

Notes: 13 February 2019 @18:30 UTC

Apologies: Patrik Fältström

Actions:

01 Staff to draft agenda for discussion SG in Kobe (to be circulated next call)

02 Staff to prepare update for ccNSO meeting, (to be circulated before next call)

1. Welcome & Roll Call

Attendance from ADOBE room.

No audio only attendants

2. Administrative Announcements (if any)

Little discussion on the list.

Next call Emoji SG will be on Zoom for foreseeable future (see agenda item 7)

Test before start of the meeting. There will be extra announcement . In addition, 30 minutes before the next scheduled call warm-up for SG members

3. Action Items (if any)

No action items previous calls

4. Review Revised Draft Report

Question: SLD for ASCII or IDN or both?

Document prior the call. No immediate comment. Discussion on section by section basis

Background section: no comments

Section Evolution of domain:

Includes adjustment of Emoji definition. Paul: Changes suggested by PAF are reflected. The more detail the more confusion

Q: Why we are following IDNA 2003 why not IDNA 2008?

Response Paul: Poorly answered in ICANN. Most Browsers implement IDNA 2003 and not IDNA 2008. Talking about both in this section is helpful. Title is History

Q: Are Emojis considered IDNs? Is Emoji considered separate script?

Response

Paul: Script property is not formerly agreed upon, Some consider it part of Symbol script, but definitely not script on its own. This question is relevant to determine which group is responsible for label generation rule Label Generation per zone.

For Root zone is ICANN. Hence no Emoji in TLD. But beyond that every (cc)TLD responsible for LGR. Really complicated, not spend much more time on it.

Section Overview of ccTLD that accept Emoji:

To be confirmed .AZ and .SU. To be noted in the draft. Done test registration or received confirmation. Details on research in Annex.

Page 8: Alejandra made comments

No additional comments

Section 3 draft report. No real comments, only comments with examples, changed them

Section: Observations & Conclusions

Paul: Heard opinions, but no conclusions

Do we need conclusions? Conclusions could be a lot of observations

Page: i think we have not even identified the issues that need concluding.. Agreed by paul

Comments A: None

Comments B: No comments

Section Annex C: No comments

Section Annex D: New, includes details

Offer or Accept? in Heading of paragraph change to Accept

Page: theres a space to add, the .fm only offers a restricted list of emojis, and these have their emoji have higher registration and renewal fees than normal registrations.

.fm single character names are \$4000 per name.

Section Annex E: Concerned, in some cases significant edits from what is included ICANN IDN glossary

Paul: Do not assume there is one (1) ICANN glossary, and they are not set in stone.

Reasonable to say definitions are derived from IDN glossary. If this group believes better definition then change

Action Bernie: track changes for next call. Major point remark Page (on conclusions)

Peter: Some changes by him. Some discussion on what to consider an "emoji" Explanation from glossary seem to cover both sides,

Be a bit more precise. Also explain why to look at it one way or the other way.

If observation what are the points are (Page comments).

Paul: Still not identified issues that need concluding. Additional research the differences

If no conclusions then remove it.

Comment

Only couple of data points, anecdotal evidence, SG may suggest way forward.

In summary:

Page. I think there's a sense we are trying to fill the gap between what the Security Report said, emojis are banned, and the market which is registering them. So if we work from both ends, we can start with those issues in the Security report that don't rise to the level of banning all emojis and then recognize that emojis have some different aspects of domain registrations, one they aren't as clear as letter or IDNS. so maybe instead on conclusions, we just expand.

This is good start for further work. Alejandra: include in report why some ccTLD do register.

Bernie. when difficult, maybe plan strategy to interview ccTLDs in Kobe of those who are present. Other approach send out Draft report to ccTLDs to seek their response.

Need to avoid impression they are bad guys.

5. Kobe

Prepare for next call :next reading of document

5.1 Begin preparing agenda for face to face meeting (complete at next meeting)

5.2 Begin preparing update for ccNSO meeting (complete at next meeting)

6. AOB

None

7. Next Meetings 27 February 2019, 18.30 UTC

ZOOM, _+ additional prep session starting at 18.00 UTC