ICANN Transcription
IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group
Tuesday, 12 January 2021 at 18:00 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/gwJACQ

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar/2021

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and welcome to the IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team group call, taking place on Tuesday, the 12th of January, 2021 at 18:00 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 portion, could you please identify yourselves now?

Hearing no one, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription recording purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Please note, the raise hand option has now been relocated. You'll now notice it is on your bottom toolbar under reactions. Again, please check the bottom toolbar and select reactions to see your raise hand option. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to chair. Dennis Tanaka, please begin.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Terri. Welcome, everyone. I think we are six team members and staff so I think we can call it quorum and we can get started. So we have the agenda in front of us. We can check number one and number two. So those that attended last session, last week, we started with a preliminary draft charter and went all over the—discussing about the basis of the charter.

So we took a step back and said let's put all the information that we have available—and that's from SubPro Final Draft Report, to the staff paper, and TSG paper—and compare where do we have consistency, and where do we have gaps, and we'll start from there, with the principle of this working group is not expected to revisit policy questions that SubPro already discussed and arrived to a policy recommendation.

So those are going to be taken as—I think the word that we used last week was "assumption." They are going to be assumed to be policy and therefore we build on top of that, whatever gap or deviation is needed, as we are going to be discussing here. So that's going to be what's going to take most of our time today, to review the mapping document because that's going to be the basis to readjust the draft charter that we have in-hand.

That said, we have been going through this preliminary draft charter, addressing comments, changing some of the stuff that we already—for example, a lot of duplication of languages. We're trying to collapse those and addressing some of the low-hanging fruit edits—just a little different wording or whatnot. So those are being also worked in parallel.

Time permitting, we'll move on to item three on the agenda, look at the actual charter and see where we can go and make some progress there. And finally, AOB.

So I'm turning to the chat window. Jeff, "Can you give us access to the comments in the mapping document?" Yeah. I think that should not be a problem. And welcome, Maxim.

All right. So any comments, observations before we move on to the mapping document? Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to the mapping document. So Ariel, do you mind just going an overview as to how this table is being organized? And then, we'll jump in, into the substantive discussion.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Of course. So presented to you is the mapping document. And we circulated that later last week. And hopefully, you got a chance to see them before this meeting. Just a quick overview of the structure. The way we organized this is based on the section each of the recommendations covers.

So column A are the sections in the draft charter and the respective charter question number that may correspond to a relevant recommendation from SubPro, or the staff paper, or the technical utilization recommendation, or other studies—from SSAC, for example. So that's how it's arranged in a horizontal manner.

And then, column B is additional notes that we have provided, based on Jeff's comment—is to highlight whether there is any material inconsistency among these recommendations under the

same topic, and if so, what are they and whether there's a gap that we should call out. And also, they're color-coded in a way that you can quickly see whether there is consistency or inconsistency. And when you scroll down to the page, you can see that some of the recommendations from the staff paper were not covered in SubPro, or from some other paper were not covered by SubPro. So that's why some of the note cells are empty, because there's nothing to compare to.

And then, for the column C, it's basically the relevant IDN-related recommendations from SubPro PDP. So I don't think we need to go into detail in here. But at the same time, there is maybe a couple of recommendations that are not exactly IDN-related. For example, there is one recommendation about a challenge mechanism that SubPro was proposing. And that has some relevance to one of the technical utilization recommendations. So it's not IDN from SubPro recommendation but it's relevant to call out. But the vast majority are IDN topics under the SubPro discussion.

Column D is from the variant management staff paper. And one thing I want to note is that besides the recommendations themselves, we have also included some of the questions proposed in the staff paper for GNSO's consideration. So it's basically calling out the potential areas that may be impacted by these recommendations. So the staff paper has proposed these questions for GNSO to deliberate. So we want to be comprehensive here and include these questions in the relevant cells.

