EN

COPENHAGEN – ICANN GDD: UASG Workshop
Sunday, March 12, 2017 – 13:45 to 18:30 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

DON HOLLANDER: Welcome, everyone. It's now 1:47 in the morning in my body's time zone. My name is Don Hollander. This is the Universal Acceptance Steering Group Workshop. We've had a tradition of this for the past couple of years where we get together early on the ICANN meetings to do some work. On the mailing list there's been a number of agendas/papers sent out and we're going to get a start.

For those of you in the expensive seats in the back we do have space here at the table which includes a physical table that you can actually lean on and put your computer on so you don't have to prove that it is indeed a laptop. So you're welcome to join us here. We expect this to be a interactive session.

Please feel free to raise your hands and ask questions and so forth, but as you speak into the microphone please state your name so that people who aren't here can actually have some idea who's saying what.

Now I'd like to introduce our Chair, Ram Mohan, and Ram, I'll try to drive the slides and you drive the gathering.

EN

RAM MOHAN: Thank you and good afternoon. This is the workshop session for the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. As Don said, we've been gathering along with the ICANN meetings for the last little while. The origin of this initiative really came from the recognition of the fact that what originally looked like a much more isolated problem is a much larger problem now, particularly with introduction of all the new TLDs – both gTLDs, ccTLDs, IDN, etc. – and that the scope of the problem has changed and the frequency of occurrence potentially has also increased. That led to the formation of eventually what became the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. It's a community-driven group. It's not an ICANN group. We've been the recipients of funding from ICANN to help drive progress, to help drive things forward.

When the Universal Acceptance Steering Group got started, one of the first things that we recognized was that it was important to level set and understand what does Universal Acceptance mean? What are these terms? Lots of people are using Universal Acceptance as a term without some common set of definitions, etc.

In the last more than a year, the biggest set of things that the Universal Acceptance Steering Group has done has been to

produce a set of what it would like to think are reference documents – documents that provide clarity about the usage of terms and also clarity about the meanings of the various terms that are used. So when you hear, for instance, " UA-ready" or when you hear, for instance, "storage display," things like that, inside of the Universal Acceptance context they're not just regular words in English. Effectively we've defined them and when we're using them, we're using them in that context. That's a useful background.

There's a whole set of documents and other information that has been produced. It's all public. You can find it on UASG.tech, and the work of the UASG is also public, there's mailing lists, it's archived, it's accessible, so on and so forth. That is really a focus of Universal Acceptance itself.

There is a – it's not a corollary, but it's also a part of Universal Acceptance – is the fact that it's not just top-level domains, it's not just second level domains, it's not just acceptance of domain names, but also one of the biggest uses of domain names in the world is in e-mail. It used to be that all you worried about was the distinctions between left to right versus right to left writing schemes, but when you start to introduce those complexities plus how e-mail and e-mail systems work, there's a different set of issues and that short form there is EAI – E-mail Address Internationalization. You'll find some people call it "IDN e-mail"

which is, from a pure technical definition, both redundant and wrong. So inside of the UASG we end up focusing on, when we speak about e-mails and how multiple scripts, etc., various representations, are done, we use EAI and that's E-mail Address Internationalization.

It's a separate topic because the sets of issues that we have to deal with as users of the Internet, as people who use e-mail addresses, there's quite a bit of overlap but in some areas there are specific and unique things that have to do with the nature of e-mail, some history about how mail agents work, how clients work, etc. So by itself, it's kind of a separate linked but separate area.

Part of the reason why E-mail Address Internationalization is a Universal Acceptance issue, I can think of at least a couple of reasons, but one of them is when somebody registers a domain name and people start to use the domain name on a regular basis, one of the common things that is done is then people say, "I want to use that domain name in my e-mail address." And if you take the case where both the top-level domain, the second level domain, all of them, are, say, in a particular character set, it's entirely understandable, it would be understandable, that folks say, "I want to have my actual e-mail address – what's preceding the @ symbol – also to be in that character set. There are a couple of things that come as a result of that. You have

EN

systems that may not recognize what that is and you also are pretty likely to have humans on the other side of it who don't recognize what it is. In fact, I think even now there are several systems that say that if there is an EAI, you can "safely classify" it as spam because it is in a script that is not understandable.

So there is a UA issue there as well because if I have a real, valid, legitimate, e-mail address, then there is a reasonable expectation that that e-mail address be able to traverse and reach the other side, assuming that the various technical parameters are accurate. There's a reasonable assumption of that from users and the fact is that that reasonable assumption is not actually the case in the real world. That's why it is also a UA issue.

For those of you who have attended the UA workshops, you'll note that this is probably the longest speech you'll hear, and all the rest has to be in workshop mode. And even here, if I'm saying something wrong I have so many friends here who will correct me and say, "That's absolutely wrong." And that's the wright way to do it because this is not about showing authority, this is really about sharing experiences and understanding the problem space and figuring out what to do better or what to do different or what to stop doing because we're not doing it the right way.

The other thing is, currently the way the UASG is structured there is a coordination group. There are a couple of major initiatives that the UASG is working on so there's a EAI work that the UASG is working on. There is also work that goes into communications and outreach, etc. And we have coordinators for those and in addition there are in the way the Bylaws of the charter of the group is, there's a Chair. I'm the Chair and then there are Vice Chairs of the UASG and in a moment when I finish speaking I'll ask folks to introduce themselves and provide a little bit of their background including all of you back benchers.

As kind of normal governance, there's an election in progress right now. There was an election for Chair and Vice Chair. The Chair election results are out. I've been reappointed as Chair but I'm term-limited. And the way we set it up originally was that no office bearer can be in that office for more than two terms. Each term can be two years. So two years are done. There's another two-year term, and that's just starting up. So that's happening.

There's also election for Vice Chairs that is underway. I think 19th of March is the deadline for those votes to come in and it's open to all. I'd encourage you to meet all the folks. There are six people who are in contention for three Vice Chair positions. I'd encourage you to meet or talk to everybody who is in contention and to understand what's motivating them to volunteer and to really serve, because at the end of the day this thing only runs

because everybody's interested and everybody's volunteering and contributing their time. I'd also encourage you to vote. It's important. It adds credibility and legitimacy to everything that we're doing.

With that, let me actually ask to go around the room for everybody to say who they are and what their interest is, what their affiliation is. I don't know if there's a microphone that's roving for the folks there in the back. If not, I'd ask for you to come up here to one of the microphones and speak.

Why don't we start from there and go forward?

SATISH BABU: Good afternoon. My name is Satish Babu and I work with the Asia Pacific Regional At-Large Organization of ICANN At-Large. My interest in UAI is from I am also part of the IDN Working Group and I come from India where Internationalized Domain Names as well as Universal Acceptance are very big things now, especially right now the government is going through a lot of effort to bring in many, many, millions into the online cyberspace and this becomes a very interesting challenge in India. Thank you.

EDMOND CHUNG: This is Edmond Chung from .asia. I guess my interest being a pioneer of IDNs and have been running some new gTLDs, that's kind of a [form] background, but I'm also a pretty strong believer in diversity, special cultural diversity, and I think this is a big part of it to be able to express our identities in different languages but also in different words on the Internet with domain names. And that's I guess the interest that I have. Thank you.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: I'm Sigmund Fidyke with icann.org. I run Dev and QA and Architecture and Cyber security there. I'm a rubber meets the road kind of guy so globalization is in my blood and this is what we have to make happen so I'm all about making it happen.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Hi, everyone. I'm Andrew Robertson with the PR Firm Edelman. Most of you will be aware that we've been assisting UASG with their raising awareness of the key issues here and I'm here today to provide an update on the Comms program.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Andrew. Asmus, do you want to do a quick introduction?

ASMUS FREYTAG: My name is Asmus and since I won't be left alone until I speak I have now spoken.

MARK SVANCAREK: I'm Mark Svancarek from Microsoft. I used to just be "Mark from Microsoft" but I think I'm familiar enough now that I'll let people struggle with my last name.

LARS STEFFEN: I'm Lars Steffan. I'm with eco – Association of the Internet Industry. Together with Christian Dawson, I'm co-Coordinator of the Outreach Project Group of the UASG and eco is gathering a number of registries that are dealing with a UA issue so this is the reason why I'm here.

PETER MEYER: Peter Meyer from eco as well. I was invited by Christian and Lars today to talk a little bit about abuse and give some feedback from Anti-Abuse community on UASG today.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Richard Merdinger with GoDaddy as Vice President of Domains. My interest in this group is that we provide products to millions of people that we want to make sure that they actually function and they function with integrity and consistently. I'm also one of

the Vice Chairs of the UASG since its inception and am the Chair of the Domain Name Association.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: My name is Andrew Sullivan. I am currently employed by Dyn which is currently being acquired by Oracle, and I am currently the Chair of the Internet Architecture Board, but that I can say for sure will stop in a couple of weeks. I guess the reason I'm here is because I have been interested in this for some time. I used to work at Afilias when we deployed IDNs first there and I did some of the work on some of the various LGR stuff and the Variant Issues Project and that stuff.

RAEDENE MCGARY: Hi. My name is Raedene McGary. I'm from CentralNic and I work with a number of new gTLDs, IDNs, and I'm currently working on two more Fast Track IDNs from different parts of the world. It continues to be an interesting topic for me. Thank you.

KIM KYONGSOK: My name is Kim Kyongsok from Korea. In the past I was involved in IDNA and EAI so that's why I'm here. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I am [inaudible]. I'm from [.bzr] new IDN gTLD. I specifically am more interested in seeing IDNA2008 implemented fully by the browsers.

SEBASTIEN PENSIS: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Sebastien Pensis. I'm here with WURid, the ccTLD registry for the .eu domain. We publish a regular report – The IDN World Report .eu – just talking about the state of IDNs in the world, looking a little bit at how they're growing and so we're always very excited to be able to listen in to other people who are advocating for the use and growth of IDNs and always looking for points of cooperation where and when possible.

ALEXANDER CHILIKOV: Hello everyone. My name is Alexander Chilikov from Valideus Limited, a new gTLD consulting firm providing front end registry management services and assisting with the application process for new gTLD registries. Our interest is to better understand the issues you're tackling and to provide better services to our clients.

GUSTAVO LOZANO: Gustavo Lozano, ICANN staff. This is a topic that is of a lot of interest for me.

[AARON BIDAHONG]:   Hello. My name is [Aaron Bidahong]. I work with [Orange] which is my current employer. I also [inaudible] Telecommunication Network Operators Association. I'm involved representing [inaudible] in the [Orange] in the ISPCP Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers, and as you know, this is a very big issue for us.

ALINA SYUNKOVA: Hello. My name is Alina Syunkova. I'm currently employed by Uniregistry and I've been following Universal Acceptance issues since 2015 and I believe that it's one of the most important issues. I'm here as an observer.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sarmad Hussain. I'm ICANN staff with the IDN program.

[TIAN JONG]:   I'm [Tian Jong]. I'm working for .asia. [Inaudible] and me used to co-Chair the IDN Cross-Community Working Group and also I used to work for APTLD where the region has a big interest in IDN.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

[LUI]:   Hello. My name is [Lui]. I came from China Academy of Information Communication Technology and we are the think tank to [inaudible] and we also have signed an MoU with ICANN three years ago and we are the local partner. And we also have [Chinese] Community Engagement in cooperation with [GAC] of ICANN and then we also pushed the Universal Acceptance and IDN application in China and we have a UA-ready test by the USC development and [through the] to test how the China market the preparation for the UA situation and we will have the… I carry our book here and I will give you the book about the test report. Okay. Thank you.

GRETCHEN OLIVE: My name is Gretchen Olive. I'm with CSC Digital Brand Services. We're one of the largest corporate registrars out there so we're very interested in making sure that the new gTLDs on both the ASCII and IDN side work properly as well as we represent well over a third of the .brands that applied in round one so obviously making sure that our clients can get maximum use out of their .brands.

DON HOLLANDER: I'll just point out that Universal Acceptance is about IDNs and non-IDN top-level domains, so it's not just an IDN issue. It is an ASCII issue, even a short ASCII issue.

BRIAN CONCHURATT: I'm Brian Conchuratt. I work for Corsearch. I'm the Director of Product Strategy for our Domain Services and I just need to make sure that our software supports Universal Acceptance.

[CAM]: [Inaudible]. I'm [Cam]. I'm with Amazon Registry Team. We manage Amazon's TLD portfolio and UA I think has been an issue for quite a while and I'm now with the registry side of things so I'm interested in knowing more. I'm here more as an observer.

LUNA MADI: I'm Luna Madi. I head Communications for Europe, Middle East, and Africa, for ICANN, so Universal Acceptance is one of the issues that we work on creating awareness for. So I'm here to really see where we are and learn more. Thank you.

GWEN CARLSON: Hi. I'm Gwen Carlson. I'm the Senior Director of Comms at ICANN and I work with the UASG on their communications efforts and help Luna do pretty much whatever she tells me.

[JOHAN SAMPSON]: Hello. My name is [Johan Sampson]. I'm a software developer and architect from a small software company called

[SuperNova]. I'm just here to learn today, to try to learn something new. Thank you.

KEISUKE KAMIMURA: Hello. My name is Keisuke Kamimura. I work for a university in Tokyo. I'm a linguist by profession so I'm always interested in how technology affects the use of language. Thank you.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks very much. For this group there are more chairs over there and that's where the chocolate will be. And [Johan] here is here because we spent an hour together in the canal in Copenhagen yesterday and he looked like an IT guy and it turns out he was.

I'll just let people know that we do have people online so we have Dr. Data who's in India, Andre, Dennis, [Hazim], Jim, Joseph, Lars is in two places at once, Roger, and [inaudible]. I think that's all pretty much. I'm trying to multitask here which is a bit of a challenge. No, I think I'll be okay.

My name is Don Hollander. I'm the Secretary General or Chief Cook and Bottle-washer for the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. When people ask what I do, I just… I try to help.

What I'd like to do is spend just a few minutes talking about some of the things that we're doing in brief, some things we're doing well, some things that we're not doing so well, and I'd like advice from this group if there's something that's in the wrong column or something that's missing. This is not an update on what the UASG is doing. We've done those in the past. They take about 90 minutes and not where I want to spend the time.

The communications work – we'll hear a little bit later about quite a lot of the work that the Communications Team is doing, so thanks very much to Lars and Christian who's not here and Gwen in particular for helping this. We have a very clear strategy and a set of tactics on how we're addressing the communications of the work that we're doing.

We have projects to do some evaluations on browsers, messaging, and e-mail, that is not going so well. One of the challenges here is finding people to do the work. That's where I would particularly like some help. So we have projects well-defined. We have funds to fund the projects and we're just looking for people to redo [a] review of browsers – how UA-ready are the browsers? The short answer is we think they're pretty UA-ready but we want a structured evaluation. We have a project to look at messaging systems – social media messaging systems, LINE, or Skype, or Facebook messaging, or whatever.

There's perhaps a dozen or two dozen different messaging platforms – to see how UA-ready they are.

We have a third project to look at e-mail systems of the very largest e-mail software and service providers to see how UA-ready or EAI-ready they are. And that's proving to be the hardest task of finding somebody to do that work.

Programming languages – we had this vision that we would look at the most common open source programming languages, see if they are UA-ready and if they weren't, to make them so. So that project has not started well. We've changed some parties involved in that and we'll hear a little bit later from Sara to give us some ideas to where we're going. So the first task is to create the evaluation criteria. She'll give us an update on where we're at with that. And then for people to go out and do the evaluation, come back to the community, report on that, and then to go out and fix it, and then we will rinse and repeat that for the next 18 months.

Rich?

RICHARD MERDINGER: Thank you, Don. I understand your comment regarding difficulty in getting resources to execute on the well-defined projects, and the construct to date has been to try to find someone to hire to

do so. Is it time to look at alternatives whether – and maybe you have so I apologize if I'm assuming anything – through universities or through organizations where rather than trying to pay someone to just get your results, to engage with an organization that could help drive the result even if it's done on a little bit longer time frame?

DON HOLLANDER: Those are both good points. We're certainly looking to work with organizations and not just individuals, and we're also looking at universities. In fact, one of our projects is to develop some university lecture notes, and we're struggling to develop some choice in people who can do that work with some confidence. So yes, universities are on our list and we've reached out to universities in Latin America, in Eastern Europe, in New Zealand, and North America, and we're still struggling. But good ideas. Thanks.

The next thing on the list is local engagement, so the Universal Acceptance Steering Group is looking at things at a global scale. We have in our budget, in our plans, to help facilitate local Universal Acceptance initiatives, not so much in developing core documentation or developing the evaluations but to raising the issue within the software community.

Our target audience are software developers and system architects. So here is a classic example of somebody that we're trying to reach and we've done that. So that's one out of 18 million. So we just have a few more to go. We're looking for people to start some UA initiatives locally. We have funds. I call it "beer money." It could be chips and nuts money. I don't really care. We put out a "help wanted" ad which is how we do things and we expect to be getting some proposals coming shortly. And hopefully later today we'll hear from some initiatives if people show up – so Germany – Lars is here. There should be somebody from Thailand and somebody from Argentina later on.

EAI is one of our big topics. And just to be clear, EAI is the issue because, not so much that the domain name could be an IDN – that is an issue, relatively easy – but the harder bit is the mailbox name doesn't have to be in ASCII and that's the bit that's particularly hard. So we have a session towards the end of the day that Mark's going to drive. We have an EAI workshop scheduled for Seattle next month. We think we've recently released the Quick Guide to EAI for those of you who haven't read it, these are all on the UASG.tech /documents website and we have plans to do an EAI bug bashing Technical Implementation Review to identify issues. That'll be happening in Seattle. And we're also working on an introduction to EAI – quite an extensive technical document very much like our

introduction to Universal Acceptance. And our challenge there is, again, to find somebody who can take the lead from the community of volunteers and do the writing. We thought we had somebody and they slipped through our fingers. So we're still interested in somebody who can write well and understands e-mail.

IDNA is moving slowly but with some direction and Asmus, who is shy, is helping us drive that through the IETF community. Some progress has been made over the past few months where a different approach to the IDNA Unicode issue came up where we might actually see that responsibility shift from the global amorphous community and into the registry who will need to take that responsibility.

I don't understand the full details, but he's not objecting violently so I think I must be pretty close. And there was an e-mail that came out recently on an Internet draft from John [Clenson] who is sort of the Father of international e-mail, and he's suggesting that these things might happen, so there is some hope there.

And I said the biggest challenge is finding people to do the technical work, and we are not financially constrained so ICANN has been very generous over the past couple of years and expect to be generous again and our biggest problem is we can't spend

the money that they're allocating us, partially because I tend to be frugal and Rob tends to be even more frugal, but neither one of us is really afraid to spend the money as long as we think we're going to get good value for it.

