
BUENOS AIRES – At-Large IDN Working Group
Wednesday, November 20, 2013 – 10:00 to 11:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

EDMON CHUNG:

Welcome everyone to the At-Large IDN Working Group session here in Buenos Aires. Shall we go around the room? I'm looking at my Co-Chair now, Rinalia. This is Edmon. Thank you for coming. I guess, let's just get started. I don't think we need to do any roll call or anything. The Agenda put forward is pretty simple. I expanded it from the Agenda that was circulated quite a while back, mainly on some of the ongoing works for IDNs at ICANN.

Two main areas that we wanted to touch on today are the IDN variant TLD Program, there's some development there, and secondly the universal acceptance of IDNs and the user-experience side of things. That's what I have on the Agenda.

The third Item, if we have time, is some other IDN-related issues. Earlier in the week I've had a chance to speak with a number of people, that the WHOIS development, especially the internationalization of such, is increasingly becoming an area of interest from the At-Large point of view. Does anyone think anything else should be added? If not, we'll just get started.

The first Item is the IDN variant TLD project that we're... There are a number of ongoing projects. Two of the main ones – one is the label generation rule set development, and that splits into what's called an

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.

integration panel and a generation panel. Then also there's the implementation process project.

I guess from the At-Large perspective there are a number of areas that we have identified as being concerned with, or at least a couple of areas that's of interest on the At-Large side of things, especially whether we have the right make-up of the panels. Do we have the right expertise? Do we have sustainable pool of talent to man these panels?

I guess, Rinalia, you've been following that a little bit more. Perhaps you could give us a sense of how you see what the developments there are, and what the At-Large perspective might be? Since we have Naela and Steve here, perhaps we could get some updates from the staff as well. Rinalia, why do you help us kick the discussion off?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Edmon. Good morning everyone. As we know, the root zone label generation rules project has been launched, and the integration panel has been selected, and there will be a program update this afternoon, I believe at 4:45 until 6:15, when we'll get the program update.

We, in the At-Large, have been following this project very closely, and Edmon and I have been participating in the root zone LGR procedure development, and recently the At-Large community, together with ICANN, organized a workshop at the IGF in Bali. On the procedure itself we felt that that was very important to identify what key concerns could be from the community side, and some concerns were identified and the

outcomes were circulated on the At-Large mailing list, and we'll follow up with staff on those issues.

In terms of the generation panels, we know that some language communities are already mobilizing. The Arabic Task Force is forming a generation panel right now. I'm one of those Task Force Members. We know that we recently heard that the Korean community will be forming a generation panel as well, and there might be a combined hand script panel because of that, because we know that the Chinese and Japanese language are already preparing for it.

We do know that C-DAC in India is mobilizing for a Brahmi panel. Other than that we don't know, and perhaps Naela can give an update on that later. Whatever help they need, we'll probably need to support that or get the expertise to support that, and they will let us know what kind of expertise they require to get through the generation panel proposals. With regards to the integration panel, we've been getting some feedback on the level of expertise that they have.

We know that a Wiki has been set up. We were wondering whether or not the SOIs have been posted, because that is a concern for our community, as some of the members come from organizations that are applying for new gTLDs. We would like some clarity on whether or not the SOIs are already posted, and we look forward to the update later on today. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Rinalia. I wonder if Naela would have some response to that? I understand there is the update session coming up today, in which some

of this might be there. So I'm not asking you to go through all the updates, but I guess on a number of the issues – the formation of the generation panel and the integration panel, how the development is there, especially on the persons that are selected, and SOIs.

NAELA SARRAS:

Thank you Edmon and Rinalia. Back to the generation panels, because that's the first thing you mentioned. You're absolutely right – Chinese, Arabic and Brahmi are the ones that are most known to us right now. Again, this will all be discussed much more thoroughly this afternoon, but then another one that's showed an interest so far is Cyrillic as well. We've received some interest there.

Granted, it's individuals that have come to us so far, and our next focus is on the generation panel, so we'll probably be seeking more help with identifying individuals that we can connect with, that people that have identified themselves so far.

On the formation of the integration panel, it was announced back in September, I believe. We have five individuals on the integration panel. Their names are announced and listed, and I think this afternoon we have a link to where they are and even a photo of them. As the procedure called for choosing panelists with Unicode, DNS, IDNA and linguistics, that's exactly the expertize that we went after.

