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>> In case you are wondering, we are just getting ready here. We are trying to get connected with our remote participation person. Once we get connected, I guess we can get the session underway.

So I guess we should ‑‑ we could get started. All right.

So, welcome, everyone. Thank you for coming in so early for this session. It is something I certainly feel very important. Hopefully more and more people will feel important about this, as well. We're going to talk about the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs and especially how we ‑‑ and it is all about the applications and the environment online, accepting Internationalized Domain Names, domain names in different languages.

So, I'm really happy to have a very good group of panelists with me. And thank you, Hongbin, for joining us remotely. And instead of introducing everyone, I guess I'll just jump right into the session and introduce everyone as we go.

So if we can mute the remote. That's perfect. Thank you.

So I guess I'll go first to talk a little bit about the background about what this topic is about, and then we have invited Eurid, Giovanni, to share with us one of the very important reports that is put out on this subject and then the perspectives from APTLD. And then we'll go into actual experience from TLDs that are in operation. So is my presentation ready to go? I'll just sit there. Okay.

So I guess to ‑‑ this is just to really introduce the topic itself. And the issue we see is ‑‑ sorry.

So, really what this issue means is that many applications or infrastructure components do not readily recognize IDNs, and especially IDN top‑level domains, and issues such as using, you know, currently a lot of applications expect like .com or some ASCII or English alphanumeric characters. Once we move into IDNs, that becomes an issue.

These are other types of issues, like there are dropdown boxes. When you have a dropdown box for top‑level domains, it might not be updated frequently enough.

Another type of issue. When you sign up for an account, for example, on Facebook or some other portals, when you give your email or URL or domain name, they might have a problem accepting those domains.

Another type of issues, the domain names are being used in search results. Are they going to be able to accept IDN TLDs and also not only search results but also ads, when you place an ad on Google or some search engine, will you be able to use your IDN TLD?

And the reason why some of these, of course, is that some of the applications online ‑‑ in fact, we've seen a lot of them that are ‑‑ that have hard‑coded list of top‑level domains. There's an expectation that top‑level domains don't change that often. So some of the applications would hard code certain lists. These are other types of examples of a hard coded list.

So in order to update them, especially when IDN TLDs or even when new top level domains are added, developers need to go in and make changes to the Code, which is reason why it makes it very difficult.

The other ones, you know, I guess smarter developers sometimes put different types of checks, as well. They have an impression that all the top‑level domains will be within a certain length, two to four characters in this case. Therefore when the new Top Level Domain is more than four characters, especially for IDNs, because IDNs are expressed in what is called a punicode formality, which is an alphanumeric form which is always going to be longer than four characters. So these type of coding will also have a problem with IDN TLDs. So what has been done to date? The community and the industry has been working on it for quite sometime. In fact, these type of issues were discovered not recently. This was discovered 13 years ago now almost in Year 2000, when the first set of new Top Level Domains like .info and .museum were launched. These issues were discovered, as well. And these issued were also exemplified when the introduction of new IDN ccTLDs came in in year 2010. That also made it an issue not only for generic top‑level domains, but also now for country code top‑level domains. And so this is an issue. This is a sort of common issue between gTLDs and CCLDs at this time.

Back in year 2003, in fact, SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee for ICANN, had put out a report on this particular topic of universal acceptance of TLDs. And they put out a number of recommendations. I won't go through them in detail. You can find them on the link. But they provided some rather concrete recommendations. Some of them have been implemented. Actually, some of them have not been fully implemented. Some of the things that have been implemented by ICANN includes ATLD verification code, that's out there. The question is: How widely distributed that is and how well advertised it is.

The other is that ICANN is also ‑‑ the ICANN team also has worked on a number of outreach materials that is being put together right now and will be further distributed.

But there are also some of the items that haven't been worked on as much, and this brings me to a set of recommendations that a Working Group at ICANN worked together on.

So one other thing that is interesting about this particular topic is its implications on the unique authoritative root, which was also identified by the SSAC. But not so much talked about generally. The reason being that there are many different lists out there today that have the potential to, I guess for lack of a better word, "compete" with the ICANN authoritative root. There's the public suffix root which ‑‑ manages. A lot of people refer to the Wikipedia list of Internet top‑level domains as a sort of relatively authoritative listing of names. And one of the things I want to show you is that there is already in the world, we can see certain hard coded lists start to have domains that don't even exist yet. Like .geo in this particular case. And this has an element threatening the unique authoritative root and how we clean this up over time is going to be a challenge, as well.

But going back to the core topic at hand, a joint Working Group, as I mentioned, this issue became a big topic between CCLDs and the CNSO started looking into this issue. The Working Group itself was formed in 2010, and we worked on a number of common issues and universal acceptance of IDN TLDs was earlier. We had an initial report and a draft report was published a couple months ago. And we completed the public comment period, but your participation is always so welcome.

These are some of the areas that the group looked into. First of all, because it's an ICANN Working Group, looked into whether there are policy aspects that need to be considered by ICANN. That's direct influence that ICANN has. And then a few other areas, like what ICANN can do with other organizations and which areas that ICANN should focus its efforts and exert its influence on, what types of work should be done.

So, the Working Group came up with four particular recommendations. And I'll go into each one of them.

The first one actually is really to get our own act together. And this has some policy aspects to it; however, the proposal is to have this implemented into the ‑‑ what is called the IDN guidelines of ICANN. And what we really mean is that even for some of the ‑‑ our own registries and registrars, we are not supporting universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. What I mean is that here's an example. There's a registrar that offers an IDN top‑level domain, but when you try to use IDN in the email address or the name server field, if you use the IDN TLD in the name server, it has a problem. It says that it's malformed.

So the issue is not just other people ‑‑ I guess besides ‑‑ within the industry, we also have issues of not supporting IDN top‑level domains or IDNs in general.

