UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It is November 6th, 2016 in MR102 for the Internationalized Domain Name Program Update, 08:30 to 09:45.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, good morning everybody. We'll start the session. The session is on the IND program update. Here is a brief overview of what we are going to go through. So, I will present just a general overview of what IDN program is currently undertaking as far as the projects are concerned. Integration panel is going to give an update on the work they've been undertaking and some feedback based on their interactions with generation panels.

We have an update on the IDN implementation guidelines that will be presented by Edmund Chung. And then we have community updates from our generation panel members. We will have an update from, on a topic, generation panel from [inaudible] …generation panel by [inaudible] …generation panel from [inaudible], and Thai generation panel update from [inaudible].

And then we go into a question and answer session. So, let's start with the IDN program overview and progress. The IDN program at ICANN undertakes multiple projects. They are obviously more focused on the top level, but we also undertake a couple of projects targeting the second level, and additionally, we undertake work for community outreach and involvement.

I will go in a little more detail on the work on label generation rules and the [inaudible] tool set, and IDN ccTLD fast track process. We have a separate presentation on IDN implementation guidelines, and I will also overview some of the work that we have done on second level LGRs and community outreach.

So, starting from the first topic. One of things which we've actually been involved in is defining the root zone label generation rules. These rules will be used to determine what is a valid top level domain, and also determine what are the variants for any top level domains. This is somebody of the work or progress so far.

The first version of the LGR, root zone LGR was released in March 2016. That contained Arabic script at this time. In addition, at that time, Armenian generation panel was also, had also completed their work, but that was not integrated because it had similarity with some of the other scripts and integration

panel wanted to wait until those script proposals were also in before integrating Armenian.

Since then, we've also received Amir LGF, Georgian script LGR, and more recently Lao script LGR. So, we have five language, sorry, script communities, which have now finished their work. In addition, we have Thai LGR, which is very close to finishing their work. And Chinese and Ethiopian generation panels making very good progress.

We also have a good progress from Japanese and Korean, some of the other communities. So, basically, currently we have Lao… [Inaudible] generation panel just very recently finished their public comment process. Lao generation panel is currently open for public comment, so if you have time, go take a look at that proposal and do give us some feedback.

So many of these generation panels will be presenting their work during this session, and the next session later in the morning, during the IDN workshop, LGR workshop. Once these LGRs are available, obviously we need tools to use these LGRs. For that reason, there was some initial work which was identified during the variant issues project, undertaken by the IDN program.

And there were a couple of things which were identified. First was that there needs to be some specification in which this

linguistic data which has been produced needs to be stored, and work was undertaken to develop what was called label generation rules, which is a formal, format in XML. This work was done at IETF, and the specification has recently been finalized into a RFC 7940.

And all the LGR work, which is currently being undertaken, is based on the specification given in this RFC. The second requirement which came up during the earlier discussions was that, in addition, during the specification, one needed a tool to basically process this data. So ICANN IDN programs worked over last year to create this tool set.

It's called the LGR tool set, or LGR tool, which is now online. Using this tool, you can actually, as a generation panel member, or even for second level, you can actually go online and create a LGR. You can also upload an existing LGR and use it to determine whether a particular label is valid, and what are its [inaudible].

And then you can, it has multiple other functions like comparing two different LGRs to see what a change in LGR has been and so on, which would be useful for people using LGRs, obviously, top level as well as second level.

It is available online. We released a reasonably detailed user guide for using this tool that is also available online. And we

also released the complete code of this tool through open [inaudible] license. It's open for everybody to download, use, at their own level and integrated in their own systems.

So moving onwards, at the top level, we also, the IDN program also undertakes IDN ccTLD fast track process implementation. Currently, there have been 57 IDN ccTLDs from 39 countries and territories, which have been successfully evaluated. Most of them undelegated, some of them are now undergoing the delegation process.

So 47 of these have actually been delegated, representing 37 countries and territories. These [inaudible] 21 scripts and 35 languages. In addition, the IDN ccTLD fast track process is currently undergoing a review process, distribute process in 2015. There was some feedback received on updating the second similarity review, which is called EPS RP.

And the Board actually then resolved to ask ccNSO in consultation with GAC and SSAC, to review these guidelines. These guidelines were reviewed by the working group with ccNSO, and were recently published for public comment, and that public comment recently closed. And now these guidelines are ccNSO for the processing.

In addition to the work being done at the top level, we have a couple of projects which are focused at the second level as well.

One, as I mentioned earlier, was the IDN implementation guidelines that will be talked in more detail later in today's session. So, I'll just very briefly introduce a second piece of work, which is currently being undertaken that's developing this reference second level LGRs.