And column E is—

DENNIS TAN: Ariel, just a second. We have a few hands here and just want to make sure their comments are timely, as we are going through the table. So let's take Maxim and then Jeff.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I have a question, in particular about section A, where there are wording saying that all TLDs must use, basically, the new format of tables. But there is no text about legacy TLDs. And there were no information about how they migrate to new tables, how much time does it take, etc. Because if we don't add it somewhere, we will have instantly a situation where most of TLDs are basically bad ones. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Let me jump in real quick here, just to clarify and make sure I get the idea. It seems to me, Maxim—and please confirm—you're talking about the IDN tables, not the application process for a TLD. Root Zone LGR is just a tool to validate a label. But you seem to be talking about IDN tables and how the RFC 7940, the XML LGR format, and how you can represent IDN tables in that specific format. And of course, there are legacy TLDs today that publish the IDN tables in text format in IANA repository. And IDN Guidelines section four is trying to change that and change into RFC 7940. Is that where you are referring to?

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's a bit shorter. Do you see the selected cell in the window? It's D-something. And if you read it, there's a legal text. It says, "All TLDs and their variant labels must be defined by the RZLGR." It means all TLDs. You scrolled it.

DENNIS TAN: Right. It meant "TLD labels."

MAXIM ALZOBA: It should be clear that it's only for particular TLDs because if you leave it as is, it's a situation which we faced—some registries faced with ICANN Compliance, where they told, "Oh, no, no, no. You don't have new format of the table. You are bad one." If you approve it, it will be an issue.

DENNIS TAN: Right. I think we are conflating the IDN tables that describe what are your policies regarding acceptable IDN labels that you can create under a TLD.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Oh. Sorry. Yes, indeed. I think I conflated the strings and tables.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. In recommendation one, SubPro 25.2, and the TSG paper talk about the validation of labels that are meant to be used as top level domain names. It has nothing to do with the IDN tables. And that's what I was going to … This group is not supposed to talk

about the IDN tables, per se, unless the operational track determines that a policy group needs to talk about that. So I think we clarified there's a difference between the IDN tables that live under a TLD and how you determine the validity of a label, etc., that's going to be—it's applied for a TLD. But thank you, Maxim. That was a good question to clarify. So, Jeff, I'll turn to you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. That's helpful, too. A couple of general comments. So I completely agree that where the working group needs to focus is on the gaps between SubPro and the other documents out there because we need to make the assumption that SubPro will be approved into policy. So once that gets approved, then there's no need … Well, then the working group needs to decide whether there's really a necessity to go back and review it. And where there's no inconsistency, I don't think there is that need.

But on some of the things here identified as gaps, I don't really think that they are gaps or that they will be gaps. And the reason I say "will be" is that if you look at the first row, for example, the question from staff paper is to update the policies and procedures, which is something that the IRT will do during SubPro. So there's no need for the working group to do it.

So if something's a gap because it hasn't been done yet, the first question you need to ask is will that be done by someone else. And in this case, that someone else is the IRT for SubPro. And if the answer to that is yes, then this working group doesn't need to do it because it will just be double the work for no reason.

So yes. It's currently a gap but it will not be a gap. So because it will not be a gap, I don't think this working group needs to work on that. Issue. Hopefully that makes sense.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. I think it does. And I think Maxim also is thinking along the same lines and suggests, there might to be [inaudible]. So potentially, this group wants—or not this group but the future working group—needs to make the connection explicitly, rather than let's not worry about this but make sure that SubPro is taking care of that. Donna, I see your hand up.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. I agree that—identify the gap. Make it explicit that if it's going to be the implementation of SubPro, Jeff is going to address it, then let's just capture that as well. I don't think there's any harm in that.

But I do have a question about … Jeff, in chat you said, "I think there are questions related to how to deal with legacy TLDs." So I guess for me, that raises a question of with the recommendations from SubPro, is the intent that they only apply to gTLDs in subsequent rounds or is it retrospective? Does it go back prior to 2012 and beyond or whatever the opposite of beyond is?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So Dennis, do you mind if I answer that?

