
BARCELONA – ccNSO: Study Group on Use of Emoji as Second Level Domain

Saturday, October 20, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 CEST

ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

PATRIK FALSTROM: ... Various different kind of combination of characters and gives an example of that. But, I think everyone knows that [inaudible]. So, I don't really know what to comment because it's violating the 2008 standards, so I'm not the one to comment on this, I think.

PETER VERGOTE: I think that opinion is well-known and received. Maybe in that particular case, since you mentioned that there are particular concerns raised in the SSAC document, for example, that go beyond "this violates the standard" which you mentioned, like the skin tone one modification and other concerns that probably apply to other IDNs as well. Maybe you can elaborate on that.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Oh, absolutely. For example, in my table, I don't really know. In the PDF, when I display the PDF, all the characters with the example emoji, if you scroll down, let's see what it looks like on this monitor. Further. Down to the [fairy]. Yeah, it's the same thing. Can you see the difference between these? But if you scroll to the next page, there you see a man has his hand raised. That is kind of interesting that just a [fairy] without gender specification is a female, but if it's a gender specification man, then it looks different. But [fairy] and female, a woman [fairy], looks the

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.

same. And the one prior is obviously male, as you can see. It's interesting.

PETER VERGOTE: Indeed. In all fairness, we might not be completely sure that this is not an artifact of the particular document, but that of course ...

PATRIK FALSTROM: And whether it is an artifact or not, that's part of the issue here, actually. So, you're absolutely right to recognize that. Thank you, Peter, for pointing that out. I didn't do that as explicitly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Does it not become part of the variant description when you have similar emojis, or we are doing a different description altogether?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Did you ask whether we are talking about emoji variants? Again, we're not talking about the top level.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I am aware that we are talking about the second level, but still variants are still can be taken care.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Variant similarities in emojis.

PATRIK FALSTROM: It all depends on what you mean by variants and ICANN has not made up its mind yet what it actually is. There is a different working group working on variants and trying to define that which is some of the problems here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, I don't know if it's a final definition or not, but to my knowledge, they have a fairly consensus-based line which looks completely similar without any ambiguity of finding a similar, as falling into the variant lap, which is visually similar. So, if one [fairy] is registered, must every other [fairy] or variant gets blocked or doesn't get blocked? I don't know. Is it a question or not? Is it solvable or not solvable?

PATRIK FALSTROM: First of all, as emojis are not allowed according to the ICANN principles, it's not discussed. But, let's envision that it is. What is not resolved in variants has to do with, okay, it's nice to say that the definition is like you said, in the sense of wording, but then how to implement it. Yes, there are some discussions about bundling. Yes, there are some recommendations about either blocking or registering, but there is a separate working group looking into whether this is possible. Variants or any shape or form is possible to implement, technically or not, and what implication it has to do with the policies to the TLDs, how you keep various registries in sync, etc. So, yes, it is discussed on the high level. Yes, variance is well-defined, but still ...

And different registries that do have variants – for example, with simplified and traditional Chinese. We all know that the TLDs are assigned to the same registry. They have implemented different mechanisms of actually keeping the registration, the registrants in sync for the various domain names. But we also know that that is a headache. Anyway, it is still discussed and definitely not resolved.

PETER VERGOTE:

Thank you, Patrik. I'd like to emphasize that while this additional information is very useful and I understand that the whole topic of IDNs and how to deal with bundles, variants, and confusing similarity touches upon various groups within or beyond ICANN, our task is not to come up with solutions. We're just in an information finding and documenting phase which means that unless we find somebody who is already doing their own variance implementation, which we haven't seen so far and which I doubt, but we don't know yet, the topic of variance would be out of scope for this, especially since Patrik just mentioned the ICANN working groups will I think likely not deal with emojis in particular in that context because, in the gTLD world, per the board resolution, emojis are not allowed because they are not in the IDNA 2008 standard. Patrik?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Yes. There is another thing regarding this document [inaudible] that we'd like to point out to people if they don't see the details. There is ... Under additions to this version, there is something called emoji glyph facing direction. I just want to make people understand that that is

something different than bidirectionality, which is something different. This has to do with really what direction the face is pointing. Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: Sorry. Now you got me confused. Are you saying that the left and right is subject to bidirectional modifiers?

