

Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires IDN Variants Update

Saturday 20 June 2015

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/#fjun> The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Next session deals with the work on IDN variants and we - you will recall ask for a - for the Council to be kept up-to-date on the work relating to IDN variance and maintain a regular status update on the program and so to assist us with that we have the familiar face of (Samet Hassein) from ICANN staff. So (Samet), welcome. And over to you.

(Samet Hassein): Thank you. So thank you for giving us the opportunity to come and give an update on the IDN program. Just to take you through the agenda for today. Basically we'll be covering all of the different projects which we are undertaking and give you an update on each of those. We basically divide the projects in two categories.

There's a few projects which are near towards top-level. IDN's and then a couple of projects which are geared at the second level for gTLD's. Within the top-level we have the IDNTLD program which is - which has three different aspects -- the label generation rules for the (unintelligible) zone. We are developing a tool set to use those rules and also internally at this time

working on looking at radiance aspects of radiant implementations, radiant TLD implementation.

In addition to the TLD program at the top-level we are also working with IDN cc TLD fast track process implementation and looking forward to second level we are working on IDN implementation guidelines and IDN tables. This is a present book we've just started. And finally we also do a lot of community outreach -- so I'll take you through that as well. Next slide please. Thanks. So this is not showing up properly but I will now go through the history of the IDTLD program.

As we've already discussed that a couple of times here but just to point out that we are now in the implementation phase where we have three different projects within the TLD program -- the LGI development project and LDR toolset development project, and LGR radiant LDT implementation. Next. And I'll talk about these now. The label generation rule set of project basically started.

The background is that when IDN's were being implemented at top-level it was not clear what the rules which will govern what the top-level domain name is going to be in different scripts and also for the different scripts whether a TLD has any radiance. So there was a process developed in which ICANN decided to reach out to the community which uses those communities which use those scripts and ask the communities to define those rules for ICANN which I can implement.

Those rules -- those linguistic rules -- are now called "Label Generation Rules". And since these rules are for top-level domains we normally call this project "LGR" for the root zone. As a starting point, as the process was defined by the community the starting point was that an (unintelligible) panel loss and tool panel of experts would be formed which will define the starting point which is called "The Maximum Starting Repertoire" and then community panels will use MSR and define the particular script rules.

Just to update you, we've - we simple released the second version of MSR. It is based on Unicode 6.3 and contains 33,490 characters governing 28 scripts and this actually completes the current script coverage which we intended these second (unintelligible) acts -- six scripts and 700 core points from the first volume of MSR -- and now communities can start working on MSR and develop their own scripts best proposals.

Next slide please. In addition - as the communities are now getting in more than doing their LGR based work for the old script, we are developing very detailed guidelines to help this script community based panels for different scripts which we call "Generation Panels" and these documents are being made available on - through the IDN program for - to help these communities to go forward.

Next slide please. This is the status of the communities engaged in this work. As you can see Arabic and Armenian communities have already finished their proposals. These proposals are going to be released very soon - released for public comment and after public comment they will be handed over to Integration Panel for evaluation and final integration.

So the first version of LGR is expected to come in the worse of third quarter of this year which will include Arabic and Armenian scripts. Chinese, Japanese, and the (unintelligible) script panels and (unintelligible) script panel have also been seated which means that formally announced and they're working and then in (unintelligible) Lao, (unintelligible) -- so those script communities are also active and in the process of formulating their panels to move forward.

We do have a couple of script - a few scripts which are still not active and we are now actively engaging with them. These scripts include Greek, Sinhala from Sri Lanka, Ethiopian, Georgian, Hebrew, Latin, (unintelligible), and Thai

so we'll be - we're still looking for volunteers for these scripts to come forward from later panels and take the work forward.

Next slide please. As far as the - once we have the LGR linguistic data that obviously must be put to good use and to allow that we are actually developing an Open Source tool which will be available through ICANN and also that it lead to the community for - then to deploy. It has three use cases. It will allow - it has create LGR use case which will allow generation panels from the different script communities to develop their LGR's in the format which we have finalized.

