

---

BEIJING – At-Large APRALO Multi-Stakeholder Roundtable

Monday, April 08, 2013 – 17:00 to 19:00

ICANN – Beijing, People’s Republic of China

MATT ASHTIANI:

Good afternoon everyone. Welcome to the At-Large APRALO Multi-Stakeholder Roundtable. My name is Matt Ashtiani. Today is Monday, April 8, 2013. Please remember to say your name before you speak. Please remember to speak into the microphone and please remember to speak at a reasonable place for our interpreters.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen my name is Rinalia Abdul Rahim. I am a member of the At-Large Advisory Committee and I represent the Asia Pacific Australasia region in the ALAC ExCom. My Co-Chair Holly Raiche and I would like to warmly welcome you to the APRALO Multi-Stakeholder Policy Roundtable. And for those who do not know what APRALO is, it is actually the regional At-Large organization for ICANN specifically for the Asia Pacific Australasia region.

Currently there are 38 organizations that have been accredited from the region as an ICANN At-Large Structure. We commonly refer to these organizations as ALS in the singular form or ALSs in the plural form. That’s just background. Now today's roundtable features two very important topics for the APRALO region. And they are both relevant to the new gTLD program.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

The first topic is consumer protection with regard to new gTLD. And by consumers we mean both end-users and registrants. And the second topic pertains to community readiness for IDN variant TLDs. We will proceed with roundtable one and I'd like to introduce to you the panel of discussants. To my left is the moderator Mrs. Holly Raiche. She is the APRALO Chair and my Co-Chair for the APRALO Beijing organizing committee. In terms of our lead discussants for this topic, representing the end-user point of view we have Jeremy Malcolm who is participating via remote participation.

He is the Senior Policy Officer from Consumers International. We have a representative from the governmental Advisory Committee; he is Vice-Chair of the GAC, Peter Nettlefold from Australia. He is also the GAC lead on new gTLDs. He is the authoritative voice from the governments regarding this topic. And representing the business community we have Zahid Jamil. He is an executive committee member of the ICANN Business Constituency and he is also a member of the GNSO Council. And he will speak from the perspective not only of the business constituency but also from the developing country point of view.

And we have on my right, from ICANN Compliance Maguy Serad who is Vice-President for ICANN Contractual Compliance Services. For this roundtable three questions have been posed to the discussants. The first question is how can end-users and registrants be best protected in

---

the context of new gTLDs? The second question is what are the issues associated with turning applicant commitments into a contractual obligations?

And number three what are the issues related to the enforceability of contractual obligations? And what recommendations should be made regarding the scaling up of ICANN Compliance? Each discussant will speak for about three to five minutes and after that the moderator will manage an open discussion involving participants in the room. And from here onwards I pass on the session to Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Rinalia.

JEREMY MALCOLM: Thanks very much Holly and hello everyone. I was asked to talk to you about new gTLDs and consumers. And the first question, I'm talking to you where the global federation of consumer groups with about 240 member organizations in 115 countries. The area that I coordinate is called Consumers in the Digital Age and that includes internet governance issues although [Inaudible 00:06:19] outside of our attention.

HOLLY RAICHE: Jeremy we need to you to talk more slowly.

JEREMY MALCOLM:

And I looked at the question of how many end-user consumers have their own domains. And obviously it's a very low number. The domains that are dedicated to end-user consumers are virtually unused. I decided to focus instead of end-users who are affected by the domains that they use, not the domains that they register. And looking at the new gTLDs there has been a lot of rhetoric on both sides that is those who are in favor of the rollout of new domains and those that are against about the interest of consumers.

But a lot of this doesn't come from consumers groups or from consumers themselves. For example, the Association of National Advertisers was with its submission to ICANN painted a very gloomy picture of how consumers will be subject to not only cybercrimes but crimes in the physical world related to the roll out of new domains. And we feel that this is blown out of proportion and doesn't really represent the concerns that consumers actually have. What are the actual concerns that ordinary end-user consumers have?

The concerns that consumers have usually boil down to the end consumer rights. These are the right to safety, the right to be informed, the right to choose and the right to be heard amongst the others you can see there. And the most important related to the new domains are two of those rights. I have isolated some right to safety issues enacted [Inaudible 00:08:58]. There is theoretically as we note there is an increased attack [Inaudible 00:09:06] due to new domains that are confusable with old domains who are confused with trademarks.

This is something that is well understood. I think there is a weak argument [Inaudible 00:09:21] there are some domains that are obviously dead [Inaudible 00:09:25]. Another issue that's been raised is the potential for software incompatibilities that could create certain issues. If you try and use a device or a software application to contact a server that's hosted on a new domain and you can't get through then there's a very slim likelihood of a safety issue there. But I think the main safety issue for consumers is that they may assume that certain new domains will have requirements relating who can be registered there, such as [Inaudible 00:10:07].

We know that some applicants to these domains have put in screening criteria and some haven't. I think it's an open question to which consumers expect this because under the existing domains there is very little screening of professionals. But having said that the consumer movement will welcome improvement to the screening of professionals who register domains in certain [Inaudible 00:10:44] new gTLDs, without by any means suggesting that people who register [Inaudible 00:10:51] domain should also be screened, this is more of a value add rather than something that we expect.

[Inaudible 00:10:59] there are new domains that could have additional value if they were screening. Moving on the next slide, otherwise we don't feel that there are - that the sky is going to fall in from the new

---

domains. There has been a lot of exaggeration about the risks to consumers which [Inaudible 00:11:23]. Most of the other effects that we will see are positive. Consumers will have more domains to choose from for their email, for their websites. Consumers as creators will have more choice. And we think some of the domains will also be beneficial in furthering the right to be heard. And in this context the [Inaudible 00:11:46] domains could be a useful means to consumers to express themselves.

We had some concerns about whether these domains will be monopolized by defensive registrations. Peter can speak later about how this Australian government objected to these domains on the basis that they may be advantageous to a company. We rather think the opposite it would be disadvantageous for consumers if they don't have the first chance to register [Inaudible 00:12:24] of all of these domains are snapped up by corporations trying to protect their brands.

We would rather see that the registration requirements favor consumers over corporations rather than reverse. I think I'm out of time. The stereotype about end-user consumers and gTLDs is that they don't know and don't care about the new gTLD program. And largely that's true because both the public and negative impacts are relatively minor. They are big issues with consumer protection online.

---

But most of those don't relate specifically to the new gTLD [Inaudible 00:13:15] or about transnational consumer protection and how we can make that work. And that's the important discussion but it's one for another day, so thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Jeremy. Could we save any questions or comments until after all four speakers have presented? Our next speaker is Peter Nettlefold. You were asked a question by Jeremy if you want to respond to that as part of what you have to say.

PETER NETTLEFOLD:

Thanks Holly and Jeremy and thanks everyone for coming to this very interesting session today. I think it's a very timely and pertinent discussion given what is many of us are thinking about here in Beijing. I was going to briefly touch on each of the questions just with a few introductory comments. I don't want to take too much time because I think the utility of this session may be the interactive part afterwards.

On the first question just to point to some of the points that we heard earlier. The Australian government did issue a number of early warnings. We identified a number of public policy categories. What we tried to do is look at the range of applications which came in and identify a set of clear risks. What we then put our minds to doing was to thinking about if there was any sensible way to address those risks, so looking at potential safeguards and so on.

---

I think like many governments, the Australian government took the approach that we were not going to object outright. I heard that word earlier but we certainly weren't keen to object to any applications as such unless there was really a very strong case that asked to be a very strong intervention. However, looking for ways to address risks as applications go forward and so on seemed to us to be a very sensible thing to do.

