is a collection of different thoughts for some of them and I guess the next discussion would be to I guess craft a policy recommendation for each of the six. Does that make sense to everyone?

And that would potentially be the structure of the final report I guess. And just to I guess refresh people's mind, from what the sort of process that we have for this group is that we would decide to generate a final report and then it will then be passed to the respective Councils, the GNSO Council and the ccNSO Council.

And then the Council would eventually decide what to do with it, whether they would respectfully just take it on board or in the ccNSO case perhaps just take it as an input into specific PDP, or in the GNSO case whether it's further then passed on to the Board is up to the respective Councils.

Okay, hearing none I guess so - I guess my following question - then my question would be in terms of timing, I think it might make sense for us to try to put out a final report before the Cartegena meeting which is in about two months.

And if we can turn around a final report before that then we can have - try to have some public session there as well. My question actually I guess both to everyone and also to Staff is what's really the process that we wanted to try to have a more open session, and not just the Work Group sort of meeting but also a - sort of a outreach to the larger community.

Is there a way to do that? Is there - I guess is there interest to do that? How do we go about doing that?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart.

Edmon Chong: Bart, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I can only speak say - I don't know how the processes within the GNSO will work. The only thing I can say is the ccNSO is having a special session on IDNs or in fact on the IDN PDP on Monday afternoon, and I could ask and could suggest that say the single character final report will be discussed at that session as well so - or included in the whole session on IDN ccTLDs.

Edmon Chong: Well that's - that is sort of the - but that is the ccNSO session, right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chong: I'm curious about the main session whether, you know, how the - what the process is for developing something for that.

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry, could you repeat your question again?

Edmon Chong: The question - well for the main sessions like, you know, there - sometimes there are these sessions within the main hall during Monday afternoon or Tuesday afternoons where particular topics would occupy a certain timeframe.

I was wondering, you know, how that process works and whether this is something that would be of interest to the more general community.

Bart Boswinkel: I'd say I can check whether say - first of all whether it's feasible and the second - and I think it's up to the Working Group whether they think it's - it - there is enough traction for this topic to have a special session in the main hall.

I think one of the - what - say one of my concerns but that is particularly with - say with the ccTLD ccNSO has all raised that some of these sessions run in parallel with the ccNSO sessions but probably somebody who's supporting and this GNSO would say the same.

Edmon Chong: Sure. Well I guess the - like my feeling is that, you know, we put out the initial report and we continue to do our work. With all the things that are going on at ICANN I was - I wanted to make sure that - I think some of the issues that are being discussed could use some attention just - generally just to make sure that we're, you know, it seems to me that people are okay with it.

But we don't have a ton of comments coming in, which is good and bad. But I was just wondering if the group or others would feel that, you know, at least that we've done a broader outreach would be an important thing to do.

If not then, you know, we can just continue how we have and, you know, go about it that way. Anyone?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I ask a question?

Edmon Chong: Yes. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, and I - first of all I apologize for not having paid enough attention to some things. In terms of broader outreach of course in general that's always a good thing.

I mean, it's kind of like, you know, motherhood. Generally you have to be a real ogre to not think that is a good thing. But I'm wondering and I did not pay attention to the comments yet that we got on the part that's been on review.

Was it a very shallow set of comments or was there significant comments? We haven't seen the review of it yet because as it was mentioned that's coming later.

So is it that we're not getting a broad outreach or is it just that we got a good outreach but more is always better? And I apologize for not knowing the answer.

Edmon Chong: So I guess - well Bart probably can add to it, but I guess we got these comments. I mean, there is - some of them are pretty in depth and does hit on

a few issues like the risk names, like the issue of, you know, how it relates to ASCII - single character ASCII TLDs.

I think it's not - I definitely wouldn't say that the comments received were shallow. The volume is, you know, is however not big and that's just one of the things that I, you know, was wondering whether that, you know, everybody thought it was done.

You know, it's fine. We're good with it. There's no issue or people just never paid attention to it. But - and thus the suggestions so Bart, if you want to add to that.

