

**JIG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 20 July 2010 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 06 July 2010 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/gnso/gnso-jig-20100720.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul> <<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung - co-chair

Jian Zhang - co-chair

Avri Doria

Rafik Dammak

Fahd Batayneh

ICANN Staff

Olof Nordling

Bart Boswinkel

Gabi Schitteck

Kristina Nordstrom

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Doron Shikmoni

Sarmad Hussain

HanChuan Lee

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JIG call on Tuesday the 20th of July. And on the line we have Fahd Batayneh, Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Edmon Chung and Jian Zhang. And for staff we have Olof Nordling, Bart Boswinkel, Gabby Schitteck, Kristina Nordstrom and Glen de Saint Gery, myself. Thank you Edmon, over to you. And may I ask you - remind you all to say your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Glen and thank you everyone for joining the call today. (Around) not really much of an agenda but basically today the task is to try to go through the remainder of the document for the initial report on single-character IDN TLDs. And if we are able to finish it, then I think the idea is to set a - maybe a deadline for last call on the mailing list so that we could have it published for public comments as an initial report.

And I guess as usual just feel free to jump in and speak - just announce yourself and speak. And so if it becomes chaotic we'll take queue. With that Jian did you want to add anything or I'll just continue from really where we left off last time?

Jian Zhang: Actually I - this is Jian. Actually I just have (two) comments (unintelligible). Under Issue Number 5, I don't know, are you going to continue to, you know, to talk about, you know, the (unintelligible) elements? Hello?

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Jian Zhang: Hello?

Edmon Chung: On Number 5. Yes, we can hear you.

Jian Zhang: Yeah. On Issue Number 5, shouldn't we have some kind of (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Right. I'm sorry. The line is a little bit unclear but if I got you correctly you were asking whether Number 5, if there should be some kind of mechanism to distinguish between IDN single character - IDN ccTLD and single-character IDN gTLD.

Jian Zhang: Yes. Because on your, you know, I (unintelligible) approach, you know, with (unintelligible) can think about (unintelligible), you know, what if somebody applied for IDN ccTLD (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: In the case where somebody's trying to apply for an IDN ccTLD, a single-character IDN ccTLD through the gTLD process what happens there, right? Was that the question?

Jian Zhang: Yes, yeah. yes, yeah.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Jian Zhang: And shouldn't we have some kind of mechanism for when this happens?

Edmon Chung: Okay. If it's okay with you, I'll - we'll come back to this question. I just want - I want to make sure that we cover the whole document and when we get to Issue Number 5, you know, we'll talk a little bit more on this. Does that work for you?

Jian Zhang: Sure. Yeah, sure.

Edmon Chung: Okay. I guess just to recap from last time, we identified two additional issues to be covered in sort of the stocktaking and I've included it as Number 5 and Number 6. Number 5 being I guess what Jian just mentioned is the - how the policy should be for distinguishing between a single-character IDN ccTLD and single-character IDN gTLD.

And then Number 6 was whether special policies are required to address the usability of single-character IDN TLDs given the existing application environments. That was added - the discussion was that some of the applications or even browsers may not recognize single-character IDN TLDs and, you know, with the experience from more than three-character TLDs, that could become a problem. So that was also identified as one of the issues.

So I've added 5 and 6. And then we had a bit of a discussion on what - on that there are certain issues that might be approached even though the issue itself is a common issue between IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs, single-character ones, it may be that certain issues would be addressed slightly differently between IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs so we would sort of restructure the document a little bit to reflect that.

So I've added that particular description discussion in the document as well. And in each of the issues I have for those that might be handled slightly differently between the gTLDs and ccTLDs I have added an additional column so that one of them would be focused on IDN gTLDs and one which would be focused on IDN ccTLDs. So as you will see in Issues, I think, 2, 3, and 4, there would be the additional column so that people can better understand what - which side I guess is pertained.

Does anyone have any questions, thoughts on how this is - the discussions last time was incorporated into the document? Hearing none, I guess it's generally acceptable. But in any case the whole thing we'll put out to the mailing list again to get comments (from).