That's just a quick update on where we're at and I'm happy to take any questions or criticisms.

Is this the after lunch –

RAM MOHAN: I'm going to ask the folks who are here to comment on two things. One is, we set out this work plan about a year ago and we're executing on this work plan. It'd be great now or sometime in this workshop session if you think there are other pieces of work that are important in moving the Universal Acceptance agenda forward, if you bring them here for discussion and potentially for adoption. It's a quick cycle. You look at some of these topics here a year ago somebody came to the microphone and said, "I think this is important. I think you are the right guys to do it." We had maybe five minutes' worth of discussion and then we adopted it and then we were able to go find money to go get somebody to go work on it. So there's a process that is low barrier to entry to get some of these ideas implemented, so I'd encourage you to think about it if you have ideas that are actually going to help Universal Acceptance move forward

please bring them forward into our sessions because that's the way…the ideas had to come from all of you folks. And our job in terms of what we are supposed to do is to try and execute and make those ideas become reality. So put your thinking caps on and don't feel shy to bring up ideas and work items that we could legitimately do.

DON HOLLANDER: You don't all have to raise your hands at once.

Edmond.

EDMOND CHUNG: I guess just adding to what Ram was saying is that we've set out to do this work but we need more feedback so that we are actually allocating the resources in the right places and making impact. Of course, we try to make our best guesses but it's important to get the feedback as well. I know from those who are in the room are kind of looking at IDNs and looking at different issues as well. If you see something that maybe should be done and it's not on the list, please bring it up.

DON HOLLANDER: Rich.

RICHARD MERDINGER: One of the things – for those of you that haven't followed the UASG since its inception – it started off being a working group of individuals that had ideas, and whenever a new idea came up, there was a little hesitancy because along with it came a work load. And where we migrated to today, which is different from some of the other communities that I've been part of, is we literally are looking for good ideas and owners of driving the idea with the work being done by people with which we engage. So having an idea and having a need, there isn't the downside of, "I'm just giving myself more work." It's, "let us know what it is so we can help get it prioritized and in the pipeline."

This is a rare opportunity at an ICANN meeting – and I know we're adjacent to ICANN – but to get your needs and desires out there and let us rally the resources to try to help make it happen. By the way, that means Don.

SEBASTIEN PENSIS: Good afternoon, everyone. I was wondering if I might be able to discuss the local engagements idea. I think that the deployment of Universal Acceptance, getting IDNS and ASCII and other scripts out there, is a huge task, and doing it on a global level is on some level I think biting off more than one can chew. So I'm wondering where you guys stand on the concept of really

focusing on a certain region or even country to get a thorough UA and IDN implementation going.

For example, we've just gotten the .eu in Cyrillic launched in Bulgaria so we're working on having that be as accepted and as recognized as possible. A project that we would very much support and be happy to contribute to actively is getting all the major players in that country to sit down together – Facebook, Google, Microsoft – and make a strong commitment to work together to get all their platforms integrated just for that script and get that lesson going. And then once they've developed a Best Practice, once they've really gotten UA and IDN in that one country down pat, they can share that best knowledge through this group to another country and another one and see if that would maybe develop a sort of domino effect.

So instead of looking at it from the global, really starting local from the country that has the most will to get involved, setting it up there and then building it up from there. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: What do folks think?

Yeah, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What I like about that idea, from a software development point of view if I solve for one Unicode I'm done for all. But it still makes it a huge task. The focus doesn't help the programming but it really helps the justification. One of the problems we have is it's still a vague… you don't see the people that can't come to your website or can't use it. I think, Ram, you mentioned e-mail and I love the focus on e-mail because I believe that's going to be the first impinging on some once Belgium or someplace is really in, they're going to go to any number of websites with their e-mail, try to use that as a log-in and everything's going to come crashing down. So that's going to be the first.

But the focus on one location – and India's another one because they have 154 languages or something. Sorry, I'm overstating but it's a big number – that I think is a great way to start it. I love that idea and I think it's a great way to get the focus and say, "We're going to do it for here."

RAM MOHAN: Edmond?

EDMOND CHUNG: I think that's a great idea. In terms of our work, as you pointed out, I think the local engagement is definitely towards that. However, we're kind of spreading out a little bit more. Rather

EN

than us trying to say it's going to be Singapore or it's going to be Malaysia, I think the local engagement, the idea is to have multiple of these things started, starting small first and what we probably should do is think about follow-ups. Let's say 10 of these guys come along and in a few months' time we see that two or three of them are becoming more promising, then we should have a mechanism to follow-up and add more funding and more help to them to develop the kind of showcase that you're talking about. I think that might be something that we can look into.

I would add one more thing though, that to think that we can find one place and make it 100% is probably equally hard because the software is developed kind of globally as well and there are services that are beyond the local – even for Facebook I don't know how they set it up – but there may be things that have to be done in the U.S. So I moderate that a little bit, but I do believe the idea of let's focus our… even though we're not financially constrained I'm sure there is some constraint, focusing on one or two countries or places or even cities is definitely a good idea.

[SEBASTIEN PENSIS]:   If I may, I completely understand that it is happening on a global scale, whether we're focusing locally or globally but I think that

one advantage of , for example, choosing one specific market would be to show all the people who would benefit from having Universal Acceptance, some concrete number. So instead of saying on a global scale you're missing out on an entire market, you can say within the Indian market you're missing out on X% of the population who are not accessing the Internet so if your local manager, your manager in India, is handling getting that development, he'll push towards some other aspects within the company that'll eventually show some hard numbers in hard markets where they can invest. And I think that that's one way of getting Universal Acceptance at the forefront of all the major companies' mind is showing them where is a chance to get in on a new market?

[ANDREW ROBERTSON]:   From the communications side – and I'll go into more detail on this when we provide the update – we are actually focusing on not specific countries but more regions, and the way we're doing that is through – two ways – through [association] engagement, engaging with technology and, say, ISP associations to help get the message out. We've got materials and we can provide to them and they're helping us amplify this.

The White Paper is going to be talked about soon and when we launch that, that also includes a component of regional

outreach where there are certain regions we're choosing to focus on more than others where we've got quite some significant things to say in those regions. So it is something we're definitely thinking about from the communications side but it would be good to get – perhaps we could speak afterwards and you could give me some indication of associations in your area that you'd like us to focus on as well and we could look at doing that.

GWEN CARLSON: I just wanted to add to that and let you know that from ICANN's perspective we're leveraging our Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, so they have been fully briefed on UA, they have material, they include it in nearly every presentation they do, and when they talk to governments we ask them to bring it up as well. So that's just another piece of the entire strategy. But I like your ideas. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Raedene.

RAEDENE MCGARY: Hi. I'd just like to say I like the idea about looking at different regions or locations. For example, we're working with a number of different countries and organizations in the Arab region, and if

we could develop a model for one then we'd be very interested to help look at how we could do local engagement in, say, the Middle Eastern region and the different IDNs and we could pool our existing relationships to that one event for that region.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much and are you sorting out Bulgaria for us? I just wanted to make sure I got the spelling right.

[SEBASTIEN PENSIS]: Sorting it out for you might be a little bit of a tall charge but we would be more than happy to cooperate with you on the local initiatives.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fantastic. Thank you very much.

RAM MOHAN: Let me follow up on that. Is that a good example? Is that a good case to go and pursue because you have some experience there so help us understand what kind of impediments you faced and what results you are seeing.

EN

[SEBASTIEN PENSIS]:   Absolutely. From our perspective and the launch of the .eu in Cyrillic we definitely think it's a great test case for the implementation of Universal Acceptance because even though the Cyrillic alphabet is the primary mode of communication within the country, there's still several issues with having it used on a daily basis which doesn't mean that users who do have the option of surfing in their native tongue, of having their own e-mail address reflect their name, are still preferring to choose an ASCII code sometimes. So we believe that we would see a higher uptake in the Cyrillic IDN if that Universal Acceptance was more strongly developed.

And of course, the more Universal Acceptance is developed, you have the cat chasing the mouse every time, you'd have more growth in IDA IDNs. IDNs means more IDA.

So absolutely a good test case, and I do want to add just for the communications we do talk about a lot of this deployment in the regions, so not only Europe but the Middle East, Latin America, on the IDN world Report that we publish. And that's always a good source of numbers to just get a view on what scripts are used and in the European region we offer our own statistics out there. So it's idnworldreport.eu. It's no longer an annual publication but it's constantly being updated and we work with registrars and registries around the world in order to make sure that IDN growth is charted. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: So Don, I'd imagine that we have to find a way to take this idea
                        and try and get words around it and put it out into the UA
                        discussed list and then see if that gets enough traction to move
                        it forward. That'd be the path forward here.

                        I want to make sure that he didn't just bring the idea and that
                        we're actually doing something about it because that's what I'd
                        promised we'd do. Okay?

[SEBASTIEN PENSIS]:   Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Other ideas?

                        Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thank you. I have two comments from the At-Large side. One is
                        that we had a interesting experience a couple of weeks back
                        when the ICANN's At-Large website was declared as IDN-ready
                        and we were asked to see if this was really true and whether we
                        could test it.

Testing is actually something that we had not done before and we had some difficulty with it. It was discovered instantly that some features did not work with Cyrillic. But to do a comprehensive, complete coverage testing was very difficult. I wrote to Don and he gave a document which we subsequently used. But the challenge here is that I'm sure where there's any way of comprehensive testing for readiness through which the community can help out in declaring a website as Universal Acceptance compliant.

The other point is that At-Large has a fairly large community and we could help in the local initiatives, in particular in parts of Asia Pacific where I come from and in India specifically there appear to be a lot of interest in this thing and I'm sure there's a lot of work going on and we see that that's also reflected on the mailing list. So if there is any way the At-Large community could help, we will be very happy to support it.

RAM MOHAN: Don, you could respond to the first part of this, right?

DON HOLLANDER: I actually like the second part because it's now in my notes and we're very delighted with that actually that the At-Large community is keen. With respect to how do you know that you

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

are UA-ready? That's something that we think we're close on but we're not quite there yet, and in fact we'll hear from Sara shortly about the next phase that we're looking at programming languages. So that's always been one of our objectives. We just are not there yet, and there's just some more work to do in the EAI space and the programming language space and then I think we'll be in a position where we can actually get some clear definition of what UA-ready is.

We do have some UA use cases. That's in the UASG004. There's nothing in Cyrillic. And I'll talk to Sigmund later as to why there were problems with Cyrillic and not some other languages.

But I'm also quite conscious of time and what I'd like to do is invite people to contribute and continue the discussion in the UA discuss list, but now I'd like to move on to the programming language issues and where we're at with defining those things.

While I'm playing with the computer, Edmond if you could raise the issues that are in the chat?

EDMOND CHUNG: I was going to let you know that there was a comment in the chat. I'm just going to read it out. It's from Ajay Data. His points are, "1) We need to have these e-commerce and social media companies start having their IDNs and start accepting EAI for

sign-up and registration. UASG to reach out to Amazon, e-bay, Booking.com, Expedia, [Trader], Facebook, Instagram, etc. to start accepting EAI."

I guess I can quickly respond to that. I think that's a great idea. That's one of the things that we have been focusing on as well in the last year to getting the big guys ready and I think Edelman will help us update a little bit on that later on as well.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Thank you. I feel like I'm going off the deep end a little bit with this comment, but every time we talk about IDNs and Universal Acceptance EAI comes up and it's a natural extension because we're talking about the Unicode local part, etc. Being a registrar and an identity provider as what my company does, we try to promote the matching up of ecosystem handles as well so that people can have a single identifier concept. And should we be including Facebook identifiers and the identifiers within [walled] gardens as part of this initiative, at least from an awareness standpoint so that people can have a cohesive set of identifiers within their own scripts?

I know I'm out of the blue here but it was bugging my head.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The short answer is, "Kind of." Because on the one hand you always want to encourage people to internationalize things to the extent that they can, but at the same time there's literally no standard for Twitter handles because it's owned by Twitter and they could [inaudible] tomorrow as they've done in the past. So I think that that's a thing where maybe what you really want to do is talk about the generic questions around internationalization there as well. So you might actually want to say there are these associated things and you might need some sort of materials that talk about internationalization generally. There, I guess, are some materials you could just ship but there's probably some stuff that would need to be friendlier and so on.

It's actually way more complicated because whereas EAI has already done for you a whole bunch of analysis comparing the current local part of e-mail addresses and how that relates to past practices in e-mail addresses, noting that past practices in e-mail addresses are not actually what anybody deploys, is that work's already been done.

If you are the controller of a namespace, an identifier space, you have to think about every one of those issues yourself. So all of the stuff around mapping of characters, what should [F-set] do in Twitter handles? Well, let me give you 20 years' worth of speculation on this. Here Twitter Engineer, go work it out. And I think that that's something that you better be prepared for them

to say. "We're not doing that today because it's not commercially viable."

That's just a thing that's worth worrying about.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Just to close out on it, that's exactly where my head is as well and that's why I ended the comment with it's just giving them awareness of the issue and the fact that we're dealing with this and they can choose to align or not align, but at least they don't deal with it independently completely.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I guess what I'm trying to suggest though, is that if you're going to raise awareness you better raise all the awareness. You better draw the dragons with the teeth and the fire coming out and everything. Don't draw cute little dragons because people won't understand that they've got a very deep problem they're going to wade into if they're not careful.

RAM MOHAN: Richard makes me think that there are some registries today that accept emogis, for example, and you have Universal Acceptance issues theoretically in there as well. And in my mind anyway it's a separate class of problem, and I'd love to hear

from folks whether that should be in scope or out of scope as an example.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Emogis being in scope?

RAM MOHAN: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, definitely. I have an emogi domain name and soon an emogi e-mail address.

RAM MOHAN: What do folks think?

[RICHARD MERDINGER]:   I was just going to ask you where you got your emogi domain. Basically GoDaddy is in favor of the practices of Universal Acceptance following the evolution of language and communication, and if that begins to include emogis it ought to be considered as scopeable. I don't want to say "in scope" but it should definitely be part of the scope that we're looking at for inclusion.

EN

RAM MOHAN: Andrew? Edmond? And if there's anybody else in the back who wants to speak, please come up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're aware that your emogi domain name is not Universal Acceptance ready since it doesn't conform to IDNA2008.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I know that my emogi domain name resolves and displays correctly in some browsers.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: In some browsers. I think that that "some browsers" term is I think one of the reasons that that's a really significant issue for this group. There is a problem. There is both a technical problem and a practical problem with using emogis for identifiers at Internet scale. It's a little different for the local part of your e-mail address, of course, because that was always your problem and your rules. But the Internet scale side of things is a different story, and I think that we've got…this isn't to say that emogis are bad. I like them. I use them and all the rest of them. But there's a difference between emogis are useful and good and the emogis are useful and good as identifiers at Internet scope. And I think that maybe teasing some of those issues out would also help for the sorts of awareness things that you might want to

RAM MOHAN: suggest to Facebook and Twitter and so on because it's the same set of problems.

RAM MOHAN: Edmond?

EDMOND CHUNG: I think personally I support emogis. In fact, 20 years ago when we first started talking about IDNs my first example was a smiley face. But here I think we need to be very careful. We are right now going out advocating for people to become compliant with protocols and be compliant with standards. If we go out and send a mixed message, I think that would probably defeat a lot of things that we're trying to accomplish.

While I think that's a worthy fight and I'm happy to join the discussion probably at IETF at the protocol level and say, "Hey, are these characters also should be an evolution of the language and therefore part of the identifier system?" That I'm absolutely happy to support. But UASG as a whole I think, especially on the domain side, I think emogi right now is probably out of scope specifically because it's prohibited by the protocol – this very protocol that we're trying to advocate.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I want to add to that in that it's a very deep hole because you're making up a language. Just to say that there's one guy walking around here – I know because he works for ICANN and he's on the tech staff – and his name badge is in Klingon. Once you get down the self-made language area of emogis, that's a deep hole of a lot of self-made languages that'll go way beyond what Unicode can handle.

RAM MOHAN: Asmus?

ASMUS FREYTAG: Thanks, Ram. I've been active in the Unicode Consortium for many decades and, in fact, from before it was founded, and I observe what is happening to them over there. It is that emogi have become a seemingly unstoppable force. They're not necessarily more well-liked by what you could call the "elite" of the character coding establishment, but like some recent maybe political trends, there seems to be a certain populism around these emogi that just garners unbelievable amount of attention, unbelievable amounts of mind share, unbelievable amounts of commercial opportunity for those providers that add them to their text services, and from my vantage point as an observer of this phenomenon, I would conclude that what is happening as far as Unicode is concerned, they're essentially trying to ride the

tiger but the tiger goes where it wants and they try to make sure that some vestiges of sanity prevail but that's about as best as they can do.

Comes across system egging on the phenomenon, I don't think what they say or do actually in that regard has any effect on what's going on. One of the most well-known talk shows in the U.S. has had segments on emogi with mention of the Unicode Consortium twice now. This is an absolute unheard level of exposure for what is sordid and squalid and low-level infrastructure of the software world.

This group and ICANN and IETF and all the other technical communities ignore this phenomenon at their peril. That is my warning essentially I would like to throw in here. That doesn't mean I am ignoring or willfully ignorant of all the wonderful technical problems that pertain to this, but as long as various actors have the freedom to do things like register emogi or provide emogi e-mail aliases or whatever, the best way forward is to try to ride that tiger in all these other arenas as well. And having a plan of what you want to do would be much better than just saying it ought not to be done, because it will be done. There's just no way around it.

There's a whole generation of people that have all decided that, for better or for worse, this is the way they want to communicate

and they have spoken with their feet. I think you need to be really, really, clear about that.

RAM MOHAN: Good, sound, advice. We're a few minutes behind our original plan but this is, I think, a useful intervention, useful set of comments. I feel reluctant to draw a conclusion out of this, but what I would like to suggest is to take the specific topic of emogis and in scope or out of scope for our UA work and place it on our parking lot and we'll come back to it later in this workshop.

Over to you, Don.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks very much, and sorry to cut people off for interesting discussions but we're just about two hours running late now as it is.

Sara, can you hear us and can we hear you?

SARA DICKINSON: Hi, Don. Can you hear me?

DON HOLLANDER: Yes. Quite nicely.

SARA DICKINSON: Great.

DON HOLLANDER: I love technology when it works. Over to you.

SARA DICKINSON: Thank you very much.

Hello, everyone. My name is Sara Dickinson. I'm going to be talking today about the effort that is underway under Don's leadership to attempt to perform a review of the commonly used programming languages in terms of their Universal Acceptance compliance. The stage that we're at with this review that we are still in the stages of trying to pin down the exact evaluation criteria that we want to use for this. We've recently done quite a comprehensive update to the document describing this, so we feel this is a timely opportunity to talk about what we're going to use as a basis for the criteria.