We heard earlier about issues associated with some strings which may have an implied level of trust, an issue of prescreening. The issue of defensive registrations -- I might leave that one for afterwards for our discussion but it's one which we've been looking at very closely. And one of the ways that we're looking at it is to try to identify the underlying causes of defensive registrations in some of those particular strings and see if there is a sensible way to address those causes of defensive registrations, like causes.

In terms of looking at the next step is in how those sorts of safeguards can be implemented, a clear chain of responsibilities. That's the package I guess for the first question. In terms of the second question which goes to turning commitments into contractual obligations there seems to be a number of component parts of that, one is having a clear idea of what you're trying to achieve, what is the goal of any commitments?



---

Then there's obviously a need to find a detailed way to implement them. Like if you identify a risk or an issue that you're trying to address, how can that sensibly be done. And then at the end once you've developed some mechanisms or hopefully developed some mechanisms or safeguards to look back and see if they do actually address the issue you had identified. Broadly that's the sum of the thinking which we've been trying to do and I'm sure others are doing around this sort of second issue.

In terms of the enforceability of contractual obligations I might take up my intervention to a particular thing which is I think being given some concrete form through the PIC process which we know about and some questions there about who can raise concerns if contractual or a commitment isn't realized. Who can they notify? What is the mechanism for that being considered? And who enforces it in terms of having a clear path and clear mechanism for any actions to be resolved?

Just to add a little more to my introduction, at this stage I should disallow being the - it's an interesting time to saying that I'm a GAC lead and the governmental authority as the GAC's considerations are still in train. I should be clear about that. Certainly I'll be happy to put forward the Australian government's perspective on some of the things the GAC is thinking about.

---

I wanted to be clear about that upfront. Also I previous had another hat. I've been on the WHOIS Review Team and some of the stuff that the WHOIS Review Team considered I think goes to the discussion today as well. I'll stop there.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Peter. Our third speaker is Zahid Jamil.

ZAHID JAMIL:

Thank you. I should start off by saying that most of my comments are going to be hopefully in line with the business constituency's point of view but I should say that I'm speaking in my personal capacity today although I am a [Inaudible 00:18:42] as well as [Inaudible 00:18:43] representative to that. I will do something similar to what Peter just did which is address all three different questions.

From our perspective there are three different stakeholders when you look at protection mechanisms within the ICANN space. One is the end-user as identified in the way this workshop was put together, the registrant and the trademark holder. And what I will be speaking about in response to all three questions, it should always be clear that we're not trying to protect a vested interest of one. It is of all three that the intention of the BC's comments generally has been over the years of new gTLDs.

---

Let's start with the first question which is how can end-users and registrants are best protected in the context of the new gTLDs. It's very important that confusion both from a brand holder's perspective as well as a user's perspective but it's also important that it's avoided from the point of view of a registrant. When a registrant tries to register a domain name it's important that he also knows that the domain name that they're about to register does it have any risks attached to it.

This is something we haven't spoken about too much but the various mechanisms that ICANN has put into place try to address some of this. And I say try, so the trademark clearing house being one because end-users and registrants can't go to the URS. They can't do anything in the PDDRP. They are only left with one protective mechanism which hopefully will work to allay any confusion and that will be the trademark clearing hose, which is if the brand holders do their part and actually apply and send in their trademark application, the TMCH.

There is a problem. We've heard from IP constituency and from the BC about the confusion in the ASCII space and the importance for ASCII trademarks to be protected. That makes perfect sense. But we have a bigger problem I feel coming from a developing country with respect to developing countries especially if you're using a different script.

To give you an example, in the ASCII space there's confusion because words are similar, they're not necessarily identical because if they were

---

identical in the sunrise they would be cleared out and picked up by trademark holders. But when you deal with developing countries we're talk about scripts that are visually identical. This is the issue of the IDN variance.

If we were to take a similar - I know people who speak Arabic or Farsi or indu or Cyndi they would recognize this, the word [Inaudible 00:21:49] with [Inaudible 00:21:51]. The question would be is it different in Arabic in the Unicode? Is it different in [Inaudible 00:22:01] or in Farsi or in Cyndi and the answer is, it is different Unicodes but it looks identical when you visually look at it. And the trouble is there is nothing right now in the trademark clearing house which says anything about this policy.

Technically speaking you would have to file a completely separate application for each and every IDN variance, so the cost is on the trademark holder to do that. And remember when the trademark holder is doing that what he's doing is he's also creating a protection for registrants and a protection for consumers or end-users. But imagine the cost now on the brand holder. And they will ask themselves this question; do I care about the Arabic script?

Do I care about the Farsi script? Which script do I really care about? That's where they'll put their money in. And that will mean there may be certain areas where consumers, users, registrants or end-users may

---

not be protected and may continue to have confusion. I'm sorry but I have to go faster. When it comes to developing countries the issue is number one cost, to get into the trademark clearing house I think you'll have a problem with that.

We were just getting used to using the DDRP and we have a situation where we get into the trademark clearing house but a developing country business says what's the benefit, sunrise maybe? Okay I have to pay for that. What's the benefit afterwards? Well there's a claims notice that lasts 90 days. That means after 90 days anybody can infringe my trademark.

Why would I pay for that? I won't do it. I won't go into the trademark clearing house. Does that mean the developing country trademark holders are in the effect of it disenfranchised? I don't know. That's an interesting question, we'll have to see. Moving to the issue of [Inaudible 00:23:57].

This is something that's become apparent and I think was a glitch but it is going to impact everybody and I'm going to run over time a little. This is the issue of S's. I don't if many people have caught this. In the GNSO there was some discussion about this and was mentioned that now you have the ability for applicants to apply for auto, .auto and .autos and they're not in contention.

---

You can have pets and pets and you're not in contention. You can have game and games and I'm talking about actual applications that have gone through. And they've gone through the examination. They've gone through the string contention and the result is that they are not in contention. Now imagine the impact of that on users and registrants. And I think ICANN if there was a glitch needs to figure out a way to address this.

Everybody talks about oh no you should not bypass the policy development process. Well that's going to take too long. This needs to be fixed today, as soon as possible. So that's a huge issue. And as I mentioned the [Inaudible 00:25:00] also is something that is a [Inaudible 00:25:02]. Now what is the effect of this? Is this going to deepen or broaden the digital divide? Or is it going to bring us closer in the developing world. It's a question we need to ask ourselves.

Lastly, is the issue of how do we get a commitment [Inaudible 00:25:19]. One of the most important ones would be to make sure anything that has been mentioned in the application and as responses to commitments to ICANN queries find itself by reference into the contract. This is not right now the way it is. And that needs to be done at the contract negotiation stage so that whatever they've said during that process as an applicant it's not something they've said to get through the contracting process.

---

But it's something that they are going to have to be held accountable for. There's another point on the RAs, we are concentrating heavily on the registries. But a lot of the abuse, etc. can also take place at the registrar level. And we have a new registrar accreditation agreement that's been negotiated, that's excellent.

But there's one problem, in the registry part if there is massive abuse there is something called the post delegation dispute resolution policy. It only talks about you affirmatively positively do things which are not right. But it doesn't say anything about omissions or blind eye; if I don't know about it then I don't have to care. Irrespective of that deficiency that kind of a contractual compliance tool does not exist for the RAAs.

There's mass abuse by an RAA and 99% or 90% of abusive registrations are going through a particular registrar there is nothing currently in the registration accreditation agree that allows you to look at it and say well there's a pattern of abuse we're seeing when you do something about it. Both levels registry and registrar should have mechanisms of that similar nature. As I said, if we don't do this we have a couple of problems. And this is where the developing country issue comes up.