So last time we sort of went up to Issue Number 2, completing Issue Number 2 and then we - and then I just mentioned the - well quickly walked through Issue Number 3 and 4; 5 and 6 we added last time. So I guess we'll start with Issue 3 again and in terms of if anyone has any additional thoughts to it.

Just recapping Issue 3 is the one that which essentially says that because there's a relatively smaller pool of possible names whether certain policies should be created to provide for special allocation methods. Last time we did get one comment from (Inum Eum) and - saying that this argument may be somewhat (smart) because if we say that one character has a smaller pool and therefore requires different policy than two or more characters, then two-character ones, you know, have a smaller pool than three characters and three characters have a smaller pool than four characters, then, you know,

where do we draw the line on whether different policies need to be made for three, four, five, six characters. So...

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. I'm sorry I was on mute. I do have say a question about Issue Number 5 when you asked the question but I put it on mute. My question is, do you - say the way it's phrase so issues or policy aspects for single-character IDN so that section and then Number 5, do you foresee a distinction between the selection of a single-character IDN ccTLD and a single-character IDN gTLD? Is that really - how should I phrase it? Is that policy different than for instance currently under the Fast Track and the new gTLD process?

Edmon Chung: Okay. Well I guess since Issue Number 5 seems to be most interesting, so let's jump right there then. And I'm not sure whether I got you correctly but you're basically asking, you know, the - would there be anything - are we sort of suggesting anything different from what is already in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track and what is being proposed in the new gTLD...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Edmon Chung: ...Draft Applicant Guidebook. At this point no. And I don't...

Bart Boswinkel: No.

Edmon Chung: I guess it's an open question in a way. Do you see anything special we need to...

Bart Boswinkel: No. No, no, the reason why I ask is if you look at the way Item 5 is phrased in the issues aspect, it states, what should be the policy for distinguishing

between a single-character IDN ccTLDs and single-character IDN gTLDs, I would normally say if I would phrase it as an assumption that there's no distinction so therefore the JIG follows the current disting - or (follows) rules for distinguishing between the two because you open up Pandora's Box with the way it's phrased right now.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I should word it as in almost in a way that the default would be what it is right now?

Bart Boswinkel: That would be my suggestion. So...

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: ...I'll continue some language because then it's easier say as a starting point than say if you look at it as a tree that's a starting point and the rest will flow from it. So it's not...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I think that's a good idea. And if you are okay to suggest the wording then that would be great as well.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. I will.

Edmon Chung: Cool.

Bart Boswinkel: You will have it by the weekend or so by Monday, upcoming Monday. Is that okay for you?

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, okay, thank you. I'll go back on mute.

Edmon Chung: Okay. The other one on Issue Number 5 then, you know, let's jump right onto it. Jian you mentioned a question, I think it seems to be similar to what Bart was mentioning as well. Did you want to further elaborate on - Jian?

Jian Zhang: Yeah. Yes, yes.

Edmon Chung: So on Issue Number 5, your question was the - sort of the mechanism - I think right now the IDN ccTLD Fast Track and there is the gTLD and you asked if it went through the gTLD process, what would happen. I guess the - at least for DAG4 anything that would come across as representing a country name or ccTLD-related name that is no longer sort of available. I think if I read the current DAG correctly, Avri, I don't know whether you can help me out there, but essentially that sort of eliminates it.

And if it does actually go into, then I guess it goes - comes down to the objection process. If it somehow slips through the process where it says, then anybody could raise the concern and I guess the rule would still apply. So it would sort of prevent an IDN ccTLD being - actually going through the IDN gTLD process, at least for the first round, at least based on the DAG4.

I hear that Avri was on the call. I'm not sure if you're still on but - or others could help me out on this if that's I think what I understand from DAG4. Okay. Does that answer sort of your question, Jian? Oh, somebody wants to speak.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, this is Bart. So from - as being involved in the geographic names' discussion in the CCNSO I think your representation is correct (say) that during the first round of applications, country names are not eligible as gTLDs. That's my understanding as well.

Edmon Chung: Right. So does that help on your question, Jian.

Jian Zhang: Yes. So there is something in that gTLD limitation that fits?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, to...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: ...prevent that type of application.

