

**ICANN Singapore Meeting  
JIG  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 20 June 2011 at 16:00 local**

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.

Coordinator: The recordings have now been started. Please go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Thank you and welcome to the (JIG) Meeting, the Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group. This is a working group meeting here at the ICANN Singapore.

And I guess we'll start by sort of a sort of a roll call in a way by just everyone introducing who you are and where you are from. And if I can start from Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi I am Avri. I am - I just am an observer on the (JIG) from the GNSO. And I'm chair of the NCSG. Thanks.

(Oksana Tihut): Hi I am (Oksana Tihutka), Ukraine, European Media platform. I am a member of the working group of IDN brands and I am from ALAC working group also.

(Vladimir Sherdenov): (Vladimir Sherdenov), I'm the Director of Policy for Telnik dot tel registry, a member of the Registry Stakeholder group.

(Josef Eve): (Josef Eve), I'm a (unintelligible) to participate and then want to learn about what the progress of the issues.

(Chris Dillon): (Chris Dillon) from University College London. I'm a member of the Chinese Case Study.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung from dot Asia, a co-chair for this working group, from the GNSO side.

Ching Chiao: Ching Chiao from (unintelligible), the co-chair from (ccLO) side.

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings, ICANN consortium staff member and Project Leader for the IDN Variant Issues Project.

Bart Boswinkel: Bart Boswinkel, staff support for this working group.

(Gabriella Shatay): (Gabriella Shatay), ccNSO secretariat.

Sarmad Hussein: Sarmad Hussein, I am observer on (JIG).

(Ma Il): My name is (Ma Il). I am a member of the Arabic Case Study on IDN Variants and Egypt staff representative.

(Jan Esoesnik): (Jan Esonsnik), I've started here as ccNSO but then moved to GNSO. And also I'm running with dot (unintelligible) so kind of familiar.

(June Tayl): (June Tayl), VeriSign.

(Harry Chen): (Harry Chen) from Hong Kong (Dutch KM) and also IATF secretariat.

Edmon Chung: And from the back row I wonder if you want to...

(Wai Xao): Oh here it's me, (Wai Xao), from (Phoenic) and the observer of the (JIG) working group and participating in this meeting by remote. Sorry can't be there.

Edmon Chung: Good to have you with us (Xao Wai).

(Wai Xao): Thank you.

(Daniel Kolchev): (Daniel Kolchev) from the Bulgarian (tudor) registry, and I (serve the) working group.

(Unde Apgar): Hello (Unde Apgar) and I come from the NCUC yes.

(Xijan Wong): My name is (Xijan Wong) (unintelligible).

Kristina Nordstrom: Kristina Nordstrom, ccNSO secretariat.

Glen DeSaintgery:Glen DeSaintgery, GNSO secretariat.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. So I guess we'll get started.

I see that we have a number of new people join us. And I just want to say that this group itself, you know, we really welcome more participation and welcome observers.

So feel free if you have, you know, at the end - by the end of this session hopefully you are interested enough to join our biweekly calls. But given that we have quite a number of new people who haven't joined previously, I'll spend probably about five minutes or so just to give you a brief history of what this working group is about.

The (JIG), the Joint IDN basically Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group was a - I guess one of the first joint working groups between the ccNSO and GNSO. And it is created by a mutual charter between the organizations. And it had - it started with five members each from the ccNSO and the GNSO and thereupon other observers.

And also ICANN support staff we had, you know, ample support from the staff which is very important. And, of course, Dennis joining as an observer from the - especially as we liaise our work with the IDN Variance Issues project.

We started since March of 2010. We identified three issues of common interest. The first one is single character IDN TLDs. The second one was IDN TLD variance. And the third one was universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. These are the three issues that the (JIG) has identified as issues of common interest between the ccNSO and the GNSO. So this is, you know, the three topics that we talk about.

In terms of meetings we have been holding conference calls since March last year as I've mentioned. We've had face-to-face meetings on each of the ICANN meetings since then: Brussels, Cartagena and San Francisco and, of course, here now in Singapore. So that's really the general background.