So recommendation A from the Working Group is to recommend that all IDN TLD operators themselves, including ‑‑ and also registrars to support universal acceptance of IDN TLDs in their own systems. And those include the contact information and also name servers and child hosts of the systems.

The second recommendation is to ask ICANN to identify this as a strategic initiative, so, really to raise the profile. And this allows ICANN to allocate specific resources to this particular topic and foster consumer trust. Because we really think that, you know, consumer trust is eye a kind of high priority at ICANN. But if we cannot have a universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, there will be a loss in trust of IDNs and TLDs in general.

And the third recommendation is to provide supportive materials for new IDN TLDs. New IDN TLDs that are applied, including ccTLDs and gTLDs they might not be fully aware that's after, you know in the gTLD case, after paying $200,000 or maybe winning an auction for millions of dollars, your TLD might not work in many places. They would not be very happy. So one of the recommendations is to provide that information, to make sure that the applicants, make sure that people who run these TLDs know about this issue and know about the ‑‑ how to address and what type of materials that they can provide to people to help address it.

And then the fourth recommendation is a little bit broader. It's to urge ICANN to put some effort into beyond a ‑‑ because so far ICANN has been producing materials and producing code; however, have not been outdoing explicit outreach to the community about this. So part of the recommendation is to ask ICANN to be more proactive on this. Things have been done. There's a working code at ICANN to address this issue. There are also materials at ICANN. But it's not very broadly distributed in time. So engaging with community beyond ICANN is one of the things that support the recommendation.

So in terms of next steps, it's finalizing the report. Right now it will be submitted to the respective councils for adoption and we'll be following up at ICANN staffing team on its implementation, at least that's the anticipated next steps.

So, always, I think, all volunteers are welcome. Please connect with myself or actually I think Young‑Eum will be joining us. She's the co‑Chair on the group, as well. As we look into the future of TLDs and IDN TLDs, this will be a very important issue that needs to be addressed.

So, I guess this provides us with a bit of ‑‑ hopefully a bit of an introduction of the topic itself. I now pass the mic to Giovanni [Inaudible] who I understand worked on a very good report on this issue, as well.

>> GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot. (audio difficulty).

Of .com or .net ‑‑ so I'm going to, if I can, let's do it like this. First of all, to skip the heat of the lights, and, secondly, just to have the slides close to me. So, if I press ‑‑ okay.

So I start with a sentence that was in the forward of the 2012 report that we produced with UNESCO. And we are about to complete the production of the 2013 report. And the 2013 report is a bit more complex because, as I said, we started the corporation with Verisign and that allowed us to investigate a bit more the use of .com and .net IDNs. And that basically expands the report and provides more data and more useful information to understand that if IDNs are really used and to what extent they are used.

So basically this sentence said that it was that the Internet was not as multilingual as it should be and, therefore, in the forward underscored the importance of supporting IDNs at all levels.

My presentation will go to four points. The first one is the adoption of IDNs, the usage of IDNs and some factors that impact the current uptake of IDN at local level and some conclusions.

First, short history. And I'm going to go very quickly through it because some points were already mentioned by Edmon.

The first, IDNs we start to talk about IDNs in 1996. Then again I'm going quickly through those slides. In 2008, the IDN standards were revised and we had the IDN A 2008 protocol. And in 2008, we started also talking ICANN level about the fast track process for enabling IDN CCLDs. And in fact, as Edmon said, in 2010, the first IDN ccTLDs were launched by the fast track process.

What is important ‑‑ and I don't know if Hiro is going to speak briefly about this ‑‑ it's basically that this year, after a long work with many members of the community, the ICANN fast track, or the ICANN policy support introducing IDN ccTLDs were reviewed. And this is quite important for the community. Took quite a long time, but we made it. So it's going to be future, possibly, for some TLDs that were initially rejected. Some applications for IDN ccTLDs that were initially rejected.

So let's go straight into the adoption of IDNs. And we start with the chart.

And basically what we have done is we have investigated the deployment of IDNs at registry level. And this year compared to last year. So this is a preview of the 2013 report. You can see that the number of registries that have implemented IDNs has grown. And this is also because this year basically takes into account the feedback we received from the ‑‑ community which was not included in the 2012 report. As you can see, there is a move toward the implementation deployment of IDNs at the second level by many registries. And in 2012, at least in Europe, there were three registries, France, Italy and Serbia who introduced IDNs at the second level.

Second question we asked to our registries, the registries who participated in this survey is if the uptake of IDNs met or didn't meet their expectations. And as you can see, basically out of the 35 responses that we have received, there is a slightly decreased in terms of meeting the expectation. As you can see, five was given by 11 respondents in 2012, only by 8 in 2012. 2011 was 11. 2012 was 8. Which means that many registries who have implemented IDNs basically they didn't see much response that they were expecting in terms of at least registration of IDNs under their Top Level Domain.

If we ‑‑ basically we asked the same question to the registrar community. And what we have done this year is basically that we have asked the same questions we were asking to the registries. We asked them to the registrars. And we have taken a sample of 33 registrars and distributed differently on the basis of their business model, on the basis of their size. So the feedback was provided to us by big, big registrars, registrars who are registering domain names all around the world in almost all extensions and also small‑scale registrars.

And as you can see, basically the number of those were in between is much wider, much bigger. And that's because probably registrars are closer for many registries to the end user, to the community that register the IDNs.

And what about the end user awareness of IDNs? Again, we start with the registry view. And basically in 2012, out of the 38 responses, we have seen even in this case there has been a decrease in the excellent vote for the awareness of the end‑users, which means that many more ‑‑ much more registries have said to us that there is less awareness in the end‑users about IDNs. And this is a response we didn't expect. But if we confront this response with the one that was given by the registrars, we can see again that they are a bit more pessimistic than the registries. And that's because, again, they are closer to the end user, and sometimes they see that there is not such demand of IDNs. And that also highlights the fact that probably both at the registry and registrar level should be more dialogue, more cooperation to pass the message on to the end‑users that IDNs are available, that end‑users can speak in their own language when they register a domain name.