DENNIS TAN:	Go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:	Okay. Yeah. You're right, Donna. SubPro only looks to the future. When I was saying there are questions to legacy TLDs, I was referring to in this charter. So in the draft charter, there are certain areas where it says, "Okay. If you decide that this is the policy going forward, do we do anything about legacy TLDs?" And I have a separate comment on that, saying that that needs to be handled with some care because that becomes, now, a consensus policy potential as opposed to dealing with the future, which doesn't necessarily have to be a capital C, capital P Consensus Policy.
	But what I was referring to was that there are questions in the draft charter—this draft charter of, "Okay. If we decide this is the rule going forward, is there anything we should do about the ones in the past? And that's something that the working group may need to address."

DENNIS TAN:	Thank you, Jeff and Donna, for the questions. I think that's one of the differences, if you will, of the work of SubPro and this future working group. Whereas SubPro is more leaning towards the future, this working group needs to look at both. And as I put in on the chat, one of the areas that needs to be discussed, for example, has an existing registry operator applied for a variant TLD, as opposed to whatever mechanism is laid out for new rounds, or on a rolling basis, or what have you—so as an example.

All right. So no more questions on that one. Sorry Ariel. I think, hopefully, we didn't break your train of thought. It was a few minutes. But can I let you finish going through the table—the format?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. Thanks for the discussion. It's really not much to talk about, the general format, as it's pretty self-explanatory. So column E is for the technical utilization recommendations. Some of them were consolidated together because they're under the same topic and correspond to the same topic in the staff paper and SubPro PDP. And also, we call out some non-recommendations—for example, the single character TLD-related text is in the appendix B of that paper. It does have some suggestions but its not a formal recommendation from the study group. So I have included these in column E.

And column, F and G, they're SSAC papers related to IDNs. But the reason we include them here is because in the staff paper or the technical utilization recommendations, they mentioned some of the SSAC work on IDNs. And these are the ones that have been highlighted. So that's why we included them here. But of course, there is many other previous studies on IDNs. We don't have them in this table, as they are prior work and not really being highlighted in the most two important documents that we're working from here.

So that's pretty much it for the structure part. And I think we can probably talk about the substance. So back to you, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you for that explanation, Ariel. So let's now … Before I go into the … We're going to go into the substantive discussion row-by-row here. Any other comments about generalities? Okay. Seeing none, let's jump right into this.

So I will start referring to the row number in the Google Sheet, so row number three. This is basically affirmation of the SubPro about the importance of IDNs in the gTLD program. So nothing there, really, to discuss. And as a matter of fact, there is no charter question that is needed here.

I'm sorry. Maxim on chat. Yeah. I think, Maxim, you are right. Where there needs to be consideration, we'll make sure those discussions take place.

So moving on to row four. And this extends from the staff paper, recommendation one, the use of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules as the only source to validate, determine, calculate TLD labels and their variant labels and subsequent disposition values, whether it's an allocated or blocked label. And so, this is consistent with—that recommendation, the Root Zone LGR as a tool to validate the TLDs and calculate the variants—is consistent with the TSG paper on column E, recommendation one, and the conclusion and recommendation that SubPro arrived to recommendation 25.2.

And as Jeff pointed out, implementation's supposed to take care of how you really apply that language into whatever process, procedures, policy need to take place and will make the

connection that this also applies for existing TLDs as well. And that is relevant, you see, in column E, recommendation two. That talks about how or what should be—where does the Root Zone LGR need to be applied to? So one is for future applied-for TLDs, second for existing delegated TLD labels, and also to those labels that are reserved—the top-level domain names that cannot be applied by anyone. But also, you need to calculate their variant labels so that those variant labels are also put in a reserved status, if any.

