Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting

JIG Meeting

Monday 15 July 2013 at 15:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul

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

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Coordinator: This is the 3 o'clock start and (all for) the joint ccNSO, GNSO, IDN Working Group.

Edmon Chung: We're good to go. So welcome everyone. Do you need to have the - I don't know. Usually the session starts - therefore do I just go ahead? I'll just go ahead now.

Man: Yeah. All right.

Edmon Chung: Okay. All right. So thank you everyone for joining the JIG meeting, the joint ccNSO, GNSO, IDN Working Group. I don't see a lot of my colleagues around here. I guess we're in stiff competition from other sessions. I just came from an IDN session that's ongoing at the ALAC meeting. So but in any case, thank you for those of you who could join us.

This is - okay. Let's see. The other one. Okay. There. So this is following from our monthly conference calls now. And the main agenda is to talk about the IDN Variant TLDs and especially the letter from - the letter to the ccNSO and

GNSO Councils in response to the Board resolution and to talk about the - some updates on the universal accepts of IDN TLDs and any other thing. So that's a pretty short agenda.

I'll - as usual in public meetings I'll just do a quick background of who we are and where we came from. The JIG was chartered by mutual charters by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils and it was to identify issues of common interest between the two SOs on - in terms of IDNs and three of which were identified including IDN TLD Variant and universal acceptance, which we'll talk about today.

We had biweekly calls from March 2010 that was changed to monthly calls because of the level of work has dropped a little bit and since last year. We've been having face-to-face meetings. We've had a workshop on a Single Character IDN TLDs. And we also had a workshop on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs last time in Beijing. So that's a quick background of the group.

So in terms of this particular meeting as discussed on our previous conference calls, we'll spend the first half talking about our draft - well actually our letter in response to the Board resolution on IDN Variant TLDs.

So earlier in the year in Beijing actually the ICANN Board resolved to adopt two of the Variant project reports, one which is the - what is called the LGR, the Labor Generation Rule set report. The other is the user experience report.

And in the resolution the Board also requested interested supporting organizations and budget committees to provide a response to the implementation of the recommendations.

It was scheduled to be before July 1. Obviously that date has passed. We have asked the Councils to forward a note to the Board asking for a slight extension on that. So in any case, that's the current situation.

In terms of the draft and the summary is really in response to the resolution and the two documents, the summary basically and three main points to respond to the resolution.

First of all it's the - it's sort of the confirmation from the reports, which is consistent with the community understanding all along that again Variant TLDs is not a purely technical matter. It couldn't be solved in a purely technical manner and therefore needs a - requires a policy decision. I'll get more into this in a little bit.

And the second thing is that basically based on that the ccNSO and the GNSO should be - as supporting organizations should develop the policies for the IDN Variant TLDs and also continue to monitor the implementation of the policies. So that's number two.

And then third one - third sort of recommendation that is a broader base outreach. It's in line with our report on the (versatile) assessments of IDN TLDs.

The many issues that were raised in the user experience report really should - really calls for ICANN and the ICANN community to spend a little bit of effort to reach out to the technical community to explain to them the challenges that will be coming along with the implementation of IDN Variant and IDN Variant TLDs.

So that's the summary. I'll go back - go into the - a little bit of the details of what we included. So in terms of confirming I guess that there is a policy aspect to IDN Variant TLDs, it's pretty clear from the report that there are - there is a competing view from technical community and the linguistic community in terms of what conservativeness means and in terms of what conservatism means in the implementation of IDN Variant TLDs.

On one hand the technical community is more conservative as doing less - having less IDN Variant TLDs in the root. On the linguistic community the kind of conservativeness is having more because it, you know, it helps the user more. There's more protection and more conservative to have more of the IDN TLDs in the root.

So the balance between these two views is essentially the policy decision that ICANN is past and ICANN community must bear in terms of the responsibility of making.

