
KOBE – ccNSO: Study Group on Use of Emoji as Second Level Domain
Saturday, March 09, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

PETER KOCH: So, it's half past one. I suggest before starting we wait another two or three minutes for people trickling in. We would expect one or two more study group members. Give them a chance to take their seats and then start from there.

Kim, do we have any more participants already?

Thank you.

Okay. So these additional two or three minutes have past, and I suggest that we give it a slow start. Maybe I should introduce myself first and then hand it over to Kim for the usual admin.

My name is Peter Koch. I'm the Chair of the Study Group on Emojis at the Second Level, tasked by the ccNSO Council. Kim?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: I just wanted to remind everybody this call will be recorded and transcribed. Right now, we don't have any remote participants that I can tell that aren't already in the room. With that, I'll turn it back over to Peter.

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

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thank you. So we have 90 minutes today. I suggest that, other than during our regular calls with Adobe – oh, no; Zoom now these days – we give the members of the study group a few seconds each to say who they are and where they are. [Maybe] we start with Jaap.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Jaap Akkerhuis from SSAC.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom, SSAC.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sarmad Hussain, ICANN staff.

[YIEN TAN]: [Yien Tan], ICANN staff.

[SAVE VOCEA]: [SAVE VOCEA], ICANN staff as an observer.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Bernard Turcotte, ICANN contractor.

PETER KOCH: Peter Koch, Chair.

[HUKO BRAKA]: [Huko Braka], ccNSO Secretariat.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO Secretariat, also ICANN staff.

AJAY DATA: Ajay Data, ccNSO Council member.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] Serbia USG.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Paul Hoffman, ICANN staff.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: I'm Allan MacGillivray from .ca, an observer today. Thanks.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Thank you. Do we have anyone in the remote participation tool right now?

No? Okay. So this is today's agenda. We'll walk through the notes from last time, address the agenda items, and then run through

the latest changes applied to the draft report following the discussion during our latest call, start discuss on any potential conclusions, and then discuss next steps or discuss them in a more concrete manner.

We agreed upon the study group already. We agreed upon putting the draft report out for public consultation and also to explicitly submit the draft report to those registries that have been mentioned in the document. For those of you who haven't seen the document or read the draft report yet, we'll walk through it and you'll find out who these registries are.

We'll talk about the presentation to the community, which means that we got to have another session in the ccNSO on Thursday, I believe, half-an-hour at 16:15 or so?

BART BOSWINKEL: Thursday? I think it's Wednesday.

PETER KOCH: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Wednesday or Tuesday. Joke, you know? We'll look it up.

[JOKE BRAEKEN]: Tuesday.

PETER KOCH: Tuesday. Apologies. So Tuesday, 16:15 for half an hour we'll present the report to the community. This is not the final delivery to the ccNSO Council because we want to give people an opportunity to comment on the draft report, of course.

For today, Any Other Business, then next meetings, and wrap-up.

So, where are we? Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Thank you. I apologize for not being on the last call, but in looking at the minutes afterwards, I have a question about 5A or the thing of letting the registries who are mentioned in the document have an informal review.

We actually have two classes in there, the ones who have told us something. We also have the class of the ones where we discovered them but have not had any real interaction. Is that informal review? How are going to deal with the second class, or are we just going to not try to get them? I didn't understand that from the call. Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Okay, yeah. Thanks for that clarifying question. I think we had a number of 15 ccTLD registries. We were going to treat them all equally, like everybody gets another heads up or their second heads up. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: As I did in the earlier version on behalf of Peter, the Chair – I sent the letter to the individual ccTLDs – I’ll do it again to those mentioned in the report. So I’ll go to them directly. At the same time, in parallel, there’ll be this lightweight public comment period. So that’s more a broad stroke to see if anybody’s interested. But this is specifically targeted at those ccTLDs that are mentioned in the report.

PETER KOCH: Okay. With that, I suggest that we – can we put up the notes from last time, Kim, which bring us the action items so that we can tick them off, I think? Let’s work through Action Item #1. Could you proceed – yeah, here we are. So that’s Alejandra to verify. She isn’t here, but I think that happened.

The other is an editing remark. We can address Action Item 2 when we walk through the documents. Okay, please, next page. I think Action Item #3, same thing. 4, same, and 5, same. Deferred

for document review. Remove. And that is another action item to be dealt with in the document review. I think that's probably it.

Could you proceed to the last page? Hang on. Yeah, that's –oh, no. We have 7. Again, update the document, circulate drafts on the list. That has definitely happened. And here we go.

Okay. So then we've deferred most of these action items to our next step, which is running through the document. Is the document actually available online? It should be in the mailing list archives, right?

[BERNARD TURCOTTE]: Well, it was distributed as a PDF right before this meeting. The e-mail archive has the link for the Google Doc.

PETER KOCH: Okay, [Bernie]. So just in case, because this was circulated on the mailing list for the study group, which is publicly archived, anybody in the room who is interested in reading the document while we walk through it or can't read it on the slides is welcome to get [to] the archive. We find the archive by going to the ...

[BERNARD TURCOTTE]: Usually we'll post it in the chat.

PETER KOCH: Okay, great. Yes, in the chat of the remote participation tool. Cool.
So, Bernie, could you guide us through the updated document?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: My pleasure, sir. All right. Okay. I'll skip over the portions of the document quickly where we did not bring any changes over the last few times.

PETER KOCH: Excuse me. Sorry, Bernie. Let me make one remark. Understanding that we have a couple of observers and visitors in the room, it's probably a bit hard to jump into a document that the study group has been working on for a couple of months. We are at a wordsmithing level almost already. We can put in stopgaps if people want to ask general questions. Clarifying, if you don't understand what we're talking about at all, we can't make this a tutorial session because we need to go through the document, but we'll put in stopgaps so you can get ask questions.
Okay. Thank you, Bernie. Back to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, sir. All right. So on the background section, I'm not go into detail. It basically describes how we got here and what we've been tasked with, which is basically up there. So the study group

will summarize the issues associated with the use of emoji as second-level domains as identified by SSAC in its report. And there's a whole bunch of caveats below that.

All right. Definition of emoji. This first part hasn't changed, but what did change is starting here. Now, from our last meeting, basically we were talking about the definition of emoji and that our definition was unsatisfactory. We wanted to give examples, so I tried to give it a shot. So this is the new text. I'm just going to read through it. It's just a few paragraphs.

