

## Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting

### JIG Meeting

**Monday 8 April 2013 at 16:30 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/#apr>

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

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

Edmon Chung: Feel free to come and sit at the table because I think we will have plenty of seats. I'll try to invite the panel to sit, yes, this end but there's still two ends of the table so please do come on up because then you would have mics and we could have a more interactive conversation. So, don't be shy.

And the other thing is because of the late reschedule of this meeting, it was originally scheduled for 4:30. It's not rescheduled for 4:00 so that we have a whole hour to go through this. I'm still waiting for a couple of panelists who might have gotten the note late. But I guess we'll wait for another few minutes before getting started but do feel free to come up to the table. There is better power that you can plug into and it's more comfortable.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Edmon Chung: Since I - hello? Hello? Is this on? Hello? I'll repeat what I just said since I see a few people come in as well. The session, because of late reschedule, it was originally 4:30. It's moved to 4:00. So I'm planning to wait for a few more minutes. Thank you everyone for coming and also thank you for the patience for waiting a little while. Because of that change we'll aim to start at maybe 10

past or 15 past. We are missing at least one. Let me see. We're missing one panelist. Two panelists, actually, unless Francisco is - yes, Francisco is one of them and (Rom) is the other one.

So I guess we'll wait for another few minutes because this was a very late reschedule. So thank you everyone for bearing with me. And also, those who are sitting over at the audience, feel free to come to the table. Would allow us to - for better interaction. And to my clock, it's about 4:06 right now so I guess we'll wait for a few more minutes for the two panelists. Thank you for bearing with us.

Right. Yes, as mentioned, they're probably both in the SSR session but they did promise to hop over. So I guess we'll - it's too interesting, right? This is too boring, I know. Maybe a year from now there will be a lot of people talking about this issue.

Anyway, so as I mentioned, we'll wait for another few minutes. Thank you everyone for your patience.

So thank you everyone for being patient. Since we do have, you know, a reasonable gathering I thought perhaps we should get the show on the way. Christina, I'm not sure (unintelligible) the logistics to you to get the recording or anything. Is that necessary or it's already done?

Christina Willett: (Unintelligible) but that's fine. And the recording is on.

Edmon Chung: So what I just said was all recorded?

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Edmon Chung: OK, so I'm just stopping to get myself into the Adobe Connect room, in case there are any questions there we can get an answer.

So, thank you everyone for joining this session. It is the universal acceptance of IND TLDs. It is a work that the joint GNSO and (PCNSO) working group on IDNs is working on. The main issue is about different systems, databases and browsers or ISP supporting new IDN TLDs.

So before I begin I just want to quickly introduce the panel. (Instead), rather than me introducing why don't I invite the panel to just quickly introduce yourself and where you're from. And we'll probably start with Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Hi, I'm Jordyn Buchanan with Google/(unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: Hello. I'm (Chris) and I'm from University College London.

Minjung Park: Good afternoon everyone. I'm Minjung Park and I'm from Korea, the Korea Internet and Security Institute.

Mary Wong: Hello, I'm Mary Wong and I just said in what capacity I'm here. So I'm from the ccNSO council but I want to make sure that I'm not speaking on behalf either of that council or of the ccNSO as a whole. I was also previously a member of the (GNSO) council -- I'm not speaking for them either. So I guess I'm here as a user and as someone who's originally from Singapore and therefore very interested in this particular issue as well as RIDN issues.

Jian Zhang: Hello everybody, I'm Jian Zhang, the General Manager of APTLD and also the co-chair from (unintelligible) from (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Thank you and I just Realized I didn't introduce myself. I'm Edmon Chung from DotAsia and also a co-chair from the GNSO side for the (unintelligible) Working Group.

Just to get it started, just in terms of the joint group I'll just give everyone a very brief background. The group itself was formed as a joint group between the ccNSO and the GNSO and the purpose of the group is to talk about and

find possible ways to work together on issues of common interests between ccNSO and GNSO on IDNs. And the group itself started in March 2010. We had biweekly calls, which were changed to monthly calls since June of last year. There were three issues that we identified as common issues between ccNSO and GNSO. They include single-character IDN TLDs, IDN TLD variance and the topic that we're talking about today is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

So just a very background of where this group is coming from and sort of the background of the recommendations where it's coming from.