Some of the people on the integration panel are known to this community because they worked on previous projects of the integration panel. We've posted all the SOIs, I believe, in the last week, on the project Wiki, and there's a link to that in this afternoon's slides. The

format that you see, we followed it and it's the same exact format that ICANN uses for the Board Members. That's what you see listed there.

When we looked at the statements, you don't list all their hobbies and interests, so if they are part of a club or a sailing club, for example, that's not listed there. It's only things that are most relevant to the work that we're talking about. Some of them have a very short bio because they really are new to this community – they are not related to this community, so there's not a whole lot listed there.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Naela. I guess from the At-Large point of view, one particular aspect in terms of the SOIs is whether there might be conflicts of interest in that, and how it plays... I do understand that in general the integration panel, the generation panel, has nothing to do with evaluation of strings or that matter, however they do have implications.

So I guess Rinalia's point was whether those declarations are fully there, and whether there needs to be further follow up on that. Rinalia, did you want to add to that?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Edmon. I just want to clarify, it is the potential conflict of interest that we want to address. That needs to be clarified. You don't need to address that now, just take it back and make sure that it's done. Thank you.

NAELA SARRAS: If I just may ask... You're right. I'll just say that during the selection process it was potential... Appearance of potential conflict of interest were both looked at. We have others. There was a whole Selection Committee and other people in there, from staff, who advised us on that. So everybody had to fill out a conflict of interest and that had to be evaluated. But I'll think more on that question or statement.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Naela. Speaking of that actually, thinking aloud here, on that particular topic we understand that there probably has been a thorough process for making a selection. What probably seems opaque to the community is how exactly that was done. I guess this goes to some of the other panels, and I think the general At-Large point of view of how panels are selected, and how suppliers are selected, those types of things.

Again, I'm not asking you to respond now, but I guess with the At-Large hat on, those are things that are of interest if not concern. So that's... Are there any other updates, thoughts or questions about the IDN variant programs? No, actually, the integration panel and the generation panel?

Seeing none I'll move onto the implementation process. I forgot the exact name for project seven, but I'm using 'implementation process' for here. I guess there, that is a project where the processes for actually delegating the variant TLD, how perhaps it's handled at the IANA database, at the root WHOIS, and even the paperwork or the process itself, whether there would be further evaluation – those kinds of things would be, I assume, dealt with in that particular project.

I know there will be an update this afternoon, so I ask everyone to go to that. But I guess from that At-Large direction one of the questions is – I don't know if Naela's in the position to share yet – where we are with the process in terms of timing, and then whether there will be public comment processes, and how are we actually putting that implementation process in place, and when can we expect it? If you have information, if... Naela?

NAELA SARRAS:

Thank you Edmon. Project seven is really an interesting project. It has two big areas of work. One is to... If you remember in April 2013 there was a Board resolution for the SOs and ACs to provide any input and guidance to their implementation of this user-experience study. So that's one major part of the project – to solicit their input and incorporate it into our work.

We've just recently received, even though ALAC was one of the first ones to submit, and then I believe we got the SSAC report, and now we've recently received the gNSO input. So that is just now being incorporated or analyzed by staff. There was some delay there.

So that's one part. Another part of project seven is really to keep monitoring what's going on in point two, which is the implementation of the LGR procedure. For the implementation of the LGR procedure, we need for all those processes to go ahead to create the LGR, before we have any input from the LGR to do anything about it. So I'll talk a little bit more this afternoon about what we've been doing with incorporating the input.

But what I can say here is that the work in front of us right now, and what we know for sure we have to do is to implement the LGR procedure. That's on track and that's what we're focusing on. Until we have solid output that we know how to act on from the LGR, it's hard to go too far into the planning of the other processes.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Naela. I understand the timing is difficult to pinpoint now, but in terms of the process, is it a vision that it's kind of like the development of the AGB or the IDN ccTLD Fast-Track type of process, where an implementation process is put out, comments are received and then...? Is that kind of the process? Or are we chunking it up into further components? I guess that's really the question. How do you envision that to progress in terms of process?

NAELA SARRAS:

Thanks for that. That's clear. Right now, what we've done is gone through and identified who is impacted, or areas of work, and then for sure what you're saying, I believe there would have to be a process that's put out for public comment. Yes. Then we'd have to get feedback and incorporate that before it's something that's workable.

