ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 04 August 2022 at 13:30 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/KAYVD

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

DEVAN REED:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Thursday 4th August 2022 at 13:30 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call, attendance will be taken by the Zoom room.

We do have apologies from Dennis Tan, Michael Bauland, and Nigel Hickson. And Maxim Alzoba will be arriving just a few minutes late.

All members and participants will be promoted to panelists for today's call. Members and participants, when using the chat, please select everyone in order for everyone to see the chat and so it is captured in the recording. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have view only chat access.

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

need assistance updating your statements of interest, please e-mail the GNSO Secretariat.

All information and documentation can be found on the IDNs EPDP wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, and over to our chair, Donna to begin.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Devan, and welcome everybody to our IDN EPDP call today. A little bit light on attendance. But that doesn't mean we can't continue with our work. And for those that are in the other room, I'm sure Devin will get you over here very shortly.

So just as part of the update today, Ariel and Steve informed me last Friday—informed the leadership team recently that the ICANN—I think it's the GDS team that are responsible for the implementation of policies when they're developed, they're going to start trialing something a little bit different to be a little bit more—I don't know whether active or prominent or whatever the word is in the work of the PDP at the time as it relates to implementation.

And some of you might have noticed that we have Michael Karakash that attends these meetings. He's been on, as far as I can remember, all of the calls that we've had. And Michael's from ICANN Org, but I think he's with the GDS team.

EN

So what we've asked Michael to do today is to give us a bit of an overview about—it's not another step in the process, but my understanding is it's intended to help PDPs think about the implementation as they're going through their work rather than develop a final report absent any consideration of how it can be implemented.

So Michael, if you don't mind, I'll hand it over to you. And you can explain to folks what the plan is. And also, if people have got questions, feel free to ask them of Michael. I'm sure if he doesn't know offhand, we can certainly get an answer later. So Michael, can I hand it over to you?

MICHAEL KARAKASH: Sure, Donna, no problem. Thanks for the introduction. Yes, exactly. So we've been meeting—I'm part of the GDS team. In GDS, I'm part of the policy research and stakeholders program team that reports to Karen Lentz. And what we're doing is it's kind of a new idea, but it's not very new to ICANN, because we've been doing this for a lot of the PDP has already. It's just we're trying to create a more formal, transparent process that we can replicate for a lot of the PDPs to ensure that the work that we're doing doesn't delay the process of the review once the PDP is completed, but the work is conducted in parallel to ensure that we don't cause any delays.

So we're still in the process of trying to figure out what's the best method of doing this. But currently, we want to do the analysis in parallel before the close of the PDP. I know that there's already a process that we're doing here with EPDP and everyone on this

call has been really great in working through these recommendations, but I'm going to be the one who, as the GDS liaison—I'm on the same team as Sarmad and Pitinan actually, but they're on the more technical aspects, I'm going to be the one coordinating the review and the input that ICANN Org is going to be giving to the draft recommendations once they're in a state that's good enough for ICANN Org to provide their input. So I'm going to coordinate with a lot of other teams like Legal and Compliance and Technical Services to ensure that the feedback is incorporated and provided in a method that's easy for the working group to understand. I know Steve and others can provide more answers. But if you have any questions, we can definitely look to provide those answers to you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. And personally, I think this is a really good initiative, because what we've seen with some of the PDPs is once it gets the implementation, it can be complicated. And not just from a strictly the implementation point of view. But also implementation review teams do have a tendency to hash out issues that were discussed in the PDP.

So I see this as a positive initiative that may overcome some of those delays that we see further down further down the road when it comes to the implementation of PDPs. And I think also, anything that can enhance the Board's consideration of PDP recommendations is also helpful.

I think all of us understand that we have a number of challenges with the work that we're doing here, because we're trying to—

EN

not—well, we are, in some respects, trying to second guess what the processes for the next new gTLD process would be.

And I think Michael, being part of Karen's team, is really helpful for us, because Karen is also responsible for doing the ODP on the SubPro work. So maybe there's some something that they're seeing there that we haven't thought of here that Michael can share with us, or even Sarmad or Pitinan. And so I think it's a positive development. I don't think there's anything we should be worried about. And I look forward to—Michael's been a silent partner, I suppose, from ICANN Org, but to the extent that he wants to be a little bit more prominent and share any—if there's been issues that ICANN Org has been thinking about as we've been going through this work that Michael wants to raise, I'm more than comfortable for that to happen. So does anyone have any questions for Michael or any thoughts on this as kind of an addition to the process that we're working on now? Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, thank you, Donna. Rarely speaking from the Board, I guess, I'm glad to see this happening. And I want to say thank you, Donna, for suggesting something like this to happen a couple of ICANN meetings previously, at the GNSO Board meeting, and I'm glad that this is happening. I think this group can make best use of it. And thank you, Michael, for paying attention to the work and look forward to your feedback to the work and to smooth out the process. And as Donna said, if there are any questions, I think it's good to raise them early so the team can work on it as we think through the different options in terms of policy.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. Okay, so with that, we'll get into today's call. So what we wanted—and this is our first discussion so it's not the last discussion on that—Dennis Tan raised an issue on the mailing list about for the language that we use, I suppose, when we trying to distinguish between IDN gTLD, whether it's the primary or whether it's a variant. And Dennis in particular had concerns about the use of the word primary and that it may be if we maintain that distinction in our reports and also in our discussions, then we should think about whether there are other things that we need to think about in terms of impacts for a primary gTLD as it goes through the process.