PATRIK FALSTROM: You could have bidirectionality as well on any Unicode characters and there's a separate discussion of whether in what order the characters are rendered which has to do with bidirectionality, which in turn has to do with whether the text itself is right to left or left to right. Then, on top of that, you apply characters which are the right to left or left to right, and then you have characters which modify the general directionality, if you want to. Then, on top of that, this document points out, if you scroll up a little bit. There you see emoji glyph-facing direction, which is something different than directionality ... I just want to say that this document actually points out yet another layer of abstraction and what direction certain things points, which makes things even more complicated, and for me, even more arguments to run away from this.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay, but bear with us for a moment. Thank you.

DON HOLLANDER: Don Hollander. Well, I used to be with dot-WS. My question is where did the document come from? Did it come from the folks at dot-WS or did somebody? Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: [inaudible]? Okay. So, there are no further questions. Do we have the other document available?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just for the record, for the study group, the e-mail was sent from Ed on October 11th if you want to reference that.

PETER VERGOTE: The mailing list archive of the study group is I believe publicly accessible.

PATRIK FALSTROM: And to explain a little bit further, what people can look at is that the WS do have on their website a file which includes all code points and combination of code points which are emojis which says either whether they are valid, invalid, or mapped to something else. The document that we just looked at is explaining why the mapping table they have generated looks the way it does. That's the [inaudible] of this document. I'm happy to share more links with you, Don, and we can do it afterwards.

PETER VERGOTE:

Any comments to this document from members of the study group after Patrik's clarification? This is a rather long 14-page document, so I don't think we will do a line-by-line walk through. But there are some ... Here we are. It's a very detailed documentation of the characters, the modifiers, as Patrik said, and the reasoning and [inaudible] fragments for the definition and the IDN chart. And here we go. That's it.

So, what the study group is looking at is different practices, so we get a broader picture of what is currently happening out there. So far, we've not received other input. As I said, we identified a couple of TLDs, but we are waiting for contributions. By any chance, is there anybody here who does emojis at the second level in their TLD, or ccTLD I should say, and would like to speak? Does not look like it. Okay. Please?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

I can say a few words. [inaudible] from Serbian registry, dot-RS. We had some proposals to introduce [inaudible] at the second level. It happened before, let's say, two years or something like this and we have been pushed hardly to do it. But I made a small analysis and I somehow convinced people that it is not ready yet for introduction, so we didn't do anything about it. But, I just wanted to say that there are people thinking about it, that it will be nice. Yes. I agree. It will be nice to have some nice pictures over there, but they are completely regulated and it is a big problem with misuse of it.

PATRIK FALSTROM: I think the outreach that we did in the working group to reach out for WS which is something we knew but we found a couple of others – maybe it is the case that we should make a general outreach to anyone which [have done] evaluation regardless of whether it resulted in accepting emojis in the second level, third level or whatever, or whether the evaluation resulted in the opposite, that we include any of these in whatever documentation we have. Might be an idea. Which means that we should ask to whether it's possible to share the result of that evaluation as well. I don't know.

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. Thanks, Patrik. I think that's a good suggestion as a second stage. After looking at what is out there, basically what you're suggesting is [inaudible] out there and then why. So, what were the deliberations and the reasoning behind this? I would really like to invite you to ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] member of this group because I spread my time over a few groups and I cannot follow all of them. But I can find my report.

PETER VERGOTE: As opposed to everybody else, of course [inaudible]. Thank you for being honest.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just came to see what are people thinking about it because I didn't have enough time to follow what was going on in this group, so I tried

to find these papers somewhere to translate it because it is written in Serbian and to send it to you to see what was my thoughts before two years or something like this. It might help. It might not. But let's put it on the ...

PETER VERGOTE: Thanks very much. Yes, that would be a very good contribution, and no I did not want to drag you into the group. You're welcome, if you want, but you don't have to subscribe to all the meetings and the work and so on and so forth. This is an open session, so we are especially looking after additional feedback and input. Thank you so much. Don?

DON HOLLANDER: Don Hollander from [Book Haven]. Just with respect, you've gotten this paper from dot-WS and no similar papers from the others. Would it be useful if somebody actually – somebody from the committee or the working group or the study group or the group proactively went to produce comparable documents for the other ccTLDs that you know or that you think might be doing this, so that you can compare, you can take a heading for that section of paper and you can then compare different approaches taken by each of the relevant ccTLDs. Would that be possible?

PETER VERGOTE: Peter here. So, the fact that WS did submit something and nobody else yet, it's probably because WS is ... People with strong connections to WS are on the study group and are reaching out to others, got a bit of a

slow start or late start. So, it's not because people weren't interested or didn't want to talk to us. They need a bit of time, of course, to come back with responses.

