EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 09 September 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/pABmCg

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

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on the 9th of September, 2021 at 13:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please identify yourselves now? Hearing no one, we have listed apologies from Dennis Tanaka and Donna Austin.

All members and participants will be promoted to panelist for today's call. Members and participants, when using chat, please select either "panelists and attendees" or "everyone," depending on your Zoom update, in order for everyone to see the chat. Observers will have view only to the chat.

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. If you do need assistance, 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. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to our chair, Edmon Chung. Please begin.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Terri. Welcome, everyone. Thank you for taking time to join this EPDP call. In front of you is the very brief agenda. We're hoping that we can dive into a little bit of a discussion of the substance, starting this meeting. I have four items I want to—as an update. So I will note the four and then see if anyone has any questions or thoughts on it.

First one first, we did the survey in the last couple of meetings. The work plan is still being developed by the leadership team and the staff. We're trying to put a work plan together. We will look to try to circulate that before next week's meeting and also set aside some time next week to talk a little bit about it. But please expect it, probably, in your e-mail in the next few days. So we won't be touching on it today but we'll come back to that.

Second of all, the expression of interest for chair is still out. If anyone here in this group is interested, please put it in for September 15th. As you know, it's because I will be joining the

ICANN Board at the end of the AGM, at the end of October. So I'll be stepping down from chair on this group. I'll touch on this a little bit more on the next item. But the deadline is September 15th so please yourself or if you know anyone who may be interested, please direct them to it.

The third item that I want to note, just in terms of getting into the discussion today, I expect this to be a first pass. I think we will have multiple passes through the topics. I expect very much that there might be issues that we might have to park or move on to the next one and come back and so on. And especially, as we go through, we might identify areas where we may need to collect some data and metrics. And the staff team is prepared to do that for us but we need to spell out the specifications of what kind of data we want to inform our deliberations and decisions.

I think, at this point, my general plan would be to go through a first pass of the A and B questions and maybe come back and do a more thorough stock take of the types of data and metrics that this group would need to talk about the issues and come to a decision on things and we'd be able to get the staff team to help us actually collect those data so that it can inform a decision and discussions. So that's number three.

Finally, number four that I want to update everyone on is about my joining the ICANN Board. I have had the chance now to talk to ICANN legal and the ICANN Board—the BGC, the Board Governance Committee chair. Right now, continuing my work here should not be an issue. But of course, if anyone feels otherwise, please, at any time, raise your concerns or please feel free to raise the issue.

EN

Also, upon my joining the Board, if this group is willing, I can … You probably have seen Board liaisons to different PDP teams. So if this group is interested, and willing, and think that it might be useful, it would be possible for this group to seek a Board liaison to this EPDP team. So if people feel that might be useful, please let us know. And if you think it's valuable or if anyone has any concerns, please let me know as well. I see the note from the chat, Maxim. Yes. It ultimately will be the GNSO Council leadership's view as well but I think the view from this working group is probably useful for the Council's consideration as well.

So those are the four things. So if there is any thought whether I might be able to rejoin you guys and you feel that it might provide value to have me as a Board liaison back to this group, I would be more than happy, as I won't hide the fact that I'm quite passionate about the topic here and I think I should be able to contribute. So anyway, those are the four things. Any questions or thoughts about it before we jump into the agenda and whether there are any thoughts about the agenda, as well, for today? Thank you, Satish, Brian, and Nigel.

Seeing no hands, I guess we will jump right into the deliberations of the substance. So the first big chunk, A, is about the consistent utilization of the Root Zone LGR. The basic question is that the … I'll just read this because it's short enough. "The charter itself recognizes that the Root Zone LGR-related recommendations that the following questions seek to address were developed with the aim to achieve the security and usability goals for variant labels in a stable manner and were designed to be conservative, with the

EN

view that that IDN variant TLDs are being implemented for the first time."