Many countries don't have the proper legislation. We don't have the cooperation mechanisms with developed countries. Now the tools we

---

have developed work very well for developed countries because apart from the tools they also have their mechanisms to be able to cooperate to protect consumers, the FTC does good work. The law enforcement in those countries are efficient and have the money and the resources. But in developing countries they don't have the cooperation. They don't have the legislation.

And so they become soft targets. That's where people are going to concentrate. And what happens then? Because of this if they become soft targets and the developing countries don't necessarily come up to this level, well the reaction of the blowback from developing country governments to oppress users, registrants is something to be thought about.

It's better that we fix the rules at ICANN, do it here and do it right, irrespective of the policy development process being circumvent or not, get it right or we risk being criticized and having this thing taken away from us, hopefully or having blowback to developing country registrant, users and trademark holders, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: That was almost over time. Maguy.

MAGUY SERAD: Good afternoon everyone my name is Maguy Serad and I'm with ICANN Contractual Compliance. The first question on the table is how can end-



---

users and registrants be best protected and - from a contractual compliance perspective and also from end-user perspective it is about being informed. How can that information be relayed and provided to the end-users and the registrants?

In preparation for new gTLD the contractual compliance readiness plan is about identifying the gaps in the contractual requirements through a gap analysis. We took those gaps and preformed a risk analysis based on the probability of registry failure and the severity of the impact because those have direct effect on the registrants and the end-users. Based on those failures we built a readiness plan to be rolled out. The most important message here is that we're focusing intensely on what we call proactive monitoring.

For example, the registry's failure to provide services can be reflected in many ways. The service level agreements are not being met, that the escrow failures but to prevent those. As you know there is the ebarow escalation process that's being developed and will roll out. And I think they've already identified some of the third party vendors to provide that service. In addition to the proactive monitoring that compliance will be leveraging we'll also have developed a preliminary audit plan.

The reason we call preliminary because the contract is not final. We're just waiting to see what is going to come out of it. In relation to question number two, the issues associated with turning applicant

---

commitments into contractual obligations. I guess that issue really was I didn't fight through the GAC's concern about nonenforceable commitments and that led to specification 11. As the audience knows there are now over 500 applicants who submitted PICs and these PICs are submitted and published for public review.

Your voice and your input into those to relay the issues and the concerns are critical into how it forms and what goes from there. As it relates to question number three on the enforceability of contractual obligations. Again the APRALO and the ALAC audience is most familiar with the issues on the lack of clarity of contractual obligations or the vagueness or ambiguity that sometimes is there. Some of those issues, you've heard some of the panels discuss and you are bringing some of those issues to the table. But how is contractual compliance getting ready for that? Again, to address some of the vagueness we currently face today is we look at how can we address it in a fact based manner?

We're looking at real-time automated monitoring tools because on a specific revision, what is that action that will help us identify and correct and take action on it. But sometimes proactive marching is not the key for everything. It may require also what we call periodic audits. And you've seen us launch audits today to establish some of those baselines.

As it relates to scaling up of ICANN contractual compliance we all know its contingent on many things. We're getting the tools ready, the

---

processes are being put in place, and resources are being trained. But also scaling up is going to depend on the rate of delegation. We're putting everything else in place. We're looking at how is this rate of delegation going to happen?

And we've got you know whether it's an increase in tools, in people or streamlining and optimizing existing processes to address the concerns from the community.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Maguy and I should say thank you to all four of you. All four presentations were extremely interesting and raised some of their own issues. I'm sorry I'll speak more slowly matt. I think the first thing to say is the panelists themselves; do any of you have any questions or each other before I open the floor? Do you have questions you would like to ask each other first? Before Rinalia and I ask questions, I'm opening the floor up to questions. Please put your hands up and Rinalia will take names down.

ISIA MASAI:

I've been the member of At-Large from the beginning but I stopped coming to ICANN meetings since 2010 at Brussels. Many of the new gTLD things are very new to me, like many of the guys who come to this meeting for the first time or the second. Thirty minutes ago I was approached by someone from Taiwan. This is my first time to ICANN and I don't know why I came here but the boss said I should go.

---

What is ICANN all about? You tell me. But I shared a similar if not entirely the same approach. Listening to the panels I come to very stupid questions. At the At-Large why there were only three applications from the developing countries out of 1900 or something. I was talking with somebody outside the room about an hour ago and asked how many applications did you make? And they said 101, from a single company, it's called Google. And then I realized how many others have applied might be, is that easy or not is the first thing. Whether I'm asking myself whether I should claim myself as a socialist to see the market as a whole and optimize, or just let market decide.

Listening to the TLD application processes and the objection processes these are usually based on that string whether this don't touch it guidelines are not. But not the businesses of or from the public interest view point the market should have some kind of guidance and rules about the player. Do you feel very confident if Google takes 50 and Amazon takes another 50 and the rest be divided by? For some I think it's no problem.

For others it might be a big problem. Have there been any serious discussion about that or will there be on or should we do that or not? Is that under the [Inaudible 00:37:07] of At-Large being the trying to represent not only the end-users but largely public interest at the same time. That's my comment and question, thank you.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that was two possibly three questions.

ISIA MASAI: I have one addition piece of information for the sake of fairness; Microsoft applied 11 and Apple only 1. It's not the American last corporation and Google is representing.

ZAHID JAMIL: Thanks for that Isia especially the last bit. Here is my thinking first of all to in defense of the fact that this is not an East versus West or a North versus South issues from the way the applications were filed. It's not really just the issue of developing versus developed. If Google has 50 TLDs and the way that they have committed to serve the public helps developing countries.

And I know that they are currently working on some special tools for IDNs which will hopefully solve some of the things I just mentioned. That is a great advantage for developing countries. I don't have a problem with the number necessarily. What I do have concerns about is the fact that developing countries may not have been able or were not resourced enough because of information and outreach to be able to participate.

Now we've seen it change of it. We just saw the Middle East Working Group Stakeholder Working Group that just presented about an hour ago. That's a good way to go forward. But we need to have that

---

engagement and outreach not just in hubs but actually go down and partner with private sector because the people who will be applying will be private sector.

Or the people who will power developing country applicants if they're not for profit will be the developing country private sector. And so in order to be able to engage them I think that's something that needs to be done, just a clarification on the developing country applications. If not mistaken if we're talking about three developing country applications I think what we're trying to say is three applied for financial support, which is different from how many applied from developing countries.

No that's it tends to be viewed sometimes that way, just to clarify. And I don't know to what extent information will be out but they may be very good reasons that one out of three actually went through and it may not be just to clarify due to prejudice or North versus South. However, there were developing countries that did apply for gTLDs. Sometimes they have to use western or developed country registry or even consultants but they have applied. It's not as if they didn't.

Many did not apply. They thought about it. Cost was an issue and they couldn't understand how this would be monetized. It hadn't been understood by them. And one other thing let's not forget if you keep changing the rules to a procurement or a tender you're going to have problems with. People are going to say well that's difficult for me to do that and I'll stop here.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Peter you had a comment to make?

---

PETER NETTLEFOLD:

Thanks Holly and thanks for the question. I think it's actually quite a complicated couple of questions that raise a good number of issues. I may comment on part of it. One of the things from the Australian government's perspective we've been looking at relates to the proposed use for a string. In relation to the example, as you've mentioned you've mentioned the corporates applying for large numbers of strings.

That may or may not raise concerns I guess depending on your perspective. One of the things that the Australian government has been looking at is the use of those particular strings and trying to look at them from a public policy perspective. And one issue we identified was or one concern we identified was applicants who apply for strings which tend to relate to a broad market sector with a broad range of competitors and potential users within that sector and where the applicant is seeking exclusive use for themselves.

