

**Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Group (JIG)
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 17 May 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Group (JIG) meeting on Tuesday 17 May 2011 at 1200 UTC. 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. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-jig-20110517-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar#may>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Sarmad Hussain, CLE-KICS, UET
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Avri Doria, NCSG
Wei Zhao, .cn
Edmon Chung, .asia (Chair)

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Dennis Jennings
Kristina Nordström

Apologies:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Andrew Sullivan, guest
Jian Zhang, APTLD

Kristina Nordström: Okay, hello everybody and welcome to this JIG call on the 17th of May, 2011. On the call we have Sarmad Hussain, Rafik Dammak, Avri

Doria, Wei Zhou, Edmon Chung. And from staff Bart Boswinkel, Dennis Jennings and Kristina Nordstrom. Apologies from Jian Zhang, Fahd Batayneh and Andrew Sullivan.

And if I could please remind you to state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And thank you everyone for joining and also thank you everyone for staying on; again apologies for starting this late. So since we are late so let's get started. I sent around a brief agenda the first item being a follow up on the discussion on the mailing list about the implementation of the single character IDN TLD.

I was wondering if there is any update or any questions from the staff on that item?

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. Say, you sent around a - two topics - two questions. The first one was regarding the references on the ccNSO Website, etcetera. First of all they both refer to the same document so the final report is included on the JIG Webpage itself.

And say the other one you've noted was an announcement that the ccNSO always - or what we always do for the ccTLD community on the ccNSO homepage.

Today we, say, in the course of today we'll announce there will be a third - or second announcement that the ccNSO Council has adopted the JIG final report and refers back to the JIG Webpage. So there should be no confusion, say, the first one - the announcement you've noted is only that the JIG has published its final report. So that's one.

Regarding your question if and how it's implemented in the application guidebook I don't know because I'm not involved in that arena. I also am not aware what the status is whether (Defon) has forwarded it - the final report to the ICANN Board.

I know there was a conversation between Lesley Crowley, so Chair of the ccNSO and GNSO that the ccNSO has adopted it and that they will forward it to the ICANN Board. And we just informally discussed that the most probable step is that the Board needs to take some action based on advise from staff.

And that it will - staff is aware of the final report and probably has already paid some attention to the single character IDN. That's what I had to report back on. Say, ICANN, number one, and about your question you raised last week.

Edmon Chung: Okay thank you for the update. I guess Avri, you marked the item. I wonder if you have any questions or thoughts on this?

Avri Doria: Not really. I mean, I guess - and this came up in our informal conversation before so I just put it on the record now. I wasn't really certain that anything necessarily needed to happen other than it was said to the Board and the staff got it so if there are any issues to resolve in the guidebook they can and the Board approved them, you know, when it approved the whole guidebook.

And the only reason I brought up the question is because when I started looking at well if this has to go through another period of community review and it has to go through a Board decision how does

that Board decision get made in with all of the timetables I've got going on everything else.

And so that's why I asked the question just, you know, but - so I was curious more than, you know, it just - when I started looking at schedules and decisions and how decisions get made and was actually a decision actually necessary by the Board on this outside of the global applicant guidebook decision of when I asked the question. And I really don't know more now than I do then.

Edmon Chung: Okay, okay. I guess I share that. And the - I was also curious I - as I note on the email I see that there's mentioning of implementation models that are being developed by staff and we'll get more community input from - I was wondering, you know, how we could follow up on that.

So I don't know - I guess I'm not sure how to follow up on that because that's - on the applicant guidebook right now with the version it has that note in it. So I guess I'm just curious I don't know where to start the conversation.

Bart, or others, other staff, on the call I guess that was also one of the questions that, you know, if there are actual implementation models that are being developed and we're talking about a timeline that would have the new gTLDs implemented soon I wonder, you know, how we can follow up on that?

Bart Boswinkel: I'll check.