Now we have the big new gTLD bunch of IDNs. And this is really a bunch of IDNs from the new digital applications. There are really about more than 100 IDN applications in the new gTLD round. And most of them are for the Chinese script followed by the Arabic and the Japanese. We are asking ourselves if probably they will get lost in the big bunch of new gTLDs. And this is a question that our new partner in this report is asking, Verisign. And basically they are telling us that they have put forward the application certain IDN application because they felt it was needed. But now they are doing some market search. And they're understanding that there will probably not be such a demand like the one they were initially thinking about. But we'll see in the future when they are really launched.

About the usage of IDNs. We are ‑‑ this is from the 2011 report, the one that was published last year. So the data are from the 2011 report. And basically in this case, we have investigated what kind of language, what kind of script was deployed by registry. And as you can see, in case of registry implemented IDNs, 95 percent of registries will have implemented IDNs, they have implemented IDNs to cover the local language. Only 5 percent of the registries we surveyed have implemented IDNs ‑‑ local language. (audio difficulty).

Official European languages in 2009. At that time we had registered 47,000 .eu IDNs in the first couple hours of the opening of the IDN. There was a peak that was reached almost one year later. And then what we have seen is that there is a decrease drop in the renewal rate. And that's because most of the registrations that were done were done for protective measures. And many of them were, as we have seen now, they are not really, really used. Although there is a good percentage that is used for business purposes. And it's still in line with the average use for business use, but it is still going down.

What we have also seen for our IDNs .edu is that there is a strong link between the local language and the geographic location of the registrar. So 46 percent of our current IDN come from the IDN Latin spectre. And basically they come from German registrars. 75 percent of the IDNs, the registrar is located in Greece. And 85 percent of those ‑‑ are located in Bulgaria. So there is this strong correlation with the local language and the drafting location of the registrar. We have also investigated the reasons behind the drop. There is an extremely low knowledge of end user of IDNs. When we went around Europe, we asked in Bulgaria, in Greece, in Germany because there is also some, let's say, non‑ASCII characters. If they know that they can register those characters, basically say "no, we are not aware of that." And this is extremely important to consider for any future action.

And as Edmon was pointing out, there is quite a variable user experience of IDNs in browser application that ‑‑ impediment for further use of IDNs.

There is a correlation between the domain name growth and certain country‑specific factors, like grease, share of IDNs dropped from 9.7 ‑‑ 9.7 percent down to 7.6. And that is also due to the financial crisis of that specific country.

There is also another factor that registrars sometimes promote heavily domain names ‑‑ marketing campaigns and marketing campaign is over, basically the registration is not renewed certain value to that specific registration.

I was talking about the use ‑‑ and you can see that we have made a comparison about what a website in which .eu domain name results into is used. And if you take the .eu sample, we see that a bit more than 21 percent is used for business purposes against 31 percent of our domain name portfolio. If we take the .com is about 29.50 percent. And this is an aspect that will be investigated more in depth in this year's report, so we are currently putting together all the data and analyze what IDNs are used, if they're really used. And this is, again, thanks to the partnership that we have formed with Verisign.

Some factors that impact IDN's uptake of local level. First of all there is some country indicators. Linguistic and culture, broad penetration, the local language content, and the size of the population. There are also some important other indicators, factors that impact the uptake of IDNs and they are linked to the ccTLD.

First of all, prices. Price makes a difference, especially if the ccTLD doesn't allow direct registration. Registrations are made by the network of accredited registrars. The registration policies, in some cases we have seen that, at least in Europe, there were some registries that have launched IDNs at the second level, but the policies were not ‑‑ and therefore that was also a barrier to the uptake of IDNs.

The brand of the ccTLD. That's extremely important.

Some ccTLDs, they have some sort of, they are facing some issues to have their ccTLD recognized as a brand. If you think how difficult it will be to have it at the IDN level, that's also a step up. So this is something also to think about.

And then the network of local registrars. If we think that for instance in our case in Greece we have 7 accredited registrars and in Bulgaria we have only two accredited registrars. So we would like to promote IDNs and we'd like to promote the Greek script or ‑‑ script. And sometimes we have, I'd say, a shortage of local registrars who can support these kind of promotions.

And then there is the end user site. The end user and what and how they perceive IDNs and why they do not register IDNs. First of all, as Edmon was saying, there is a limited support for IDNs at different levels. It could be application social networks, could be at registrar level, could be at Internet browser level, and most of all could be at email functionality level. And this is also a great barrier, the fact that if I register IDR in some cases I can use it. But I cannot have my email. So that's going to be a sort of duality because those who really believe in IDN and they like to have both domain name and the email in IDN, in some cases they cannot do it. And there have been some developments, which this report is exploring in the fact that the email functionality is about to be overcome as a barrier, but we're still a long way to go.

So, just a couple of conclusions. We believe, at least this is the conclusion in the Eurid‑UNESCO report that education at end user level and the dialogue and strong cooperation among the key Internet business players are the key factors to insure an uptake of IDNs. Without the educational element and without the cooperation, it's like working in different boxes. And those different boxes at some point, if they don't communicate, at the end big disadvantage is for the end user, for the people who may access the Internet their own language but they're not able to.

And we also believe ‑‑ and for the second year we are saying that the total support of IDN is really one step, probably one of the major steps, transform the Internet into a truly multilingual tool.

So those are the conclusions in the report of last year. Those will be the conclusions in the report of this year.

We are currently working with different players to try to find a way to educate the end‑users and also to strengthen the dialogue between different parties, different business players in the Internet community to make sure that IDNs will become a channel, a good avenue to make certain communities enter the Internet. Thank you.

[Applause.]

>> EDMON CHUNG: And thank you ‑‑

>> GIOVANNI SEPPIA: There are some copies of last year's report on that table in front of the stage. So if you'd like to get one copy, please do so. And the 2013 report will be uploaded on our site around the end of September before the IGF meeting where it is going to be officially presented. Thank you again.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Giovanni. And we look very much forward to the 2013 report. It's very, very informative.