And I sort of move to the agenda that was sent around the list earlier. And just as one additional background, out of the three issues the first one we have -- the first one was single character IDN TLDs -- and we have completed the final report on that issue. And it was adopted by both of the Councils and eventually passed on to the Board.

And it is now with ICANN staff in terms of the implementation. And that actually is one of the agenda items, if we get there, which is to follow up, sorry, with the staff team on the implementation of the single character IDN TLDs.

With that I was wondering if anyone had any questions before I move on? Seeing none, so the agenda that was sent around first of all the one of the first item that we should maybe talk a little bit about is the Charter itself.

This group was formed by, as I mentioned, a mutual charter between ccNSO Council and GNSO Council. And in the original - and in the Charter actually it

specified a sort of natural conclusion when the Board adopts or approves the new gTLD Applicant Guide Book which I guess by now everyone know that that happened this morning.

And so one of the things that we should take a look at is how, you know, (add to) the extension of the working group Charter. In the ccNSO and GNSO lunch, the Council lunch earlier today, the issue was brought up briefly.

I think (Leslie) of, Chair of ccNSO, also mentioned actually - well added to what I just said just now in saying that the Charter also allowed if the - if both the Councils agreed to extend, you know, continue the work then, you know, the (JIG) can and should continue.

And looking back at the three issues that we identified, we have completed one of them. And the second one, which is IDN TLD variance is, I think, we're working in - we're continuing the work and working in parallel or in coordination with the IDN VIP.

And also we have identified the third items which is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs which seems to become more and more of a topic that is of interest especially with the IDN ccTLDs that are being deployed.

So the general feeling, at least from between myself and my co-chair, (Jane), is that we would like to continue the working group and to ask for the two Councils to extend the Charter. And I think the, you know, the initial reactions from the Council seems to be positive so far.

But I wonder if (Jane) you want to add to that.

(Jane): Yes also because, you know, we haven't finish our item need to be work on three items. So I think we should continue this working group so we are going to ask both Council to recharge the authorization to continue it.

And also (Leslie) mentioned if we could provide a rough timeframe for each, you know, item we are working on that will be better, you know.

Edmon Chung: Right so I guess the sort of the initial informal feedback is that we should come up with a, you know, the remaining items and also a timeline to achieve those - to complete those reports.

But the process forward is, you know, the general feeling is that we would continue the work. And we'll get formal resolutions, I guess, from the respective Councils as they - as their work proceeds.

So on that particular item I was wondering does anyone want to speak to that or add? Seeing none I - can I take that as a general consensus that we think that this, you know, group should continue and work through the other issues of common interest identified?

I see nodding heads so I will take that as a - as the general consensus. So thank you. Sorry, okay.

So the next item that we sent around was the IDN TLD Variance and talking about some of the next steps. And this week we had a series of meetings from the IDN VIP. I think a lot of the - that we were seeing a lot of overlap in this gathering here.

So I don't really think we need to repeat a lot of the things that were discussed there. But I think one of the things that might be useful is to continue to play sort of a liaison role between the IDN VIP and also the IATF discussions that were continue - that has been happening.

So in our - just for those who were not there in the working group, we also - the working group also looked at in the last meeting and through the mailing list also looked at the IATF work on the requirements for a liaising in the DNS essentially. And we felt that perhaps this group it is good and appropriate for

this group to, you know, liaise with them and also provide some input into them.

And I guess, you know, on that particular subject also interested to hear from Dennis since we have his presence here in terms of the - because one of the things I think that I mentioned earlier is about timelines. And I think one of the interests is to synchronize sort of the timeline that the IDN VIP is working on with the work the (JIG) will take on.

But one of the things is to - that we said we would do is to observe sort of what the IDN VIP would be working first. And then, you know, somewhat catching up and then deciding on the items that this group would take on.

So I wonder if Dennis could add to that in terms of the timeline and how you see that collaboration continuing.

Dennis Jennings: Edmon thank you very much indeed, Dennis Jennings here. Yes just to remind everybody that the project has invited the (JIG) to have an observer on each of the case studies so that you are constantly informed.