Edmon Chung: So, yes, if you could help identify who is actually working on it and...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...we could probably provide some input.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I'll get back to you as soon as I can.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Okay so I guess we'll move onto the second item which was the main - to be our main discussion. Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, may I suggest that you change 2 and 3 because again on the informal conversation I think we addressed Number 3 a bit in preparation and I think one of the items that came out of it it was rather a good idea - and maybe we start working on that one is just a recap and then we spend the rest of the hour on Number 2. Hello Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Certainly, certainly yes. So I may have missed the very recent email. But, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: It was part of the informal conversation we just had before you joined.

Edmon Chung: Oh okay. So let's get back to that then in terms of Number 3. Does anyone want to - well the item itself is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. I had brought up some items that might be relevant. Of course for our particular discussion it's some consideration of - if any policy aspect of the item should be talked about and then - so I guess so I wonder what the informal discussion was?

Bart Boswinkel: You want me to? Yes, let me recap and I'll...

Edmon Chung: Please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: And others please - yes, yes, add stuff when I get it wrong. Say, our understanding was not, say, going back to the initial discussions we had as a working group or the JIG had about this, this is first and foremost is not so much policy as it is a outreach effort in order to encourage, say, the acceptance of IDN TLDs whether they're CCs or gTLDs.

And as a result it's more reaching out to - and encourage say software vendors, browser manufacturers, etcetera, to allow and - the IDN TLDs when they start coming.

And so what we've noted is we see the same issues or that was they identified at the San Francisco meeting regard to DNSSEC - they although the ICANN - ICANN has the multi stakeholder model that accepts and adopted the DNSSEC and IDN TLDs the other parts of the ecosystem have not yet and it's far more an outreach effort maybe together with the IETF and ISOC that we should encourage others in the ecosystem to start adopting it.

And, yes, one of the suggestions that came out of, say, our informal conversation is maybe to organize a special event together with ISOC and the IETF on DNSSEC and on the acceptance of DNSSEC and IDN TLDs at one of the upcoming IETF events.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. I think the one step in that discussion was that when we were talking about who do we mean accept it because what does acceptance mean? One of the things we looked at is acceptance has a

lot to do with, you know, the coders, the people that update browsers, the people that do mail systems.

Some of it is, you know, free and open source; some of it is company proprietary. But for IDNs just like DNSSEC and resolvers and (unintelligible) etcetera, for IDNs to actually make it it needs to be supported through all that so getting the acceptance of the coders of those people.

So we're not even at the point yet where one could have a bake-off and I know we're not allowed to call them bake-offs. But somehow how does that - and so one of the ideas was if you announce far enough in advance in an IETF context that there's going to be like an (INTROP) even the weekend before or the weekend after or something like that does that motivate a couple people who have had it on their back burner to say oh, okay, this becomes worth doing it.

I don't know but I think that was part of the reasoning step that got there is if you don't get the coders to accept IDNs then it's not going to happen.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Avri. Can I just go on or just some...

Avri Doria: Yes, yes, go on...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Oh okay. Thank you, Avri. And I guess when I put out the items I also was thinking what this group's role should be. I guess that should be a

discussion as well. We - certainly this is an issue and this is an issue of common interest between Gs and CCs.

The question is what this group should do as well. Because this is - I guess this is a group that is put together and not intended to be bundled; that this particular effort is more likely going to be ongoing.

So my sort of question is whether this group should create a report that says, you know, here are the things that ICANN as a whole to - should do and, you know, and lead toward a more ongoing or, you know, this group should just continue on and, you know, just participate as a group and get these initiatives started along with staff. That's one of the first questions that perhaps should be asked.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. I think that the first step is what do you want to achieve with it? And if say - if say the informal - say the outcome of this - say the informal conversation and the conversation we just had is indeed as a major attention point I say we note that within the ICANN environment some policies have been adopted or some new technologies have been adopted like DNSSEC and universal acceptance or universal interoperability is an issue and we first note this.