So if, for instance, IDN gTLD, the registry operator wanted to retire that string for whatever reason, and leave the variants working, is that a possibility? And that's not something that I believe is part of our work. So we've actually taken that and put it in the parking lot from a leadership management perspective, and understand that it could be something that we would come back to.

But what I said in response to Dennis was that we are aware that some of the phrasing and terminology that we're using in the drafting of the recommendations that you guys are reviewing isn't consistent, and we're aware of that, but we're trying to make it as descriptive as possible so that people understand what we're talking about. But because it's sometimes very hard to distinguish the differences, then we are conscious that we have to clean up the language that we use.

So, I did note that we were thinking about a glossary, we think that would be helpful And what Ariel is going to do here in a minute is just go through—she's pulled out some key words that we should think about developing a glossary for and also some of the sources that we could go to for developing the meaning of those.

But what I really want to focus on at the end of this is I just want to have a conversation around the use of the word primary when we talk about an IDN gTLD. And also set, because set can mean many things. And I think when we've been drafting language, the set has a number of different permutations that it can take on. So I'd like to, if we can, have a discussion and try to get a little bit of clarity around that and see whether in some instances, set means one thing, and in another instance, set could mean a different thing.

But I'd just like to have a conversation around that today, we're not going to make any decisions. But I am also aware that when we were having a conversation last week, it seemed that my understanding of a term that we were using wasn't necessarily the same as someone in the working group.

So we're just going to have a conversation around that today. I don't want to make a big deal of it. But I just think it's timely that we had that conversation. And then once we get through that, we'll go through—I've got a brain blank here. Ariel will tell us what comes after that. So Ariel, if you can take us through the glossary, and then if folks have got questions or suggestions about the glossary, that'd be great. pleased to hear that.

But the intent here is not to kind of get into the glossary today. It's really to identify some of the key terms and where we would drag—or sources that we would use to develop the glossary for the purposes of this IDN EPDP. And I think that's the other important distinction here. This is for the work that we are doing. And I'm also conscious that when we have these discussions, we have kind of a common understanding of what we're talking about. But when we go to put that on paper, it may change as we try to get the language a little bit more concise.

So with that, Ariel, can you take us through the glossary list? And then we'll come to the primary issue after that.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Donna. So I guess as Donna summarized earlier, today's purpose of starting to discuss this glossary is because we understand the need to provide clear, concise, precise and consistent definition of specific terminology, which are repeatedly used during our deliberation, and also may be unfamiliar to casual readers. So that's why eventually, we need to develop such glossary list as appendix perhaps in the initial report. But definitely, we don't need to do it right away at this moment. Because as the group drafting the recommendation language, some terms may be more relevant or important to including a glossary list. So we could do it little by little. But this is the main purpose of discussing this.

And then I just want you to draw attention to some existing sources that already include glossary that's relevant to IDNs and variants and issues that we deal with. So for those who—we

actually mentioned these existing sources before, so the first one, which is the oldest one is the integrated issues reports on IDNs, that was a rather old report in 2012. And that actually served the basis of some of our discussions, especially related to the label states of variants. So anyway, that's kind of the old report, but it includes a pretty comprehensive glossary list that we could possibly reference.

And then another document is the IDN implementation guidelines. The latest version is version 4.0, published in May 2018. That guideline is mainly for second level related IDN implementation, but it does include some important key terms I will show very shortly that we can also borrow or reference the terminology definition in that document.

So that's the second document. And then the third one, which is one of the key documents that we used for developing the charter of this EPDP and also understanding the context of those questions, which is the staff paper on IDN variant management. And that document also includes a glossary list, and then we probably don't need to reinvent the wheel and maybe we can just borrow the definitions there too.

And then the fourth document is the ccPDP4. They have a policy proposal that's under construction, but they already started appendix to define terminology. A lot of them are related to variants specifically, but they also have some ccTLD related terminology like meaningful representation, countries and territories and though things are specific to their group.

So these are some existing sources, and I just want to show you some examples here. So, the integrated issues report, the oldest document, the link points you to the appendix, where the glossary and the terminologies are defined and then the list bullet point here, you will see they have already defined certain terms that are relevant to our current deliberations, such as activation, allocation, delegation, the internationalized domain name label, the IDL set and variant, etc. So these are some of the terms that are already being defined in that document.

And this is the IDN implementation guidelines and the link points to the appendix where the terms are defined. And again, I want to emphasize that because the guidelines is really related to how IDNs are managed at the second level, the definition of these terms even they look very much similar to the previous document integrated issues report, they're mainly in the context of second level. So that's something we really want to kind of keep tabs on or just keep at the back of our mind.

