
PRAGUE – At-Large IDN Working Group

Wednesday, June 27, 2012 – 15:00 to 16:00

ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Edmon Chung: Thank you everyone. [French interpretation] Thank you, Olivier, for reminding there are a few people behind me hiding, but we can...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: There are some people hiding yeah, but we can find you.

Male: We wanted to be hidden. So (inaudible).

Sarmad Hussain: Sarmad Hussain.

Michael: Michael [Cumlaude].

Edmon Chung: Okay, welcome everyone. Oh...

Male: (Inaudible).

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.

Yuriy Buzcko: Yuriy Buzcko; 101domain

Female: [Raydine McGarry], here to represent .la

Edmon Chung: Okay, thank you everyone for joining. As I was mentioning, a few agenda items were sent to the mailing list for this working group earlier, and basically there are three items, one of which is the current and/or recent public comment periods and taking a look at whether this group should respond to it. The second item is the IDN gTLDs. From some of the discussions that we have had earlier this week, there was one particular question, and perhaps this I guess is a question to this group whether we want to take it on as a work item to make a statement from ALAC in supporting prioritizing IDN gTLDs in the new gTLD process.

And the third one is I guess the main item that we want to spend some time discussing today, that is an ALAC sort of IDN position and vision going forward. This is taken very much from the inspiration from the very good work from the Future Challenges Working Group, which Jean-Jacques and Evan have been leading the efforts and many other from the ALAC as well, and try to really bring together the thoughts and some of the fundamental views of the ALAC on IDNs and how it should be prioritized or how it should be viewed in the ICANN context.

So those are the three agenda items and on number three, I was hoping that people would be asking me more questions or we would have a

sort of dialogue. But anyway, for the first one, the recent public comment periods, I guess there were two in particular that was directly of relevance. The IDN ccTLD review, that was a second annual IDN ccTLD review. I personally took a look at it and there were a number of comments that were received through that process. In terms of the ALAC or from the At-Large, it appeared to me that there wasn't a significant aspect, except for a slowing down of interest for the program and also some lingering issues that seem to be somewhat stuck.

I didn't see specifically that ALAC would be saying anything specific to it, so we didn't draft any statement of comment to it. I wonder if anyone wanted to raise that back from the dead or is there anything that we want to say about it. If not, we also had the VIP Project Plan that was vastly reprioritized and in my update to the ALAC earlier in the week again we felt encouraged by the direction currently and we will help the VIP extend its invitation to around At-Large and also to continue to keep an eye on the process of the VIP.

Other than that, again, I didn't feel we had an urgent need to provide any comments at this point and therefore in a way I think that's progressing in a good fashion. Of course there are still a number of issues to be resolved and a plan is in place. So if there are not from those couple of items, I don't know, since we have Dennis here I don't know if you might want to add before we move on.

Dennis Jennings:

Thank you Edmon. Dennis Jennings here for the record. I just want to draw your attention to project six in the Variant TLD Program, which is examining the user experience implications of active variant TLDs, and

the timeline, which was presented and will be presented again tomorrow at the session at noon. There is going to be an opportunity for consultation on the study proposal and on the report that comes out of the study. And that's probably an area that At-Large and ALAC, representing the users, should have a look at because it's a key part of the project is to try and define what a good user or acceptable user experience is.

[background conversation]

Dennis Jennings:

The presentation isn't available for this session. I've assumed – I can probably get it up in due course, but I can assume that you were aware of it from previous presentations or will come to it tomorrow. So let me just respond to that request. The description is, of project six, "To study the user experience implications when two or more IDN variant TLDs are activated, have resource records in the DNS." The expected outcome are "Recommended rules or guidelines a TLD should operate under to provide an acceptable user experience with regard to variant TLDs, including appropriate policy or contractual provisions to make these rules effective. And in addition, creation of a useful reference for educating application developers and others affected by these changes."