And maybe report this back to both Councils and encourage the Councils to inform the ICANN Board and suggest to organize maybe together with ISOC and IETF such an event.

Edmon Chung: That's probably a good idea. So what we're perhaps talking about - do we need a formal document or, you know, basically just say simple email I guess from - Jian and I was talking about this earlier just - at

just a - an email I guess somewhat from chairs, co-chairs and pointing to the respective Councils saying we talked about this and thought this is, you know, something that...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, from a procedural point of view what I would suggest is that say based on this conversation if you, say, if we listen back that we, yes, do a document say, of no more than two pages saying we note this and send it around to the working group.

If the working group agrees then use - and use this (Interpol) meeting to share this with the broader community. And they think it's a good idea and put it on the agenda of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils at Singapore as well.

Edmon Chung: That sounds good. I doubt whether we will make that in report but at least, you know, that's a good target I guess. And, yes, you know, something like a, you know, a one-page or at most two pages, as you mentioned, would probably work well. I guess, you know, probably myself and Jian will try to draft something based on what we talked about and circulate it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: I wonder - anyone else have any thoughts?

Dennis Jennings: Edmon, Dennis here. You raised a question about policy considerations in your note, policy aspects of the topics. What have you in mind?

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Dennis. Actually that was one of the questions I wanted to ask. I don't really have anything in mind. But this group is - is supposed to be focused more on that area being chartered by the GNSO and ccNSO. So I think it is - we should ask about that.

I really don't think there needs to be any policy sort of developed or recommended on this item. I wonder, you know, if anyone would like to bring up any possibility like, I don't know, whether ICANN should mandate registries or registrars to set certain things like there is I guess discussion about certain security measures, for example, that ICANN has started to require registries and registrars to do.

Is this something that ICANN should put forward as some sort of a policy for a new registries and registrars? So I don't really have something in mind. I wonder if anyone can think of any policy aspect that should be addressed.

Dennis Jennings: Well Dennis here...

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. I've just opened the charter of the working group and maybe this is - how should I phrase it? One of the differences between the ccNSO and GNSO the ccNSO is not limited to policies.

And I could imagine that a - knowing this - say this is an issue, the universal acceptance but there are no policy aspects to it that the chair - the co-chairs of the working group note this and suggest another appropriate avenue to resolve it meaning setting up, say, something like an interoperability conference.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Bart. Dennis, you wanted to - hello?

Dennis Jennings: Yes, the only policy - Dennis here - Dennis Jennings here. The only policy thing I could think of off the top of my head is a situation where a registry supports IDNs at the second level as an example. And the registrars only support the ASCII labels because they refuse to go to the bother of implementing the IDN labels. Is there a policy issue there?

Avri Doria: I don't think so. Registrars tend to pretty much absolutely what they want to do in terms of what they support and what they don't.

Edmon Chung: That's a very good point, Dennis and Avri. I guess I understand where you're coming from. But perhaps - because right now there is this equal access requirement to registrars and, you know, in the future we're talking about of course the vertical integration.

But in terms of the equal access I wonder if registrars, you know, do not offer IDN capabilities or, you know, does not offer them in a way that's, you know, that's fully compliant or some sort - a standard then whether a registry could have slightly different policies between IDN aware and IDN non-aware -registrars that might be - there might be a policy issue there, I don't know.

Like, you know, that registries could treat registrars differently because, you know, with IDNs and non-IDNs.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart. Say although I may - I agree that may be an issue I wonder to what extent it is an issue of common interest for CCs and...

Edmon Chung: Right, good point.

Bart Boswinkel: ...and gTLDs because that's, say, part of what is happening or what this - what the JIG is about.

Avri Doria: Yes, and this is Avri. I - while there's something definitely appealing about trying to get some symmetry and the notion of must-have accredited registrars and what registrars must do trying to get in that battle would definitely be like trying (unintelligible) wall while hot oil was being poured down on you.

