
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 04 November 2021 at 13:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/eQyHCg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP EPDP call taking place on Thursday the 4th of November 2021. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room.

If you're only on the telephone, could you please let yourselves be known now? We have apologies from Anil Kumar Jain and Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

All participants will be promoted to panelists for today's call. Members and participants, when using chat, please select "everyone" in order for everyone to see your chat. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have view only chat access.

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.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. if anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Since you asked, I should do this. I'll put something in the chat as well. But just to let folks know that since the last meeting, I have ended my term as an ALAC member, but I have also taken up another leadership role which is the ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council. Thanks.

JULIE BISLAND: Fantastic. Thank you, Justine, and congratulations. Anyone else? All right. Anyone needing assistance updating your statements of interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDNs EPDP Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior.

Thank you, and over to our chair, Donna Austin. Please begin.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everybody. Just by way of some updates, I think on our last call, Jeff Neuman may have mentioned that the Board has written to the Council about elements of the IDN guidelines version four. My understanding is that the

councilors had some preliminary discussion about that and they're waiting on the Registries Stakeholder Group to come back to them with information that will guide the Council, I suppose, on how they want to move forward with that. So I'm not sure whether there's a leaning towards sending that to us for consideration or whether it will be resolved with the assistance of the Registries Stakeholder Group and Council. But we will keep track of that, and if we need to shift things around to accommodate the Board's request, we will do that at the appropriate time.

So what I want to do today is just kind of continue where we left off last week. Ariel sent out to the list an updated chart. So we had some additional conversation within the leadership team earlier this week and we kind of expanded that process flow, for want of a better word, which is really intended to just be illustrative so that we can have a better understanding of what the process might look like, and that in turn should help us answer the question that we have before us.

So what's going to happen today is Ariel is going to take us through that extended process, and then we'll look to the questions that were sent to the list as well by Ariel. So, is that okay with everyone? Does anyone have anything they wanted to raise now before we kick off? Okay, and I'm really sorry, I should have mentioned there won't be a meeting next week. It's Veterans Day in the US and ICANN staff will be observing that public holiday.

I'm also conscious that we will not be having a call two weeks after that to observe Thanksgiving in the US. So perhaps we can have a conversation in the next week online about some options for

how we move forward with our calls into the future, because we do have a time zone change in the US over the weekend, so that will impact what we arrive on as well. And I really would like to move to 90 minutes so we could t registry to get some work done.

With that, Ariel, I will hand over to you, and if you can take us through the expanded process flow. And if anyone has any questions, please just raise your hand and we'll try to respond to those or have a conversation around that as we go. So Ariel, over to you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks very much, Donna. So we'll just pick up from where we ended in the ICANN 72 session in this diagram, and just want to remind folks that what we're looking at is the step following box 19 which is the rightmost orange box here saying applicant believes DNS stability panel's assessment of RZ LGR application is incorrect. Then what would happen next? So because this slide is getting really crowded, that's why [inaudible] additional slides following this to show the extended steps following step 19.

Basically, this is where the challenge process comes to play, is that the applicant initiates a challenge process to the DNS stability process requesting a recheck of the RZ LGR application. So here I want to emphasize the point is that this challenge process may deal with the technical mistake of RZ LGR implementation but not the RZ LGR rule itself. That's why the challenge is raised to DNS stability panel here.

So one of the paths is more the path that's probably preferred by the applicant, is that the DNS stability panel conducts the recheck and finds out the previous assessment was wrong and the label is actually valid, then the application will proceed to the next stages. So that will be a preferred outcome.

But the other outcome, which would be the DNS stability panel finds that the previous assessment is still right and the label is still invalid, then the application would be rejected again and the applicant is informed. So basically, that's the end of the challenge, and that's not something that applicants want to see, but it probably happens in this path.

So if the applicant accepts the outcome of this challenge process, the applicant withdraws the application for that specific label and this path stops here. However, there's some other scenario that the applicant believes the RZ LGR rule itself is wrong, so the calculation is wrong or incomplete. Then how would the applicant raise that issue? It actually needs to be raised to the generation panel itself because the DNS stability panel is not in position to determine whether the RZ LGR rule is right or not.

So what the DNS stability panel may do is to refer the applicant to submit a change request to the generation panel and that will be dealt with by the GP through its own process for updating RZ LGR. And here I use this dotted line because it seems to be outside the application process and seems to be outside this challenge process. It's something external and something to be handled by the generation panel. And it actually can happen anytime, not limited to the application period. So that's why it's using a different way of presenting this step.