So we've had face-to-face meeting since Brussels and this particular meeting we are hoping that be sort of a public meeting to invite the community to provide more feedback to us on the issue that we're talking about, which is the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

So, the issue itself is that, as I mentioned very, very briefly - and I wasn't planning to talk too much about it. I guess this issue has been brought up many times. It is the case where certain systems, databases, software, like browsers or other pieces of software, may treat certain top level domains as invalid or, you know, an error. And this is an issue that actually was uncovered well, you know, quite a few years again in the year 2000 when the first new gTLDs were launched -- Dot info, Dot Museum. It was met with certain issues and the issue back then was also addressed. In fact, the FSAC put out a report in 2003 that provided a number of recommendations. Some of the recommendations have been implemented. In fact, most of the recommendations have been implemented. You know, some of the work that has been ongoing since 2003, one of which is a staff led effort, which is to maintain a piece of code to verify the TLDs and also to provide some assistance in this issue.

But I would like to mention, there are some - like, for example, number five on the screen -- having a repository of known software issues. That doesn't

seem to be fully completed yet, which brings us to sort of the background of the (jig work), is working on some of the FSAC proposals back then and looking at some of the issues that we will be facing as new gTLDs come into play.

And one important thing I did want to mention - sorry, I'm jumping back and forth. One particular difference between 2000 and now is the addition of new IDN ccTLDs. So since the launch of the IDN ccTLD fast track, this became an issue of common interest, because previously it was mostly the longer gTLDs that had a problem. Now we have ccTLDs and IDNs that are also facing this issue, different pieces of software are basically choking on new top level domains.

And here's just some of the background work that the group has collected. There are a couple of emerging industry standards that is being used these days. Like, for example, the Public Suffix List that is managed by Mozilla. As new gTLDs are added, as new IDN and ccTLDs are added, the timing of the changes to the PUBLIC SUFFIX LIST could be different than the changes to the root database and the root DNS and that presents one of the situations where, you know, for example, when the new IDN and ccTLD is added to the root, it's not immediately accessible by some of the browsers that utilize the PUBLIC SUFFIX LIST as a way to identify whether the domain is a legitimate domain.

Some other lists as well. Wikipedia is often quoted and in terms of this issue, there are some other relevant work as well, including the ICANN IDN Guidelines, including the IRI, including the Internationalized Email Addresses -- these are related to what we're talking about because these contain domain names and IDN names and IDN TLDs.

So, there is one additional - I mentioned about the PUBLIC SUFFIX LIST and there is one additional sort of tangent issue, which is about the Unique Authoritative Root. Because of the not necessarily fully synced situation with

the PUBLIC SUFFIX LIST and the Root DNS, there could be cases where the, you know, Unique Authoritative Root is challenged in a way, because it's not fully synced.

So, with those kind of background information, the group then went on to take a look at the - oh, and a couple of other things. The group also paid attention to the variance issues project, (studied) team reports, especially the user experience report on some of the challenges that those IDN variance may bring in terms of universal acceptance as well because that is another area. But in terms of scope of this particular project, we won't touch on, you know, whether or not or how variances are handled but just to raise it as, you know, with IDN TLD variance, the universal acceptance and resolution of those names are also important.

So, with that background, the (Jig) actually went on to do a bit of work on exploring whether there are any work to be done at the ICANN policy level, whether there are any policies to consider at all or whether there are any implementation that needs to be done. And also, we looked into which organizations, which areas ICANN perhaps should be focusing their efforts on and also, you know, what types of works because, you know, this particular issue seems to be more of an advocacy type of issue.

So this was the - an initial report was put out to gather some information from the community. We received a number of feedback and through the public comments process, which opened early last year, actually, and, you know, closed last year. And from there what we realized is that a lot of the work really needs to be driven by staff team, which at that time actually became more active as well because of the new gTLD process. One of the things we'd like to bring out is that this is now an issue not just for new gTLDs but also for IDN ccTLDs.

So based on the feedback that we got, we have now drafted a draft final report, which will be published shortly after Beijing, I believe. We completed it

just before Beijing and it's in the process of being posted for public comment but it never left. It's put out basically four main proposals for recommendations. And I'll just go right into it.

So recommendation A, one of the interesting things that we found is that within the community, there are actually some work to do as well because beyond just reaching out to application providers or databases, we will realize there are certain databases like the gTLD registry itself, you know, IDN ccTLDs themselves and registrars actually have their own system that take in, like, main server records or email addresses that are in the Whois and contact information.