So the overarching thing is we want to be conservative. And we are looking implement IDN variant TLDs. And the Root Zone LGR is a very important component of it. Basically, the first question is asking whether we would accept that the Root Zone LGR must be used as the one and only authoritative source for evaluating and accepting IDN and ASCII gTLDs.

The particular one for a1 is whether existing delegated gTLD labels need to also be compliant and basically be valid with the Root Zone LGR tool. And here again, immediately, we might have to ask the question of whether we need to ask staff to do a little bit of research on data gathering for whether the existing TLDs—if we run it through the current Root Zone LGR, whether there are any of the TLDs that may run into a problem. But the main question on a1 is whether or not we feel that it is the right approach to utilize the Root Zone LGR for all TLDs, essentially, and all gTLD labels. So that's open for thoughts. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. Maxim says we might need to communicate with the RySG. My question, I would just word it the other way around. That is does anyone know of a reason why we wouldn't use the Root Zone Label Generation Rules as the sole source to calculate the variants. I don't know. Is it the RySG that would potentially have that? The ICANN staff? But absent knowing any reason why we wouldn't, I think we should always strive for consistency where we can between existing and new TLDs.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. I guess that's a good way to put it as well. This brings me to … Steve, if you can jump to the mapping document. Everyone, you can refer to the mapping document as well, noting that the SubPro and the TSG, the Technical Study Group for the Root Zone LGR, their recommendations is fairly consistent in exclusively utilizing the Root Zone LGR. It's very tiny on the screen right now but please jump to the Google Docs document. If you have problems with the Google Docs document, I'm sure we can send you an Excel spreadsheet. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I remind us all that we do not recommend changes just based on, "Why not?" The source of technical expertise here is in technical teams of registries or backends. So neglecting this information input might not be a good idea. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maxim. Do I understand you correctly that you are supporting the previous inputs? Or you're asking this group to not be overly tainted by the previous study? I want to make sure I understand it correctly.

MAXIM ALZOBA: For clarity, I suggest we do request the opinion of registries in this case. Thanks. Because the previous studies, they were conducted by technical experts who didn't act on behalf of the group. Thanks.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maxim. I think the SubPro might not be the same but I see Jeff's hand up. Probably, Jeff can elaborate on that. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. No. I'm just agreeing with Maxim in the sense that … Just to clarify, my comments were that I think we should operate under the question of whether there are reasons not to have consistency. And the only way we're going to know that, as Maxim says, is to talk to the existing registry operators. It relates to the next recommendation two, if I remember correctly, about doing the calculations. It would help to know whether the variants that were certified by applicants, now existing registries, do they map to what the variants would be if we calculated it under the Label Generation Rules? So hopefully that makes sense.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. Yes. I think that makes sense to me. And that relates to a2 as well, if I recall correctly.

JEFF NEUMAN: Right. Yeah.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Thank you. So we might want to shortly take a1 and a2 together. But I think just on that point and also Maxim's suggestion that we ask RySG—get a sense of the room, whether that's a good idea as well. Satish?

EN

SATISH BABU: I support consulting—

EDMON CHUNG: You're coming through very softly.

SATISH BABU: Okay. I'll [type it] in the chat.

EDMON CHUNG: Sorry, Satish. Did Satish say he was going to type it in the chat? Did I get him correctly? So, Satish, you were coming through very softly. I think you said you were going to put your question in the chat. If so, please do. If not, please put your hand up again. But your mic was very soft.

SATISH BABU: Can you hear me now?

