

FINISHED FILE

ASIA PACIFIC REGIONAL INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
MACAO 2015
1 JULY, 2015
ROOM 1
16:00 LOCAL TIME
INTERNATIONALISED DOMAIN NAMES:
A MULTI-STAKEHOLDER, CROSS-COMMUNITY CASE STUDY
SESSIONS 6 AND 27

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning
are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility
and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

Live captioning at APrIGF Macao 2015 is brought to you by
Internet Society

>> MODERATOR: Ladies and gentlemen, let's go ahead and be
seated.

Welcome everybody. We're in the last session.

Let's start. Last session for today. I know everybody is
tired. This is one topic that you would be interested in.

I'm from the Asia-Pacific in Singapore. We are very, very
interested and we want to make sure we can clear the way, just
as this process today, I think we have already talked about,
wanting to enable the next digital generation. As you know, the
majority will come from the Asia-Pacific region and a lot of the
communities in this region actually will not speak English. An
important thing is how do we enable communities not speaking
English to be able to come online. A key area is building a
block for this to happen, that even -- you'll have to type and
then not have to type the .com after that, that doesn't make
sense. For that to happen, we have to create communities to

decide what kind of characters or scripts can go on a top-level. I cannot decide what characters will go to the top-level domains and there are complications, which you will find out later, which is why we put together this session to facilitate for this discussion. I shall not be taking too much time to introduce this work with regard to generation rules, it is actually a committee.

I'll pass the mike now to introduce the speakers and we'll proceed with the rest of the session. As we had mentioned, because of the remote participation, we have to use the mike even though we don't like it. For questions, also, to direct the questions through the mike as well. We appreciate everyone just doing this small administrative matter.

Thank you. I'll pass the mike on. Thank you.

>> Good afternoon. Thank you. Thank you to ICANN for sponsoring this session and for inviting me to join this session to share the work.

We also have the adviser to this work. This here, this is not a new issue, our members, my boss, my teacher started this research ten years ago, even 20 years ago and we have worked with the Chinese domain registrations, and that's some of the work that's been done in some other regions and countries. Account Chinese domain name, it has been activated for many institutions throughout China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, for TLPs, it is a bit different and it is much more complicated even in administration.

For today's session I think we'll try to explain this today. I'll go first and introduce and then I'll pass it on to others throughout the session.

>> Thank you.

Before we go into the more technical aspect, I think I have been asked to give a very brief overview, if you will, of what this really means to users. Thinking about it here, we're sitting in Macao, I find it surprising that I need to explain that but it is true. Actually IDNs as mentioned, you know, the ideas were introduced in 1998, 1999, around that timeframe. Myself, I don't know whether I should be happy or not, but I have since then been participating in being a pioneer of pushing forward the internationalized domain names and those that don't though what they are, they're basically domain names that are names, www.whatever, .com, .asia, wherever you're operating, IDNs, it is the ability to use Chinese, Japanese languages, the Arabic languages in domain names and domain names today remain a crucial part of the navigation on the Internet, every user, you know uses domain names in one way or the other. And the most give away, it is the e-mail addresses, even with using mobile apps and as you search today, the e-mail apps, it is a very

important part.

I'll come back to apps and search in a bit. They're very important questions. The main question on IDN it is I think over the last 16, 17 years that we have been working on IDNs is that two people use it, are they useful, do people even care? I think it is really a word view not in my mind, it is not a world view of whether we believe in a diverse world or when we talk about an international community, on the Internet we can have everything marginalized, everybody looking at the same thing and English -- we're at a point in using English today, right here, it seems to be a unifying vat, but personally I believe in a richer world with diversity at its heart, that's a very important part of IDN.