So that's the extended step that staff and leadership team envisions, and hopefully that's helpful. And I see some hands raised. I will stop here. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Jeff, go ahead, please.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks, Donna. So I think I agree with all that. The only thing—I don't think we should actually include 26 and 27 in with the new gTLD program. In other words, the only way to challenge this in the actual application process is to challenge that it was not technically carried out right or—you used a word better than I did. Oh, technical mistake. There it is.

I think anything else needs to be completely outside the new gTLD program and would also result in the application being thrown out. In other words, I don't think we would want other applications to be held up—especially if it were in a contention set—simply because they want a different rule or they want a different character or whatever it is they want changed in the root zone LGR, because I think as you all pointed out last time—which makes sense—is that the LGR tables are out there, they will be out there, the applicants can look at them, and if they really wanted to challenge, they could have done that. If they really wanted to challenge a rule there, they could have done that at any point prior to the round opening up.

So I think we need to make it clear that 26 to 27 are not really part of the new gTLD program. They're completely outside of it. And it

also wouldn't just affect gTLDs anyway, it would affect ccTLDs and anything else if you're going to make these changes. So I hope that makes sense. I think I rambled a little bit. Sorry.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jeff. I think it makes sense, and I think that's what Ariel was getting to with the dotted line, is we see this outside the next round process as well. So that's something that once we get to ... maybe it falls under the category of implementation guidance or something, but we could make that explicit. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Hi. Yes. I actually have several comments. I would start with the easy ones, like for example block 25 and 18. Why don't we also have a path here? The applicant withdraws application for the label or readjusts, updates the label in order to conform with the root zone label generation rules.

But then I did not raise my hand for that. [Let us think] together. Any applicant is able to run its label through the tool that currently exists and is able to know whether its label is valid or not in advance, like today, if an applicant is thinking of a label, he could go ahead and run this tool—we've all seen a demo of the tool—and would already know if the label is valid or not according to the tool, to the algorithm used.

So why would an applicant go ahead with a string or a label that it already knows that it is not valid? Why would it still go ahead with it to the new gTLD program? And the answer would be because we are simply offering a path or a way for the applicant to

challenge the outcome of the tool, of the root zone label generation algorithm.

And here's where I stop and say, so, why are we offering this through the new gTLD program? This process should be able to happen like today. And if an applicant finds an invalid label and wants to challenge it, he could go to this panel that we are suggesting in the new gTLD program. Why do we have to incorporate this in the new gTLD program? And what is the benefit of that?

DONNA AUSTIN: Hadia, can I just stop you there? Ariel, can you take us back to previous slide? So I think what you're talking about here is the question that we have outstanding that relates to 12.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Exactly.

DONNA AUSTIN: So it's a decision here about if we accept that there is going to be a challenge process, then under what circumstances would we allow an applicant to proceed, knowing that the root zone LGR, that the label that they've submitted might be inconsistent with the root zone LGRs. I think that's the question you're asking.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Exactly, and that's block 12. I personally do not see the benefit of that. But of course, I'm open to ideas and discussion. My other

question would be, what exactly the DNS stability panel do? My initial thought that maybe the DNS stability panel is looking into issues beyond the root zone label generation rules, but that's not the fact.

So, is the DNS stability panel redoing the calculation? Is it running the same program that the algorithm already ran, or does it have a new program, or does it do this manually?

DONNA AUSTIN:

So Hadia, we have made a certain set of assumptions here when we put this process flow together, and we don't 100% know the answers to those questions because the SubPro recommendations haven't been approved by the Board, and the Implementation Review Team hasn't started.

So we've made certain assumptions here based on conversations that we've already had within this group. So there's two possibilities here. One is that the application system may not have accurately copied across the root zone LGR, and the second possibility is that whatever was given to who develops the application system—I think Dennis Dan referred to this at the—in transposing what's in the root zone LGR into some kind of IT format, it's been done incorrectly.

So we've had discussions among leadership what we think would happen with the DNS stability panel is that it would be a manual review, but we don't 100% know that. So that's what our assumptions are based on. And the DNS stability panel would have a much larger role than just looking at whether the root zone

LGR was applied correctly. There are elements that regardless of whether it's an IDN or a normal gTLD, it would have other responsibilities. But we've had to make some assumptions here in order to help us answer these questions. So, does that help?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Donna. Yes, indeed. I do think the DNS stability panel is important and that it has a role. However, I do not think that this role is actually rerunning the program or doing it manually, because I do not expect any manual calculations to be better than a program.