Next slide please.

As we all know, one of the big problems is that there are observations by users in a variety of ways of UA issues which are found in applications and this can take a range of problems. It can be as simple as restricting a TLD to be three letters,

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

restrictions to ASCII to e-mail addresses, across to far more subtle issues.

These issues arise primarily because of problems in the software used. This is not a simple problem because, as we know, there are many applications and they are written in many, many, languages and they have many, many specific requirements.

Specific questions of this piece of work are to look at how well do the languages used natively support UA and how compliant are they? From that, we hope to move forward to being able to answer the second question which is, where precisely do we need to expend effort and improve the situation? Is it in those languages themselves or at a higher layer, more likely in the application layer?

Next slide please.

There are some high-level goals to come out of this work specifically. Firstly, we need to evaluate the languages. But with the results we get from that we're hoping that we can provide guidance to the whole spectrum of stakeholders here. And this starts with engaging directly with library developers. If we find compliance issues, we want to have technical details so we can approach people and improve the situation.

We also want to be able to communicate with application developers, so guiding them towards the best libraries, talking about good practice in using those libraries even to the extent of providing example code. We also want to [provide grants] for managers to make architectural decisions as to how they should be moving their software forward to have the greatest UA compliance with the minimum effort from their side.

Also we hope the output from this will be data for other influences in terms of being able to talk more concretely about the overall status of UA in software today.

Next slide please.

The specifics of how we're going to do that – we're developing the evaluation criteria with multiple considerations. There's more on the next slide on that.

For each language we will produce a report, and we're going to use a rating system in order that we can provide recommendations and differentiate between the libraries. And the second output from that report will be to identify whatever remedial action is actually needed for a given language. In other terms, we should have the specifics about what is broken – not working in a particular language – or are there big pieces of functionality that are simply missing and unimplemented?

That then gives us the basis to move forward either through direct engagement or possibly through the team producing patches themselves to improve the situation in terms of that remedial action.

Next slide please.

I'll have to come back a little bit to the question of scope here and what is a programming language, because this was something that was actually the subject of a reasonable amount of debate amongst the team trying to determine criteria.

We've ended up with pretty much about the most flexible definition we think makes sense – so very generically, a software component. So we're talking about it could either be a package, it could be a framework, it could be a set of libraries, it could be a library with a binding in a different language. We're going to consider any and all of those things within the scope of this work.

Obviously we need to be mindful to have a focus on [inaudible] languages, but we want to make clear that we're going to consider the many other languages, too. Initially – I think I'm right in saying – we're going to focus on the open source languages in the first round of the evaluation.

Next slide please.

This is a list. This is not exhaustive. It is just a handful of languages to be illustrative at this point. Clearly we would look at languages such as Java script and PHP. We also want to look at languages like Python and Go. And additionally we're including things that might be considered lower-level languages like Libidn which is written in C here, not at least because there are numerous and growing bindings for libraries of that nature.

Next slide please.

What are the evaluation criteria? We have decided to split them into two groups. One is the nonfunctional qualities of the library and the other are the purely functional. The test suite bullet point there in italics is the core functional criteria that we're going to use and we want that to be the major contribution towards the overall criteria. So it will be overall scoring.

What we don't want to do is take into account some of the nonfunctional aspects of these libraries in terms of their usability. So the kind of things we also want to consider are how permissive is the license on a particular piece of software? Are there hidden costs in using it in terms of advance features or support? Are bugs fixed in a timely fashion? Quite critically, I think, what's the quality of the documentation like? How likely are developers to use it correctly? And also we come across

common pitfalls in using it that application developers might also fall into.

So what we're going to do is assess the criteria alongside a functional assessment and weight them together to come up with a single figure to represent what we think the quality of the programming language is. And this allows for cases where two libraries might have rather equivalent functional coverage to have their nonfunctional aspects be tie breakers and dictate which one we might recommend of the two.

Next slide please.

Very simply, what functionality will we test? We all know that we need to accept, validate, store, process, and also display – which should be there – in terms of keywords we like to talk about that software can provide. We also know that we have to [inaudible] with identifiers, domain names, and URLs.

Next slide please.

What we've done in the current document is try to split the evaluation of the functional side of this into two levels that are rather arbitrarily called "low" and "high" level. What we mean here by "low" level is to look at, does the language provide basic [translation] services? In other words, these are the things that defined in a relevant IDNA RFCs. This allow for transformation

from ASCII to Unicode with the subtleties and variations therein and also to determine equivalence of labels.

Those are what we've scoped here as low level but we also want to look at – it's called "high" level but it might be better to call it more application level features. These are things applications might want to commonly do, one being decompose an identifier into its constituent elements and another might be to perform some sort of syntactic and semantic check. One example to give here is, a programming language might provide a function that allows the determination of whether or not a TLD is currently registered. And there are many more semantic checks that we could add in there, and that's one interesting area that we need to think about the scope of.

I'm not going into any detail here really today. We'll look at these functional characteristics of the library and come up with a score, so I hope this gives you a flavor of where we're going in terms of what this score will be based on.

Next slide please.

Just to wrap up, we have a new version of the document that's available for review which does go into the technical details of this evaluation if you're interested. The link here is to a Google doc. The document has [a] permission so that anybody with the link can comment on it. So we are very grateful to receive any

feedback on the overall approach or on the details, and so with that I think I'll conclude and hand over to Don to see if we have time for any discussion on this.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks very much, Sara. For those of you who are subscribers to the UA discuss list, last night/this morning/sometime in the past 24 hours, there should have been a note in your mailbox with a link to the document so that you can provide some comments. What I expect that we'll do is sometime before the end of the month we'll convene another call of people who have a particular interest in this to go through that document in some more detail.

I don't want to rush, but comments?

Rich.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Thank you. First of all, thank you very much for presenting that. I appreciated it. There was a slide where you mentioned or you included the concept of a URL as being part of Universal Acceptance and I'm curious, it's something we haven't really thought – I haven't talked about – is do we include the concept of the scheme? Will the scheme http or https, are they always

going to be ASCII or do they get included in having a URL truly be able to be in a single script?

Andrew's laughing at me.

[ANDREW SULLIVAN]: I'm not laughing. I'm having –

RICHARD MERDINGER: Convulsions?

[ANDREW SULLIVAN]: Yeah. So the scheme identifier is an IANA registry and I don't believe that there's any current plan to alter the schema identifiers. I can think of aesthetic reasons to it but I can think of no computer science reason to do it. And since the schema identifier is…this is another example of really stuff that is probably internals that has leaked into the user interface, and probably the better thing to do is to try to hide it from the user interface. If you want to internationalize that, do it in another level, in a presentation layer or something.

DON HOLLANDER: But Rich, you raise the interesting question because Sara does talk about a URL, not just a domain name. And in our UASG004

we do include non-ASCII characters in the last part of the URL after the slash – it's got a name.

[ANDREW SULLIVAN]: The path portion has always been…that's really got local semantics. People don't often do it that way, but it's usually local semantics. But the schema portion of a URL or a URI for that matter, is determined by the registry for it and I don't think there's any plan to address that.

Arguably, domain names, it was a mistake to try to internationalize them and what we should have done was put a user interface over the top. One view of what IDNA does is, in fact, user sugar on top of the thing which is why there's this presentation level which is the U label and then there's the [wire] format which is the A label.

DON HOLLANDER: Any other comments?

I'd like to say, Sara, thank you very much for getting us back on track. This is only a year late. My fault. I take total responsibility for it. But it is now I think there is light at the end of the tunnel and I don't think it's a train but I expect to see this resolved in April.

Sara, do you think that that's a reasonable timeframe?

SARA DICKINSON: I do. Yes. I think that's reasonable.

DON HOLLANDER: Meetings in Chicago and other places in the world accepted.

Thanks very much for that.

SARA DICKENSON: Thank you.

DON HOLLANDER: And thanks very much to the room techs for getting Sara's voice coming through so clearly. I really appreciate that.

Now we're going to move on to the White Paper. And Michael is here and I'm going to try to get the screen to work out.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Michael. Just come and take a seat. And Rich, I have unfortunately for the next 30 minutes or so another obligation so could you take over when I'm gone? Thank you.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Yes, as long as the next presentation takes 30 minutes or so.

DON HOLLANDER: Michael Kende's here from Analysys Mason, or as I call them Analysys Maison, but apparently they're not French.

Last year we put out a bid to get a white paper produced. We've had this vision really since before the UASG was formed to create some paper, a White Paper, to show the benefits of becoming UA, and so we put out a "help wanted" ad as we do to ask somebody to help us look at the social, cultural, and economic, values to the globe for being UA-ready. We had a number of some excellent candidates and Analysys Mason is doing the work and we've seen a couple of drafts and Michael here is going to walk us through the drafts and we look forward to comments.

Michael.

MICHAEL KENDE: Thank you. If it helps your memory, Dave Mason was a international Rugby player for England, definitely not French. That's the Mason part of Analysys Mason.

Thanks very much for the invitation to come and spend a few minutes on talking about the paper that we've put together. As

Don said, we've distributed a few drafts and so I'll run through it. We can look at both the qualitative part and then we did a model and we'll look at some of the numbers that we put together to make concrete the economic benefits of being UA-ready.

What we'll do is talk about the model and the paper. We've circulated a draft. And then we'll go through the paper and maybe quickly at the end talk a bit about the roll-out or next steps in rolling it out on April 11th and I guess your next meeting in Canada.

[DON HOLLANDER]:   Seattle.

MICHAEL KENDE: Seattle. Close.

[DON HOLLANDER]:   Canada sounds more promising [inaudible].

MICHAEL KENDE: So as Don said, we put together a White Paper looking at Universal Acceptance of gTLDs including the IDNs. The purpose of the paper is to raise awareness of the benefits and show the value, both qualitative, cultural, and social, benefits – as well as

EN

the economic benefits. It's really aimed at a high level. It's not a technical paper. It's aimed more at a senior level, commercial policy, or cultural, audience, to get someone at a senior level to say, "Hey, if we're not doing this we should for these reasons" – the increased revenues that we'll talk about and the other benefits. It's relatively short. We're putting together an Executive Summary with some infographics so that it's quite easily accessible, and it just really runs through these points with some case studies. We did some interviews with some various key players including registries and application owners and got some numbers through some secondary research as well.

The basic focus of this is on software and application owners – that is, let's say an e-commerce site – as to why they should be UA-ready, why they should accept all domains. And the simple answer is because if someone can't register, then they won't buy on your site in terms of the economics or they won't get the cultural or social benefits that you're targeting with your new domain.

The benefits, of course, are more broad – and you can get kind of a virtuous circle going but they're [broadly] – of course the users get the benefits if they can use their e-mail and identifiers everywhere. The domain registrants get benefits because they set this up, they wanted to establish a new identity with one of these new domains. And then the software and application

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

owners, as I say, will get the benefit because people will be able to interact fully with their websites.

Our finding was in general that in all the discussions that we had that the effort to implement Universal Acceptance is not great. It's not that onerous. It depends, of course, on the software and how things were set up. We did find one example where there were some complicated systems based on old teletype technology that is being upgraded but currently, for reasons similar to the Y2K problem, just doesn't have the memory to accept IDNs in Unicode. But we'll go through that in a moment.

The ultimate end argument is that the benefits outweigh the cost, both the financial ones for the sites that are trying to directly revenue as well as the other benefits outweigh the costs of implementing Universal Acceptance.

Some numbers, you may have seen these. That's hard to read. On the left hand side it's the cumulative registration of the gTLDs in the couple years that they've been available. The dark blue is total registrations – that's going up to about 25 million. The lighter blue part is the ones that are used. The rest aren't being used for whatever various reasons. So there's about 11 million being used and the others are registered but not yet used.

On the right hand side it's the cumulative registrations of the IDNs, starting of course from a very low level and going up to about a million, but very fast rate of growth – about 140% per year if you normalize it. And that doesn't include also the country code IDNs that there's about at least another 1.8 million of.

That's the scope.

Yes?

[RICHARD MERDINGER]: Thank you. Curious why the graph on the left shows active versus inactive or passive, if you will, and the one on the right does not.

MICHAEL KENDE: I don't know if the numbers existed on the right. There wasn't a conscious reason. We can take out the…if there's an objection but –

[RICHARD MERDINGER]: No – not to interrupt – but not an objection. I'm just intrigued and curious and want to know the other numbers. Do you know how much of those are being used? What is the ratio?

MICHAEL KENDE: Maybe we didn't see the ones on the right – the used versus unused. If they exist then send them over and we can update it.

Here's this virtuous cycle. As I said, we're focusing ultimately on the benefits to the application and software owners who need to make the changes, so we're trying to show the benefits to them of making the changes. But It of course benefits the users if you have a new e-mail address or identifier website. Identifier – it helps you if you can use it everywhere. It of course helps the person that you got the e-mail address from, the domain owner, and that then feeds down to the application owners who will see more traffic. That will make them more useful. People will register because they won't be hearing that they don't work everywhere and the whole cycle continues.

One of the case studies was the .bayern domain. That's a region of Germany with its own dialect and strong identity, starting with their soccer team that uses this domain for their local site in the local dialect. The registry was very positive. They think that the benefits are very good in terms of establishing an identity for Bayern signified through the domain. They will help registrants if there's any problems with Universal Acceptance. They say that it's picking up speed. They're seeing fewer problems and when there is a problem, people have been very willing to make changes to their websites to accept the domain and that it

hasn't really been a big effort for them. Something that we heard in most of the interviews that we did.

Here comes the model. I'll show the highlights and then we can walk through a little bit how we got the numbers, what the assumptions were behind them. We split the model into two. The one on the left-hand side – and I'm sorry if you can't see it – but it's for the gTLDs and it shows what the benefits for existing users of the new domains are if they can use it everywhere and spend money on every website that they go to. We focused on increased e-commerce revenues or spending as a result of being able to go to every website.

We got that at $3.6 billion per year in the first year, and that can grow as more and more people are starting to use the domains. So that's just the increased benefit to the website owners of taking in all of the gTLDs.

On the right-hand side we did a slightly different calculation. This is the new IDNs and it's broken up into five major language groups that need IDNs – Vietnamese, Russian, Arabic, Chinese, and the Indian languages. This says that there's many people in these countries who are not online so we just looked at increased number of users as a result of Acceptance, and this would be for people who are reluctant to go online because they can't use their own language. It may be that they don't speak or

read any ASCII languages or that they just don't see enough relevant content. The idea is as more relevant content becomes available as these new IDNs are accepted universally, they will go online and start spending money. And again, this shows a total benefit of $6.2 billion in the first year. This number one could expect to grow as more and more people go online, but that's for the first year increased spending.

This next one I don't think anyone will be able to read, but I'll just walk through it quickly where we got the calculations.

The calculation on the left is the methodology for the new IDNs – the new users. The top box says, "The number of non-Internet users in each country," of the five language groups we look at, the biggest being Chinese. There's still 550 million not online. India 805 million not online.

Then we had done some surveys asking non-Internet users why they aren't going online and 22% of them said it was because there wasn't enough content in their local language. So that's 22% of the ones not online weren't going online because of language issues.

So then we tried to be very conservative and said, if just 5% of those went online – 5% of the 22% - went online because they could use the new domains in the language that they understand everywhere and people would be telling them it's

more useful and they would get more use out of it. If just 5% of those went online, we get these numbers and it totals 17 million new users in the first year. And then we took an average which I'll talk about at the right and said if they each spend $360 a year, that's a total benefit of $6.2 billion.

So we tried to be as conservative as possible and came up with a relatively interesting number for simply making the websites be able to accept all of these new IDNs.

On the right-hand side we go through the calculations for the gTLDs – that's existing users who can't use their gTLDs everywhere and then would give up or spend their money elsewhere. So we took the average number of the total active gTLDs domains registered as 11.7 million. That was the graph on the left that we showed earlier. We just took some global numbers to show that each domain on average has 13 e-mail addresses associated with it. Then we assumed half of those people wouldn't have another e-mail available or they want to use their primary e-mail address – so that's 77 million e-mail addresses, took some other averages that show that on average each e-mail address is associated with $360 worth of online spending, e-commerce spending, that based on the .club test that I'll talk about in a moment, 13% of websites weren't ready, couldn't accept the new gTLDs so if they all started to accept it, that would lead to $3.6 billion in new spending.

EN

So obviously we had to make assumptions here. No one has done a study of what happens when all the websites work, of course, so there's no behavioral studies so we took some assumptions with some averages, tried to be as conservative as possible and came out with this number of almost $10 billion a year just in the first year alone.

I'll just focus on the one on the right. These are the results of tests. The one on the left is the ICANN testing of new domain acceptance that came out last June, 2016. The one on the right is the .club testing showing as a total and then broken down for different types of website categories. The acceptance, which is the dark blue, then the lighter blue in the middle is where it failed, and then the top numbers are where one couldn't test because for instance the website didn't have any place that it needed to accept an e-mail or a website.

So the one on the far left says 13% of websites failed in total. That includes retailers, travel, and other websites. So that's the number we used to say the increase in spending that would come about from having Universal Acceptance.

Finally, a few more of the case studies – all relatively showing similar results. We talked to RTLD which like .bayern helps registrants when they have Universal Acceptance issues. This is for .bank and .insurance. For .bank, it's particularly important

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

because they said they don't allow it to point to .com if you use .bank because of the security. Because it signals a higher security it has to be its own website. You can't use a .com underneath it. So it's quite important that it's accepted. They had problems with Adobe and Twitter, and both Adobe and Twitter said they'll just put it in their next batch of updates, and within a month or two those sites were updated and accepted all new gTLDs.

One of their registrants, a small community bank – the Bridge Community Bank – had some issues with Verizon, and as we were speaking with them actually they had one with Wells Fargo and they sent us the screen shot that said, "We do not accept .bank." Both of them, the Verizon issue was resolved within four hours, the Wells Fargo was resolved quite quickly as well, just signifying that a lot of the time it's just awareness. Once the awareness is there, the problem is solved.

The U.S. Treasury, however, did not make the update. I don't know if that's going to go faster or slower now. That's a separate topic. But nothing happened when they signaled to the U.S. Treasury which said it has to be a three or two-letter domain TLD.