And for a range of reasons we don't think that's the best arrangement. And understand there are ranges of use within the community. ICANN has obviously heard those views and opened a public comment period and received a good number of submissions. We are discussing it within the GAC as well. It's certainly still something which is a live topic for discussion. But from our point of view I think it is relevant to this concern. We were looking at the use in the proposed use and how that may impact on a range of stakeholders.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Peter. Jeremy do you have a question or do you have a response.

JEREMY MALCOLM:

Well just to there are definitely some issues of competition law with different companies, the largest companies monopolizing the new

---

domains. But something that we should remember is that ICANN doesn't need to reinvent the whole public policy space within its machinery. I think that there is a need to have a look at the global level on the completion issues. But it's not necessarily ICANN's job to do that.

I think we need to think in a broader sense about internet governance and areas in which we need to take a level approach but don't necessarily restrict it to names and numbers. So maybe that means that strengthening [Inaudible 00:44:08] which does work on competition looking at free trade agreements that are being negotiated now has an impact on competition on the internet such as [Inaudible 00:44:23] involved in the number of other countries that are involved in the [Inaudible 00:44:29] negotiations at the moment.

Does that have an impact? Is that a more appropriate vehicle for looking at competition issues in respect of new domains? My only point is that there are a whole of responsibility we may want to make to competition issues around new domains. They don't necessarily have to be addressed through ICANN. Maybe we're not capable of addressing all of those issues. We have to look at other global mechanisms and of course national mechanisms.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Jeremy. Evan you're next.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I guess my question is primarily for Zahid but hopefully the rest of you will take at it. It's a two part question. One has to do with the trademark issues. And when I comes to At-Large we've found ourselves



---

pretty well split between the demands of the trademark advocates and the keep everything absolutely wide open advocates, agreeing with the fact that trademarks very often help consumers as much as they help producers.

But finding very often in the ICANN context that the demands for trademark protection go well beyond sometimes what's purely consumer protection and then start going into the realm of stifling competition, stifling criticism and things like that. For instance on the issue of the GAC scorecard, the ALAC came out with a response to it that agreed with a good chunk of the scorecard perhaps more than civil society would've liked.

But disagreeing with it where it went into what we thought to be strange extremes. And I'm wondering if it's possible to sort of try and get a better middle ground that doesn't always try and grab for everything possible and sort of looks at trademark really from the end-user perspective in terms of reducing confusion as opposed to simply looking at it from the producer side of things.

And if there's time and this may be a bit of a hornets nest, I'm hoping could get some of you to talk about the issue of closed generics which also was an issue in At-Large and in fact we were able to come out with a statement that had although it's a very divisive issue we had a number of people within At-Large that said that well closed generics under the way that ICANN has required applicants to come in.

If an applicant wanted to do a TLD in which they just gave away all the domains they would have to do it in such a way that they would maintain ownership and let others use it or lease or it something like

---

that. In order to do such a scheme like that that kind of innovation requires what is currently called the closed generic. And so I'm wondering if you could speak about closed generics.

We found in many cases it's not a good idea but also the kind of blanket condemnation of closed generics also has a potential to stifle innovation in models as well. I'm wondering if that's not too contentious if it's possible to deal with that, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm going to intervene and say there's 12 minutes left and you've asked for an answer that's probably about 20 minutes for one speaker. Can we try and have a two minute answer from people.

PETER NETTLEFOLD:

Thank you good question. I don't think it's too controversial. I think it's a great thing to discuss. And the first thing I should say is from the Australian government's point of view we issued a number of early warnings here. There is certainly no blanket condemnation of closed generics. Haven spoken to many applicants who would potentially fall into this category as a result of our early warnings we certainly saw our early warnings as a start of a dialogue.

One thing we quickly realized that each string and each application and each market sector is different. And that's something which we're very mindful of. From the Australian government's point of view one thing which we're looking at and have been considering is whether it's useful to consider a public interest test for closed generics, so that in fact a closed generic may be entirely fine if there is a demonstrable public interest. And perhaps I will leave it there.

ZAHID JAMIL:

On the trademark issue I think the good thing about ICANN is that these things have debated quite a lot. I can say that we as trademark holders, businesses haven't even gotten - this is controversial - half of what we have been required by them or us. But I think the trademark clearing house as it was earlier designed or suggested was supposed to have some sort of a block like a GPML or it was supposed to take the name out of the system, I'll just have it.

Or it was supposed to be a system where you had a reverse UDRP and that was also a thought. None of that has happened. All it does is generate a notice when you try to register, that's it. There is no chilling effect of saying no you can't have this one. And the reason there's a public interest and why that's there. But the trademark there held by itself does not disenfranchise or take the words out, it just generates a notice.

I think to address the broader issue of yours that GNSO restructuring and review hopefully that leads to restructuring may be able to help us. Because right now what's happening is there's a complete deadlock within the GNSO on many controversial issues. Something not so controversial, fine that goes through and then there's a great performance there. But there's no performance when it comes to the tough issues and that's where we have to concentrate.

On the closed generics developing countries businesses when they have that much money, for them they're trying to look at this as a giveaway. I'll give you an example of some ccTLDs; they've been unable to have their users in that developing countries actually register in their ccTLDs.

---

Dubai is such a big economy, doesn't have the critical mass that you've expected. [Inaudible 00:51:30] doesn't have it either.

But the thought is that their businesses which will have closed generics when they applied to gTLDs would be able to use in it an innovative fashions and that's very helpful. I would support that and definitely should have a public interest element attached to it too.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. We have very little time and three questions, can three of you who have question, please tell me what your question is in 15 seconds and we will leave it open to the panelists to answer them.

SALVED MARTELOSAM: I just made a poll in my Facebook; do you know that new generic domain names will appear? I can say that even advanced users don't know about it. And I think one of the reasons is public awareness. If people don't know about it, risks are increasing. Don't you think that we have lack of public awareness on this case and what can we do?

HOLLY RAICHE: Next Jean Jacques?

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: First several times the word consumer was used. And I would like to bring up two aspects, competition and separation. Competition is something which is good for everyone in theory. But the reality, the geographic, the economic reality of the world today and even more so tomorrow or 10 years from now is quite different. What is lacking today for me as someone who has followed this quite closely both on the board and now on the ALAC, is the real state of play report but also looking into the future.

So my question is a request actually, to you who have taken the initiative Holly and Rinalia and all those around the table to do a study

---

with two components. Your gTLD world as it is today and second the gTLD world as you think it should be and could perhaps be in the next few months or years. In other words go from descriptive to normative.

Why do I say this? Because today we see there's a complete misfit between the number or the proportion of vendors, of the domain name space, etc., who are mostly located in the United States, well let's say North America and Britain and a bit in Australia, etc., so a certain type of the world. whereas we were reminded today at the opening ceremony by our hosts and even more strongly by Steve Proctor and Fadisha Hadi that the reality of the world is going in a completely different direction.

Where do I see the fit between the two? I don't see it. I would like you to set up a group or suggest a group to study under what conditions it may become possible and workable for a greater number of registries, registrar to exist elsewhere then as simply as subsidiary companies of companies situated in the United States or in Great Britain or Australia, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

That was 40 second, Sala you have 15 seconds.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO:

My question is based on the diametrically opposed views that have been in terms of the competition pertaining to Isia's initial question on significant market power and dominant market power noting that Jeremy had actually mentioned that ICANN could possible develop policy and we should only be restricted to ICANN but the other global force. Noting that Zahid had mentioned that for developing countries that don't have legislation ICANN should really hurry up and

---

develop policies. I'm not sure - I know he may not have been eluding to competition policy but the -

HOLLY RAICHE: Sala there is no time for the answer.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Sorry the question I have is this to the three different perspectives, in terms of the treatment of competition as far as significant market power is concerned what do you propose would be limited to ICANN's remit and what could potentially be other global or international?