Bart Boswinkel: No, not really. I think if you look at it say the - say just by not the sheer number of comments but say some of the organizations they represent, say like APTLD or the Queensland Law Society, it means that say at least it is - followed what the Working Group is doing and there is interest in that sense.

But say on the other hand if you look at the type of comments that most of them concurred with say the conclusions of the Working Group and the way forward of the Working Group.

So there's not really contentious - yes, with the exception of say in the relation with the DAG and everything there, but say - but there is no real - I think there was no real issue with say the issues raised and potential solutions suggested by the Working Group.

Avri Doria: That - this is Avri again asking a further question. And so are we saying that basically not enough communities have been hit, because I don't know that - the number of people within a community.

But if we believe that any particular communities that perhaps would have been expected to respond didn't then I'd say yes, further outreach is definitely required.

If you've got the - and I wish I had been paying enough attention to know the answers to my own questions. If the sampling though covered most of the communities you expect to care, even if it's only one of the - and that's kind of what I meant by shallow, not were the comments themselves shallow, but was the breadth and width of commenting entity shallow.

So far be it for me to be on the record as saying anybody's comments could be considered shallow. But basically was the breadth of community - what is worried about because of the depth is not that big but we got at least something from most communities, I'd say we're doing okay.

But if there's communities that are missing then I would be very supportive of finding some targeted way to do outreach to those missing communities.

Thanks.

Edmon Chong: Okay, so I guess when I brought it up just as a, you know, bringing up an issue I didn't have in mind a thinking that, you know, that the comments were not enough or not represented.

In fact I think we do have a pretty good spread. It would have been better if the - I guess the large side would have some comments too, but I do know that they were working on it.

Well at least the (H cynic) side which is more keen on the topics and working on it but ran out of time. So - and it will - they will definitely be providing

their input for the final report and they are watching the development right now.

So yes, you know, I guess from the discussion then it seems like they're probably at this point, at least for this issue, we probably don't - I don't really see a need for a sort of strong, broader outreach.

We will I guess entail a person - I guess myself and others in the group as well and myself and (Jan) as the Co-Chairs, we will definitely be reaching out a little bit more in the next couple weeks to the technical community and also the - oh, and one area I don't think we have received much response from is from - I guess from government.

But what we do have is comments that are relevant specifically about geographies names, so I can't say we have got the government covered but at least, you know, there are relevant material on that - on topics I think they would be most concerned with.

Okay, so I guess with that we've pretty much, you know, the main discussion for this topic. What I - if people feel comfortable with it what I would like to do is that in the next couple of weeks I'll - (Jan) and I will try to put together a - sort of a framework for this - well sort of a skeleton or a first draft of the - how we would see the final report and then circulate that.

And then we would go on - we would - from - on the next - on our next meeting we'll go through that and talk about it. The structure itself as I - as Bart and I mentioned would sort of follow the initial report, but we'll structure it in a way that it's going to be talking recommendations and we're, you know, we could go through the - and wordsmith as we go along.

So that would be sort of a - the suggestion for how we report. Do people feel comfortable with it? Okay, so since there really isn't a lot of contentious issues in this, then I guess it will be - we'll move forward as I mentioned.

Okay, so the next topic I wanted to cover is the - on IDN variants. I think - I sent around a link for the Board meeting - Board resolutions on September 25.

And I think - I'm not sure if everyone has had a look at it but there's a - there was a whole section about variant management trend in which there are a few - I guess a few main points, one of which is that it does say that in the next version of the Applicant Guidebook nothing will change in terms of variants management in the gTLD level.

And it specifically identified the IDN ccTLD Fast Track - the Chinese IDN ccTLD that were - that had variants and a word that was dated and it stings out those couple of - those few delegations and saying that there are serious limits to extending the same approach to gTLDs.

So I - and then it also - the Board also asked the GEO to further develop an issues report and to report back to the Board in the next meeting. I guess my question is perhaps to the Staff, is how do we interact with this process and, you know, where do we start it? I guess Bart or - whether we have any - I guess Olaf or whoever.

Bart Boswinkel: No, I have no idea so I need to check and let me get back to the list on this one, say how and with whom to start interacting on this issue. Can you hear me?

Edmon Chong: Okay, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I thought I was on mute but...