Finally, the one area where there wasn't an issue, which I mentioned, was with the airline industry. The airline industry, of

course, has a lot of experience with new gTLDs having taken the sponsored .arrow and running into problems several years ago. So they felt there was no issue with the gTLD. With the IDNs, there's two separate issues – whether the airlines accept – and the person we spoke to wasn't sure but thought most airlines, particularly in the countries with new IDNs, would accept them – but when they were trying to pass reservations through their own system, as I said it's a teletype system, it was done with efficiency in mind and ASCII as the language and it just doesn't accept Punycodes. They're too long according to the person we spoke to. So that is being resolved, and actually the timing seemed good. They said basically, "Good reminder." They're designing the new system and they'll make sure that the new system accepts all of these new gTLDs and IDNs.

That's where we're at. There's a draft out. Obviously if anyone has any questions, that'd be great. But there's a draft out. We're finalizing it along with some of the press material that we're working with Edelman on and then it will be released, as I said, on April 11th. Thank you.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks very much, Michael. I feel like we have two rooms here so I'd really encourage you to come here. There is plenty of space.

Questions, comments, for Michael?

RICHARD MERDINGER: I feel like I comment on everything but when looking at the numbers – and I've not done anything around analysis like Analysys Mason would have done – the potential impact UA dollar spend-wise [with] online shopping ,etc. seems awful high. A question that I'm thinking of is probably one that another reader of the paper or distribution may have as well is, if someone wants to get on, can't get on, doesn't go online, because they do not have content available in their native script, UA may enable them to get an identifier to go online but it's not going to address having content in their native script. But also, if they're going to go online it's not that they can't go online today, they just can't do it in their native scripts. It seems like you did a – not you – but there was a one to one replacement of, "They can't do it in UA, therefore they're not doing it." And I think it's more they can't do it in their native scripts so they're doing it in a sub-optimal way and therefore you're only getting a percentage of them online.

MARK SVANCAREK: To that point, yes to this. So it wasn't one to one, it was 5%? It was 20 to one?

RICHARD MERDINGER: I was going back to the previous [slide].

MARK SVANCAREK: I had a question about the slide, though. It was –

MICHAEL KENDE: Sorry. Can I just maybe answer this one?

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, then I'll come back to the –

MICHAEL KENDE: There were two calculations. So for the one with the 5%, we were saying those people weren't online at all. So it wasn't that they were online but they were acting in a sub-optimal way because they just weren't online at all. So we said 22% of them said that the reason they're not going online is because there's not enough content in their language. Presumably it means that they just either can't read or aren't comfortable in English or another ASCII language. And then we just said 5% of those 22%, the holding back is the Universal Acceptance.

So they're not online at all. So these are new people and it's just a numbers game, and if you look – well you can't read the top – we're talking about basically 2 billion people, and 5% of 22% of them going online is 17 million so that's where the number

comes from It's just taking a small percentage of a very large pool of people.

RICHARD MERDINGER: The slide I was thinking of was the previous or earlier one where it dealt with the new gTLDs versus the IDN where the IDN had the breakdown by country and I see this further breakdown here and I get the 5% piece. Just looking at that it made it feel like this huge impacted group could spend this much money, therefore we're missing that much money. Maybe I misinterpreted I'll reread the paper.

MICHAEL KENDE: Okay. This one just explains the numbers from the previous one – this slide. That's why I went to this one.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Thank you very much.

Mark.

MARK SVANCAREK My concern with this slide was the bottom line conclusion that there'd be $360 U.S. of additional spend per person and it seemed to me that that would be very region-specific. That may be in the Cyrillic zone you'd have one level of expense – maybe

it's $360, I don't know – in Vietnam it felt to me like maybe that would be different. China is a big place. India is a big place. They have big social spreads in spend, I suppose. But that $360 number didn't seem like it was justified and I didn't know where it came from.

The rest of the flow – 22%, 5% - seemed pretty good and in fact, you could probably justify that 5% with some of the EURid research that was done two years ago showing connections of local content and creation to use of IDNs.

MICHAEL KENDE: Okay.

MARK SVANCAREK: Again, it's going to be sort of indirect. They want local content. IDNs influence local content. We're still talking about how much they spend which is disconnected yet again. But you might be able to further justify it. It's the $360 number I was worried about.

MICHAEL KENDE: Yeah, we don't have numbers per country. That's why we [didn't do] the breakdown of new Internet users by region but not multiplying it to say there'll be this much in Vietnam.

So we took that in two ways. First we took the global e-commerce revenues dividing by the number of domains then the number of e-mail addresses per domain. So that's all countries that have e-commerce numbers. We sanity checked it in China. The average was $1,000 per person per year. In India it's far, far, lower - $44. So there's not numbers for each country but we just tried to go on the global average which of course has a lot of first movers but now includes a lot of countries that are coming along later [and] less developed.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, that spread of $44 to $1,000 I think in my own mind I would be substituting $50 for $360 if I were to share this with people within my leadership but other than that, I understand your methodology.

MICHAEL KENDE: Yeah, the numbers aren't perfect but even with $50 it would still be about a billion –

MARK SVANCAREK: [It's still a big number].

MICHAEL KENDE: Yeah. And if that's a concern, we tried to be conservative because exactly for this reason. If everyone says that seems really high, then it looks like it's just a marketing exercise.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Looking for other comments and input from around the room. Questions?

Seeing none, Don, do you have the agenda handy?

DON HOLLANDER: I do have the agenda. I'm just reading through the chat to see if there's anything. Dennis is typing. Dennis actually provided some feedback in the UA Discuss list wondering that you didn't seem to cover anything in the IDN space in terms of your case studies and he is currently typing, and he had one other material point but you've seen those comment already.

RICHARD MERDINGER: [Inaudible]. Thank you. Are we ready to move on to the next topic, Don?

DON HOLLANDER: I think we are. The next topic is a break which is scheduled to finish 20 minutes ago. Should we take a break or just carry on?

RICHARD MERDINGER: I would like to carry on.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks. I'll provide some nourishment during the next couple of minutes. I don't know about nourishment, but sustenance

The next topic is communications, and we have Lars and Andrew, and I'm going to try to work this machine but I don't know how to do that.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Great. Thanks, Don. Let me know when you're ready to kick off.

I'll just start by saying, what we're going to do here is just recap what we're communicating first of all, who we're communicating that to, and how we're doing that, what's happened since ICANN57 – so the updates in communications and the good progression we'd like to show you – and where we're heading with this. And as well, Lars has got some input as well on some specific activities.

DON HOLLANDER: I'm just going to get some technical help to make it big or huge.

EN

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Thanks, Don.

We'll really be starting on the third slide which is what we've termed the "Umbrella Message." This is just a quick recap on our messaging, and you'll recall that we went through a fairly rigorous process in working out what we wanted to say and who we wanted to say that to. That resulted in what we call a "Message House." A key component of that is the Umbrella Message, so that overall this is what we're saying to all of our audiences, that "Universal Acceptance is essential for the continued expansion of the Internet, as it ensures the new domain name extensions and e-mail addresses can be used by all Internet –enabled applications, devices, and systems."

That's our Umbrella Message and that remains unchanged.

I won't read through all of these but this is backed up by our supporting messages – numbers one, two, and three – and what they refer to is our "next billion" message that this is part of the gateway to the next billion Internet users. And the second one is the "businesses have a responsibility" message that businesses stand to benefit if they come on board, and indeed we're calling them out for having a responsibility for taking part in this.

The third is the UA leading to better user experience. These are the three main strands of messages that we're communicating

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

through our various channels and mechanisms as we communicate the program.

Who are we communicating this to? Would be slide #4 where you see the target audiences. We're going to the people that can make this happen – the developers and the systems architects and the consultants and the contracting firms – people who can direct this to happen – the CIOs would be one group and a very important group – and people who can influence this to happen – so the other C-suite which would include CTOs as well, Board members, government officials, consultants, media, and industry influencers. That's what we're saying and who we're aiming to say that to.

That was just a recap on what we told you on the last time we updated you.

This now going into what's happened since ICANN57. We've had some really encouraging and solid progress. We've got materials developed and we know what we're saying and we're actually going out there and doing it now. It's been really quite encouraging to see that this is actually getting some results. So we've split this slide into four columns – [median and analysts], associations, digital and social, and UASG techs – are what we call the "owned content."

First of all, hopefully you will have seen some of this come through. There's a really good byline that actually Gwen managed to secure [in] CIO Review – Ashwin, ICANN CTO, wrote that. I hope you all got to see that. It was a really, really, solid piece. We also got some nice coverage that related to the ICANN meeting in India – the Hyderabad meeting. So it's also good to see that as we take the UA message on the road in different locations. That also presents an opportunity to get coverage as well. But we're still only in the early days but it's starting to come through.

Before, I alluded to the associations engagement we're doing, which we're doing on quite a regional basis. What we do there, we identify associations that we think can help us get the message out. A couple of examples you'll see here that we've – a few examples we've already had success with aside from Domain Name Association which is great but that's really good to see – the Internet Service Provider associations seem to be really the message is resonating with them and we're outreaching to them. We're saying, "Here's the issue. Can we provide you with materials and would it be appropriate, can you disseminate that to your members?" And the general feedback we're getting is yes.

So what they're doing is – I'll come to the materials in a moment – but we're getting these materials to them and they're either

sending them out directly via e-mail blasts or planning to include them in newsletters. We're having those translated so we can further broaden the engagement through different countries and regions. And that's generally going quite well. We're getting some good feedback there. And it's not just ISP associations. We're getting good feedback from various technical bodies that we're approaching in different countries.

Amplification of this – there's a really good opportunity to amplify this through social media – Twitter and other social media – that's addressed in the third column. As you see these articles and things come out or if you're seeing materials that have been published, reposted, it'd be great if you could… I would really encourage you to tweet those out yourselves and amplify those.

DON HOLLANDER: Just out of curiosity, how many people have a Twitter account and how many of you actually use it other than to read recipes? Do you actually send stuff out?

What Andrew's ask is, if you see a UA article or something comes on the e-mail or something's published on the website, could you tweet? Apparently tweeting is a thing. Most of you are younger than I am. We're just keen to do it. We don't do a lot of UASG…it's not constant every day but if you guys tweet it and I

know some of your networks will be huge, then that would be…more people are going to see it.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Thanks, Don. Great. There's actually an opportunity that I'll come to in a moment or right now in this fourth column. Hopefully you will have seen some of the case studies that have been complete drafted and published and posted on the UASG website. If you haven't, if you take a look at the document section down on the bottom half of the page you'll see the case studies listed out. So far we've got the ICANN one, APNIC, THNIC from Thailand, and as of today Xgen, which is great to see. That's one that we'll be tweeting out and would encourage you to retweet. That'd be really good.

Just going on to the fourth slide then – our priorities. "Case study program" I just mentioned. "Content development" – What is that content? I'll give you an update on that in a moment. "The engagement with associations and analysts" which I'll detail more in a moment. And the "LinkedIn groups." "Upcoming announcements" – Things like the White Paper, for example. And "Website and social."

Going into more detail on the case study program – I've told you the ones that we've had published and the one that was published as appeared today – next one is [Zensa] coming up

and then – and this is all a call-out to anybody then that's got any UA projects underway as well that they're aware of that they could flag with us and we could possibly look to develop more case studies for, that would be great. So that's case studies.

Please, if you've got any questions stop me.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: I'll talk on this later. I have a lot, individually on specific things and lessons learned and things we've gone through, and I'll get together with you and try to pass on [inaudible]. Thank you.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Yeah, great.

So "Content" – what's the content we're developing and we're getting at via our various channels? The first piece of content that was completed for dissemination through our association engagement was a 101 article on UA and quite a concise article, about 500 words because that's what we've found people were willing to accept and it's nice and concise. That's what some of the associations are already sending out or have already sent out, and more will send out to their members. It was, of course, written in English but it was translated into German. Thank you, Lars, for that. He translated it into German. And also members of the UASG translated that into Spanish. Very helpful. There's

scope to translate that into other languages if anybody wants to put their hand up for that and then we can get that out to our other associations, so more still to be done there.

The second one which is almost complete is a 102 article on EAI, and then we'll look to start placing that in the very near future.

DON HOLLANDER: Just on the UA 101 and 102 – these are introductory articles that we see going to people's newsletters. Right now they're available and if you want to be a hero to your local community because you're a member of the Wisconsin Software Developers Association, we're more than happy for you to take it and take credit, put your byline on it, make adjustments for the local community. I published one in New Zealand and I just added a paragraph, a couple sentences, about the local issues in New Zealand. So if you're involved in some professional community group, just take that on and make a contribution. We would like to know about it just so that we can keep track, but we're quite happy for everybody to be a hero. Thanks.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Thanks, Don. So other materials, other content, that's been developed,. A few blog posts have been drafted and posted and

we've got some more coming and then there'll be one on the White Paper and the state of the UA report.

I've kind of covered this, but this gives a bit more detail on the sorts of associations we're outreaching to and how we're going about that. It's a process that does take time because the way we approach it, what we're finding is it's best to try and speak with, have a quick conversation with each association if possible because this is coming from very left of field for a lot of people. We want to explain what it is, explain how we'd like them to act, and then get them engaged. We're finding that those conversations are generally yielding results and myself and my colleagues continue with this.

Does anybody have any questions on that side of things or any associations? We're always willing to add to our list for outreach if you have associations in your region and especially where you've got contacts. That's something that's really helpful, if you've got an in with any of those people it's always good to go in there with a referral just to be able to mention somebody's name. Not essential but just helpful.

DON HOLLANDER: There's a comment in the chat about why we haven't got one of these done in Chinese, and the answer because we haven't had

anybody ask for that yet. So if there's a desire for this, then no problem. We can get that done.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Okay. That's noted.

Moving on to our technology analyst engagement, most people here I imagine will be aware of the role of technology analysts, the way they consult, how influential they can be, in the tech sector. They were considered an important audience for us.

Ram has been helping us out with that a lot and we've been securing the briefings and Ram has been conducting the briefings, and we've been conducting follow-up.

The three we've done so far is one with Forrester – it was done in December – one with RedMonk in January, and most recently and most successfully I would say, was with Constellation Research in February. And Cindy's out – I'm not sure if you…hopefully people might have seen her blog post as well that was published after the briefing – really insightful and it was a good result for the UASG. Of the three briefings we've done so far – the other two were absolutely worthwhile – but that has been the most successful one.

And then we've got more coming up as well. We continue to…we're focusing… the next ones will be with 451 and Gartner

and a couple of others. That's what we're doing there and it's starting to yield results. And these people will be amplifiers of our message and endorsers of our message hopefully going forward.

Any questions on that? No? Okay.

Something else we've been doing is looking to engage through LinkedIn groups. Why do we do that? We had previous experience on an issue around name collision with ICANN in the past where we pioneered our LinkedIn engagement and found that to be quite successful and so we recommended that that be one of our avenues of communication for UASG. We're just underway with that now and it is working. What we're doing, we're identifying relevant LinkedIn groups and the important thing here is it's got to be the right authority. It's got to be the right person doing the actual engagement. It can't be us doing it on someone's behalf. We can help write the material and that's what we're doing, but the actual engagement needs to be done, say, by, for example, we've just done one with Ashwin from ICANN, him being the authoritative voice. Ram helpfully has been a part of that and Lars as well and some other members of the UASG.

This is another thing we would welcome your involvement with if you would like to be involved, so please consider that and we

can talk about how you might be able to be part of this. Typically we're outreaching to CIO and CTO type groups. We can also outreach to others.

Lars gave me a really good insight the other week when we were talking about LinkedIn engagement in Germany, for example, and that was LinkedIn is not the only avenue for this type of engagement. In Germany, for example, there is a competitor to LinkedIn which is apparently more widely used than LinkedIn so in your various countries, that could also be the case and we could extend this to other professional social media forums as well.

Any questions or comments on that? Yes?

SEBASTIEN PENSIS: I have a thought and a question. First the thought – I once heard about social media that LinkedIn is basically Facebook in a suit and tie. And I'm wondering if some of the content that you're sharing through the LinkedIn platform could also be transferred over to a Facebook page or something that could engage Facebook users which I know might reach a wider audience in terms of youth who are more active on Facebook rather than on LinkedIn.

And then for my question, this goes back a little bit, sorry. But with regards to twitter, you've asked us to tweet and to share which we do through our own accounts. But I'm wondering if the UASG has its own dedicated Twitter account so it could be an impetus so it puts out the first paper, the first thought, an invitation to a session, and then all of the members can collectively retweet, share, and like, to get the ball rolling.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Sure. That's a good question. I think Gwen would like to address the Twitter side of things.

GWEN CARLSON: Yeah, sure. We do have a UASG handle, however we did some research. We worked with Edelman and their Digital Strategy Team and we have at this point kind of put that on the back burner because of partly the lack of content and we have figured it's just a little bit too early on to launch that channel. So what we are doing is regularly tweeting UA and UASG information from the ICANN account.

So one option could be if you see something or maybe we can work together, Andrew, on new content. I know we have a actually Twitter calendar we're working on, follow ICANN and

retweet from that. We have very broad reach and we've gotten, I think, some good feedback there.

And then I just wanted to offer up your point with Facebook. We use Facebook quite a bit so I'd be happy to post that information on ICANN's Facebook page as well.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Thanks, Gwen.

Any other comments or questions on LinkedIn or [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For the Twitter account if I may suggest maybe we use a hashtag UASG so that it's easy to filter from the main ICANN account.

GWEN CARLSON: Yes. We can use them both. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Thank you.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Media. Media engagement is obviously very, very important to us and it's a way to get the message out more broadly and again, to the people we're trying to influence. The activities that we

engage in on that front are materials development, press releases, and so forth, and the next opportunity for real media engagement will be around the White Paper. We're currently planning our media outreach around that which is going to involve, is likely to involve, Europe, U.S., Thailand, China, Eastern Europe, and a couple of other countries in Asia, will be the main focus. So it'll be quite international in its nature and that'll be tied to various aspects of the White Paper that'll lend itself to…the White Paper contains some really good facts that relate to specific regions – sorry I missed India. India will be very much part of that as well. Hopefully shortly after April 11th when we launch this, you're going to see some good media coverage related to the White Paper.

Other things we're involved, we're focusing on, is stakeholder outreach and some possible paid amplification of media stories.

On the next slide is what's ahead. A look at the next three months before we report back to you. More case studies, carrying on with the association outreach that I outlined, more material development – the 102 and another one after that – the White Paper launch, and a meeting in Chicago. And then there's a Seattle session as well, so we'll be hosting that in April. And just continuing engagement and materials development into May. Did we say analyst briefings in that? That's implied that we'll be doing more analyst briefings in that.

Before I hand over to Lars for an update on some specific activities, does anybody have any questions for me on the update I've just provided?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks. I do have a question about the UASG session [plus] meetings. I don't' have any context about that. Can you give us some [inaudible]?

ANDREW ROBERTSON: I might give that to Don to talk about.