This definition is unsatisfactory to a number of people for a variety of reasons, which include that it fails to provide a complete and definitive explanation of what should be considered an emoji. Part of the problem in defining what is an emoji is that the Unicode list of emojis is growing rapidly. Unicode version 9.0 added 72 emoji in June 2016. Version 10 added 56, Version 11, 145, and Version 12, 72, for a current total of 1,719 emoji, excluding skin tone modifiers.

An additional complexity, which is not reflected in the above definition, is that not each emoji has a one-to-one correspondence with a unique Unicode point. In certain cases, several emoji can be amalgamated into a single new emoji using a zero with joiner. An example of this is joining the lady with the airplane using a zero with joiner, which produces – here it didn't

come out in the document, which is supposed to be the woman pilot.

Although the result of this joining is a single emoji, which is supposed to look like a woman pilot, which has a unique entry in the Unicode emoji table, it cannot be represented by a single Unicode code point, like the woman.

So I'm going to propose that we finish going through this little updated section, and then I'll take questions.

PETER KOCH: [Yes, please.]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Similarly, some emoji can also have skin tone modifiers applied to them, which create new emoji. As an example of this, the woman, which when used in conjunction with the dark skin modifier, becomes the dark-skinned woman, which again doesn't show.

Skin tone modifiers also apply to emoji created using zero with joiners. As an example of this, the dark-skinned woman and the airplane gives you dark-skinned woman pilot.

The use of the five skin modifiers in Unicode version 12.0 of emoji creates an additional 1,295 emoji and the references. [They]re] where I got that.

Another concern is associated with the symbols class of emoji. This class of emoji includes as an examples the question mark and the exclamation mark. But these marks are also part of the Unicode basic Latin block, and we give the codes there.

Additional concerns arise from the country flags class of emoji. These are based on the ISO 3166-1 list and portions of its exceptionally reserved list without any clear explanation as to why the [Annex D] codes, which are on the exceptionally reserved list, are not included.

Emojipedia also notes the following regarding emoji country flags. If the ISO 3166-1 standard was updated to add a new country tomorrow, that would almost certainly end up on the emoji flag list.

For those of us in the room who've been part of ccTLDs, that is not as a statement that really warms our heart, which fails to clearly spell out the procedure for doing this and, more importantly, does not mention any procedure for removal. Again, for those who are ccTLDs in the room, we know that removal is a lot more painful than adding.

In trying to arrive at an authoritative and all-encompassing definition of what is an emoji, one may, at least for the moment, have to settle on referring to the latest version of emoji as documented by Unicode Consortium.

So there's that block which sort of describes we're sort of unhappy with the definition, the Unicode definition, of what is an emoji. I'll be glad to take comments or questions at this point.

If you keep being good like this, you can go early.

PETER KOCH: Or stay for retirement.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Or stay for retirement, right.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Having only seen this since you did it since I wasn't at the last meeting, I just want to say very good. It's not an exhaustive list, but it is a compelling list of the many reasons that we had talked about [earlier], so thank you for that. Because I was one of the people bugging, especially about the symbol stuff. So I felt that you did a very good job on this.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. I was not trying to be authoritative and total on the list, but I thought that we should give a few clear, clean examples—

PAUL HOFFMAN: Right. And I notice that you use the question mark and exclamation mark and not the X, which would have made it much worse. So thank you.

PETER KOCH: Maybe let me just add one or two sentences. Of course, the mission here was not to duplicate or complement the efforts of SAC095 but to frame the expectation or the properties of what emojis are and what can be done with them, at this point not yet driving to any conclusions.

As Bernie already said, there's no attempt that this an exhaustive tutorial on all of the properties but just pinpointing on some of the maybe unexpected issues.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Peter. All right. Moving on to our next major changes section, some of the history of the emoji domain names did not change at all over the last little while.

All right. Here, in registering a domain name which includes an emoji, let's talk about including an emoji because we had a comment the last time. We were trying to change it and the simple solution we came up with didn't really work in this document. So we've taken it under advisement and maybe we can talk a bit more about it today or we can discuss it on the list. But the quick fix we had just didn't work. So more to come later on that one.

On the list of registries, [we redid] the homework on these. Basically, as the footnote clarifies, we didn't have a budget to actual register a domain name, but to get onto this list, basically, the registry's search engine has to say that you could register a domain name that contains an emoji. We had to find a registrar which also tried to sell you that domain. If both those conditions were met, then we assume that the registry does offer domain names which contain emoji, although it's not failsafe. But it would seem to be a pretty good guess.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

As a point of anecdote, I actually saw a Twitter comment the other day from someone who I had met two weeks complaining about some registry that said that he could register an emoji domain name in – he didn't say which ccTLD – [and it] took his money and then sent, "Oh, no, you can't," and kept the money.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Oh, good. Yeah].

PAUL HOFFMAN: I can chase it down if we want. I think we're into the weeds on that, but he was complaining that there was a registry who not only took his money but wouldn't give it back when they said, "Oh, and you are not allowed to do that."

PETER KOCH: Yeah, I believe that is an interesting anecdote, as you said, but completely out of scope for the study group. So I'd recommend against putting that in the document.

Bernie, there's one point in the headline because we were talking about "include." The whole point in this discussion was that "include" might confuse people to think of content, like web pages, instead of the domain name string. But we still have "offering" in there, and that's the other part we wanted to discuss. My recollection is we arrived at "accepting" instead of "offering" there. But, yeah, let's do these minutiae later.

By the way, this is the list of 16—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 15, [I think].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PETER KOCH: [So] it goes down to 16, yeah?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 16. Sorry. You're right.

PETER KOCH: Yes, maybe 15 organizations and 16 TLDs then.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think there is one organization from the Netherlands which runs about two or three of them [and they're not full]. So that's an interesting one.

PETER KOCH: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PETER KOCH: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PETER KOCH: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Following on on that conversation also, even if the registry does seem to accept domain names with emoji, it doesn't mean all its registrars will offer those. As we did the test as we were walking through this, it was basically pretty random. That's the only thing I can say.