And then one thing I want you to note, that they actually have a definition of primary IDN label in the implementation guidelines. So we can reference how that's defined. But again, that's regarding second level. So we probably want to modify if we want to use primary to define top level related glossary.

And this is the staff paper for IDN variant management, and it's a limited set of terms that are defined, because a lot of those other terms are already defined in other papers and studies. And I believe that's the reason they don't feel there's a necessity to repeat those. And then also, these are the most relevant terms related to variants. And then most of the terms are related to these

EN

label states that our group already discussed, as one of the charter questions. And then there are some other terms that are defined like registry operator, ROID. So I think those are terms, they believe it's relevant in a staff paper, and maybe that's something we can consider whether we need to define them in our glossary.

For ccPDP 4, I just kind of put together this table because the document is still under construction, it doesn't have a URL that I can link to, but I just wanted to show you how they try to define the terms there. It's not a comprehensive list, but only the list including ones that are related to variants. And mostly the glossary is related to label states like withheld, active, allocated, rejected, delegated. So I think they're basically borrowing from the staff paper how that's defined, but happy to be corrected if that's not the case. So that's how they developed the list.

And then here, I just want to consolidate all these lists together and show you the overlapping terms or overlapping kind of a glossary that's being defined in all these four papers. And you can see there's quite a lot of terms all of the papers touched on, basically, it's about the label states. So potentially our label state related recommendation, we can include that as glossary in the appendix as well.

But then there's also some documents, they both defined what IDL set means here and also some paper, they define what code points mean here, so, not all of them, but we see, at least two have a definition for those terms. So maybe we can also consider whether those things are worth defining for our glossary or whether that's not super important.

And this is to show you that some of the terms are defined in certain papers but not in others. So, as I mentioned earlier, the IDN implementation guidelines define what primary IDN label means, at the second level, and then staff paper defined what ROID means. So that means for the EPDP's glossary, we can also single out some terms that are repeatedly used in our deliberation, but we may need to figure out how to define them, because we may not have a reference point in some existing studies.

Here is the issues for discussion, and I will just read what's on the slide, but happy to turn over back to Donna to start a discussion. So, first during our deliberation, we have adopted language terminology that may be technically correct but appears to be commonly understood by members of the team, but the language containing our draft recommendation should be more precise to mitigate any misunderstanding or ambiguity.

For example, it will be beneficial to have a discussion about what we mean by two terms that often used. One is primary or primary IDN gTLD. And then the second term is sets, variant sets or variant label sets. And then whether the context in which we use those terms can change their meaning.

Here, I want to show you some existing definition related to these two terms. So for primary, in the IDN implementation guideline, it says it's an IDN label applied for or submitted by a registrant. So obviously, this is regarding primary IDN label at the second level. So that's how it's defined in the implementation guidelines for primary. And then if we do want to have a definition of primary gTLD, at the top level, that definition will need to be modified.

EN

And then for set, there's some existing definition in the integrated issues report. So it's really in the context of the IDL set, which was related to the IDN labels. So first, we should learn what IDN label means. So this term is used in RFC 3743 to talk about individual labels that make up IDNs. It identifies the label that is under consideration under the language table. So that's what IDN label means, then IDL set, ADL set is IDN label set. So how it's defined is a label whose code points are all included in the [inaudible] repertoire, along with all of the labels arising from the application of the code point variant rules on that first label.

So when I first read it, I don't think I understand it clearly. I don't know whether that's something we want to use to define sets in our deliberation, whether we can just borrow this or we need to make it extra clear, the set means you have a primary label and then you use the root zone label generation rule to calculate its variants that include allocatable, and blocked, and then all this is regarded as a set. I don't know whether we need to do that, or we can just borrow this existing definition. But at least we have this reference point to look at to begin our discussion. So I guess I will stop here and turn over the floor to Donna, and then see whether there's any comments or questions.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you, Ariel. And thanks, again, for the great setup work, we're very fortunate that Ariel can really dig into these things for us and provide meaningful context when we have these conversations. So I think it's really helpful to identify the glossaries from other reference documents that we've been using as part of this work. But also identifying where there's common terms that

are used and not so common term. So thank you to Ariel very much for that.

So I guess just to kick this off, what I would like to have a discussion around is when we talk about the primary IDN gTLD, what is that? What does that mean for folks? And for me, what we're really talking about is we're just making a distinction between—we're really talking about this in the context of when somebody applies for an IDN gTLD. So we're identifying the primary as—and I think Dennis might have referred to it as the source in his e-mail, and then it's got variants that will be attached to that.

So just like to have a conversation around what do we mean by primary, and are people comfortable with that as a term that we use in our discussions because we understand what it means? And then whether it's okay to use it when we draft that language. Because I know [inaudible] identified using the word primary in one of our recommendations recently as problematic. So that's what I just want to try to get a sense from people. Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Donna. So I think the word primary serves a purpose. Now, at the technical level, we understand that all labels are equivalent, meaning they're all independent. There is no primary that we can fix from the technical side. But actually, the origin of the primary as well as the variants is not technical, but it is linguistic. It is the language communities that actually propose that a particular word has to have a variants.