On your second point, which I think you are trying to clarify now, my understanding was should the study group do the documents, I think we agreed in the study group that we wanted original or firsthand information, and from there, get to a comparison and whether that's a comparison table or something else will heavily depend on how the documents look like. So, we have a very in-depth documentation here. Other policies might be completely different. There could be a policy – not saying that there is one – that says, well, I'll accept anything with an [inaudible] that is very quickly documented, and we'll go to the relevant points after that. Did I grasp your suggestion in that way?

DON HOLLANDER:

Yeah. And it's really a question as to ... So, what I think I heard you say is you're letting people submit what they want to submit, which may result in additional work going ahead of time to try to compare and align what you get from different people, whereas if you have this as the template, these are the questions that you'd like answered and then they could be done consistently and you can compare LA and WS and whoever else. But, I think your approach might take longer, but could very well have a more robust set of information.

PETER VERGOTE:

Yeah. Noted. That's probably a risk. We do know where information is. We just didn't want to just go to the website and grab the documents because some of them might or might not be up to date. We would like to give the ccTLDs a chance to explicitly say, "Well, this is what we submit." If we fail in that direction, we will consider further steps including what you just suggested.

Also, we wanted to avoid second guessing because it's, of course, very difficult to understand just from poking into the domain name space and finding some characters, whether that's a legacy registration or something subject to some rules or procedures on the side of the registries. There are some registries that seem to have set aside certain code points or groups of code points and will only have them registered and others, as I said, are completely open. That's hard to find from the outside, so the study group will go ahead.

Once we've received a couple of these, we are probably in a better position to phrase the questions we then want to ask of others. And that was the reason for the open approach, so how big is this space? That cleared your ...?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

I was just going to ... [inaudible] I think that Don asked a second thing which has to do with extracting information from these documents and comparing them and we are definitely not [inaudible] in the working group not even know whether we should or had to do that.

To start with, personally I support strongly to collect data that each registry submits to us instead of the vice-versa so it really ends up being a registry of things that people have chosen themselves to send us instead of us second-guessing. That's where we are. And then we'll see.

PETER VERGOTE:

I'm sorry for the delay. I'm just trying to follow what's happening in the chat so we don't miss anybody remote. Let me make one remark addressing one comment in the chat. With presenting this work, we're not raising the expectations for everybody else. As I said, some of the documentation might be of much less volume and detail and we'll not judge all that. We'll just take this as input and we'll work with what we can get from the registries, as we said before.

So, are there any final questions on this agenda item from the study group members or from others? Kim?

KIM CARLSON:

I think [Reo] has some remote comments.

PETER VERGOTE:

Maybe I missed. I missed that. Oh, yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

[inaudible] said, "My comment would be no other ccTLD besides dot-WS has done the work to address emoji issues in between emoji not being allowed, yet not simply only required 'turning on' to work. In

practice, dot-WS may have 80-90% share. And emoji require updating as the alphabet gets additions each year.”

PETER VERGOTE:

Yeah. Thanks, [Paige]. As I said, we’ll not expect this level of depth and detail from everybody, so this might be one of the more prominent examples which is not really a surprise. We have people from WS in the working group – or have, sorry, on this study group, I should say. Any other final questions or remarks?

SHERI FALCON:

Yeah, hi. Sheri Falcon. I’m just curious if there’s a way to get on a mailing list about this specific issue as it evolves? Based on the communications today, it sounds like there’s going to be some outreach and some greater data collection and some more substantive reports potentially in the future and I wasn’t sure the best way to track that.

PETER VERGOTE:

So, the archives of the mailing list are publicly available. What is the best way to make that link available? If you’re in the Adobe room right now, we’ll make sure that is posted with the meeting material. If you go to the ccNSO website and look for the study group on emojis at the second level, there is a link to all the materials. All the meetings are recorded. The mailing list is archived and this is all publicly accessible.

SHERI FALCON:

Wonderful. Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: You're welcome. So, we can I think close this agenda item and get the agenda up once more. So, let me see. So, [inaudible] after getting through the two documents from that one ccTLD, the intent was [inaudible] still discuss the current practice that we've seen documented and compared with the concerns raised, especially concerns raised in the SSAC document but I would also include on the occasion concerns raised or judgments that our colleague from dot-RS mentioned. Still, you're very welcome to do that at a later stage, but as well now to compare what is in the documents and what registries do with what were the concerns mentioned in the SSAC report or why did you, for example, say this is ... I think I heard you say it is not ready yet, so what were those concerns or objections.