Further information. These registries can be found in Annex D. We redid Annex D and we'll get to that a little later

All right. Registrars. There we had promised Alejandra that we would do some cleanup here in that first paragraph. I understood her comment that it was not perfectly clear. So we'll just go through this. Not all registries accept the registration of domain names which contain emoji. Google Domains does not seem to accept the registration services for any ccTLD which accept domain names which include emoji.

Additionally, there is little standardization amongst those registrars which do accept the registration of domains which contain emoji as to how to search and present the results for such searches.

So we cleaned up that part. I think that's hold together okay. Then Alejandra asked for an example. So, as an example of this, searching for "woman" in GoDaddy.com, which can perform this search for this domain using either the emoji glyph or Punycode version, while Hover.com will only accept the Punycode version and simply ignore the emoji glyph pasted in its search bar. And I mean ignore this, totally. You put it in and it brings up the page again with no error message or anything else. It just says, "Huh?" So I think that covered that.

The second paragraph I explained what I had done to Alejandra, and I think we were okay with that. There were no changes brought there.

Any questions on this?

AJAY DATA:

So I just wanted to share my experience. We tried many time around registering the emojis, and I think, almost every time, you succeed on .ws to get a domain name. But if you go to any of the sites, most of the time you fail. Like you said, there's a blank page.

Search or final registration fails. Money is not coming. Many, many cases. But .ws is prominently for sure registrable 100%. Even before I came to ICANN, this was possible.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. I'll note that Freenom – since the domain registrations were free for three months, I actually carried through, and they all worked well also. And we've got a table saying what registrations they accept and we'll get to that a little later.

Any other questions?

Not seeing anything. All right. Let's move on. All right. Section 3: Emoji domain name issues and considerations. That first part has not changed, stating the SAC095. Then, in addition to the issues raised by SSAC – all right. This is where we agreed at our last meeting to make some changes. Let's see.

All right. Implementation of the emoji. There are significant variations of implementation of the emoji, and [inaudible] has not changed registrar support for [emoji. That] has not changed.

Direction of writing. So after Abdulmonem at our last meeting really wanted something here, we agreed we would try and put something in. Everything emoji seems to be based on a left-to-right writing system. The impacts of using emoji with languages

which use right-to-lefts systems seems to remain an open question, [though] I've just tried to insert that.

The other point was cultural, linguistic, generational, or religious significance of emojis. Emojis may be standardized via Unicode, but the meaning of emojis can vary greatly, depending on culture, language, generation, and religion.

An example of this is the thumbs-up symbol, which is a sign of approval in Western culture. However, traditionally in Greece and the Middle East, it has been interpreted and even offensive.

And we get a thumbs-up for Jaap, which we'll take the right way.

[JAAP AKKERHUIS]: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. So that was the change there. Unfortunately, I don't think we have Abdulmonem here today. Hopefully he'll have a look at that and it'll meet his requirements.

All right. We're talking about confusability and we had our list of items of confusability, where we're bringing everything up again. We've updated this slightly.

The first thing that we updated is we've included the country flags class of emoji as we talked about earlier. These are based on the ISO 3166-1 list and portions of its exceptionally reserved list [emojis]. We've talked about that.

Vendors aren't required to support all of these flags. Microsoft does not support any country flags on Windows, instead showing the two-letter country codes, but generally do support everything on the list for compatibility.

Additionally, the Unicode documentation regarding emoji flags states the following under caveats. Although a pair of regional indicator symbols is referred to as an emoji flag sequence, it really represents a specific region, not a specific flag for that region. The actual flag displayed for the pair may be different on different platforms.

For example, for territories which do not have an official flag, the displayed flag may change over time as regions change their flags and platforms update their software. For some territories, especially those without separate official flags, the displayed flag may be the same as the flag for the country code with which they are associated. For more about cases, blah, blah, blah.

An example of this, for Google, Apple, Facebook, and other implementers, is that the emoji flag for the United States of America – we all know what that is – and the flag for the U.S. outlying islands both use the same image for the flag, which creates multiple code points for the same glyph and becomes an additional factor to be considered to be consider with respect to confusability.

Flags. Questions, thoughts, comments?

AJAY DATA: I have a question.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, sir.

AJAY DATA: What do you really mean by that Microsoft does not support flags?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: They do not – well, exactly as it says in there, they do not show a glyph. They just show two letters. That’s all. So, if you have a Microsoft platform and you enter that Unicode code point for the U.S. flag, you will get U.S. You will not get an image.

AJAY DATA: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. All right. Since there are no red flags on the flags section, we will move on. Multiple Unicode code points for the same symbol. We talked about this a little earlier, and I brought it back here.

So, as an example of this: the question mark emoji, which can be registered as a domain name in certain ccTLDs, and the question mark in the Unicode basic Latin block, which cannot. Potentially even more confusing is the minus sign emoji and the minus sign in the Unicode basic Latin block, where the minus sign can be used in ASCII-only domain names, such as hello-all.ca, and is used in the Punycode representation of IDN and emoji characters as with the emoji question mark, which has a Punycode representation of [xn -- 8di].

As a note, the minus sign emoji is also available for registration as a domain name in certain ccTLDs, and minussign.ws is active and currently redirects to an active website.

Thoughts and questions?

PETER KOCH: With my Chair hat off and just asking as a confused individual, when we talk about the question mark, not the emoji question mark but the vanilla ASCII question mark, as an unallowed code point, I think, we did not explicitly test for that, did we? What I'm trying to get at is that, while we're focusing on emojis and we have seen examples – maybe we'll get an opportunity to mention that later – where registries or at least one registry has a list of acceptable Unicode code points currently known as emojis, there might also be a completely open registration policy that would also allow other characters that are not emojis but also not available under normal circumstances. That ... or maybe ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I actually did run some tests on some of these, not as exhaustive [in] all of them, and the basic Latin codes were automatically rejected in all the registries I tried.

PETER KOCH: [Kenny], can you add anything?

[KENNY]: Yeah. I think we now and then in this group are hitting this generic issue which the ICANN Board actually included in their resolution, and that is, based on the SSAC document about emojis, the Board talks about compliance to IDNA2008.

What we are trying to do in this working group is look at how emojis are handled, but we are hitting also the gray area of non-emojis not compliant to IDNA2008. That complicates things a little bit.