If you talk about whether you can reach the world with IDNs, maybe that's the wrong question in my mind. The question is: How do we make the Internet relevant for the local community in IDNs? They play an important role there. One of the best ways I think to talk about them is that the business plan -- the business card test, if English is the only language we need, why do people still produce business cards that one side perhaps are in English, the other side in a local language. Today I have a bunch of business cards from the Chinese officials here in Macao and they also have one side in English and one side in Chinese. Today that Chinese e-mail address, that domain name, it is still in Alpha and that's what I handoff myself. That's the identity for people that they can use online, it reflects the country, their heritage upfront. That's really the importance. It is not just about, you know, whether it is the Internet for the whole world and, you know, you use IDNs, some people may not be, some people don't speak Chinese, that's a reality. This is how the world -- how the Internet can be more like the real world.

I think even if we come back, even going back to commerce, which is a very important driver of things, of adoption, including the Internet, I think that there is a huge market for IDNs as we think about that. In India, just in India, as an example, there are 8 million small, medium sized businesses and micro businesses that focuses on the local market. They're using India in their own language, there is more than 10 million small, medium sized businesses in China that focus on the local business, and in IDN, e-mail address in Chinese, it makes a lot of sense, that's what the customer, you know, how the customer knows about them. The business card question, it is really the question that IDNs solve.

Now we'll get to search. People talk about search, they say, you know, people don't use domain names anymore, but think about search. Think about the domain name. One thing you may

not already know, the domain industry in the last ten years is driven by search engine optimization and 30, 40% of the domain names registered in the world today, it is allocated, attributable to search engine authorization. Just look at the new expansion, the new domain expansion, a company that bought the most domains, Google. Why would -- you know, if search is going to replace domain names, why would Google invest in more than 100 million domains. You do the math, you think about it. In the reverse, search is actually going to be an important part of IDNs. People today may not be typing in Chinese domain names actively. Think about it, who in China would be searching this in English? 90%, close to 10% of searchers will be in Chinese, if you think about the search engine optimization value in that light, I think that IDNs, they're an important part even with the search in place. That's one thing, you know, that's important to think about.

The other thing is the apps, people say that the world is about mobile apps now. Think about it. Every single mobile app, it is about domain name. Every mobile app is connected and domain names, it is an important part of it. The common, if you will, technical part of the Internet, it is still driven by domain names and IDNs make their heart and especially that regard, the most important of all, mobile apps will not replace the need for domain names. When we think about -- for those that may not understand this, HTML5, this is the future of mobile apps, what's that do? It basically turns every website back into an app. How are people accessing those apps? Domain names is a natural way to access.

Think about it, how many apps can you download? How many apps can you download? 50, 100, 200? Let's download 500 apps on to your iPhone. You won't download a million apps, right? There are a million websites out there and more than a million companies out there that want to give you the application, that wants to give you the information and navigating that role is still going to the domain names.

One more thing, if you provide an app, for example, if we provide an app for -- let's say for whatever. You wouldn't want your customers to go on play, go on app store to search for the apps, right? If they search for the app, thousands are doing exactly the way you are, it is right there, so you're sending your customer to your competitors. Domain names, it still is relevant. The other thing about mobile revolution, it is about speech tech. Think about IDNs, think about the English domain names. Today a lot of people still use English domain names, but when you're talking to the phone, to enter the domain name from navigation, I doubt, you know, most people in China or Japan would still be using English, it would be much more easy

to navigate with voice, with your native language. I know that we have been looking at this. There is a great video about a website, I encourage you to search online tomorrow for this. I think that IDNs, it is very important, especially when we move to speech input.

I will stop there. You know, I'll end with a couple of items, one is that domain names, the domain names still will be identities that connect with people. That's about -- that's what domain names are and that's -- there are challenges with IDNs, there are still challenges with IDNs, the accessibility by different applications and also policy deployments especially on what's called IDN variance. Those are issues that are brought in because of holistic issues, technology, it is not perfect, the Internet, it is not perfect, you need policies to make it a better place and IDN variance is one of them. Providing traditional Chinese situations, one of them, the power of distribution, it has a different issue with IDN variance but all in all, I think these are policies that still need to be completed by the community to make IDN work and I think it is meaningful for IDN to work not just in that it is a fun technology, not just because I have worked on it for so many years and I want to do it. I believe in more of a diverse world that can use IDN and, you know, that's the Internet that I think -- that I love, and that's the Internet that would be ready for the next billion to come online.