EDMON CHUNG: Oh. This is perfect now. Please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks. Sorry for that. [Inaudible] I support the—

EN

EDMON CHUNG:	Oh. No. We've lost you, or most of you, again. Satish, we are not able to hear you. Okay. Sorry about it, Satish. We'll watch out for the chat. The ccNSO, that's useful. Thank you. So Steve.
STEVE CHAN:	Thanks, Edmon. Sorry. It took me a second to get off mute. I just had a question about the nature of the outreach. I just want to point out that there's still the general outreach that's a standard part of the PDP process that will be done to the SOs, ACs, SGs, and Cs. And that's very much general. It's going to be referencing the charter questions. So I want to make sure we differentiate between that general outreach and any specific outreach that we might want to do.
	The other thing I would point out, that this is a representative and open group. So presumably, there are … Actually, I know there are RySG and ccNSO members on this group. So in some instances, we actually rely on those groups to be able to identify the specific issues that we might need to raise specifically. But oftentimes, those members will be able to provide us with guidance from the respective groups. So like I said, I just wanted to differentiate between what type of outreach we want to do here and make sure that it's separate outreach beyond the general outreach and also the contributions from the representative members on this group. Thanks.
EDMON CHUNG:	Thank you, Steve. You're reading my mind. I just jotted a note here on my notes that the next time I would be speaking is to

EN

actually give the RySG members on this team a little bit of homework, to go back to the RySG and get the information for us, since that was suggested. So I think that might be a good way to do it. Did I just say what, Jeff, you wanted to say so you put down your hand?

JEFF NEUMAN: Pretty much. Yep. I defer to Maxim now.

EDMON CHUNG: All right. Perfect, then. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I suggest we add to our usual to-do list after the end of the meeting, that for members of RySG is to check with the membership if any issues are foreseen in implementation of this as the only method or something like that. So just we do it in some form or fashion. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maxim. Yes. I think this would be an action item coming up out of this meeting—for RySG and also ccNSO members on this topic to get a sense of what people might think on a1—probably a1 and a2. Hopefully, we at least can talk a little bit about a2 as well because I think they're somewhat related.

But I do have a question. Besides asking them, is it worthwhile to get staff to do a bit of data gathering—to run all the existing TLDs through the Root Zone LGR so this group can see more clearly

EN

which ones might or might not be affected? It seems to me that it might make sense but I would like to hear from everyone as well. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Edmon. I'm assuming that … I know, Maxim, you're representing Registries Stakeholder Group so I'm assuming that, if I understand correctly, that you cannot … The members from this group cannot respond to this question and they require us to request this information back from them. Is that correct?

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Tomslin. Maxim, please.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes. We cannot say just for all registries right now. But we can request this information out of Registries Stakeholder Group. Some TLDs are not part of the Registries Stakeholder Group but most active who participate in technical part of life of Internet and ICANN are members. So we will have, I'd say, majority of answers. But I remind you that the interaction with the constituency is not fast. It's usually one week or so at least because the meeting was yesterday and the next meeting is in two weeks. So we will have to conduct it offline via mail list. We might not have answers by the next week. That's what I mean. Thanks.

EN

EDMON CHUNG:	Thanks, Maxim. That's well-noted. In response to Tomslin's question, just to make sure everything's clear, I think right now, they probably can't represent the whole RySG. They will go back, and do a bit of homework, and report back to this team. That seems to be the approach. Jeff?
JEFF NEUMAN:	Yeah. Thanks. I think at the … I think question in a1, if we can go back to the charter, I think that's almost an overall question that we really can't talk about anymore until we get how that would play out for the delegated gTLD labels. That's the information that Maxim and the RySG can help provide, as well as the ccNSO.
	So it's almost like we have to go to a2. And for that one, I would ask ICANN staff to help us figure out what the self-identified variants were, according to the applications that were submitted. And then, the second part would be to take those self-identified variants and map them against the label generation rules that we do have to see if there are any inconsistencies because the questions in a2 are hypothetical. What if they don't comply? And we don't know whether any do not comply. So we need that data.
EDMON CHUNG:	Yep. That seems to be the case, for sure. I see a couple of questions from Satish and also from Gopal in the chat—also getting a sense of how do we gather that data. I'll probably put it to Steve for that in a bit. But I see Nigel and Sarmad on the queue. So Nigel.

EN

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much. Good afternoon. I suppose two parts to the question. One—and Jeff covered this, really—that presumably, ccNSO might have a view. I know they're not directly impacted like the Registries Stakeholder folk but there might be operators there that would have a view.