The intention of this work is to assist gTLDs or registry operators, who want to offer different language LGRs at second level to make reference available for them as a starting point, or for them to consider. They don't need to follow this reference exactly. They can deviate from it, but this gives at least a basis for them to look at and see how they want to support their community.

There was initially guidelines which were published to develop these reference LGRs for public comment. Based on the public comment, these guidelines were finalized. The LGRs were produces, and LGRs were also published for public comment and feedback. Based on the feedback, 27 LGRs have been published. They are in the LGR format specified by RFC 940.

And the list of these LGRs is given here. In addition to the work which we are undertake, we also very actively engage with the community. It will tell them about what IDN program is undertaken, and to involve them in our work, because a lot of, most of our work is actually based on community involvement.

**EN**

We reach out to the community through, at the ICANN meetings. But also beyond ICANN meetings, so over the last few months, we've had a workshop in [inaudible] for Ethiopian generation panel. We helped organize session on LGR, root zone LGR at APR IGF, and the trainings and sessions in Sudan, Turkey, for Arabic taskforce. In time, we help support the Chinese, Japanese, Koran generation panel coordination meeting.

We've also been reaching out to the larger community. So, for example, through blogs and through our website, and also through our IDN mailing list. And here are a couple of contacts. You can see [inaudible] about the projects at our webpage, through our landing page at ICANN dot org slash IDN.

And that's our email address to contact. So, let me stop here and hand it over to integration panel members here, to talk about, give an update to you on the work they are undertaking. Thank you. We'll take the questions at the end of the session.

MARK:          Hello. I'm not [inaudible]. [Inaudible] is there. I'm Mark. I will be presenting a short presentation on what the integration panel has been doing since two ICANN ago. And, specific considerations on some scripts.

We have been doing a detailed review for near final GS4 [inaudible] Georgian, Lao, and Thai. Well actually, three of them now went to public comment. So, in our process, we, we are doing, we try to be involved in the early working of the generation panels to the end, instead of only being involved at the very end, when we received the LGR.

The idea here is to, you know, work together in a sense of… It's sometimes related to just the LGR format, the way the syntax works, or out to encode, you know the various scripts, and to a LGR representation. So, what I'm showing here is the fact that we actually are involved in the early work of the generation panels up to the end.

Where the detailed and final review happen at the very end, before we do, we provide some considerations or things that the generation panel should be thinking about. So, we did the interim reviews of the Chinese, initial feedback on Korean, and [inaudible] some communications with Japanese, [inaudible], and probably we may have others that we haven't written there.

So, it's an ongoing discussion with the generation panel. We also had a face to face session in June, in Seattle. Some considerations, and in fact, it's written here as Southeast Asian, you know, in at least the conclusion of this slide could be applied to any script.

So, we are seeing a good rate of progress, and at the same time, the IP itself, intrusion panel, is actually gaining some useful experience with these complex scripts. What that means, complex is not necessarily because, complex in the sense of the LGR work, and the fact the way they are rendered by the [inaudible].

So, this requires specific placement of certain code points to enable the actual correct rendering. And so, one thing here is, we need to be careful on, you know, mapping the [inaudible] into the LGR. So there is obviously some mid-ground here of making sure that we actually encode what is required in the LGR.

Another example of this, there is something, sometimes some limitations on letter recommendations that are customary, but not structural. Again, here, the purpose of the root zone or domain names are related to key words, and may not be real words in the actual script. So, we need to be careful on putting too much spelling rules into the LGR.

That's not the purpose. We're not trying to describe the language. We are trying to describe all you can write various characters into a label that could be of a non-existent word. So, we need to be careful on putting too much spelling rules into the LGR.

**EN**

And a corollary of this is that we want to make sure that the LGR itself is not too much complex for no good reason. So there is compromise here in terms of complexity and encoding. We are seeing good progress in SGK world. The [inaudible] have chaired the [preliminary?] LGR drafts. And [inaudible] again, [EIP?] to give detailed feedback earlier in the process.

Actually, when we wrote this slide a few weeks ago, we saw a good progress in variance, but we recently get even more information that it's going very well. Obviously, the big challenge in this context is to reduce the number of allocated variance. And so, the other thing is, also trying just to document the source and the use case for all variance, given the number of code points in this repertoire.

So again, when generation panel share preliminary LGR drafts with [inaudible] panels, that introduces early feedback and obviously, the consequences are faster convergence at the end. So we encourage generation panel to provide to us their preliminary LGR drafts, then if they're not finished.

That actually helps just to for formatting purposes, we can help the GP to format their LGR, the XML file as well as the document to be more conforming to what we expect. And get a, you know, a standard from that into all of the LGRs, so we actually help the generation panel just for, also for that purpose.