Edmon Chong: No, so I guess I don't know where to start the question either. So I guess we'll hear from you.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chong: And it seems to me that this is - well it's obviously very much related to the discussions that we're having and we intend to continue to have. So I have a feeling that those - there should be no point that we sort of have a complete overlap in discussion.

But I want to figure out, you know, what the issues report will, you know, what it's intended to be and how our group can perhaps write input or, you know, part of the discussion might be overlapping quite a bit so we can proceed together. So Bart I guess we'll hear from you.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chong: Okay. With that it actually brings me to a strange point because a couple of meetings before we had a pretty good discussion about IDN variant TLDs. We started working on an initial report and we're about 2/4 of a way in I guess.

And I sent along a revised version with the - incorporating this - discussions we had from last time. The main changes would be in Aspect 3 or 4. Let me try to - I'm opening up my own - sorry.

Okay, I'll bring that up to - on my computer. I think it was Aspect 3 or 4 that we went through and added the concept of a two-step evaluation process, one

of which happening earlier in the whole process regardless of the gTLD or ccTLD in the string evaluation part.

And then the other step being the - and during delegation, so that was - that sort of completes Aspect 3 of the initial report that we were drafting together. So my question now is whether we should continue the discussion or wait for what's happening with the Board sort of mandated - the EEO issues report or should we continue to forge ahead and start discussing the remainder of what we have - the framework that we've sort of put up? Does anyone have any suggestions, thoughts? No? Avri, do you think...?

Avri Doria: Yes, who are you calling? No, because I almost always have an opinion on things, yes I know. I - this is Avri and I'm actually - was quiet because I'm undecided.

I can see certain value in waiting but I can also see, you know, value in having come to the sort of policy perspective that would then mix with the rest.

So as I say I didn't open my mouth because I really am undecided on what the best path is.

Edmon Chong: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Say maybe the easiest way and say we don't - either this call you want to continue, maybe you can use next call. But by then at least you know how to interact if you want to interact with this Board Working Group and then you have more - a better idea of how to progress.

So say that means say for today we would say leave this as is, say that - the comment document and continue in two weeks, but then you have a broader

understanding of - maybe of the scope of this Working Group and ways to interact with them if you want to.

Edmon Chong: Yes, actually I think it might make sense. I - as much as, you know, I think - well two things. One is it would be very useful and I think the - in terms of the timeline we were hoping to develop an issues - an initial report that could be put out for public comments before the Cartegena meeting such that - because I think earlier on we had a discussion with (Chris) as well.

It'd be nice to put out a document so that in Cartegena then both the I guess GNSO and the ccNSO side can have a little bit more discussion about both topics.

And, you know, in that sense I'd like to continue to forge ahead. But I think Bart what you mentioned makes a lot of sense. I think, you know, these couple of weeks, you know, it's probably worth waiting.

My feeling is that we're not too far away from being able to at least put out a document for comments, you know, with a bunch of - I shouldn't say disclaimers but, you know, just put notes that says, you know, "This is really for public comments."

So I guess the - it seems to me that it might make sense and again I'm - I apologize. I only turned around this document earlier today so perhaps to give everyone in the Working Group some time to take a look at the document again in the next couple of weeks and we'll come back.

And I guess we'll hear from you Bart about how we can interact with the stuff that will be happening from the Board resolution. And in fact meanwhile if

you have any updates because I think it says that by October - late October it's - that some outcome would be created already.

So in the meantime even within the next couple weeks we at least send it to the mailing list and we can probably discuss it there as well.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I will.

Edmon Chong: So I guess with that we can cut this meeting short. As mentioned please take a look at the newest revision on the draft based on the last session, and also (Jan) and I will start to work on a - the - a - sort of a new document for the final report of the - for the single character IDN.

So next week that - two weeks later, our next meeting we'll try to cover both topics as well, about half each. All right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chong: Any further questions people want to bring up? If not then thank you everybody for your time. We are cutting this meeting short and we're - we'll take - let's continue the discussion on the new ones. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you. Bye-bye.

Edmon Chong: Bye.

Avri Doria: Bye. Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White:Bye.

END