DON HOLLANDER: The UASG Coordination Group has one or two face-to-face meetings each year. This year we have one scheduled in Seattle. It's a day and a half face-to-face meeting for the UA Coordination Group followed by a day and a half EAI workshop in Seattle. I had thought that that had gotten published in the UA Discuss list. If not, then we will do that shortly after today. We will meet in actually Redmond not Seattle, but close enough, and then we'll also have a similar meeting in Hong Kong in October, the week of October 10th. I think the end of that week.

What we've experienced is for the UASG Coordination Group, getting together during the ICANN meetings is a challenge and

getting active engagement and people's attention is sometimes a challenge. So getting people physically together seemed to help us make quite considerable progress. So that's what's happening in Seattle in April. So there are public meetings open. We broadcast them through Adobe Connect. People are welcome to attend. We had somebody from Donuts come to one of the meetings that we had in Pennsylvania. We've had other people come to the meeting that we've had in Washington. So welcome to come to Seattle or Hong Kong later in the year. The more the merrier and more interactive. My concern is that we have very active sessions and that's what those are for.

Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN PENSIS: Thank you. Don, may I just ask you to expand a little bit on the UA Discuss mailing list for the new people here who might not have heard about it?

DON HOLLANDER: The UASG operates a number of mailing lists. The principle one is UA Discuss which is a generic open, it is our discussion platform. We have another list that's used by the Coordination Group to try to find times that people aren't in airplanes generally. There are a couple of other smaller – there's an EAI

mailing list and there might be one or two others. But UA Discuss is the place where the Universal Acceptance Steering Group as a community lives and you can subscribe by going to uasg.tech/subscribe.

RAM MOHAN: And the list is open to all. There's no restrictions unless you're a troll.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Great. Thanks. I'll just hand over to Lars at this point. He's going to provide an update on some specific UASG activities and events.

LARS STEFFEN: A handful of weeks ago we've been approached with the opportunity to have a UASG night talk at WHD Global which takes place the 27th of March. There was some discussion because many people haven't attended WHD Global yet so this is why I put two pictures to the slides to give you an impression what's going on there. WHD Global is the largest hosting and cloud service provider event in the world. It takes place once a year in Europa Park in Rust. It's the second largest theme park in Europe, so they have the facilities and also the infrastructure to host such an event for that's going on for five days.

On the first night – it will be Monday night – the UASG will host the night talk. So you have a fair, you have a conference, and in the evening there will be social events. But for those who are still interested in content, each night at 10:00 there will be a night talk. We've been approached if we would like to be the host of the first one and we accepted and Christian and me set up the panel. This is the place where we'll be. It's the entrance hall of the Hotel El Andaluz in the Europa Park. You see around 100 [turned] people roughly attending each night those night talks, and if you scroll down you'll see how the panel is usually set.

How we describe now the Universal Acceptance topic for the audience there, because we have all the large cloud service and hosting service providers there, is where your next billion euros come from. So it's the approach, what you are missing when you are not UA-ready. So this is the message we want to get out there.

If you scroll a little bit more further you will see the setting so far. We are very glad that Ram will have the time to be there. We will have Blake Irving on stage who already confirmed is the COO of GoDaddy. We have McKailey Nalem, he's the CO of Black Knight who will also already confirm to be on the panel. This is something I [couldn't] update early enough. Aaron Phillips will not be the fourth one on the panel but it will be Rafael Laguna from Open Xchange. So we will have somebody on stage who's

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

in the second line of the supply chain to provide the e-mail software for most large hosting companies. So this is why we were really glad that he confirmed yesterday to Christian in Austin where he could have a face-to-face meeting with him.

This is the setup for the panel. Moderators will be Christian and me, and I think this is a very good idea to have a broader outreach to one of our core target groups we want to talk to and to address, and there will be some drinks and there will be some UASG bottle openers for the drinks. So I think this is a really good opportunity to work on the outreach part we are working on.

The next thing I have on the agenda is something where Don is already thinking it will never happen anymore. It's a CIO's Guide to UA-readiness. Christian and me are working on to finalize it. We spent the last weeks on gathering some feedback from CIOs and CTOs we personally know and we sent them the paper and the current version and we received some feedback we are still working on implement it and we would like to spread it on the mailing list in the next few days because one of the main parts of this paper is the Appendix which includes a number of software that we know that is used in hosting and cloud service provider companies, but I think it's still far from being – it will never be complete – but we would like to add some more names of software that is used in the industry just to give an idea of some kind of checklist. Please check if you are using this kind of

software in your company. Please take a closer look at it and this is the first task we are asking the community for to give us feedback to add more content to this Appendix of software that is usually used in the industry and we are especially looking for software that is only spread in local markets and that we are not really aware of that you can add this to this list.

This is something that will happen in the next few days, and I hope Don is still looking forward to it and we are happy to make it ready and provide it to the community. This is what I wanted to add to the communication part of today's agenda, so this is what I just wanted to say. Thank you.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks, Andrew. Thanks, Lars. Comments? Questions? While you're thinking of them, I'd just like to point out we have a poster. One of the things that we talked about in the past was getting some posters that can be put up at some technical forums. The IETF, for example have a Hackathon and they have posters in the Hackathon about different topics and sometimes they just have posters up in the room. Certainly in New Zealand at NOG and other academia-ish events – things at universities and training institutes – they'll have a gathering and they'll also have posters. And they have poster competitions. So there is a prize to be won for some posters. This is our first go at a poster.

Please have a look at it. It's been distributed on the list as a smaller pdf but you can see it in real life and if you have suggestions on how to improve it, please share those on the list.

I have Ram and I have Jonathan. Ram.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. One of the things that I did recently was – and Edelman has been helping here – has been to provide briefing reports through analysts in the industry. The intention is to bring them up to date and see if they can influence the people whom they consult with. I had just a phenomenal discussion recently with one of the analysts and, Andrew, I missed… Did you…?

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Yeah. [Inaudible]. We covered a little bit of it but please. I was saying how successful the briefing was, but feel free to go into more detail.

RAM MOHAN: Right. The most recent one, the big takeaway for me was not that we did a briefing. It was not that it was a successful briefing. The key takeaway for me was that the analyst had a pretty different take on what we're doing in the UASG. She blogged about it and you can read the blog. But what she was saying was

effectively that we're completely off base and our approach that we're taking is – and I'm paraphrasing here. She didn't say "completely off base" – but she was basically saying that, "Look, you're talking to the wrong audience. You really ought to be talking to CMOs. And you ought to be talking to CMOs and folks in the sales and the marketing area," and the rationale that she was using was, "Look, contact management systems, things like Salesforce.com, etc., are very important in today's world – LinkedIn and Salesforce – and if those lead generation systems cannot handle EAI or if those lead generation systems cannot handle a top-level domain or a domain name that is not one of the conventional names, one of the legacy names, then you actually lose sales. You lose leads. Your database will not accept it and you lose leads."

Her perspective and her suggestion was that, for the UASG to change its focus from talking to the geeks to talk to the people who – I'm paraphrasing again – talk to the people who make the real decisions, who make big sales decisions, who get to swing much larger budgets and who also get to move where entire companies and corporations go. To me, that was not only interesting to hear but I stored it in my mind to bring it up here because I'd love to hear what you folks think because that actually expands in a somewhat different direction what the focus should be.

In the current plan for outreach, the primary focus is on reaching influences and folks in the technology area – often CIOs and CTOs or developers, programmers, folks like that. So it's much more technically oriented and in fact the way I was explaining it I was saying, "Look, we've come about this saying that there is some technology things that had to be fixed and perhaps if those things are fixed from a technology level, the problem will go away and we can disband and we can all go away." And she was suggesting that we're looking at it the wrong way, that this is really a sales and marketing problem.

Andrew, you were on the call, right? Could you also jump in and characterize some of what she said?

ANDREW ROBERTSON: Yeah. She'd had a lot of previous exposure to the domain name industry and she was quite well-informed. I think a lot of her opinions in taking this into a marketing direction was also because she had been in a marketing role. She was coming at it as a marketer who had particular expertise in the domain name sector. That was my interpretation of what… and I could see where she was coming from. I'm not sure if I want to be the one to change the direction of the communication, because I do still see the value in targeting CIOs and that audience. But it may be the scope to expand it to marketers but I did wonder if she might

be the most well-informed marketer you're going to come across in that way.

DON HOLLANDER: Andrew.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: It strikes me that once before, we had this conversation. There was a conversation somewhat early on where there was a question about what the audience was and my recollection – but others might remember differently – is that we decided that the marketing and the CMOs and so on was the wrong target because the technology was lagging badly enough that if you created the demand and the CIO said, "No, that's a $200 million project this year," the whole thing would die and you wouldn't get any internationalization. And so the idea was to seed the technical capabilities first before you started approaching this other market.

I don't know whether the response to that is, "Oh, okay. And we've moved the ball along that far and so now it's time to reach out further." But I am still a little concerned that if you create an expectation that this is going to work properly and the technical end of the company does a bad job of it, what you will get is the

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

same thing that we saw the last time where it took a great deal of time to get over the hump of, "Oh, those things don't work."

RAM MOHAN: Andrew, that's a good point. When I presented some of that kind of a perspective, what she said was that most corporations are demand-driven and the demand's driven from the sales and marketing function, and if the sales and marketing function demands that it has to be done the technology function will follow.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: I completely agree with that, but the problem here is in symmetry, right? The side of the company that's going to demand that, they don't need just their company to do it properly, they need some third party to do it. And any time you create expenses for somebody else, the chances that they're going to spend that money is pretty low. This is the story of BCP38 and everything else that you can think of like that.

I'm just nervous about the externality problem here. That isn't to say that it's the wrong approach. It seems to me at the very least we can't drop the other target which is people are going to demand this of you, and maybe the right thing to do now is to goose it by saying, "Oh, there is this demand. See? I've got this

EN

thing over here," and maybe the place to do that is not so much in the current CMO high-level markets but actually in emerging markets where the demand really is pressing which is one of the reasons that I like the presentation earlier despite quibbles with maybe the numbers, I like the point about, "Here are the people you're leaving behind."

JONATHAN FRAKES: I'd like to actually kind of complement what's been said about who the discussions should be with and the substance of this. From a large standpoint, I've had a variety of different conversations within software development executives whether they be in the CIO suite or sometimes in the strategic suite of decision-making inside of companies and even CEOs of software development companies about the matters that we are faced with, the challenges in UA. A lot of the problem that they seem to identify, they really liken it to the Year 2000 issue with the two-character year being adequate until they realized it wasn't and the evolution in chronology changing.

What they akin this to, though, is a technical debt that requires some addressing and then they try to find some budgetary justification to address that technical debt. And it is really, really, powerful when they identify that with a sales opportunity or some sort of a business initiative that they can tie numbers to

to enable them access to the purse strings and the budget to then endeavor to go and address some of that technical debt in the guise of building a new opportunity. So they're kind of very tied together.

But the strongest successes that I've had are in talking with the software executives, people at executive summits, developers, because they're in there and they're doing the educational part that we have with the poster and what not are very helpful to get into break rooms to be a proactive measure so that the developers are aware and they can address these proactively as they're doing projects and then we have to find ways for them to retroactively then get budget or things to address things that the box is ticked next to "done" on as far as they're concerned. And we have to do it a way that is sensitive to the fact that we don't put them into a defensive position – "Hey, your thing is broken and you didn't do it right," is a terrible message for them. We also have to nuance it carefully so that there's not a belief, "Yeah, these new domains, they don't' work. They're broken," and that's a terrible message to have out there and it's inaccurate.

So finding the right suite – and Ram, I really do think that there is a lot to the marketing person or within the sales initiative because then it's tied to having some income from the expense that's being used to address it. But I love the poster and I wanted

to originally ask if there was a way to request they're shipped somewhere to different software developers or if we can carry away a tube and be ambassadors to deliver those to the different software development companies. I myself know a few up in Seattle area that would be great to have in the break room.

[DON HOLLANDER]: Michael, what do you think? Do you think your paper is going to help energize the CMOs and the CEOs and the CFOs to say, "Oh, there's some opportunity here, and you Mr. CIO or Mrs. CIO or Ms. CIO, whatever…" Do you think that your paper's going to be able to instigate that other group?

MICHAEL KENDE: It's an interesting question. We were more looking at retail – sales sites – not this wholesale gathering names and then having it in your database for six months later or to start a big sales campaign. But it still I think as Andrew said, it raises the awareness that there is this demand side issue that it's not just that there should be some pull of getting companies thinking about it from a sales perspective and then starting to demand that something happen.

It may be just at a lower level than the Salesforce and the bigger software packages and uses of names but I think it's a start for sure.

[DON HOLLANDER]:   Is $10 billion a big enough number?

MICHAEL KENDE: I don't know the marketing side but I think that Salesforce is, those companies that do that are massive, massive, companies. LinkedIn just sold for what? $24 billion. So I think there's probably a lot more in there for the companies that do sales.

RAM MOHAN: Here is what she says in her blog: "The Universal Acceptance Steering Group is currently focused on influencing the developer community. I have a different perspective and see UA as a broader customer experience issue that'll impact any technology that facilitates the capture of customer or prospect contact information, including CRM, marketing automation, and commerce platforms, just to name a few. I believe the UA issue warrants the attention of the broader C-suite, including CMOs, Chief Digital Officers, Chief Customer Officers, and Chief Revenue Officers, and here is why. There are currently over 3.5 billion Internet users or about 40% of the world's population according

to Internet Live Stats. The majority of new users will come from non-Latin language countries in language domain names are gaining popularity and as these customers try to purchase domains, products, or sign up for   offers with their e-mail address, the web forms will need to have the ability to capture, validate, process, and store, these new e-mail extensions. Failing the form with an error message due to not recognizing the domain extension can result in the loss of the sale.”

SIGMUND FIDYKE: I want to add to that. Yes, I think I've been in IT my whole life and I'm still the tail wagging the dog. We have new stuff we need to put in. Yeah, so what? That's still the guy with the money still says that to me. And in addition, it's not just – somebody here mentioned – it's not just IDN. Your customer base right now has a .cloud or .shopping or dot-something a lot longer than three and you're kicking those e-mails out as well? So it's not some vague, "I want to expand into Russia, India, somewhere," type of thing. It's here and now. So I think there's a lot to that and it's more immediate than people give it credit for and the marketing guy is the guy who gets excited about that kind of thing.

So it's not just the 10 billion, it's also – the other thing I wanted to add is that you could be first. And none of your competition is

there yet either. How about you be the first guy? And that could go to a marketing guy faster than 10 billion.

LARS STEFFEN: I just wanted to talk about my experience because the last two years we supported Sedo at dmexco, and dmexco is the world's largest event on online marketing so you have from my perspective the right target audience but when you talk to the people that are running around there where you think, "Okay, [that] should be experts in digital marketing," the general knowledge about domain names in general that there is something next to .de and .com is so low that it's really hard to explain those guys that there's huge variety of domain names out there and they're not aware of this. So when you put this one step further, there's also this UA topic behind it it's still too complicated for some of them, I would say.

But it's the right target audience. I appreciate the approach. But it's a little bit harder than it may sound in the first place.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I think I would even build upon what Lars is saying, that we can't always assume folks have alignment with our understanding of our acronyms. It's true in any technology company. But also some of the concepts are very challenging to wrap their heads

around because they don't understand the concept of Punycode or even necessarily what EAI is or the e-mail issues.

But finding something that really simplifies it and is a very quick message that they can latch onto has been very effective. And to build on, again, what Lars is saying, when you're having the conversation with folks who aren't necessarily exposed to this, explaining things like perhaps how zip code fields if you have a software that's written to accept form input from in the United States where you've got a postal code that's just numeric and it's five or nine digits, but then you expand into other countries where there's combinations of letters and numbers and it's six long, that a simple change to your form widens your opportunity pool and people who can effectively connect with you and integrate with you and that's new business that you're just effectively missing out on and there has been a change in the Internet where there's these new extensions and people are just not able to sign up for your service, you have money falling on the floor.

It's a very effective message. It does get Henry the Eighth to look up over the mutton leg and pay some attention.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The only thing I was going to add is that Andrew's recollection sounded right. If that was the way things happened at the time,

then I think you got it right. Move in the direction of targeting the technical decision-makers. That was the right thing to do at first. Until you have that infrastructure there, as was also pointed out, EAI included, it doesn't really make sense to invest or certainly not to overinvest in targeting the marketing decision-maker. Absolutely they're an important stakeholder.

From a budgetary perspective they're the most important stakeholder that you're going to reach out to, but until that tail can be wagged you have to try to wag the dog with it. You have to get the technology to the point where it makes sense. At that point, even taking a cautious approach toward the marketing decision-maker, meaning that you pick a few very large bellwether international advertisers and focus there first – big CPG companies – Unilever, P&G, etc. as well as maybe the Internet retailers which is the group that is really going to respond best to this analysis that we looked at earlier, especially with some additional work on it, some additional input. That's going to be your way in to that market, but I don't think we're ready yet. I think it's just going to take just a little bit more time to figure out the EAI issue and then at that point it makes sense to include all stakeholders and that may include Legal as well, by the way, because from an Intellectual Property standpoint they're stakeholders as well.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] here. So from the beginning we are talking about losing money. Our registry are selling half of the product from the beginning because it wasn't the full product that works. So it's natural to address to CTOs to technical side to fix the product to be full product and then we can address to CMOs and marketing and sales because only then we can have the real product on the market. On the other hand, Ram, what you just quote from this blog is not entirely right because you're not losing money. In human nature – and this was on the list also – if my new g or new IDN e-mail address doesn't work on some form, let's say airport company or something like that, I will use my ASCII and I it's not even I don't know even is there a form who will collect the data about not valid inputs or something like that? It's very rare.

Basically, I think it's on us to say do we have the full product? Do we have what we need to sell? And then go to the salespersons and talk with them.

[RAM MOHAN]:   Thank you.

DON HOLLANDER:	I'd like to put this in the parking lot because I think it's a important issue to talk about, but we're only 48 hours behind our scheduled time. Is the Fellow from Amazon still here?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	No, he's gone.
DON HOLLANDER:	My question would have been, is Amazon able to take customers with their new [TLD] space?
	So we're going to put this in the parking lot.
RAM MOHAN:	You should invite them to the Seattle event.
DON HOLLANDER:	Yes. We're going to put this in the parking lot and the question is, are we ready to go aggressively outside the CIO community, CIO space and any other questions before we move on?
	Thank you to Lars and to Andrew. And thank you particularly to Andrew for coming over for the day and being able to meet people face-to-face. I think it makes a world of difference.

ANDREW ROBERTSON: No problem.