So the recommendation A is about recommending that all ICANN IDN TLD operators support the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs in their own systems. Kind of like getting our own act together. And so that's recommendation A.

Recommendation B is a broader sort of recommendation. Right now this particular issue is not identified as a strategic initiative for ICANN. So recommendation B really is to bring it to the board and staff and say, "Hey, this might be one of the items that we want to identify as a strategic item in the strategic plan, specifically (input) the sources behind it." Because what we see is that as new gTLDs and new IDN ccTLDs are launched in the marketplace, if they don't work it actually impacts consumer trust, consumer confidence of the DNS system. And that should be high priority in the new gTLD program and the IDN ccTLD process and ICANN in general as well.

So recommendation B is to elevate this particular issue because it does impact consumer trust in the DNS.

And then recommendation C is a more target recommendation to ask staff to work on because as new IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs are delegated, which is pretty much imminent. And we just heard, those of you who are in the new

gTLD update session, which we just heard that it could be as soon as within this month or next month that IDN TLDs could be assigned a contract and, you know, be delegated within this year. Maybe Q3 or Q4 of this year. And we'll see them being upgraded. But see of these operators may not know about, you know, what they're getting themselves into in a way. And they may be very surprised that some of the systems out there are not, you know - how come my users can't access my IDN TLD? You know, or put it - I can't use my domain name on my Facebook profile, for example or, you know, those types of issues.

So recommendation C is to ask staff to try to kind of collect some of the information that has already been put together by some of the experience from those who launched earlier, like IDN ccTLDs who launched or some of the new gTLDs that have launched before and provide to these operators a sort of reference material. These are some of the things that you might want to be aware of. You might want to go - for example,, you might want to go the PUBLIC SUFFIX LIST and check with them and make sure that your TLD is in there. You might want to go and to Google and tell them, you know, my TLD is now live and make sure that not only a search is going to, you know, (speed) my TLD but also Ad Words would support it, you know, and those types of things. And to put together some reference materials for new IDN TLD operators -- both gTLD and ccTLDs. That's (some of) C.

And then recommendation D is to, again, ask staff to work on furthering this work because so far - I was hoping Francisco would give us some updates, but so far what has been delivered from the staff has been not as proactive. Actually, some of the information is there. There's the TLD acceptance Web site. There is also a piece of code that you can use. But recommendation D is to recommend staff to take a further step and be proactive and go out to the community, to other communities, not just within ICANN -- go to other relevant communities to talk them about, like, application developers or the W3C Web developers to tell them about the importance of universal acceptance.



So that's sort of my background on where we are. I'd like to then go to the panel and I guess if it's OK I'll start from Jordyn, just to give a brief view of the issue or maybe your experience on the topic and just general thoughts. And then we'll come back and talk about this one-by-one. So just go around the table for a general experience sharing or view on the issue and then we'll come back and one-by-one on the recommendations.

Jordyn Buchanan: Sure. I'll try to be fairly brief but I will note that this is an issue that's near and dear to the heart of a bunch of us at Google, as previous panels on universal acceptance of, you know, just the idea of the TLDs have noted there have been difficulties in the past getting some of our products to work with new TLDs. And as a large applicant for TLDs we certainly don't want to make it so they don't work with our own TLDs, much less anyone else's. We have a significant effort underway right now to make sure that all of our products work well with new TLDs and our applicants for three IDN TLDs as well and we expect actually the first TLD that we launch will be an IDN TLD. And so it actually has created a great deal of urgency within the company to get this launched. And Google has a lot of products, as probably all of you know, and some of them work quite well with both new TLDs in general, as well as IDN TLDs. Web search seems to generally work totally fine with IDN ccTLDs that already exist. Other products like Gmail don't work at all with the IDN TLDs. So, we have some work to do and are actively engaged in doing this in our own products.

The other thing I will note is, you know, we have largely taken the view that all of these proposed recommendations are incredibly important but it may be that as an industry that we need to do more than just hoping that ICANN will solve these problems for us. We owe part of the solution on our own by working together. So we, Google, along with a variety of other folks in the community have been working to create a trade association in order to help consumers better understand new domains, including IDN TLDs. And part of the mission of that trade association is intended to be (unintelligible)

encourage universal acceptance on the technical front. And so to raise awareness of these issues in the community, as well as to actually, you know, go reach out to the development community as a coordinated voice in this industry body.