Next we go to Hiro Hotta who will share with us the work in the perspectives from APTLD.

>> While we are waiting for the technical to get up and running, I guess ‑‑ are we ready? If we're not, we can ‑‑ I think they are dying to make some comments. I think they were ready. So go forward.

>> HIRO HOTTA: Yes. Finally I can say good morning. All right. Good morning, everybody. Sorry for waiting, keep you waiting.

So I have two presentations today. And first one is as a board member of APTLD, I want to give you some brief update and the experience of what APTLD did.

So many, many of you don't know what APTLD is, so first of all I want to introduce what APTLD is.

So what is APTLD? It's an Asia‑Pacific Top Level Domain Association. So it's a member organisation, of course nonprofit. The members ccTLD registries in AP region and associate members include Asia, many TLDs, gTLDs and registrars and it commenced in 1998 and legally incorporated in 2003. And what we do to participate in best practice of ccTLDs such as IDN for the benefit of its members and the Internet and to be the voice of ccTLD in the AP region on issues. So actually APTLD found that the IDN is one of the most important issues for the ccTLDs who are for the domain name usage in AP region. So to be the voice for ccTLDs for such things in the AP region to the global fora.

And continued? APTLD will achieve its objectives through consensus building. It's a kind of members coordination and collaboration. Respecting culture and variations of ccTLDs and their local communities. And it's built on membership and advantages supported by membership fees. So the AP region, as you know, it's very huge, diverse from Middle East to the Pacific Islands.

And when the use the ICANN's metrics, there are 75 ccTLDs in AP region. 75.

That's a big number. It's very diverse. And among the 75, we have around half of them joined us. Associate members we have 21. Now the central part, APTLD and IDN. As you see, the ADN has been a major focus in our region and APTLD is one of the advocates of IDN ccTLD fast track programme.

So APTLD had the resolution on IDN 2002, it's very long ago. And we issued a position paper tied to APTLD position paper on top level Internationalized Domain Names in 2003 ‑‑ 2007, I'm sorry.

And during the APTLD manila meeting in 2009, .my, Malaysia presented on fast track IDN TLD plan for the panel on ccTLD perspectives.

And, finally, the IDN ccTLD fast track process launched by ICANN in November 2009. This is the fast formal process which allowed the IDN ccTLD merging on the Internet. And APTLD's engagement in global IDN policy development. So we had IDN ccTLD fast track Working Group. And especially we, the APTLD issued a position paper. And just after that, we asked ‑‑ we brought them to the centre, central meeting. And kindly, of course, they agreed with the position paper, which says that we need fast track IDN launching for the global Internet. So this is a fast track. And the second one is a CCPPD, 1 and 2, and it's eye as Giovanni said, it's a kind of permanent, not fast track, permanent Rule for IDNs. For example, in the fast track, non‑Latin, Latin IDNs are not allowed. But in the permanent Latin stream, they are allowed as TLD. And this is what Edmon explained. And variant issues project. This is also ‑‑ and IDN universal acceptance project. Some of our members participate in these projects. So this is the list of APTLD engagement.

And of course we do periodically the information sharing among members. So we had in August the APTLD members' meeting and IDN acceptance was presented by Korea, Vietnam and Iran. And they said that typical issues are existence of IDN‑aware applications. There are not so many. And lack of such IDN‑aware applications prohibits our use of the IDN TLDs or IDN.cc. And difference in layers among applications such as, for example, brothers has some different presentation to the users. So it may prohibit, may hinder the usage of the IDN.

And typing methods. For example, the Vietnamese presentation said that typing IDN is very difficult or very cumbersome to the process. So it may hinder. And dealing with IDN variance, it is usually difficult to deal with IDN variance. Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Hiro. In the interest of time, we started a little bit late, so we'll run right into the next portion where we'll see some experience from .jr and cn. And if I may ask the speakers to speed up a little bit and shorten a little bit.

So first of all we have from .kr KISA, Minjung Park.

>> MINJUNG PARK: Good morning, everyone. I'm Minjung Park. I work at KISA, the Korea Internet and Security Agency. KISA is the registrar agency. My presentation will be on KISA's efforts on improving the IDNs. But before I go into the main contents, I'd like to first briefly introduce the history of KISA.

KISA stands for the Korea Internet and Security Agency.

It was established in 2009 by merging three different governmental agencies which were KISA, which looks the same and sounds the same but was a different organisation. It was then responsible for information security. And the other one was NIDA, the National Internet Development Agency. It was the agency responsible for Internet resources, such as domain names and IP. The last one was KIKA, the body responsible for IT international cooperation. So by merging these three different governmental agencies, we currently have the Korea Internet and Security Agency.

KISA, the Korea Internet and Security Agency is a government‑affiliated institute established by the ministry of science in ICT and future planning. It was established to enhance the quality of information, network and security and to support international cooperation, facilitated access to foreign market accordance law. The act and provision of communications network utilization and information protection, which has a quite long name. And the last one is the Internet address resources. As you can see just right from the title of the law, that's on the Internet address management.

So the general information of KISA, we currently have about 579 employees. That's quite a big organisation. And our budget is $123 million, approximately. And among many other activities, we are also managing Internet address. And it is managed by KRNIC, which is a department within KISA.

So the main contents for today. It consisted of two parts. The first part is on the introduction of the group, the ttCTLD that we have launched in 2011. And the second part is on our efforts of improving the usage of .hankuk.

We have submitted the fast track request to ICANN in November 2009. And we're finally delegated by ICANN and became the registry of the hankuk in 2011. The service was launched in May 2011, and we had a sunrise period for five months from May to October. The sunrise period consisted of two phases. The first phase was for the government bodies and public organizations. At the phase, one official name and one abbreviating name of the organisation was allowed to register. And the second phase was for the trademark holders. At the second phase one main name per trademark was allowed to register. And then we had in August general registration in October 2011.