So eventually ICANN must make this decision between balancing between the - what is called, you know, what is viewed as conservativeness between the two communities.

So that's - with that one, you know, that's sort of forms the basis that the SOs should be involved and continue to be involved in the oversight of the processes to put in place IDN TLDs and also that the ccNSO and GNSO should separately provide policy recommendations for the implementation of IDN Variant TLDs.

It's not showing completely so let me - so and really that's pretty much the first point in terms of that the two SOs should - must - should work on - that the issue itself is of - has a policy aspect and the two SOs needs to work on it.

Just following a little bit further on the user experience report. There is a - the general conclusion is that there are different - the different languages and different scripts have different specifications and different requirements for IDN Variants.

But there is also a set of recommendation in Section 6.2, which we particularly singled out that is for registries. The reason why we have sort of singled it out is because the registries - the Section 6.2 in the user experience

report actually lists out a number of recommendations for registries to implement.

And through the conversation with the authors engaging, it became clear that those are - those should be considered option by the authors. And I think that's an important note.

And further to that really is that those - at least - I'll come back to this point a little bit more. But those are - those will be recommendations that are not included in the current set of policy recommendations from the GNSO nor from the ccNSO for that matter, if you will.

And therefore would require much more policy work to put in place. So there's a caution in the note that says, you know, Section 6.2 is probably - should remain optional and if there needs to be an implementation that might need to trigger additional policy work.

So moving forward on the topic following is that as mentioned because it has the policy aspect, the two SOs should have policy recommendations in place. In terms of the ccNSO side, the IDN ccPDP final report currently does not include any recommendations for IDN Variant TLDs.

There is a placeholder there. So the recommendation there is that further work needs to be done by the ccNSO to make policy recommendations on IDN Variant TLDs for their implementation for IDN ccTLDs.

On the other hand, for the GNSO side, we took a look at the outcomes report from the GNSO IDN Working Group, which was adopted and incorporated into the GNSO final report on the new gTLDs.

And the view is that they already include relevant policies - policy recommendations for the implementation of IDN Variant TLDs. So, you know, if that is within the recommendations then no further policy development

process should be required for its implementation at this stage; again at the root level.

So in the document we've quoted the actual few items including the language community input, one string per new gTLD - new IDN gTLD and it includes a sentence that says except for IDN Variant - for handling IDN Variant TLDs in which case it would be more than one string per application.

It also lists out the limitation of confusion and collision for - as a, you know, as a reason for introducing IDN Variants and specifically distinguishes between confusing the single strings as well.

So it's actually quite consistent with the two reports that came out including the LGR report and the user experience report. So - and the final point is, as mentioned, the prioritization or increase some priority for ICANN to allocate I guess (unintelligible) in efforts to tell the world that this is coming, that IDN Variant TLDs are coming, IDN Variant implementations are coming.

And it's somewhat similar to the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs and they share a similar set of target audience, the technical community, the user community. And they are both issues related to consumer trust for the DNS because it relates to the ability of being able to reach a sort of resource through the DNS.

And so finally there also included a brief explanation that the current set of reports - the two reports have not specifically included any review mechanisms. And in considering ICANN commitment to candidly and openness and transparency, that periodic reviews off these processes and implementations should be important and should have the participation from the SOs.

So that's - but however this particular letter doesn't specify any specific review mechanism which is that to raise the point that review mechanisms might be needed.

So the letter itself includes three annexes that is - it's drafted to be used by ccNSO and GNSO Council for their consideration. Just as a background, the JIG was chartered to report back to the two Councils and so a report created by the JIG would go through - back to the Council. Then the Councils could, you know, in their decision to report to the Board or otherwise. That's our recommendation. Of course it's for it to be adopted and passed forward.

So that's really the summary of the letter to - in response to the Board resolution. And so I wonder if there are any questions, thoughts, comments on this before I go into next steps. Okay.