And so I will just make a quick pitch. If anyone goes to [whatdomain.org](http://whatdomain.org) you can sign up to learn more about the trade association and we think that there's a lot of self-help that we can do in addition to relying on others to solve these problems for us. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: if you don't mind me asking - well, actually the trade association is very good. But I just want to remind that I guess this recommendation is that the trade association should do this but ICANN should also pitch in and that's a...

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, I don't disagree that it would be great for ICANN to do these things. Certainly as an IDN applicant, we don't want to ICANN to that so we want to work on the problem ourselves, as well.

Edmon Chung: But I did have one question. You mentioned that, for example, Google is looking into their own system. What might be useful maybe - you know, are you looking at it systematically across your systems? How are you identifying those? I may not be asking you for an answer right now but if you would document that that would be useful for other organizations to look to as well.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, that's great. I will just say, we are already coordinating. In advance of the trade association we are coordinating with some other companies as well on the general acceptance of new TLDs. And so I think that those general findings might be useful as well.

So, Chris.

Chris Dillon: OK, so I was looking at the recommendation C and that's been talked about on the (Jig) phone calls. And the idea there really is that there is a possibility

of there being an online resource, which would probably split into two parts. So part of it would be run by ICANN staff and that would have sort of an official documentation (unintelligible) by ICANN model documentation really. But then another part of it, truth be just a collection of documentation which has already been developed by, you know, various registries and registrars.

At an earlier point, there was also a possibility of there being resources targeted at other audiences. But that is no longer the case. I think there was a decision made but it will just be resolved as looking at those two audiences. So certainly gTLDs and ccTLDs, although the existing (unintelligible) is only ccTLDs, only IDNs. And yes, certainly if (Jig) gets involved with just collecting things then the suggestion is that that would possibly be done in a Wiki platform. But I'm starting to actually get into the recommendation, so perhaps I should stop at this point. Or I can do the whole thing, if that's more convenient.

Edmon Chung: If it's specific on one particular recommendation that's, you know, (unintelligible) for the...

Chris Dillon: OK. It's rather difficult to split this thing into two things. ICANN has a wiki. I have an account on there. I haven't used it particularly recently. So one suggestion I'm making is that we use that wiki. It runs on the so-called Confluence software, which is very easy to use. I have a lot of experience with Confluence. And that we would just gradually start to collect those materials. We could discuss at our leisure exactly how we would do that. So It might just be walking around the exhibition -- that might be one way -- but on the calls we could actually talk about how we would want to collect those materials.

Once we have the materials, I don't think we would be doing anything with it. I think we would not (sort of) saying, "Well, most of this is right but we're not very happy about that (there)." I don't think we could really judge. I think we'd have to have a disclaimer saying, you know, this a collection of what exists.

It's to help save people time. It's a lot quicker to use existing resources than to go from scratch. That's really one of the main reasons for doing it.

Let me think. Is there anything else I really need to say at this point? I mean, we could start doing it now. I mean, the only thing that we would have to do - you know, obviously at this stage it's only going to be ccTLD stuff but in the future it would be gTLD stuff as well. And basically, perhaps we could have a standing point on the telephone call agenda so each time it would be, "OK, is there anything we need to do on this?" And just (deal) with it like that.

The other thing is that presuming this is the way we want to go, it may make sense if we actually say, "Right, (I want that first) to this resource. I can put things in there." I'm certainly personally happy to do that but we might want to decide, OK, these people are going to apply for accounts on the wiki and we would actually do that on one - you know, rather than doing it in drips and (draps) and driving the ICANN (unintelligible) people up the wall, many, many requests to get access, it might make more sense just to, you know, to do it, you know, to start up along with. Like, please give these people (these email access) to the (fifth).

Edmon Chung: So, looking at the time we're, you know, quickly running out of time but if you can wrap up.

Chris Dillon: That was the end of it actually.

Edmon Chung: Sorry.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much.

Edmon Chung: Sorry for doing that. But I just want to take the time also to welcome (Rom) to join us on the panel. Just to get you up to date, I was just giving a little bit of background of the issue itself and leading up to what the (Jig) did for those recommendations. I'm asking the panel to just talk a little bit about the

general view about the issue and then we'll come back to each recommendation and talk a little bit more about it. So, I guess I'll finish up with (unintelligible) and Mary and then come back to (Rom).