I understand that Patrik made a couple of remarks in the direction already under the previous agenda item. Does anybody have anything to add or want to comment on this? Who was first? Sorry. Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi. Alejandra Reynoso. Just a suggestion if maybe we can, after this meeting, distribute all the ccTLDs that we found that are using emojis in second level and contact them directly and see what they have to say. That's a suggestion.

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. That's the plan. Thank you. Patrik?

PATRIK FALSTROM: So, I want to say some positive things as well about this document. So, they point out explicitly how they are setting the version numbers of these documents and this is version 1100 and they point out that what they're doing is that as they are picking character by character selection, they have chosen explicitly to use the same version number as the Unicode version that they are picking from and I think that's clever.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you, Patrik. Maybe, Patrik, not picking on you, but we've heard it mentioned and you also said that since the Unicode standard is evolving over time, maybe not always completely predictable, could you add some sentences how that is kind of relevant for the emojis and how characters get in there and so on and so forth? I understand that I'm deviating from the agenda a bit, but I take my [inaudible].

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yeah. So, let's try to do the two-minute version on this. When we started to do internationalized domain names in the IETF, we started to look at whether we have the competence within the IETF to decide what code points were okay or not. We came to the conclusion that the competence for code points is within the Unicode Consortium.

On the other hand, we saw that a lot of code points actually were the same and we already had, well, the same for some definition of same, which of course is different in different contexts.

But what we needed was some kind of mapping or from what the person entered to what actually was used in the DNS, so that the comparison algorithm that was used in the DNS would actually work.

So, the first version of IDNA 2003 was looking at once specific version of Unicode and used the various information that Unicode Consortium has produced and did a picking or selection of code point by code point [into] both mapping and what code points were allowed to be used. So, IDNA 2003 did that.

What we discovered was that process in the IETF was so damn slow – sorry for the language, but it was actually quite a bit of an uproar – that the process was too slow, the selection of code points was too arbitrary. What was same was different in different contexts and specifically you could not map between the Unicode version and the [Punicode] version which is the ASCII version of the domain names without having a loss, so it was not a one-to-one mapping.

So, work started in the IETF, and for IDNA 2008, we turned that around and came up with an algorithm that was applied to the Unicode standard which basically was a mathematical formula by which you can calculate whether a code point is allowed or not in IDNA 2008.

So, IETF moved away from picking code point by code point, and instead having [algorithms]. So, given the Unicode version, you can calculate what code points are okay or not. [If we now] ignore all the mess in the IETF, which they are currently working on regarding the versioning, what WS is currently doing is that they're going back to the 2003 thing which is picking code point by code point which means that

they have to update their standard every time Unicode is releasing a new version which might have either existing code points might be changed or it might be the case that new code points have been added, assigned. So, they then have to decide whether a new code point, a new emoji, that is introduced, whether it is allowed or not according to their rules, and because of that, they are just like the IETF was in IDNA 2003. They are forced to come up with a new version every time Unicode, a new version [inaudible] sort of rules every time Unicode is coming up with a new version of Unicode.

PETER VERGOTE:

Thank you. Any clarifying questions? Okay, then thank you for everybody for allowing that small detour, but I think that additional information might be helpful. Thank you, Patrik.

So, any other contributions regarding the practices identified and the concerns raised so far? Any final questions before I close this agenda item? Okay, thank you. Then, I think we'll move to the next agenda item number six which is the outline of our report. We've had that in a previous meeting. So, this is for the study group to think about and for everybody else, of course, to also think about and maybe already give feedback and input. This is the frame of how the report will look like. We haven't, of course, added any substantive content, but it's important to frame that work because that will inform our progress until the Kobe meeting and we'll talk about that towards the end of the meeting.

So, of course we'll have the usual introduction summary, issues at stake as a second bullet item starting from SSAC 095. Then, the work that I've described a couple of minutes ago that the study group has undergone, like we've identified a couple of ccTLDs. We'll list the findings and the material received. We'll still need to discuss whether we integrate the material or incorporate it by reference. So, this is all the fact-finding and the input collection. Depending on that, we'll come up with recommendations.

One part of the identifying of the ccTLDs will be that we document the two or three methods that we've applied for finding those, including the obvious technical drawbacks of poking into the domain name space and then hoping to find those TLDs or those names in the first place.

The draft follows the outline of a draft of a previous study group, the study group on [inaudible] at the second level and the methodology is kind of similar, the methodology of poking the name space, like asking DNS queries in all of the TLDs to identify emoji domain names, but of course can't be as complete as in the case of the [wild cards] for technical reasons and we'll document that in this section which is probably the first one that we'll add text to. And if you're really, really into it, since we'll share this text on the mailing list, you will find draft versions or early versions of this on that list or in the archive, respectively.