HOLLY RAICHE: there are two issues. The main one is public awareness which is a real issue. There is a much more forward looking question which is asked for studies, that sort of question. So possibly we'll confine this simply to the competition issue and if you two want to respond we just might.

PETER NETTLEFOLD: Very quickly I think there are a whole lot of questions in there about what's being called the competition issue. I guess as I have very limited time the first thing I would say is I think it's actually broader than just the competition issue. I think it's doing a disservice to the issue to limit it to competition itself. There are certainly other components about openness in the internet potential consumer confusion, etc., which come to this issue and are relevant as well. And I will pass over to Zahid so you don't run out of time.

ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you very much. Absolutely I think look at the AFC it talks about consumer protection and competition and their emerging issues that have to be [Inaudible 00:57:39] so I agree with the comment made. It also ties in with awareness. It's a huge risk putting this stuff out in the

---

market. I'm starting to get business cards now with .aero and that's a very old delegation.

Right people weren't using it. And people are confused when they call up and say listen I don't think you've given me a full email address, what do you mean at .aeu. Yes, that's my email address. Send it; it will get to me, right? Imagine what happens when this takes place. You will definitely need to have ICANN go out there and really educate the public otherwise all the things we talk about here are at risk from a consumer or user perspective.

When it comes to the issue of competition I think that there are also developing country regulations that need to be looked at as well. We have a responsibility in our countries or our governments to look at how they're actually creating a space which is not open enough which is causing this problem. And the biggest one I think we're faced with and I can tell you from my region is when it becomes a cross border regulation issue there is no regulator.

When you have a telecomm operator in my country which is doing something but is doing it also in the Middle East, also in the sub-continent in other places, we're talking about undersea cables and the way those landing rights etc. are dealt with. And that's a huge issue. And I think that's something that the other place needs to look at. They have enough work there, thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Maguy wants the last word. You've got 30 seconds and then we have to - I think the very interesting and terrific thing about this is we're all

---

going to leave with a lot of questions that need to be asked and that need to be answered. So thank you and would everybody please thank our speakers. One minute while we change panelists.

MATT ASHTIANI:

Hello everyone welcome to the APRALO Policy Roundtable Part 2. Please remember to say your name before speaking, speak into the microphone and please speak at a reasonable rate. When you're giving your presentations I will be flashing you how many minutes you have left to make sure we stay on time, thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Matt. This roundtable will focus on community readiness for IDN variant top level domains which is a priority issue for the Asia Pacific Australasia region. It is known that of all the new gTLD applications, 86% of the IDN applications are for the languages of the Asia Pacific Australasia region. Let me introduce the panel of discussants we have. The moderator for the session is Edmond Chung. He is Chair of the At-Large IDN Working Group and he is also the IDN policy liaison.

Next to me is Holly Raiche who is Co-Chair for the session. And we have a very large panel which we will somehow manage. On my right is a representative from ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee. Jim Galvin is a deputy chair of ASSAC to speak about the Japanese language and script. We have Jiro Hota from Japan Registry Services; to speak from the point of view of the hind script in the Chinese language is one way from the China Domain Consortium. He's on my far left.

For the Korean script we're expecting our only lady discussant. She should be on her way. That's Young Lee from Korean National Open University. For the [Inaudible 01:04:04] we have Norbert Kline from the Internet Society of Cambodia who is participating via remote



---

participation and he is currently online. For the index script have Ron Mohan from Aphyllies and he covers 11 languages as far as I know.

In terms of the [Inaudible 01:04:24] script we have [Inaudible 01:04:26] from the internet society of Sri Lanka. He's also participating via remote participation. And his presentation has overlaps with the [Inaudible 01:04:34] language and script. And so his presentation can be considered as in tandem. And finally we have the Arabic script presented by Sermat Hussein who comes from Pakistan [Inaudible 01:04:47] Institute of Computer Science. Three questions have been posed to this panel. The questions are as follows.

The first one is will the introduction of IDN variant TLDs destabilize the internet and undermine its security. This question is quite important. Every time we talk about IDNs and particularly IDN variant inevitably someone will raise the issue will this destabilize the internet and affect the security for the rest of us internet users. And so we'll hear some responses from the panelists who are experts and particularly from the SSAC who have a ready response to this. The second question is a bit long and I have to explain the context of it.

What is the level of readiness among language communities already active in ICANN in forming generation panels to propose script character repertoires and variant rules for the root zone that will enable variant IDN TLDs? Now the context of this is that for communities who are ready for IDN variant TLDs they have to participate in the process that ICANN is about to set in place with a very specific procedure. This procedure will be decided upon by the ICANN Board on Thursday.

---

And if they approve it it will become reality. So today we're talking about it in a hypothetical sense but afterwards if it's approved it becomes reality for our language communities. What is required for language communities who are ready is that they get organized; they form these generation panels basically and develop a repertoire of copoints -- basically a compilation of Unicode copoints that correspond with a script of their languages.

And within this repertoire or compilation they would be variance. And simply defined and it is a more nuance understanding but I will put it simply in terms of variance as alternative copoints that could serve as substitutes for existing copoints or a sequence of copoints within the repertoire. So the generation panel of each language community would have to propose these repertoire as well as the rules that would apply for the variance.

And the proposals would go to an expert group that will be appointed by ICANN who will have ultimate authority to accept or reject. And if it is rejected then the community will have to start again if they want to. But the concern of the expert panel will be security and stability of the internet. And in terms of the variance themselves the concern, what the generation panels have to establish is that they have to determine whether the variance should be allocated or blocked in a root zone and they have to propose that to the expert panel.

So the language representatives here are being asked is their community ready for this process and what are the key issues in moving forward? And the last question that is being posed is that how can the readiness of language communities not yet active in ICANN be

---

supported? And this question is being asked because we noticed that only some language communities are represented in ICANN discussions. And we know that the others are not represented possibly for various reasons.

Either they are not aware or they are aware but they don't care or they are aware, they care but they don't have the resources or the capacity to participate. And so we are asking our panelists to provide some ideas or suggestions in terms of how we can bring those communities to the table to participate in the ICANN process. And so those are questions, these are the panelists.

And I think we have our Korean speaker, yes welcome Young Lee. And I hand over the session to Edmond.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you Rinalia. And I guess we will jump right into the speaking order that was suggested. We will go with Jim first.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you Edmond. I'm Jim Galvin, Deputy Vice-Chair of SSAC. I have two points that I want to make on behalf of SSAC for this discussion. The first is that SSAC currently supports the policies and procedures that we have for the delegation of IDN TLDs. We've spoken on the issue in several documents along the way and for right now want to maintain that position. And that really means two things.

First it means that we need to remain conservative in what we permit. We need to grow our body of experience and understanding in what it means to deploy IDNs and how the user community will accept them and in fact how the infrastructure and systems will accept them. We want to be careful and to gain additional experience as we step through

---

this process. And then of course that also means that we should plan to be able to reevaluate our policies and procedures on some regular basis.

I don't really want to speak to what regular means. I think that as a community we will figure that out as we go. As we gain experience and learn new things about how the system works, how IDNs are used, what the community thinks about them, and then we'll have an opportunity to step back and broaden what it is we want to allow and permit as we understand what it means for IDNs to work in the internet at large. The second point to make is that we do recognize and accept that user confusability is a concern.