It's a technical XML based format but this tool allows a very simple graphic user interface for the communities to enter their data and create that XML format at the back. Once the format - once these LGR's or LGR is created the tool also gives a use case which will allow any end user to come in and type in a domain name in any script and this tool will using their element LGR they'll whether that domain name is valid and also whether that particular domain has radiance or not.

Finally it has a managed LGR use case which will allow registries and other users which are going to more than backend operations tool. For example, to compare two different versions of LGR or act to LGR's to create a third LGR and so on. And these - this tool in these three phases will be available to the community starting from September this year and we hope to complete all the three use cases and have the tools available early next year -- by March next year.

Next slide please. We continue to work on the IDN ccTLD fast track process. Technically there are 47 IDN ccTLD labels which have been successfully evaluated from 37 different entries and territories. Currently there are IDN fast track processes and they are going public and our public review as well so that's also something which are managing at this time.

Next slide please. IDN implementation guidelines are - is one of the projects which we undertake to look at second level IDN's. Basically this is a community driven project where community or then defies policies and practices to minimize risk and confusion. This is work which has to be led by the community and we obviously a play a (unintelligible) and coordinative rule in it

At this time we've actually we've reached out to both CCNSO GNSO to forward issues which need to be addressed in the division of the (unintelligible) of IDN implementation guidelines. We are actually still waiting for response from GNSO on it and also CCNSO on it and we hope to get some - we hope to make some progress on this so...

Next slide please. IDN tables is a recent project which was in initiated on the request of the GNSO Council and Members meeting the (gold radiant) Working Group back in London at ICANN 50. The challenge was that when the new gTLD's which are offering IDN's at the second level when they're evaluated the IDN tables - their IDN tables which they submit are also evaluated to work as called "The Pre-Delegation Testing".

There was no difference available for this Pre-Delegation Testing which obviously made the testing difficult for - difficult and so this project is basically going to be developing reference IDN tables for different languages and scripts. This - these will be the difference only meaning that these will be publicly available for registries to use and to offer different support for different languages.

They do not have to follow these tables so these are not prescriptive but in case cannot afford Pre-Delegation Testing if they deviate from the tables they will have to provide additional information. If they use this - these tables, they will not have to provide any information and they can go through the PDP process.

The - basically the process involves linguistic experts and DNS experts to develop the tables and then these will be (unintelligible) for public comments and once they finalize they will be released. The RFP for this project has been released and is currently open and the application or proposals will be registered through July 7.

Next slide please. So that's an overview of the different projects which we are undertaking. We are also undertaking a significant communication and outreach program. We - based on internal communications plan which we have developed we give regular updates to the community at IDN program -- of all IDN program. These are on Wednesday's so please - if you want to learn more, please come and join us on Wednesday.

We also go and give updates to SO's and SE's at ICANN meetings like this one to GSNO. We also - we've also been making that direct and indirect outreach to community including a webinar which was done in collaboration with (AP Dano) and APAC Hub on (unintelligible) pro and we've also given presentations throughout the GSE team at that meeting and many other forums across the world and also had direct outreach to different countries to get involved in the RG - LGR process.

We are also updating our IDN pages and revamping our pages on ICANN website so do come and visit new IDN pages coming up soon. And then also maintaining an active list of - a mailing list for different script communities and generally for people who are interested in IDN's. Next slide please. So please get involved.

At least, you know, the best way you can do is to volunteer for one of the script generation panels and give us feedback on how to use your language and scripts and - in top-level labels. Please, if that's - if you don't have time to volunteer that much please do review and give feedback on documents which we release very frequently for public comments.

And do keep - do come to our public sessions and get updated on different details on the different programs we are undertaking. So, thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you so much. I pulled a couple people interested in talking with you. So just to let everyone know it's most convenient if you do raise your hand in the Adobe Connect Room. This meeting is - I'm sorry, if you logged in, that's great. And we've got a new feature where we can see that queue up on the screen in front of us.

If you don't and you're sitting at the table you can use your name tag to make yourself known as wanting to ask question by putting it vertical. And if you are not neither at the table nor in the Adobe Connect Room, by all means just come and stand up at the microphone as Colleague (Edmond) is doing right now.