But I do agree with you that the panel definitely has an important role into looking into issues of security and stability beyond manual calculation or rerunning the program. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. In the spirit of testing our assumptions, can we go to the next slide? I think it was step 27, and looking at it from a practical point of view. And I understand, I appreciate this possible, tentative flowchart for us to discuss, deliberate. But I'm just thinking, again from a practical standpoint and testing our assumptions, is whether it is feasible to submit a change request to a generation panel which might not exist.

Generation panel, as you may or may not know, they come and go as a practical matter. They are formed, they deliberate, discuss, develop the proposals of the LGR, and from there, it's disbanded, to put it simply. So it might be the case that one generation panel or any generation panel does not exist in the future when the application process is taking place.

So again, just as a practical matter, do we want to put generation panel here, is it going to be something different? Again, just testing our assumptions and making notes of what's feasible or not. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. I think that kind of goes to Jeff's point about 26 and 27 really need to be considered outside of the new gTLD process. so maybe it's not the DNS stability panel that refers the applicant to the generation panel, it's actually, here's your other path if you want to challenge the calculation and information about the generation panel. And the applicant will have to understand all of these things that you've identified, that maybe there won't be a generation panel that they could go to. So I understand what you're saying, and it is something that we can only assume would happen. But I think with this process flow, we've kind of given the applicant two bites at a cherry. And if the second one comes back, then I think it's, in my mind, game over. But I think what you're saying, your assumption, is consistent with what Jeff had stated previously. Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. If we follow Jeff's suggestion that we do not allow step 26 and 27, I was wondering if there might be the case—and we should consider it—that someone wants to apply for a TLD, checks the root zone LGR, finds it's not supporting the TLD and then makes an appeal to the integration panel or whatever the ICANN group is responsible for that, and that appeal is ongoing, and while that is ongoing, they apply for their TLD. Then of course, we will end up to step 24 because the root zone LGR as it is now [inaudible] rejected, but there's an ongoing proposal that might validate it. I'm wondering whether we should cover such a case. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. Ariel, can you go to the previous slide? So Michael, is what you're suggesting related to number 12? So if the applicant decides to proceed with the submission, even knowing that it's failed the algorithmic check, that there's an option at that point that they launch an appeal process to the generation panel, assuming one exists?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, more or less, or, say, even started the appeal process days or even weeks before they started the application process. I was just wondering that if there is an ongoing appeal which is out of scope of this process but which should be considered as happening and we should maybe deal with that.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Michael. I guess that adds another complication, but it doesn't mean that we shouldn't try to cover it all. Okay, so I think we've had a good conversation, and Jeff has to drop off, so thanks for joining, Jeff. Ariel, can you go to the questions, please?

So I think the conversation we're having at the moment is, should the applicant be allowed to submit an application for a gTLD label knowing the label is invalid according to the root zone LGR? So I think what I'm hearing—so Hadia, if I understand you correctly, I think you're kind of sitting in the camp that suggests they shouldn't be allowed to. But I think there are others that are comfortable that if we look at that item 12, they should be allowed to. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Donna. If we can go back to the chart, please. Jeff put in the chat SubPro decided that every decision made during the evaluation should be able to be reviewed through a challenge process. And I agree to that, definitely. Let's go to the previous slide if we can. But let us think here, again, so the applicant runs an algorithm before applying. The applicant knows in advance that the label is not valid according to the algorithm.

The only reason that applicant would go ahead with an invalid label to the new gTLD program is that this applicant knows in advance—is that we offer a challenging process to that applicant. So if we think that this process needs to exist, it needs to exist from now. From my point of view, it has nothing to do with the new gTLD program.

So the applicant, if we need a panel for that, then this panel should be a standing panel that the applicant can go to now and go through a process to validate or unvalidate the label.

Anyway, so we still say that we will run the algorithm again, which is of course something we need to do. And if the algorithm is valid, then it goes to the DNS stability panel in order to recheck. And I think this is important, because again, I think the stability panel might look to things beyond the algorithm itself.

But actually, if the algorithm says it's invalid, then the applicant can update or abandon, but we give them another path. We give them a path that they would go to the DNS stability panel again. Okay, so this would be like a second validation, like we give them one more chance for a manual look. And again, I think if this one more chance should exist, it should exist outside of the new gTLD program. It doesn't need to be part of the new gTLD program.