Minjung Park: Hello again. Minjung Park (unintelligible). The Korea Institute Regency, (which is) (unintelligible) registries for (unintelligible).

Korea has introduced the Korean ccTLD called (unintelligible) in May 2009, which is two years ago. And we currently have about 100,000 domain names under (unintelligible). Back in 2009, we used to receive complaints from IDN users that some of the Internet browsers were not supporting IDNs and two years later, in the 2013, most of the complaints that we receive now are not on the PC environment, as in the past, but on the mobile (unintelligible) environment. The (unintelligible) as many of you may be aware has a very high penetration rate of Internet, both wire than wireless.

According to the survey done by (KISA), our organization in 2012, 90% of the total population were using wireless Internet and 60% of total population were smart phone users.

So it's a step forward to a better environment for a (unintelligible) population. I think it is crucial to have a collaboration with the application provides as well as hardware and manufacturers with which I have Apple and Samsung as well.

So in this respect I find it very encouraging to have (Jordan) from Google with us today and hope to have more engagement (unintelligible) to help us, ICANN, as a global coordinator in the future. This will be a general view and (unintelligible) recommendations. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Mary?

Mary Wong: This is going to be short. I actually have 1.5 comments and one question. So since I'm here most as a non-technical user I was quite struck by some things in the report.

First of all I was - (unintelligible) realized that even our current providers and systems aren't able to support acceptance of different scripts. I think you could ask a lot of users, including people who I experience in this community will come as a complete shock to them. Where I think pointing that out and having that recommendation is really useful.

It seems to me then that a lot of these recommendations break down into really three levels of engagement. One is internally within the ICANN community, both for existing as well as new participants. Secondly is obviously to the broader user community. The third I guess overlaps with the second which is beyond ICANN who, how, and what.

So I think using the (unintelligible) is a great idea. I mean it really does cut down on staff demand and it's a matter of pushing it out and letting people know, here's where it is.

So I was really open - I think here's the 0.5 comment - 0.25 and then 0.25 to (Jordan), I think, it's really nice that you are working with other companies for that thing and I think if there is regular communication and coordination with not just in (unintelligible) in ICANN then I think the push out at - to all these levels will be really, really much better comparatively to the outreach effort using - tell people about (unintelligible) in the first place that we went through a few years ago.

So my question, Edmon knows what question I'm going to ask I just think he's not going to answer it, is that the recommendations - say, A, for example, right, why wouldn't it be a mandatory requirement as opposed to just a guideline? So for example, you'd put it into a registry agreement.

Edmon Chung: That is a very good question. As you said that I wouldn't answer it so I won't answer it, no. We'll come back to talk about that in one moment and a quick answer to - one of the answers important to note also is that - now you're on the ccNSO you probably realize the ccTLD part also is part of this group.

And when the GNSO Council takes this recommendation perhaps, you know, the GNSO Council can initiate additional work as well. And I'd encourage it to do so.

But the ccTLD side might be a little bit different than the ccNSO side. So thank you and cautioned with time right now and just want to welcome Francisco to the panel as well and we'll just be giving background, talking about the general view of the issue.

I did talk about - a little bit about what staff is working on and some of the recommendations with staff. So I'll go to (Rom) and then I guess to Francisco to give a general view on the topic or sharing experience. And then well go one by one and please keep it very short.

(Rom): Thank you. So we were the first TLD that didn't get accepted many, many years ago. It wasn't IDN. It was .info, four letter TLD. And the world had coded for a TLD - a valid TLD to be two or three letters.

So we spent years working on the problem and even as recently as two months ago we found a major provider who didn't support .info email address per registration.

So as a result I've come up with - so - and we support many other great than two or three letter TLDs. We support mobi and asia and so on and so forth. So come up with three really rules if you will which I'd love to see broken as we expand.

But Rule 1 that I've at least understood and identified is old TLDs would be accepted more than new TLD. Rule 2 is an ASCII only TLD will be accepted more than an IDN TLD. And Rule 3 is that three-letter gTLD would be accepted more often than a longer string even if that longer string is a gTLD. So that's in general.

Now as far as IDNs are concerned I think there are far more things than simply the length of the string that are not just about acceptance but that have to do with applications, interoperability between applications, things like that. And that's a far broader thing to do.