So looking at the chat. Good question, Maxim. So Maxim is asking whether all existing TLDs comply [inaudible]. So we don't know yet. But that question has been flagged, if I'm not mistaken. Ariel, please keep me honest. That has been flagged as a data and metrics question that the working group might want to look at, in order to define future policy recommendations. Jeff, is that a new hand?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I just want to make sure, just to understand where we are. So for this particular topic, are we agreed that question one—or, sorry, the recommendation for future TLDs—that's already covered by SubPro and therefore, we don't need to look at question one in the staff paper, but for past, or for legacy TLDs, and also for assistance on 26.10 in the SubPro report, that's what we need to work on?

DENNIS TAN: Let me read quickly 26.10 again.

JEFF NEUMAN: Actually, no. Maybe not. Maybe I was looking more at how to calculate and all that kind of stuff. But maybe that's covered elsewhere. Yeah. This is just consistency.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. Exactly. But yeah. The principle of using the LGR as the sole source to validate TLDs is the one. So for future, I think what we are agreeing is it's a given, basically. SubPro is still not consensus policy but it's going towards that way. So we could pretty much assume that's going to be what we are going to have as a tool.

Now, there needs to be a—not sure a question or direction that that also needs to apply for existing TLDs, as existing TLDs, in the future, may be able to apply for the variant labels that are going to be calculated at a later point, as well as ICANN reserving labels for the top level that nobody can apply to. They need to also calculate those variant labels so that those labels are not applied for either. So I think we are on the same page, in agreement.

Maxim, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we have two items which we might reflect somewhere. First is legacy TLDs, which doesn't have rules for them, and basically you have a situation where, for some reason, a group of technical experts said, "No, no, no. You definitely have to kill that TLD," which is wrong.

And the second thing is to review the situation where one TLD is from the past—I mean one of the legacy TLDs or maybe one of the current TLDs—and another is from the future round. Because you will have to somehow make them synchronized in terms of rules. And it will create a situation where SubPro might not be enough for that because you will have to touch the old one. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Maxim. I think you're a little into the one possible outcome from running the Root Zone LGR to existing TLDs. So one is that a TLD—existing delegated TLD—is going to be found to be invalid or a variant with another existing delegated table. So we don't know yet. I think thus far, I think that the calculation has led to zero results. But if in the case that happens, yeah. I think the working group needs to assess that scenario and think about that question.

As well as you're referring to potential conflicts between variant labels that are going to calculated for existing TLDs and the future round of TLDs. How do they reconcile? I think that's going to be the question for the future group. How do you manage the application process for the existing registry operators that want their variant labels to be activated? Does that go through the new gTLD round? Do they have to wait for that? Or is anything open for them just to apply for, in any time, in any case? So I'm not sure.

I think that's a question that the group needs to discuss. SubPro, I think, is going to be clear as to what they're going to come up

with. What about the existing TLDs? Do they need to use the same window to apply for or they are opened up in a different process or what have you? So yeah. Thank you, Maxim.

So yeah. I think we're taking notes. And we have also this recording. So we can go back and check our thoughts here. So yeah.

All right. So I think we are good on row four. Let's move on to row five. And this recommendation has to do with inconsistency. This is going to be interesting. So recommendation five from the TSG paper and it's an implementation guidance from SubPro 25.3 talks about the case where a script is not yet integrated in the Root Zone LGR. So let's imagine something that we are familiar with. I don't intend to pick on it but something you are familiar. Chinese is not—or Hanja script, to be more specific—is not in the Root Zone LGR. How does the new round of TLDs or existing TLDs can apply for this one, if Hanja is not integrated in the Root Zone LGR?

So both TSG and SubPro arrived to the conclusion that the application needs to be on hold. But they disagree into the timing of that hold status. So that's mainly the inconsistency there. Jeff, I see your hand. Please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So for this, there has to be complete deference to SubPro. And the reason I say that is there were a lot of conversations on this. And it was because there were comments filed by staff on it and possibly even the Board. But there was a lot of conversation

on this. And this, now, I can say has full consensus of the working group. We came out with that document last night. So that means unanimous.

