Session #4 : Thematic Session on Domain Name Registries perspective
Highlights & Conclusions

Speakers:

VeriSign Inc./ Pat Kane

DENIC eG / Sabine Dolderer

JPRS, Japan / Hiro Hotta

WIPO / Christian Wichard

Session Chair: Cary Karp (MuseDoma)

Rapporteur: Tina Dam (ICANN)

o IDN Launch 2000, 1 million names in 6months

o Initially low renewal rates, high # live sites, but resolution problems, user confusion w/ ASCII.IDN

o 2004 CJK market study shows enterprises want ASCII for high traffic, users want full IDN TLDs

o Keywords meet user wishes, as would full IDN but not ASCII.IDN

o Firefox, IE7 ease of resolution, renewal rates comparable to ASCII rates, secondary market interest

o Name products continue to develop and will compliment and compete each other

o 2004 .de launch IDN, common policy w .ch/.at

o Introduction of 92 new characters, Latin-1 and Latin Extended A

o Support IDN Standards, RFCs.

o FCFS, no sunrise, dn contracted is IDN not ACE

o Support issues included: how to register, translate, type, which characters, increased disputes.

o IDNs work well in .de market

o IDNs need to work in email as well as the Web

o 2001 launch in SLD .jp, strong market demand

o Priority launch on trademarks, then FCFS

o Rapid growth of # registrations at 2004 IE7 announcement

o Examples of use: advertising, billboards, Google, cell phones, etc...

o Growth is dependent on synergy between environment, users, registration.

o Poor environment is solved by IE7 launch and mobile usage → synergy and growth

o Trademarks are means of protecting products that must be read, pronounced, understood

o Challenges in multilingual context are translation, transliteration

o Solutions for TM conflicts: lawsuits or UDRP

o UDRP in effect per 1999, 8000 cases (55 IDN cases)

o IDN challenges w/determine similarity and deal w/ increased number

o Need different process for scale, increased risk of abuse, sunrise requirements.

o   The TLD registries that participated in this session provide IDN support for a significant variety of languages and scripts. All agreed that localization issues specific to their constituencies needed to be dealt with exclusively on the basis of the IDNA protocol, and in the single, globally-interoperable root. The maintenance of that space is also a prerequisite for ensuring equal protection of the intellectual property rights of all name holders. Offering users a range of alternative providers of trust and name service introduces at least as many problems as it is intended to solve, however great the urgency for such solution may be.

o In order to address the underlying need in as rapid and efficient a manner as possible, we recommend that a clear distinction be made between issues and practices relating to the internationalization of the name space, and the result of that process, which is the availability of localized domain names. The DNS cannot be expected to provide an adequate platform for the expression of the diversity of written language and is, in fact, incapable of fully representing any single language (not even from among those in the mythical ASCII language family). Similarly, localized keyword systems are, by definition, targeted to individual languages communities and rarely scale well across their boundaries.

o A common middle ground should therefore be identified where the internationalizable attributes of the name space provide a natural point of entry into the more finally particulated localized contexts where adjunct identification schemes can provide further support for specific cultural requirements.