This shows you the registration policy. If you could just look at the red box, it has the special requirements for .hakuk. Since it is an IDN domain name, it's required to have at least 1 character in the domain name and it can't exceed 17 characters. For the general requirement part, local presence is required. And we need to register to our accredited registrars, which we have about 30 currently. And the registration period is up to 10 years. Registration fee varies. On average, it's about $10. It could go up to 20 to $30 according to the registrars. And additional services that they provide. This slide shows you the registration trend. The bottom graph shows you the accumulated numbers, both containing the numbers to are that KR and .hakuk. We have about 1.2 million domain names under our ccTLDs, both ASCII and IDN. And among these 1.2 million, .hankuk is about 90,000. We used to have about 200,000 by the end of 2011, but if you look at the chart below, we had a sharp drop by the end of 2012, which dropped from 110,000 to 90,000. That was a sharp decrease, but didn't happen unexpectedly. We knew that it was coming because most of the initial registrations had come from speculation. So we had an internal discussion in KISA whether to put a provisional campaign, perhaps, to keep the registrations, but decided not to because we thought that we should as a priority focus on having a healthier environment for the IDNs. So at the time, actually, at the year of 2011, the usage rate for .hankuk was about 30 percent. We clearly have about 50 percent of usage rate for IDNs. So we think we have a much healthier environment. And it's time for us to put more efforts on raising awareness and do some more promotional campaigns for the actual users of IDNs.

This chart shows you the current status. We had a research in 2012 on the environment of IDNs in Korea. When we first launched .hankuk in 2011, we used to have complainers of the users of PC environment. But if you see the results, which was done in 2012, you can see that most of the PC browser problems have been solved. Most of the complaints that we receive currently are mostly from mobile users. So we are working with mobile application providers to provide more convenient, more IDN‑friendly environment for the users in Korea.

So from 2011‑2012 we've had meetings with global companies as well as domestic sites and manufacturers to improve if use of .hankuk. As a result, most of the PC browsers have updated their applications. So PC environment is quite okay, but we're still facing some problems with mobile environment.

So what we've done in 2012, as you can see from the pictures, we had a campaign to produce the .hankuk. It was done in front of ‑‑ from Chinese dynasty who invented the Korean character that we're using these days. So we had person wearing the costume for the king and others wore traditional scholar costumes. Pictures from the campaign. So this is about the end of my presentation. Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Is your person also in the costume? Anyone full KISA in the costume?

>> MINJUNG PARK: No. They're taking pictures.

>> EDMON CHUNG: So next we have Hiro, who will talk to us about the experience from Japan.

>> HIRO HOTTA: So I'll talk about the acceptance of IDNs in Japan. This time I'm wearing the hat of the ccTLD in Japan, JPRS.

I'm going to be brief. So this is the total number of the JP domain names, it's around 1.3 million now. And this is the trend of number of IDN.jb, the second level IDN. I think this is very similar to .eu and .tr one.

So we started in 2001. And the first was on speculation. It reduced. And new usage developed from 2003 to 2007. This is, for example, sightseeing website is made ‑‑ were made, created using the Japanese domain name. So new usage. But waiting for new value and slight risk and it seems that new value was found. This may be we guess that it's the IDN has some value in SEO, search engine optimization. That's our guess. But I don't know. But the market thinks so, I believe. And this was the IDN and the ccTLD process in Japan.

We haven't launched the IDN ccTLD which we named ‑‑ but we had decision process in Japan. And it's very complicated, but so complicated but it's easy to understand that the government started to set up a committee how IDN ccTLD in Japan should be decided. And it decided that the private sector initiative should reside to determine how IDN ccTLD in Japan should be launched and should be managed. And that result, Japan Internet domain name council was created. It's an organisation, nonprofit organisation. By the private sector. And it sets up a selection committee for IDN CCT registry. And many applicants, they thought that many applicants come to that want to be IDN registry so I put some of them. But the reality was just we, the JPRS, applied for that. And they ‑‑ our proposal and they selected us as an organisation. And our registration policy. In the proposal, we put some basic policy in the proposal. This is the process in Japan. Successful applicant which is us, we did consultation with the community. We made a survey to domain name ‑‑ Internet users consultation was through online survey. And their majority said that .Nippon and ‑‑ should be e‑commerce space not ‑‑ space. And other party, .jp registries gathering, they say the same thing, .nippon must have the same ‑‑ and the registry of .Nippon and .jp should be the same. And our advisory committee, which consists of six expert members from different communities, they said that the registrant of .Nippon and jp should be the same. So it seems that Japan is currently ‑‑ seems to be conservative, which means that the .Nippon has to be the same, equal to the .jp. Just rename of .jp.

So, we proposed having such flavor of the community or temperature of the community. Our proposal said that only the registrar of .jp can register the same label under .Nippon. That means that those who want to use .Nippon can use it immediately. Just set the name server. Those who don't want to use .Nippon at least for sometime don't have to register domain name just for protection. So this was the main concern from the community. They don't want to register a domain name just for protection. If we open up a new space, usually some brand owners get their domain names just for protection. But with this scheme, they don't need it.

And Internet users won't guess incorrectly by the implication of the .jp and Nippon, it seems their perception. This is very important. Japan's committee think that .jp means .Nippon. Not a different one. And so we decided that .Nippon reservation should be provided as a value‑added service of .jp. By that, features of .jp‑‑ usability and ‑‑ will be provided by clients ‑‑ basic acceptance of IDN TLD in Japan. So far user perception seems to be, as I said, .Nippon is just another notation of .jp. No new meaning for usage is expected by .Nippon. Just an alias. Technical preparation has been pursued by us, acceptance of IDN. Registries system as everyone said and contact email address should accept the IDN. Brief.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. So we move immediately to Hongbin from China. Do you hear us? We'll have to unmute Hongbin so he can speak to us, as well. Is there anyone who could help? Hello? Hongbin, are you still with us? Are we still connected with China?