And secondly, I had understood that this particular part of the recommendation, a1, it was picked up in the SubPro work and it's been widely articulated. I'd assume that there were fundamental reasons why you shouldn't go beyond this. Perhaps it would be a good opportunity to explore those for a second. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Nigel. That's probably useful. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. Just going back to the data question, I wanted to share that there are three, I think, specific, probably, questions based on the question which is being raised. One question is whether all the existing top-level domains are valid, based on the Root Zone LGR. The second question would be whether the variants which have been identified are also variants determined through the Root Zone LGR—if they're not, then how they differ.

And then, the third question actually, which may be a little harder to answer is that when variants are allocated through the Root Zone LGR—sorry, they're determined through the Root Zone LGR—they're determined as either allocatable variants or blocked variants. I think in the application process, that distinction was probably not made at that time. I was just wondering whether we

EN

then would be able to answer that third question or not or how we answer that third question. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Sarmad. I take it that when we formulate the ask for the data, we probably should take note of that and be careful about how we said it. Nigel, is that an old hand? If so, I'll come back to you. But okay. Thank you. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. I just wanted to address Nigel's point. SubPro looked only or was able to only look towards future new gTLDs that will be delegated. So it was an easier determination, if you will to require all future TLDs to follow the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. What we didn't really have jurisdiction to do was to examine the impact of those label generation rules on the existing TLDs or what to do about that, if there was nonconformity.

So the issues considered by the SubPro were more of the nature of it makes sense to have one set of rules going forward. The Root Zone Label Generation Rules were developed by experts and went through all these processes so there's really no reason not to use that as the authoritative source going forward. But unfortunately, that doesn't help us answer the, "Okay. But if we went backwards now, how do the existing TLDs stack up against that?" So thanks.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. Yeah. I think that's an important clarification. Also, building on what Sarmad has said—I think a little bit in response, probably—when the last round was put in place, IDN TLDs were allowed and they were asked to put their suggested IDN variant TLDs in as well. The question is how that now falls into the Root Zone LGR and whether it combines.

So I think … This is a2. Yes. Thank you, Steve, for highlighting it. I was going to say that it seems to me that in the discussion, we are really looking at a1 and a2 together. A1 is focused on the applied-for gTLD and the whole set of variant labels. A2 is specifically, in the last round, applicants were asked to self-identify IDN variant TLDs. And I don't remember fully but it might have said which ones you were looking to delegate into the zone as well. If that's the case, then that answers a little bit of what Sarmad was asking. But we'll probably need to look into that as well. But together, a1 and a2, I guess that's one area that we might want to ask staff to gather some data and metrics for us.

So I'll go to Jeff and Gopal and then I'll put Steve on to explain a little bit about how we would ask staff to gather that data for us. Jeff? Jeff, is that a new hand? Oh. That's an old hand. Gopal?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you. Thanks, Jeff, for partly answering my concern about the way in which we would get the questions done in. Either way, I am understanding that there are other methods. Earlier on, there was a limit—upper bound on the number of characters that can be used. For example, when we were registering our domain name, it was eight. .edu is common. www is common. In the middle, we

can have only eight characters maximum. So is that bound still existing? What are the [relaxations], and is it language-dependent?

EDMON CHUNG:	Thank you, Gopal. This is an interesting question. I don't remember what the last round was, nor whether the SubPro actually has any specifications on that. Sometimes it's based on the Punycode. Sometimes certain registries—for second-level registrations, certainly—make certain limitations. But I honestly don't remember, for the 2012 round, whether there was a limit set or whether SubPro considered that. So Sarmad or Jeff, if you have any ideas on that, please let us know as well.