So, with the basics set out, we will get to our ... Well, if we have any recommendations to make, we'll add them in that particular section. Otherwise, we'll document what we found and then we'll document

where the members of the study group agree and we'll also document where the members of the study group don't agree. I hope we on what we agree on, and what we do not agree on, that should be soluble. Then we have the usual end of the year, end of the document listing the members and scopes which are copied from the charter of the study group. Do members of the study group have anything to add or remove, even? Anybody else have an opinion or suggestions what they would like to see in such a document? [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Peter. I was wondering if we could include in the document the reasons for including the emojis and their opinion on the SSAC document regarding emojis, if they are aware and if maybe why are they doing it even though it's not advised?

PETER VERGOTE: So, that is including positions or statements from the [CCT] registries that we identified or even beyond that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, as in maybe not only having the reasons why they include them, but if they are aware of this document and what are their thoughts regarding the document?

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. I think that's a great suggestion. We can invite everybody, of course, to contribute in that way which I think we almost already did by

asking for the material but I think that suggestion is very good to make that a bit more explicit, so that people can add their thoughts there. Abdalmonem?

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Yeah, this is Abdalmonem. I would like to add in the issues here emoji issues was [inaudible] script, as it is [inaudible] issues will be raised after we use Arabic names with this emoji, as [inaudible] somehow, as our browser doesn't recognize the domain name with emoji and emoji and second level and [Arabic] as a top-level domain.

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. Thank you. Since Patrik mentioned the different levels of left to right, right to left, bidirectional and so on and so forth already, is that going beyond what Patrik mentioned? Because you mentioned software explicitly, like browsers not recognizing which is another step that would go into looking at software.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Yes. That is good, but also we need to have ... There is some issues will be raised after we use emojis with top-level domains in Arabic. That is why I am asking for that. This is besides what Patrik said.

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. Okay, thank you. Do you feel in a position to ... I'm putting you on the spot, I'm sorry, but since you brought the topic up, would you be

willing to submit some text to that direction, write a short note, and then we can go on from there?

ABDALMONEM GALILA: No problem. I will do. Yeah. Okay.

PETER VERGOTE: Patrik?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yeah. So, I think what is needed and the reason why I think having you write a text is a good thing is that I'm a little bit confused to what you're asking because I ear Arabic, as in Arabic language, Arabic script, and directionality is used [inaudible] because emojis are a little bit complicated there. So, [inaudible] the text that you write that you are very, very precise what issues you're looking at.

PETER VERGOTE: Yes. Thank you. So, Abdalmonem, feel free to elaborate a bit on that further on the list.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Yeah. I will send examples about that, about this issue.

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. Great. Thank you. Looking forward to this. Okay. Anything else? Oh, thank you. Could we have a reading of the comment that Paige [inaudible]? Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Paige [Howe] said, “I assume this isn’t a final or our only chance to contribute to the structure of the report. Also, on the directional nature, I don’t think this group is setting any policies that should be used or any top-down allowing or not allowing. There will be some things emoji domains can’t do.”

PETER VERGOTE: So, the first point, Paige and everybody else, no, that’s just not final. We are evolving this document over time. We’ve had this outline in the study group a couple of times now, but we add text and evolve it into the document. I’m not calling closure on the structure of the document. If you, Paige, or anybody else has suggestions, especially if they go to the substance of the outline, they would be most welcome as early as possible. We’ll go into further detail later and then restructuring the whole document might make the effort a bit more cumbersome. So, no, not a final reading, of course, but substantive comments or suggestions. Please, bring them in.

On the second point, no, as correctly observed, this study group is not going to set policy. What I heard Abdalmonem suggest is another observation of potential issues with combinations of, and then deferring to Patrik, language/script/bidirectional characters and so on

and so forth. This is not about setting policy. And thank you, [inaudible].
The concerns seem to be addressed. Thanks, Paige.

No further questions? Then I have a question. So far, nobody has brought it up, so it might be too obvious. But, one of the responses to issues and the like is, “Yes, but it works.” I understand that the SSAC report had some comments on this flippant remark of mine or of others. How do members of the study group feel about looking into this particular issue? It works, so software supports it to a certain extent. Patrik, I would have hoped you have a comment on that.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Well, in that case, we go into definition of what it means by it works. And that’s where the disagreement is.