So before (Edmond) I'd have a couple of people I'd had - Frédéric with his hand up and (McKaley) and then I'll come to you (Edmond).

Man: Yes, thank you. (Unintelligible) for the record. Just one question to the slide with the LPR tool if we could move back to that. Just a second. The example that's on this slide here was it confusing to me as a German because the letter (unintelligible) and the letter "O" are not necessarily variant of each other but actually separate letters that just looks similar and have a similar genesis but they do not - different words.

So if we have, for example, the word "(foreign language spoken)" which is which is "bird" and "(foreign language spoken)" which is "bird" in the plural that would be two different words which have a very similar look as letters for - I mean, German.

There would be no confusion of what these letters differentiated. So having one letter blocked and the other not what -- at least to a German users of the

internet -- very inconvenient because entire words could be eliminated by their - what is showing here is that possible alternate being used first so I would just like to add clarification if this actually means that these (foreign language spoken) vocals would be considered a variance for the normal vocals.

(Samet Hassein): Okay, the LGR for specifically the LGR for the root zone is stripped specific standard so the language B standard which means that the rules -- and by the way just to - before going into more detail, the Latin Generation Panelist did not formed so once the Latin Generation Panelist form they will devise the rules for Latin script so this example is not something you, you know, this is not - this is just illustrative.

It's not a real example because this is not coming from the Latin generation family itself. However, again, to answer your question the rules are at script level which means that even though they could be characters which are different and unique in a particular language, they may be perceived as similar in another language using the same script -- so the standard one is developing through a generation panel must aggress users of that script across all languages at the same time.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead (McKaley), thanks...

(McKaley Valem): (McKaley Valem) for the record. Couple of things -- first off, I'm wearing one of my halftime involved with APWG so it was - there has been discussion on some of the APGW lists around potential security issues involving certain types of IDN characters, let's just say. And as part of that discussion one of the issues that came to light was there's a lot of the registries have an opportunity to publish their IDN tables somewhere central that people can access, but most of them aren't doing it.

So the question I suppose really is, "Why aren't they doing this? And what can be done to encourage them to do so so that you don't end up having -

because the situation where people can't easily see which characters or upsets and which tables some of these IDN's are actually using?" And the second one is, "Are you guys linked up properly with the universal acceptance work or not?" Because I didn't really - I - maybe I missed the slide but I didn't really see anything in there about that. Thanks.

(Samet Hassein): To answer your first question -- there is public webpage maintained by IANA which lists all the tables which are submitted by gTLD's. There are - I'm not sure how updated that table is but my understanding is all the gTLD tables are there and the CTPLD's -- the tables which they were (unintelligible) submit -- are posted there as well.

As far as linkage with (unintelligible) acceptance is concerned I can staff team which is involved with IDN's is also involved with the universal acceptance initiative so there is a - there is certainly a direct link but if there's - it is currently different program so that is why it's not covered in the slides here.

(McKaley Valem): Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: (Samet)? (Edmond)?

(Edmond): Thank you John. Is it on?

Jonathon Robinson: Yes.

(Edmond): Yes, okay. Thank you Jonathon and thank you (Samet) for a pretty comprehensive update. I have three items I wanted to touch on but first of all on Frédéric's point actually I think, you know, it is good timing that we change that slide a little bit because we now have some examples that maybe are more illustrative than what it is now.

I understand it's easy to read for those who read English that's "domain domain" but I think that's a good point and I wanted to respond quickly to

(McKaley)'s point. I'm actually I'm a little bit surprised that you think that the majority of the TLB's do not submit it to that list.

(McKaley Valem): Didn't say majority's...

(Edmond): Oh, okay so a lot of...

(McKaley Valem): Because quite a few of them aren't a problem.

(Edmond): Right, okay. So I think all the gTLD's must submit. If they don't, then it'll be nice to point out I think that that's something that probably staff want to know as well. So I have three items. One, first of all you mentioned about the IDN implementation guidelines update. I - it seems like it's kind of in a limbo at this point because this was raised almost a year ago maybe and asking for feedback from CCNSO GNSO and well I think the fact that you haven't received them doesn't mean that there isn't interest or anything but perhaps it is a little bit - perhaps you need to switch it around and create the Working Group and create, you know, and ask for volunteers into the Working Group and looking into the issues first because it's very hard for, I guess, the GNSO and CCNSO without any Working Group or anything create a kind of response into, you know, into that particular project -- so, you know that's sort of my suggestion. The second item - forgetting, sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: So (Edmond) just on that previous point before you come to the third one can you just be - specifically what should change or what are you suggesting (unintelligible) participation?