So that seems to me like an area that you should keep an eye on, watch for the reports and for the public comment and input your own views

on what is an acceptable user experience. So that's the only suggestion I have to make Edmon.

Edmon Chung:

Thank you Dennis. And on that particular item I think, as you were mentioning, it seems it would be interesting to get a group at ALAC, we have been looking at the Registrant Bill of Rights – I forgot the right term – Rights and Responsibilities part which might be somewhat relevant to this as well. Dennis you did mention that the outcome of which would direct what the registry sort of contract, or some compliance possibilities might be. There might also be some – should I use “trickle down” – also some provisions on the registrar side and also some provisions on the registrant side. So for us, perhaps the registrant side. I'll let Sala speak first, and then go back to Dennis.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcript record. I think the Bill of Rights, just to correct, I think ALAC released a previous statement and we sort of quoted certain international legal instruments, which are binding on Nation States in relation to multilingualism and is facilitated primarily by UNESCO and that sort of thing. And not only by UNESCO, but actually mandated by governments and their relevant legislations across the world in terms of, this is from public users perspective. Thank you.

Edmon Chung:

Thank you. Dennis and then we have a comment from the Adobe Room.

Dennis Jennings: That's a very interesting which you might provide to us. I think it's particularly relevant to IDN variant ccTLDs which would be representing states or countries in some way. I don't mean to have them make any political statement about that, what their applicability might be to gTLDs is an interesting question, but I'd certainly like to know about that material as input to the project. So thank you for that reference, if you could provide it to us that would be very useful.

Edmon Chung: Okay the comment is specifically on number two agenda item so I'll come back to that. Before that, we're still on number one which is the current or recent public comment periods, whether this group would want to respond to. So those were the IDN ccTLD Review and the VIP Project Plan; I think there is some follow up work on the VIP Project Plan as well, but I don't see any immediate sort of work item for the working group at this point. So unless somebody thinks we – okay Sala.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Just in terms of a suggested Action Item, if we could put out a quick survey where we construct questions for the different RALOs to extract the pertinent information in relation to what's on the ground in the countries where our ALS has presence in, in relation to the legislative instruments in that particular area that's relevant.

Edmon Chung: Can you elaborate on that? What exactly are we asking ALSes, what should we be asking ALSes – is this response in response to what Dennis was mentioning as an input into the project six?

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Yes. Remember the statement that – sorry, Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the transcript records. There's a statement that we've developed already where we've made references to the international legal instruments that we can give to Dennis. And the second one is where we specifically articulate the legislative provisions from the countries where ALS has presence in and give it to Dennis. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Sala. I do remember that. Two things, one is do I hear that we have a volunteer to help draft something – thank you Sala. This is Edmon speaking again. Sorry, I keep forgetting to do that. Edmon Chung speaking. And the other part is that while a general sort of reach and then to collect that information is very good, one of the things that perhaps if we want to make it an input into the VIP Project, perhaps it's important to focus on whether there are IDN variant specific issues. So there's the general IDN, the importance of IDNs and that part, which I think it's valuable to solicit from ALSes, especially on the legislature or requirements in different jurisdictions.

But if we can also have a component of that focus on whether there may be IDN variant issues within those languages, languages used in

those jurisdictions that might be even more useful as a direct input into the VIP. Does that make sense? Good. Dennis?

Dennis Jennings:

Dennis Jennings again for the record. Yes I was going to make that point that the project of course, the program that we're working on is related to variants, not just IDNs generally. So no variants, there's no issue as far as we're concerned. Just to draw to your attention that in the second half of the session tomorrow at noon, probably from about 1:00 for half an hour there will be a detailed discussion on the study proposal on user experience. So if you're interested in that then not only come to the session but stay on for the 1:00 to 1:30 discussion on user experience. That's where we're consulting people in relation to this user experience study. Thank you.