Some scripts, for example [inaudible], I think, like to present previous slide. There will be some presentations by the generation panel today on most of those scripts. I do not seem to have an agreed upon spelling, which makes, obviously, a GR design challenging. You will see a presentation today. We encourage [countries?], we'd really like to see especially Latin generation panel, in Latin GR itself to move forward, Latin being an important script to include into the LGR.

And finally, as [inaudible] was saying, the LGR for all specification is now a standard track I see. And now, a small note here is the namespace inside the XML exchange. So, be careful, but that's a more technical detail. And I think I'm done.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So thank you Mark. We'll move on to the next presentation, which is an update on IDN implementation and guidelines. And I'll request Edmond Chung who is one of the co-chairs to present. Thank you.

EDMOND CHUNG: Thank you so much. So, we actually had a public session yesterday, and I see very familiar faces around, so I'll try to be brief. The IDN implementation guidelines, is the purpose is really for focus a little bit more on second level registrations and

to address some of the user issues, and one of the interesting things about the IDN implementation guidelines is that it pertains both to ccTLDs, and gTLDs. This is a rather special document for, in the ICANN context.

And especially focusing on the gTLDs, in fact, because these guidelines are referenced in the registry agreement with all new gTLDs and some of the legacy gTLDs as well. So, this has pretty big impact in that aspect. So, there has been previously three versions over the last 10 almost 15 years now.

And the latest round of review started about a year ago, and we've been meeting at ICANN meetings as well as having conference calls every two weeks. This is the working group members. These are, I guess, experts from IDN and registry operational experience. And it includes members from the ALAC, ccNSO, GNSO, and the SSAC. And the three co-chairs, including myself, from GNSO, and Matt is from ccNSO, and [inaudible] from ALAC.

So, we so far we have split up into about nine areas, including the encouragement of the completion of the transition from IDNA 2003 to 2008. We are hoping to be somewhat ambitious in terms of terminology. There are lots of different terminology created for IDN over many years, and we're trying to see if it

makes sense on the operational sense to come to some agreement and better terminology going forward.

Mark just mentioned about the format of the IDN tables. The development of the LGR, we are looking to include that into the IDN implementation guidelines, which would then bring us to number four, which is the consistency of the IDN tables.

There is a general hope that there would be as much consistency as possible across TLDs, understanding that there may be differences, and also there may be differences between gTLDs and ccTLDs, but at least the format of which, and the approach of which, to be more consistent. And ultimately, addressing on user acceptance and user experience issues, on how to, how the consistency also relate to those, to user experience.

In fact, number one to number five, we have completed a first pass of, the working group has completed a first pass on coming up with some recommendations. I'll come back to that. But we are currently working on number six, and then hopefully we can complete six to nine in the next little while, and put out an interim report for public comments.

But six to nine, I think one of the key aspects is, of course, IDN variance. A lot have advanced in the last few years, since version three in 2011, on IDN variance. So we're looking to provide a better framework for TLDs implementing IDN variance. And then

seven to nine are a number of areas that we haven't completed yet, haven't started yet, and also potentially may or may not be included in the document.

In fact, some discussion and similarity and confusability of IDN labels, whether that first in within the guidelines, or what we need to point to other places for the actual dealing with that. You know, I think recently the SSAC report on some of these issues are relevant, and so how do we use that. And then number eight and number nine is the registration data, both on what is usually called WHOIS, but more officially called registration data at this point, and then EPP, the provisioning part of it.

So, the detailed text, you can actually find with the current draft, you can find in that very long link, but I guess you can search for it on the ICANN website. Next steps, as mentioned, the last four items were on the IDN variant issues, and then we'll try to complete the three other areas, and then we hope to release the proposed IDN implementation guidelines.

This is a first draft, out for public comment. After receiving the public comment, the working group will take those comments into consideration and try to finalize the guidelines. Upon the finalization, there will be another round of public comments,

just to highlight that. And again, that's the link for the draft so far. I encourage everyone to take a look at it.

If you have a need of feedback, please send it to us, or to the IDN program. So, with that, thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, we don't have, seem to be missing [inaudible] today. I'm not sure what's happened, but we will skip to the next presentation. So let me just go through that, and go on to [inaudible]. She's the chair of the Georgian generation panel.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good morning everyone. Since [inaudible] already introduced me, I'm [inaudible]. Sorry. Of the Georgian Generation panel. So I'm going to go through the updates following this agenda. I'm going to talk briefly on script and the principle languages that are using it. I'm going to introduce you the generational panel members, and the overall development process and methodology that they used while working on the LGR.

The challenges we faced and current progress will be the last part of my presentation. So, as far as the introduction of Georgian script. The Georgian scripts are coming into three writing systems. These are [inaudible], but the last one is the

current Georgian script, that is just from [inaudible] language. The rest are used are used for only historical religious writings.

So, the script is quite old. The first, it was found, dated back to 10th century, and it's written normally horizontally, [inaudible] left to right direction with the spaces between words. So, we don't have any upper characters, Georgian script comes only in a single type face.