Thank you.

[Applause].

>> (No microphone).

>> IDN in Asia, it has issues and it is a headache. We have so diversified levels of script. So far we have IDN in Arabic, Indie and I know they have started others and there will be more and more. I think that the China IDN, it will work well with the output when we help those challenges and source groups.

First of all, I wanted to start with an evolution of Chinese characters. For Chinese, we're talking about these varying issues because of -- you know, it is -- in the past, in the last thousands of years, the characters of the Chinese points, they have evolved. They have many different forms from the very early engines, we have the other gal and then we have the modern simplified and in general we like to say that this standard script, it was actually generated about 100 years ago. There are traditional forms, this is a modern simplified form. It doesn't mean that this doesn't exist. Actually in the past 11 years the traditional ones and the modern simplified, they coexist. The calligraphers, the pioneers, they're looking at these points. In the last 100 years, in the last century two governments, the two, they have tried to solidify the Chinese

character. But the first efforts failed, the second one succeeded. In the China amendment we use the simplified one as the official character outstanding in Taiwan, Hong Kong. That's why we have a complicated Chinese variant. For example, for this component, the standpoints of the character is here but for others, the two, they're the same. There is another case, the traditional and the simplified one, they're different. Besides that, there are other forms that are apparent. It is a complicated situation.

That's the forms and we have identified this table. The CDNC's contribution form, I think it is in -- it is in 2002, yeah. Yeah. We have the number, including the CDNC, we have these and also we have the numbers like SDG and others in here as illustrators. We have tried to combine the traditional ones and the others in one single table. If you take a domain name, you have this character, so then it will generate those, the modified and traditional one and use characters like this one.

In this case, this is the preferred variant, the two traditional preferred characters. This one, this is not. So the paired delegation, this means for many, they're similar and should be detested to the single same character.

This is from 2000 to now. The experience of Chinese variance, okay. For the Chinese, it was around 2000 -- yeah, I think so, yeah, I think, yeah -- so this is 77%, and then 83%, in Taiwan, they have that form and then in Hong Kong, you're around 85.

This is the top Internet address, it is the second largest initiative.

Since, we have -- you know, the Chinese characters, in China, you have the Chinese scripts, it does not use Hanja and then in Korea in Korea it is not -- it is not official, the used characters, and sometimes you see those.

This is the relationship of the Chinese character in three scripts.

For Japanese, there is over 6,000, I think it is over 6,800 Chinese characters. In Korean communities, it may be over 6,000 Chinese characters. For Chinese language, we propose it is over 19,000.

There is some coordination principles. Each generate a singular rule that applies for this which means that you can predict from this area and from others, so we better coordinate before that between the principles and try to generate the support. I have two coordination cases. The first is -- we call it I in Chinese. We have the certain points and for -- for this community, we have only -- we have only one character. If you want to coordinate them together, which means for Japanese community, this is the platform, it should be blocked. For

Chinese communities most would be generated and then detonated to the applicant and then some are being preserved, others are blocked. But for Japanese community only this informal -- only one formal. Thank you. And then we have any other combination of lots. For most of the characters, there is the similar relationship and similar solution, disposition could be found for them. There is some other difficult coordination cases like this one.

In Chinese most of that means machine. In Japanese and Korean community, this platform means desk and in Chinese it is machine. This is much different, it is much odder for two of to us make that process or propose a coordination associated with it. The tradition, the definition, it is made the same, pronounced the same, machine, they're supposed to be simple but this definition does not rely on this platform for Japanese and for Koreans.

Challenges, we need negotiation and compromise among the throw panels. This is challenging, difficult characters. And we're supposed to do some code points reduction because mainly for the roots, you can't have as many characters in the second-level domains in the Chinese communities. The labels reduction, it requires us to make some reduction, some automation to make sure that we have the database, that they're not to contend with other labels, trying to limit the workloads.