And Recommendation D is the right direction but that's a multiyear effort and anybody who expects that after we - when ICANN goes and implements all four of these that a couple of years later we're going to have a much greater level of acceptance is in for a big surprise. Info launched in 2001. We're in 2013 and we're still seeing problems.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, (Rom). And as I see more people come in I'm encouraged but also I guess one year from now when the IDN TLDs actually launch we will have a much bigger audience on this particular topic.

So I'm going to go to Francisco but I did mention very quickly the staff that the team on the TLD acceptance have done. I don't know whether you want to do - add anything before we go forward. And I now - I'll try to go through all four recommendations and then I'll open the floor for - but time is pretty short.

Man: In the interest of time I will yield to you so go through the recommendations.

Edmon Chung: Okay, thank you. So I'll go into each recommendation and also open the floor as we go along.



So Recommendation A really is talking about getting our own act together and I'm pretty serious about this and quite surprised in talking about two - I'll talk about two incidents that happened in the last month.

One of which I was trying to go through the UM IGS work shop proposal process and my .asia address was rejected. And I ended up using a .org address that - anyway.

And the other one was the IDN ccTLD fast track. I was applying for dot (unintelligible) in Chinese for IDN ccTLD fast track and unfortunately the ICANN system also rejected my .asia email address.

So - but it was fixed very quickly. So now it's fixed, just want to let everyone know, ICANN is very efficient. But what it really means is that we need to get our own act together and that's what Recommendation A is about.

So registries, registrars, cc - again, ccTLDs as well. We think that - before we go out and say, Microsoft or Yahoo, get your act together, we've got to get our own act together and that's Recommendation A.

And the current proposed implementation of it in suggesting (unintelligible) it might be different for, you know - on the GNSO side and the ccNSO side is to update the ICANN IDN guidelines. But with that I wonder if anyone from the panel wanted to add to this or give their thoughts on - (Rom)?

(Rom): Very briefly and I'll respond back to one of the comments made earlier. This is an area where if ICANN were to make it mandatory I could see some value for it. But the thing is that you make such things mandatory then you have to go and validate it and verify it and there's really no good way to do that.

So that's why I'm really not a big fan of yet more contractual requirements. This ought to be something that there's a commitment for.

The IDN guidelines, the work that has been done in the community with ICANN for years now have been a very good example. We put IDN guidelines together. The people who formed that committee came from the community and registries across the board have more or less adopted it without a contractual whip on them.

So I think that's a model to follow. So I think the model that's proposed here is the right model.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, (Rom). Any - Francisco?

Francisco: It's more a comment on (unintelligible) actually a requirement so if you put it in the IDN guidelines it will be a required for new TLDs.

Edmon Chung: Without having to change the contract. Not saying it's a backdoor so - but I did - I think - I just wondered if anyone from the audience wanted to chime in on this particular item? (Andre)?

(Andre): Sure, (unintelligible). We are IDN (unintelligible) by default but our engines run on third party platforms. This is a logical thing. We're not inviting the software. We're not giving it to the end customers. We're not in the browser business. We're not in the email platform. But yes, we are IDN compliant but so what?

Edmon Chung: Right, so this is just one of the four recommendations that I guess this - the point is to get all - to make sure our systems are ready. Your system, great, is ready but some of them are not fully at this point. You know, some of the registrars and registries might not be. And I guess before we go tell people that's one thing. So...

Seeing no further I'll move on to the Recommendation B. Recommendation B is really about identifying a - this particular issue as a strategic initiative for ICANN.

And what we mean by this is that we kind of think this is an important factor on consumer trust because, you know, if users, you know, try to act as the IDN TLD and fails, you know, their trust for the whole system and the whole process could be hurt.

And that's - you know, we think that - we'd like to suggest that the Board and staff consider this as a strategic item in the strategic plan and allocate specific budget and resources behind this issue.

And as (Rom) said, it's not a - you know, one or two year thing, you know. This needs to be a multiyear effort and ongoing effort and that's why we kind of would like to make it a recommendation that this be a specific item. So with that I wonder if anyone - (Andre) again, please.

(Andre): Of course, I think this is the most important topic because - for ICANN, domain names are the primary business. It's not the business but the business as ICANN address domain names, this is number one.

And this should be no different between licensed and not licensed TLDs because otherwise it looks like a digital (unintelligible). And I think if ICANN (unintelligible) 10% of its efforts to outreach in the regions to the IDN problem it probably will go away in the year because we're talking about this problem for three years already, right, since the fast track.