It is an observer role. It would be up to the Case Study Coordinator as chair of the meetings to invite people to participate and so on. And we hope that we'll keep the (JIG) informed.

There are obviously a number of people here who are also on the working groups. So there will be plenty of opportunity for information to flow. And you have seen from the presentation the wiki and the mailing list for all those people who want to enter into the general discussions and track what's going on in the case studies.

The timelines are the 30th of September for the case study reports. That we've decided to hold to that even though the amount of work to be done is really quite enormous.

If you were at the session over lunchtime you'd have heard some of the complexity from some of the case studies which is mind boggling for me, perhaps not for those who are experts in the area.

So we're going to hold on that. And the case study teams are already up and fired ready to go. And the detailed plans, including a detailed timeline for the Arabic case study, and we hope they'll be able to deliver against that.

Once we have the individual case studies, the current plan is that the six Case Study Coordinators will meet in Dakar and Senegal and start the work of producing a collective report, or a harmonized report or a report that tries to consolidate those things that can be consolidated, that are common and identify those that are unique to each of the case studies and produce that final report. I think the date is the 16th of December.

I'd expect by then by Senegal we'd also have more detailed plans about the next phase of the project which is solving the issues that have been identified. I think that addresses your question, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Dennis. And I just switched over the slides to some next steps that we have identified earlier in our discussion at the working group. And I guess we're still at the stage of observing and participating in the VIP study groups.

I think with the - because right now as most of you would probably be aware of your participate in the VIP study groups that it was going through the process of identifying, you know, what will be talked about.

So I think in terms of this group it seems to me to make sense to wait for a little while longer to - so that those questions are being collected. And from there work on some of the things in terms of continuing our work on the - some of the quality aspects that we have identified earlier.



Just to, I guess, have a reminder of some of the things that we have said earlier in the working group and for the benefit of those who are just joining, we sort of, in terms of coordination of work, we were looking to the VIP too to work on a lot of the more linguistic side of issues which is why it is - they are separated into the six different languages, well, case studies I should say and avoid using the word language.

And in that - in our working group I also advertise not using impolite language but anyway I understand the sensitivity there. So it's separated into the six studies for that purpose.

And in terms of the (JIG) I think what is really important for us would probably be to look at back whether and if there are any policy implications such as if it, you know, ultimately would it deviate from the GNSO recommendations, policy recommendations, when (the gTLD) leave and also, you know, I guess on the ccNSO side whether it, you know, whether and if it ultimately what we do or what in VIP eventually does might deviate from those - from the fast track policies throughout.

So I see...

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe there is another point. I think what will be raised on tomorrow and on the (IDN PDP) because that's far more important in looking to the future is the (IDN PDP) will continue. And we will not be waiting for the (far) end. And we'll revisit the policy itself once the policy (unintelligible) of the (VIP) study are clear, because there is no sense of comfort.

And maybe the results from the (JIG) could provide input but it's up to the (IDN PDP) and that will be done. And as soon as that is done and probably we hope to conclude the say the work under the (IDN PDP) by Dakar, that will replace the fast track in due course when it is implementable.

But we have the experience of the fast track so we can build on that one as well. So that could be reasonably quickly I hope background information.

Edmon Chung: Yes thank you for that. I think that's quite important. And this is Edmon speaking again. And I think we - I'm not sure whether we have - we are scribing this. But I guess for those purposes just to note as you speak who you are as you speak.

So yes thank you Bart for that intervention and the update from the ccNSO and the ccPDP. I think that's important as we go about this discussion as well.

So I guess with that that's really the background of which. And I guess I wanted to just quickly identify that this is - we earlier on the (JIG) actually did went through a round of discussion about some of the policy aspects for IDN TLD Variant. And a early draft was circulated.

As mentioned I'm thinking, you know, we would at this point sort of I guess slow down for another month or so and - in anticipation of the work from the IDN VIP and then probably to augment that as we move forward.