Finally, the process including the LGR algorithm and the human interaction mechanism because of the data, the working group, trying to make an automatic assumption which can generate other labels for any script for Chinese, for Japanese, Korean, Arabic, but we think many times the application and utilization, it steps, it will never replace the effort of human interaction. We could never predict what kind of label the applicant wanted, and sometimes -- and we find that this can tend to solve that problem. So thus, the challenge.

Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> (Microphone turned off).

>> I think we're opportunistic, the language is used almost only in Japan. Most Japanese people use only Japanese language. This is the situation for us.

The scripts used in Japanese documents, we use Kanji, Hiragana, Katakana and Alphanumeric in Japanese, as Japanese scripts. And our experience with IDN, we have -- most -- we have the domain name with a mixture and we're already with the 15 years of experience and we have about 120,000 registrations today.

Let's look at the relationships. In some regions, the line characters in the Japanese to Chinese to Korean. This is a kind

of chart. All know to the Japanese IDN, the JGP, they have the four scripts, they come from the Han, and they cannot be mixed, that's the rule.

Note the second line. At a material level the integration, there's a mixture.

We set up Japanese Generational Panel for investigating this. We started our work from August 29, 2014, meetings around the advancement and so we did our proposal to have formal meetings and that started in February and then we moved on to march and you see CJK meeting in May and June. Each have eight members from different sectors, diverse experts and IDNs, they're familiar with. This is a community effort to set the rules. We as a JGP consult with a wider community, with diverse communities so the members would discuss with their communities about this and the -- bring the information to the Committee and get opinions from the Committee and bring that back to the public so we can discuss more.

We have website, and the medium out there, it is condensed. All of this, this is published, the thoughts. We have compact models for inviting comments. Unfortunately we haven't seen anyone's comments so far. We do have explanatory sessions and ICANN meetings in Japan on Internet governance, Trademarks, press release and public comments to the draft RootLGR would be planned, maybe late this year.

Opportunities, activities, the JGP establishment, we are developing our comments. For this, the CGP and KGP integration, they want to be integrated into one, the CJK and LGR and agreed by CGP and JGP and KGP. They input into the algorithm a preliminary Japanese LGR will be drafted.

This is the frame work we're working on. Chinese with the CGP. First version is developed and then after that we looked at the Japanese chapters and see how it works and if we have found problems in the output and then we'll have feedback to each method of rules. This is how it works. The discussion status, the scope of the character codes, as I said, Kanji, Hiragana and Katakana, and we had around 6,000 characters here. The variants and each variant type for Kanji, we don't have variants in Japanese rules. It is very hard in the situation.

The whole label evaluation, this is -- it is extremely hard with the traditional character and the other characters at the same time, that's needing more investigation. As I said, all the characters in Japanese should be there or amended. There is no rules.

This is another example. The exchange.

I think that's all.

>> Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> I'll now pass the mike to talk about the communities.

>> Thank you very much. First of all, we'll start -- I'm the least prepared. I didn't actually think a lot about this session, I thought it was kind of -- I thought it was just -- how do I say -- the -- the completion of the CDK but I should have expected a larger community here.

I have a short description of the Korean label, but let me kind of explain how it works.

As you know, in Korea we have our own character set, just like Japan. It is basically each Korean syllable uses the vowels, sorry, I can't remember exactly, but I don't know how many vowels. Sorry about my ignorance, 17 and then 12 vowels, it is a combination of those. So usually the Korean label consists of a consonant and a vowel or a consonant, vowel, consonant. Basically we claim that we can actually generate all different sounds within Korean but if we use the old Korean characters, that is how we do it I think.

In real life we used Hangeul although the -- we use Hanja but for the official documents, this is used for a wider understanding of the document.

The controversial arguments against whether we need to use the Hanja continues or not is to another point.