The idea of trying to in any sense give registries or the registrant and expectation of certain kinds of support on IDNs from registrars would be so very painful.

Dennis Jennings: Edmon, Dennis here...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: That sounds like too much fun for us. Dennis please.

Dennis Jennings: I fully agree with Avri. But it was the only thing I could think of but I agree - dropped my phone, pardon me. So it looks as if the acceptance is the route to try and create an opportunity for - the opportunity in supporting IDNs rather than in the policy regulatory approach.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess, yes, I guess that's noted. And probably we can have one sentence on that in the draft letter. But I guess overall we feel that there's - there really isn't any (unintelligible) here.

And I think that's in itself a pretty good finding. I guess it's important that we at least cover the topic and that's why I included it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Avri Doria: Right. I actually - this is Avri again. I actually think it would be a wonderful display of fireworks to send back something saying we recommend that this is something that the GNSO, you know, consider and it's an important topic but that the JIG didn't take it up because of, as Bart says, it's not a joint issue.

However upon noticing it we thought it would be good to refer the topic back to the GNSO for consideration.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Avri Doria: That could be entertaining.

Dennis Jennings: Avri that's called...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: We always love fun right?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: At first I must admit I have an aversion, you know, it's kind of like a fear factor aversion to making any recommendation to the registrars because I know they'll, you know, comment in some way that's painful.

But on second reflection, you know, you can't run away from them just because you're scared of them. Probably should be reflected back.

Bart Boswinkel: And maybe - this is Bart again. And maybe another point is say we're speculating this is the case.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So referring it back say so it might be necessary to analyze and first of all to do some fact finding and analyze this is truly the case.

Avri Doria: Yes that's true. But they may all be supporting them now...

Edmon Chung: Right.

Avri Doria: ...fully and actively and we just don't know it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Did I hear - I think somebody wanted to speak up earlier. Wasn't sure if it was Dennis or other? No? Okay. So I guess we have a reasonable path forward on this item. We'll address and we'll circulate and we'll see where it takes us.

So the final item would be the - walking through the IETF DNSSEC requirements document that's on the (alias) and the discussion. Avri, I wonder if you could...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...help take us through that. I'm sorry if we're running out of time but I guess, you know, for the remainder of time, Avri, please assume - if we run out of time and we can take it to the list and our next call.

Avri Doria: Well I actually don't know, you know, certainly in seven minutes walking through it. And certainly I still think that walking through what we've got more people here and including them.

But I did want to, you know, it's probably just worth mentioning a couple of things that sort of stand out to me and I read it again in fact this morning I got up at 3 o'clock this morning for a Geneva meeting so I got to read this again at 5 o'clock this morning.

There's a couple things that stand out to me in it because you had come to me and said can I write, you know, perhaps some questions and such that come up as opposed to the walk-through which in now 6 minutes would be silly.

One of the things that's clear in it is that as things stand it doesn't look like there's a technical solution. As things stand it - there's a sort of declaration that there are administrative mechanisms and that the registries have great tools for being able to handle this at an administrative level.

But when I start to think about that, a, I guess I don't know enough about registry pools for doing this administratively. I still don't understand how they do it administratively beyond the second level, beyond the third level and so on.

So that's certainly something that probably needs to be understood because my gut feeling is telling me that there's really only a limited administrative capability to make two DNS trees equivalent in some sense.

There's a third issue which is a definitional/philosophical one that's always been there between the IETF and ICANN. It's one that I had when I first came into ICANN where I would say the fact that a DNS name is a human recognizable word it's just a happy coincidence because DNS is just a string of characters.

And the notion that you have a name that means something and therefore you have to have an equivalent is not a concept that is - even makes that much sense. Now they're willing to accept that there is some notion of sameness that people want to have but there isn't that same kind of - that same level of acceptance between the two groups.