Edmon Chung:

Thank you Dennis. Edmon here. I hope that's not the only consultation you're doing, but I'm sure it won't be. So with that, those are the two items from number one and the next question is are there sort of other relevant public comment periods ongoing. I sort of scanned through the list that is current, one of which seemed to have come up and that is the WHOIS Review. I know that we already have a team that's looking into that and providing comments, I did see that in the WHOIS Review one there's a big section on internationalized domain names and relevance there in the WHOIS Review.

The question is whether this group should take a closer look at it and see how we could integrate the comments into the larger response. I

wonder what the status is with whether there is an ALAC response on the WHOIS Review already sent in and where we are with that and how the IDN portion of which might work. We're just talking about the WHOIS Review that is out for public comments. I noticed that there is a big section on IDNs. We were wondering if this group could help add to it or is that already covered in the WHOIS Review Team?

Carlton Samuels:

This is Carlton Samuels for the record. Edmon to answer your question directly, surely further and better particulars are always good in this context. What the WHOIS Review Team said, and which we endorsed, is that all of the ideas about WHOIS in the existing gTLD space translates into the IDN space. So they are working on an Internationalized WHOIS Program that is intended to produce the same effect as is in the existing Arabic or Latin script space. That's one thing.

They're also endorsing the development of a new what they call a directory service; this is the same thing. And there again, they were emphatic to say that they're endorsing that to the extent that it addresses the IDN space as well. So for this group what would be important is to ensure that the WHOIS data set, because of the issues with variants and so on, whatever the WHOIS data set that is finally developed and adopted should make sure that the concerns you have with variants and so on that could be material to what is actually displayed.

We need to make sure that those concerns are reflected in whatever comments we make about this new protocol stat. Okay?

Edmon Chung: Thank you Carlton. Edmon here again. From a brief look at the current review team report, I don't know how familiar the people from the working is with that document, but from my first read of it it seems like it already covers fairly extensively about the IDN and those issues. Because this is a review team report it doesn't have any specific recommendations at this point. And it seems to me, besides saying "yes we agree that IDNs are very important and internationalized data for the WHOIS or whatever directory services would be very important"; besides that it didn't occur to me that we needed to add anything more to that at this point.

Carlton Samuels: Yeah you're probably right. I just am asking you to keep it on the radar. Because they were emphatic for example about the accuracy and they actually made a point of suggesting that in the IDN space WHOIS accuracy was even more important. So they have embraced the concept of WHOIS to cover whether it's Latin script or non Latin script, it should have the same effect. And what I'm saying to you is while there's a full embrace of that, because of the issues that I am hearing, and I'm only becoming familiar with them now about the variants and so on, it might be useful for you who are expressing this area, to keep a listening ear and keep an eye on it.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Carlton. And just as a very quick – this is Edmon Chung speaking. As a very quick overview how IDN plays into, or

internationalized data plays into WHOIS and why Carlton was mentioning that it has some relevance with WHOIS accuracy, it's because there are a lot of situations where the registrant may be living in an area where he or she would like to use the address in their own language, for example with accented characters, for example with different languages. And currently, the WHOIS doesn't quite allow that or doesn't allow it in a consistent manner.

Therefore it creates situations where the accuracy of the WHOIS data is maybe worse, if I may use that word, then in an ASCII area. Because just because I'm living in France and I happen to use certain accented characters and they cannot be reflected currently in the WHOIS for that street name or place name, and that creates certain accuracy issues. In terms of the IDN portion, there is of course the variant part, whether that's included in the WHOIS as well and some other elements, the domain itself being able to be reflected consistently in the WHOIS.

That is what is being asked by the WHOIS Policy Review Team for ICANN to work on at this point. So yes, we will definitely keep an eye on it. At this point, as I mentioned, at this point I think they have provided a fairly good scope already and I think we'll just keep an eye on it and if it requires us to put in anything, we will for sure. Thank you Carlton.