DON HOLLANDER: Michaela is going to talk about the logging system. She has no slides because she doesn't need them. She's going to talk from her heart, and she said, "Do you still want me to talk?" And I say, "Absolutely," because just yesterday I had a private note from one of the members of the UASG said, "What happened to that logging idea?" And I said, "Well, we actually implemented it just after Hyderabad," so they obviously missed that e-mail.

But how are we doing with that, Michaela?

MICHAELA QUINZY: We're doing quite well. Michaela Quinzy, icann.org. I'm going to correct you just a little bit. I do have slides but I'm saving those for Wednesday when the rest of the team will be here. They're actually the ones doing the work and so I don't want to steal their thunder.

We redirected the web form on uasg.tech to salesforce.com in November of last year. The idea that Don approached us with was to both help understand the breadth of the problem and also help direct resolution. The volume of inquiries that we've gotten to date have been extraordinarily low – somewhere around two a week and our success rate in driving resolution on

those has been mixed. Interesting conversation that you just had. Some of the feedback that we've gotten is that the issue may not be big enough for the technical teams to invest the time and resources in resolving it because we are reporting one instance two instance, at a time, and so they are giving the feedback that volume might drive resolution because of the impact to revenue.

Like I said, the volume has been relatively low. The ability to find the right person has been mixed. The team is finding that per instance it's taking us about seven hours of collective work to get the issue reported and get an answer back when we're able to do so. But they're like dogs with a bone on it and stick to it.

We've gotten good reception. The folks that we do talk to are cooperative and their responses range from, "Yeah, we kind of get it but we don't have the resources for that," to, "Okay, we'll fix it for this particular domain and maybe later we'll address the issue more broadly."

JOTHAN FRAKES: Thank you very much. This is really good to see. I thought it was brilliant that you plugged it into Salesforce so you can get the measurement of these issues. The first thing that I did is I went to the uasg.tech page and I'll be darned if I can't find where this is to submit, and I wonder if that might be a challenge for folks

who are trying to perhaps report an issue. Is it possible? How can we navigate to that from the home page? Is there a way? Could you show us how to get there from the main webpage because I think a novice user if they have to go too far, I've often been in my experience that that's a big filter that might artificially minimize an issue or be a barrier to receiving that feedback.

DON HOLLANDER: That was a specific strategy actually to not make it terribly easy because people within the registry/registrar community thought we would be inundated with them so we actually did sort of hide it.

[JOTHAN FRAKES]:   You were successful.

DON HOLLANDER: And we said our strategy was to spiral out, so the original plan was once we had 100 issues we'd review the whole process but we haven't got to 100 issues and about a month ago or so we expanded it out with a broader promotion so the DNA [I2] coalition, eco, the GNSO maybe, possibly the ccNSO were all given information on how to address this but I'll take your point and I am sure that somebody knows how to put it on the front page.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I apologize to be that guy. I didn't realize there was a methodology behind this. But I was shocked. I was a bit flummoxed that there was not a very high feedback level because in conversations I have with people I frequently am told, "Hey, this doesn't work in Twitter," or, "This doesn't work in this, that, or the other, software." So I was surprised.

Not to take away from your thunder and I really appreciate the resourcing and time and energy you're putting into this. That's why I apologize to delay your presentation. Thank you.

MICHAELA QUINZY: Not at all. It was a good question and kind of a precursor to where I was going. So on Wednesday when we do present more quantitative data, one of the objectives that we had was to drive discussion with the group on how do we spiral out? How do we expand? We're positioned internally to add more resources and today we filter all of these through our team in Europe which is just two people only covering a very short window of time, but we're prepared to have the 5 by 24 team in all of the locations supported when the volume justifies the resources. Not necessarily to have the conversation today, but to just kind of seed your thoughts and have a conversation about it on Wednesday when we present more data.

[DON HOLLANDER]:   Gwen.

GWEN CARLSON: I just wanted to say we can update the web page pretty easily so I'll just coordinate that and Andrew, maybe we can work on that and then as part of the spiral out campaign we can also update the ICANN page and put that on our UA site and once that's done and we're geared up, we can even tweet if you have a question or an issue or something, so I think there's a lot we can do to promote it. And Don, thank you for the chocolate.

DON HOLLANDER: Any other comments or questions for Michaela?

HOPE SCHAEFFER: My question is, I didn't originally come from the Internet background and I had no idea what UASG was. Universal Acceptance doesn't make any sense to me as far as a user who doesn't know the Internet. This is one of the things that I would suggest – adding as far as your search – things like, "Why does my e-mail address not work?" The reason is, that's the first thing I'm going to think of when I input my e-mail address and it doesn't work. The first thing I'm going to do is I'm going to

search that: "Why doesn't my e-mail address work?" Then UASG site could be the first one to pop up. But for that to happen, you'd have to have that information or text within your website. I think that would help a lot instead of just UASG, because if I weren't from this group, I'd have no idea what you were talking about.

DON HOLLANDER: That's also a strategy. Before we started this, we talked to CIOs and they said, "Oh, yes. You've just spent five minutes explaining. I get it. Now where do I go for more information?" And the answer was, "Good question."

So that's what the first year and a bit was all about was being able to create the documentation to answer that question, which comes back to the previous question about are we ready to actively expand outside the technical community? And maybe it's my bias, but as a former CIO I hated my internal customers wanting stuff before I was able to give it to them. So I want my colleagues to be given a fair chance. And it could very well be that, "Yes, they've had that fair chance. We have the documentation. It's easy for them to get to, raise awareness…da-da-da-da." So we'll come back to that.

Thank you for the question, though. So there is some method to the madness but what I think I'm hearing is we need to start spiraling out more quickly than we had.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Your favorite gad-fly here. I wanted to just offer that the substantive dialog and discussions that have happened and the documentation that's been formed over the period of time under your leadership has been fantastic and very, very, helpful in the conversations that I've been having so I don't mean to sound in any way like I'm detracting. I'm actually very encouraged about all that I've seen. And it's been very, very, helpful. So thank you for that, Don.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you. And I'd actually like to thank Gwen and her team for making it actually look really smart. So regardless of what it actually says, it certainly looks smart.

Thanks, Michaela.

MICHAELA QUINZY: You're quite welcome.

DON HOLLANDER:	UA and phishing and spam and Peter and I have had some discussions about this. Peter, quite conscious of time and I will try to get some slides up while you talk.
PETER MEYER:	Okay. My name is Peter Meyer. I work at eco. The same organization as Lars but in a completely different division. I have a more IT Security background in the security industry for many years. Christian Dawson was able to get up a round table at the last [mock] meeting which was two weeks ago in San Francisco and the reached out to the global Anti-Abuse community with the questions, "What are the needs and issues of the Anti-Abuse community regarding UA.
	I have a similar working group in Germany. We had a meeting two days ago so also addressed the same questions to the German, Austrian, and Swiss, community regarding this. And the answer is actually – maybe if you bring up the slides. You can go to slide four – never mind. I think it's the same… That one. Exactly. Then to the next slide. That's where I want to jump in.
	The discussion really went into… not really into [UA] specific at the group because there were really a lot of organizations and basically so the answer is there are not too many technical issues. It's more a content issue related to what's on the specific new top-level domains was hosted there and so on. So there are

minor issues related to technical stuff and so most of the slides I will present now are quotes and statements really more generic so there may be one or two points that might be useful for this group.

I think the most important feedback is that people's most first experience related to new top-level domains is an experience because of abuse.

[When] you go to the next slide.

DON HOLLANDER: Just to be clear, this is the result of an open-ended question at an Anti-Abuse meeting.

PETER MEYER: Exactly.

DON HOLLANDER: So not necessarily any science behind this.

PETER MEYER: No.

DON HOLLANDER: Okay. I just want to make sure that we have that context clear.

PETER MEYER: Really this is a closed group so here are some of the statements what we just got [inaudible] for example you see that new top-level domains usually start ranking at the top of bad domain rankings. Some people say that new top-level domains are primary used for abuse, that IDNs add new abuse vectors, for example, that registrars don't respond on abuse notifications, for example that companies have issues registering new top-level domains, for example, they reach out and say, "I want to register something-dot-something," and they get the answer, "No, you're not allowed to register it," and two days later they see somebody with a faked WHOIS information getting that domain. None of these issues are related to this group probably.

From a technical point, I also asked the question what is the state of art? What are the problems? Are you UA-ready? And the statement from the abuse guys is, "Yes. We're ready. We run proprietary systems. We are the first ones who see abuse and we're able to fix the stuff. We're able to report issues. We are able to do all the logging. We are able to run our abuse systems related to everything that's more or less new." And they say they're well set up. On the one side they just see, "Okay, there's a lot of abuse going on and we're the ones dealing with it and we're faster than our company. We're faster than software

vendors because we run our own systems and we just see the stuff."

They have one or two wish lists – just coming back. That's not on the slides. They have a big issue with multiple chart top-level domain registrations. For example, if you have PayPal might use Latin characters combine with a Cyrillic "A" or something like that. From their perspective this is 100% abuse and they see some maybe legit reasons but technically this is just an open door, an open invitation, for fraudsters to do this abuse and from their side they would like to see something like "Prohibited" or "Not Allowed" or [when] just regulated some way. This is something probably you might discuss here.

They would also like to see, I just learned before that there is there some kind of central database where they can pull all the valid top-level domains maybe along with some technical information from one central server. Right now some people told me, "Okay, why go to news magazines? See, okay, there is new top-level domain then I go to wiki page and pull it manually." So it's probably a communication issue to reach out to everybody saying that there is this list so probably not a technical issue so rather communication.

RAM MOHAN: Hold on. These are technical people in the Anti-Abuse community saying that?

PETER MEYER: Yeah.

RAM MOHAN: Wow.

PETER MEYER: Yeah, they are a close community so maybe they don't look out too close maybe. That's just one or two statements.

Anyway, the biggest issue they still have is copyright but this is also not really a problem here. Let me just bring up one of my slides here as well maybe for some feedback.

They also say that they have really well-established workflows and data [exchange] with the communities also on UA content, so this is all working. For example, they get the spam reports from Spam House with all the new stuff in there. They get the phishing feeds as well. They can report it back. All the systems on abuse accept UA and so that's a good thing. The abuse and take-down processes work. The cooperation with law enforcement [and] brand owners [is] working as well even though this is a lot of manual work because they might not be

ready to support it and also the data sharing among the community works.

They also came out just with just one or two points where the situation needs improvement. This is a cooperation with the registrars. They would prefer direct contact. They prefer better maintenance of the [use] information and better monitoring and responsiveness on the abuse at owner mailboxes and they would also have to kind of escalation or the question were to escalate if the abuse process not working. None of these things are really UA-specific.

When you just go back to the slide before just with the issues that came up.

What they would like to see is a strong cooperation between the UASG and organizations like APWG, Spam House. That was the first kick-off at the last meeting. There were a couple of action items defined to trigger this process to have more exchange in the future. My impression was also that there is a lot of missing knowledge what's going on on the one side and on the other side so that too many organizations are independently trying to solve the problem and that the community needs to come to get stronger and have a more frequent exchange across the different organizations, countries, and stakeholders.

From the Abuse side, they would like to have more exchange and collaboration at the operational level. They already share [inaudible] on abuse. They would probably also like to pass this on to ICANN what they probably some do, others don't. And they would like to see some common abuse metrics also on UA abuse. I think this was also one of the action items we agreed at the [mock] meeting and also one central place to report what's broken.

These are the things at a quite high level and as a summary so the Anti-Abuse community wants to see less abuse [but] they see that all the new top-level domains, IDN, everything's bringing more, bringing some challenges, for example, the spam filters are not efficient if you need to figure out what's the spelling of Viagra in Chinese is, for example, or in Russian, they have experts, they have a community that do it but the old systems with Latin characters are not working so they usually have new technologies.

So from your side you surely want to increase and grow and be more international, and there's a kind of conflict between the two groups and it would be great if the one side – the Abuse side – and the UASG meet somewhere and work together to listen what's happening on the one side to what's the needs of the other side.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

I think the most important thing is trust and these guys are smart, you are smart, so get good together, work together. That's more or less the summary.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks very much, Peter. So you're the messenger so we shall not shoot you.

PETER MEYER: No. Exactly. But I can pass on some information to some people.

DON HOLLANDER: In terms of one of the specifics that you pointed out is they would like to have a current, up-to-date list of where they can go to get valid top-level domains, and Andrew in the chat says the DNS does that for you. There is a number of other places and in UASG007, I think, the document's called, "Introduction to Universal Acceptance" there's a paragraph with a couple of URL references that point them to a very dynamic, updated four, six, or eight, times a day, of top-level domains.

PETER MEYER: I believe [inaudible] minority who came up with the statement, not the majority because I think the most companies, organizations, whatever, who attend these groups know where

to get all the stuff so it's probably just a minority I think one also probably get out to and reach this information, for example, I don't know, whatever they need, so this is part of the discussion what's missing.

DON HOLLANDER: Anyway, so the information is there.

PETER MEYER: Yeah.

DON HOLLANDER: I have a couple of other questions. Early on in the UASG we looked at the Anti-Abuse issue, particularly around homographic attacks and there are studies that we found show that in the past year there had been seven which suggested to us this was a pretty small number and perhaps not worthy of our attention. Is that number sound right or can you find out if that number is right?

PETER MEYER: I can try to find [that out].

DON HOLLANDER: At least on an order of magnitude, is it 7 or 7,000 or 70,000?

PETER MEYER: It's hard to say because it's always comparing apples and oranges. On the one side some people want to keep it small, the other one [see it] big. I personally don't trust any numbers.

DON HOLLANDER: Okay. And then the other issue is we wanted to make sure that your members/participants that their own systems are UA-ready. So you're saying their abuse systems are able to deal with all these domain names would want to make sure that they can deal with the e-mail addresses as well that are non-ASCII in the mailbox space but also their own business systems are UA-ready.

PETER MEYER: I think these are two different topics because the Abuse guys, it's a small close group, and I think if they're rather UA-ready then the rest of their organization but they're also the guys that pass it on. If they have doubts and they say, "Okay, if something's broken, doesn't work," they'd probably rather shut it off than fix it first. So they want to see their [first] systems first seeing it's working and they probably roll it to the complete company.

DON HOLLANDER: Peter and I have had an e-mail discussion for the past week or so on… Any other comments?

PETER MEYER: Summarize just to say okay, problems are not technical. They are more a matter of content and reputation on the new generic TLDs.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks, Peter. Andrew?

ANDREW SULLIVAN: This makes me wonder whether one of the audiences that we haven't maybe spent a lot of time on is in fact operators of the new infrastructure. The problem here is that the incentives are sort of aligned wrong because the Anti-Abuse people, what they want to say of course is no to anything until they're pretty sure that it's good, which is a good security strategy – deny by default. The problem for new TLD operators is that they need to boost sales because they need to recover the large amount of money that they've already spent on this thing. And so the incentives there are the opposite way, that is, they don't have a strong incentive to make it harder for new customers to come on and run in there because there's lots of abuse in .com, too. The problem is that they're a big name and so if there's 100,000

abusers in .com it's not that big a deal. If there's 100,000 users in new TLD and there's only 200,000 registrations today, then you look like you've got a 50% problem.

Somehow we've got to make the incentives line up right so that it works well for new TLDs to figure out how they could clamp down on abuse without shooting their own feet off. I have no suggestion for how to do that. I wish I knew how. But that's clearly one of the places where if you want to discourage the [mog] people and so on from just like putting the list just like you know, you still get this, right? Let me tell you this – if you use .info as your MX you still get hit in a lot of automatic things. And I run a lot of mail through my MX but it doesn't matter. So I think that that's an issue.

RAM MOHAN: Andrew, I wish Rich Merdinger was here because we've had a discussion about this in times past. The tension that you describe is not only a very relevant one but I don't know how to make incentives align in a new registry whose primary goal is to expand its base and the primary metric is not usage. The primary metric is number of domain names that are sold. Were it a metric on usage, I think actually some of what we're trying to do will get across. Because I remember back in the day with .info that was what was going on. We were inside of Afilias we were

looking at the metric of success being the total number of domains sold and soon enough we found that .info had been bought by a lot of folks who were not using it in a salubrious way. And we ended up taking some strong actions. But in that case, what changed .info's actions was the probability that .info would get blackballed and tarred.

And here we are seven/eight years later after a significant amount of effort, millions of domain names that have been taken down, and .info still has some of the problems from operators' decisions from almost a decade ago. We could explain that. We could say that, "If you don't take corrective action you may have a problem." We could say that to new TLD operators. And perhaps, Don, that's something that we should take up as an exercise. Perhaps we talk to a few TLD operators who've been here and done this before and who can share that as experience or as advice, if you will, for new TLD operators.

The other thing is, for the Anti-Abuse folks I think the default behavior of "deny first" I don't see how to affect that incentive because that's a conservative approach. I don't think we can attempt to touch it. But in your summary slide, Peter, you'd said "improve trust," but there are three determinants of trust – knowledge and expertise, openness, and honest and concern and care. We can demonstrate from UASG those things but some

registries actually do exactly the opposite because their business models are different.

PETER MEYER: Absolutely. These are the conflicts. I think maybe one interesting quote or maybe two points I just want to bring up. Regarding trust, there was one quote that was also interesting saying, "When I see certain top-level domains I would rather work with a white list than with a black list," so basically get a list of maybe [1 to 20 or 1,000] domains where I know it's trust and block everything else? This is definitely a point where we should not be going to. And the other point is with regarding how to fix the problem. Something interesting I learned is about Switzerland where the .ch domain was there was a call for a new registrant and clear and good abuse process is one of the criterias to give it to a new registrar and each of the companies had to present an Anti-Abuse model.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks very much. Sigmund, can I just ask your forbearance for just a little bit? Tony Harris from Argentina has come to join us and he's left another meeting to be here, so he was here at the right time but apparently our agenda wasn't. So I'd just like to talk about the communities section and Argentina specifically.

Tony.

TONY HARRIS: Thanks, Don. I can actually dedicate [inaudible]. I wanted to be here today but I'm on the GNSO Council and Sundays they run meetings all day.

Hello, everybody. By the way, if you haven't met me my name is Tony Harris. I work in the Argentina Internet Association CABASE, and my day job is building – let's say assembling – Internet exchanges in Argentina and recently we've launched a large project for the implementation of IOT services using our network of 360 ISPs connected into this network.

Basically, we did something last year which didn't go as well as I'd hoped. With Don we participated in an event by an organization called Sysarmy which is a voluntary collection of system operators who network but basically they network to solve problems online and discuss technical issues. So I showed up at this event with a banner and material which we printed and found that all these young guys were all sitting at tables with earphones and computers, and they were all solving difficult problems and chatting. It was almost impossible to catch their attention. It was a very strange environment. But all these guys were programmers. They were all techies. So it didn't go as well as we'd hoped and the same thing happened, we had

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

a talk arranged there which, again, they assigned us not much time. It wasn't as well-organized as we hoped.