PETER VERGOTE:

Yes, [inaudible] report. Not taking any position here. There seem to be parts of the community for whom it works well enough, as in one could ask the question when this is not allowed in the IDNA standard, I put these code points into my browser, I explicitly did not say I typed them into my browser, so I get them in somehow. Obviously, many implementations, many software pieces know what to do with it and deliver some result that makes some people happy. Now, this is not the happiness study group. I know I got you there.

But this is, on a practical level, on an end user perspective level, for example, this is something that we may or may not be happy with in the end an dealing with but that’s an obvious question that people would

ask. So, where is the problem? We understand that there are all the difficulties around confusing similarity and so on and so forth, but if I can type it in and it appears, why would the software implement forbidden or prohibitive code points?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Can you repeat the last question?

PETER VERGOTE: From an end user perspective, even if the end user would agree that after reading the report, which is great for end users – it’s important because they are affected by much of what is described, unless there are methods in place that would probably prevent some of these issues. But the same end users getting these emoji strings or emoji characters into their web browser to get to one of these, in most cases, web pages, and get the web page delivered, they might wonder why if these code points are prohibited, why would the software not prevent them from doing that? So, the software does it. What’s the point? What’s the problem? And I have that neither the group nor ICANN is going to police software implementations, but that’s not what I suggest.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: First of all, end users will never read the report. I mean, come on. Well, end users will never read any report. The thing is that ... I just checked, it works. Everybody is probably trying to do this thing and it does DNS resolution. You go to the site [inaudible]. Users don’t read reports. They complain. That’s a key. There will be some confusions and when you

cannot detect while [inaudible] you're typing in, it looks pretty, it looks attractive, you type it in. you go to some phishing site or some wrong site. That's where we can start ... That's where we start seeing the user. Not at this stage. We start seeing users when they start to complain, when something goes wrong. That's my concern, actually.

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. Thank you. You mentioned phishing. Did I hear that correctly?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Phishing, yeah, [inaudible].

PETER VERGOTE: Yes. There are lots of emoji—

ANDRE KOLESNIKOV: It's all about confusability. It's not in danger for the domain name system or infrastructure or whatever. It's all about the confusability. That's my opinion for that.

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. Thank you. Patrik?

PATRIK FALSTROM: We also have to think about who is actually confused here. Is that the domain name holder or whoever tries to reach that, for example, web page? And a domain name holder is [inaudible] by registrar to registrar

to register this cute domain name. They buy it. They end up in a contractual relationship, and then after a while, they see that they're starting to get complaints because their customers cannot use that domain name. That is the situation and the kind of situation that is sort of the phishing situation. So, the question is back to what Andrei says. Who is reading the report? It's the registrant or becoming a registrant? Is it the registry or the registrar? So, we have different groups here.

PETER VERGOTE:

Understood. I would laugh, of course, that end users – aren't we all end users? That end users would read the report. I think the primary target audience are different groups. Still, what I hear is that, yeah, that can be problems. So, the user is kind of in the victim role. And the considerations in the SSAC report, for example are going in that direction and they make that point. However, assuming there was the opportunity to register a fixed set of emojis, like whatever, the smiling face and you can register one or two smiling faces and three and get rid of all the other joining characters and so on and so forth.

The question is if the code points, if they are prohibited, why can't I still get them into my web browser and get the page without thinking about that there is confusability involved or may be involved? I'm not pushing the shoe in. I'm just trying to find out whether this is an aspect that people in the study group would like to have addressed and are confident that we can do that within the boundary of resources that we have.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, just for the limited scope of why the browser should allow a prohibited [inaudible]. It may be prohibited for a varied domain name system, but the browser is also in [inaudible] with [intranet], browsers in [inaudible] with the local defined host names which may not be accessible to the worldwide web, but for the local security purposes, radio purposes, whatever purpose it may be, ultimately the entire Unicode code points are available in the system and this can be ... There may be many users other than the domain name itself.

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. Thank you. There's a very interesting and valid point that you did make or I heard you make that you maybe was not in the primary focus, which is that this is a mixture between a technical and a policy decision, because as you said, it could be a local [inaudible]. Of course, nobody is talking about the third level at the moment anyway because there's little reach into that, so that would be an interesting argument. However, then, browsers have a history of doing things special for different levels of the domain name system anyway. But that is a point well-received. Thank you so much. Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Peter. I would like to read you a very short paragraph about the dot-FM policy appendix on the emoji domain names, that I find it interesting.

It says, "By selecting and registering an emoji domain, registrant also agrees the following. Emojis are still not accessible to many Internet

users. They do not and may never have the same functionality as traditional ASCII domain names. By registering emoji character domain names, you understand and assume the risk that your domain name registration might temporarily or permanently be suspended, deleted, or denied based on further developments by Internet standard setting bodies.”