But if we do give them this second chance and then the applicant is also allowed to challenge the panel in that case—and challenging the panel in that case, you're not actually challenging the DNS stability panel, you're actually challenging the root zone label generation rules. And in this case, again, I think it should not be part of the process, because you're not challenging the panel, you're challenging the root zone label generation rules, the content which needs to have a different path.

So I would say even if we give them this other chance to go through a DNS stability panel, it should stop there. But to go further, you're not challenging the panel, you're challenging the

root zone label generation rule. I don't think it has any benefit or it's wise to do it within the process. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: For question one, I'm wondering what exactly is meant. If we mean that the label is actually invalid according to the root zone LGR, then of course, I agree that this is probably outside the scope. If it's invalid according to the algorithm that is implementing the root zone LGR, then this is exactly step 12, what we are talking about. And here I think we have to allow for submission of the label and to give the applicant possibility to have the algorithm result rechecked. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. I think you're correct that this question should actually be—knowing that the label isn't valid according to the root zone LGR as reflected in the algorithm or the application system. So there could be a problem with application system and there could be a problem with the way that the algorithm has been developed from the root zone LGR. So I think what you've identified are probably two problems we have with the question. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I have a few items here. First of all, in the past, ICANN had issues with the applicant portal. ICANN had issues with tools. Data—so we shouldn't think that algorithms don't have mistakes, because they're written by people. People tend to do mistakes. And also, the same for data. It can be altered during the course, maybe due to technical mistake or due to some other reason.

For example, in the past, we had SWORD algorithm, which was quite questionable. So there were examples in the past of things which went wrong due to maybe mistakes in logic, in programming, or mistakes in code or maybe wrong data. So we shouldn't think that the tables or algorithms do not have mistakes. We need to have path forward to prevent this to be a deadlock. Because situation where for some reason, the algorithm or data is wrong in reality, and applicant has, "No. Why? Because we say so," I don't think it's in someone's interest.

And speaking about language panel, we might recommend during the times of rounds to have a standby panel, a set of volunteers who in principle are not against participating in a panel if the need arises. Maybe they will be paid or something. I don't know. But it will allow to gather one if the need arises, and without spending initial one or two months on this. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Maxim. Dennis.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Donna. So I think we are focusing on the ... I guess I want to call it a threshold by which an applicant can challenge the

application process at this earlier stage. So just in my understanding, question one needs to be tweaked. I think we are agreeing or at least leaning towards, yes, a challenge process should be allowed for the applicant if they receive a rejection, but the threshold is not that the root zone LGR itself is invalid, as Michael was pointing out. The root zone LGR—and when I say root zone LGR, it's the algorithm, the XML file, the rules, that is going to be available for everybody and anybody can make an implementation UI in order to use it.

So what is going to be a challenge here is that me the applicant, I use the root zone LGR, the raw file in order to test my string, and I test it and it's valid, but the UI presented to me through the program says it's invalid. So I want to challenge that result because I use my own UI and it says it is valid, so I want to challenge the implementation of the root zone LGR that is being used for the program. So I'm not challenging the root zone LGR itself, I'm challenging the implementation of it, the user interface. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Correct, Dennis. And I think discussions we've had in leadership and what I'm hearing here today is that there's kind of two possibilities here. One is that the UI itself was incorrectly transposed from the root zone LGR, and then whatever is in the application system has been incorrectly applied as well. So that would be the two circumstances that I think are possible in what we're talking about.

So Hadia, I want to come back to you. Are you now comfortable with the discussion that there are actually valid reasons for an applicant to challenge how the root zone LGR has been provided in the application system and transposed in some way?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, Donna, I am, because as you mentioned, mistakes could happen within the application itself. I do not expect if there are no mistakes. If you run the algorithm or check it manually, most probably, you'll end up with the same results. Yes, I am comfortable to answer your question. I still do think that we need to have a process for applicants to be able to challenge the outcome of the algorithm that is outside of the new gTLD program that maybe people could use now. But yes, I do see the point of view and I agree with it. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Hadia. Okay, so I think we've got through question one. Are people comfortable with where we're sitting? So I think, Ariel, it comes back to that number 12 in the PowerPoint that we had. So we've answered that question, that we think that the applicant should be able to proceed even if a label is inconsistent with the application system.

Okay, so now the second question is, what's the role of the DNS stability panel, I think. So, does the DNS stability panel have a role in assessing whether the root zone LGR has been applied correctly? So I think that's our second question. Any thoughts on this one? And I think what we're getting to here is whether the

DNS stability panel is the appropriate place to assess whether the root zone LGR has been applied correctly. Ariel, can you get back to the PowerPoint, please?