You know, there's not much change except the browsers started to understand the HTTP - blah, blah, blah, something IDN. Other engines, they just don't. I mean Google as an example, it just doesn't support IDN to many engines. It's a fact. And ICANN should spend the time and budget and its efforts to push this thing forward because it's their primary task. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. And (Rom) and I think Mikey, you wanted to (unintelligible). So I'll go to Mikey first and then I'll...

Mikey O'Conner: Thanks, (Rom), for letting me go first. My name's Mikey O'Conner. And the reason that we all showed up late is we were all upstairs at the SSR thing (unintelligible). So it's no reflection on your deal.

This one is a puzzler for me. I did a little rant right at the end upstairs where I sort of said, look, new gTLDs are a product offered by registries and registrars. I'm an ISP. I'm the one that's going to get the call when that product doesn't work. And it's not just in the browser, it's in all the applications and the routing and the - you know, who knows, maybe the Cisco operating system and the routers themselves. Who knows.

But it seems to me that the job of making sure that these things work is not ICANN's job. It's the product provider's job. And, you know, (Rom) is talking about how affiliates have spent, you know, years - at least a decade trying to get poor old .info to work.

And now we've got a bajillion of these new TLDs hitting the root and new scripts and things and at some point the providers of those names, the people who want to reap the revenue and the glory, ought to step up and do much more than this.

I mean it seems to me that there's got to be some really aggressive outreach into the - all these interconnected systems to fix this. But ICANN - it's difficult to get my arms around that.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Mikey. So before you came in I think (Jordan) mentioned that the industry itself needs to work on this as well. But I guess the question is whether this is also a consumer trust issue, you know, that's the reason why this has been (unintelligible) because when names don't work people don't trust their DNS as much.

And that's one argument. And again, sorry for rushing this because we're running out of time but the public comment period will be opened and please do send in the comments.

I don't know whether (Jordan) wants to immediately respond to that. I did what you wanted to say already? Okay, so (Rom)?

(Rom): Thanks, yes. This is strategic value to the organization, I agree with that. But this is not something that is solved just by throwing money at it. And it's not just advocacy. The question for organizations that are involved on the - in the space, not just the DNS, is to be addressed as why is this really important?

Because it sounds like this wonky-geeky thing for TLDs that nobody may ever use, some IDN stuff. I mean it sounds very vague and if you're trying to make a case to a C-level person you're going to get no time from someone like that.

So I think one of the other things to be thought of is what the business case for doing this. We can say - we can get on our moral high horse and say this is an ICANN mission and responsibility but it's one thing for ICANN to actually do it. It's another thing to have an audience who's willing to listen or is ready to listen.

And the case has to be made in a way and packaged in a way that actually attracts the attention of that community, that is - because that's where the ultimate changes have to be done, not at ICANN.

So to me on that proposed recommendation - implementation I think what we should do is to craft this into a much more precise and shaped set of actions that can go to the Board and the Board can then look at it, say, this sounds reasonable, and then task staff to take action A, B, C, and D.

A larger broader thing like what's in there - take into consideration, identifies as an item and budget and strategic plan I fear can result in a \$2 million

budget with seven checklist items that are decided and then executed upon after which ICANN as an organization can say, we checked the box. We followed Recommendation B.

And we as a community may end up saying, but you didn't actually solve the problem. Right, so two - so two basic things. It's bigger than just ICANN. The second thing is that proposed implementation, I think we have to shape it and literally almost convert it into something that can be looked at and then passed straight back on to staff.

Edmon Chung: There is a little bit more information in Recommendation C and D and also the actual document which is not on the slide. But those are very useful information. (Andre), very short.

(Andre): Sure, I'm not - it was not about the money. It was about the attention. How many sentences to date (unintelligible) talked about the problem with universal acceptance? ICANN can address this issue on a high level to the leading - to the head of the companies, to the governments. This is not about money. This is about preaching about it.

You know, this is a (unintelligible), it exists, this problem exists. We can talk here for many years but, you know, I think the top management of ICANN and ICANN senior peoples, you know, should preach about it. They should do something about it also.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. (Dennis), not a lot of time but, please.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you. As you know I've worked for some time in this area, up until the end of last year, and I'm quite familiar with some of the problems. What I wanted to - want to say though is that simply standing on your dignity and saying this must happen - it's not going to affect anything.