So, the languages that are using this script are as follows, it's [inaudible] language, which is a south Caucasian language, and it's spoken by half a million people in total. The [inaudible] language, which is quite close to the [inaudible] one, and it's spoken mainly in Turkey and Georgia by about 33,000 people. It's [inaudible] language, which is a smaller speaking population. It's only 30,000 people, mainly in the northwest of Georgia.

And the [inaudible] language, which is a northwest Caucasian language, but they now mostly use Cyrillic alphabet for writing, for political reasons. So, let's move on to the panel members. I'm not going to go through the names, I'm sure you won't remember them, but I want to pay your attention to the diversity of the organizations they come from.

And I want to show you that their [expertise?] is quite significant to their designated roles. So, if you decide to contact any of

them, happy to assist you and provide the contact information. So, it's for the development process and methodology. You know they come up with a principles that are used to determine the [inaudible] [alliance], labels and points, so we organize several face to face meetings with the members I introduced on the previous slide.

And as I mentioned [inaudible] is also used to write several of the languages, except Georgian language. So we have me and other panel members, have looked at these languages during the analysis, and as long as the [inaudible], the language is also written in [inaudible] script, and it ups the rules of the Georgian script, with some of these [inaudible] characters are no longer every day speaking and writing.

However, they are designated by Unicode as the extensions for [inaudible], so we decided that this three code points, will not be included in the LGR, because they can't completely be substituted by other characters of more than [inaudible] script, and so we decided not to allow them because [inaudible] language is fully supported by the Georgian script LGR.

So, we are tightly engaged in an [online?] conversation with ICANN to get the recommendations. And I want to thank you again for your help. So as far as the challenges behind the process. While that is, while we were developing the LGR, we're

not manage challenges we faced, because our alphabet, as you can see, is quite unique, so we adopted the decisions of the [inaudible] or whole label evolution rules, in the use of the selected code points, as there are no cross script variance with any of the scripts.

So, the last one is the current progress and timeline. At the moment of making this presentation, about two weeks ago, we were at the public comment stage, which has now ended. So, we are hoping for the final submission. However, we face the main challenge here is that we didn't get real public feedback. So, if you just decide to comment, you can meet me here, and I would like to listen to your recommendations. Thank you.

Here is my contact information.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Thank you. So, we now move on to the next presentation, which is on the [inaudible] generation panel.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Thank you so much. Good morning everyone. I am [inaudible] from [Central?] Development for Advanced Computing. And I'm here to give you a brief update about the activities of [inaudible] generation panel that have been happening since a few days. So

at the end of the presentation, is introduction to the scripts that are part of the new [inaudible] generation panel.

Then an introduction to the generation panel members. When we started with the panel, we were faced with a difficult task of getting onboard the volunteers, for all of the scripts handling that we had taken onboard, to be part of the new [inaudible] generation panel. So, initial part of our GP activities, mainly getting the members onboard. So, I'll touch briefly upon the outreach activities that we did in that period.

The current progress, then I'll go on to the challenges that we are currently facing, which fortunately, yesterday with interaction of [inaudible] generation panel members, many of them I see are going away, and we see that we make a really good progress in time to come. And then, timelines, as we have decided at the end of the first face to face meeting that just happened.

So, as you can see, these are the scripts on the left-hand side of the table. So, there are two parts. And on each, you can see on the left-hand side, there are scripts, and on the right-hand side, there are languages. So, currently, we have taken [under our scope?] 21 languages, which are represented in 10 different scripts.

So, there are cases of multiple languages being [represented?] in same script, and the one language using two different scripts. So, you can see the major chunk of the languages that we are covering belong to the [inaudible] script. And there are three languages which belong to [inaudible] script. Now, okay, so before we…

I would like to just give you a brief background to where we came from. So, my organization [inaudible] was part of the national policy making process, before IDN program started. So, before we got into this, we had a comprehensive national policy [chopped out?] for all of the languages. And that policy was very detailed, and since it was one zone that we were talking about, and when I say one zone for a particular script, there would be only one ccTLD.

So, the rules were a bit relaxed, so that had already been done. And when we came to this new [inaudible] panel activities, and we, here we had to deal with the fact that there is only one zone that we are talking about, that is the root zone currently, as the prime focus on root zone. And here, we have to deviate from our policy of going by the language and coming to the script level.

So, there were obvious changes that needed to be done to the already existing policy that we know as exists in languages. So, I

guess the, that main challenge would be faced for the 10 [inaudible] languages, and three [inaudible] script languages.

That is, I think, would be one of the major activities in days to come. So, these are currently GP members, and since I said we have 21 languages under our scope, and then scripts. So, we're trying to get as many members from all of the languages possible. At least to review the work that we are doing, and giving us important feedback.