(Edmond): Right. So for the last year (Samet)'s team has been asking for GNSO and CCNSO for input on what to change in the IDN implementation guidelines. I guess neither of the SO's were, you know, successful in creating that input so rather than waiting for that I'm asking (Samet) to think about creating the Working Group and getting volunteers from the two SO's and starting the work in the Working Group first and then coming back to the SO' s to get the

comments as the work goes on rather than continue to wait -- that's the suggestion.

So the second - did you want to take this or should I go through all three questions first?

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead. We must run up because there are a few other people waiting in the queue...

(Edmond): Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: ...but I think it's good to hear from you.

(Edmond): Yes, I'll...

Jonathan Robinson: (McKaley), you want to drop your hand just as well to make sure, yes.

(Edmond): Yes, so the second item is on the reference implementations for second level registrations. I'm curious about the vendor concept and, you know, it - do you think of - is it conceptually going to be one vendor dealing with all the languages or is it going to be multiple vendors or, you know, how do you turn vendors because there are certain groups including the Arabic group, the Chinese group that has created these tables that are being used.

Are they part of what you call "Vendors" or "Potential Vendors"? And a third item is probably, you know, I keep coming back to this every time -- Project 7 -- the project where we talk about how this is eventually implemented into the processes for the delegation of the couple of the names. This is becoming more and more important especially with its relation to how we deal with some of the LGR issues and I think (Samet) you - I don't know whether (Wenway) has already sent this email, but we have been talking about a situation whereby we don't know whether it should be an LGR decision or whether it should be a process decision down the line.

And without having some discussion on the process of actually putting these things into the root, it's very difficult to then think about, you know, what the LGR should produce. I understand theoretically and ideally they could - they should be completely separate and one after the other, but in the real world I think, you know, more and more we're thinking - we're seeing situations where they are interrelated.

Jonathan Robinson: Did you want to respond (Samet).

(Samet Hassein): Yes. So as far as the implementation guidelines is concerned we can certainly move ahead by calling for going out and reaching out to potential volunteers and forming a Working Groups if that's how you would prefer us going forward we will certainly do that so that's not - that's something we'll follow-up on.

As for- so the second question was on IDN tables. Currently, the RFP asked for one or more vendors so potentially it could be more than one vendor who can undertake the project at the same time -- would depend on the expertise available for the vendors across different languages.

And what we are basically asking the vendor is to put together a team of experts so it's all going to be one person but - or a few people but actually experts from each of those languages which are being developed and they will put together the team and apply it for this work and we will evaluate the expertise for each of the languages they're proposing before we move forward.

And based on public feedback or public comments on the process we will also make certain that once these - the guidelines are developed and these tables are developed we reach out to the development generation panels which are working at the top-level, not at the second level, but still reach out to them and make sure we get feedback from the generation -- active

generation panels -- and that feedback is incorporated in the tables for the second level.

So we'll make sure that the expertise is there to develop the work on the language. We'll make sure that even after that expertise has been used we reach out to the development community and get its feedback before we finalize these tables and in addition we are also instituting the vision process for these tables so even if something is not included in the first version there will be a process where community can come in, raise a comment, and that comment will then be taken into consideration to revise these tables over time as - so we are making sure that we address all the concerns going forward as much as possible.

Of course, but we do need the tables to do Pre-Delegation Testing. I think that's where the necessities coming from. As far as the third question is concerned on implementation or radiant TLD's I also informed earlier in the meeting last time we are making progress with Board Radiant Working Group. Every last - so we've actually done homework on the requirements on policy and operation possible requirements for policy and operation in instituting IDN radiant TLD's.