I think that is the reason it works for now.

PETER VERGOTE:

Okay. I think we have a comment from the chat. Thanks, Alejandra.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

We have two comments in the chat. The first from Paige [Howe]. “I’d say it works at some level between 40-90% on some platforms. In any SLD, the buyer is being asked to research and know what they are registering. But, as has been said, many of the expectations users may have about universality, it won’t be met with emoji strings. No e-mail, similar strings. Yet, compared to a world without benefits of allowing emoji domain names, the ccTLD space may be a place to allow innovation where less ICANN top-down regulation exists. So, it works well enough, but unclear even over time if working will be better or worse. And, as was shared, it requires work and effort at a level that doesn’t exist with non-emoji strings.”

Would you like me to read the second one or did you want to ...

Mark [Blanchett] said, “While browsers may be seen as the access to the Internet, talking about how browsers have implemented something is misleading. On a typical mobile phone, most users will, without knowing, i.e. by apps, by issue 100 times HTTP requests with domain names obviously than the explicit ones they type in their browsers.”

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Thank you, Paige. Thank you, Mark. We have one more question from the table.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you, chair. Barrack Otieno from AFTLD. I’m just curious, is there anything going on within the ISO community with regard to the subject we are discussing here? I would really like to know if there are any comments around the use of emoji as ccTLDs, considering their work on the ISO 3166.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: No. There is nothing going on on emojis or whatever. The ISO 3166 deals with codes, countries only to use with the ASCII characters A to C and the numbers. That’s it. Anything outside of that is not part of ... Anything outside of this range is not part of ISO 3166 or whatever.

PETER VERGOTE: And this response brought to you by Jaap Akkerhuis. Thank you. Barrack, does that answer your question? Or, when you said ISO community did you have 3166 in mind or what was?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm just curious from a research and development perspective. I know that probably it's not expected that it discusses this issue, but is it under consideration? Because as we are discussing it here, I'm trying to imagine whether this is ... Whether it would be useful to have even someone from there to participate in this conversation.

PETER VERGOTE: I'll defer to Patrik for a second.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yeah. Let me continue to answer while you are thinking. Another branch of ISO that is dealing with this is the one that looks at characters and they are, just like the IETF, inheriting exactly what the Unicode Consortium is doing. So, ISO have accepted that emojis are symbols and that is defined by the Unicode Consortium, and by doing that, ISO has the view that the emojis should be and can be used, and cannot be used, where just like any kind of symbols, and that is also what IETF has been doing.

So, the classificational characters, if you look at it from a pure character standpoint, is something that ISO, just like IETF, has decided that Unicode have that competence and has not questioned that.

PETER VERGOTE: Yeah. Thank you, Patrik. So, ISO is not involved, and if at all, the Unicode Consortium would be, but we don't see any use for participation from

that side because they deliver the raw material and we are already in the tech and policy space, dealing what has come out of the IETF, as Patrik said, on the basis of what the Unicode Consortium delivers at output. They create [inaudible] the emojis and nobody else. Okay. Thank you.

Any final remarks on the outline or things that you would like or would not like to see? I see one more contribution.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Yes. Javier Rua-Jovet for the record. I'm with At-Large and I'm also a member of work track five of the DNS PDP on subsequent procedures. Work track five, as you know, is geographic names as TLDs. I know we're talking about second-level domain here, but I wonder if there's any discussion out there on emoji flags being registered because that would raise concerns that ccNSO, GAC, and things that many people care about in terms of the cultural linguistic and national sensitivities.

PETER VERGOTE:

The chair is not aware of any such discussion. While there are a lot of these flags and interesting mapping rules for those flags, depending on whether it's an independent state or not and all these details, but has not been of concern to this group and I'm not aware that it was even mentioned in the work track five. Of course, since emojis are not to be expected to appear in top-level domains, from a technical perspective, would not be an issue there. Patrik, anything to add?

PATRIK FALSTROM: No. The only thing I'm aware of is that, in the input, too, the subsequent procedures, some groups, SSAC being one them, had just reemphasized that IDNA 2008 standard should be followed.

PETER VERGOTE: Thanks, Patrik. Abdulmonem, one final remark.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Yeah. Do you have a limit for the numbers or the range for emoji [inaudible]? Why I ask that, may at some time in the future, someone asked us want to make an emoji for this button and want to add this Unicode [point] to use it.