So if you look from that perspective, it does serve a purpose because the first—suppose, for example, IDN variants are not allowed, then what would be the label that will be used for registration? If variants are allowed, we have a number of choices what could be primary, what is not primary. But if variants are not allowed, the default label that would be used to register would, for me, be the primary. So therefore the primary has a meaning for the language communities, and I believe that now the question of retirement of the primary, now if the linguistic communities feel that this is the primary for linguistic reasons, then I would assume that the possibility of retirement of that label would be fairly low. But I do concede that we do have a problem to handle if the primary label needs to be retired. Thank you very much.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks for that, Satish. I hadn't thought of it from a language community perspective. But I guess if I understand you correctly, it's the language community that would identify what the primary TLD would be, and then associated variants that they wish to use as a set—do I dare say that? So for the application purposes, and then moving forward, I guess it does have a relevance. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Donna. So few comments. Not totally, I guess, related to each other, but still, to some extent. Since we're talking about primary, I guess the language community would determine that given a label, what would be its allocatable or blocked variants, which obviously is now encoded into the root zone LGR. So we can refer to the language community or if we actually refer to the

root zone LGR, we are in fact referring to the language community, which has actually encoded their, I guess, thought process into this formulation. So root zone LGR in some ways then could be really thought of as synonymous to the community point of view on using the script.

Primary label is largely the choice of the applicant based on their own business model. And, of course, then given a primary string, root zone LGR, slash the community, then devise a formulation on which particular other strings need to be tied up with the primary string in a variant relationship and then what should be the disposition of that variant, whether allocatable or blocked. At least that would be a way of looking at it from my point of view.

I wanted to also raise a couple of other points. First of all, in some cases, some of these definitions may actually depend on other definitions. So for example, we would need to define a label, to define what a primary label is, and a variant label is and so on. So in some ways, there is some relationship between some of these definitions as well, some dependency in a way. So that's something to think about as well so that we can probably define those items which are more base and then work on the other items or definitions which derive from those previous definitions. Just as a way of working through it.

The last point I'd like to—

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, can I just ask you a question on that last point you made? So when you say primary label, is that the same as primary IDN

gTLD from your perspective, or are we talking about something different?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sure, primary IDN gTLD, so primarily labeled would be—yes, I'm talking in the context of an IDN gTLD or a gTLD. Actually, any label which is being applied for at a top level. So in our context, of course, that's IDN gTLD.

So the last point I wanted to make was that in the discussion we had during the IDN implementation guidelines, it was suggested not to use the term variant, because variant is ambiguous, because variant actually can be at two levels. If there are two characters in a language, let's say A and B, which are variants, then we call those characters code points. So variant actually could be at a code point level. But if we, for example, formulate a label, let's say, A, B, A, then they actually can be variants of the label as well.

So variants could be of code points or variants could be of labels. And sometimes when we use variants by themselves, it becomes ambiguous in a text that if the context is not available, whether we're talking about code point variants or labeled variants.

So in the IDN guidelines, the community, IDN guidelines working group recommended not to use variant by itself, and use either variant code point or variant label, and then I guess develop other terminology based on that. Just a small note. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Sarmad. I'm starting to appreciate that there's more to this than I had originally thought. Maxim, go ahead.
MAXIM ALZOBA:	I have a question. From the technical perspective, there is no primary label. There is a set of labels which are variants of each other. And what is the benefit to call one of those equal labels primary? It's initial. If someone applied for something, it's the initial label, and others are variants of that. But also, the first label is a variant of others instead. So what is the benefit or reason to have one of them called primary? Why do we need it? Thank you.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Maxim. So that's exactly the discussion we're having. So Dennis raised this question in an e-mail a couple of weeks ago. And [inaudible] also had some problems with using the word primary in some of the language that we had in the recommendation. So that's why we're having this conversation.
	As chair of this group, I think we've come to understand that primary is equal to I guess Dennis referred to it as the source label. So when there's an application for an IDN gTLD that is also seeking variants, we have to identify a primary or source label. And then there's the variants. So I think that's why it's important in the context of our discussions, but what we need to understand is whether we carry that through in our recommendations. Which we could still do, provided we have an explanation around why we have used that terminology. So Maxim, that's exactly the conversation we're trying to have. Sarmad, and then Edmon.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Donna. I'll try to respond to the question which Maxim is raising. So the motivation, or perhaps the reason for identifying a primary label comes from how the variants actually can be defined. So if, let's say there are two labels, A and B, there is a possibility that an applicant applies for label A, and B is available as an allocatable variant. And therefore the person can eventually get A and B both.

But the way root zone LGR works, that it's not symmetrical from a disposition point of view, meaning that there is a possibility that if the applicant applies for label B, label A then is blocked, it's not allocatable. And therefore, the applicant may not actually get A and B together at any point in time.