I guess, if you could help us connect back, in the meantime, I guess, if I can also invite Young‑Eum to join us. If you can join us for the interest of time. And as we get connected back with Hongbin, perhaps if I may ask for a way to give your comments. I was going to ask you for comments after his presentation, why don't we start first we'll go back to Hongbin and the panel.

>> HONGBIN ZHU: Hello? Can you hear me?

>> EDMON CHUNG: We have Hongbin online now. So why don't we go with you first, sorry for the second time to do this to you.

Hongbin, we can hear you loud and clear.

>> HONGBIN ZHU: Well my script just control ‑‑

>> EDMON CHUNG: Yes, we are ready for that. Please go ahead. Hongbin, you may start?

>> HONGBIN ZHU: Dear Colleagues, good morning. I'm Hongbin Zhu the international policy adviser ‑‑ sorry that I can't be with you in person right now, but still it is my true great pleasure to participate remotely ‑‑ to work with KISA and JP‑‑ as well as other people's address. As you know, has been cooperating with diverse Internet partners for years on the IDN technical issues and universal acceptance. Admittedly, we have benefited a lot from learning from each other.

Next slide.

Today, I would like to share with you about the history and research offerings and the work of promoting IDN‑‑ that presentation is four parts ‑‑ introduction followed by discussion. Next slide. As you can see in the chart, the Internet in China has been developing at a very fast speed. China had 564 million users by December 2012, a gross of 10 percent over the previous years. Regarding to the domain name market, right now China has a total of 13.41 million domain names, including 7.51 million .cn domain names which takes a proportion of 56 percent in China. And 280,000 ‑‑ IDN ccTLD in China.

However, as many of you know that China is a diverse country which has a population of around 1.35 billion. Differences apply to different regions and different user groups. For example, there is a significant urban‑rural divide of Internet penetration, which is 59 percent versus 24 percent. According to our national survey, this kind of divide is mainly for the lack of infrastructure ‑‑ allow citizens and also language barriers.

The next slide.

The Chinese language content and the International Domain Name should be a major factor for the Chinese users, nonbarrier access after 20 years of improvements, China has a vibrant Chinese online content industry. The most popular of which is instant messaging. And most widely used application has 416 million users. Other popular domestic applications include ‑‑ such as by do which has 450 million users. And blogging has 308 million users. For these Chinese content providers a huge Chinese Internet user community. According to the broadband commission report 2012, chin ease is the second most online language and the number of Chinese Internet users is predicted to overtake the number of Internet users to dominate using English by 2015.

The next slide.

Now we go up to the IDN issue. Responding to the huge Chinese user market, Chinese domain name, work on promoting its universal acceptance.

Next slide.

The Chinese IDN has been developed for 14 years since 2000. And a couple of community coordination mechanisms, platforms, have been developed by the joint efforts in our community by then ‑‑ terrestrial ‑‑ and ‑‑ of Hong Kong ‑‑ and ‑‑ of Singapore and also .asia has been our partners working, we have been working closely with them. Backbone of the Chinese domain name consortiums ‑‑ we have been working together in driving the development of the Chinese IDN. Meanwhile, we have also cooperated with Korea and Japan as a joint taskforce for developing the IDN registration guideline Chinese and Japanese and we have developed with ‑‑ these efforts ‑‑ published Chinese IDN table in 2005. Following that, the Chinese IDN expanded 4713 was published and finally after this preparation work, we had a monumental achievement in June 2010 which is the ‑‑ work by IDN.

The next slide.

‑‑ was launched in 2010. In the first month, Registration Number was 318,000 domain names. However, many of them are registered by broadband protection users. So the number is ‑‑ 37.2 percent domains are not ‑‑ domain server which is not resolvable. And because supported by the application provider timely registration great struggle whereby 2013 the Registration Number just over 218,000. While in October of last year, there was a slight increase in the Registration Number. This is ASCII second level domain time, for instance which do not have Chinese translation intended to reduce Chinese domain name ‑‑

Next slide.

Our users are distributed all over the world. As you can see, there is a large proportion of users in the U.S. and in other countries. However, one issue become very crucial, which is ‑‑ issue.

The next slide.

During the long‑term development and ‑‑ the Chinese language have evolved into two writing systems Chinese script and traditional Chinese script. Chinese have the same pronunciation and the same meaning as its official form. Chinese users regard them as interchangeable. Experience with ‑‑ shows that over 10 percent of ‑‑ therefore if the ‑‑ have not been handled properly, many labels which can be ‑‑ many labels ‑‑ might be generated. In the worst case, the variance can easily be utilized for phishing and other malicious preferences.

Next slide.

R3743 and RC4713 which mandates that the Chinese domain name labels and variants must be to the same ‑‑ to allow the ability and resilience ‑‑ domain name are allowed to activate it ‑‑ original domain name which is a mixture of traditional and ‑‑ by Chinese. This is the domain name which the applicant want to register. Simultaneously, we will activate one domain name ‑‑ by Chinese characters. And also traditional Chinese characters. And other mixed traditional ‑‑ the same ‑‑ the registration of the Chinese domain names ‑‑ found as the same domain name only true forms will be added to the ‑‑ as the mixed form will normally be in use.

Next slide.

Universal acceptance has always taken great efforts for promote utilization of Chinese domain names in development applications.

Next slide.

The first one is ‑‑ in 2004 ‑‑ Chinese email and ‑‑ after that, in 2006 pushes to form the email address ‑‑ Working Group, international Working Group. In 2012, the RC about ‑‑ 2 P extension to support ‑‑ is published. Finally 2012 through the newly established ‑‑ email demonstration platform and in conjunction with market Internet information centres in the Asia Pacific region held a ceremony in Beijing in celebration of the ‑‑ the first international ‑‑

Next slide.