So sometimes we have non-compliance that are not really emoji issues, and we just need to keep track of what we are actually talking about in this group, which I think should be emojis.

PETER KOCH: Yes, thank you for reminding the Chair. That was the reason I had my hat off. Now back on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's complicated.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. It is complicated and it touches on the potential registration policies that we [may be] reviewing the details that we receive on that, like lists of characters and so on and so forth. But of course, non-emoji. Thank you.

PAUL HOFFMAN: So I totally would understand if you shot this down, but are we also concerned with some of the emojis that have a color in their name where the color does not appear correctly? For example,

question mark that you keep calling question mark, is formally called black question mark ornament, even though it always shows up as red.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PAUL HOFFMAN: I'm only bringing it up as, if you wanted to add another thing, that would be one because consistently that has shown up as red.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Patrik, you go first.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I think the problem there is your use of the term "correctly."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Peter, I've got a question from [Pei Chow] remotely. "On the dash and the dash sign, those are different keys on a keyboard, one from an emoji keyboard on the alpha. So it's not the same?"

PETER KOCH: We are looking at each other to find out who's going to respond.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. So he just clarified. “[One the] dash and the dash sign are different keys on a keyboard, one from an emoji keyboard, one from the alpha. So it’s not the same?”

PETER KOCH: So it’s not the same key that is used. It’s also not the same code point, but it is looking very similar. The glyphs might even be identical. That’s probably where we’re going at. And that’s basically what we say in the text, right, Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Right.

PETER KOCH: Yeah.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, we did include all the Unicode code points and the Punycode just to be very clear about what we’re talking about. But the point we’re making here is, depending on the implementors’ implementation of the emoji, it can be very close to what the Latin version can be found [as] in certain fonts. Therefore, at the end, although you are entering it in different ways, what we’re concerned with in this paragraph is, if you’re not

the person who's entering it but a person who's looking at it, do you know which one we're talking about?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Peter, there's a comment. "They are not identical."

PETER KOCH: The "they" is ambiguous there. So we have glyphs. We have code points. It's unclear what ... Page is a member of the study group, so we'll give him some time to clarify there. He's unfortunately not able to use the audio, but we've ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He's typing [away].

PETER KOCH: Yeah, he's typing. We've been able to deal with that. So ...

[BERNARD TURCOTTE]: Thank you for discussing.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Fine. Thank you. Paul still waits for being shut down? No, that –

PAUL HOFFMAN: [inaudible] Again, if you wanted to add another confusability, [inaudible].

PAUL KOCH: Yeah. Okay. Again, anecdotal, but we're not on a mission to have an exhaustive list of all the confusability issues. Again, we don't want to duplicate SAC095. SSAC might be inspired to send an update, but that's a completely different issue. And I didn't suggest that.

This is not to frame but to set sticks in the landscape so that people can dive further and find out if they are interested. But not the core. We're still in the fact-finding here. Yeah, let's leave it with that.

[inaudible]?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. Sure. Thank you, Peter. And I thought the dash, given we're a ccNSO working group, would be an interesting example in this case.

All right. Moving on, these haven't really modified. Then we come to voice recognition applications, which we discussed at our last meeting. Voice recognition applications. As noted by SSAC in its report, there's no standard way to verbally pronounce an emoji

in any language. This could be a significant issue as voice-to-text applications, especially in the mobile market, have become a standard feature on most platforms. Failure to have an agreement to stand – oh, a little correction there – to a standard way of pronouncing or verbally describing what an emoji is could lead to significant confusability issues.

This issue also has impacts on applications which assist the visually impaired.

So I was trying to capture all the discussions we had around trying to use the voice applications with emoji. Any thoughts or questions or comments on that?

All right. That was the last change in this block. We will move on. Annex A has not changed for a while. Annex B, the history of emoji, has not changed. This is a copy-paste from the emoji section. Implementation of emoji has not changed. Annex D has changed.

So, at our last meeting, several people felt it was a little fuzzy, so we tightened it up quite a bit, I think, and basically have now identified what tests we ran on which registries and what the results were. So multiple emojis. We used the [link], paper clip, and the beer mug. We give the Punycode for that emoji, which uses zero with joiner. Again, in this PDF version, we cannot get the woman pilot, but it's joined paper clips and woman pilot.

Emoji which use skin tone modifiers. We have the dark-skinned woman pilot. Emoji which are symbols. So we got the copyright symbol and the black circle of death. Emoji mixed with ASCII characters. So we've used both upper and lowercase joint paperclips and the beer mug. And emoji mixed with IDN characters. Easier for me to use accentuated characters since I have a French keyboard. So we just ran that.

So that was our test suite. Again, we did not try every possible combination. That's not the point here. We just wanted to see if these things would work or not and what the results would be.

Any questions on the test set?

All right. So, on those 16 registries –oh, come on – we ran through them and basically, if it was already registered or would allow you to register it, [the] first column is the registry. The second column is the registrar which we used to run the test. The remaining columns are the test set as described.

Basically, the only no we got was the skin tone modifier from the Freenom group.

So I hope that cleared up satisfactorily what we were trying to show off there.

WHOIS and registration of domain names which include emoji. Again, given identifying the relevant registries and the registrars

associated with the required some research, this has been [collated] in a table to facilitate referencing these: the column registries, the ccTLD, registration via registry notes. If the registry [can] perform the registration without having to go through a registrar, WHOIS Search is the website used initially to identify the registry accepts domain names which contain emoji. Registrars list the registrars listed on the registry website. So this is just reference to the work that we did to get the first table that we talked about previously.

And here registration policies' terms of use. This did not really change. We just added a bit of a header to describe it.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, but the table – if you go back – is definitely something that we hope to be able to complete, or at least it leads to more completeness, by addressing the registries in particular because there are some question marks because we weren't able to read the language or understand the script. Or both, actually. And we hope to get that filled in one way or another. That would be great, at least.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

.ge. I actually tried phoning them. That didn't work out well at all I didn't get anyone.

.su. I did manage to talk to several people. They were all confused about why I was asking them about this and said they would talk to someone about it. I never heard from them again. So we will see what will happen.

Annex E, the glossary. The only change that has been done, derived and [excerpted] from ICANN’s IDN glossary; that was included the last time – is we removed all the links to that glossary in the definitions that we have below. And we [excerpted] all the comments and proposed changes.