Jian Zhang: ...something in the gTLD.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Jian Zhang: Hello? The line is not very good. So there is already something in gTLD (limitation) guidebooks (unintelligible) country name shouldn't be available to gTLDs process? Is that correct?

Edmon Chung: Yes. Yes, correct.

Jian Zhang: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess moving back to Issue 4 then, if there are no more questions on Issue 5. Okay. Issue 4 is that we - Issue 4 was identified in the sense that because of the relatively (full restrain) that it may be easier for users to make a mistake, type in the TLD and actually end up with another TLD that is single-character IDN TLD.

The issue was sort of raised as a question of whether that, you know, additional potential user confusion that certain special policies need to be in place or, you know, special consideration needs to be given.

So I just want to make sure that the issue is not so much that if we - not so much only that it would be easier to mistype a single-character IDN because mistyping it, you know, going to nowhere creates no issue, it just goes nowhere, but that if, you know, if you make a mistake and you actually end up somewhere, that's the issue being raised. Like one single-character if you

make a mistake, it's more than likely you would go into another existing single-character IDN TLD.

I guess the initial sort of thought on that is that, you know, there's at least the - there's a presumption that the thing - that the mistyped IDN TLD already exists and that assumption is rather off. And I think in terms of the common approach to this issue - as an issue itself, because it's sort of an issue that raises a flag on whether it might cause user confusion, I think the general approach needs to - it's a common issue between IDN gTLDs and ccTLDs and the preventing confusion is likely, you know, a common approach as well. However, for the actual implementation probably IDN gTLD and IDN ccTLD implementation might be slightly different.

And in terms of collecting the ways to address the issue for the gTLD side, I think the confusingly similar test and the trademark issues have identified a very good body of I guess check and balance against the issue of confusion and also issue that's an (abusive) type of confusion because if you are getting TLD simply for somebody who might mistype a single-character IDN TLD and land into your TLD, then that would likely fall under the issue that is already covered by the new gTLD process and that's something that's not - sort of not allowed based on the existing policies.

And for ccTLDs there's the - there's also the (string) confusion part in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track. And I guess for the IDN ccTLD - IDN ccPDP that's also something that would be taken into consideration. But the, you know, while the crux of the issue is of user confusion, you know, I think while it may be handled slightly differently in the different gTLDs and ccTLDs, I think the existing or ongoing process or policies would apply to single-character IDN TLDs as well. Perhaps the only thing is to make sure that evaluators or (in the) implementation people are aware that a single-character IDN TLDs might have this additional item that needs to be looked into.

So that was Issue 4. Any questions, thoughts, additions? Hearing none, I'll move on to Issue Number 6. We already talked about Issue Number 5 earlier.

Issue Number 6 is - I keep typing - I'm having this typo with whether - but anyway whether special policies are required to address usability of single-character IDN TLDs. This was raised last time that certain applications, databases or spam filters, those type of features may inadvertently disallow or not recognize domain names with single-character IDN TLDs. The concern is that, you know, some of the applications are designed in a way that would not expect TLDs to be a single character.

So in terms of ways to address the issue, I think the - as mentioned last time, really the place to - this is not a new issue. It's the same issue was discovered - or essentially the same issue was discovered when TLDs with more than three characters were introduced in the 2000 round and thereafter. And for the next, you know, few years, the different registries and also ICANN has worked on the issue and as the JIG (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay. Sorry.

Edmon Chung: Sorry. Does somebody want to speak? Hello? I guess not. Am I still on?

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry. This is Bart. I was not on mute and somebody was passing me. So I'll go back on mute again.

Edmon Chung: No worries. Okay. So, yeah, this issue is also an issue of common interest that the JIG has identified. We haven't started looking into it but I guess it's relevant in this case as well so we've added into it and basically it's related to the universal acceptance of all top-level domains. And for single-character IDN TLDs there is actually two, I guess, two sides or two aspects of this issue, one of which is being a short TLD of one character that certain applications might choke on.

And the other situation is that in fact a single-character IDN TLD might be considered a long TLD when you look at it in the A-label form or the (funicode) or ASCII form which would have definitely more than four characters long. So the issue for IDN TLDs essentially is that they - the issue of it being too long would exist in general anyway.