Seeing none, I wonder if (Steve) or (Nila) or some from the staff would be willing to perhaps give your thoughts or any updates on the implementation itself. (Nila). Thank you.

Naela Sarras: Thank you. Let me get a little closer, sorry. So I think we understood we want to do a little bit of update on the implementation of the LGR. Correct. That's what we're doing here.

Edmon Chung: Of the (level) program.

Naela Sarras: Sorry I didn't hear that.

Edmon Chung: On the whole program.

((Crosstalk))

Naela Sarras: Okay. So starting from - and I didn't prepare slides for this because frankly...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...would be sufficient.

Naela Sarras: Okay. But I do encourage everyone to come to the session that we're holding on Thursday. Instead of doing slides here and there, we want everyone to come and give feedback at that session.

But a quick update here. So starting from the Board resolution that was passed during the Beijing meeting, which was in actually three different parts. One is to go ahead and implement the procedure that was developed in the previous phase of the IDN Variant Program.

So this is the procedure to develop and maintain Labor Generation Rule for the DNS root shown on the specified (unintelligible) (labels). That was one part. Then there was also a part to incorporate the Labor Generation Rules for the root done in the specs of IDN enabled and impacted processes.

And then to invite interested supporting organizations and advisory committees to provide staff with any input and guidance they may have to be factored into implementation of the recommendations on the user experience study.

So starting from there in April we - that pretty much launched the Phase 4 of the program. And we presented this is several meetings before. So the IDN Variant issues project started in test 2010. Eventually evolved into the IDN Variant Program.

They went already through three phases and this phase that we're talking about now it represents Phase 4, the implementation phase. So it includes the implementation of the LGR and then incorporating this input.

On the implementation of the LGR if you remember what the procedure called for is a two pass procedure. The communities through what's called the generation panels develop their LGR for their script and that's submitted to ICANN, which - I'm sorry. That's submitted to the next system pass process, which is the integration panel.

Integration panel - that's with proposal and they come back with questions for the generation panel. Eventually when the proposal is accepted it gets submitted into the Labor Generation Rule.

So to implement that procedure it calls for both integration panel and generation panel was done. We've done work on both pieces. So the integration panel there was a call into - and for experts to join integration panel.

That call closed already I think by the end of June. We have applications that came through for that expert panel. And we are in the process of evaluating those applications and I think in the call we said the selection will be made or candidates will be informed by end of July. Sometime around end of July. So that's on the integration panel.

(That's supposed) to establish the integration panel first because integration panel has some set of words that it needs to get going on before it can take - start taking proposals from the generation panel.

In terms of response, we got about 25 applications. That's really good representations of the communities that we - of the expertise that we do need on the panel. We'll talk more about that in terms of the backgrounds and type of interest that we received. So we'll say more about that in the session on Thursday.

For the second part of the procedure, the generation panel, we did issue a call last Thursday -- I think it was 11 July -- for the generation panel to start

forming themselves. So this is really for the communities to start looking at what it would take to create a generation panel and start interacting with ICANN.

There's a lot that needs to be developed in terms of - of course it's all according to the procedure but there'll be a lot that needs to be developed in terms of the logistics.

And frankly the way we're looking at it is the first few panels will probably be helping shape the process as they go along. So in terms of what kind of support from the staff will be (unintelligible). We will do the same logistics that we did in the first phase when we did the case studies or not. So that is going to be in development at the same time we have the generation panels also thinking about what they want.

So these panels are community and volunteer based as the procedure that there'll be one responsibility - one panel per script. It is expected that in some cases there'll be panels that will be based on prior work in the community on prior similar work that has already existed in the community.

And in terms of timeframe, it is - I think we will be ready for them in terms of integration panel be ready for the generation panels to start working - to start their work in the third quarter of this year. So September timeframe.

So that generation panel call is out and I encourage everyone to go and read it. And while we're here or even after we leave, please email - I imagine there'll be questions about what it takes to establish a generation panel. So please send us email questions or stop us in the hallways or whatever it takes.