That’s it. Back over to you, sir.

PETER KOCH:

Thanks a lot, Bernie, for the presentation and also for all the work that has gone into the document so far, including the research regarding these details.

So that was another work through of the fact findings so far. We’ve collected a lot of data points literally, but also in a more a metaphorical sense, what is out there. That was one of the starting points: what is out there? What is actually happening, at least on the registration side? We are not equipped as a study group to go on the consumption side, like what else could be done? What we didn’t have in the charter is, “Yeah, and how does software deal with that?” One could be tempted to do a full

research on how different web browsers behave and so on and so forth. But that's not in scope for the study group here. Let's stick to that scope.

The question now is, what's next? Before we discuss next steps, we do have on the agenda the item of discussion conclusions, if any. And "if any" is important because we may offer conclusions to the ccNSO Council, which is the addressee of our report, but we don't have to if we don't find we can agree on conclusions.

So I'd like to open ... do you want [it] now, or ... okay, Patrik, please.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

The reason why I say "now" is because I should have said it earlier but I might have missed when the time was right. I had done some studying on directionality regarding emojis. Most of them are neutral, which is an interesting case by itself because that means that it sort of inherits directionality from surrounding characters, which means that, if you have them in a domain name, it might be an interesting thing happening, depending on what characters are there, specifically how the domain name is actually used. So if the domain is used in [the URL], for example, the surrounding characters might not be part of the domain name. It might be something else, like a slash.

But there are also emojis that have strong left-to-right directionality, and there are also emojis which are European numbers, which consist of several categories when you talk about directionality, whether directionality is strong or weak.

So the situation directionality? To answer that question is complicated, and it's not easy to say what the outcome is. You cannot say that emojis behave a certain way because it depends on which one of the emojis they are.

So, given that, I was thinking of whether the test cases that you have been using should have picked emojis with different directionalities, specifically in some of the scripts that might have different [directionality]. So maybe diving deeper.

But, given that the overall chain issue for this work party is just to identify who were actually allowing emojis from a more general perspective – and then, from an SSAC perspective, we are more interested in general conformists to IDNA2008 – I draw the conclusion personally that we don't have to dive. My suggestion is that, in this work party, we just draw the conclusion that different emojis have different directionality, which means that they work differently when you use the bi-di algorithm of Unicode, which is complicated [already from] the beginning. Then we don't have to do anything else and stop there. Thank you.

Basically, it's a rat hole by itself.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Patrik. Without intentionally rat-holing, at least, because you said you offer that as a conclusion, I'm inclined to say that's an observation.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Okay. Sorry. Yeah.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Because conclusion would say, "Yeah, please, this is the next step," and so on and so forth. Yeah, thanks.

Would any specific text follow from your shared observation, or do you feel that this is covered in what the earlier section already set about bi-directionality and direction sensitivity of the emoji itself?

PATRIK FALSTROM: The text says only, "If everything ..." I think it should be, "Every emoji seems to be based on left-to-right. The writing system impacts the emojis," etc., etc. The question is whether that paragraph has to be changed. I don't really feel so. Most of them, many of them, or whatever.

Let me send this. I can send an e-mail to the list with my summary.
[inaudible]

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. I was going to suggest, if the wording right now is ambiguous or technically difficult – say, to avoid “wrong” – I’d really like to invite you to send clarifying text there. But as you said, we’re probably not going to add another section to fully explore that confusability issue there. I guess we have made the point multiple times and maybe also added additional facts or findings or observations to what SAC095 did already.

The fact that directionality and emojis is complicated is received. Maybe we need to spell that out a bit more explicitly if we haven’t done that already.

BART BOSWINKEL:

I think maybe it’s a good thing to run through what is still missing from this from the findings and then close the findings because the more you discuss it, it looks like the more will be added. At one point – what Paul is saying as well. I think that was the outcome of one of the earlier calls as well. So you can do this for years and add complications [on] complications and complications and nobody can read it anymore.

So maybe one call for who wants to add anything to this would be my advice. This is one, and that's it. Then call this part as closed, knowing this is probably not complete and there is further action needed to make it complete.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, absolutely. Every other book on quantum physics that you read is confirming that this is complicated, and we are not on that mission right here.

Also, we should assume that there is some audience to read this. If we drive the into the gory details of emojis, which are interesting, technically and from a number of other angles, this is to support some next step in the Council or other parts of ICANN.

BART BOSWINKEL:

[May I ask] a question? So, if anybody has some issues they want to add to this text right now, please send an e-mail to the list during this week so we can add this and then close this document, do a final clean up, and that's it. Because then we can send it out. At least on the findings part and the factual part it's done. Then we can talk about next steps.

Maybe that's another suggestion for the next part. If you go back to the agenda, you will see conclusions. What you just said and what Patrik just said maybe is the wrong word. It should be next

steps and what are recommended next steps instead of conclusions because conclusions is almost a final thing.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. The one thing is differentiating between observations and conclusions. Well, observations can already be interpretations or clarification of the fact that we've found, but conclusions is always directed at someone, saying that this is what we learned from this. We haven't gotten to that point, which is next up on the agenda. I'd like to ask Kim to switch the documents, get back to the agenda. We can also discuss without that, but before we start, Ajay, you have a question?

AJAY DATA:

Not a question. Just a small observation for consideration if it is important for this group. I think there's a wonderful work done on the study of which registries and top-levels are offering ws. Will it make an impact if, while the testings were going on, there were only experimental registrations open [and] were closed later? Or they should have assessed change during this course? So is it going to impact our study or no?

PETER KOCH: Well, it's impacting history because it's adding facts to the history. A historian will, of course, disagree with facts and history, but that's a different issue.

We do have examples in that in the history section, that there are TLDs that do have domain names registered that will not be able to be registered today. So policies have changed over time. This is why we went out trying to gather the actual current registration policies. Then grandfathering and other issues are separate from that.

AJAY DATA: Another thing. Because we hold onto our TLDs in our group, was it not easy to just simply send a questionnaire and ask whether you support emojis or not to 100 people?