Anyway, because of that, when we actually introduced IDN ten years ago, we only had did the Hanga character, but when asked whether the Korean KGP is applied, whether it is trans character or -- it is the exclusion to the trans character, it is okay, and we -- our community will talk about that.

At that level, there are many people who like to apply the Korean character but also with the Chinese character if possible. That's something that we get involved into this discussion. If it is simply from the beginning this side only including the Hanja character, our life would be much easier, simpler. Only Korean characters, that's it, so LGR, it is pretty simple but we dare to get involved in the lengthy, complicated discussion about this. We learned many things.

Let me just -- you know, let me just share what I have done so far. It is not done, but we -- this is -- this is what we have done, we have made big progress. We invited the Hanja, transcript expert, two members into the panel. Our panel consists of 50 members, including language experts, technical expert, registrar and the registry.

In the second -- so there are about five -- four areas of the things that we need to consider as the coordination with our CJK friends.

The first is -- well, this one, the last one, the MSR, it was presented to the general public, especially within Japan, it raised attention on this, what is the basis for the 6,017

character number. I thought our delegate explained that and I found that he didn't! Well, the standard excluding 3 and 4, it is still -- you know, there is still others that overlap. This is not 100% official but there is some language in Korea which is used for how good you are at using China's character.

At the basic level, the certificate, because the 6,000 character understanding, that's where this number comes from.

The number 3 and number 4 we try to include the North Korean definition even though we don't have direct communication with -- we have some refugees from North Korea, but there are so many people who claim they're experts, we couldn't choose one. There is so many people that claim that they're the expert of North Korea Chinese characters. We're still waiting.

In the next few months we'll have the public hearing on this position. One of the results should be are we going to include the North Korean transcripts or not. If we decide not to approve, then this number will change, but not much. Based on the 6,000 characters we identified 132 characters, the 66 pairs of the variance. There were many things. Well, we just simply tried to have our queues from the pairs of the members, it is much more, the variance and under 57 for characters, the -- well, this is -- well, the example already show that. The second one is machine here of the two characters are not considered the same, it is completely different. A complete difference. There are other examples, they're similar but use cases, for example, the number one, we have three different cases for. That's just one stroke, just for the number, and then there is another case that is used for -- as kind of a more complicated number one used for accounting. The third one, it is for the statements, the sequence, the order. We have all different case, we consider those three characters as meaning number one, but in China, they are the same meaning.

The different uses, but they're similar. In this case, the meanings matter. We still need to have that discussion.

Recent activity, the KGP was formed last year. We had a meeting every month since last summer, but because of not using the domain name, it is very difficult to have consensus with very different members. As I said earlier, we have the public hearing soon, maybe in a month or two. Currently we plan to have a public hearing before the end of September so we can actually file -- have a semifinal. So this transcript, we'll actually put it on the table and see the differences.

Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> I think I'll take a quickstep become and do a quick summary of what happened. There are a number of pretty technical terms that happened.

What you can see, the work, it is still ongoing. We're for the Chinese, Japanese, for the Korean communities and many other language sets and script sets, basically the work that we're trying to do is to reach out to communities and to work with them on various scripts so that they can develop a rule set which they'll formulate the LGR, a rule set on what scripts are on a top-level domain, what cannot. What happens if there is variance of two characters in the same, what happens if it crosses this or within your own script, then what happens when your script cuts across into another script that's very similar to yours. In this example we're looking at the Chinese, Japanese, Korean communities and how they have to coordinate with each other so that you can have the kind of rule that allows the I want gracious and when users use it, they don't encounter problems.

If you have a script in your own community and you're not sure whether work is being carried out. Reach out to me, and we'll try to find out whether there is any work being done. If not, then I'll work with my colleague from the programs to reach out to you so that we can work with you to bring experts on board to follow-up. From there, we can start work on the label generation panel and from there we can develop the rule sets of how you can see from the Chinese, Japanese, Korean communities.

The next part now, it is the cross community coordination between the three communities and we'll invite the panelists also to come up front so you can share your experiences with this. Following that, then we can go into a discussion of Q and A and answer any questions that you may have.