You look at their document - and this is one for Dennis - you look at their use case section, Section 3, and it's still really quite shallow. It's still missing pieces.

And I know they say they're not going to wait but I think that there's strong cause either in an ICANN recommendation or an individual when this gets to last call to sort of say, you know, the use case part of this is just not deep enough and, you know, we really recommend that you do have to wait. So that's something that we all have to consider and talk about.

You know, I mean, they get into the whole notion - and I guess again this is what they have been working on, this whole policy aspect of what is the same and what isn't.

And it comes up time and again though the problem of getting sameness at various levels. And if you're going to give people that assumption how do you really guarantee it? And does it really mean that if you - whether it's called bundling or something else to TLDs at the lowest level, at the top level rather, that you can expect that the fourth level will still be the same.

And in fact the expectation is that necessary and would it ever be possible. And even when you look at some of the solutions you put up like, you know, shadow zoning, I don't quite understand how shadow zoning works at the fifth level. You know, are we creating shadows at every zone file as we move on?

So those are some of the questions not well formed but that on re-reading it and my first reading it was sort of like as an IETF type reading it say, yes, yes, yes, this makes sense. But once you start reading it in terms of the policy part and expectations I think there may be a lot of discussion to be had with them and (Andrew) and this group when it's fully fleshed.

So, you know, I mean, there's a lot that can be a walk-through. Section 2, you know, where they're posing the problem statement is probably worth walking through in detail with (Suzanne) and looking at the various statements that she make about what the problems are and aren't. As I say 3 needs a bunch more, you know, so I think it's a - the 3.1 section.

So, yes and, you know, and then I think really getting it ingrained in our policy heads and finding out whether it's true that my feelings on reading it and the deeper and deeper I get into it is that we have a problem here that we don't have a solution for. And I don't think we're going to have a solution for so what implication does that have on policy going forward?

Certainly the policy going forward that says you can bundle names but only use one of them and the rest of them are there but not used that solution works and it prevents the confusability. But to say that you're going to have two trees that shadow each other and are identical for any one typing in any fully qualified, you know, domain name is a stretch.

So anyhow that's what I got from my morning reading.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Avri. It seems like I guess it seems like a reading that's good for when you can't go back to sleep.

Avri Doria: Well I think I...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Now I - from what you just mentioned seems to me there are three problems, one is the operational readiness capacity of registries and

essentially registrars as well but more so registries. The second item you mentioned is with the examples in the document that that seems to relate very much to the case studies so perhaps I don't know whether Dennis wants to add to it.

And then the third item is I guess overall, you know, whether we want to (unintelligible) so do we want to talk about a - sort of a position after reading this what ICANN should do?

You finally mentioned that, you know, use one, reserve all others, I think that's certainly a possibility technically but (unintelligible) I guess coming from the Chinese community that would definitely not be workable or desirable for the standpoint of the traditional Chinese situation.

Avri Doria: No I just...

Edmon Chung: So...

Avri Doria: ...I totally understand that I'm just saying I don't see how - but - and perhaps one of the good things would be if someone that really, you know, from what I understand scenic and others have said they can do it maybe you guys have decided in .asia that you can do it perhaps explaining to people how operationally this is possible because every time I hear it I hear there's registry magic that makes it so.

And I don't know if - certainly I don't understand what registry magic makes it so.

Edmon Chung: We're running out of time but that - there's really no magic because right now everyone is delegating the same - the names to the same registrant. And, you know, there are certainly certain special resolves set up for making sure that they would resolve the same. But there's no magic in terms of the DNS, in terms of delegation, I mean, not DNS - the NS delegation that's essentially what all registries are doing for NS right now.

But I guess you brought up the three items - sorry we're running out of time because I was late. But - and the first item, the operational capacity probably this group can try to initiate a - some sort of a survey whether, you know, informal or formal survey across registries and perhaps that would be valuable information.