PETER KOCH: Sending out that questionnaire was indeed easy. It was also very easy to not respond to that. So the reason why this study group went out digging, at the risk of missing code points and missing policies and also at the risk of interpreting instead of getting to written policy, was that, despite our continued efforts to reach out to registries or other parties, we got a limited number of responses. We didn't feel that that was enough to support the

view of the spectrum that we intended to have before interpreting the results. Thank you.

[BERNARD TURCOTTE]: Can we change “limited” to “very limited” number of replies?

PETER KOCH: I could not possibly comment.

Okay. So that would mean we got some remarks and some comments that we at least have captured on the audio or in memory for another—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] [Yoko].

PETER KOCH: Oh, [Yoko], of course. Sorry, I’m not in that particular room. So we’ll have another pass there. Of course, also the study group members are invited to have another look. If you find the next typo, there needs to be some edit proof reading or something anyway. So we can submit that at this point in time as well.

Anyway, as Bart suggested, we should really then close the fact-finding part because I’m pretty sure we’re finding more facts but they’re not necessarily in form to further progress.

So, coming to conclusions, what did we learn from this? So we've found lots of complicated things on the technical side. We see that a couple of TLDs do accept registrations. Obviously, these acceptances are also not theoretical, but people do register those because we found them in the wild. We don't have any information so far on how popular these domains, either in terms of registration – what are the emoji registrations numbers – because we just picked more or less randomly some testing domains. Also, we have no idea how popular they are in terms of usage. Also, we don't know how confused people really are.

The tiny piece of information that we do have is that, for some registries, we know that they address or trying to address – trying to not judge here – the concerns raised in the SSAC document, for example – but also phrased in our own document here – by giving an explicit code list, for example, for emoji code points. – I'm pretty sure that's the wrong wording – that are available for registration.

We know that other registries apparently – we have indication that other registries do not check anything at all. So, again, there's a spectrum of policies or approaches to how to deal with emojis or, for that matter, other characters that are uncovered by the IDNA standards.

What do we learn from this? What would be possible conclusions? That I ask to the members of the study group, of course, first. This tiny thing is a microphone. You can push the button and then ...

PAUL HOFFMAN:

I will speak to why I'm not speaking, which is that what you just said before conclusions, which were factual, I thought was actually a reasonable summary that'll fit on a page. We can point to other parts.

But we have two questions here. One is, what do we want to say? The other is, how do we answer what the Board asked? I'm wearing ICANN org hat. I like to answer the Board when they ask things, and I try to answer them with what they asked.

I'm not feeling like we've gotten there on the conclusions here. We can see we looked at it. That's clear. But I don't have a feeling that, from the conversations I've heard on the calls that I've been on, we have conclusions. We might, but I haven't felt like everyone was pointed in the direction of a conclusion.

PETER KOCH:

Okay. Other contributions? Responses? Additions?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Let me also explain why I am not talking. I sort of [inaudible] with Jaap. We are both members of SSAC. We brought things into this. So we don't think we are the right persons to be coming with conclusions. Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe [I] rephrase the point of conclusions and what I just said. What would recommend any next steps to be taken, either by this group or by a next group? Or by somebody else? We had some discussions around it before on the calls. This is just [anecdotal], what we scratched upon.

You mentioned some areas which we did not go into because of lack of response or whatsoever. I could imagine that making that observation, these are recorded in the observations, and based on that say either you recommend something to the ccNSO Council or to the broader community. For example, the whole issue around the definitions of emojis, which was, I think, a few calls ago.

Getting more clarity around that one and ensuring that people use it in that way is already [a starter]. And maybe, based on that

definition, go back to some of the research that Jaap suggested in the past and unearth some of the results of it as a next step.

So get rid of the word “conclusions,” because I think, as Patrik indicated and Paul Hoffman indicated and the silence in the room, there are now hard conclusions based on this work today.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Bart. Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: If we go back to the Board resolutions that we talk about, once again, speaking from the outside here and trying to help the ccNSO move forward, I think that this work party has addressed quite well Board resolution 2017110210, which says, “The Board requests that the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (the ccNSO) and the GNSO engage with their side to more fully understand the risks and consequences of using a domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels and inform their respect communities about these risks.” I think we’re pretty fine.

But the next resolution, on the other hand, says – number eleven – “The Board requests that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their eleven policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resilience and

interoperability of domain names.” That’s a different thing. That is not really here, right? Or yet. Or something.

I’m taking a step back here.

PETER KOCH: And it’s not necessarily in our [tool book] either.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I know. That’s why [inaudible].

PETER KOCH: Yeah I know you know. But so it’s on record.

BART BOSWINKEL: So I think one of the topics – I don’t know whether it’s recorded – is what is in the fast track and the overall policy around the ccNSO. That’s the reference to IDNA2003 because it was done in 2007, or it’s successor. So that part is covered.

At the end of the day, that’s where the real issue is: to what extent second-level domains are covered by this. This is where you run into the limits of the ccNSO policy setting.

PETER KOCH: Indeed. And let's not forget that the third and any subsequent or deeper level cannot be governed anyway.

But I was going back to Paul's remark when he said answering to the Board and – oh, yeah. You said we haven't had any conclusions so far and that's –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Page has a statement he's made.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Let me finish the [sentence] and then we'll get to Page. And you had your hand up, Paul. I've seen that.

You mentioned that we haven't arrived at any conclusions in the discussions – yes – and that was the very reason to ask whether people would be able or willing to suggest any conclusions because, let's face it, we've managed to avoid the issue in a way.

When I said, yeah, we could do studies on this and that, we could go forever in fact-finding. I for one do not have a plan to be a 15-year study group chair to get – 15-year-old study group chair would be nice, but anyway – even more facts in and even more facts in and we need more facts and we need more facts. That's not it.

I could try from the other side, saying, “Well, we’ve heard that there are risks.” I think that at least of the members of the study group – and I’m confident that it’s beyond that particular group – have understood from a technical side that this can happen and that can happen.

Now, we see that these domain names are registered in the wild, and we assume they are used in the wild, but the sky hasn’t fallen yet. Now, we don’t know how deep the sky is hanging by now, whether it’s falling and we just haven’t noticed, but there is a risk assessment, maybe, to make. Some of the registries seem to have made that.