The technology that's in place does not support many of the things that you wish to have and may never support some of the things you wish to have. And may take as (Rom) has pointed a very, very long time to be developed. It can be developed to support the things that you wish to have.

So there are very serious issues here that I think you need to drill down and be a lot more specific about exactly what your expectations are in specific situations rather than - you know, this is our right to be able to communicate in our ordinary - in our normal languages and our normal scripts and it almost work.

I think you have to drill very down - very closely down in saying, we mean that IDN TLDs with domain names at the second level without variants will work. And if there are variants at the second level the following behavior is expected. Or we expect that IDN email addresses will work the way ASCII was or not. And probably they don't at this point in time, maybe they never will.

If you consider the issue of using IDN email addresses as unique identifiers for logging in to something like Facebook how is uniqueness created when there are variants? What are your expectations?

So I think you need to drill down and be very, very specific about a set of things you want to happen so that ICANN with the industry can address these specific things one at a time. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, (Dennis). And we did have this particular conversation in - and because there is a staff team that is now starting to become reactivated because of the new gTLD program I'll quickly go to Recommendation C and D and wrap up.

Recommendation C and D really are to ask staff to do a bit more work because a lot of the work might need to be first driven by staff and then the community can chime in and complete and support the work.

And so Recommendation C was to talk about, you know, creating some reference materials for newcomers, the new TLD operators because they - you know, as they come in they might need some help, some information on what might not work when you launch a TLD. And that's Recommendation C.

And Recommendation D is - so far we have done - staff team has done some outreach and some awareness on the issue but Recommendation D is exactly - some of the things is we need to drill down more and consider other - you know, more specific items to be done.

And that's Recommendation D to have it led by the staff team and then with the participation of community.

At this particular level we are a relatively high level but I think most people agree that there's still a lot of work to be done. And also, because this group itself is from ccNSO and GNSO and once this recommendation goes in the path that the GNSO might take and the ccNSO might take could be very different.

And I'm hoping that the GNSO side would have much more to do, ccNSO a little bit as well, but that is very different - two different - very different organizations. So that's where we are.

So with these two recommendations we're, you know, well over time. I was wondering if anyone wanted to - anyone from the panel wanted to have any closing remarks. But before I think (Joseph) wanted to say something.

(Joseph): Yes, thanks, (unintelligible). A lot of the recommendations we say has (unintelligible) open up with the TLD acceptance report (unintelligible) or the



ICANN staff team and there is a (unintelligible) that might be - and some others have mentioned it, (unintelligible) groups go after the same work or different communities (unintelligible) the same work.

So almost all (unintelligible) recommendation could add a line (unintelligible) saying that they would be merged with what the recommendations set in the (unintelligible) team has been - because they have been more specific and (unintelligible) to make sure they reach the same goal of what is proposed of them and - this is - ICANN is (unintelligible) but ICANN can be a facilitator to consolidate all the registry or registrar's wishes into one whether they - every different group go after the same community or different communities.

And when we fix (unintelligible) to fix .china or what not.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, (Joseph). And in the document that's exactly - you know, some of the things you mentioned are exactly what is in the document, is to have - get staff to coordinate or facilitate the efforts and to sort of consolidate some of the efforts and be a sort of platform.

With that I - looking at the panel and there's no - Mary, please, you'll have the last word.

Mary Wong: Oh dear, it's a very simple comment, you know, and I'm glad to hear you say, (Edmond), that honestly the GNSO and the ccNSO work differently and the scope of what they might be able to do or want to do is different.

But it seems to me building on some of the discussions that the two groups have had with each other, including at this meeting that are in this report specifically where the two groups can work together.

For example, you know, convening the experts and trying to figure out what the new dispute resolution problems might be, I think both spaces have (unintelligible) that ICANN community as a whole can draw on.

So I really urge this group in your final report to put that down and ask those two communities to investigate that possibility.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Mary. And with that we've run out of time and I am already late for my next session. And this will go out for public comment and please do respond. It's very important. I hope the community will give us more feedback on the issues and so we can enrich the report as it goes to the two councils. So thank you everyone.

Man: Ending time stamp for acceptance of IDN TLD Community Recommendations for ICANN Actions Meeting. It is currently 5:11 pm, meeting finished early.

END