We have also stepped in the global arena for cooperation in the internationalized email address. For example, there is 47 meeting of APEC telecommunication conference was held in Bali, Indonesia for 25 to 27 April, 2013. And this meeting the proposals made to promote national in advanced technology in Asia Pacific region was widely supported by APAC communities including Korea, Japan and Russia, and they have approved our proposal by voting. This means that the international email address technology has been prominent level support in the PAC region. So the process of this deployment is expected to be activated. And impact meeting representatives of some economies including email service vendors said that they were very pleased to see that China has international actor for technology, was leading other economies to actively deploying this new technology of ‑‑

>> EDMON CHUNG: This is Edmon. I apologize for interjecting, but please try to quicken up a little bit and wrap up. We are running out of time. But I guess we started about 10, 15 minutes late. I guess we'll overrun for about 10, 15 minutes if people are okay. But Hongbin, please try to go a little bit faster and wrap up. Thank you.

>> HONGBIN ZHU: I may need 3 minutes. Support for Chinese IDN browsers including Internet Explorer 7, 8, Firefox Safari 6, which is the most popular Chinese browser ‑‑ domain is well supported by browsers.

And the next slide.

As you can see, (audio difficulty) but we still need to allow four things to promote more accepted by Asian providers.

Next slide.

Also negotiated with Yahoo and Google and now support Chinese search engine.

The next slide.

And now I would like to share some source of how to further improve the universal acceptance of IDN.

The next slide.

‑‑ in 2010. The survey indicate that 90 percent of respondents ‑‑ IDN was very promising. From our experience, the key for acceptance ‑‑ versus technology standardization. For example ‑‑ (audio difficulty) ‑‑ also telecom efforts to promote widespread of India ‑‑ of IDNs influence in the users and business. And demonstrates also need to have instance in the sufficient communication with the software where suppliers and ‑‑ the strongest power to push acceptance of IDNs. So ‑‑ end‑users to step forward application providers.

The next slide.

In the longer term, we are still very optimistic about user acceptance of IDN usage of the Chinese characters online is becoming much more easier. For example, we see that voice recognition will enable users to access websites through Chinese language voices activated commands. This is a very promising development track for the IDNs. Meanwhile the service users can also utilize the IDN toss personalize the applications for points for the people who are more familiar with their native language, therefore we still have language overhead and it is still very promising work.

So as my time stop has ended, I will leave to have further discussion. Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Hongbin. And I'll go immediately to go away to give us some comments and then Young‑Eum to open up for some questions.

>> KUOWEI WU: First I have to say that what I'm seeing is based on my own personal ‑‑ now represent ICANN at all. Well this is basic ICANN policy.

First of all, I think Giovanni, actually, the report is really, really sufficient. Particularly from those survey and point out those other issue. And I think those who are currently the CCT or the IDN come with Giovanni's studies.

I think I have some of the comment about ‑‑ first of all, as we know, the IDN is quite new. If I remember in the 2009 or 2010, when the IGF meeting when the people talking about IDN, and actually at the time I am not on ICANN board. And I actually stand up, I say when you promote IDN, we need to bring up the fact and choose to be careful. The reason is as we know the IDN, what we have right now is only on domain name. Actually a lot of applications is not ready. Even the email, international email or RDC is in IETF in the test bed right now is not finalized yet. Even we finalize the international email in the IFC, I think for all of us in the industry, we understand that it still needs to take time for the providers to develop. And of course software providers, they go to develop for IDN were really based on their business estimation, you know, from the business point of view and not from the standard, you know. If we go back to the IGF almost 7, 8,000 of IFC see how many of them have actually been implemented. Actually it's a very small number, you know. Because some of them is no business value.

So I think this is somewhat a fact we have to recognize that. Because to gain the community trust, the best strategy is, you know, trusted data and the fact just Giovanni's submission, it's a fact, we have to understand it.

Another thing I like to point out is ‑‑ another thing is I don't know what about the other IDN, but at least on my personal experience, I am using the Chinese characters. If I want to type my email, it's much easier using the English than the Chinese character because it require me to type almost I think it's four times or five times more strokes on my keyboard. That's a fact. You cannot say this is not a barrier, less barrier, because you need to type more strokes on your keyboard to make it work.

And second of all, what we will face, you can imagine if I am using the IDN email and send it to the non‑Chinese IDN user, what you can see under ‑‑ the user do not have Chinese character. You will see confused email address. In this day, I believe most of the people it used cannot recognize the email. You assume that is spam mail. You would delete it. That is a problem. Because I don't believe anybody can install every language on your PC, nor book, iPad or your mobile phone. It's no way. So definitely you will be limited your market in your own language group. And is that a value? Of course it is value to some people. Some of the people don't use English well. They like to use their own local language. I think there's a value for them. But it also limited the market. Because you only can provide to those people using that language, you know. And so that is another thing.

And I think from the ‑‑ JPI the CNNIC and including the TWNIC the same, I think there is a couple experience we need to learn. Right now we see the Registration Number. But the next indepth we need to look is how many visit to your DNS compared the ratio. Because right now you have number of IDN, number of ASCII domain name, right? But is that ratio equivalent to what the user visit to your IDN and to visit your ASCII? Because if the number is greater, good news. If it is about the same, that means do people treat really just like how do they say, the people treat Nippon and the JP is the same. If less, that mean the user is kind of still resistant to using the IDN. I think that is the data we have to take a look.

And two more things I'd like to point out is, you know, on the first thing, I really respect JPIS. They put a protection, you know. You don't need to worry. I think to reaches the domain name should not be because you want to protect your company name or your own individual name. You want to reach the domain, it has to be you want to use it. And I think the JPIS do a very good job, at least they say you don't need to worry about it and you don't protect it. Because there will be, you know, you mustn't map it to your JP or that. And in Taiwan we have a different thing. In Taiwan, what we did is we don't charge the IDN. If you have the TW, they will give you the IDN for free. So there is mapping in such cases. So every .tw, you have a chance to reach one IDN mapping to the .tw. So this is another way to do that kind of thing.