So yes, it's envisioned that it will be put out for further comment, but again, it all depends on what we're doing right now.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Naela. I guess when you do have more thoughts on that it would be good to understand whether a first report would come out

first, or would it be kind of like an implementation plan already? The real question is, are you going to have sort of like – for lack of a better word – a concept paper out first for comments, and then the implementation plan? Or this is going to be an implementation plan and comments on?

So that's the... You're probably not in a position to answer that yet, but as the project goes through that, that would be useful, especially from the At-Large in terms of looking at the process – how it's being implemented. Any other questions or thoughts on IDN variant TLDs? I see a few more have joined us. Besides this particular topic we have two other Agenda Items.

One is on the universal acceptance and IDN user-experience, and a third one on really other issues, such as WHOIS and the related internationalization efforts. On this first topic of IDN variant TLDs, are there any other...? Seeing none, we'll move onto the second main topic, which I think is very much of interest from the At-Large perspective.

It's the issue of universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, but more generally I guess, universal acceptance of IDNs. The reason why the current joint ccNSO and gNSO Final Report, that was focused on IDN TLDs, is because of the Charter of that particular group. But a wider issue of IDN user-experience is something that I think the At-Large... This is probably the right place to try to get some work started, perhaps.

I guess in this particular session I'd like to get a sense around the table on what perhaps we could start to work on and whether we should look into this particular issue. So far, just some background, the joint IDN Working Group has just finalized a report, which is now being submitted

to the two council; the ccNSO Council and gNSO Council, with a few recommendations on furthering outreach on universal acceptance of IDNs.

Really what that is is that some of the applications, like email or even sign-ups to social networks – your profile might have a URL. Would that accept IDN TLDs? Sometimes when you register a domain name in IDNs – like we now have IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs – can the name servers be IDN TLD? Are those systems in place? In some places it might work, in some it might not work. There are different reasons for that. This is what this topic is about.

Then you also add on the IDN variant issue, both on the top-level and on the second-level, and how different applications might react to it. There's a very thorough user-experience report that was put out. The question then for this group, or for At-Large and I guess our network of ALSes, is whether we could look into this issue and develop some next steps to it. With that, does anyone...? Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Edmon. I'd just like to add to that by saying that at the IGF Workshop in Bali, the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs emerged as the most important concern for the user community, and it's something that we need to look at. I know ICANN will probably say it may not be entirely within its remit, but we do believe that ICANN has a role to play, and we need to collaborate with the industry to make sure that something is done.

I just want to read a few policy recommendations that came up from the IGF Workshop about this issue. “Concrete policy recommendations to address the problem of universal acceptance include: (1) discourage systems that do not accommodate IDN and IDN variants; (2) develop ways of identifying what is a legitimate IDN TLD label...” and there is some research already being done in the industry on this.

“(3), encourage IDN TLD operators and accredited registrars to ensure that they support universal acceptance of IDN TLDs in their own systems; and (4) advocate for universal acceptance, raise awareness and provide reference or learning materials.” Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Rinalia. Those are very good terms of reference, even for if this group were to try and take on and think about what the community, or together with the staff and team on addressing this issue further. I wonder if anyone else...? I’m looking at Chris, because this is one of the topics that Chris is most keen about, so I wondered if you would...?

CHRIS DILLON:

Thank you for that Edmon. This is Chris Dillon speaking. Yes. It’s something that I’m certainly very interested in; the whole idea of consistency, that at the moment it’s possible theoretically for variants to be established in several ways, depending on the top-level domain and the language, also whether it’s a gTLD or a ccTLD. At the second-level there are already many different implementations.

It’s a very interesting and key area as the two of you have been saying very clearly. It strikes me that it’s probably too late to talk about policy,

because to get some sort of policy that would make all of this consistent would take a long time, and it's really too late to be doing that. But what we can consider doing is, is there a space somewhere in ICANN for a place where people can actually talk about not policy, but just recommendations? That's really what it comes to.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Chris. That's actually a very good observation. Probably the train has left the station, but all is not lost. Part of the JIWG recommendations did talk about additional things that maybe the ICANN community or ICANN can help coordinate. Right now, in terms of the second-level IDN registration policies, there is a central repository at IANA about all the tables.

What is missing though is how exactly are they different? We have a listing of all the tables, but perhaps what this Working Group or at least this Working Group could start looking at, or from ICANN, is to produce some materials to actually identify what the commonalities and differences are, so that an end user would be better informed of the consistencies and inconsistencies of that matter. I don't know whether that makes sense to people. Chris and then Naela.