And we certainly have today some procedures that we use for evaluating and that confusability. Additional issues are likely to surface as we continue to deploy IDNs and work with them and users begin to use them. One of the key questions that still remain is what exactly is a variant? We still need further clarity on what a variant is. And nothing that we have seen so far has made a clear and specific statement as to what those are.

And that's another reason for maintaining caution and being conservative about what we allow. Until we can clearly define what those are and we'd know what to do with them and how we want them to work, it's important to be conservative in how they're used and how they're deployed. Another thing to keep in mind is one of the issues related to variance is whether or not you can have more than one name that are related according to whatever definition of variant one prefers to work with.

---

Can you have both of those names in two different TLDs and can they be synchronized. Can you ensure that a user will have a uniform experience regardless of which one of those two names they use. And it's important to recognize that today in the DNS services that we have today there is no technical solution that ensures that two zones can remain synchronized. And that's important when one thinks about how you want to define a variant and how a user is going to use them. So thank you.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you Jim. Interesting that you point out that confusability because the earlier panel actually talked about how it wasn't handled very well in the ASCII part. But we'll go on to the second speaker Jiro.

JIRO HOTA:

Thank you, my name is Jiro Hota from JPRS the .jp registry. I'd like to briefly speak about the historical experience first and then we'll talk about the generation panel for the new gTLDs. The Japanese scripts consists of four scripts. We use the mixture of [Inaudible 01:13:25] and ASCII. For example in the newspaper we see these for scripts. And we started in 2001 IDN service on the second level and dot jp.

And for this in '99 a community wide task force was formed by [Inaudible 01:13:57] with more than 10 members and open discussion was made I guess a draft paper in physical meeting and on a mailing list. And in 2000 draft paper was posted on [Inaudible 01:14:09] website for the open discussion again. And physical presentation meeting for draft paper, explanation and discussion was made several times.

And [Inaudible 01:14:24] we launched the [Inaudible 01:14:28] service. And in the meanwhile Chinese, Japanese, Korean character communities cooperated because the [Inaudible 01:14:42] characters

---

are used by the Chinese community and we the Japanese community and Korean community. So the [Inaudible 01:14:51] characters should be set or the variant should be coordinated by those three language communities.

So we made an organization called the JET which is Joint Engineering Team between those communities. And we made [Inaudible 01:15:22] for Japanese scripts. We allowed the characters it was Japanese [Inaudible 01:15:27] level 1 and 2 it has around 7000 characters as a basic set. It's enough for user post line names, trademarks and daily use documents.

And variance we discuss about this heavily and results was that we would have no variance. The reasons were old and new forms of characters we use intentionally and prohibition of similar looking characters makes IDN useless. And so in Beijing the Chinese communities, Korean community we are talking about revitalize JET to take care of the generation panel for the new gTLDs, thank you.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you Jiro. It's a very important development and especially in the JET side. So next we have Wong Way from [Inaudible 01:16:43].

WONG WAY:

Hi. [Inaudible 01:16:49 audio cuts out]. And in Korea it is called [Inaudible 01:17:11]. Actually when we talked about a first question or issue the IDN TLDs would destabilize the internet I think. Anyway it depends on how we defined a term of stabilization. Since our ancestors failed to build the tower of Babel so now we have the problem about the new gTLD variance.

---

But the good news for Chinese characters is that we have been working on Chinese variance for the year over 10 years for the last decade. And for Chinese language community the Chinese variance is pretty simple. We just simply call it traditional Chinese character issue. The simplified Chinese character was used in China mainland and in Singapore. And the traditional Chinese character was used in Taiwan, Hong Kong and some other areas and countries.

But in the Korea and in the history the Koreans use a Chinese character and in Japan they have the use Kangy Chinese character. For Chinese language community we have the demand from the end user that demand is pretty simple. That the Chinese want to read and write and use a Chinese character freely both in traditional forms and simplified forms.

We formed an organization called CDNC, Chinese Domain Name Consortium. And on the [Inaudible 01:19:23] that the people or the domain name applicant, registrant should register a domain name they should have both forms of traditional and simplified. We call it [Inaudible 01:19:39] equivalence. All the other variance they should be reserved. And we also have a coordination organization we call JET which the Joint Engineering Team for Chinese, Japanese and Korean to solve the variance issues between the Japanese and Korean and Chinese language community.

I think based on the principle and experience which we already worked for the last 10 years the current solution should be safe for the internet. Of course we are glad to see that ICANN has launched the generation panel project. That's what we are doing. The engineers from Japan,

---

Korea and China we are talking about we built the JET team and work under the framework of generation panel based on the Chinese script to build different language tables for different languages and worked on the framework.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you. And it's interesting as you mentioned that the importance of the IDN variance for Chinese and contrasting from Japan and perhaps the first questions of IDN variant TLDs destabilize the internet. The other way around think about it perhaps is whether introduction without IDN variance would destabilize the internet as well. Next we look at Young Lee from Korea.

YOUNG LEE:

Thank you Edmond. As for the language in Korea our main language is phonetic. And it's called [Inaudible 01:22:13] and that's the language we use daily. However Chinese ideographs have also been used in written formats and we call them [Inaudible 01:22:22]. However in terms of daily use there have been a series of laws encouraging the use of hunger over Hanja.

However, the reason why we do use Hanja is because many of our words we use are derived from the Hanja characters. If you know the meaning of the characters in Hanja then you can understand what the word means a lot better. And in 2011 a bit stronger, all government documents were mandated to use hunger and use Hanja only if it were permitted by the President. And that should be used in addition to hunger in parenthesis.

It was specifically mentioned. So you can see how much we emphasize the use of hunger. As for Hanja in Korea it originates from mainland China but some unique characters have been developed. And because



---

our Hanja in the traditional format - Taiwan for example I can read almost all the Chinese characters. In Beijing I can only read maybe a third or less of it.

However given that even the Korean Hanja and the Taiwanese original characters there are some difference in some of the characters. We have identified 4000 basic Hanjas that we use daily, high school students have been mandated to learn about a thousand or some Hanja characters. But we also have the Unicode CJK table that was mentioned before.

As for IDNs in Korea we began registration of hunger in August 2010. We are only allowed to register hungry domains so far. And actually because we emphasize hunger so much there are no plans for registration of Hanja yet. But because we do use Hanja and because some of the Hanja are learned we feel that we support the efforts of the CJK in coming up with a variant table, a cooperate variant table to take care of the confusion issues.

And as Edmond said if we start with a fairly complete variant table then the introduction of IDN variance should not destabilize and we also believe like the Japanese that the Hanja variance should take a conservative view and adopt the CJK community wide table rather than a country specific table to add to confusion.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you Young. And now we see another interesting contrast in terms of the concept on conservativeness. One with the language part where conservative means protection whereas the other on the technology side conservative means putting less things in the DNS. Next we go to Norbert who's online with us.

NORBERT KLINE:

Yes I am online from Cambodia and unfortunately I've had a very weak connection. I am [Inaudible 01:27:10] from Cambodia to talk to you [Inaudible 01:27:13] this discussion. I would like to start by saying we are not really involved in the IDN discussion yet because for several reasons the question of how to treat the Korean language on the internet has been somewhat [Inaudible 01:27:36].

We have the Cambodian script defined in Unicode since 2004 basically in [Inaudible 01:27:47]. From 2008 on there is a [Inaudible 01:27:51 poor audio quality] how to promote the use of the Cambodian language in IPT education. After more [Inaudible 01:28:03] people have been trained in the use of this Unicode. One of the large software providers of the [Inaudible 01:28:15 poor audio quality].