But just want to highlight that that we did went through a process. And we will pick this up probably in about a month or a month and a half's time. That's at least the proposal I - Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe this is more for practicalities. Say if - I think the - what's going on we have - this working group has established a very good working relation, I think, with the VIP.

You have a type of deadline by the end of September. And it's just focusing on what's happening within the VIP is probably taking a lot of time adding already something by the mid of August, because that's what you're actually saying.

I would advise to wait until just one more month because you've got the other topic as well. And turn the order around. Play your role as an observer and whether it's one month or two months later it doesn't matter anymore. But then you know precisely what is the outcome or the - what the real direction is.

And I'm a bit selfish in this case. There will be some holidays in Europe. And most of your support staff is located in Europe, unfortunately, or not fortunate - unfortunately. But so if we could manage around that and it will not really delay the work of the (JIG), then you have a reasonable schedule forward as well.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. And I hope that's not the case for the IPN VIP in terms of the staff.

Dennis Jennings: No it's not but it is a challenge the holidays in the northern hemisphere and Europe and in the Middle East. And as I mentioned this morning, Ramadan is in August this year and - which adds to the complexity to demand a lot of work.

So we're under no illusion that the deadline of the 30th of September is a very significant challenge for the case study teams.

Edmon Chung: I understand that. I guess this is not what (JIG) is talking about but thanks for the information. It's useful information. But I think that that in general is the way forward.

We'll - the reason why I said a month and a half is I guess we will revisit it in our working group calls as we go along. But I think the general direction of waiting for the September and for the first rounds of the case studies to come out is probably a useful approach, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And the second thing is say if those who were on the calls I think when we start - or the (JIG) started to discuss the say the outreach efforts to make IDNs more effective is that I think the working group already agreed on a way forward in saying at least suggest that something needs to be done to the outside world and the vendors not just maybe incorporation with (unintelligible) acceptability as well, because there is an issue. And it's also it's reasonably similar for some groups. So there the working group would focus on that one first.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Bart. And that is exactly my next slide. And that is the next slide on the agenda. But Avri you wanted to...

Avri Doria: Yes I just want - before you moved on one of the things we had talked about, and I don't know how we wanted to go about it, was making the recommendation either formally or informally to the IATF, oh that's after this?

Edmon Chung: That's the last bullet item. You're right. I mixed it.

Avri Doria: Oh I thought you had already moved on to your next slide. So that's why I wanted to come back.

Edmon Chung: You're right. We should come back and please continue.

Avri Doria: Okay sorry. Did I say it was Avri?

Okay so we had talked about making some sort of communication to either (Suzanne), or I mean we just tell her, or more formally to the IATF the DSNX on suggestion we were going to make that perhaps they wait a little longer before taking the current draft to working group review and publication until they were able to get some of the VIP examples because one of the weak parts of the draft from the IATF at the moment is on their case studies.

And so there was an assumption that they didn't have to wait for the VIP process to complete totally. But somewhere along the line we might be able to help them with the case studies for the VIP group. But I don't know where we are in the decision to notify them. Just tap, you know, (Suzanne) on the shoulder and convey that or do something more formal, et cetera.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Avri. And that is supposedly on my plate. I think I remember from our last call I should send a note from I guess from myself and (Jane) to (Suzanne) and Andrew on that. I apologize I haven't done that. I should do that.

And also I think we said we were going to try to come up with a more detailed document. And maybe we can talk a little bit about that. And I - I'm looking right at you and seeing if you would be interested in maybe drafting something of that sort besides just tapping them and saying...

Avri Doria: Yes, no, certainly. I do still participate in the IATF. And I'm willing to help work on it.

As I say I think, and we talked about it in that meeting, and I think (Suzanne)'s document is quite good except for the case study part being still weak and not being able to give enough of an indication to the people looking at requirements as to what the cases might be for.

So sure I'll do stuff.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Avri. And I will definitely send a quick note to (Suzanne) and Andrew on it.

So with that I, you know, we move to the next item which is the third issue of common interest that we identified. And I'm glad that we have so many new people joining for this session here.