CHRIS DILLON:

Yes. That is the case. There are many tables in that repository. They are absolutely gigantic. Some of them are very good quality, some of them are really less good and very permissive of things that most people would not want to allow; dead languages, heaven knows what if you

look at some of them. So yes, it's possible for electronic tools to do comparisons, but this in a sense is part of the issue.

Yes, it's possible to create electronic tools that will look at them and see what the differences are, and they will perhaps bring together variants from different languages using the same script, for example. This is really the project one tool, effectively. I think the issue really is less of a technical one. I think the issue is more user experience, because also technically it is possible to do these comparisons, for the user it's totally bewildering.

They'll be thinking, "Why is it that it behaves this way in this situation, and somehow differently elsewhere?" That's why I'm saying there may be a case for having a home somewhere in ICANN to talk about... Effectively it's getting very close to project seven, I think. It's a talking shop for recommendations, but as I said before, probably not much policy now, because it just takes too long.

EDMON CHUNG:

I think that's interesting. We're not just talking about quantitative analysis, but qualitative analysis between those different approaches as well. There might be some place here at ICANN where we could explore that. That's what your driving at?

CHRIS DILLON:

Yes. If you actually look at the tables you can see fairly quickly, because if you do see dead languages or symbols or other odd things in there, then you get a fairly good idea of the quality. One warning I would say to you is that a lot of the tables are literally Unicode code points, so it's

U+ 1, 2, 3, 4. It's that standard. So it's not very easy for human beings. It's much easier for computers.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. I think most of them – not all – would have a link back to how they developed the policy, so that might be useful as well. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you. I wanted to remind everyone one of the... It's not talked about but it's actually significant work that's done in the LGR now, and that's project one. It's actually called the 'LGR tools' – the label generation rule set tools – and it is an attempt to... It is representing the label generation rules in XML format, and eventually it is very much conceivable that this format will replace what's in the IANA repository.

I agree with you. Right now a TLD can submit a table in any format they want. There are a lot of PDF files up there, text files, you name it. So eventually... This is being developed right now. It will be talked about more this afternoon. Kim Davies is behind the presentation. He has a draft that's out now, an IDF draft. It's been out for a while.

The tool is to basically express IDN tables and other registration rules in an XML format, so you can compare, you can download and you can do a bunch of other things on them.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Naela. I guess as Chris mentioned, this is more to make machines able to distinguish the things easier and how that works, but I guess from the At-Large point of view, what Chris mentioned is much

more about how the user would now have an expectation of that – how the variants might work differently from this TLD to that TLD.

They can probably realize that with those tools. The question is why. They will need to get a sense of why. Perhaps, if I'm not mistaken, Chris is suggesting that maybe we should have some materials that describe, if not cataloguing everything, at least first tell the end user, "Hey, they are going to be inconsistent," as a disclaimer, if you will, from ICANN. "Don't expect all the IDN variants to work the same across all TLDs and here's why."

That body of material I don't think has every quite been developed, and perhaps that material would be useful to disseminate to user communities, and even technical communities, to get a sense of why that's the case. Not just machine-wise, that technically this is how we can implement it – that's great – but also a little bit of 'why' for the end users as well. I see Chris and then Rinalia.

CHRIS DILLON:

Thank you Edmon. Yes, there is a recent update of that format, which is quite easy to read. It's an XML format. If I've read it correctly it still won't be actually showing you what the things looks like, if things actually show you what the characters look like you end up with a much clearer idea of what's going on.

There's a part in it that actually says, "The reason why we can't show you what's happening is in this other report," and then you go off to the other report and I wasn't able to find what it was referring to, so that was rather frustrating. But anyway, if you do a search on the Internet,

that will turn up, and it is a very useful report. If people are going to come back this afternoon perhaps it would be good to read that.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Chris. Rinalia and then Carlton.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Edmon. I was just wondering why we are accepting the status quo and expecting the end user to be educated on your activities on the Internet, or that your experience of using the Internet will not be as pleasant or as you expect, because there are all these inconsistencies that the business or technical communities did not address together in a coordinated way.

Why don't we address the problem that's in the middle, which is to address the suppliers and the providers, and bring them together and try to encourage them to achieve some kind of harmonization? At a different level there is the root zone LGR output, and even though we cannot enforce the LGR for the second or third level, there is the hope that we can encourage the adoption of that all the way.