And therefore there is no [Inaudible 01:28:37] from which we could easily [Inaudible 01:28:43] into the IDN discussion. There is another element which I think has to be considered in Cambodian case. [Inaudible 01:28:51] and we have about a dozen [Inaudible 01:28:59] providers in the very small country, there's a very small market which means there is not so much [Inaudible 01:29:08] or a solution of common problems.

But it is basically [Inaudible 01:29:14] which tried to get their share in the market and therefore they [Inaudible 01:29:23] common basis in which IDN [Inaudible 01:29:27] discussed in Cambodia. [Inaudible 01:29:32] apart from the fact that also [Inaudible 01:29:37] the Unicode took a long time because [Inaudible 01:29:47]. We have two levels of simple scripts and two levels of [Inaudible 01:29:53] and we have all

---

together more than 120 different graphical elements in a script which [Inaudible 01:30:02].

So a lot of energy has been used for that and [Inaudible 01:30:13] Cambodian script can be used for communication but [Inaudible 01:30:17] doesn't not have a broad interest in the country. There are some people in the internet society also tried to get this discussion promoted but it is not [Inaudible 01:30:34]. And that is what I would like to contribute.

And I'm very grateful that I can listen but it is very difficult for me hear your [Inaudible 01:30:49] on the telephone connection I have, thank you very much.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you Norbert and apologies for the sound quality that's coming your way. But again that's a very interesting thing which brings us to the third question that Rinalia mentioned what about those who are less active in the process, how that impacts the whole IDNs and also IDN variance. And so next I go to Ron.

RON:

Thank you Edmond and thank you for inviting me to speak here. A couple of things I want to speak about indig scripts and languages from the India or from that region -- so there are 20 in India alone 22 official languages. And Hindi for example is spoken by over 400 million users. Now Hindi as a language uses script underneath it called a David [Inaudible 01:31:51] script which is shared with seven other languages including Sanskrit for example.

Now there's another language in India that's an official language called [Inaudible 01:31:59]. That's in the Arabic script which again as you

---

know Arabic script is shared by many other languages. The other thing that's interesting about the indig case is that some languages share a single script. And in at least one case language can be represented by multiple scripts.

Some other interesting things for us to consider Tamil it's one of the official languages in the country it has only 80 million speakers and that shares characters that are similar to another language called [Inaudible 01:32:32]. But that's a different language with a different script representation.

Telegu has a little more than Tamil. It's also kind of a minority language in the country, 85 million speakers in the country or in general and that shares characters with [Inaudible 01:32:55] which is one of the official language in [Inaudible 01:32:56]. So if you look at indig script [Inaudible 01:33:01] is generally not considered an indig script but if you were to think about variance and you were doing - if someone were to apply for an IDN TLD in Telegu you have to think about the overlap with [Inaudible 01:33:14] which is not even considered an indig script.

So if you wanted constitute a community input or a panel or folks who are relevant you cannot just stop and say indig script is sufficient in [Inaudible 01:33:39] I will be speaking more to that we have an overlap that crosses over to a neighboring region. The point I'm trying to make is that IDNs in general are a very complex issue, IDN variance are also complex.

I echo Jim's comment from earlier that even the definition of variant is not a settled fact. And as anybody who is a student of history knows language is tied to culture. People go to war over simple letters and

---

characters and things like that. This is more than just a DNS and more than just a technology problem.

With that as a preamble if you look at variant rules and the readiness inside of the some of the scripts that are there I'm going to speak about scripts rather than languages because 22 I could spend all of the remaining time here. If you look at [Inaudible 01:34:40] that has eight languages that use it, the variant rules are pretty much done. And the community is ready.

There is a significant amount of effort. The Indian government has a unit called the Center for Development of Advanced Computing. And they have a full-scale project that has been running for years now and funded and with lots of community input. And they are tasked with both the creation, the development of rules as well as the vetting from the community language experts, etc. on all 22 languages. But we know that the work is quite advanced for the for sure.

There was another question that was asked which is will the introduction of IDN variant TLDs destabilize and undermine the internet's security. I'd like to raise it up a level. It's not just introduction of IDN variant TLDs. The question is probably as applicable for the introduction of IDN TLDs itself. The way that question is structured the answer is yes because you have a stable system right now. You're adding something to it.

It does cause stability is going to change. And change always introduces something new. To be more specific my thoughts are if you look at delegation of IDN TLDs it raises several issues. For instance, ICANN as an organization has no control over second level domains or below what

---

the behavior is and how it should work. You could have control at the top but you might have stability or security issues further down below.

Also there's really no good way to have control over application behavior. How is your browser going to work? Is email going to work when we try to send between each other? And how much work is required there? It downstream when you get a business card handed to you by somebody who has an email address that is completely in hongu will I know how to enter it in?

Will I have an application problem? Does that destabilize? Those are things to think about. The introduction of IDNs you could say brings more of the world's people online and increases the interoperability of the internet. But in an almost perverse way intercommunication for a sum amount of time anyway is likely to have some suffering because I might not have a device that can enter characters in the particular IDN script that somebody else prefers to communicate to me with.

The other question was on security. And look I mean this is technology this is new stuff. And it's almost inevitable that new vulnerabilities will be discovered. That doesn't mean that it undermines everything but we should expect new vulnerabilities as a result of the introduction of both IDN TLDs and should that day occur, IDN variant TLDs, thank you.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you Ron. And it's strangely comforting to hear that it is inevitable that it will be destabilizing and yet we are moving forward because there are larger goals that this needs to achieve and that's actually strongly comforting. Next we go to Hasha who is online with us.

---

HASHA:

Quite interesting Ron had spoken about [Inaudible 01:38:43]. I think what is interesting that I want to address is there are two types of variance that I see. One is what I call phonetic variant and the other I call [Inaudible 01:38:55] variant. Now the I think in most of our [Inaudible 01:39:00] but I think Ron had spoken about it [Inaudible 01:39:12] if you see the scripts.

Now if you look at that script you will see there are what we call phonetic similarities for variance. [Inaudible 01:39:37 poor audio quality] and when you compare we don't have a variance. But when you get the variance we have to [Inaudible 01:39:53] for instance [Inaudible 01:39:58] if you look very carefully you will see that [Inaudible 01:40:02] and also when you make the smaller font sizes [Inaudible 01:40:14].

Now [Inaudible 01:40:19] depending upon the font sizes that you would see the [Inaudible 01:40:27] problem comes back again because it looks like a [Inaudible 01:40:34]. Now there's another interesting part actually the [Inaudible 01:40:43] which is the [Inaudible 01:40:46] language of [Inaudible 01:40:49]. And most likely I think you will get IDNs I think for [Inaudible 01:41:09] also [Inaudible 01:41:12].

The [Inaudible 01:41:16] also has a [Inaudible 01:41:15] we normally when we [Inaudible 01:41:22]. So there are some variants we will find in [Inaudible 01:41:27]. We also have another issue I think [Inaudible 01:41:37] didn't touch upon it but I want to mention something about it. Some of these we use [Inaudible 01:41:46] another issue we have to look at [Inaudible 01:41:55]. [Inaudible 01:42:04] so the phonetic variance [Inaudible 01:42:10] we try to do that.

We try to keep the variance like for a particular word we try to use that variance in the same order for instance [Inaudible 01:42:21]. We can actually handle that very easily by [Inaudible 01:42:36]. [Inaudible 01:42:43] the way the variants are written. The [Inaudible 01:42:48] which is our other second official language and of course we have a [Inaudible 01:42:54] in India which is [Inaudible 01:42:57].