So that was the only thing that I saw in the public comment period that is somewhat relevant to IDNs. If I don't see anyone jumping up that says others are we should look at then I'll move to number two in the items. And this is one thing that was brought up in the earlier meetings, which is in the new gTLD program, we all know that the digital archery has been stopped and a new way to batch things might be coming. But

one of the things that we talked about is whether the ALAC should develop a statement in support of prioritizing the processing of IDN gTLD applications.

So rather than me talking, I was hoping if anyone has any comments or thoughts on it...no? Rinalia.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim:

Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcript record. I think that the ALAC should come up with a statement for the processing to prioritize IDNs. Because in the ALAC community I think we have to represent the interest of the global internet users. And in our previous session before it was said that there were three things that we should look at – one was IDN, the other one was community and the other one was geographical names. And given all the considerations I think IDNs should be prioritized.

And I think in a conversation with a Board member of a technical capacity just now during lunch time, it's not a technical issue it's a policy issue, so in that regard I think we should just go ahead and do it.

Edmon Chung:

Thank you Rinalia. I have Sala and then Siva.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcript record. I echo what Rinalia just said. I believe it's the coordinated and cohesive view of the At-Large community that the IDNs jump the queue of the gTLDs; IDN

gTLD jumps the queue in this regard, especially in relation to the rate limits or whatever that new process is called.

Edmon Chung: Rate limit? I don't know. This is the first time I've heard about it. This is Edmon Chung speaking. I understand that there is a root scaling requirement that limits the number of TLDs we can add within a particular time, and therefore it requires a sort of scheduled insertion into the root. I have Siva and then I go to Eric's comment on the virtual room and then Rinalia and then Dennis.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: I actually have a technical question. Sivasubramanian. When an IDN TLD is delegated and at the same time an ASCII TLD is also delegated, does it for any reason take a little longer for the IDN TLD to be implemented. That is the technical question. And another question is a commercial question. When an IDN TLD goes to market and when an ASCII TLD goes to market, because of the newness of the IDN concept does it take a little longer for the IDN TLD to mature in the marketplace. If in both the cases is yes, and it takes a little longer for the IDN to be implemented, even to that extent the advantage to be given to IDN TLDs at the application stage so that there is a certain degree of priority for what takes longer.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Siva. Edmon Chung here again. I think what you pointed out is interesting. I'm not sure whether it would take longer for IDNs. I don't think I'm in a position to answer that, but what I do take from

what you're saying is that even though or even if the IDN applications might take longer that might give us even more reason to process them earlier and provide a priority for them to be processed earlier in the queue if you will. And sorry, just going to Eric's comment online.

[background conversation]

Edmon Chung:

So Matt, if you can help find it and then we'll come back to that. If there isn't, let me know. If that's the case then I had Rinalia and then Dennis. Okay, Dennis.

Dennis Jennings:

Thank you Edmon, Dennis Jennings for the record. Just a comment, I mean everybody is special pleading at this stage – “me, me, me, me first.” So if you are going to make such a submission than I think you should consider the rationale and the justification and document it. So for example, since application support for IDNs is weak at best, and this is a gTLD not a ccTLD, and therefore for all users, perhaps an argument is that priority should be given to gTLDs in order to develop experience and promote application development that will be able to cope with IDNs.

This is nothing to do with variants; this is just to do with IDNs. But my general point is not to put words in anybody's mouth but to say everybody is saying “me first.” So if you want to distinguish yourself from that crowd you need to justify your particular “me first.”

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon Chung. We're saying "we" not "me." Do we have the question from – no, we didn't? Okay, so we're...so I'll go to Jean-Jacques first and then I'll come back.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Edmon. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat speaking. I'd like to take up Dennis' remark and contribute to also to the rationale. I think I agree with Dennis that we have to provide some rationale for suggesting to put the IDNs first. In addition to what Dennis said I would say that we can also use a general remark about availability, demand and offer. In other words, part of the new gTLD thing is driven really by business opportunity, in other words by offer.