And I think that the issue is universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. I guess just to categorize the issue is that there is a universal acceptance of TLDs in general from ICANN staff, ICANN team. Especially with I think it was started when the first round of gTLDs were introduced dot museum, dot info, those - it triggered an issue where there are certain applications or ISPs that choked on long TLDs so TLDs that are more than three characters long.

And so there were some work done back then on making sure that there is universal acceptance. Different applications would be able to take in new gTLDs.

The issue we are talking about here is that while that issue affected, you know, certain areas and as we look into IDN TLDs there are certain applications, there are certain infrastructure even ISPs that may have issues with IDN TLDs; either treating them as malicious domains or, you know, simply not being able to handle IDN TLDs.

One of the examples is, you know, if they have a Facebook profile where there is a domain name, you know, you can put in a domain name there would they be able to handle IDN TLDs.

So this is the broad topic. I think, you know, I sort of a one of the things that this group wants to do at this point is a stock taking exercise. And try to, you know, get a sense of what those issues are. What those issues might be in ICANN and GNSO context.

When I talk about that I need both actually whether there might be any policies to be considered as likely, "No." The answer to that, I think we should still ask that question. And also, you know, what initiatives that ICANN probably should take on, on the ICANN community should take on towards this direction.

And towards addressing this issue of a sentence of IDN TLDs and the issue previously that I mentioned only affects gTLDs because ccTLDs are always two characters.

But this issue becomes an issue of common interest with the introduction of IDN ccTLDs. So I guess with that I sort of open the floor to try to get a stock taking of these issues. Please go ahead and mention your name as you comment.

Woman: (Unintelligible). My comments is about last combination without the initiative. You have more than one and maybe more than two working groups for IDNs and I see some difference in approach sort of the problem of the IDN.

(Unintelligible) for me the issue is alternative routes. And for example, in our group proposition to discuss this issue was objected rather objectively. It was within our last working group where met with a different understanding. What do you think about it and how would you like to coordinate this approach?

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you. I just want to clarify you're talking about alternative routes. So alternative roots from ICANN...

Woman: And are there may be political cultural, ideological issues of IDN not on the technical effort.

(Daniel Kolshev): I think that's a perfectly okay topic to include. And in fact this is, you know, probably a policy aspect and but in -- I think it is definitely a good thing to raise and include.

In general though, I think ICANN does have a -- we can refer back to some ICANN statements about a single route. The position of maintaining a single route and that, that should sort of address that issue.

But it's probably good to, you know, identify that as one of the things but refer back to the general ICANN position of maintaining a single route. That's my view. I don't know whether anyone wants to add too or agree with me or disagree with me? Avri

Avri Doria: This is Avri Doria. I don't know. I would kind of think that we would want to avoid the political topic so that we would avoid the religious response.

(Daniel Kolshev): (Andre)?

(Andre): And I support Avri. I don't know what those alternative routes are.

(Daniel Kolshev): Okay. Anyone else want to add to that? So it seems like the sentiment is that yes the issue is raised but I - we do not wish to include this, you know, documents.

Avri Doria: Because that's kind of what I was saying because to just go with the sort of fast aisle standard answer would be problematic in some sense.

(Daniel Kolshev): Okay. Don't see a strong fight for it.

Woman: I hoped for the direction of the community because I hoped that (unintelligible) domain out of the discussion will be open for comments and that may be broader community give more support for this idea.

(Daniel Kolshev): Okay. So far it's 2:1. I guess I'll take two as the bigger number for the time being and we'll -- unless somebody wants to speak further on this. But I guess the question is still out in terms of other issues.

I don't think we need to come back to this issue. We probably won't include it for the time being. And if we go out with public comment that's in this and come back, then we'll have to address them, you know, as public comments anyway. So (Andre)?



(Andre): I'm sorry I just wanted to make this clear just in terms of routes it just popped out. There's a history, you know, there like - there was a couple of projects where people wanted an alternative patch, IST patch, GNS services surrounding they were like you, like are you there were other countries was running in to violation of the single route system on the ICANN, you know, the system.