I'm going to make it up to Don because CABASE is having an Internet Day on May 17th and 18th – two days actually – and this will be large event which we will control. We will control the way it's organized and handled, and since it will heavily feature a project which we are undertaking to launch IOT services in Argentina which is supported by the government. This is bringing us into contact daily with universities, particularly the digital education for [inaudible] offices of all these universities are coming into contact with us about this and also the software associations who we don't have that much networking going on usually with them. They're sort of coming in to see what we're doing. We're leading this project in Argentina.

I still have a lot of material which we printed, that booklet unless it's outdated, we will be able to use, and I think we should have easily maybe 1,500 people coming to this event all from, let's say, the Internet services world. And in our own fold we have something like 2,000 technicians who regularly attend seminars that we give in CABASE which are mostly about BGP and network operations and [routers].

I think that this particular date of May the 17th and 18th will be a good event. It will be very well-attended. And it will serve to

highlight, let's say to improve, our efforts of last year – at no cost, by the way, Don. This is on us. We owe you that.

Aside from that, I might mention that the Argentina government changed about I think it's 15 months ago for the better for many things, but one strange thing they did was to make it very difficult for registrations in the .ar space. The ccTLD has complicated things to such an extent that no one can act as a registrar or register multiple addresses. It has to be an individual identifying himself with his national ID card. So sales are plummeting on .ar registrations and people are looking at gTLDs – a lot of people are looking at gTLDs – and obviously all the hosting companies, companies who offer different Internet services including a domain name, are all looking at gTLDs now and not the local string. So that's going to dovetail into generating more interest in getting this word out and sorting this out locally.

That's basically what I wanted to tell you, Don and Ram and everybody. We're extremely supportive of this, as you know. And I think this will be an event where we'll be able to highlight this a lot better. If there are any videos produced – I haven't followed that closely – it would be good if you could give them to us. We would run them on our stand there so people could watch them and also make the material available to everybody who's going there. I have a lot of brochures.

That's what I have to say right now. Any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks very much, Tony. I'll send you links to some videos and other documents that we have in English and in Spanish and in Thai. There's some very good Thai videos.

Comments, questions? I know Tony's got to go back to the GNSO, but thank you very much for coming. Thanks.

Sigmund.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: I have a quick presentation here on our efforts to be UA-ready. I'll just run through it quickly.

These next three slides are a quick definition of what UA is. I don't want to go over them now except to say Gwen created these so if you need an entry set of slides to use to say, "This is what UA is," Don has them. The first one just says, "This is what it is," with examples. The next slide are the five things you have to do – and by the way, in the comments on this slide there's a lot more text I put in there about what "accept" and "validate" and "store" and "process" and "display" mean – and I think you

can find those quite useful and like I said, Gwen went through this so I feel better about the text.

The next slide is, again, why we're doing this and why we need to do this. One thing I want to add quickly to everything we say about e-mail – and this is from my techie point of view – is that 80% of every log-in out there uses the e-mail as your ID and so that just adds a level of "Oh, my goodness" on top of it all. That's why that last line, "Your online identity has to be in an IDN."

Next slide.

This is an update from what I presented at ICANN57. What we learned – and we've been at this for a bit of time – is that, to my view, there are two major parts of UA-readiness. One is just handling longer ASCII domains in both identifiers and URLs and in e-mails. And it's fairly easy. It's easy to test and actually somebody mentioned about testing our own site and it's really, really, hard to test the next one. But this one is easy to test. And this is where I think most people are going to get hit soonest because there are more in the new gTLDs. There are many more of these than there are of the IDNs.

Sorry, to put it in my own terms which I'm not sure I should, this is where I look stupid – when I don't handle these as opposed to I can justify my way around not handling Cyrillic but I can't justify my way around not handling .cloud. So that's one set.

The next one are a lot harder. We found a number of things that we have to watch for. "Finding every place a user domain," of course but being consistent everywhere. "Storage problems because of the size of Unicode," and, "Interaction with third party applications," caught us really hard in a couple of places and UTF8, there are some variations on UTF8 and testing is more than a challenge.

Thanks to Don and UASG there are more options available, saved us a lot of time there, but is still an ongoing thing and still something we're going to be looking toward and then documenting that. So I have an "easy" and a "hard."

The next slide, this is our plan now. So all of our custom applications within probably about six months will be changed, modified, to handle long ASCII domains one, because it takes less than a week in general, two, and that includes the testing because again, it's easy and I do it on what I call a non-budget, a bug fix budget, which means it doesn't have a budget. There's a catch-all for any time a bug comes up and we have to fix it, and we just throw this in there with it. But the key is that while I do this, when I'm done with this I will know throughout all my custom systems all the places where I have to work on it. And once I document that, when I get on to step two which is the hard part, I've got them all documented. I know where they all are.

If we go back to the Y2K problem, the problem wasn't fixing Y2K. The problem was finding all the places where you needed to fix Y2K. And this is similar in that. So what I'm doing in my first step – and again, I'm not saying this is even a recommended way. This is how I'm doing it. In the first step I'm doing all that finding.

The next step we're doing is that every time we have a significant update to an app we have a set of UA-readiness stories we're an agile shop so we run through stories. We have a set of stories already written that are just added to the process, to the project, to say this is the UA-readiness task that you need to do.

And so we're going through that with a couple of our services that are under a significant rewrite and we'll get to that. The step four after that is, after a year – actually every six months – we see where we are. Some of our rewrite projects are longer than six months. That's why a year I think is going to be significant. And at that point I see how much I have left and maybe I can find a budget to attack the rest straight away as opposed to waiting, but right now we have enough that in-rewrite or will be replaced by something that it doesn't make sense to try to set up a set of projects to do that. So for me, I'm going to hit everything within six months to get them UA–lite, and then I already have my stories set up for what it takes to become UA-ready and those get added to every project.

The step that we're getting into now that we haven't really made progress on is number three which is to make UA-readiness a part of our requirements for off-the-shelf right now. We run about half and half. Of all the services that we offer about half are off-the-shelf and half are custom. So that's a process that's coming forward now.

Next slide.

This is where we are now. Just a quick…We've been at this for about a year. On the right, the green is ones that are UA-ready or not applicable. If they don't have a e-mail or a URL in it it's in my "done" list. And the light green pie chart on the bottom there – the Custom Services – are the ones that I'm in progress on which means that overall I'm about 40% complete and I'll report again on how we're doing but we are taking this on as a non-budget – I don't have a separate budget for this but obviously I'm spending time doing it. And it's been fairly successful this way.

Next slide. I think I'm just about done.

Now that we've come this far, some thoughts that come to mind – and these are just my thoughts of things that we need to consider going forward – one is for ICANN itself, for the ICANN organization, we need to consider getting domains in other character sets because my view personally is that handling UA doesn't mean that everybody's typing on every character set. It

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

means that people who use a certain character set, that's their Internet. That's the Internet they're going to see. If it's in Hindi, that's the Internet they're going to see and if I'm only at icann.org then I'm not in their world. Something that comes to mind for me is that I'm not saying I need another whole website. It can be just an entry point. But I need another IRI or URL, whatever's the best way to identify that in those other character sets as an equivalent to .com or .org or whatever become available. One thing that I'm just looking for.

My Cybersecurity hat – part of the stories we have for becoming UA-ready has some security issues in it as well because there are additional security concerns when you allow other character sets in and so those are part of the stories as well. So just keep that in mind.

And then the last one I've been thinking about is, expand what you mean by "e-mail" because going forward we will have other ways to identify yourself. There's wearable, there's sensors, there's ambient identification, etc. and those are coming.

Yes.

DON HOLLANDER: Just on your increased security concerns, so my keyboard is set to Hindi. I can type icann.whatever and I can put my

hindi@hindi.hindi e-mail address in. Can I put my password in Hindi as well?

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Yes.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks. And have I always been able to do that?

SIGMUND FIDYKE: No.

DON HOLLANDER: Was that bit hard?

SIGMUND FIDYKE: No. Once we got the Unicode going, we were done.

[ANDREW SULLIVAN]:   So you know that in the password field there have been these many, many, occasions where you've had injection attacks through password fields.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Right.

[ANDREW SULLIVAN]:   So Unicode opens the attack service for that.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Yes it does.

[ANDREW SULLIVAN]:   So as long as you are okay with that and you knew that –

SIGMUND FIDYKE: That's sort of what I meant about the additional stories going in for that.

[ANDREW SULLIVAN]:   I just didn't want somebody to hear this recording in six months and say, "Oh, well. We'll just turn on Unicode and everything will be good."

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Thank you for that because my own [head] would spin off right about then. That's part of the increase of the attack service, and not just that it's Unicode and bigger but that Unicode character sets can be composite or not – an Ñ, it's acceptable to have an "N" and a tilde mean Ñ as well as Ñ. So the attack service expands in interesting ways and you have to be very careful

about how those are used. I'm not saying that you have to put in a special case for each of those. You just have to lock the password field down better than you did before. Those are the kind of stories that end up – again, stories meaning agile specifications – but those are the kind of stories that go into security.

Those are sort of side effects to think of once we become UA-ready across the board all of this comes to mind. And the last one which I just mentioned a second ago was, again, e-mail is often the identifier for your login and we do that as well, and that has security issues and changes how we do things. We are moving ourselves to a micro-service for user profiles and for logging in, so we're going to solve that problem once as opposed to, in my case, about 100-and-something times. So we're trying to address that that way. But if I could start over and not use an e-mail as a personal identifier, I would do that. It's just not going to happen.

The last thing I have, the last slide, is just a mention about Zensar's tool. Zensar created a Universal Acceptance Readiness Analyzer that goes through your website. They got fairly far into it and then marketing said, "I don't think we're going to make enough money on this," so it's now open source. I am working with our Legal department – somebody mentioned Legal earlier and it got me thinking – on presenting it as an open source and

so we expect to have it available on an ICANN website somewhere within a month or so by the end of April.

DON HOLLANDER: So is your issue with ICANN Legal because it will have an icann.org domain name?

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Yes.

DON HOLLANDER: So if I give you a different domain name –

SIGMUND FIDYKE: It will make my life easier, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Like uasg.tech?

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Yeah, one of those.

So we'll have that figured out by the end of March then but we'll get that out and available quickly. I don't expect either ICANN or UASG to have the resources available to run it as an open source where we manage additions and updates to it. It's just sort of,

"Here it is," and then the world can go from there. But it's a nice scanner that goes through and just looks through the HTML and what you had, even other parts of it, as long as the parts of a web page that are generated at run time don't show up to the scanner because it's going through static code but it gives you a good handle on in how much trouble am I or how much do I have to do?

What I am planning to do – and this is part of the delay – is this isn't mine but I'd like to be more confident in it before I make it, before I add to it, and even put it on your site which means I'm going to be running it past a number of our sites so that I have more confidence in its utility. So it will be within a month but this is something that can help. It doesn't fix things but it does help show where they are.

DON HOLLANDER: So this could be a Hackathon-ish sort of project that, here's an open source application and we are looking for people to improve it.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Absolutely. This is like a starting point and please help.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you. I'm trying to get us back under time.

RAM MOHAN: Too late for that.

If you could go two slides back, what did you mean by saying "expand what you mean by e-mail." I didn't understand. You went through that fast. I didn't understand what you tried to say there.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: I'm sorry. My view is that, while we use e-mail extensively now and even for a log-in identifier, I don't expect in five years that's going to be quite as prevalent. There are a couple of companies I've been talking to that are using wearables and other ways of identifying yourself, and I see us getting to a point where some of that identification, not that the application itself may keep your e-mail as your identifier but when you walk up to your computer with a wearable it's going to say, "Ah, that's Ram."

RAM MOHAN: So if I paraphrase it, the connection to UA is that those devices will have software or hardware on them that may store e-mail and those devices we ought to be thinking about ensuring that those device manufacturers or software manufacturers for those

devices also take into consideration UA-readiness. Is that the takeaway?

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Yes. Thank you. Yes. The two takeaways – one is that the devices, for us, for UASG, that those devices are UA-ready. Absolutely. The second one is, while I'm doing all these things, while I'm touching where my e-mails are, I want to think about what if it's not an e-mail? I'm in the code already. This isn't really a UA-readiness. It's a architect. I'm also that. It's an enterprise architect thought that I'm touching where the e-mails are.

RAM MOHAN: Okay. Got it. So that's where I didn't understand the linkage to UA. So it's a larger issue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: At IGF late last year we talked about EAI as identifiers for people and we had to admit that most identifiers in the future are not going to be e-mail addresses. Is that really UA or not? Debatable.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: And thank you. I wasn't trying to say that it was a UA thing but the device part of it you mentioned is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But once you're in the code you might as well be thinking about making identity a more generic concept.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Exactly.

RAM MOHAN: And it may hasten the end of UASG which may be a good thing.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: But here's the problem, just like with the device, underneath it all it's still going to be an e-mail address. It's just the community isn't using an e-mail anymore but it still is. Like I said, if I had my choices I would take the e-mail out as the identifier and that's not going to happen because that conversion is just not going to happen. As much as I'd like to say that the DNS won't require ASCII and Punycode, I know that's not going to happen in a reasonable amount of time. So that's why I don't think that last part, while it sounds like it eliminates the need for UA-ready, it really, really, doesn't.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you.

DON HOLLANDER: So Andrew, those fingers saying that you had a question or you can't decide whether or not to interject?

ANDREW SULLIVAN: The fingers are down.

DON HOLLANDER: Any other questions for Sigmund?

So from my perspective, Sig, I'd like to again say thank you to you and [Asha] and your entire team because you are really the only real world example of people who are actively pursuing UA in a public fashion that I'm really seeing. So thank you very much for that.

One of the things Andrew said earlier is we have a couple of documents that we're working on. "UA 101" was an introduction to Universal Acceptance. "UA 102" is an introduction to EAI. "UA 103" is a tips and tricks for developers. So we're very keen to leverage some of the work that you've already done to create a series of 200-word tricks.

SIGMUND FIDYKE: Our set of agile stories will be available here within a month. I say run them past Gwen so I don't get in trouble. The stories are not specific to one of our applications or another. They're

generalized things we need to do. And we went through a bit of time to do that so we can make that available as well.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks. I think that could be very useful for people. And that's one of the things the UASG is trying to do is get people's… some of their work done for them so they don't have to reinvent the wheel 150,000 times.

So we're only 40 minutes late, so thanks to Peter and Sig for helping us catch up.

Next item on the agenda is update from the communities. We've heard from Argentina. Lars, you want to talk to us about Germany?

LARS STEFFEN: I can do but [inaudible].

DON HOLLANDER: Do you have slides?

LARS STEFFEN: I have three slides.

DON HOLLANDER: Do I have to find them or can you talk to them?

LARS STEFFEN: I sent them to you yesterday.

RAM MOHAN: So Lars, while Don is doing that why don't you start walking us through the update from Germany and then Don will catch up.

LARS STEFFEN: Yes. Thank you. Okay.

I call it a starting point because we haven't really started yet, but I would like to do so after WHD Global in April. So I followed the structure that Don has written in the paper for local initiatives.

So who do we want to involve when we are having a so-called local initiative in Germany? You will see that there are some stakeholders involved that are not that local and from my point of view, so as eco is one of the driving forces at EuroISPA we will also involve EuroISPA to do more outreach and have a combined effort with Edelman. And there's also the ISPA in Austria. It's one of the German speaking ISPAs as well. So I'd like to get them involved as well to spread articles, newsletters, and papers that we already produced.

Then as I already mentioned several times on the call, we have this alliance of associations based in Berlin. The interesting part about this association is that they combine several smaller associations which are reaching out to small and medium businesses and the alliance of associations is running a website on a umlaut domain so they have the German "a" with the two dots on top of it so when I reached out to them and explained them what I would like to discuss with them and I mentioned Universal Acceptance, the person I was talking to was not aware what I was talking about but when I explained what it is about he said, "Okay, I know what you are talking about because we have this umlaut domain and we have some certain issues with that. So when he got the idea what it's all about, he was very keen on helping us to reach out to their members and having smaller outreach events with their members so this is really something I would like to catch up.

We are also already in touch with the Chambers of Commerce because we provide them with articles already about new gTLDs in general. We have some German specific new gTLDs like .gmbh which are quite interesting for them and in the second row I would like also to discuss with them Universal Acceptance.

Then we have a row of special associations like VOICE. VOICE is the German Association for CIOs. We have [BITNE] which is the small and medium businesses in the tech industry, and we have

one corporation partner that's the CMS Garden where all the content management systems that are open source are gathering. So we have Joomla, you have TYPO3, WordPress. They are all gathering there

Then we have a strong partnership now with a Center. This is also something we would like to add to our group, like Sebastien already mentioned that EURid is one of the active members on this so they are definitely on my list. I had a meeting with them yesterday to which extent they would like to be involved and this was also the trigger why Sebastien attended today and had the approach about why don't we take one specific country as a good example.

There's also the geoTLD group because the geoTLDs most of them are also eco members and they have been the driving force of why I'm sitting here so they should also be the ones that are involved in our initiative. And of course we are in regular touch with ISOC in Germany for the prep ICAN meetings at the Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Energy because the GAC representative in Germany is located in this Ministry so they are also asking for regular updates on what we are doing.

Then we have one association it's called VITAKO. It's the association of municipal IT service providers in Germany so on the long run it's our goal to – this is something I have on the list

later – when it comes to procurement processes on the Federal level we would like to see that UA-readiness is one requirement and that it will be put into the papers in the requirements and when there is a project that some kind of software needs to be bought by the government or by Federal resources we'd like to see UA-readiness as one of the requirements.

Of course as I already mentioned, we have the eco membership and I would like to reach out to software development companies. There's one I have in mind specific in Germany that's Mayflower because it's the largest PHP House in Germany and the COO is also the Editor-in-Chief of the PHP Magazine. He's the Head of the [Content] Advisory Board for the international PHP conference so he's one of the main influencers I have in mind to spread the word and he's also very active on those beer and pizza events for developers. So this is my dream figure when it comes to local outreach and to have the first real [inference] on this topic for us.

We can switch to the next slide.

We are also in partnership with the smaller conference PHP [Rua]. It's a local PHP conference and as you can see it's also using a [.rua] domain and this year they are planning a small road show to promote their conference and we are already clear

with them that Universal Acceptance will be one topic of the road show.

The goals for this audience are quite clear so we would like to have the exchange of information Best Practice. We would like to have input for our documentation from our group that we would like to put together, spread the word with blog posts [inaudible] articles. We'd like to have speaking opportunities at the associations that I already mentioned and at their events and to identify more engagement and influences.