So further procedure once these panels are established will be officially seated, a chair will be officially appointed and then they can start their work.

What else did we want to say? So that's the two-pass system. In terms of - that's the LGR procedure.

In terms of the other part of what we're doing in the implementation is taking into consideration both the user experience that you went briefly though these recommendations.

And frankly we haven't really started to allow the, you know, what we - what is implementable and what's not because we're waiting for the input that's coming from the SOs and ACs for the resolution.

And we have the input from ALAC so far that's been submitted. And we haven't established an official extension. The input was due by 1st of July. But internally the team has accepted that, you know, we have the ICANN meeting and everybody to do the ICANN meeting. And some of the work will be happening here.

So we sort of established this internal red line of 28th of July to give everybody more time to get their input in. And that's when we'll really be sorting through the input and their recommendations. So that's on the user experience side.

There's a big part of what needs to happen also is once the LGR is rolled out and the work of the LGR is going, ICANN needs to get ready for - when and if the Variants are allocated, we need to get ready for these Variants in terms of our handling the Variants in terms of both the ICANN systems and processes.

Things as simple as, you know, in IANA we're now talking about how to handle these records in terms of processing them come - when a delegation requests to receive them. So it's in the root (unintelligible).

And then further on maintenance of that. So the Variants tied together somehow separate. If the change happens to one, does it happen to all the other TLDs, et cetera.

And so that's what's happening in Project 7. And we're currently trying to basically pull together all the information that we need to - we're calling in (grand rules) of, you know, how these will work and then provide them to the different departments that need to update their systems to be able to handle these things.

I can tell even we were in a discussion about two weeks ago and it's things like oh, well how are we going to refer to these - I mean these are (general) IDNs. How are we going to refer to them in the system?

So we use a label (XN-S). Well we use the (U) label. If we can't - if I can't read a (U) label, what am I going to call it, right, if I'm talking about this label? What will I call it?

So I think it even goes down to these things that we, you know, totally - nobody has started thinking about that. But there's other things that we need to start thinking about in terms of implementation, what's affected and what are - what is the team's recommendation and how can we work with the - all the different departments to help them get this.

And then as we said from the beginning I think with this project as we go along there are things that pop up that maybe haven't been discussed. And so it's - this team takes it as its duty to document these issues and bring them to the community for discussion.

So but us going to the department just saying all right, you know, start looking at your systems what you need to do. There may be things that they will say well we need to, you know, (unintelligible) something that we still need to discuss so that we may be coming back with issues or they - that department

may be coming to the community with issues understanding and know what they are.

So that's what we're doing. If any of my colleagues here have anything to add but that's where we're at on the implementation side.

Edmon Chung: Thank you (Nila). Any additions? I see that I think (Jonathan) and (Joseph) and (Andy), perhaps some others are on the call. I just want to see if you have any questions or comments at this time. No. Well, I'm not sure whether you're being able to speak up but if not, in any case, I am looking at the chat. So if you have any questions, feel free to put it into the chat.

So I guess - oops. There is no audio on Adobe Connect. Okay. I don't know whether the technical team has taken note of that. It seems like they're not getting the audio on Adobe Connect. But in any case I guess unfortunately we'll continue to move forward on here live. Oh, okay. They're working on it.

So in terms of next steps as sort of mentioned a little bit, the letter is being sent to the GNSO and the ccNSO Council. For the GNSO Council it will be - it will be discussed. It was discussed in the workshop a couple days ago. And it will be discussed at the Council meetings her in Durban. Because it sort of missed the motion sort of schedule it might be bumped to the meeting for the actual resolution.

But I've had a chat with (Jonathan), the Chair, that, you know, he's willing to try to push it forward. We'll see what the response from the other councilors are. But in any case it's in the process.

On the - in terms of ccNSO Council, perhaps I'm wondering (Bart), do you have any update?