Thank you.

>> HIROFUMI HOTTA: Thank you.

I have reading the work from the three panelists, and the procedures, it is rather complicated and different.

>> (Laughter).

>> Different settings.

>> Correct.

>> HIROFUMI HOTTA: However, we have to make a similar because the TOB speaks and it is just one speech. Just one.

When we start this panel with the presentations of the panel, much -- this is what I spoke about. We made -- the three of us, we talked about the conservation of our community in each of his side, in each community, but we have to have coordination.

As you have seen in the presentations, each of CJK had thousands of Han characters, many characters, and then we looked they three languages and characters to see the same characters and some of them are different. Then we looked at the different usage that remained in different languages.

The variant definition is different in different languages. The CGP defines currently about 3,000 variant groups. JGP has no variants. KGP tentatively defines 66 variant groups. The rules for strings are different from language to language. It was very streaking.

Some combination of characters are prohibited in Chinese strings, as I side. All combination of characters are allowed in Japanese strings. You have to coordinate. We need to coordinate.

(indiscernible).

We met for 1 and a half day with IP participation in some parts. We had four times of two hour meetings in June. A few more meetings may be needed to coordinate and conclude. The conclusion may be reached, I hope, by early next year. It is complicated and we have no experience on this.

(indiscernible).

This is the questions, the first is what's the biggest difference for your community between 2LD rule definition and TLD rule definition.

The second question is what is the biggest challenge in the CJK coordination.

The third one is what is the key to make CJK coordination successful. These are questions. (indiscernible). I guess I can get us started. I think important, key questions that we need to ask, and -- I think could be question one for the audience as well, what is the biggest difference with the domain name. Traditionally, even today, it is important to understand, there is a different in the policies, type of top-level domains allowed and types much second-level domains allowed. For example, numbers are not allowed in the top-level domain. This is a fundamental difference, you know, but second level they are. Another example is that hyphens are not allowed. EPA today rules of top-level domains are different.

Coming back to CJK and this particular issue a main challenge is that in a second level if we are especially talking about country top-level domains, you can identify that second-level domain, that it is reasonably understand to be in that language if you see the domain name.

In the top-level, without that context, a user looking at a few Hanja, they'll not be able to understand whether it is either of those three, that's the challenge. The user will gloss the contents of the domain as the context of language. In the top-level we have to -- we have to understand that the rules will have to apply to all three languages, and the biggest challenge, of course, is that there are characters that in the Chinese community we believed to be the same, whereas in a situation, Korean, Japanese community they consider those

characters to be separate characters and, therefore, there is the need for the coordination. Up to this day, because it is not on top-level, second level, you know, they would treat it as it would be the characters, but in the Chinese, they're treated as the same character and put together by strings. I think that's the biggest difference, the context wall, as a user uses the Hanja, they use that character on top of the domain, they'll lose context on whether it will be in Chinese, Japanese or Korean. That's my thought.

Do you have a question?

>> So I'm trying to understand. Today we have -- you're saying that you have context of JP, so that's Japanese and KR, KP, that's Korean, I think I understand that, but I don't know how somebody who's unfamiliar with the characters would understand that. I won't worry about that right now. Today we have top-level domains already in Chinese. The rule sets that you're working on, they're for that next round perhaps of the top-level domains or the current round?

>> Both.

>> I'm trying to make sure I understand this, at the second-level for existing and under the current round of new ones, if with respect to the respective one also apply the same rules to their second level or not? I don't know if I asked that question clearly.

>> I can answer it. I guess the main thing is that the second level rules are going to be different. The first point is that they're -- well, first of all, as I mentioned, even in English, Alpha numeric there is a difference, you have to be more conservative in the top-level. The smaller number of characters that are allowed, so that's the reason. Another reason is conceptual reasons, that's -- currently there are -- it is not about Asia rules, but there is contextually from my end rules. So that's less of a concern. The actual rule sets themselves, on the top-level, second-level, I think almost I can guarantee that there is a difference. You know, the reason is precisely -- first of all, there won't be numbers in the top-level name but there will be numbers in the second level. That in itself is a difference.

