

# Report of Public Comments

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Variant Issues Project -- Latin Case Study Team Issues Report</b>											
<b>Publication Date:</b>	29 November 2011											
<b>Prepared By:</b>	Leo Vegoda											
<b>Comment Period:</b>		<b>Important Information Links</b>										
Open Date:	7 October 2011	Announcement										
Close Date:	14 November 2011	Public Comment Box										
Time (UTC):	23.59	View Comments Submitted										
<b>Staff Contact:</b>	Leo Vegoda	<b>Email:</b>	leo.vegoda@icann.org									
<b>Section I: General Overview and Next Steps</b>												
<p>ICANN has conducted six case studies of individual scripts to investigate any issues that need to be resolved to facilitate a good user experience for IDN variant TLDs. This report provides a summary an analysis of comments submitted for the Latin case study report. ICANN will complete a consolidated issues report that will summarize and synthesize the issues identified by the case study teams. It is expected that the results of the case studies will play a crucial role in the identification of solutions towards the delegation of IDN variant TLDs.</p>												
<b>Section II: Contributors</b>												
<p><i>At the time this report was prepared, a total of three (3) community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.</i></p>												
<u>Organizations and Groups:</u>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Name</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Submitted by</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Initials</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>At-Large Advisory Committee</td> <td>Matt Ashtiani</td> <td>ALAC</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Name	Submitted by	Initials	At-Large Advisory Committee	Matt Ashtiani	ALAC			
Name	Submitted by	Initials										
At-Large Advisory Committee	Matt Ashtiani	ALAC										
<u>Individuals:</u>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Name</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Affiliation (if provided)</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Initials</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>John C Klensin</td> <td> </td> <td>JCK</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials	John C Klensin		JCK			
Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials										
John C Klensin		JCK										
<b>Section III: Summary of Comments</b>												
<p><i>General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).</i></p>												

The two responses to the public comments can be seen below. Both comments note the validity of the comments received but note that the issues raised are unlikely to cause any confusion as the work progresses.

#### **Section IV: Analysis of Comments**

*General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.*

I have been authorized by the host organization for the Latin script study, the Internet Infrastructure Foundation, to make the following remarks on its behalf about the public commentary received on the final report of the Latin team. The ALAC comments are duly acknowledged but no detailed response appears necessary. The submission by John Klensin goes into specific detail about the Latin report and his remarks are the focus of what is said below.

John's knowledgeable and insightful observations are gratefully received and the time devoted to their preparation is most appreciated. He calls attention to several points in the report that would benefit from rewording due either to their being poorly founded or the risk of their being misleading. This does not invalidate the conclusion drawn in the report, but weakens the argumentation leading to it.

In response:

The Latin report is now being merged with those of the other script studies by the Integrated Issues Report Coordination Team. In the process, issues that are inadequately expressed or potentially confusing in the individual reports are expected to be clarified as then presented in the unified issues report.

The Integrated VIP Team has progressed well into that work and there has as yet been no indication of their misinterpreting any of the issues in the Latin report that John's commentary flags as being shakily presented. This may be due to the presence of two representatives of the Latin study on the integration team who can rectify incipient misunderstanding at its first indication. Since this buffer will remain in place for the duration of the integration work, there is little reason for concern about greater confusion during its latter phase.

In light of that, and the conclusion of the Latin report being unchanged by any frailties in its background preparation, a detailed discussion of the individual points in John's commentary appears to be without material consequence. If that is an incorrect appraisal, the host organization is following the integration work and will note any arising situation in the remaining VIP activity that might benefit from external clarification. The original Latin team members, including ICANN support staff, will be advised of this with an offer of host support if they feel it useful in resolving the underlying issue(s). This includes facilitating the redacting the original report if such assistance is desired.

Cary Karp

I had the privilege of serving as the team lead / coordinator for the Latin-VIP team, but stepped down in early October after the delivery of this report from the group due to time conflicts.

The ambitious objective of the group was to provide a report that would be used in subsequent efforts (now underway), with a fairly narrow focus, mandate, and scope. The team who assembled the Latin report disbanded as we delivered the report that is up now for commentary, and there were two members of the group that proceeded on into the next phase of work, Cary Karp, and Harald Alvestrand.

I personally doubt there was any misunderstanding about Latin variant conclusions in the subsequent groups that are working with the team issues report. That is my personal thought, though. It would be a challenge to collect the thoughts and synthesize the response of the Latin Team as a whole because it has been all but disbanded. It may be the case that individual members may elect to do as I, and respond.

I would suggest that perhaps the group response be most appropriately communicated from the host organization, in lieu of attempting to assemble a response from the ranks of the disbanded Latin VIP team.

Gratefully, Cary Karp is the representative of the host organization that was supporting our work in the Latin VIP team, who took over editorial pen on the group as I transitioned out, and contributed much of the substantive material of the report in its final form. Cary also is participating in the integration team, and I'd let him comment as to what the pragmatic experience is within that work as to if anyone in that group were misled by the findings of the Latin team with respect to variants, which I highly doubt is the case. That said, I am responding below in a personal capacity, in-line below [see [attached PDF](#)] (bolded) with my reflections of the team's discussions or my own perspective. I respectfully acknowledge that John Klensin will win any debate or discussion on the matter, though I hope that some of my comments in response will be considered. I encourage other team members to respond by 11/28/2011 in their individual capacity if they feel it is appropriate.

I again thank the ICANN community for the privilege of serving as team lead coordinator on this important work, I thank all the participating team members for their time.

Jothan Frakes