And I assumed to believe that this was in the past and there is no reason to come back. I mean they're gone, we have IDN, and the ccTLDs, ccTLDs and we'll soon have real IDN gTLDs. So I mean there is no reason to come back to this dark ages of the internet. Thank you.

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you. (Ann)?

(Ann): I just wanted to support what was just said.

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you. So I'm sure this is not the only thing that we can talk about in terms of acceptance of IDN and TLDs. I wondered.

Man: Yes, I'm sorry, there's also working group, what's the name CDC the group which actually takes care of the application level for the IDNs. I think it is run by VeriSign right? There is one working group which deals with the application level.

They give the recommendation to the application level providers. So we must dig into it and if we talk about the groups which work on this issue there is another one that's...

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you. On that I don't know whether (June) you want to add I know it's based on help to get that started as well. I think that initiative is quite relevant to this site.

Man: I have no other comment. Dan, I was going to teach another core group of this working group.

(Daniel Kolshev): No, no, not the alternative route, we've moved beyond the alternate route issue now.

Man: I'm getting ready to go home. So...

Avri Doria: We're talking about I couldn't record the exactly name the consortium.

Man: You mean IDN Security Development Consortium?

Alex Gakuru: Yes.

Man: We are not trying to implicate anything being done in IPFMO. I can we are trying to facilitate the adoption of protocol, as well as adoption of any best practices or any human track of society for a study are in the future by application vendors switching from not only browser vendors, email vendors, but also a WebEx email and ultimately the universal acceptance of IDN and second level as well as top level.

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you. And that's why I think (Andre) raised the issue that in terms of this issue of universal acceptance of IDN TLDs it's probably very relevant topic.

Man: Yes, IDN should have been treated and handled and usable alternately like ask names of those sites, people use those ask names. They do not expect any weird behavior and normal application they use. IDN should have been in the fashion ultimately in the better and wider adoption, that's partly ultimately aiming at as a group correctory.

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you. So seeing no burning issues are coming up why don't I actually try to ask the questions? And, you know, I sort of framed it in a way and see if we can, you know, get a little bit more from the group gathered here.

The first question I think, you know, if we are obliged to ask is on the issue of universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. Are there, you know, or, you know, are there any policies that should be considered, you know, whether it's, you know, what registrars, registries should be doing.

You know, oblige in terms of ICANN policy. My general feeling is no but, you know, I still think we should ask the question. (Andre)?

(Andre): Yes, I'm a little bit familiar with universal acceptance because they have a lot of domain names and very still low usage IDN domains. Because of some applications that just does not work. But ICANN can only recommend and this is only a question to the community not to ICANN as a body trust internet addressing system.

Monthly its best application providers and search engines (unintelligible) who really have to accept IDNs as the universal is asking basically? And for them it's a matter of commercial, you know, commercial view, commercial value of their services because if they don't deal with IDN properly, they may lose some significant part of the internet users.

I don't see it as a ICANN issue honestly. But it would good if people who deals with IDNs, you know, do their preaching, do their work back at home trying to push vendors to support for the universal support of their ideas.

This is more like marketing and promoting rather than procedures and resolutions.

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you. Here's the question then, should ICANN mandate registrars? They take who information right through emails, you know, should they, must ICANN credit registrars a set of IDN TLDs evolve for example.

I'm guessing not all registrars, those are databases right for who is contacts that is potentially one issue. You know, in terms of domains the who is also contains the container of domains or when you do (RWO) there's a container of the URLs so is that something that ICANN should look into?

Bart Boswinkel: Just a question on BELL this is more procedural question with regard to the work of the GAC. Now we're very deep into I call it the registrars and who is and how that works and that's something is completely different in the ccTLD world.

So I advise you to keep it up otherwise you end up in a report if you do anything on this that is fully and only applicable to the gTLD world.

(Daniel Kolshev): Good point Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Should I say that this is a painful issue also for the country because it's looks like this part doesn't exist.

(Daniel Kolshev): Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, there's just the one other thing is there's also the IRD working group that's looking at the who is and IDN issue and so and so. If there's a caudation effort there's certainly that.