So, this is the, this is what we have got at the end of initial outreach efforts, and then after first face to face meeting, also there was faced a need that we should do more outreach and get more members onboard, so this list now is the outcome of that particular effort.

So, the initial outreach at first, where we conducted a workshop in [AP IGF?] 2014, where we issued a call for participation that was a workshop conducted where we appraised the community of all of the activities, the nature of activities, and we got a good response from there also. Then two ICANN channels, we also floated a call for participation. That was under the outreach effort.

And then we have been participating in, not on a very regular basis in ICANN meetings, but whenever we get a chance, we used to do the outreach as well as update sessions. So, what

has happened until now is the new [inaudible] made face to face first time in July 2015. There were considerable discussions about… So, the initial discussions in that meeting were focused on getting everybody onboard the concept of what is the IDN, because majority of the people were very proficient in their own languages, but they were not very much [inaudible] of the concept of what is a domain name.

Or, in some cases, what exactly takes for a language to be represented on a digital medium. And then challenges vis a vis digital medium, and written language. So those things we also needed to say, educate the linguists from that point of view. So, initial, in the first face to face, it was only updating all [inaudible] members about what exactly we are doing.

And at the end of the discussions [inaudible] we need more members. So, the meeting concluded at that point. So, again, I'll go through the points if I have missed something. So, inviting identified experts, since we had to take more members onboard, we had to revise the timelines that we had initially proposed. Then meeting over the [inaudible] being called, that is not actually happening again, because many of them are not that [inaudible].

So, this is not possible with them. But in the days to come, we plan to take a different approach, where we'll be focusing more

**EN**

on the mail communication rather than face to face meetings. So, and I hope that will definitely work out well. We also have plans to have a second face to face meeting, and let's see when that comes up.

Currently, we are in the [inaudible] phase, so we have come up with a set of [core point?] for eight to 10 languages. And even yesterday, we had good discussions with [integration?] panel members, and I think those discussions will definitely take us, make good progress on the whole [evolution?] and variant rules.

Coming back to the constitution of the new [inaudible] generation panel, so we have integration panel, and under that we have [inaudible] generation panel says new [inaudible]. What we plan to do is segregate as 10 different script based panels. And within each script panel, we plan to have language expertise for the languages that are spoken in the right script.

So, you can see the major deviations for the [inaudible]. Challenges in our developing [inaudible] are obviously, the shared number of languages and scripts that we are processing. That is one of the major challenges. So, a new set of conditions, and then existing policy. As I said, we had already been working on that, on a national policy, and that existed. But with the root [inaudible] came new set of [environment?] and reconsiderations.

So, major focus on, the major challenge was on that front, and then third one is the core team challenges, that is something that we have been facing. So, the way GPs constitute, there is like, we have three member core team, which used to do the [measure?] activities, and then only get the necessary feedback as in required from the language experts.

So, there have been some problems with the core team leaving some organizations, so that is one of the things that we have been facing right now. So, this is the timeline that we have proposed. As for the timeline, we are lagging behind because at this time, we are not on the [inaudible]…

But I think, with the new information that we had got, especially like [inaudible] has passed. And there is considerable information gathering that has happened that is, we need to relax some of the [inaudible] constraints in terms of simplicity of rules and everything. I think we can definitely achieve this timeline.

So, this concludes my presentation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Thank you. And we'll move on to the next presentation, which is done by [inaudible] on behalf of the Thai generation panel.

**EN**

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good morning everyone. I'm [inaudible], presenting on behalf of [inaudible], he is the have to be at a GAC meeting at the moment. So, today I'm going to go briefly on the background of the language, we mostly nearly to the end, so [inaudible] what are the code points, variants, the cross-script, and also the rules that we proposed.

So, a little bit on the background. The Thai language is actually the [inaudible] script, which is writing left to right. We don't have the space between words, which makes it a little bit harder to separate each word from each other. And we don't have the uppercase and lowercase. Normally, we write [inaudible] will happen around domain characters. Thai script appears in 35 languages, according to the [inaudible], but it's not very active in use.

The one that's really active is [inaudible] within the territory of Thailand. So the Thai [GP?] considered six main languages, which is spoken in Thailand. Basically the Thai would be written in Thai itself, the other five, some they have their own script as well from the [inaudible] time.

So, basically, the can do it both ways. So the root that we are working, is relaxing some of the spelling, so, if they wish to spell their language in Thai correctors, they still can be doing in their dialect.

One of the special things that we have, this is a little challenge, but we are quite lucky that before this, this issue has been solved for [inaudible]. The issue is if you see this one above is the tone, so basically, first of all, you can type tone [inaudible] in the different sequence, it appears as the same, but in the computer core, it will recognize this differently.