But with that, I would like to see if Steve can maybe explain to us how—because it seems like this is certainly something that we would need the data. We will need to know which ones may be impacted, is it a widespread impact, and how to make the decision on existing delegated TLDs. So Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:	Sure. Thanks, Edmon. The first thing I want to point out is something that Justine posted in the chat already. That's that the drafting team for this charter actually identified some sets of metrics that they thought might be useful to this group, which was intended to be non-exhaustive. So if this group determined that it needed additional data or metrics to do its work, then it was perfectly within its rights to ask for more data.

EN

That said, Edmon was asking about process. We generally have a form that the group, or the staff, or the leadership team—some combination of that—should fill out. That basically asks questions about the nature of the data, why it's needed, timing, and things like that. And then, that can be considered by either the staff team or potentially, if there's actually dollars and cents involved, in the sense that we might need a vendor to help provide the data. Then that becomes a slightly more-involved process.

So just to summarize, there's some suggested data and metrics that the group might find useful. Those are included in the charter. I don't remember exactly what section because I'm not looking right now. But in the event that there is additional data and metrics that this group feels are needed for the work to be completed, then there's a form that gets completed. So those are the basic two ways.

Just to add, the ones that are included in the charter already, I think it's just a matter of the group agreeing here that that data is needed and then, staff can take it as an action item and try to action it. Hope that helps. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Steve. That's quite useful. I have to admit, I haven't been through this exercise enough. Others who have been through this type of exercise, please jump in to help as well. My question might be should we collect …? The question is … We're going through a1 and a2 now and immediately we see a need for this. We might see more as we go through a3, a4, and each one of them. Some of them might not need. Some of them might need. Is it a better

EN

approach for you guys that we go through at least a batch—put a few together and ask—or should we fill in a form every time we bump across something like this that would need the data?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Edmon. I think that if we could batch them together, that's obviously helpful. I think one of the homework items that you identified is to have all of the members of this group, or all the participants as well, to take a look at the charter questions ahead and try to identify them in advance. So that's ideal if we can get things grouped together but we understand that you might not understand the need until you actually look at the question in-depth.

I just wanted to add, in reference to the form that gets completed, it really is intended to try to provide some guiding questions to make sure that the data request is well-understood, the need is well-understood as well. And that really stems from the fact that gathering data and metrics is … Even if the data doesn't cost anything from a dollars and cents perspective, there is still a cost from time and effort needed to actually gather that data. That's why there's a form, just to make sure that everyone is well understanding why the data is needed and a sense of the scope of how difficult it would be to gather it. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Steve. That's very useful. And yes. That's part of the homework. As I mentioned in the early part of this meeting, the idea is that as we go through this, it becomes much more clear

EN

that we are going to need this data. For those of you who have done your homework, sorry for taking a further road. But hopefully, it's appreciated that we try to go through some of these questions and identify the need.

Gopal, is that an old hand? I'll go to Jeff first.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Old hand. Sorry.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. No worries. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. This is getting away from the data a little bit but my question was more on the substance of this one, on a2. It was let's say that an applicant identified variants and because it did so before any Label Generation Rules, there's probably a chance that they may have identified variants or not identified variants that may now be identified using the Root Zone Label Generation Rules.

I guess the question for Sarmad and others is, "So what?" What if they were wrong? What is the practical impact and then what is needed to fix it or does it need to be fixed is the question I have for Sarmad or others that have more expertise.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. If we "fix it," it's either that they have to change it or we would have to not exclusively use the Root Zone LGR. It seems like that's the directions. But Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. There was actually some language which was already included in the application process or in the applicant guidebook as well for the previous round. I think it may actually be useful to look at that language vis-à-vis the status of self-identified variants. So that's, I think, one point which the group should consider.

And then, given that there may be possible … Because the Root Zone LGR work was done from the ground up on how the script should work, there may be potentially some diversion. I guess we will get that data and come back to all of you.