In terms of the registrars on the gTLD side I would think trying to get anywhere close to requiring them to do anything would be scary. I think, you know, one of the other things that perhaps could be encouraging -- by the way I'm always a little nervous about the notion of universal -- I think if we get global we're doing fine.

But in terms of one of the interesting things that happened in the ITD 6 world which is another universal adoption process. That were people that put

together a little test that people could run to see if you were in an environment where an ITD 6 worked.

Now obviously this group wouldn't be the one to build such tasks but perhaps encouraging the creation of once there are more IDNs some sort of ICANN test where, you know, you could easily firm a location see what works and what doesn't.

Because at the moment we could sort of encourage people get your mail to work, get your website to work, get this to work, get that to work. But there's really nothing to tell people is it working? Is it not working? Do I know? Do I care?

So perhaps there's something in encouraging ICANN to build some kind of tool evidentially that allows for a determination. Am I in a place where IDN does work? So that might be something but...

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you Avri, that's a good point. And in terms of the terminology global versus universal why I took that from the original ICANN staff initiative for your universal acceptance.

Avri Doria: I was just being petty at the word universal always kind of makes me petty. I'm sorry.

(Daniel Kolshev): It's not the trademark we're talking about but so yes, I guess this is one of those suggestions that we, you know, again this is part of the I guess stock taking of what are the issues that, you know, we should include in our initial and final reports.

So that's why I'm trying hard to get everyone to think about all the issues that might be there. And as I was going through it was the first question that sort of obliged to ask is, are there any policies related to acceptance of IDN and TLDs that should be?

Because we can definitely put in a position that says, "No there isn't any pulse related and it's all about initiatives to encourage the acceptance and has not." So far I haven't - we haven't stumbled across any.

Avri Doria: Yes, I guess again -- and I'm talking too much again -- in terms of the IRD working group they're looking at, for example how one would do it if I understand correctly.

Then there will come a time when GNSO and ccNSO will have to make policy decisions on what should happen whether this group wants to make recommendations to them on that, could be something that we'd want to talk about.

I don't know, but that could be a place where, you know, people are looking at what can be done? Technically, what could be changed technically? At some point the two policy groups got to figure out, "Okay, should we do that? This group could have something to recommend on those decisions, if we're looking for something policy oriented, that this group could productively work on.

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you Avri. I want to stay neutral on whether who going to take it or not. But I think it is probably a good idea to, you know, include it in our, you know, initial report as one of the items that is talked about and, you know, it's sort of down the road after the IRD would have done.

This might be an area of interest but at this point it seems like these are for basis of discussion around the table which is now this is not a topic that we would take on at this point. Did it summarize it? Okay.

Hearing no other potential policy issues then, you know, in terms of policy recommendation we and, you know, moving on is what are the other types of initiatives that ICANN in the ICANN community given the ICANN community

we could recommend to the initiative one of which I already put down is potentially in the future.

I know there are tools that ICANN did build for the universal acceptance of TLDs in general. I wonder if they are the applicable for IDN and TLDs. We should definitely ask staff that question.

And so that's one of them anything else we think...And I guess, you know, just some of the items that I generally put together is, you know, other materials or things for registrants, registrars, registry related?

Anything we need to do in terms of outreach to infrastructure providers, application providers? Applications like, does anyone want to - I'm just looking around and seeing if anyone has any ideas what we should try to incorporate in our report going forward in terms of recommending ICANN and the ICANN communities spend effort or not on these sort of issues?

(Chris Dillon): I may be in completely the wrong direction but I'll tell...

Dan: Your name.

(Chris Dillon): I'm Chris Dolan from University College in London. I'm wondering whether there could be some problems with input software, say the software that people use, you know, for creating strings not just for IDN but for anything, work group those things.

I mean I'm not just imagining. I was typing an address in Japanese what problems would I have. I wonder if this is an issue, as to punctuation because to find the full stock for example, the adoption on Japanese is not particularly easy unless you go back into it English.