So, this thing we have one standard in Thailand to fix this. So the sequence of the typing has been defined, and we follow this document as well. Also, we have both [inaudible] and [inaudible], so basically if you have the [inaudible] then, the [inaudible] can be in a different place as well. But this also is already solved and handled in the previous standard we defined.

So, we used that standard to be the input of our considerations. Also that standard refers to the spelling, grammar in the ministry of education. So, we just use this [inaudible]. So it's coming to the core point. We decided to remove some, and the one, we also have the one that added in is the code point sequence, which is [inaudible] on working on some of the rules.

So, for example, if some [inaudible] definitely have to follow the exact [consonant?], then you don't really have to create a specific rule for that. So, this is something that, after you submit a proper proposal to the [integration?] panel, they have good

feedback and a lot of suggestions that you can simplify your work.

So for the variance, we have quite a bit of it, but it's unresolved, so some of the [inaudible], you can look the same, if you type two times twice on this, has to be shown in the rules. Also, not in this slide, but we also considering the variant across the script, we're working in the, pretty much the same [inaudible] with Kamer and Laos, because we have the rules of the language is similar.

However, we don't find a significant [singularity?], so there is no cross-script variant. So, at the end, this is the rules. I'm not going to go through this. It's about seven or eight rules now. We actually almost at the end, but currently there is one challenge that we still have to figure it out is a funny fact of the language. We have one specific mark, which is the functional as a repetition mark.

So, instead you type, dot, dot, you can type dot and then that mark, which is meaning the same, look different. Is not really used in a formal language like in the official document, you won't find it. But in the everyday life, you use it, which the internet thing is more under everyday life, so now we are, this mark, [inaudible] and Thai have, all we have, Kamer decided not

to include it.  Laos decided to include it, so as Thai, I know we have to go back and discuss how we want to do.

So, that's the only part that we still left off, and we can solve it soon.  Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Thank you.  And now we'll go to our last presentation of the session.  We have the Ethiopic Generation Panel chair here.  So let me scroll the slides back to Ethiopic GP, and then we'll start.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     [Inaudible], the chair of Ethiopic Generation Panel.  I will briefly describe the activities the Ethiopic Generation Panel has carried out since establishment.  I'll first give few words about the script background, and the composition of the generation panel members.  And the challenge that we have of developing the label generation rules.  And then the progress and [inaudible] on the development of the label generation rule sets.

So to say a few words about the script background.  Ethiopic script is 1,600, more than 1,600 all [inaudible] script.  It's used for the national language of Ethiopia and [inaudible].  Ethiopia is the second populous country in the region, so there are more than [inaudible].  So of the [inaudible], which use the script languages, their writing system is not more than 20, but out of

**EN**

those 20 which fulfills the criteria for label generation [inaudible] development, are only eight.

So in this label generation rule set, the development process will have only considered [eight?] language out of the many languages of the country. The user community of the script are, besides from Ethiopia, there are many countries which makes use of the script in their racking system.

The country code [inaudible] Africa… In fact, there is [inaudible] community living in this country, historically, it is one of the uses of the script, but there are [inaudible] South Africa, South Sudan, Kenya, United States, and Europe, and Australia, can also use the script. So the letter of the Ethiopic [inaudible] have this characters [inaudible] has both a consonant and a vowel.

As you can see, to describe a particular code point or character, for example, there is one code point which we call [inaudible]. It has six other characters, we [inaudible]…

We go up to six order. The code points, one of the characters [inaudible] some language have some phonic decay, or some [redundancy?], particularly one of the languages. The [Abrahamic?] language is derived from the ancestor language which is known as [inaudible]. So in [inaudible] there are properties of code points like phonic decay or what we call homophones.

So that means a particular order, you can look at that. In Ethiopic, we call that the first word [foreign language], and second word [foreign language], was they produce the same sound, but in [inaudible], the ancestor of one of the Ethiopic language, is treated this treated, what it is treated as homonyms.

But [inaudible], there are no longer homonyms. For example, there is the first [inaudible], as you can see, it says sung, and the second one is [inaudible]. So, this properties, [inaudible] to do is ancestor language.

When it comes to [inaudible] language, that's the first word. And the second word [inaudible] is the same message, [inaudible] is the same message. So, as you can see, we have a little bit challenge in terms of identifying the variants. There are many variants. We have identified a collection of variants in the label generation have [inaudible] integration panel.

We have seriously addressed these issues. So this is about the composition of the generation panel members. The first person, the chair of the generation panel. Then we have, as we can see, linguists by profession. We have also people from the, who have a background in cyberspace and internet governance.

So, these are the list of members of the generation panel. The challenge that we have here is we are trying to develop the label

**EN**

generation rules, mainly language mostly being [inaudible]. We do not find information about language, the [world?]. And then we had, because of that, we had made some deviation from the original timeline that we submitted while we, the first time when we submitted our proposal for forming the generation panel.