And I think that IDNs sometimes distinguish themselves from the general case because they represent more of a demand from the base, from potential users who are not organized in the same way, who do not have hundreds of thousands of monetary units, whatever they are to publicize, to attract business and to how should I say, invent a need for new gTLDs sometimes where they do not really exist as a necessity. So for that reason too I think we should underline the necessity to give a fair chance and therefore priority to based amount for fundamental demand.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Jean-Jacques, Edmon Chung here again. That's one of the things that in the third item I wanted to raise in terms of the ALACs vision. And a lot of what we see is that the new gTLD process is very

market driven, and some of the need for IDN unfortunately, while at least personally I believe that there is a strong demand , the demand itself is not from the registrant and the registries and that's one of the reasons or problems that is facing. And that's why just by using market forces, or letting a free market run would not addressing these kinds of needs and there is exactly where policy needs to come into play. Did we find – okay, Matt.

Matt Ashtiani:

So there's actually three. The first one is a comment from Andy G. Andy G writes "Non Latin script users have been disadvantaged for way too long. It's time to pressure ICANN to push some IDN gTLDs through." The second is from squirrel. Squirrel writes "Edmon, what is the state of single character CJK TLD. I'm sorry if this has been discussed, but just let me know and I'll read the transcript if it's already been discussed."

Edmon Chung:

Thank you. The first was from sorry, I didn't catch that.

Matt Ashtiani:

Andy G.

Edmon Chung:

Andy G. Thank you for the response. I think the room generally agrees. The second from squirrel and at least on this particular working group meeting we haven't talked about single character IDN TLDs. That is being discussed at the JIG, the Joint IDN Working Group between the GNSO and ccNSO. If I can take a few seconds to summarize that, a

report has been given to the Board. There is a report from the SSAC identifying some issues around it. Personally I find the SSAC report contradicting itself quite in a couple of places at least, but there really isn't a forum to discuss that at the moment. My question back to squirrel maybe is are you suggesting that this group do further work on it.

Matt Ashtiani:

And our two remaining questions from the remote participants both come from Eric Brunner Williams. His first question states "I suggest that if ALAC wishes to make a public policy based recommendation relating to IDNs and the current set of applications that there is a difference between applications by 2000 round, name space operators for brand promotion and scripts other than Latin, and applications by linguistic communities."

Edmon Chung:

This is Edmon Chung again. Thank you Eric. The second question, the particular item that we're talking about is what was brought up earlier this week was to prioritize IDN gTLD applications. From what I recall, for both the 2000 and the 2004 rounds, there were no IDN applications per se, except from the .asia application where inside of which it did explicitly say that it would like to work with ICANN to have the IDN versions of .asia included. But other than that, I just want to make sure – I guess the question back to Eric is I didn't quite get the question and this particular discussion is focused on whether we want to have a statement from the ALAC for prioritizing IDN gTLD applications.

Matt Ashtiani: His follow up, or his additional question is, it's actually a statement, "Additionally, if use and stability of end user expectations and experience that the existing HANS script name spaces for which [CNNIC] and [CONAC] have submitted applications, these two may be distinguished from applications from Legacy in 200 round name space operators seeking to expand their brand in scripts other than Latin.

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I'm going to need somebody to help me with that because I didn't quite understand. I have Dennis and I have Jason.

Jason Polis: Hi, it's Jason Polis. I think what Eric's asking is should we differentiate our support for IDN TLDs between commercial and community applicants.

Edmon Chung: That's a good question. Does anyone have – well before I add to that I wanted to just state this. The reason why I'm not adding anything to this, I wanted to state it out, is a I do have a conflict of interest because I am helping a few IDN new gTLD applications, so I'm not wishing to add a lot, but I'm happy to facilitate the discussion here. I have Sala.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the transcript. It's a difficult one and one which I would suggest that we tread carefully. On one had there's a

need for capacity building as Dennis had alluded to in relation to IDN gTLDs. And on the other hand, if you have like a whole bunch of commercial versus community based applications, one could argue that they are one in the same and there is no distinction. So there are many ways of looking at it; that there is no distinction, the fact that it's multilingual anyway and that sort of thing.