And the second item, Dennis, I don't know whether you want to briefly talk about it, you know, whether - there are quite, you know, a number of examples that is in the document. I wonder that seemed to be tied very closely to the studies - whether we should tell them to wait for your studies because, you know, it's so much - there does seem to be some overlap there especially in the examples.

Dennis Jennings: Certainly Edmon. It's Dennis here again. First of all I think I agree with much of what Avri said about reading the document.

Avri Doria: I can't hear.

Dennis Jennings: Can you hear me? Hello?

Bart Boswinkel: You're very faint, Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: My phone is causing problems. Can you hear me now?

Avri Doria: Sort of better than before, yes.

Dennis Jennings: I think my electronic phone is causing problems. Can you hear me now?

Avri Doria: Yes, no that's much better.

Dennis Jennings: Okay.

Avri Doria: Still dim though.

Dennis Jennings: I'm going to have to throw this phone out. I think after reading the document, Avri, you've got it right, there are a number of messages there. One is that right now there is no technical solution. Two, that the - and related to that before the IETF will do anymore work they need to have a better statement of the problem.

And this is where the overlap with the IDN variant issues project is - where we certainly hope to come up with a better set of use cases and a better statement of the problem.

In terms of telling the IETF to wait, you know, the IETF is a bunch of voluntary people who, you know, don't report to anybody and do work if they feel like it. I've attempted to say, guys, you really should wait for the end of our variant issues project. And they got pretty clear pushback that says that that's not the way the IETF works. So there is a bit of a disconnect there.

So the only thing that we can do in the project is to better articulate the requirements, better articulate the case studies and to be specific, Avri, is there a requirement that's the same or equivalent work that the second, third, fourth and subsequent levels or is that not a requirement.

So there - more work needs to be done and certainly the case studies hopefully - the project will develop a fuller understanding of what the need is but also what compromises may be acceptable to the community in looking at the IDN issue.

So that's really all I have to say at this time.

Avri Doria: I know we're past time. I just want to make one quick comment on the IETF telling you to go away and leave us alone because we're the IETF and we know what we're doing. That is always their first approach.

Dennis Jennings: Yes.

Avri Doria: The ICANN does have a liaison relationship with them. And if on a policy level ICANN wants to say hey dudes, we think you should wait, you know, then using that liaison mechanism. And then there's of course yes they're just a bunch of individuals - and so are we - and we can within that process, within working group last call and within IETF last call certainly raise these issues.

Now that doesn't mean that the IIEFG will in the end agree to hold it but I sure think there's more than just you talking to (Andrew) and him saying, no, no, you know, we had three guys in the group - and if you

go back through the minutes it was really three guys in the group said nah, we don't want to wait, that that's the end of the story.

I - as an IETF person for 20 years I don't think that that is the end of the story unless we decide that it is the end of the story.

Dennis Jennings: But - Dennis here again. I think it's not unreasonable for the IETF to say give us a better statement of the problem you're asking us to solve before we continue work just - what (Suzanne)'s document is saying is if the problem statement is as she understands it there is no technical solution at this time. There is work that could be done in exploring solutions but there is no sort of solution at this time in the DNS.

Edmon Chung: Right, okay. So I think I agree with you, Dennis, and, you know, if there's no solution then they can go about thinking about one technically and that's part of the item as well.

So we're running out of time. I wonder, Avri, if you could perhaps send a note summarizing some of the things and I'll definitely add to it to the mailing list and we'll continue discussion there and in two weeks time in our next call.

Avri Doria: I'll lob a grenade (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: All right sounds fun. So I guess that brings us to the end of the call. Sorry we're quite a number of minutes late ending. But any particular item anyone want to bring up before we close the call?

If not thank everyone for joining and we'll further discuss it on the mailing list and talk again in two weeks time.

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

Avri Doria: Bye-bye...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Bye.

Woman: Thank you. Bye.

END