What I would like to do as well is translate more of our documents into German for our efforts and yes, as I already said, make UA-readiness a procurement requirement.

As I already did with the last lot just to give you some ideas how it looks like this is a typical venue we use for events in Berlin so when we have outreach on the Federal level this is how it looks like. When you see the next slide this is one of our regular working group meetings. This is a working group e-mail so in the background you see [Sven Kolas] who is one of the leading mail security technicians [in 101]. This is a very active and also closed workshop working group and the last slide you will see our regular events we will have in the European Parliament. This is also a place we would like to be active. We are already reach out to the European Commission together with EURid that we would

like to have a small outreach breakfast event with them to talk with them about Universal Acceptance and the requirements. Thank you.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks very much. Any questions? Anybody feeling inspired of doing the same sort of thing somewhere else like Iowa?

LARS STEFFEN: So it won't be an initiative that is having a small group on a local level. They're just gathering once in a while. It will be a little bit broader approach.

DON HOLLANDER: And eco's spread throughout Europe. Do you expect to replicate this sort of thing in other countries as you go forward?

LARS STEFFEN: If it turns out to be a good example, yes.

DON HOLLANDER: Like Bulgaria.

LARS STEFFEN: I'm already thinking about this, yes.

DON HOLLANDER: Okay. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: You know, Don, to follow up on what you're saying, the one example that comes to my mind as an area that we could focus on is China.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Actually I have been thinking of setting up something like that since starting with Chinese domain name Universal Acceptance test last year and we just gathered some momentum and were thinking to take advantage of that and just set up something like that this year.

RAM MOHAN: Just to follow up on that, I think there's value in making that one of the focuses that we work together and find a way to partner and to grow it because I would say that there's not only a great deal of learning but there's learning also in the fact that the Internet market there is emerging and there's lots that can be done together there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes indeed. And actually UA is one of the requirements I think for Internet users here in China and I think by doing that we're definitely benefiting not only to the Internet users but also to the Internet industry itself.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I want to say something about this. In the last year we have organized two workshops about Universal Acceptance. Also we have a cooperation with [inaudible] .asia and [inaudible] registrar in Hong Kong and also we hold a Chinese domain industry conference in Beijing gathered by the MIT and also gather supporter with other Ministry. And more than 200 people attend this conference and we will update this conference for annual meeting. And also in this year MIT gather our [inaudible] to write some research report and to maybe draft some policy initiative to further promote the UA.

So I think the government has take serious concern and to on this issue and that they take very important things and it should be the priority for promote the new gTLD and the also for the Chinese domain name.

Also for the industry I think the registry and the registrar and some big IT company they also take this as their priority. And now we need to do something like this for the Internet companies like Baidu, Alibaba, and Tencent. They need to

update their applications. Also we will cooperate with mobile phone vendors to update to their application initial store in the mobile phone.

Also we will have the community meeting to explain and we will [call] all the stakeholders into the [inaudible] session after this ICANN meeting and to explain how the UA is important and why we need to work together to solve this problem.

So I think China is one of the important market for the domain industry, especially for the new gTLD, so I think our community will work together and we need to cooperation with all the other foreign partners also we need the gather with the UASG.

In the beginning of this session, we talk about the local engagement. I think for the local engagement for the China – not only for the China mainland but also for Hong Kong, Taiwan, Macau, and maybe Singapore and other countries – there are many people use Chinese so I think for the Chinese, the new gTLD is the main part of the IDN new gTLD so I think China we want and we are sure we can do more contribution and we also think the ICANN and the community and the local community can work together.

I want your feedback and your suggestion. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. I'm actually very pleased and honestly very excited to hear about the various things that are going on and two thoughts it sparks in my mind – the first is that we've already announced that later this year we're going to be meeting in Hong Kong and there's going to be a smaller group this meeting but there's still the UASG brand, if you will, that goes out there. It seems to me, Don, that we might be able to do something larger than only a meeting there. Perhaps there's something that we can work together with you and what you're doing is the first thing.

The second is, it appears that you're creating sort of a Playbook on how to move this forward inside of China and I'm learning a lot by listening to you but I think for the world to learn it would be great to find a way to have this written up or have this documented in some way. And if we could work together on that, whether it is written or whether it's a video interview or something like that, I think that'd be extremely useful for the rest of the communities in the world to understand and to be able to learn from your experience.

DON HOLLANDER: My fantasy about the localization project has always been that people will go out and deal locally but then the local initiaters will gather virtually or physically, I don't care, and say, "This is

what we did. This is what we did. We got 70 people. We got 7 people," just sharing ideas because we know that the UASG can't do each community but each community can do UA within their communities and looking to share experiences and ideas and how to keep it sustainable.

I know there's work happening in China, I know there's plans for Hong Kong, I know there's plans for India and Thailand, and a couple others, where people have said when we put out the "help wanted" ad for we can provide a modest amount of support – I call it beer and pizza money – and people were very appreciative. This covers some incidental costs, some travel costs, or office costs, or whatever. But it's not going to be able to sustain a local initiative but it will help get things going so that it [can then be]. So that was the fantasy is – go out, talk. Go out, talk – like an accordion. People know what an accordion is but they make music.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think we need to do more practice and not only to talk and have workshop. I think Ram's suggestion, I will ask my colleague to summarize what we do last year and our experience and about maybe the picture, the materials and maybe the videos and to share with you and also share with the community.

I think I and [Alan] we also learned about from this workshop and I think since ICANN has also local partner in AP region so maybe we can organize a AP regions local partner [I sign] MoU organization with ICANN we can do something about this. And we also think that [Don, Edmond] and the ICANN AP [Hub] and the Beijing engagement center and they also do more work and they do their contribution through these issues. I think we can do more things this year and to promote this.

DON HOLLANDER: I'm aware of time more than anybody else. I think what I'm hearing is maybe come April or May we can hold a teleconference specifically at localization issues. So we should have some experience out of China. Obviously China has experience already but we can get it written up. We should have some real world experience out of Germany and heck, maybe we do it late May and then we'll get the experience out of Argentina as well.

Why don't we aim to do that? We'll have just a conference call and it might have to be two calls on the same day just because –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Time zones].

DON HOLLANDER: Let's look to do that in May.

RAM MOHAN: I strongly endorse that. I think that's a really good idea. I think there are two benefits out of it. One is the learning but the other is cross-pollination. The point I really want to emphasize again is, better find a way to document these and create the record, if you will, share that on the UASG site, because that's really the ripple effect of that is huge and that's something that I really want to emphasize the effort of doing that is really worth it because the effect could be far more transformative and amplifying.

DON HOLLANDER: My goal is to get the UASG out of the way actually, but we can get things seeded and going then. I think that's good.

Any other questions, comments on… We have a small group.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's about to get smaller. I have a commitment. I apologize. [Inaudible].

DON HOLLANDER: So it's now 6:00 and we should be finished. We have two parking lot items but before them we have EAI discussion that Mark's

going to lead. Mark, I just need to be conscious – we have a date with the GAC when the big hand is on the six so I would like you to finish when the big hand's on the three. If you could do that and then we can wrap up and I would like to be gone by the big hand's on the five.

MARK SVANCAREK: I was confused by all those hands but I can go pretty quickly. We don't need to spend very much time on this content. Let's just move ahead.

Is that my first slide? Okay.

Just a reminder to everybody what is EAI. Here's an example of EAI. This is an example of a slide we can go quickly through. There's a mailbox part and a domain name part, and in the case of EAI they can both be Unicode.

The table on the left shows a high level timeline of EAI support and I think it's easy to forget how many people are involved with this so the companies on the right – Cormail in 2013 going to Office 365 lately. Our most recent entry into the UASG XgenPlus happening in 2016 and bringing in a ton of new languages. We talk about these companies and these projects a lot but look on all the people who've been participating on the right. Big round of applause to all our other partners.

I was going to go through the Quick Guide today. The Quick Guide has finally been published. I think there's still a bunch of things that are controversial in it so I was going to go through it again calling out the parts that I think are maybe provocative. They have to do with A-labels in the domain portion, A-labels in the local portion, providing multiple aliases in IDNA. So we'll see if you want to talk about any of that stuff today.

Here's the stuff I think is non-provocative – "Display things in Unicode." We've always said don't display things in Punycoded format. "Follow the good practices guides for linkification and for validation of the domain name. Always remember, validate as lightly as possible."

Next.

More interestingly, we are suggesting that you pass the domain name in the A-label format. So you're starting with a Unicode thing. We're suggesting that you could send it in the A-label format. There might be some compatibility advantages in some systems. The system should be able to treat both of those identically. We're just suggesting that if you do this, there might be a slight chance that it would be more compatible with some systems. Debatable, whatever.

Even more controversial, for robustness accept the so-called IDN-style e-mail where there's an A-label in the beginning so that

you've got a Punycoded thing in the beginning. That is not EAI, however, a lot of e-mail clients will accept it, will translate it, correctly and turn it into U-label, U-label, U-label. If you accept it you can deal with people who send it. Also there's a bootstrapping scenario that it potentially enables.

No controversy on this one – "Advertise your support for SMTPUTF8," and everybody should be aware of what that means when they see it.

Non-controversial – "Don't enforce case sensitivity in the local part." I remember one of the first e-mail addresses I got, the Internet service provider gave us our e-mails to go with it and they enforced case sensitivity. I could never figure out why my e-mail address didn't work is because it was "capital" Mark. So don't do that. And don't issue mailbox numbers that will duplicate other mailbox numbers.

A lot of things that you can do to make this work better are at the provider level. If you restrict the name space, if you simply say, "That e-mail name is not available," you can reduce a lot of problems down the line. That's maybe not a popular approach.

Another thing that is non-controversial is offering an all-ASCII mailbox name as an alias. So when I acquire my EAI address, also give me an all-ASCII equivalent and then I can use those interchangeably and they would both go to the same mailbox.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

And that enables a couple of scenarios, bootstrapping or otherwise.

More controversial – consider when you're limiting the mailbox names consider treating them as if they were a domain name, things that conform to the domain name label generation string. That means that you can generate a Punycoded equivalent which means that that can be used as a bootstrapping mechanism. This of course would require people to accept A-label, U-label, U-label in order for the bootstrapping to work. I'm not sure how popular that would be, but that was an option that was listed in the Quick Guide.

No objection?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

MARK SVANCAREK: I know. Actually it was meant to be provocative so –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE(S):   [Inaudible].

MARK SVANCAREK: No, we have enough time. I'm blazing through these slides. We have enough time for the things that are provocative.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: The problem is that this is completely undefined behavior. We've got a specification for SMTP with UTF8 and we've got a specification for 28, 11, and so on, e-mail. And we have no specification for how this thing would work. It seems like inventing a new level of incompatibility without any concomitant benefit.

MARK SVANCAREK: I recognize that. We had talked about actually generating a change to an RFC to define this behavior and that has never been done. I do know that clients are generally accepting this format so that is the question. Should this exist in the Quick Guide or not?

ANDREW SULLIVAN: I wish you luck getting that proposal through RFC [inaudible].

MARK SVANCAREK: I know.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: I can think of many, many, proposals that have a better chance. The difficulty here is that IDNA sucks. We only did it because we've got this problem that there's all kinds of stuff out there that thought that the LDH thing was a protocol requirement. But nobody ever thought that about the local part. There was never any restriction on the local part. So in order to do this, as you point out, you've got to create something that is compatible with U-labels and so now you've got all kinds of restrictions on the local part that never happened before. So this is incompatible even with the existing software. So it's a new level of incompatibility in both directions. I just don't see what the benefit is here. It's self-induced wound and it strikes me as actually an impediment to widespread deployment.

MARK SVANCAREK: This is the kind of feedback I was looking for. So considering that we have a different bootstrap mechanism, namely the two aliases where you acquire a EAI address and an all-ASCII address, this is probably not needed and so –

Edmond.

EDMOND CHUNG: I'm not sure whether we want to throw this completely out yet. I think this is a reasonable thinking for, especially for Chinese. I

think [Cormel] says that they have the traditional and simplified Chinese equivalent implemented based on the CTNC tables as well.

Rather than think of it as like a protocol, maybe it's a suggestion that when you create aliases, this is a good reference to think about. There are all these work that has been done for different languages. If you are offering EAI and you want certain user experiences then these are reference tables for creating aliases rather than view it as almost a protocol or [inaudible] because I'm not quite sure exactly what you're recommending exactly how the LGR stuff is actually being used.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah. The suggestion as I read it is that if you limit the mailbox names, the local parts, to a really small set then there's more likely that they could be translated by the clients appropriately. But you're right. There's no associated protocol. It's not really defined. We just see that a lot of software's already doing it in order to get around the rampant incompatibility that's out there already.

EDMOND CHUNG: I guess a quick note – I think Andrew wants to jump in – my quick note is I think let's not throw this completely out yet because the

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

name part, the local part, there may be some useful cases for pulling in the LGR to create the variance and those kind of things. But we need much better definition of what we're [inaudible].

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, we would need much better definition and last comment – we already know that people impose all sorts of rules. For example, case sensitivity. It is allowed. Nobody actually allows it in real life because it's weird. This suggestion is akin to that.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Okay. So really there are two very different issues here and I'm worried that they're getting conflated. The first one is, okay you have a local part that somebody wants to write in one writing system and that writing system has multiple compatible variants, is what we would say – in domain names we would say there are two variant labels here, for instance just to pick two so that this is manageable. There's nothing wrong with saying, "Okay, well you need an algorithm for generating the aliases that you're going to have for a mailbox." And that I don't have any difficulty with. But what this is suggesting is an additional one which is an ASCII compatible encoding of the Unicode labels. That's what that A-label, U-label –

MARK SVANCAREK: [Inaudible].

ANDREW SULLIVAN: This is an ASCII compatible… So this is the A's and the idea is to use… that's why it says "A-label" there as opposed to "ASCII-compatible encoding" or something like that. And the problem is that this creates a whole new set of restrictions on the local part that nobody in the world has and now we're going to create them.

MARK SVANCAREK: Well, these are restrictions at the e-mail service provider, not in the Internet itself.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right. But you're going to have to convince all of the operators to do that reliably and correctly and we haven't even managed to convince all of the TLD operators to figure out how to do this. You're now going to talk to every mail operator in the world to get them to do this.

MARK SVANCAREK: No. There's no requirement. This is simply, "If you do this, somebody can share their e-mail address in ASCII." And having

typed it in, it's likely to be converted to Unicode wherein it will go into your address book and live there forever as Unicode.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Why is it likely?

MARK SVANCAREK: That is the [inaudible].

ANDREW SULLIVAN: The problem that I have here is that there is literally no specification anywhere that requires that.

MARK SVANCAREK: That is true.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: And there's no reason also to believe that [XN] minus minus something is, in fact, a Punycode encoded label. There's no specification anywhere that says that for the local part.

DON HOLLANDER: I'm just going to interject because I'm aware of the time and I'm going to stop you here.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, okay. That was a provocative thing

DON HOLLANDER: That's okay.

MARK SVANCAREK: And we've provoked, and now the question is, does this stay in the Quick Guide or not? Because it's in there right now.

DON HOLLANDER: Right. So we have a EAI workshop in Redmond April 12th and 13th. We'll have an Adobe Connect room open for that. Why don't we put a review of the Quick Guide on the agenda? I'll allow sufficient time for it and work through it.

So in the EAI space, the UASG is looking for a couple of things. One is a current evaluation of EAI readiness of major e-mail software and service providers. We can't find anybody to do that work. The second is somebody to write a comprehensive guide to EAI akin to our introduction to Universal Acceptance. We can't find anybody to do that either, but we think that that's an important thing to do. We have this Quick Guide to EAI which was aimed at not doing technical specs but looking at good practice – not Best Practice because we don't even know what

that is, but here are things that we're seeing in the wild, let's describe them, document them or whatever.

I am happy as part of that Seattle meeting, given that we currently have something in production, I'm happy to change it – let's not worry – but we can go through it. One of the things that we have been successful in getting our other documents is we do a close reading where we read through paragraph by paragraph and have extensive discussion. And we did that with the UASG Quick Guides and I think we have a very good document there and we've done it with the Introduction to Universal Acceptance. The document UASG007, that's been in production in the field for a year. We did a review of that this year, the end of last year, I can't remember. We want to put it out to the community. Any comments, any issues, I think we made three typographical changes. One was just a boo-boo. So I'd like to do that for the EAI stuff. My goal is to get EAI finished this year. Ideally, I'd like to do it by June but at the current rate I don't think we're going to be ready.

Mark, I'm going to stop you there. The slides will be available and distributed.

MARK SVANCAREK: I think there's only one more slide.

DON HOLLANDER: No, there's three more slides.

MARK SVANCAREK: Is there?

DON HOLLANDER: You're on nine of 12.

MARK SVANCAREK: Tap through them because the last one's… Okay, so keep going, keep going. That last one there.

UASG is meeting in Redmond. It's being hosted by Microsoft this time and after that meeting we're having an EAI event. What we will actually do at the EAI event depends a lot on who actually shows up. So Microsoft people are going to be there. I believe XgenPlus will be there. I don't know if Coremail or anyone else will be in attendance. The more people who show up from providers, the more we can do together in sort of a bug bash or a Hackathon. The fewer who show up the more likely it is we just have a party.

So please RSVP right now and I can make sure that we have the right accommodations. We can help you with your travel arrangements. We can get you the Microsoft deal on hotels. But

let me know ahead of time so that I know what to expect and what expectations to set.

DON HOLLANDER: And right now the UASG has budget to fund one person from any active EAI [inaudible] or developer and we'll look at it again closer to the time in case somebody wants to send more than one person. We're very keen to get people physically there. We think that'll make a world of difference.

With that, we have two issues in the parking lot and we have a dearth of people here to further address them. What I'd like to do is shift those two topics to the mailing list and the first topic is "Is emoji in or out of scope?" And the argument is, "It's out of scope." I guess it's not explicitly in the RFC and it's in scope because reality is in scope.

And the second question is, "Are we ready to expand our target audience from the technical community and raise [it] issue with the CMO?" So Cyrus Namazi who was here for a minute or so – very astute Vice President of Global Domains Division – said we've got push and pull so we're pushing to the IT department but they've got no pull. They're not seeing any demand from their internal customers. This is one way to do that but I'd like to carry that on either through the e-mail list or in a discussion also in Redmond.

With that, thank you very much. Thanks very much to the guys behind the black screen and thanks for those who put the time and effort into producing the slides and Michael and Andrew particularly for coming.

So I am shifting over to Room A2 for a session with the GAC, who I hope already have our slides. So thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]