And on the other hand, if push comes to shove, and again this is just my own opinion and not the opinion of ALAC or At-Large, it's not tested, but I suppose consultation would have to be done with our members. Thank you.

Edmon Chung:

Before I go to Siva I just want to respond to – I think I finally realized what Eric is asking. He is asking whether we should distinguish between IDN gTLDs that purport to be an equivalent of existing gTLDs like .com or .net or .info, and whether we should distinguish between all new gTLDs IDN applications or these special ones and whether we should do that. I had Dennis and then Siva.

Dennis Jennings:

Dennis here. Just some caution. I hear the sound of axes being ground and it's not at all clear to me, as has been said, that there is any distinguishing merit in terms of promoting use of IDNs between commercial ones and community ones. But if you think there is a distinction then do make that distinction in your justification.

Edmon Chung: Siva, you wanted to...

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Okay I think of a different rationale for grouping it all together. It would make [it devalued], and considering all applications together and implementing them together for technical reasons because even for ICANN IDNs are new and even after the TLDs delegated and the registries start implementing if they have some problem they'll have to come back to ICANN. And it's better that as a single batch, the whole problems that are common or arise at the same time and are solved at the same time. And that is the value that I see in implementing all IDNs together and considering them together irrespective if they're commercial or noncommercial or community based TLDs.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. If I may, seeing no other hands, I guess I can generally summarize that there is some consensus that this group would like to put together a statement that suggests a prioritization of Idn new gTLDs. The question perhaps, there are some details to be worked out in the exact message and whether we want to distinguish between different groups and that would require a little bit more discussion. Okay, we have two comments. Before I go to those two comments, I was hoping that we could find at least somebody who would be willing to volunteer to gather that and put it into a draft statement. I'm looking around...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Lock the doors. Evan, you always should lock the doors.

Edmon Chung: Good thing nobody is running yet. The deadline – I don't think there is a hard deadline at this time. But the ICANN has said that they're committed to starting the evaluation process by July 12th. So perhaps we can use that as a, or July 11th as our target date for the time being.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Sala and I will volunteer to do a draft.

Edmon Chung: Perfect. That is great. So there are a couple of comments on this item from the virtual room as well, Matt are you or – Matt have you...

Matt Ashtiani: The first comment comes from Andy G. Andy says "The IDN subset of the total applicants is a handy smaller number of applications to put through first in order to test the rest of the new gLTD system." Let me try that again a little bit more slowly. The first comment that we have comes from Andy G. This is Matt Ashtiani for the transcript record as well. "The IDN subset of the total applicants is a handy smaller number of applications to put through first in order to test the rest of the new gLTD system."

Edmon Chung: Thank you Andy. There was another comment as well.

Matt Ashtiani: Correct, the other comment states, this is a comment for Edmon and Dennis. “There should not be a distinction between commercial and community IDN TLDs simply because registrants don’t make this distinction.”

Edmon Chung: Thank you, this is Edmon again and I think Rinalia and Sala has taken those notes down and now I go to Evan to share with us a statement that is being prepared for the public forum.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there, this is Evan Leibovitch for the record. Holly Raiche and I have been working on a couple of comments to be read out to the public forum. One is relevant to what we’re doing here. I’d like to read it to you and get some comments back if there is any real problem with it. “The At-Large community notes with concern the tribulations of ICANN regarding the safe processing of hundreds and hundreds of gTLD applications. Generally there is not much interest by the end user community in how the many hundreds of applications are prioritized with two exceptions. We note the small number of IDN and top level domains and request that those without variant related issues be placed at the top of whatever queueing mechanism is eventually chosen.