And then, of course, there are multiple ways to address it. As Jeff said, the group could decide that, of course, the tables which we used then and those by the community, if they defer, one option is to say that the Root Zone LGR is applicable. The other option, obviously, could be that there could be … I think the TSG suggested, also, possibility of grandfathering some of the older options—not necessarily overriding the Root Zone LGR. So there are other options which the group could actually discuss to see what would be the best way forward. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Sarmad. That's useful. Yes. Grandfathering certain things could be something that we recommend as well. So that's

EN

another possible direction. Yes. I'm seeing no further hands but it seems to me that a1 and a2 is quite hinging on having that data.

So I will make a suggestion and I want to get a sense of whether people feel it's the right thing to do. We started off to try to go through A and see which ones we want to take data on. Another way of going about this is to go through the list of data that the charter group has identified and sign it off so that staff can start working on it. As we discuss the issues, we might already have those data available, rather that keep parking everything.

Can I get a sense whether people think it might …? In our next meeting, is it more useful to keep going, each of the topics …? Some of them might not actually need the data, again, and some of them will need such a thing. Does the group think it's a better use of time to go through, at least, the ones identified by the charter team first and send staff off to gather that data? Or should we keep doing what we are doing right now, which is going through the items and parking the ones as we go along? I see Jeff says we keep going. Anyone else? Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah. I was just going to say that I think there's benefit in going ahead and then we later request for that data. You did mention that we'll have many passes.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. That's useful. Then, in the interest of time, we still have 10 minutes. So I'll jump right into a3, at least to start it. We probably won't finish it but let's keep going unless people want to come

EN

back to a2 still—a1 and a2. Tomslin, I'm guessing that's an old hand. Gopal?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Yes. Thank you very much. Maybe it's just an archaic term but originally, we used perhaps something called fully qualified domain name. That includes the host name. Are we still talking about that combination? Will we factor the host name? Then, on Unix boxes, it can be 255 bites. There is reason why we should limit the characters. But is it still there—that fully qualified domain name—that IDNs are reconsidering?

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Gopal. The fully qualified domain name, I think that's a basic requirement for the DNS. So we are focusing on the TLD part at this point. Some of the questions might be focusing on the second level or the level of registration for gTLDs. A fully-qualified domain name would probably be more on the whole DNS platform. So as we're currently focusing on the TLD part and second-level part, what we need to make sure is that it doesn't break the fully qualified domain name. But I'm not seeing the exact relevance. But of course, the overall thing cannot break the FQDM rule. Hopefully that makes sense.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: [Kind of, sort of]. We can come back. We can [docket] the question [inaudible].

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. So I'll jump into a3. We have 10 more minutes. I'll close on time today. That's the aim. So a3 is actually following from … The SubPro actually has a mechanism to challenge or appeal certain types of actions. So following from a1 and a2—of course, in the future as well—if an applicant puts in a TLD in the IDN variants strings and it has a disagreement with the Root Zone LGR calculations, how should …? Should the applicant be able to appeal and say, "Wait a minute. We think this is actually the right thing and there's a problem with the Root Zone LGR?"

If that's the case, should the appeal and challenge process that the SubPro put together be utilized—I guess, a little bit expanded—because we have to define how it would handle this issue. But the bigger question is if a situation arises that an applicant puts in their application and in the variant TLDs and the Root Zone LGR comes out with a different one, how and should they be able to file an appeal or challenge? That's the question for a3.

Gopal, I'm guessing that's an old hand so I'll go to Jeffrey first. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Edmon. I think that every … The SubPro approach was that every decision made by an evaluator should be subject to a challenge. And we use the word "challenge" instead of "appeal." "Appeal" is used for the third-party objections, and the GAC objections, and things like that. So we used the term "challenge" for an evaluation result. I see it can happen in two different ways. One is a challenge because the applicant thinks

EN

that the evaluator made a mistake. Or two, it's that the evaluator didn't make a mistake but that the applicant thinks that the label should not be invalid anyway and should proceed.