So, depending on whether the label or primary label was A, they can get both A and B. But if the primary label was B, they can only get B but not A. So the choice of primary, because of the fact that root zone LGR dispositions are not symmetrical, actually makes eventually an impact on the calculation of variant labels. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Edmon. And Maxim, is that an old hand? Did you have something in response?

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's a new hand.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Did you want to respond to what Sarmad said?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, go ahead, please.

MAXIM ALZOBA: First of all, if one label is a variant of another label, they are equal, it's from the theory of sets from mathematics. And thus, it doesn't matter for which of A or B someone is just trying to apply for. They apply for A, and then they block B, because it's variant of A, or they apply for B, and they block A because it's variant of B.

Also, it's quite dangerous to call one of equal labels primary, because later it will be a notion to kill the whole set if something happens to the primary. Because it's important. No, it's not important. It's initially applied for label. We shouldn't invent new definitions when the old ones are enough.

So I recommend us to stick to applied for label, because it describes the items and there is no need to say that it's primary because it was just applied for. And after the application phase goes to deployment, etc., it's just in root zone, and there is no difference between those zones. They belong to the same registry or backend registry and that's it. I don't see the reason to bring something new which doesn't have value. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Edmon and then Hadia.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Donna. Speaking personally here. So I think whether we use primary or applied for is very similar. In my mind, what's primary is the one that's applied for. And I want to reinforce what Sarmad said, which is there is a difference. What is applied for or what we call primary is the one that is used to put in the LGR and generate the set and also most importantly, the disposition that is applied to each of the labels generated out of the set.

So there is a difference in that sense. And also, in the rare scenario where in the future, there are changes to the LGR, I believe we would also use the primary or the applied for the label to regenerate the set and see if there is any problems, whether there are any grandfathering required and so on.

So I think policy-wise, whether we call it applied for or primary really makes not a huge difference, but some designation for it is important and to me, primary is the applied for string.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I raised my hand basically to comment on what Sarmad said, and basically Edmon and Maxim said a lot of that. So I do agree that some designation is necessary, of course, for the initial label.

And I raised my hand to ask Sarmad, does the primary equate to applied for in his point of view? And I think based on what has been said, that the answer is yes. So, again, for me, it doesn't matter a lot whether we use primary or applied for or maybe initial, whatever. But I think using the word primary might suggest other meanings. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. Go ahead, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: First of all, there is no ties at all between what was in the application and registry agreement. After it's deployed, that's it. It doesn't matter, just the history. Because if you say that some registry had something in the application, [inaudible] registry doesn't have application. An applicant has application. Then when they deployed, everything is forgotten, there is no link.

And in IANA, all TLDs are equal. And all we can do is say that there is a set of labels. And if some LGR says that one of those labels is not in the set anymore, all we can do is say, "Okay." The label which is split off is just independent. That's it. And also, in IANA, if you check, there is no primary things, all are equal, and I underline all TLDs currently are independent. And it's not decided if we have to change this. So please do not conflate applicants and registries. Those have different roles, different agreements. And it's not the same. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Maxim. And to that point, I think what we're trying—and we recognize that the discussions we're having here within EPDP, I think there is value, because what we're mostly talking about here is the application process and some of those future steps.

So I think from an application perspective, when we're having those discussions about an application for an IDN gTLD, then it does make sense to either refer to a primary or what is the source label or what is the initial applied for label. I think there is value in doing that.

But I accept that further down the track, once the application has gone through the ICANN evaluation process and the registry agreement is signed and things are delegated, there isn't any distinction at a technical level. But I think what we're trying to understand is, is it still okay to the purposes of our discussion, to have—I'm just trying to make sure that when we talk about a primary, or primary IDN gTLD or primary label, that we're speaking the same language within this group. And I just want to make sure that we're consistent with that.

But when we flip it and we're talking about parts of the process which is post evaluation, it may be different. The primary is no longer at issue. So I don't disagree with you, Maxim. But I think we're just trying to put it in the context of the discussions we're having here. And particularly, we're trying to work out the application process. I think it does help to have that distinction between—I think that the word that I like the most is probably source label. But let's just get a common agreement on what we can use and what we mean by that, I think will be helpful. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Donna. To Maxim's point, I think no one is arguing against the fact that from a technical perspective, all the variants are equal. So there is no difference from a technical point of view between what we consider as a primary or applied for label and a variant label. I don't think anybody debates that really.

But from a business point of view, and if you distinguish between application as well as post delegation, I also agree with Donna. I think there is a need to distinguish what we consider as a primary. Whether we call it primary or applied for label, okay, so applied for label would work in terms of the application process. But once the application process is done and is delegated, then it's no longer applied for, but it may still be considered as some sort of a primary label. Because if you consider the fact that a registry that has gotten hold of what we are talking about as a primary level, and then decides to request for the activation of a variant later, it's important to know which is the primary and which is the variant, so to speak, from business point of view.