PETER VERGOTE: I recognize that it's not necessarily directly influencing the outline of the document, but nonetheless, since Patrik is available ...

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yeah. If you want to have emoji for an image of that bottle and you don't think there is already one – for example, you might change this and want to have a special version which changes the skin color or gender of the bottle – who knows? You'd go to the Unicode Consortium and you participate in their standards development process and have that added as an emoji and the Unicode Consortium have also found out that as a way of financing their standards organization, you can also be a sponsor of that character which means that you're paying and that increases your likelihood of getting that as an emoji. It goes through the

Unicode decision-making and it's there in a future version of Unicode.
That's all you do. It's easy.

PETER VERGOTE: I think one other part of the question was is there a limit of numbers of emojis?

PATRIK FALSTROM: You can increase the size of the table space elsewhere, but the Unicode character set is pretty large, and with the modifying characters that you have an emoji, I would say bravely no to that answer.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. I just asked it because that means that this problem is ... The chair should not have said problem. The issue is not of recognizably limited size. Nobody knows what special group of emojis comes up next and this also concerns things that are even looking equal or are equal.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yeah. And in the future, of course, you will see animated emojis, so emojis generated on the fly on your Android or Apple phone or whatever, however way you want. The serious part of this is, though, that you're absolutely right, that new emojis that are looking different, that [inaudible] in a different way, will most certainly be added in a future version of the Unicode standard. That's something we know. It will not end anywhere anytime soon.

That's one of the reasons why I said that the WS version numbers that they specifically pin their picking of code points to the Unicode version is the only way of doing it and that's why I think they have done the version numbering in a correct way, because otherwise, it will be completely impossible to keep track of what code points you can use according to the rules they have if you don't pin it in a Unicode version.

PETER VERGOTE:

Thank you, Patrik. And with that sequence of final remarks on this particular agenda item, I would like to close it and move up to the next which should almost be any other business. Does anybody have any other business? Mind you, we have nine minutes left. No other business. Okay.

So, then, we close agenda item number seven and talk about the next meeting. Actually, about the next sequence of meetings and what the plan is that I'd like to propose to the study group. So, it's a study group. We are not supposed to [be very long lived] as a group. My goal would be to have a draft final report ready by the Kobe meeting for presentation to the public in a meeting like this, or at the ccNSO, we're still discussing the details. That means that we need two readings in the study group of this draft final report and it suggests that since we need a bit of time for the publication, we need the second reading of the draft final report – and, Kim, help me. It's the 20th of February?

KIM CARLSON:

Yes.

PETER VERGOTE:

And that would put the first reading on the 6th of February, the latest. We have some work to do still, if you've seen from the very outline-ish outline. My suggestion would be to continue with the two weeks schedule that we've had until now and start again with the next meeting at the 7th of November.

We've been sticking to the 18:30 UTC point in time. We've not been rotating, and unless anybody is unhappy with that or has other suggestions, I would propose that we continue with the 18:30 UTC time slot. Any of the members present or remote opposed? It doesn't seem to be the case. So, that would give us the 7th of November at 18:30 UTC. Everybody should be mindful of any adjustments in daylight savings time in their region for the next meeting and then two week sequence after, until I guess the 19th of December. Then we'll give us a break over the change of the year and proceed at the ... We'll send the invites I guess by the 10th of January.

The goal is, again, to have the first reading of the draft final report by 6 February and the second on the [20th]. Do members of the study group have any input, suggestions, anybody who wants to work faster? Okay. I'm not asking for slower. This was your final chance. So, we'll get the series of invites and can proceed from there. [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thank you, Peter. I was just going to suggest if we can work in a Google doc that we all have shared so we can see the same document and edit

it or add suggestions instead of moving one document by e-mail back and forth.

PETER VERGOTE:

Yeah. We can discuss that. One difficulty I have, but that might be only me, with these Google docs, is that this is an always-moving target, and especially for the readings, we want to freeze these in the right way. We want it in a way that people don't need Google accounts and so on and so forth which [isn't always] doable. We can discuss that with our support staff maybe. We at least need these submissions for people who, say, aren't able or willing – I count myself in – to work with that particular tool, but thanks for the suggestion. We'll find a way to be more interactive there. Any further comments? Did I forget anything?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Absolutely not.

PETER VERGOTE:

Sorry. So, with that, I think there are four minutes left which we gracefully give back to you. And you're, of course, invited to discuss IDN issues or anything else amongst yourselves or within members of the study group or any other volunteer the three minutes or after that. Thank you for attending and thanks to our support staff for leading us through this session. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]