We've also looked at current relevant technical implementations at TLD level and currently we're now working at developing a checklist on what the minimal technical criteria and technical policy criteria required to move forward and do a gap analysis and as soon as that is done we will go public with the status but at this time the progress is still internal and the discussions are going on with the board meeting Working Group which is leading in that acting this effort.

(Edmond): Do you have a conceptual timeline for it at least?

(Samet Hassein): So the next - the criteria this particular task which has been given to us by BWWG we hope to finish that by Dublin meeting and then we'll get further direction from BWWG after that.

(Edmond): So just one small point -- so this whole project is, you know, has been delayed for at least over a year by then -- just that point. Not asking you to respond but, you know, that has been some quite some time that is - to have to wait.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, okay. So noted that it does to seem to have been a long time in the running. I guess that the question is - I've just got a small question and then only announce whether that group is a feedback group you were looking for rather than a Working Group. It's just something to - but (Samet), I mean, you picked up that it is a requirement to (unintelligible)...

(Samet Hassein): So I - and when the - you're talking about IDN implementation...

Jonathan Robinson: No, the Working Group that was suggested (Edmond) to give you...

(Samet Hassein): Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...your form of feedback. It feels like it kind of - feedback group that you need - a group of people you could...

(Samet Hassein): Right. So to initiate work on devising the guidelines -- implementation guidelines -- I think what we wanted to know what was really the issues which this Working Group which would do the work would address so that was a starting point. What are the issues which we need to work on to devise the guidelines?

But that - and once we know there are significant amount of issues which need to be addressed to then we formulate the Working Group to actually work on those problems. So - but I guess what is being suggested now is that

we actually formulate a Working Group and also a Working Group to identify what the problems are.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I've got a queue which is Olivier, (Mary) and then Phil. So let's go to you

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Jonathon. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking and as you know I'm always concerned about ICANN reinventing the wheel and I wonder with regards to these discussions that you're having as far as mapping and so on are concerned I've seen these discussions back in the INDA base Working Group and the INTS about seven, eight years ago -- how much of that work are you taking on when you start with the - with a script?

(Samet Hassein): So the work which was done at IDF defines IDN's -- how IDN labels are formed in general and all of the work is based on that. However, the work by ICANN is focused on top-level domains and top-level domains have all this in special because even in the current (unintelligible) scenario you have a label of the labels at second level can be found by letters and digits and hyphen but top-level is limited to what is called "The Letter Principle Only".

So of - what IDN was developed a genetic framework. For ICANN since we're working on top-level domain we have to define this "Letter Principle" for all the scripts and that's not something which is available to IDN and that's what the LDR process is doing, you know? We are riddled - we are working with all the script communities to see how that letter principle is, you know, in a way defined for all the different scripts and getting script community feedback on it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I think we're going to close the queue after Avri so we'll go to (Mary), Phil and then Avri. I'm mindful of time -- so let's go ahead (Mary).

(Mary): Thanks Jonathon. This is about the IDN implementation guidelines and just to follow-up on what's been said, I think I've written a note that this has been a

topic of discussion within the GNSO for quite a while including at previous ICANN meetings because the implementation guidelines address issues that are of great concern to this community primarily cybersquatting at the second level and associated consumer confusion issues.

So to that end, when the request was received from (Samet) and (Akrim) for this community as well as the CCNSO to identify issues to be considered by the Working Group that will be formed I just wanted to remind everybody that the council did form an informal discussion group, not a formally chartered Working Group. This was back in February.

There are a couple of volunteers primarily from the registries and thank you to (Donna) for working on that. Unfortunately -- and I feel that I have to say this -- but has not made a lot of progress -- so I just wanted to take this opportunity first to remind everybody that there is currently an informal discussion group within the GNSO to identify precisely the list of issues of concern to feed back to (Samet) and his team.

And secondly, however, that group is not terribly active so I will resend the information this week and hopefully our affected communities will have volunteers to help identify those issues because those issues will shape the scope of the Working Group that (Samet) will lead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Mary). Steve, have you got that as well? Thank you. All right, so then moving on we'll go to Phil and then Avri.

Phil: Yes, thank you and thank you for the presentation. Though I'm not a technologist I didn't understand all of - let me - the new TLD program one of the main justifications was the creation of IDN TLD's. They were given prioritization in the processing. I know there's another one out there right now in Arabic, Chinese and other scripts.