We can do that through advocacy, through talking to people and persuading them on the benefits of that. I think that we can perhaps consider doing something similar in this area, because after all we're looking at the end user experience. If you want to make money on the Internet, if you want to communicate better with the Internet, you would want the end users to continue using it and wanting to be more on the Internet itself. Just an idea, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Rinalia. Part of the reason – not all of the reason – but part of the reason there is the inconsistency, if you will, is that there might be a diversity of cultures issue. If you look at identifiers, even email addresses, the username part, there are still email servers that would treat capital letters and lowercase letters as different email addresses. Is there a need to unify that? That’s kind of the question you’re asking as well.

There might be cases where the inconsistency is not a bug but a feature, and I don’t want to get into that, but those are potential situations as well. So instead of having an overarching, uniform policy, what might be interesting to look at is a best practice document as well. That might be useful. But not necessarily to unify everything, I guess. That’s just from my personal... Okay, harmonize is probably a good term. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you Edmon. I’m asking this because I was asked this two days ago. I’m a Member of the EWG and this relates to a registration directory services. We are looking at a next generation RDS and the principles with which we’re framing the discussion is for acceptance of IDN data, as part of the framework. This concerns publication.

The idea is that registrars get registrant data, they pass it to the registries, and then the new framework we’re suggesting, there’s a portal or even a central database where you store all of this registrant data. The question somebody asked me was, “Say you have an IDN

registration and you get the registrant details and you store it in the publications and there are variants, what do you publish?

“Do you publish just what you get, or do you publish the variants as well?” I would love to hear from the experts on what their thinking on this is, because I didn’t know. It never occurred to me.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Carlton. I guess we’ll come back to that, because the third item is specifically on WHOIS and data, but it think Mark might want to have a comment on the previous item – IDN variants and policies. Am I correct? Okay. Mark first and then that’s a great segue into the third Item on the Agenda.

[MARK MARCHE]:

[Mark Marche? 00:40:32]. I just want to react to a previous comment, which is that the user experience study actually said it clearly, that from the user experience point of view the same rules should apply at the various levels of the DNS tree. But the user experience could just state that, but then it’s up to the community to enforce it, if possible, or to promote the idea. But it has been clearly written that way.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Mark, perhaps it’s ‘encourage’ with the right incentives? Perhaps ICANN would be in the position to provide incentives?

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you. I think on that particular topic it seems like we do have some Action Items. It seems that we should really follow up on this – whether it's best practices, where there's some type of materials for registries, registrants and for the general end users. Building on the user experience report, and also building on the JIWG Report as well.

Since Carlton brought up the subject, I felt it was a very good segue into our last topic, which is the third part. It says 'others' but it really is about the WHOIS. If we can scroll up a bit to the third Item on the Agenda? As Carlton brought it up, this is a related issue to IDNs, but very much it has increasing interest from the community as well. Carlton just now asked a question of how to represent IDN variants, or whether it's a separate entry or the same entry.

I think these are topics that seem to be being addressed in the WHOIS groups, as well as probably Naela's project on the implementation, because the IANA database also needs to figure this out. The original IRD Report did include a very simple footnote on the subject, so I would recommend those who are working on it to take a look back at that.

That particular footnote does talk about what might be considered, because that footnote was under quite a bit of debate to be included, and also its original form of what it was. I think I saw Steve wanted to add something?

STEVE:

Thanks Edmon, this is Steve from ICANN staff. On the issue of WHOIS and IDNs I just want to first provide a quick update on what the common pieces are here. I know Chris is the Chair of the Translation and

Transliteration PDP Drafting Team, so perhaps you could provide more update. In terms of supporting internationalized registration data for WHOIS there are really two pieces. There's the policy piece and there's the technical piece.

The first part, the technical piece, the current RFC 3912 has not been internationalized, so there's no consistent support for various encodings other than US ASCII. Registries today do different types of ad hoc mechanisms to address this, and in one way the user experience is not great. So on this point the IETF Web Extensible Internet Registration Data Working Group are working on several RFCs to address this issue, among other shortcomings of the WHOIS protocol.

So that's the technical piece. My reading – Mark, correct me if I'm wrong – is that there were two RFCs in the IETF last call, and then there are three more RFCs to be finalized early next year. At least that's according to the timeline. With the technical piece being addressed there's the important policy piece. The policy piece is, what elements should be internationalized? If so, what are the relevant internationalization standards for those data elements?