So I think if you have a look at what you have in front of you, on number four there, when we had a discussion around this, we foresaw that the DNS stability panel could actually pick up with the root zone LGR hasn't been applied correctly, most likely in the application system, and they will pick up on that. And then if they decide that it hasn't been applied correctly, then they would notify the applicant and the applicant would either be rejected at that point or ... I thought we had an option that they could resubmit.

But anyway, so there's a potential here that the DNS stability panel could pick up, unbeknownst to the applicant that the application system hasn't applied the root zone LGR correctly. So the label that they have submitted is incorrect. And then on what we've just discussed previously, if the applicant decides to proceed, then again the DNS stability panel has the role to confirm or deny. Michael, go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

I was wondering, looking at this diagram, it looks like the stability panel will always check the result of the root zone label generation software, which seems to be a bit overkill of their job, because usually, you should assume that the algorithm has been implemented correctly and only should check it if there is an appeal, if there's someone saying, "Oh, no, this is not the result which we expect the root zone LGR to give." But to always have the stability panel do that manual, I think that's too much. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. I'd be interested to hear other people's thoughts on that. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Short notice. If the applicant is able to provide proof that either the algorithm or the data for the particular table is wrong, why do we need to say, "No, we don't listen?"

I think we don't need to create something only for the round process, but some panel of sorts or something which takes care of such situation. But it can be used, but not limited to the round application window. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Right, Maxim, and what happens with IDN labels outside of the new gTLD program is not—I'll hand it over to Sarmad, but what we're dealing with here is we're talking about if an IDN label is determined to be invalid, should there be a challenge process? So I guess that's the question we're trying to answer. So I'm not disagreeing with you, but that's not the question we have in front of us.

Okay, Satish is saying that he thinks the stability panel should have resources who can verify the root zone LGR manually. So I think that's kind of not consistent with what you're saying, Michael. So Michael is suggesting that it would be, I guess, a little bit overkill to do so. But I guess we have to find somewhere for the applicant to be able to challenge a determination.

So I guess to Michael's question, is the only time that the DNS stability panel would do a manual check of the root zone LGR is if the applicant has identified that there's a problem [inaudible] the other way.

And Steve is saying in 2012, the string requirements were built into the application system, but they were still validated by the—I assume DNS stability panel. Yeah. Okay.

So I think given the importance of the root zone LGR—and obviously, we don't know how many IDNs would be applied for in the next round, but it seems even if it's a high volume or a low volume, it seems that it would be prudent for the DNS stability to do those checks.

So Michael, would you accept that, or do you still feel that it would be overkill?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, sure. If they want to spend their time on that, I have no problem with that. At least if I'm not part of the DNS stability panel. But I really think that if there's an algorithm which has been tested thoroughly, why should you always manually do the same things? Then why do you need the algorithm in the first place? But I'm fine with that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Michael. Okay, so I think back to our questions, Ariel. So I think we've answered question two, does the DNS

stability panel have a role in assessing whether the LGR has been applied correctly? I think we're saying yes to that.

And I think question three, we have discussed to some extent already. Is a change request made to the generation panel to update the root zone LGR outside the challenge process for the new gTLD program? And Hadia, I guess to your point, change request to update the root zone LGR can be made at any time and is not limited to the application period.

And I think that also goes back to Michael's point about there could be an appeal to the root zone LGR that's going on at the same time that the application window is open. So, is it something that we'd want to consider and allow somebody to submit a label knowing that that appeal is going on? Any thoughts on question three from folks?

I really would like to hear, if you're nodding your head or shaking your head, I'd really like to hear from folks because that's the way we're going to move on. I don't want to assume silence is assent here.

JUSTINE CHEW: Or put things in the chat.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Justine. Or put things in the chat. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hi, Donna. I'm not quite sure what the question is asking. So the change request can happen outside, or it is happening—it can happen outside of the process for sure. Is the question asking if it needs to be part of the process as well? I'm not sure what the question is actually asking.

DONNA AUSTIN: Ariel, can we go back to the slides, please?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: 26 and 27.

DONNA AUSTIN: So if after a second look by the DNS stability panel, the applicant is rejected, is the applicant then informed that that's the end as far as the new gTLD process goes? Your other options here are to go to the generation panel, but that's outside the new gTLD process. So I think that's a question.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Exactly. And it cannot possibly be part of the process because most probably, this is something that will take time. And how would you deal with it, right?