Also, things like forward slash I mean there's going to be a problem with Greek and Russian I don't think but other languages these little things could be merely quite difficult to well, maybe that was completely off subject.

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you (Chris) and I want to generally encourage more, you know, thoughts on this because this is really more of a stock taking session and I think, you know, in terms of input software that definitely seems to be an interesting topic.

But I guess my initial immediate reaction is what could ICANN and the ICANN community in understanding that generally registries and registrars, you know, what can be do? And the ccTLDs of course included. Is there something that we can...

(Chris Dillon): Well, you know, it may be just an education thing. It may be that we say, you know, if you are typing Japanese then I mean this is where the keys are if you want to do that.

But it might also be that software we would need to Microsoft and Apple and other companies, and say, "You know if want to make things a little bit easier, then make these forward stops and forward slashes more readily available."

Because the thing is that without the new you may get pressure for perhaps some registries the churches wanting to type more things without adoption, without slashes possible it would end up going in that direction.

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you. Definitely, I think that, you know, we would take that, you know, part of the stock taking. (Ann).

(Ann): I'm just going to talk about something very different if it's okay. I mean I understand why you're trying to come out with a list of issues that we should just discuss. But then out of these issues there are some that are much, much more important than others.



For example, on the things that (Andre) mentioned. So I think yes we should do the stock but then we should prioritize and make a strong recommendation or make a strong statement about the problems that exist in certain like email and browsers that's stuff.

(Daniel Kolshev): Absolutely, and I think, you know, definitely we should prioritize as, you know, mentioned. You know, we're still on the stock taking phase but I certainly take that into actually, hopefully we'll have longer list. And so far we only have three or four actually two or three.

I'm curious if, you know, I'm sure there should be more issues, you know, on this topic. I guess looking at the time though I think we are, we're running to the end of this session. This session ends at 6:30 right tonight? So it is about 6:30 right now.

We did start a little bit late but still in general though I think, you know, this is definitely a topic that is important. I don't think myself for the round table that it isn't an important topic.

It's probably not that easy to, you know, think on the fly of all the issues. So I encourage people to, you know, send it into the mailing list. And for those who are not already on the mailing list, you know, we totally welcome you to join.

If you want to join the working group, just send an email to myself of Jane and I think we'll gladly add you to it. I think this is an issue that is relevant for the community.

So I guess with that I'll -- we do have this recorded and is it also scribed. Yes, it will be. And so that will be, you can refer back to that and I guess I'll start to summarize some of the, you know, items that we talked about.

And then I'll throw - I always throw out a few more of the items and then the next steps will be to as you mentioned to well enlarge that list but also then to prioritize.

And we can come back to talk about what we want to describe about the different issues and then the, you know, create a initial report and final report that's the general idea of the process for it.

Okay. I guess I'm about to close the session, just going around the room to see if anyone has any additional item, growing issues that want to raise. There is one, (Dimitri).

(Dimitri Fatildi): (Dimitri Fatildi) there was an issue of who is I just wanted to add that for internal period it would be a good idea to include penal code decoded streams maybe both for email addresses, you know, like I see some ccTLDs are doing that.

For example, in our group when they do the (unintelligible) you would see the IDN encoded names so you can type it in letter -- if you don't have a system Russian keyboard it's for many people in the world.

And I think it would be a good idea to include it as a secondary item in any IDN object, be that a domain or email address. I don't know how - which group it should be referred to but I think it would be very important because realistically you can expect everybody to have any keyboard right, and especially right to left, don't forget about right to left domain names, as we would use a few more of those in the future. Thank you.

(Daniel Kolshev): Thank you (Dimitri). And you know I think that is a matter which was a scope within IRD which was mentioned the internationalized registration data which I happen to also participate in.

And so I'll take that back and to the back side and in fact I can let you know that it is, I think it is part of the, the current thinking that the penal code would be, would be included. So, but this is sort of the scope of this particular discussion.

But so I guess with that I'd like to close the meeting. Thank you everyone for joining. Again, you know, you're welcome to join the mailing list and join the discussion going forward at the (Jay). Thank you.

END