So I think the next step is how we can have a more application on the IDN. The first thing we need to resolve. And second much all I think we need to ‑‑ we need time to look what is marketing acceptance. I think that's the next step we need to look at that. Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. Of course IDN is very much about the local market. One thing that jumped out to me before I pass to you. We always think IDN is new. But if you look at the history, DNS was created in 1983. It's 30 years now. And IDN has actually 15 years experience. So IDN started around 1998. So we're almost half ‑‑ we're actually half of the history of DNS already. So it's not that new anymore. But we are still facing a lot of challenge. So Young‑Eum.

>> YOUNG-EUM LEE: I understand I'm supposed to discuss and explore ways of cooperating among the relevant stakeholders. And with regard to this, I'd like to discuss actually two big areas. One is the global cooperation and the other is the local aspect. First of all, with regard to global cooperation, I've been involved in the activity in ICANN, the joint IDN group of the ‑‑ GNSO and was the Chair ‑‑ and we have discussed single character registrations. And we are currently discussing the issue of variance. And so I think these activities are very desirable for increasing global cooperation. And of course ICANN also had their own taskforce on variance. But, I mean, these inter‑‑ actually multistakeholder cooperation in this case may be the model that we can apply here.

And in the Forum, I mean, recognizing that one of the biggest hindrances to the adoption of IDNs is the IDN email standards. I think what Hongbin said with regard to CNNIC's proposal and in the form of RFC6531 can be a very good start. I mean, that's another area that we can explore in terms of global cooperation.

With regard to the local aspect, well, Minjung presented to you the situation in Korea with .hankuk and that there was a significant drop after the first year. But even with the drop in initial registrations, when we actually think about it, the use of IDNs when we were first thinking of launching it, we thought that it would be very popular, not like the second level IDNs, but with the top‑level IDNs, people would be using it a lot more, but actually it did not increase as it was expected.

Well, one sort of baseline principle or baseline belief that I would like to state is that I firmly believe in the need for the IDNs because there is no doubt that the local language is much more convenient for the locals. And when Hiro showed us that new value seems to have been added, I think that was a very good ‑‑ or a very hopeful scenario for the IDNs. And so I see new hope in that market.

And of course Kuowei just said if you just focus on locals, it will not have market value, it will be very limited. Yes, that being the case, I think this is ‑‑ use of IDNs is not just a market you, but it is more of a value issue. And maybe even an issue of the preservation of culture for the local community.

So, in my committee, I mean the committee that I Chair in Korea, that is Internet address infrastructure subcommittee of KIKA, we actually had a discussion about this. We tried to sort of think of ways, I mean, the reasons why IDNs were not popular. And as most of you may ‑‑ I mean have actually mentioned so far, most of the major sites actually have a firm establishment with the ASCII name. And so there is actually no need for them to have to use the IDNs. And also with regard to the users, the use of ASCII has been the norm. And so if people are just used to using ASCII.

But I think, again going back to the JP example, I think there is an ‑‑ I mean, if we keep with ‑‑ I mean, if we stayed with the IDN, if we keep promoting the value of IDN and just keep using it, I think gradually the local population will realise the value of IDNs and the use of IDNs will, I think, gradually increase. So, so far IDNs actually have been used as an alternative route to the ASCII site. But when the use of IDNs becomes more and more universal and there is more adoption of IDNs, maybe it won't just be a value‑added service or an alias, maybe it will become the norm for the local population.

And so I think in conclusion, I mean there are a lot of difficulties in the adoption of IDNs, but this is something that in order to preserve the diversity of the global community, this is something that we need to stick to. Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Young‑Eum. Any questions from the floor? Anyone else?

So one question and we'll wrap up.

>> Maybe get away from the speaker, okay.

Thank you. My name is ‑‑ Lee. I'd like to actually echo what Kuowei just said because I have also been involved in IDN process and IDF and also the ICANN. But domain name means not enough. Also, including the converging code into the browser, it took at least a few years. Sometimes several years. So hopefully I would like to have the email, again, support takes place much shorter than web browsers. Then everybody, I think, feels IDN is really existing and then people get involved more in the beauty of IDN and the usability of the IDN use in the real Internet use.

So I'd like to propose ‑‑ I don't know the method, but better take some real action on the how to push the, be it Microsoft, Google, all the mail service providers to incorporate the supporting IDN capability into their mail services as soon as possible. Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you for the suggestion and comment. In fact, that's precisely what at least the Working Group recommendations is asking the community as a whole to start working on.

Any closing remarks? There is one from ‑‑

>> I think you are definitely right. I think the application should be implemented. Without application, actually it's difficult to get on anything because you now only go to the UIL in particular right now people go to the VIL is go to the search engine instead of type in the whole domain name, you know. And so that is a very good approach. And I think I don't know when the IFC of the international email will come out. It's already? Okay. So right now it really depends on the software developer to implement it, yep.

>> EDMON CHUNG: So the RFC is now. That's what was mentioned by Hongbin, as well. And I think Izumi wants the last word.

>> Sorry. Just be brief. As I mentioned yesterday in the multistakeholder discussion, to me there seems to be fewer or lesser effort to involve the public especially the policy making in general in the CC space. You may have different opinions, but as far as Japan's concerned, there are very few applications we have open policy debate by the users. And that goes to me to a good extent to the introduction of IDN CC‑‑ we don't really have much open processes yet for the real implementation. I would like to ‑‑ well ‑‑ may have different opinions, I agree, I see, but there should be much stronger effort in there. Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you for the comment, Izumi. I think Hotta mentioned about the process, as well. And I think hopefully this would be one of the things that we need to really engage more of the community to participate in because we can create all the policies, all the technology we want, but if nobody's using it, it's still useless. So this is one thing that definitely we need to engage the whole user community with.

So with that, join me in a round of applause to the panelists and thank you for bearing with me.

[Applause.]

[End of session.]
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