>> (indiscernible).

>> I'm encouraged by what you just said. IDN uses domain names and then this happens in one but not others, basically the -- the IDN detail, it is there, it is there now, especially the -- you know, they have resolved the issue and Chinese characters, that's another example, but the -- that's why GTLE as you mentioned, there is no country backer. Anyone who wants to use the trans character, they can apply for the character in the domain names. The use of -- you know, the understanding of

the Chinese character, it is varying from country to country especially, you know, these three countries. So far, for example, in Korea we never use the transcript -- we haven't ever used the transcript in the second domain name but China, Japan, they have used that within their sovereignty, CJK, all three example country-level domain names, we ask the sovereignty, so that's the -- the experience is a different example. Let me -- so in our case, as I already explained, we don't -- we hadn't had to use the one transcript as a domain name. This is a new experience, to transferring to Hanja for the domain name. This requires coordination, and it has been expressed and there is a different understanding of the same purpose. In the last 2,000 years, each country has their own rules. Including the creation of their own characters as well. How we actually define -- the first -- the first challenge I had to face, when I attempted back in IP, they said, well, you guys need to -- my understanding was that we must agree among ourselves having common information.

At first I didn't understand why, the tradition, the why. But it is said -- at one point the people that don't understand this history and culture, they -- it is the same according to their eyes, that one character, it is the same, why it has different meanings, so on. That I understand. Yeah. If that's the -- yeah. If that's the issue, you're not supposed to have confusion. So third, it was keeping that successful, and let's find out the trend and that's what we have been trying to do.

>> Can you provide some information about how to the Chinese community will apply their solutions and policies at different levels. I think the issues were raised 15 years ago and some solutions, they were too close and obviously it was not in good interest to make. This was applied to many different non-registration, the different policy, first it goes across the different institutions, so we have the Chinese community, Taiwan, Hong Kong, others, they have the traditional variance and they think it should be the same thing to avoid the possible domain name abuse. .com also provided that with Chinese.

When it comes to the -- this goes to a fast track which means that ICANN can give this according to the -- this is the registered preference, but the .china or .taiwan, .Singapore, more, you know, the variance. But maybe -- I don't know if there is a .japan or -- no. No. Actually. Actually -- although I haven't made a formal policy or regulation or policy, because this is a strong requirement, it is to my understanding a compromise has been made.

It is totally different. You provide for the Chinese script and you don't know where it is from, what kind of language, not just the name, but what kind of a label you should

delegate because so far all IDN application, there is also an IDN application, and it is sent with this variance, the forms, but those relevance forms, they were suspended. There was a dedication to the applicant and now we have the inflow, so now we have 20 to label and the very issue, it has not been solved. All of these variants, they have been suspended for the first round. I think -- I can -- what had the issues, the particular second ones and we're all working on that. The biggest difference between second-level and top-level, the second level, policy to be made according to top-levels registries, the group policies, but for IDN, there is only one unified rules from ICANN. I have demonstrated two cases, the second case, it is quite different, how can we try to make the processes for trying to find the solution to solve this. What do we need to do to find the solution for this.

>> I think -- this is hard work.

Not only -- it is between all of them. We had never seen this in social engineering, it needs to bring an action. For the application of the -- it is not -- when the applicant reads for a specific label, we were -- we had a better designation, I don't think it is a case like -- our policy is, I think we're trying to block LGR, most of the paralegals and all of the Delegates and have a limited number of labels trying to reduce the rules on the system. Still I think maybe we -- maybe we should not -- suppose -- the simple registration will -- cannot help in this topic especially if issued different copies and in different languages.

>> I would make a quick comment regarding the second-level, top-level, the work that ICANN -- I have two comments.