And the other thing also is we have a standing recommendation that says that all the labels that a particular applicant applies for and gets goes into the same registry agreement. So again, of course, this is probably an implementation issue. But I think there is still value in distinguishing between what we consider as the primary label or the original source applied for label versus a variant. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Justine. So Maxim, one quick follow up and then I want to wrap this up, and we'll move on to a conversation around the set. Thanks.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think for the clarity, it would be beneficial if we just asked staff to draw the situation where it's application phase, where the entity applied, then something goes, all those [inaudible] evolution, etc., answers, questions. And if they successfully pass that, then the middle phase, second phase is delegation. At this moment, registry cannot do anything, but actually follow the instructions of ICANN and do whatever they ask to be fully compliant to become the registry.

And the third phase is registry phase. And what happens to those, for example, they applied for label a, and mark that variants, B and C are eligible. And they allow it, for example, to go with A and variant B regarded to be okay for them. And they allow it to go to delegation with both., Then delegation of A, B and C, for example, it was decided not to be good for the set.

And then the registry phase. And also, I remind you, we haven't decided yet that it's going to be one single contract, and not for example, two contracts mentioning each other. So we shouldn't conflate items. And yes, the same entity goes through all those three phases, but the roles of the same entity are quite different. And after we passed to the third phase, there is nothing as applied for is valid. Please try to check the registry agreement, there is nothing about applied for entities or nothing applied for information, it's just obligation of an entity called registry after the

execution of the agreement. And that's it. I think it may be beneficial for us to understand this. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. I accept what you're saying. But I think the charter question is set up in such a way that we know when we're talking about the application process or when it's a question about the registry agreement or when it's a question about delegation.

So I think the three phases that you've identified are reasonably consistent with how some of the charter questions are drafted. So I think that when we're talking about the application phase, I think it does make sense that we have identify or are able to distinguish when we're talking about a primary or the source label, and then what the variants of that would be. So I think that makes sense.

So anyway, from what I hear, I think folks are reasonably comfortable with the—primary may not be the best word to use. But I think when we use it in the context of these discussions, we all have a common understanding of what it is. It might be the primary IDN gTLD, it might be the primary label, it might be the source label, it might be the initial string that's being applied for. But my sense is that when we talk about primary, collectively, we have a similar understanding of what it means. And that's what I was trying to get to, just to make sure that that is the case.

I think with the drafting of the language that we're doing, we will need to have a closer look at that and ensure that—because I hear the concern about use of the word primary, it kind of gives it an elevated significance when that isn't necessarily the case. So

we may, in the drafting of our language, I think we will have to get away from the use of the term primary. But that will become clearer as we get closer to the drafting, the first initial report.

So this has been a really good discussion. I think it's been really helpful. The next one is I want to talk about the set and what folks mean, what set means to folks. Because we talk about a set, which might encompass the primary gTLD and the variant labels, or it might be just the variants of the variant label set. So I'm interested to hear from people, when we talk about the set, what are people talking about?

Sarmad, maybe can we start with you? Because I think you're one of our experts here. Would you mind just giving us your—when we talk about a set, what you think that means? And if there's a distinction from an application perspective and then perhaps in that delegation phase or post application phase.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Donna. So this, basically, at least the way I would look at it is the set represent—it's basically a set of labels where each label has one—potentially a tag associated with it, either allocatable or some designation. But eventually, primary or source label, plus all the variants which are generated through the root zone LGR, all together would form variant labels set. At least that would be my understanding. So the source label would be part of the set, as well as all the variant labels allocatable, or blocked, which are generated, and over time, some of those labels may change states, as we've discussed. They may go from allocatable

EN

to delegated eventually. But all those still remain within that set. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think if we're speaking about the application, or evaluation and delegation phase, we may say that it's applied for label. Maybe it stops at evaluation phase. Because later, it's just a set of few TLDs. And if there is no special link between application and the actual life of a registry, the if we decide to use primary, it would be logical to install procedure of reelection of primary if old primary is not good anymore, because they're all equal in the set after delegation. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Maxim. Any other thoughts on set? I have to say that when we come to drafting I, I have a lot of trouble with this because we try to explain what we mean by the set and the set may mean different things in different circumstances. So the set is the primary plus variant or it could be just the—anyway, this is the one that I personally have the most difficulty when we come to drafting language side. I'd like to keep it as simple as possible.

So, Satish is putting the set equals the applied for an all variants generated by the root zone LGR irrespective of disposition. So that's not what I would have understood, but again, Satish, this is a context question, I think, because if we talk about the application

process, then the set would be the source of the applied for label and the variant labels also applied for. So context I think is important. So when we use the term set in the application process, what do we mean? Any other thoughts on this one? Zuan, go ahead.