Likewise we have the same issue when it comes to variance. [Inaudible 01:43:07] I see here I think [Inaudible 01:43:10] maybe a have a lot of problems and it comes to IDNs variant issue. And now what has happened is actually you have a [Inaudible 01:43:24]. And I assume [Inaudible 01:43:28] panel that you would have to have the experts from different language when we start looking at these variants. I think very important that we have to [Inaudible 01:44:03]. The question three on the nonactive members I think there are lots of language who are not [Inaudible 01:44:26] at the moment.

I think we should have or come up with a process how to find [Inaudible 01:44:33] language family. When I say language family like the [Inaudible 01:44:43] you will see that there are similarities [Inaudible 01:44:47]. And sometimes when you get [Inaudible 01:44:49] sometimes. It looks very similar to some of our letters. So I think what we need to come up with is some sort of way of process and also policies on how to exchange [Inaudible 01:45:08] these variance in for IDNs.

I suggest that we come up with this process so that we can tell the languages who are not active in this how about going about it. And also we should actually [Inaudible 01:45:28]. We should have it within our



---

this generation [Inaudible 01:45:34]. We have done [Inaudible 01:45:49] and I have also given the link [Inaudible 01:45:54] very carefully at this in singular. [Inaudible 01:46:00] thank you.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you and we're talking about different types of variance and how we define variance. Finally we have Samad and other types of variance with Arabic.

SAMAD HUSSEIN:

Thank you Edmond. I'm going to be speaking in the context of Arabic script but many of the things I will say are probably also applicable to other scripts as well. Those letters were not supposed to show up as they are. What I did was put in two strings. And they refer to the word Pakistan and these two strings are the IDN ccTLD strings which have actually been submitted to ICANN. And the two strings if they're entered properly look exactly the same.

However, if you see the characters in red are internally different. So visually to a user they are exactly the same but internally in the DNS if you look at the a label they are actually different A levels, so they are different entities. Like these two characters I went through the list of confusions which are currently documented in the Arabic script case study. The 120 such cases of character confusion so it's not a matter of one or two characters.

It's a significant number of characters which can be confused with each other causing many variants. It's not a trivial problem. It's not an ignorable problem. It's something that has to be addressed. Since these characters are visually identical we need to make sure that these strings which have these characters are not allocated independently to different people. That's the first thing which needs to be done.

---

Some of these strings need to be activated because if I am in a particular country my keyboard will support a different set of these characters. And if I'm in another country it will support a different set of these characters. So I will probably need to have multiple sets of characters enabled so that I can enter a particular string from all the different countries I had traveled. Also last comment, the first column is that it's not visible on the screen here but what I had was the 16 IDN ccTLD applications in Arabic.

And four of these have actually requested for IDN [Inaudible 01:49:52] that's about 25%. What are the challenges? The main challenges obviously are that these variants have to be consistently defined so if two strings are variant in Saudi Arabia well they need to variants in Dubai as well. And if there are two strings at a TLD level they also need to be variants at an SLD level and third level and so on.

There has to be consistency otherwise users will get very confused at two strings of variance in one particular domain and then odd variance in another particular context. Similarly the manageability of variance has been to be address at multiple levels.

At registration level where registrants are interacting with the systems, at configuration and management level, operations level where you have a network and configuration managers who are setting up systems for emails and web servers and also for network and security monitoring teams you need to have tools which can associate these variants and look at traffic patterns and abuse patterns and try to correct this variance.

---

Finally there is this third level of user ability where you need actually to use an application to support variance in a way they are expected by the users. For example, in browsers, email clients, search mechanisms and in all these cases one of the things that needs to be handled is the innumerability of the variance. To answer the first question will IDN variance TLD [Inaudible 01:52:03] the internet, I guess my answer would be that not addressing variance will definitely destabilize it.

We have to address them and manage them so we can manage the security and stability of the internet. There is no real mechanism to implement variance right now. What is going to be a solution to do this in a way which is acceptable across the community?

And then how we balance this issue where you have hundreds of variants which must be allocated to the same user but on the other hand you have to have a minimal number of these in the root so they remain manageable. As for the readiness of the communities the two kinds of context language community, I think there are multiple levels of engagement. I think it can be done based on the applications which I have received on various scripts.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you Samad and on the it's comforting again to know the significant of work from the Arabic community and the Indian community. And on the issue of readiness [Inaudible 01:56:00] wanted to add on the readiness in terms of the Chinese community. I will take a round of questions. I will go to Jean Jacques.

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT:

A short comment and short practical suggestion. This is about war and peace. This is really about war and peace. And I think that all of us and those online should be aware that it is no longer a question only for

---

language specialists or for technologists. It is about war and peace. In this sense ICANN is way ahead of many other organizations including treaty organizations. The kind of discussion I've heard this evening here does not appear in the offices of the United Nations in New York or Geneva.

Nor does it happen even in UNESCO. I think you should be aware of this. This is of extreme importance and I underline the political importance of this. do you know that a few years ago Germany and France set up a joint group of historians and jointly they drafted a single text which has now become the high school last year high school manual of history used exactly the same way in Germany and France.

I spoke to this with leaders in Japan and in China a few years ago and they raised their hands to the sky and said no way, no way. But what you are doing is the equivalent. Maybe it's another way forward. It is of extreme importance. Now my practical suggestion is this.

I think that you as the initiators of all this work should go back to [Inaudible 02:00:03] and say this is an element of such importance and originality of the world today that more should be made of it in the public statements, in the position papers of ICANN because this is a real success story at a world-class level.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Thank you Jean Jacques, ICANN promoting world peace that's very good. I think with that we are really running out of time. I know Rinalia has a burning question and Dennis wants to chime in.

DENNIS JENNINGS:

Thank you. I've done quite a lot of work in this area in the last two years. And I just want to add a caution on the mix of technology and

---

politics. Sometimes the technology doesn't fly even if the politics wishes to make it fly. If you build an aircraft with the curve side downwards the aircraft will never take off no matter how much political will that it will take off.

There is an underlying fundamental constraint here and that is what actually works. And that may or may not and most likely will not meet the political and user expectations at least in the short term. So a lot of caution is required in my opinion.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Well politics is finding the possibilities I guess.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Dennis and Edmond. What I failed to mention at the beginning when I read the questions was that for communities that shared a script it is required that there is an agreement in terms of how variants are treated in that shared script. And that is where people can go to war in terms of languages. In terms of CJK there seems to be coherences, there's some beautiful harmony going on there which is really nice. They're all okay. But I think on this side that it's complicated.

We'll have to figure out how to manage that. On Jean Jacques comment on alerting ICANN leadership that this is an important topic and we need to be communicating about it better, I also want to put it on the IGF agenda. The problem is it's a complex topic and there is a certain technicality and it's a question of whether or not the audience will understand it. I think that they will have the capacity to understand it if we explain it carefully.

---

And I think we should put it on the agenda of the IGF. I have sent in an initial proposal for this issue. Hopefully it'll be accept by the MAG and we will see the discussion continue. I'd like Jim to respond to the various remarks that have been made by the panelists because it's actually a challenge to the SSAC position. Maybe not just have a last word.

JIM GALVIN:

I think the issue of stability and security I think what Raman was saying when he mentioned that yes we are embarking in a new space. And there are things that are going to happen that are going to be unexpected. In a sense we don't know what we don't know. We won't know that until it happens to us. I think from SSAC's perspective the important thing here is that we do have to move forward.

We do have to deploy IDN TLDs. We have to allow this to happen but we have to be conservative in what we do until we can gain that experience and understand how the systems are going to work, thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Jim. Just to remind you there is the APRALO Showcase and Reception right outside and the food is fantastic. So do stay for that and ICANN leadership will be here. Please join me in thanking the moderator and the discussant.

[End of Transcript]