So I think that there's no reason not to have that challenge process. The question is on what grounds would the challenge be accepted or could the applicant succeed. That's the tougher question and I think that's what we need to think about in terms of guidance to ICANN—the implementation teams that are implementing this challenge process.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. Yes. I think that's what this group needs to come up with, although the question, of course, is whether we use that challenge and appeal mechanism to start with. And I would like to, if you're willing, draw on you to maybe explain a little bit. Although we've asked everyone to read the SubPro work, it might be useful if, Jeff, you are willing, right after I go to Sarmad, to explain a little bit how the challenge and appeal system actually work and which elements this group might need to think through. That may be useful for the deliberations as well. But first, Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Edmon. Just for information, there is actually a built-in mechanism within the Root Zone LGR process where any one who is or does not agree with the particular proposal for a certain script can actually raise that with the respective script community. And the script community can review that input and possibly, if it agrees, update the proposal for that particular script. And then

EN

obviously, integration panel would reconsider the proposal from the respective generation panel or the script panel. So there is also that mechanism, which is built into the Root Zone LGR development, which also, obviously, could be exploited in this context. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Sarmad. That's very useful. Those are the two avenues. There is the changing of the Root Zone LGR—the process for adjusting, or amending, or updating. And there is the challenge and appeals process for the new gTLDs.

The question that this group will need to think through is when and how to call upon these two things—whether or not we call upon the challenge and appeals first. And then, maybe as part of that, it actually needs to call on the Root Zone LGR amendment process and then wait for that and then come back to the new gTLD process or whether we don't need the challenge and appeals process and we just hold everything, and you just go through the LGR process and then come back. So that's really at the heart of this discussion, in my mind. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. I think that both need to be maintained because I think they both serve different purposes. So the process that Sarmad's talking about generally is used when the LGR rules are first released and I think that's important. But I think applicants need, potentially, a quicker way to address either something that the evaluator did wrong and/or a problem with the Label

EN

Generation Rules. In the latter case, if it's a problem with the rules, then we may figure out how to get the … Sorry. I forgot the name of the … Was it implementation community? Sorry, Sarmad. You said it would go back to the—

EDMON CHUNG: Integration panel and the generation panel.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. So it's possible that it could still go to an integration panel. But I think if you look at here … And I had Steve pull up—

EDMON CHUNG: Sorry, Jeff. Let me stop you here. Can you give a highlight of one minute and then we'll start with this in the next meeting? Because we're running out of time.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. That's what I was going to do. So essentially, any evaluator decision, whether it's on background screening or this, the determination made would be subject to this evaluation process. Essentially, it's supposed to be a lightweight challenge process. It's supposed to, essentially, just use the criteria that was in the guidebook to determine whether the evaluator made the right decision or not. And this chart goes into the different types of challenges that one could do.

What we would do, if the group were amenable to it, for IDNs is we would do the same type of table. So we would say who can

EN

challenge it? Who is the is challenge heard by? And what would be the result if the challenge succeeds? So it's pretty simple to update this chart. And then, like I said, the more difficult part is the second part of the question, which is, "Okay. What is the criteria to use to judge whether the evaluator determined something was invalid when it should be valid?"

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. Yes. That's the challenge and appeals process. And we are out of time right now. So I think there are two homeworks. We'll start with a3 as we come back next week. Two homeworks—to take another look at the data and metrics. And if there are ones that you can foresee that we need to bring up, we will start to take a first batch and ask staff to do it as we go through A and B.

And take a look at the challenge and appeals mechanism, because we're going to start with that, and see how this integrates with when we hit a situation where the applicant doesn't agree with the Root Zone LGR. Do take a look, also, at the Root Zone LGR update process as well that Sarmad has said. So these two homework.

And then, we have a couple of action items. RySG members and ccNSO members, please go back and take a look at whether there are any impacts and report back. And finally, read up on the materials and sign off. I note that there are still people who haven't signed off on having read all the items, materials. Please do that.

EN

With that, we are one minute over. Any burning questions? If not, thank you, everyone, for joining. We'll reconvene in a week.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. I will stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Stay well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]