And therefore, assuming the Council approves and it goes to the Board, this is one of those where yes, there's an inconsistency. SubPro considered that, considered the TSG, considered all the other equities and came out with the conclusion that it did. So therefore, we should not touch this with a 10-foot pole.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. I'd like to hear others. Donna, I see your hand up.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Jeff, I agree with you, given the discussion that was had within SubPro and it was worked through. I agree that the strong preference is to adopt the SubPro recommendation. But I just wonder … This gets hard, I think, when you've got different processes going on. But I think it would be helpful if we could recognize, in some way, through this effort that this was discussed by SubPro, resolved, and subsequently approved by the Board, and that is the policy or the outcome. Just for completeness. I'm not disagreeing with you. It's just the manner in which we capture how the conversation happened and what the result was.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Jeff, is that a new hand?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So I don't think that capturing would be done by another GNSO group because this is another PDP. I think what you're referring to is in the implementation, ICANN should not only put something in the Applicant Guidebook but also may want to reference this as being a separate consensus policy or something like that. So that would be the place to do it. But it shouldn't be one PDP that is able to or should confirm the policy of another PDP. You're really talking about the Board and ICANN staff documenting it somewhere, as opposed to this new working group, I think.

DENNIS TAN: So thank you, Jeff. If I just offer commentary here on why the TSG—just to point out the difference of the timing. And I think the on-hold status, both TSG and SubPro arrived to the same one. But TSG—and I know this because I participated in the TSG working group—is that if we are agreeing that the Root Zone LGR is the tool that validates and calculates variance, then you want to know that in advance so that you can recognize any contention sets prior to delegating all the TLDs.

And that's one aspect of it. There are other considerations—expectations from the part of the applicant and whatnot. But from a technical standpoint, you want to know in advance all of the labels that applied for and their variants, in order to assess what contentions or whatnot you will have in the process. So if you allow other applications go through the process but this one is not yet integrated, it's allowed to go through certain—all the way to some point, where the contention is going to be delegated, and then you find out there are going to be variant labels that are

EN

already in contention with other TLDs that were just created then what do you do? So that's one of the use cases that we looked at.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, Dennis—

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. Go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: So we certainly discussed this. And I think the problem is—and this is no offense because I know you were on the TSG. But the TSG did not understand what the difference is between the words "on hold" and the words "not processed." The words "not processed," in ICANN speak, means that the application can't even be evaluated for any other aspect and can't do anything. It's basically akin to a rejection.

The SubPro discussed the terminology and found that that is not what should be done. It agrees with you that being on hold is the right terminology, in the sense that it's only on hold until those labels are figured out and then you can do the contention set resolution. But there's no reason why you can't do the financial evaluation, you can't do the legal rights objections, or you can't do all the other objections. There's no reason. If the applicant consents to doing that, there's no reason why you can't do all that.

So SubPro talked about this for hours and ultimately said—came to the conclusion that the terminology used by the TSG was not

consistent with the way ICANN uses the terminology and therefore came out with this view and also recommended a warning be issued to … Yeah. There you see it. "Applicants under such circumstances should be warned of the possibility that the string may never be delegated."

So I think this is one area … And this one, I'm pretty strong on because of the number of conversations. There is a difference between "not processed" and "on hold." And therefore, that's why SubPro used its terminology.

DENNIS TAN: Got it, Jeff. Appreciate the explanation. So I'm curious as to what others think about it. I think we're leaning towards SubPro recommendation to prevail here and take the language. Having heard Jeff, I think now TSG and SubPro seems to be closer, rather than farther. Edmon thinks it's fine, I would assume. Yeah. Okay. So Edmon's saying yeah, it's good. Donna, please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. I'm struggling a little bit with what seems to be a suggestion here to not discuss this at all as part of the EPDP. I understand what Jeff is saying but for completeness, I just … Just at a principle and conceptual level, I'm struggling a little bit with how we manage this.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. If I could just step in, from a principle level, Donna, the SubPro group had all of the TSG information before it, through the multistakeholder process, when it came to its conclusion and ultimately came out with this view. Since this was a PDP of the GNSO, and assuming SubPro gets adopted by the GNSO and by the Board, another PDP should not look at the activities of a previous PDP unless there's substantial reason to do so. And that substantial reason can't be, "Well, we don't like the way that that PDP came out on the issue."