DONNA AUSTIN: Right.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, so I do not see it part of the process. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm just going to channel Jeff because he's left the call. He did suggest earlier that if after the second time, the recheck is done by the DNS stability panel and the result is still an invalid one, then we should consider stopping the application altogether there so it doesn't impact on other applications and the applicant can just—we just tell them go ahead and take your grievances to the GP, but it'll be outside of the application process and your application will stop here or will not proceed any further. So that's something that we might want to consider, making it clear. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Justine. I think you've done a very good job of channeling Jeff. And I would say that if in writing up our discussion, I think this falls into implementation guidance, that in considering this question, we think that this part of—if an applicant wants to challenge the root zone LGR, then that calls for a change request and that falls outside of the new gTLD process and doesn't—the label is taken out of consideration of the process, so the application is dead and has no consequence in further application processes. Does that make sense to folks?

Dennis, did you want to speak to your comment?

DENNIS TAN: Sure. I guess I was reacting to Hadia's latest comment about where do we want to put resources and make applicants happier. Again, I think we are accounting for these corner cases. I repeat—and I was putting on the comments here, unlike testing for the basic DNS labels, RFCs and IDNA 2008, applying the root zone LGR is not a simple task in certain cases. It could be very straightforward for an ASCII label and even a Latin label, but there are certain scripts that have various rules in terms of their codepoints, sequences, whole label evaluation rules. Could that push the root zone LGR to the limits? Not the root zone LGR but the application, right? The implementation of the root zone LGR, because the program needs to be coded by a human and humans can make errors, typos, fat fingers, you name it.

So I think we are [developing a] solution for those corner cases. And maybe a manual review should suffice because again, if you ask me to forecast how many [of these issues are,] provided the root zone LGR is going to be implemented and thoroughly tested—and again, manual review for those very few exceptions seems appropriate. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Okay, back to our questions, please, Ariel. So question four, I think what I will ask the team to do is based on the conversation we've had here today, just to update, start drafting a response to the questions because I think—not these questions, but the actual A3 charter question, because I think we're in a

position to answer that based on the conversation we've had here today.

But the fourth question here is upon receiving rejection from the DNS stability panel, should the applicant be allowed to amend the applied for label in order to conform with the application system or conform with the root zone LGR? Any yes/no answers to this so we could try to round this out? Steve.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks. For question four, it might be helpful to think about it in a little bit more of a granular fashion in that when you look at the word "amend," that could mean a lot of things. So it could potentially be about simple syntax fixes to make it able to be valid according to RZ LGR versus something much more of a substantial change to the string where it ends up being a material change. So in this case, maybe one is okay while the other is not. So I guess I just wanted to call out the point that amend is potentially a loaded word and that there might be more nuance here that allows the group to think about it differently. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah. It's a good point, Steve, because the label has obviously been applied for because it has a certain meaning, and just changing the label might change the meaning. So you're right, it's potentially a little bit more complex than certainly, I had initially understood about it. Michael, go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I voted no because I think it's really difficult to impossible to decide what changes should still be allowed and what should not be allowed, like Steve said, what is still okay? And therefore, my assumption would be that they can check that label beforehand and if it's not okay, they should have applied for a different one right away. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. Any other thoughts from folks before we have to close down? We're at the top of the hour. So it looks like Hadia and Satish are saying, yes. Okay, trying to be respectful of folks' time, again, we're going to have to revisit our timing for these meetings in light of the time changes that have recently happened, and also, I think we really need to extend these meetings to 90 minutes. So hopefully, people will be okay with that.

What we can do, we can schedule a 90-minute meeting. If we only need 60 minutes, that's all we'll take. But I think what we're finding here is that we would benefit from that extra 30 minutes. So what I'd like to do is get 90 minutes into people's calendars so that we have time to finish our conversation.

I think we've made some good progress today. And based on the conversation, what I'll get the team to do is draft up a possible response to question A3 based on our discussion here today, but I think we've had some movement, so that's terrific and I thank everybody for their contributions today.

Anything else that I've missed, team?

ARIEL LIANG: I think there's a quick reminder for the Registries Stakeholder Group's members to follow up on a request regarding question A1 and A2. I think it's regarding whether there's any concern about using RZ LGR for existing gTLDs. I think we're still waiting for a response on this question. So just a quick reminder on that.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Dennis says he knows that they're working on it, and it's coming soon. So thanks, Dennis, and thanks for the reminder, Ariel. Okay, I think we can end the call now and end the recording. So thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]