ZUAN ZHANG: Thanks, Donna. When we talk about set, I agree with Satish's definition. Set equals applied for gTLD plus all variants. I agree with this definition. But I may not agree with the latter part. I think it may not include all variants, because variants may include delegated and blocked variants. So, I may propose that set equals to applied for label plus all delegated variants or all requested activated variants. I may propose a definition like this. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Zuan. So with your first suggestion, that the delegated would only come into play once the gTLD application process is finished and the contract comes into play. So I think, again, there's a distinction between the point in time when we refer to set as to what that set may potentially mean. Maxim and then Sarmad.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we need to distinguish the application phase where you have applied for label and applied for set. Not necessarily all the panels approve that. Because after things go and happen to those items in application, and it's allowed to delegate a set, then we have delegated IDN label set. And at different phases, different meanings. So at the initial phase, I suggest we use applied for set,

IDN set, and applied for IDN label. And after something happened and approved, not necessarily the same set, we see. It's the IDN label set for the registry. Those are different things.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Donna. Just that we need to—there are sets and then there are going to be subsets of those sets. We are already talking about subsets for IDN label sets. So for example, we already talk about or allocatable variant labels, which is obviously a subset of the larger set. We also talk about the blocked IDN labels, which is also another set, or sorry, another subset of the larger set.

So there can be many different subsets. There can actually also be, as you were saying, a set of delegated variant labels and source label. So that's another subset. So there can be many different subsets of—you can actually use the subsets or sets as well. So you can actually call them sets as well. Sets of labels, which we need to refer to at different points in time or different stages in an application or delegation.

So I guess the question is—and then there's actually a superset of everything, which includes primary and all the variants which are generated by the root zone label generation rules, which was sort of the starting point.

I guess we will eventually need to have perhaps names of multiple of these subsets and the superset. And we can call them by

different names, we can set those names. But it's not just one set we eventually would need to refer to. As I said, we're already referring to subsets, like allocatable variants and primary or source label and blocked label and so on, and there may be more.

So I guess one thing I wanted to point out is that there are these sets and subset relationships. And maybe we want to identify all of them, and then maybe fix some names for them, whatever we want to call them. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So I think that's actually helpful to identify that set can also mean different things depending on the circumstance and the use of subsets could also be an interesting way to do this. Okay. Any other thoughts on set? So I don't think set is—it's a little bit murkier than primary, I think. But I think if we explain within— So I guess my concern is that when we do put out a draft report, that we need to be clear what we're talking about when we refer to set. So if we just have set and we explain what we mean by set in that context, might help us with this.

Yeah, so you know, that subsets are the distinction between the [allocatable or delegated blocks.] I think when we talk about sets in the application process, I think what we're talking about is that primary or source label plus the additional labels that have been applied for and that's what we refer to as the set. But once we get out of that application discussion, then it could be much broader than that, and perhaps more to the precise technical use of the word. So that's a good way to put it, Maxim, that they may belong to different moments in the TLD lifecycle.

EN

Okay, so if we don't have any more thoughts on this, I think we'll leave it there. Justine did have a question. So at least this is for our use of primary. Moving forward, if we refer to source or applied for label when we're talking in particular about the application process, does that sit okay with folks? And we try to wean ourselves off the use of the term primary. Is that something that we think we can try to do moving forward? Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it's fine to use applied for label during the application phase. Because it's not finished yet. It's not decided yet, etc. Also, we may use, applied for IDN label set. Because for example, this particular applicant says, "Okay, I think that those labels, B and C, I think those are mine too potentially." And it's up to them and procedures if they're allowed to delegate or they have right to keep it forever.

And during delegation, it's something between the registry life and approved application phase. So even at delegation phase, I am not sure we would use applied for label because they approved, not just applied for. And after approval, the delegation happens. And after that, we potentially might need to use the set of IDN labels for this registry agreement if we decided that it's a single registry agreement. And if for some reason we decided to create a term primary, we need to have the process of reelection, which one of you is primary, because for example, this particular country says, "Okay, this language is not supported anymore by our country." But it's not the reason to kill all other labels. Thanks.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. So I think I like the applied for label set to describe set in the application process. So thanks, everybody, for the discussion. I think it was really helpful. I think moving forward, let's try to move away from the use of the word primary, because it seems to be—it can be misleading. And it gives it perhaps a sentence status of that we don't want to give it. So we'll see if we can wean ourselves off that terminology and talk about the applied for or source label.

Okay, so thanks, everybody. That took a little bit longer than I thought, but it was good discussion to have. So Ariel, do you think we can make any progress on the other topic we wanted to discuss?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna, we can try. This topic we actually discussed already before for a couple of meetings, we're just coming back to that because there's no agreement by the group yet which direction we're going. And I highly doubt we can make an agreement within 10 minutes on the call considering few are still not on the call today. But we can go back to this and then hopefully wrap it up in one of the future meetings.

So this is about charter question E5 part two and it asks, should the strings ineligible for delegation, preexisting and future gTLDs be updated to include any possible variant labels? So the strings ineligible for delegation are specifically referring to the IGO/INGO names. Basically, it's something that's deliberated specifically by the IGO PDP in the past. And this PDP has recommended including a number of identifiers in the future version of AGB as

ineligible for delegation to specifically provide protection to the names associated with the IGOs, INGOs, etc.