Let me escalate simple nontechnical question and it relates more to universal acceptance and I think I read you say you're not working directly with that group but certainly you must be aware there. Proceedings -- these new IDN TLD's -- I don't know how to ask this technically, but are they working well or are they facing all kinds of technical challenges?

(Samet Hassein): So there are certainly technical challenges and universal acceptance initiative actually has multiple Working Groups and within it and one of the Working Group is actually focused on IDN's and identifying the challenges which are technical challenges which are currently faced user of IDN's and addressing those challenges.

For example, use of internationalized email. So there is a special effort around IDN's within the universal acceptance program and yes there has currently some challenges in using them.

Phil: Well, thank you for the answer. I think, to me, that's concerning. I mean and I'm an attorney and in the law there's a concept that when you sell a goods or service it should be it fit for the particular purpose for which it's being purposed and I think what I'm hearing is that registrants at these IDN TLD's that their domains may not be working well for the basic purposes for which they acquire them. Would that be a correct interpretation?

(Samet Hassein): So it's basically you're acceptance is looking at a more of user ability site rather than the technical site...

Phil: Right.

(Samet Hassein): ...inside as far as the technical operations are concerned. The domain names are represented in the system as key labels so operationally they can work but the usability side of it that they have to be visible in local scripts harder than the A label as it is called ask you to presentation of these labels so the challenge is the usability at this time more than the technical operational but

obviously there are certain things in the technical operations which are also relevant for that discussion.

(Phil): Okay, thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: I think that that however you dress it up it sounds like Phil's point has value and the net effect is that it's not - it doesn't come across quite as it might be expected. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avery Doria speaking. When the Mac went by and it went by sort of quickly for me I noticed that the America's weren't even represented on the map and that got me thinking and the first thing I went through, "Okay, French and Spanish and Portuguese and those were probably dealt with the European originals."

And then I started wondering about the indigence languages and the indigenous written scripts of the Americas of which there are many and then started wondering about indigenous languages and scripts in general and wondering to what extent and how was a decision was made of, "Is it how many people use something? Is it how important that," and just wondering about the representation of, you know, as I say, I started out thinking about it in terms of the indigenous languages of the America's but then started wondering about it in general. Thanks.

(Samet Hassein): So the IDN CC gTLD fast track process was developed by CCNSO and I've - the process at this time says that it will support all scripts except Latin script. So Latin script is not supported through the policy which was developed by CCNSO at this time for IDN's. Having - so that's a context of this particular slide.

But as far as the label generation rules that is concerned which is the other project which we are undertaking which is applicable across TLD's for both CC's and G's, we are actually looking at all scripts which are being used. The

criteria is that script has to be widely used and widely used by the community itself. There are a couple of proposals or interest which has been given to us for one for charity and one for Canadian aboriginal languages so those are two communities which have indicated some initial interest that they want to work on LGR.

If they eventually can formulate a group or panel and work with us we will certainly take that forward so there's some initial interest. But in the context of ccTLD's it is missing because of the policy developed by the CCNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks (Samet). I think that was the end of the queue although I do see alternative from the registrar's stakeholder group so as a special concession...

(McKaley Valem): (Unintelligible), and you're so charming. (McKaley) for the record. Just going back to what - at Phil's point, I mean, with all due respect to Phil, I think the issues raising is, I mean, it is a violent one but it's - but you end up where you have to that you can't use everywhere so therefore that's where he's getting at is he's not fit for purpose but the issue isn't restricted to just IDN's.

I tried to use dot Irish for my email in various forms and invariably it doesn't work. And also, I mean just to Avri's point if you want to talk about IDN support in dot.us which obviously would be the most obvious ccTLD, the dot.us stakeholder cancel would - is always welcome - welcoming to feedback, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (McKaley). That's helpful -- useful additional point. I think we need to draw a line under this topic now. It's been a comprehensive update. Thank you so much and thanks to all of you for providing the questions and interaction and I mean I think (Samet) and others are quite clearly highlighted the link between this and universal acceptance which your last point also highlights (McKaley).