So I quoted quite extensively from previous work on universal acceptance of all top-level domains and I think their still valid basically what the issues are, some of the issues that have been seen and, you know, some of the problem points, end user application, Web forums, Web sites, email services and the issue is not - the (DNS resolve) is usually not the case but there are a whole host of other applications, Web applications that have problems.

And this is an issue that is definitely of common interest now with the introduction of IDN TLDs. So I guess there's no difference whether it's a single-character IDN TLD or whether it's two or more characters except for single character there would be additional requirement because - for - it might be a case where single characters themselves also present an issue.

So that was Issue Number 6...

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon.

Edmon Chung: ...which we brought up last time. Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart again.

Edmon Chung: Yes, Bart, go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: I fully agree with the issue. I just have a question (more of) logistics. Say if you look at the JIG itself it was supposed to address three specific topics and one of the three topics was as I understood specifically the usability question

(to outreach) and everything else. Do you want to include this one into that third topic or address it specifically for a single-character IDN?

Edmon Chung: We brought up this issue last time. I think it may make sense to identify the issue here. I - actually in the write-up I also said that it is - it was identified as one of the issues to be looked at. So I think it's probably good to identify it because there is one additional aspect of which, which is it being a single character. That is...

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Edmon Chung: ...different from generally an IDN.

Bart Boswinkel: I agree. I fully agree. I just wanted to make sure that everybody understands and we put it in the document that this is one of the three topic areas, there are some specific IDN single-character issues and we move it from here say after the public comment period everybody agrees it is an issue, maybe it could be addressed in the third topic area.

Edmon Chung: Right. Yeah. That's sort of where my head is.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. I just wanted to make sure (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Cool. So with that I wonder if there are any other questions, thoughts, additions to the six issues or any other issue that came to mind and you want to add to it.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. First of all, I apologize. I fell off the call for awhile. Dropped my phone, battery fell out, took me awhile to get back so I may have missed something. You've gone now through completely the document? Because I wanted to ask another question.

Edmon Chung: Yeah. Feel free to jump back in. I was calling for you earlier on when we were talking about one particular aspect of the DAG but...

Avri Doria: Yeah. I'm terribly sorry. My phone fell apart and by the time I got it back together and figured out what I was doing, a lot of time had gone by.

Edmon Chung: No worries.

Avri Doria: So I don't remember - no, I wanted to bring up something that wasn't in the report and I don't know if this group cares but I didn't want to interfere with the report (doing).

Edmon Chung: Please.

Avri Doria: Okay. And I sent you a note on it. As people know this whole - because of the issues that came up in the new IDN ccTLDs with what's going under various names, one of them being alias names or other words that people didn't like seeing used like synchronicity and whatever else, the IETS at the moment is going through a rechartering and there are people, some of whom may, you know, are definitely ICANN involved, are actually starting to work on what would be the requirement for a notion of alias names.

Now obviously ICANN doesn't get involved in the actual technical solutions. But I'm wondering if this group has an interest in sort of looking at those requirements, making sure that those requirements match the interests of both, you know, ccTLDs and gTLDs before the IETS starts down a multiyear, you know, DNS possible extension in terms of supporting them.

So as I say, I know the two authors are - I mean there's authors from CNNIC and there's authors from ISC on it at the moment so it's not like they're not ICANN folks but - or ICANN involved folks, but I just wanted to check whether that was something we wanted to add, we wanted to wait, we wanted to ignore. I just wanted to put it on the table. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Avri, yeah, I got your message. I'm sorry I didn't...

Avri Doria: That's okay.

Edmon Chung: ...I actually forgot to respond. That is the issue of variants actually. That's tied very much with the issue of variants which is the next topic we - I think we - the group has identified to work on. So this is definitely an issue that we should talk about on our next call which will be focus - you know, in the earlier sort of workload that was suggesting, we would first work on this single character IDN TLD thing which the initial report.

Once we kick this out to public comment, then we'll spend the time during that public comment period to talk about the variant part. And I think this is very relevant and I think this group should definitely keep an eye on that and in any other discussion or as we start working on a report, it should acknowledge, you know, that work that's going on in (ITS) as well.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. Can I add one more thing on that? Sorry, I didn't quite realize that, otherwise I probably would've not brought it up because I guess and part of the reason is I'm not sure that it is just a variant issue. There may be as you well know through the gTLD space, people talk about the non-harmful similarities in some names which wouldn't necessarily be variant but might be, you know, confusingly similar that aren't confusing.