Bart Boswinkel: It will be on the agenda for upcoming Wednesday afternoon, so.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. So yeah. So those are sort of on track. And in terms of - there
                 was a - I'm just bringing this up for the group. Following from some - the
                 discussions from the GNSO session I see Steve Sheng brought up a point
                 that in our current letter it doesn't specify the (reader) mechanisms that we're
                 suggesting that that should be.

                 Then perhaps we might want to look into following up - follow up work on it.
                 The first question is going to be whether this is going to comment across
                 ccNSO and GNSO or not. So - and then if it is, then perhaps we can - this
                 group would be appropriate to just yes review mechanisms back to the
                 Councils. If not, then our work will be, you know, stop there and the Councils
                 themselves will have to figure our what further work to do.

                 So with that, I guess I can open up to see if there are any thoughts,
                 comments, suggestions at this point in terms of next steps. I'm hoping those
                 that in the - on Adobe Connect can hear me. But - and if you have any
                 questions, please type in or - can they speak up from the Adobe Connect. I
                 guess probably not. Yes. They can hear us. That's great.

                 But no one else. Okay. So in that case I guess - so (Steve).

Steve Sheng: As a practical suggestion maybe if they have comments and questions, they
                 can type into the Adobe Connect and we can relay it here so while we're
                 discussing.

Edmon Chung: Right. So please feel free to type in any questions to - into the Adobe
                 Connect. Okay. So being no further items on this, I'm moving on to the next
                 item, which is just a quick follow up on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

                 We posted a draft final report for public comment - it was posted on June 25.
                 And thank you (Bart) for pushing that through. And just quick - oops. Quickly
                 coming back to those proposed recommendations. I think we've reported it
                 multiple times.

There are four, one which - the first one is to recommend that IDN TLD operators themselves to get our act together actually within the community to have universal acceptance in their own systems.

And the second one is to ask - to recommend that specific resources for the advocacy of universal acceptance be put in place. Third one is to recommend the development of some informational materials for new IDN TLDs including gTLDs and ccTLDs to handle these type of issues because they are imminently going to be launched and we'll be facing these issues, you know, probably in the next few months.

And finally to recommend that - to recommend that ICANN support the universal acceptance beyond just outreach and awareness, to participate and to (ask) for the studies and take a look at what other issues should be taken care of. That's the set of recommendations from the report.

And I - oops. And the - again it's posted for public comments on June 25. It will be closed - scheduled to be closed on July 25. So I encourage everyone to put in your comments. But if you have any comments now, feel free to speak up as well.

Okay. Anyone from the chat room - from the Adobe Connect? Seeing no typing action, I think we're - this brings us really to the close of the meeting. Again, thank you everyone for joining. I wonder if (Jane) is on the call. I know that she mentioned that she would be going. I don't hear her or on the Adobe room.

But in any case, so thank you everyone for joining and we will - I guess we will keep, you know, push ahead in terms of the - in terms of the letter to the two Councils. And also we'll be promoting the universal acceptance report so that - to get, you know, to get the comments from the community.

And thank you (Jonathan) and thank you everyone for - oh, (Steve) has something to add.

Steve Sheng: Yeah. Thanks (Edmond). From the - on the staff side (Francesco) is going to be managing the universal acceptance projects. We had a few (leads and that) is in the planning stage. And we're waiting for the, you know, to see the prepared - looking forward to receiving the final report.

In terms of outreach, during this past trimester, we reach out some browser vendors and as a result for example we've subscribed Mozilla towards gTLD notification list. That means every time a gTLD signed contract, Mozilla will enter them into the public suffix list.

So this will resolve some issues where for example in the past some specific gTLDs being added and then is not on the public suffix list and Google Chrome, you know, treated the search terms. So hopefully that's one area that had some progress.

But again, the project is still in planning stage and we look forward to receive the report. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Thank you (Steve). With that, any other questions. Being none, thank you everyone for joining.

END