So that's a philosophical, principled reason for us not to look at it. Otherwise, you could start a new PDP tomorrow to look at the SSAD. What's to stop that? Let's do a new EPDP on the SSAD. There should be value to precedent.

DONNA AUSTIN: Jeff, I accept that. But I guess what I'm struggling with here is that this is an EPDP associated with a specific topic, whereas SubPro was a wide-ranging one. So maybe the same expertise for both efforts isn't available. So I certainly accept that we don't want to be reinventing the wheel and we shouldn't waste time unnecessarily.

But I just want to ensure, for completeness, that we capture that where there was an inconsistency identified, we have to have a reason why we've chosen—or why the charter doesn't address that. So either we have a statement up front at the beginning of this charter, saying that the SubPro recommendations address blah, blah, blah, and have since been approved by the Board, and

EN

will not be discussed as part of this EPDP or we take it through this process in some way. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: I think it's important here that we're noting the potential questions that we can put in the charter. So I think we can note something— again, to make the connection explicit—that needs to be taken … Or if it is taken by SubPro, the future working group needs to follow that, in case there are obvious or big differences at some point in the future. So let's react to whenever we have a new draft charter and look at this specific point as well as others.

So in the interest of time, let's keep moving. So row six. So we have here the question or consideration about single-character TLDs. I think there is no material inconsistency here. It's only the matter … Well, there's a potential gap or something to think about is what can the future working group do in this case of single TLDs. I think both … The TSG did not issue a recommendation because the matter of single-character TLDs is not a matter of use of the LGR. It's basically policy, determining whether you can use a single character as a TLD in the IDNs.

So SubPro is recommending that it's basically giving a green light to single-character TLDs with caveats. So a potential question for the working group is to … Okay, so let's flesh out the caveats. But I'd like to hear other observations here. So again, it's not revisiting the question whether single-character TLDs can be allowed or not but to build on top of that and define a criteria—how to select those eligible codepoints or characters that can be applied for as a single-character TLD. Does that make sense? I see no hands or

observations. Jeff agrees. Yep. There you are. Okay. So that was a quick one.

Let's move on to row seven. And this is the question about the same entity. And I think there is not really an inconsistency here. SubPro basically arrived to the same conclusions as the staff paper, that IDN variant TLDs need to managed in two layers—by the same registry operator that is the Contracted Party with ICANN and also the same registry service provider, which is the relationship between a registry operator as their backend service. So those entities need to be the same in order to delegate or allocate variant TLDs. So that's row seven. Any comments here? Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Are we sure that no current TLDs which are variants one to another are in different hands? Because the answer is quite important. You cannot just pass a policy terminating contracts. It doesn't work this way. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Good question, Maxim. So a possible question. If, again, we are adopting … I mean if we take SubPro recommendation and the staff paper recommendation that Root Zone LGR is the only one source to validate TLDs and variants, and there are existing labels today [inaudible], do you grant [inaudible] in those cases? So that's maybe a relevant question for the future working group. [Inaudible] that point, that can be calculated, running the Root

Zone LGR into existing TLDs and find out whether there are variants. If there are variants, what [Inaudible].

[Inaudible] audio is breaking. How is that …? I have dialed out because maybe my connection is poor right now.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, Dennis. It seems to have perhaps straightened out. But we'll interrupt if it cuts out.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. So where do you …? So I was saying, I think … Maxim, is that a new hand? Okay. So I was asking … That was a good question. What about existing TLDs that are found to be variants? So that's one data point that we have called out or pointed out in the data and metrics so that future TLDs can find out.

And if that's the case, then the future PDP working group can find out what's the right policy, or process, procedure in order to handle those cases, whether it's grandfathering, exceptions, or what have you that need to take place in order to handle those. I think the case where … Yeah. You don't want to un-delegate a TLD just because they were found to be variants of each other but that was not the case when they were delegated, at some point.