So these are the [inaudible] that we have [teared?] it out. We have submitted so far two times. We first submitted an early version of the LGR proposal, for the integration panel. We received feedback. And then recently, we also resubmitted, and then we have, it was around October 24th, we all received feedback from the integration panel. Generally, what we are right now, missing in terms of completing the proposal is the LGR, which the XML version of the LGR.

Aside from that, I think we are almost one step closer to complete the proposal. We only need the XML version of the LGR, the rule sets. And the tested data. So, thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Thank you. And that actually concludes all of the presentations. Let me also point out that we have another session later during the morning, where we will have all of the communities also presenting, and some more detailed feedback from the integration panel on the work which is being done for root zone LGR.

With that, let me open the floor for any questions or comments anybody has here or online.

[Inaudible] and then Don.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, my question is… This is [inaudible] from JPLS. My question is to the [inaudible], that you said, you are [inaudible] with [inaudible] script. Are you going to integrate all of this [inaudible] and script in one LGR, or separate LGR?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is [inaudible] for the record. So, initially, we were thinking of going by language wise in LGR, we would be having a tag for each repertoire, but I guess recently, we are going to shift to the… I'm looking at [inaudible], and [inaudible] discussion yesterday. Probably the call has been taken that we should be going rather on a script basis, rather than language basis.

So, we'll still decide on that. I guess that is doable. It just means relaxing some of the rules. But we won't do that at the cost of security, securely accessing the domain names. So, we'll see, but initially now, right now, the plan is going script wise.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Don.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you very much. Don Hollander from New Zealand. So, I have a couple of questions. So, the first is, what's the cover of ccTLDs in their engagement with the environment, and their agreement that they are going to follow these rules at their second and third levels within the ccTLDs?

And is there anybody generally looking at symbols? So these are the Unicode characters that are associated with any language at all, or any script at all, but a clearly growing space for millennials, or Generation Z, or generation something. People much younger than I am, seem to be how they talk.

And then also, Edmund raised EPP, but didn't go into much detail, and I would just like to know what the implications are around EPP for the work that is being done. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Let me take the second one first, about symbols. And I think for the root zone work, at least that is based on whatever is shortlisted through the IDNA 2008 protocol. And that work obviously is done at IETF. So, in a way, I think that discussion really needs to be taken to that platform. What we do here is actually, for the root zone, there is a procedure laid out, based on whatever has been shortlisted through IDN 2008.

And we are forming that procedure. Your first question, you're talking about IDN implementation for cc space. Was that pertaining to second level LGRs or for IDN implementation guidelines?

DON HOLLANDER: Second level.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, second level LGR are just reference LGRs. They're out there for the community to refer to in case they need to use it. There is no obligation, as such, to use them either for gTLDs or for ccTLDs. They're just there for people to refer to. So, you know, if ccs want to take a look at it, we'd love, you know it would be great that, you know, if they... If these can be offered through the ccs, it would be great.

If ccs would like to take a look at it and give us feedback, that would be even better. So that we can improve these tables, so we would like eventually that one of the aim of making this reference LGRs is to make sure that community can possibly look at these tables and see if they can find common solutions, so that end users can have a consistent experience.

But again, it's up to the individual registries to decide how they want to use this second level LGRs.

DON HOLLANDER: So, thank you very much. I understand that, particularly about ccs. But my question is, are you getting engagement from the ccTLDs who are saying, oh look, there is this great work being done at the second, in your recommendations, your advisor guidelines, I'll just take that up, but thank you very much for doing the work.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are getting some engagement with ccTLDs, but not, I think, at a significant level. We hope, I guess, we hope that there will be more engagement as these tables start getting used. Coming to your third question, maybe Edmond, you want to respond to the EPP question?

EDMOND CHUNG: Sure. Edmond here. So, I guess adding to [inaudible] a little bit on the first two as well, personally I think emoji are great, but the Generation Z, it would probably be more creative and oh dot oh, would perfectly be fine as an emoji. But again, the word needs to be done at IETF. So, second level LGRs, I think in terms of ccTLDs, they, a lot of the reference LGRs, as I understand, is drawn from the ccTLD experience.

**EN**

So, that's a starting point already. And in the IDN implementation guideline, the revised version, we will be specifically addressing that particular issue, and that goes to ccTLDs as well. So I think the right time to reach out to them would be when the IDN implementation guidelines are complete. At least this version is complete, and then it could be a good point of outreach to them at that point. So in terms of EPP, in fact, it's a place holder at this point. There are a number of items like how the IDN string is passed back and forth.