I forget exactly what we're calling that, benign similarity or something. And the notion of aliasing may also figure into that. So I think it's both a G and a C issue and it may actually go beyond just variant, though I'm not sure. I would just like to say up front that I'm not sure that variant is the only cause for aliasing.

Edmon Chung: Right. I guess in - yeah, I completely agree with you actually Avri and I'm just using variant for a collective sense. I should, you know, have a quote around

variant. And when we go down the discussion there we probably need to figure out as that document that you forwarded indicated that we might have to think about what sort of nomenclature we want to use, what words we want to use to describe it. But I'm just using that because we were using it before and that was the next topic.

Avri Doria: Okay. (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: So do I gather correctly that, you know, you're not really suggesting anything to do with this to be added into the single-character IDN (document)?

Avri Doria: Oh, no, no, no. No, it definitely wasn't that.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Avri Doria: I just wanted to - that's why I wanted to wait until we were done with that to make sure that this was on the table and had been brought to everybody's attention. That's all.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So earlier we were calling for you on in terms of DAG4. There was a question on whether - that there were mechanisms to avoid anything that looks like a country code IDN TLD to go through the gTLD process. And I said basically I think that was the case. There is now for DAG4 there is and Bart actually also chimed in and confirmed that. I was just...

Avri Doria: Yeah. I mean I'm not sure that there aren't people that aren't going to continue disputing that until we get the final application guide because as you know as well as I do, you know, there are people in the GNSO that do not favor that restriction but it does look like it's been imposed at this point and I doubt anyone's going to get it out.

Edmon Chung: Right. That was sort of what I would think what you would add to that discussion but there it is. But it's there.

Avri Doria: Yeah. It is there at the moment and as I say, I'm sure people will object to it, some already have, and I expect that they'll ignore the objections.

Edmon Chung: Okay. So I guess with that we've gone through at least the initial report, the draft, and the whole idea is to try to do a stocktaking of what the issues may be for introducing single-character IDN TLDs. And I guess from working forward now, perhaps I guess we'll suggest to sort of set a - send this out for last call in our mailing list maybe for the remainder of the week. Bart you said that over the weekend you could make some suggestion as to some of the wording, then perhaps we can target to, you know, put it out for public comments, you know, Monday or next week.

And if that - you know, I'll send notes to sort of do a last call on this document to be sent out for public comment. And then in terms of the schedule, last time (Kris) brought up the issue and Bart and I and Jian further discussed the issue. I think the - we would definitely try to accommodate the summer schedule.

And so the current suggestion is to have a 45-day comment period which would bring us well into September so that people are back from summer vacation and it's also a good time to get the comments in. And then we would still have a little bit of time to try to do some work and see if we can provide some input into the final applicant guidebook between - within September and between - at least between September and (unintelligible). That's sort of the idea for going forward for this item, the single-character IDN TLDs.

Bart Boswinkel: Edmon, this is Bart again.

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Just to make sure that - I was still on mute. I will send you something by Monday and I have sent you a confirmation of your proposed schedule so that...

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I got that here.

Bart Boswinkel: ...that would work - yeah, okay.

Edmon Chung: All right. So I guess with that between now and next week I'll - the idea is that once we get this document out for last call and done, we'll start to look into the issue of variants and, you know, various other names synchronized and everything. I'll send what - I'll definitely send the link Avri shared earlier on so people can keep an eye on that, the development in that at (ITS) on that issue and I guess we'll start to wrap our thoughts around that second issue in our next call.

Our next call is supposed to be two weeks from now is August 3. So I guess Gisella and Glen and Bart would be sending the reminder and the (easy) call in numbers and everything afterwards and we'll talk again then. And between now and the end of the week I'm sort of doing last call for this document and will aim to put it out for public comments early next week.

Any other thoughts, questions? If not, I thank everyone for participating tonight and we'll wrap the call.

Woman: All right. Bye.

Edmon Chung: Thanks.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

END