And then we have shown that list or its webpage. When I find that, I will post that in the chat. So just to remind that it's a specific list of identifiers to be granted protection on the basis of international treaties. And also, these identifiers are not available to be applied as gTLDs with the exception procedure that the relevant organizations associated with these names, they can apply for their respective strings when they want to do that in the future.

Another key point I want to note is that those identifiers are not included in the string similarity process. So they are simply not available for application. That's the sole purpose or sole protection for them. And so this is the IGO PDP that basically made those recommendations regarding these names.

And in terms of implementation, at the top level, the ICANN Org has not yet implemented these recommendations, because the implementation is tied to future rounds. And we don't have the subsequent rounds yet. So that's why the top level those recommendations haven't been implemented.

But at the second level, the recommendations have been implemented. And there's already a webpage. That's something I've noted before, maybe I can just click on that to quickly to show—sorry, I don't think this is the right one. My apologies. There was a webpage that shows what the exact names are. And so these are basically International Olympic Committee, the Red Cross and Red Crescent, and some IGO, INGO names. It's a very long list. So at the second level, those identifiers have been

confirmed. And so basically, those names cannot be applied with the exception for those relevant organizations who apply in the future. And then there's also a change process for adding or deleting these names. So that's something as the outcome of the IGO PDP.

So this is the context, and then the questions that the group hasn't kind of figured out what the answer would be is regarding variants of these strings ineligible for delegation, what to do with them. So there's one suggested approach, is we basically do nothing. So we keep the list of strings ineligible for delegation intact and not to update it to include any variants. And for staff, that's the approach number one.

The rationale is that the IGO PDP already have a specific set of identifiers to receive that kind of protection, and then there's already a change procedure to add or delete names. So if, for example, one day, the relevant organization wants to add a variant to that list, they could do that based on that change procedure.

And then something also important to note is that those protections are limited to exact match based on the internationally recognized treaties, exact match of the strings based on the treaties, so the bar is really, really high. And then also the work of the IGO PDP took years to complete. So if we make changes, then it basically is challenging the outcome of that work. And that could be a complicated in that regard.

And then in addition, there are other measures in place to deter any unrelated applicant from applying a variant of such protected

string. For example, there's the GAC early warning process, also the GAC advice following the publication of these applications, and there's also objection process for anyone to raise concerns regarding variants of those protected strings, if that's being applied.

And also, if we add any variants to this list, it would be extremely crazy large list of variants, because a lot of these strings are very long words put together, and then a lot of them are in Latin script. And if you calculate the variants, it could be hundreds of thousands or a million. So it's going to be a crazy number of variants if we do add to the list. So that's some of the rationale why we should just keep the string ineligible for delegation intact, and now to update it to include any variants.

But then the second approach some folks in the group suggested is going to be a step further. So the first step is to do the same, is not to touch the original list of strings ineligible for delegation, but at the same time, prevent application for all variants of those protected strings.

So if you remember, we also discussed reserved names. So those are names basically related to the ICANN community groups, and the IANA function, like ALAC, GAC, IANA, those acronyms. So those are the reserved names. So what the group agreed on is basically prevent application for all variants of those reserved names. And then this approach is also suggested for these strings ineligible for delegation to prevent application for all variants of those protected strings.

And then the third part is that variants can only apply for by relevant organization. If one day the organization decides it wants to apply for a top-level domain of its original source string, I guess, in the list already, and then it wished to include a variant in that application, then that will be the opportunity the variant can be applied, but it only can be applied by the relevant organization and be part of the application.

And also, another key point for this approach is that we need to make it clear that preventing application for variants is not an expansion of rights for those protected strings. So that's the second approach. And then again, the rationale is that this approach is very similar with how the group deals with the variants of reserved names, and also because the list is kept intact. So this approach should not provide any additional protections to the identifiers that may not otherwise be available via international laws or treaties. And also, the risk with some irrelevant party to attempt to apply for variant of a protected string may be very low, because those strings are already a combination of very long words already. And then if you think about a variant of that, it will be pretty hard for someone to apply by accident, for example. And so that's why with this rationale, this second approach is being put forward. And I think what will be helpful for the group is to discuss which approach is more appropriate. And if you don't like both approach, what alternative option do we have to deal with the variants of these strings ineligible for delegation. That's it for this question. I will stop here. We only have four minutes left.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So given we only have three minutes left, does anyone have any initial thoughts on the two possible approaches Ariel has put forward? So what I think I want to do is let's come back to this first up on our next call. So Ariel's explanation will be provided in the notes as well as the deck. So that will give folks time to review. And then we'll come back and talk about this first up next week.

Okay, so I think with that, we can call it for today. So thanks, everybody. I really appreciate the conversation on what we mean by primary and also set. I think it's very helpful for us, and probably timely. And thanks also to Michael for—it's great to know that ICANN Org is kind of looking at how can we be a little bit more keyed into the whether the recommendations we're putting forward can be implemented and where there any concerns. So Michael, thanks for that.

All right. Thanks, everybody. We will talk to you next week.

DEVAN REED: Thank you all for joining. This meeting is adjourned. I'll end the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]