There is an issue of how variants are handled over EPP. There is relationship on the, potentially on child hosts, or host objects on EPP and how to handle those related to IDNs and IDN variance. So, there are possible items, but I don't want to front run the discussion, it's currently just a placeholder for the working group to consider.

It may turn out that there is nothing that the working group should speak on the matter as well. So, that's where we are, I think.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. There was a question towards the end of the table here.

**ICANN|57
HYDERABAD**
3-9 November 2016

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     [Inaudible]. I'm a Fellow here, [inaudible] Project. So the question is about, because the script [inaudible] …almost my script, so I think this could [inaudible] increasing on the Unicode versions now. But in the IDN, I think after the IDN [inaudible] there is no version came up off the IDN there.

So, are we working some, anywhere idea for IDN standard update for the more script? That's one part. Second part is, I also think that, in the [inaudible] language, I think only [inaudible] is listed, the [inaudible] script, which is supported in Unicode 5.1, which must part for IDN [inaudible].

So that is not seen in the graph here. So.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So, [inaudible]. So, [inaudible] for the record. To answer your question in reverse order, the set of scripts that is being considered for the root zone, is currently limited by the set of scripts contained in the maximum starting repertoire, which is, itself, a subset of the available IDNA 2008 code points and scripts.

Now, the maximum starting repertoire does not include [inaudible] at this point. There is no fundamental reason why it could not be included. Required for that, would be a clear indication that it is in widespread use as a writing system for the

purpose of things like domain names. So, certain kinds of identifiers.

And evidence for that would be needed, and also evidence that there is a community willing to help define the label generation rule sets that could be used in the root. If both of those conditions were met, there would be no principled reason why it could not be added to the maximum starting repertoire in an update.

And if a community gets together and does the work and develops a LGR afterwards, then there is no principled reason why it could not successfully also be supported in the root zone. However, there is a number of scripts that we know are being used by some populations in some ways today, that we have felt that, at the current state of our knowledge about them, weren't ready for being included in the maximum starting repertoire.

But we, if you read the document that accompanies the MSR, you find that we are aware of this issue, in that we consider many of these other scripts not excluded, but deferred up to the point that somebody can demonstrate to us that they do, in fact, meet the criteria to be included.

So that was the second part of your question. The first part of your question had to do with the fact that the IDNA 2008 work is currently stopped at Unicode 6.3, where as Unicode does not

feel compelled itself to stop for that reason, and has moved on to 7.0, 8.0, 9.0, and is happily working towards 10.0 this year, due out next June.  And the June after that, there will be 11.0 and so on.

And, this is an issue that many people are aware of undermining the original concept of IDNA 2008, which was that it was going to be updated to new versions of Unicode, as a matter of course, and regularly, and expeditiously, and not limited to a fixed repertoire.  And the reason we have not seen more [inaudible] on this, it was discussed about a year and a half ago in the IETF, is that while there is a number of ideas of what can be done, the situation failed due to critical mass of people willing to work on it.

And currently, I myself, and a few other people, are trying to see if we can get that critical mass together to get that process started up again.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    To the first part of the question, the first time [inaudible] which is about the word [inaudible].  Right now, there is a government of India mandate came out last month, mandating [inaudible] cell phones sold in India must have Indian language [inaudible] support, for all 22 official languages, and [inaudible] is one among that, and [inaudible] is another phone, so maybe at the

**EN**

time [inaudible] panelists will [inaudible] not have much use for this.  But when Android starting supporting [inaudible], there is a huge user base.

And I'm feeling, because [inaudible] also involved in developing in the landscape [inaudible], which is totally open source.  And there is a community demand for including keyboard layout into that.  So I think that is a community idea now, in [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    So, I think as next steps for that particular script community, would be to organize themselves into a generation panel, or connect with the [inaudible] generation panel, and volunteer some members of the community to that panel, and start the work.

So it is totally up to the community to organize themselves and present it as far as work is concerned, you know, if there is a case which is presented, which shows an active widespread use for the script, you know, on our side, we can certainly update the MSR.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    We can help with that.

**EN**

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I just have one quick point to add. We are aware of the script nature of some of the languages, which also is meeting [inaudible] script for [inaudible] and everything. But when we started on the new [inaudible], we thought we would concentrate on the major scripts first time, and then when we get more community support, and some experience behind us, we would probably again, need to take the case to MSR and get it included in the MSR.

So that will need to be done eventually.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any more questions or comments? We are coming to the end of the session here. So, one last comment from Mark, and then we'll close.

MARK: I wanted to react to the question about symbols and emoji. They're currently completely un-allowed in any domain name at the IDN level, because the IDNA technology disable it. So, it's not about rules or anything, it's just completely disabled.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are actually at the end of the session, so if it's okay, we can take it over the break. So thank you all for attending the session.

We have another one soon afterwards, so please come and attend that as well. Thank you very much for your attention and we'll close the session.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**