And maybe there is no conclusion or suggestion to make at all. But then we should agree on that as well and not say nothing because we’re shy to say anything. Let that trickle in [inaudible] while we, I think, read Page’s statement. Could either Kim or you do that?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

PETER KOCH: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll read in Page's statement. "I might submit that the status quo doesn't require recommendation. Are we somewhere in between emoji domains not meeting the requirements, especially IDNA2008 compliance, for new gTLDs or new strings and yet, at the same time, the conclusion that may exist hasn't brought out security risks that might merit any recommendation among those ccTLD operators currently offering these domain names? Thank you."

PETER KOCH: Okay. It's a bit hard without reading. Any response to that? Patrik, you were – apologies for putting you on the spot – but no? Okay. Maybe we can clarify that part of the question – if I understand the question or the statement correctly, there was reference to IDNA2008 and emojis. I think we took that as a fact that there are issues that I would like Patrik to once again maybe mention so we get that on record again.

That those are not – and I'm asking you because I'm using the wrong word – allowed code points in IDNA2008.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So what the Board is talking about in their resolution is the need for conformance to IDNA2008. If it is the case that you're conformant to IDNA2008, you will not use emojis. It's that easy

because the emoji codes points are not valid for use if you're conformant to the standard.

That said, there are also code points that you cannot use if you're conformant on IDNA2008. So emojis is sort of a subset of the not-allowed code points.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thank you. And that, I think, couples with the discussion that we had several minutes ago about emojis being the question mark and other characters that seem to be accepted by some or be refused by others.

So the question is whether it's a compliance or conformance issue. Maybe Page can clarify because I think he referred to the gTLD policies. Or did I mishear?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [I'll reread them].

PETER KOCH: Okay. Thank you. We get a reread.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We'll get a reread. Page Howe says, "I might submit that the status quo does not require a recommendation. Are we

somewhere in between emoji domains not meeting the requirements, especially IDNA2008 compliance, for new gTLDs or new strings, and yet, at the same time, the confusion that may exist hasn't brought out security risk that might merit any recommendation among those ccTLD operators currently offering these domain names?"

To my mind, what I'm getting out of that is he's saying in the first part that the status quo doesn't require recommendation because the sky hasn't fallen.

PETER KOCH:

That's the one part. The other part is that compliance of conformance issues in gTLDs are out of scope. But, as Patrik explained or as we understand, since those code points are not allowed under IDNA2008 and there is a requirement for gTLDs, obviously, to follow that, that would not be the case. But this is not for the study group to judge or to conclude.

Since we can't set policies and do not want to set policies for ccTLDs, that leaves things open.

Patrik, you have your hand up.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Another one portion of what he’s saying from what I’m hearing is that the risks that have been presented are not real risks. Let me just say that, from the SSAC perspective and the findings from various studies that we referenced, we completely disagree with that statement. Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. I note, though, that was already an interpretation or rewording of what Page actually said or wrote. I invite Page to maybe expound [on lists] – the chat tool is probably not the right way to get the right wording out—

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And that’s why I tried to clarify that. From my perspective, I could interpret some of his words that way, even though that was not what he said or even what he intended.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Point taken. Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN: So I want to say thank you to Patrik for actually bringing back the actual words that the Board asked. I’m not sure I agree that we have yet done the first resolution because we haven’t actually

taken the report to the ccNSO. But we will, obviously. That's part of what we're doing here.

I read the second resolution as a definitive request from the Board to the ccNSO to do something around policy. I don't think that that is for this study group to do. I think we present as many facts as we can. If there is an obvious policy coming out of the study group, that's fine. I don't hear it yet. But I also was tasked as an ICANN org member to get in contact with the GNSO about the same two resolutions. The GNSO said we don't need to do that because we are told to follow IDNA2008.

So I think the onus on the study group to finish up so that the ccNSO can either decide to follow up on the Board resolution or not themselves. We have, I think, a good body of facts. I don't hear conclusions. Maybe if we give it a little bit more time we'll have some. I don't understand the process that well, but I haven't heard that this study group is supposed to change ccNSO policy.

So I would say hand off the report and see what they do.

PETER KOCH:

Thanks, Paul. So no. We are neither tasked to change nor even develop a proposed ccNSO policy, even less a ccTLD policy, and, if we agree, can absolutely submit the report to the ccNSO council without any conclusions. But then we're dumping all our facts on

them. Maybe they'd appreciate some guidance. But we can take that offline or hear from the Councilors in the room, if they want, what they'd like to have.

I'm perfectly happy just being the messenger to submit a report that has no conclusions, but I'd like to have an agreement on that from the members of the study group. Given that some of the active members aren't present, maybe we need to defer that to the list for another round. But we have another chance to discuss with the community in this ccNSO session on – I forgot again – Tuesday, I think, to gather further input in that direction, I guess.

Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Knowing how this study group came about, and also in light of the Board resolution, I just looked back at the recommendations of the Wildcarding Study Group because this group follows the [passion] of the Wildcarding Study Group.

If you look at their final report, they know and they knew they were not acting in accordance with the Board resolution because it was – and that's in the Board resolution as well . The Board is very aware that the ccNSO cannot set policy on second-level domains, no matter how hard we push. The only thing is we can share with them the results of the study group. I think that in itself

and trying to enter into a dialogue is probably something that was in the recommendations of the Wildcarding Study Group as well. So [they] try to enter into a dialogue, either as ICANN or as ccNSO or as a study group, and that’s what we do. We need to press this and record this and send this to them and see what their reaction is. So that happens.

And that was documented as a recommendation. So enhance the dialogue with those ccTLDs who use emojis doing it similar as with wildcardings. I think that is already a next step, which might be helpful, especially because the results point out to the confusing issues. I think sharing this report as it is right now with those ccTLDs and seeing what their reaction is already helpful because that was done at the time with the wildcarding. So that’s the next step.

And as a recommendation, keep on doing this and make them aware of the substance of it. The ccNSO should inform the broader ccTLD community about it. That’s already a recommendation you can [use] as a next step.

Going back to the way it was framed at the time, or the way it was worded, for the study group – let me go back to the final report ... The way the working group at the time worded it is, The recommendations are within the mandate of the ccNSO study group” – so that’s effectively the terms of reference – “and do not

address the ICANN Board’s request of the ccNSO to provide a report on mechanisms that could be employed to ensure that redirection and synthesis at the top level are effectively prohibited.” So that was, at the time, the conclusion around wildcarding. Probably in a similar way, it’s very clear that this group nor the ccNSO can do this with respect to second-level domains for ccTLDs at the same time.