The first, the work, as you can see, it is not ours and included by the panels and within just their own panels they have to spend a lot of time to decide what can go in and whatnot, and then there is the coordination work that's done between the cross panels and then these are volunteer hours put in and at the end of the day to the global community enjoys the benefit of being able to use the IDN.

The second thing I would comment on the top-level rule definition versus second-level, it is that from the approach recommended by the I wanted gracious panel at ICANN is to take the very conservative one. We mentioned that ICANN wants to block everything, which is -- many people are saying because of that approach, we have to take a minimal away and find the best way to get things across first, but as things go along, we can actually adjust that and have the initial variance and then you can actually do so, but as a first step. The difference between the top-level work, that's a lot more conservative, if you think that there is differences between the two groups, then maybe try

not to include it for now. The second-level, it is generally settled by registries, for now most are CCTLEs, the CCTLEs, they can decide what the system wants. When we have more GTLEs than IDNs being rolled out, what's happening, is the work being done on top-level domains for IDNs, they'll influence the GTLE second level RCs. This is a little composite of the work I think because of the level of what's being done influences many generations to come so that's really the comment I wanted to make. Thank you.

>> Thank you. (indiscernible).

>> I'll give a small comment on this. This is me. From the start, as Chair of the panel, I think that in most important -- the most difficult thing is the translation of Japan's script. They don't know what the difference is in the Chinese language. But when we coordinate everybody will make some compromise. The compromised point should be explained to locals and that's where most important parts of that is to make -- to really move this.

>> I wanted to make a single comment. I think you have nailed it right on.

There are compromises that need to make, I think from -- once we have the coordination, because we have the different views, there will be some compromise but the key is to have it displayed -- you know, it is -- it is our responsibility to go back to Chinese community, to go back to the Korean community, go back to the Japanese community to persuade and convince them also, you know, why and document that rational and also to pick up on what was said, I actually agree, number three, if you ask me, what is the key to make coordination successful, I think that you have a very good point in turning around and talking to ICANN and the board, is that for the last ten years working on the variance, the community has consistently said on a consistent level we're going to need to deal with it as a policy issue and on a case by case basis. There has been a dream that this could be solved magically and technically in this process that comes -- something comes in, something goes out and ICANN sits there, it is done. That's not going to be the case. Every domain after considering the variant will have to go through the view on a case by case basis and handle it on this policy level. That's becoming more and more apparent as we go down the process, especially dealing with the different cases from Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and it is time that we need to, you know, it is good to dream about an automated process, but that's not going to happen. We need to put the policy and processes in place to support the eventual implementation of the variance and that's important for the coordination and successful -- and we keep thinking about the -- there is no way to do this anymore

and then it just falls apart. That I think is going to be an important part.

>> Dually noted.

>> (Laughter).

>> Any other comments or questions?

>> There's an announcement from the organizer, the shuttle bus that's going to leave tonight from the University back to Holiday Inn will depart at 6:40, not 6:10.

>> I'm still trying to make sure I understand this.

Our concerns -- I'm not so worried about the top-level, is the second-level with the CCs, or within the GEs, and whether it is an IDN or others, are there concerns about computing between the different characters that look the same but that aren't the same?

>> The short answer is yes.

The long answer is that the variance, it is not a place to completely resolve that issue. It is not an IDN -- it is not necessarily an IDN variant issue. I take the Chinese or Japanese, Korean character one for example. That looks exactly like a hyphen to many people and that's not -- that's not going to be solved by IDN variance, that's a completely different issue. It is important to think about that issue when we think about the policies. We have to also understand that IDN variances, that they have the characters like this in Chinese, it is not necessarily going to be an issue like that. On the Latin-based script issue, that may play a bigger role in considering whether, you know, on a second-level IDN variance should be implemented because the historical, you know, usage of Alpha, A, they're more tightly tied and it has a risk origin leading to this homographic ratification, we have that issue in mind and it needs to have a holistic backing to it I think for the IDN variance to actually be the IDN variance.

>> Any other comments, conclusions?

Thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

>> [Applause].

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