A related but very important question, as you are the Working Group Chair for the IRD Working Group, is, should transliterate translation, or transliteration be done on the contact data, where, although the producer of the registration data may be local, but the potential consumers of the data are global? That's essentially a policy question. So with respect to that, and the issue that Carlton raised about how to handle variants, I think those are three pieces of very important policy questions.

With respect to the issue of what data elements should be internationalized and what are the relevant standards, the WHOIS Review Team has tasked an Expert Working Group to look into that, and that Expert Working Group has already been formed. It has been meeting weekly, I think since August. It finished its Charter and its aim is to produce an Interim Report for the community by the Singapore meeting.

With respect to the issue of translation and transliteration of the contact data, that's really a very important and if not somewhat contentious issue that's being handled. The community, the different stakeholders need to be involved in that effort, so it's being handled through a gNSO PDP, of which Chris is the Working Group Drafting Team Chair. Finally, the last piece about the handling of variants – that will be addressed in the requirement in the first Working Group.

But also I think in the variant project that needs to be looked at more holistically. One of the variant reports says introducing variants is really, in some way, causing a paradigm shift of how WHOIS data should be handled. So those issues need to be looked at closely. That's my quick update on these issues.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Steve. A quick response to Carlton is that yes, that is a very good question. I don't think anybody has the answer to that yet, but certainly how you see it on the WHOIS, or if it's a variant, does it also show you what the primary name is? Does it show you other variants, and maybe tell you, "Okay, you can look at the WHOIS for information for these as well." Must they all be the same?

I'm guessing it should be, but nobody has any definitive policy around that at this point. It would be sensible that all of them should be exactly the same in terms of the registrant, the building, the contact information – it seems to be at least. But we haven't gone down that path yet. So yes, we should definitely address that. That sort of segues into...

Garth, thank you for joining us. I had a brief conversation about the transliteration and translation issue, and how that affects what Steve mentioned. You may have a local user but the information needs to be consumed by the global community, so how would we do that? I guess I'll pass onto you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. It's Garth Bruen, Chair of NARALO. Sorry to be redundant to people I've already spoken to – I've had long conversations with Rinalia, Edmon and others about this, but I've become aware of some local communities, some rural communities, non-English speaking, who've had their domains hijacked because they didn't have the WHOIS, the technical documentation, the compliance information and other policy information in their local language.

I think it's amazing that we're reaching out with one hand with so many different languages to the Internet user, but with the other hand we're potentially marginalizing and victimizing people because of this. We can't bring people online and then have no way for them to seek any kind of recourse for negative activity.

I think this has to happen at the same time, almost. I don't know how we do that and it's obviously very complicated, but from a consumer perspective it's extremely important. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you Garth. We're sort of running out of time, because we had our hour cut short earlier, but I guess on this particular topic, because there are a number of Working Groups looking at it, perhaps from the At-Large point of view I guess we should encourage – ell, Garth and Carlton you're already on those Working Groups, but others from the At-Large community – others from the At-Large community to participate.

Perhaps generally we might have to come back and put comments or ALAC input into those reports when they come out. So for the time being we should definitely keep an eye on that, but not anything particular in terms of creating an extra set of works. That seems to be... Steve, you wanted to...? No? You were just agreeing, or did you want to jump in on that point?

STEVE:

Yes, and I agree with you. The gNSO PDP, where will the focus of attention be? I encourage interested At-Large Members to join the Working Group. I think the Council is going to vote on the motion today, and there will be a community-wide call for Working Group participants, so I think the issues that Garth raised are very important. I think it would be very helpful to bring those into the PDP discussion. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG:

Garth, please... Yes. This is on translation and transliteration, that that Working Group has just been formed, so Garth, please go there and be on that. I think we've run out of time. On this particular one it's really just a call for participation. Once the Charter is approved, from the At-Large we'll try to get more people to participate on that. On Item (2) I think we should follow up on that.

That will probably create some Action Items for this group, to take a look at what exactly we could look to do beyond... Probably not about putting out a statement or anything, but actually to see how we could put together materials that would support end users in dealing with IDN variants and IDN acceptance in general.

With that, do I see any other urgent need to intervene? If not, thank you everyone for joining. I'll pass it onto the next meeting. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]