Then it goes on: “Following our analysis and liaising with many interested parties – ccTLDs [and] ICANN – we came to the conclusion that full and frank dialogue on the use of redirection by ccTLDs should be fostered. By ensuring the harms and reasons for use are well understood, a solution is more likely to be arrived at sooner than later.” So, effectively, it was sharing the results of the Wildcarding Study Group and keeping people abreast of what is happening.

I think that’s the next step. Either this group undertakes it or the Council undertakes it. That’s already something going back to the Board resolution [that needs to be] done.

PETER KOCH:

Yeah. But the study group doesn’t have to answer to the Board. We are reporting to the Council. So that’s our next step in the first place.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just to be very clear, the study group acts within its own mandate and not the Board’s mandate. The Board requests to the ccNSO.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. That is, again, in response to Paul, who said, “I like to respond to the Board,” which is generally okay. But in this case, we report to the Council.

One observation, not to say fact, is that, during the research on the existence of emoji domain names, we still did find a couple of ccTLDs using or implying the wildcard delegation mechanisms. Just as an observation in response to your mentioning of the Wildcarding Study Group.

BART BOSWINKEL: [In] response, that’s very clear. And the reason why they did it was – some explained why they did it. I don’t know if these reasons are still valid, and probably you still have some ccTLDs who do it anyway, no matter what.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Indeed.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Thank you, Peter. Just to make a point, it says here in the purpose and scope of the study group that, if considered appropriate by the study group, the study group may advise on a course of further action, if any.

I totally agree with what Bart said. I think the Council will really appreciate [and] say, “Okay. These are the facts that we found, and their recommendation would be to let those ccTLDs that we found – that this is what could be really harmful; all of their activities. [Consider it] that way. And that’s that.

PETER KOCH: Thank you so much. That seems to make my job a bit easier and also gives a chance to come to conclusion, in a different sense, though.

Okay. Fine. I believe that we do the following. I’ll sit together with staff support to draft some short proposed wording to address this and to suggest this particular next step, mostly following your – Bart’s – suggestion and—

BART BOSWINKEL: And many just for this group I think we should stop using the word “conclusion.” “Conclusion” is too strong a word. It doesn’t capture what we do. I think what you just described is more the tone and captures more of the sense of what this study group

should end up with, instead of hard conclusions. “Conclusions” is almost final.

PETER KOCH:

No, we’re not there yet. Thanks, Bart. Yeah. We can always recommend something to the ccNSO Council.

Then let’s do that. Let’s get together, draft a few sentences in that direction. There’s also the task still open: not to forget to have a summary in the beginning, maybe highlight some of the issues, also taking into account the feedback that we got today.

Looking at the time, we seem to have short of four minutes left for the rest of this. We agreed on what to recommend in general: mailing out the words. The presentation to the community, which is the half-hour slot that we got on Tuesday, we’ll prepare, but it’s basically going through the key findings of the document, maybe not confusing everybody by bi-directional emojis with whatever direction modifiers.

But informing the community and the Council on what the key findings in terms of facts are. Also, offering the recommendation that we’re going to draft. I hope to be able to share that with the study group beforehand, but it’s basically what we discussed today.

And we have—

BART BOSWINKEL: May I make a suggestion?

PETER KOCH: Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bernie, will you be able to do something tomorrow morning? Do a presentation?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I can do a presentation, but I don't think I can finish the—

BART BOSWINKEL: No, no. Not the draft, but the presentation. And the circulate the presentation in the course of tomorrow so the working group members have a chance to look at it until Monday. Then we can finalize it Monday evening.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: [inaudible]

PETER KOCH: Yeah, absolutely. What I have in mind is that we explain what we did and why and what the results are. To the extent we agree on some – how do I say conclusion without saying that?

BART BOSWINKELP: Path forward.

PETER KOCH: No. Some interpretation, actually, of the facts, or some addition, like, “This is complicated,” which already is an interpretation but not a conclusion. We put that on the slides as bullet items. We can always expand on that based on feedback that we hopefully get during the session. And that we point that we had identified 16 registries. Maybe we have the opportunity to actually talk to them on the spot on Tuesday.

Okay. That’s it. Any Other Business? I see—

BART BOSWINKEL: Just one?

PETER KOCH: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: That’s – oh, no. Not Any Other Business. Sorry.

PETER KOCH:

Okay. No other business. Then there will be a next meeting – well, we do have that session on Tuesday. We have something to continue on the study group mailing list. We should propose a conference call maybe long enough after this physical meeting to get the final version out because we’re putting up the draft for public – it’s not a formal public comment, but we are going to have the informal public—

BART BOSWINKEL:

Let’s take a step back. So, going back to the initial discussion Bernie, it was around if there’s any addition needed to the draft report as it stands right now. If you have comments – like, for example, the bi-directional from Patrik – please circulate to the list this week so we can include it and finalize it.

So you missed that part, Alejandra. Maybe check the areas where you had comments where Bernie had made some changes so we can finalize the draft text this week and then also work in some of the next steps forward, whatever we’re going to call it, and circulate that by the end of this week as well.

Then this group needs to sign off on that final paper before it will be going to the informal public comment, the lightweight public

comment, and circulated to the individual ccTLDs as we discussed at the start of this meeting.

I don't whether we need a call—

PETER KOCH: Maybe for the sign-off, we want to have one call at one our usual slots. But let's come to that conclusion on the list.

BART BOSWINKEL: [But that is] at the end of this week if necessary.

PETER KOCH: Yes. And I was not going to propose a time and date right now.

BART BOSWINKEL: No.

PETER KOCH: Okay. So expect one more virtual meeting but ...

BART BOSWINKEL: [Prior to the – because afterwards she needs to do it as well].

PETER KOCH: Yeah, that's the point. Have two. One before submit that for informal public comment and then one to digest the feedback and suggestions.

Okay. We're done?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Top of the hour.

PETER KOCH: Top of the hour, yes. Okay. One minute bitten into the next session. Thanks, everybody, for attending. Thanks, Page, for being available remotely. Thanks to all the observers and visitors for your patience and interest. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]