Good. And Jeff also agrees. Right, for future TLDs, that should be already handled by the new round—the new processes. But existing TLDs, there needs to be a process to deal with those cases, if any.

All right. So moving on to … Okay. Jeff's doing a time check here. It's 1:59. I have another meeting at 2:00 so I will need to hard stop at one minute prior. So let's keep moving. So we are now in row eight. Or is it nine? No. Eight, right? Okay. And here, I want us to look at eight and nine as a bundle—not a bundle but together because they related to second-level domain names. And this is the only area or place where—actually, the row after as well. So this is the area where we're moving from TLDs to second-level domain names. And just because these domain names, of course, live under TLDs that potentially can be variants of each other and then you have all these combinations.

Just to put an observation here, as a backdrop so that we can understand better here, is that today, there is language in several of our Registry Agreements that requires a certain way to manage variants at the second level. So we're talking about variants now, today, at the second level in certain TLDs. And they either can be allocated to the same registrant or blocked from registration. And that language exists today.

So eight and nine, what they really do is to expand that in the context of variant TLDs because now you have two TLDs, variants of each other. And you have, in case number one, which corresponds to row eight, is the same second-level label—for example, the label "example—" into these variant TLDs. And row nine is a case where you have variants of the second level, and variants of the top level, and you have all permutations that that allows. So it's talking about how do you make that language consistent? So, Maxim, your hand's up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we might need a mark, saying that the situation where legacy domains—I mean domains registered prior to this fancy new set of rules—are going to be coupled … No, no. I'd better say there is a good chance of troubles where two variants of the same domain are delegated to different entities currently. And it will go into RPMs because it's URS—not URS. It's most probably UDRP. And yeah. There potentially is a situation where someone, somehow will have to decide how to take the domain out of hands of the currently-legit registrant, due to all these new ideas. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. So is that a potential question for the working group to consider? Again, today, registry operators can offer IDNs with variants at the second level. Either they are already offering that service or they can go through the RSEP process in order to enable variants in their TLDs. So I would assume they are already managing certain trademarks or what have you—use cases, if you will. I don't want to say issues, just use cases as to how they manage that. So I'm not sure. Unless if you can describe the actual question that the working group can look at, I don't see that that's going to be pertaining to this working group.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it might be both the currently-existing situation, where a couple of TLDs exist and the domain owner of the string one, which is a variant of string two in another TLD, which are both variants, is owned by another entity currently. And given the

principle of the same entity, it's a collision. And it should be reviewed or avoided. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. So I think we can point that question to, I think, a few rows above—whether there are variant TLDs today with existing delegated tables. So if the answer is if there is any variant TLDs today with delegated TLDs, then yeah. The working group needs to look at the question at the second—if there are any implications at the second level that registry operators need to look at. But in the case that there are no variant TLDs found among the delegated TLDs, then that question is moot, right, because there's not going to be issues at the second level.

Okay. So there's a ton of chat activity. I just want to see if anything that we need to discuss here. Yeah. I think, yeah. I think you are probably correct, Jeff. It's likely that there's not going to be any. But yeah. Edmon says [it's not that]. Right, not gTLDs.

Okay. So it's two minutes so I don't want to start a new discussion because I need to hard stop in one minute. So I think we have had a good conversation and discussion. And we have cleared some of the issues that we started last week. And from there, we can start looking at the charter with staff and start clearing the language that is there and working from there.

I think what we can do next week is to pick up where we have stopped today, continue reviewing, going through the mapping document, because I think this has been a good exercise and will

help us better shape the draft charter. Any other business before we go?

All right. Seeing none, thank you very much today. And we'll meet again next week. I think Terri already posted what's our next meeting. But basically, it's same day, same time next week. Thank you very much and have a good rest of the day.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. I'll be stopping the recording and disconnecting all remaining lines. Stay well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]