Having more IDNs to us is a critical improvement to the name space that needs to happen as soon as possible.” The next part isn’t directly related but would also say that “we’d ask to have applicant support qualified applications also put to the top of the list.” Anyway that’s a

statement that we're hoping to make. Is there any disagreement with that at this table?

[background conversation]

Edmon Chung: Thank you Evan.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Sorry Evan, this is Rinalia; just a request that you email me the excerpt.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually this will be widely stirred around and it will be brought up. There will be ALAC meetings between now and the public forum where this will be brought up.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Here?

[background conversation]

Edmon Chung: Thank you Evan and Rinalia; Edmon Chung here again. On the particular statement I do have one particular comment. I picked out the "except for the ones with IDN variant," I wonder why it needs to be in there.

We are talking about the evaluation process at this point and not the delegation, but we'll take this offline I guess. I have...

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry. The only quick answer to that was the thought that the ones without variant issues are ones that could be processed immediately and therefore could easily go to the top of the queue.

Edmon Chung: I have Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Edmon, this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I go along with that suggestion, perhaps the wording can be changed a bit but I go along with it. I would like however to suggest that we add, in that statement, the element of background or rationale which were proposed first by Dennis and a small piece by myself afterwards. Because I think it reinforces the message when you give the rationale. There is some rationale already otherwise I haven't heard it, but the thing about – I don't have it in my mind but the record has it – what Dennis said and what I said.

Evan Leibovitch: I'll be happy to do it as long as I'm not in the situation where I'm near the back of the queue and we're rushed by the Chair. If we have the ability to do so, adding a preamble to this certainly makes sense.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Evan. So, I think we're running short in time at this point, but we do have a pretty good way forward I guess. Rinalia and Sala will help us draft something together and taking into the suggestions that we've collected so far. So we have – oh, I have a countdown clock. It looks like the public forum.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So use it wisely.

Edmon Chung: So I have two minutes left but of course we've run out of time on the third item, which I've always wanted to get us going on, which is the ALAC sort of more overarching and position on IDNs. But I guess instead of doing that at this point I'll highlight a few things, one of which is as Jean-Jacques mentioned that a lot of times the IDN TLDs we don't see a lot of applications. That's because currently the gTLD process is very much market driven and perhaps that market is about registrants. Currently we do see that there are not a lot of IDN registrants, but that doesn't mean they are the users. They are not the only users.

There are many users who are internet users tying in domain names that would like to use IDNs and that demand is not being met because IDNs are not bought and sold by the registrants. That particular market has not created enough. And that's I think one of the basic premises I hope to promote from the ALAC position. And of course, building on top of that some other elements as well. So we don't really have much time but Sala you wanted to add – please do, we have 30 seconds left.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the transcript. Very quickly, competition regulatory mechanisms all across the world generally recognize that where you have certain stakeholders that are marginalized that you're trying to help build. I just like to reiterate what you said, that there is affirmative action in that regard. And in the interest of consumer's worldwide, particularly global public interest, it's necessary that that affirmative action takes place and I would just like to reiterate the importance of ALAC pushing that consistently through the various foras. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Sala. And I guess the main point is that just because we see not a lot of IDN gTLD applications doesn't mean that there is no need for it to be developed further. I guess that's the bottom line. So with that, we ran out of time – oh I have two hours left suddenly?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nooooooooo.

Edmon Chung: I can go on forever as all of you know. Sure Siva.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: I participated in this meeting and said something – and joined the discussion...

Gisella Gruber: Sorry Siva, for the record your name pleas.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Okay, I'm Sivasubramanian. For the record I have a conflict of interest on this topic and I believe that my conflict has not matured enough that I make a public announcement, but otherwise the conflict of interest is known to everyone here, which is why I did not state it. I'm a new gTLD applicant and the string that I applied for happens to be .idn. Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Siva. And with that, thank you everyone for joining. This is Edmon for the transcript record and goodbye. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]