ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 06 October 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/PIKkD

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 IDN EPDP call taking place on Thursday 6th October 2022 at 13:30 UTC. In the interest of time, we have no roll call, attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. We do have apologies from Edmon Chung. 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 you on the 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. Satish.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

SATISH BABU:	Satish for the record, I have a change of status after the last AGM. I'm part of ALAC, I'm a member of ALAC from Asia Pacific. Earlier I was the chair of the RALO. Now this shift has happened. Thank you.

DEVAN REED:	Thank you for your date. If you need any assistance, updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDN EPDP wiki space. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:	Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. And this is like a minor change. So, it's an addition. So I'm now also co-chair of the Consolidated Colicy Working Group Policy At-Large. Thank you.

DEVAN REED:	Thank you, Hadia. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you and overdue our chair Donna to begin.

DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Devan, and welcome everybody to the IDN EPDP call today. It's our first get back together since ICANN74. It was good to see people that can make the meeting actually meet you in

person and be in the same room. It was a nice change. ICANN75, was -- sorry, see you, I feel like I still have jetlag this morning, I don't know what it is.

So, during the meeting, we discussed the idea of chunking our work because a follow on from that is that we need to provide an updated project plan to the GNSO Council and Ariel is going to talk us through what that means today. And I'll just warn you to beware that sticker shock. It's going to be a bit of a surprise with the impact of changing things. Sorry, too many times this morning. So, Ariel will take us through that.

And also, a couple of other things that happened that ICANN75. And thanks to Justine and Ariel for being able to coordinate in -- some of you may be aware that I managed to get COVID at ICANN75. So, the Saturday and Sunday were the only two days that I was able to be present at meetings rather than attend remotely.

So, Ariel and Justine were able to catch up with the generation panel chairs to talk to them about single characters. So, we'll get an update on that. And then we'll go into a couple of our chatter questions that we need to review the text on. If we've got time, I don't know how we're going to go today. I just want to flag something with folks.

So, we did have the opportunity to talk about the possibility of using a risk analysis framework as part of our -- as a tool for us to use if we think we have differences of opinion that are a little bit, that are far apart. and some of the reason being in a summit is

something that the risk of doing something one way is potentially more extreme than others.

So, it's a tool that we can possibly use and I think when the leadership team thought this might be a good idea was to break the, or investigate the risks associated with the string similarity review. Currently, we have four options on the table, which was, one, two, three, and hybrid model. And they all involve different parts, whether we include blocked variants in the equation or just allocatable.

But what I wanted to do so, and one of the reasons I'm raising this now is because when Ariel takes us through the revised, the updated project plan, you're going to see it's going to lead to significant delays in our work. And so, one of the things that I'm mindful of is how can we make up time? Or how can we be a little bit more efficient in the work that we're doing?

So, string similarities is one of those items that we still need to conclude our discussion. I think the leadership team was thinking that we'd use the risk assessment to help us work through that but a question I want to pose to folks is, what's the view of your groups as at the moment on string similarity, so what I'm trying to understand is whether there still are reasonable support for the hybrid model.

And I understand that we have probably, option two is the other solution that we were looking at those others were leaning towards. So, what I'm trying to do is assess whether we still have folks that are thinking option two is probably better than the hybrid model. Or maybe now that we've had some discussions, people

are leaning back towards option two, or people have really come over to the side of the hybrid model is the way to go.

So, before we end the call today, I just like to get a sense from folks where they are on the string similarity, where their group is, what option they're leaning towards, because if it is that we're leaning towards one or the other, then I don't know that we need to go through that exercise of the risk assessment. But if we still have differences of opinion, then I think we need to, we will engage in that.

But I'm also aware that if we do that risk assessment phase, it's going to take a lot of work to prepare for it, and also take the groups through it. So, it's a tool that we can use, but we don't have to feel obliged to use it. If we think we've had discussion, and now we're pretty much leaning towards a certain option, or another.

So, I'll come back to that at the end of the call and just get people's initial thoughts. I don't want to do something just for the sake of doing it. And taking up three or four calls in the process, when we could have just had a get a sense of the room and understand that we were either pretty much all leaning towards a hybrid model, or we've come back to think that perhaps option two is the way to go.

So, I'll come back to that, at the end of the call, just get a quick sense of the room and then we'll take it from there. So, I think a lot really hinges on string similarity and getting that resolved. So, I think it is a big impediment to our work at the moment trying to resolve that string similarity.

So, with that, I will hand it over to Ariel. And she's going to take us through the project plan. And as I said, you might be shocked by the impact of the chunking our work and the extension of time that we'll need to do that. So, Ariel, over to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna, this is Ariel, and thanks Donna. So warning, it's indeed going to be a significant change to our timeline. Not just because we're chunking the chatter but also based on the progress and the time we spend so far, deliberating half of the chatter portion. You could imagine the time needed to wrap everything up would be much longer than originally anticipated.

Just as a reminder, our original plan is to publish the initial report, which goes through the chunking. So, by mid-December this year, and then finalize everything by April next year. But as you can see, that's definitely not a realistic goal, we're far from getting to that stage. And that's why we have to talk about the updated project plan. And then we also need to present this to the council.

So, they were aware of the situation we're working against, and then also the rationale, why we're proposing extension and things like that. So that's the kind of quick overarching note and then the document I'm sharing on the screen is the project plan for the EPDP, this is the collapsed version, and I can take you through some of the details. And the items I'm wanting to focus on is basically under the group deliberations, you can see, we did some structural change.

So, now you see the line 26 2.6, that's group deliberation initial report, part one. So, we have put the group have charter questions that are under initial report part one in this umbrella. And then also we have added a line item that's row 75, item 2.7, that's related to data collection to facilitate the deliberation on second level related charter questions.

So, we discussed this a while back and we are aware that we need to get some data even just anecdotal from registries, registrars, and even possibly RSPs, to understand how IDNs are managed at the second level. Without the data, it's going to be very difficult and also academic or theoretical to tackle the charter questions related to the second level.

So, this is a critical piece of the work we have to do in order to proceed to the deliberation on part two of the initial report. So, here you see we have put the part two initial report charter question under this parent row. It's the same idea, the second level related questions, the Domain Name lifecycle, the RPMs, TMCH related questions and idea implementation guidelines. So, we kind of put all these under group to deliberation.

So, we have to finish these deliberations. And then that's the major part of the work by this group. And another structural change we have here is that if you look at the initial report, we have divided this up into two that's based on the agreement that we got from the chunking exercise. So initial report, part one, we'll have relevant steps underneath.

And basically, we can't publish an issue report until we have finished the deliberation of the part one of the charter questions,

and then we also have initial report part two, that's for part two out the charter portions. So that's another kind of structural change.

And then finally, we'll have the final report part. So, the current thinking is, we will have one final report. So basically, after the public comment of the initial report, part one, this group will pause its deliberation on the charter questions I reviewed the public comments received for part one of the initial report. And then after that work is done the group have resumed its deliberation on charter questions.

And then we will go to the review of a part two out for the insured for public comment. And then after that review is done we will finish the following steps for finalizing, consolidating the charter questions and then finally submit the final report should have cancelled. So, these are some kinds of structural updates to the project plan. And then here come to the sticker shock. So, for the deliberation of the part one of the initial reports.

Currently, what we have updated is to update the end date of finishing the remaining charter questions in this group by December 16 this year, so it's basically one week before the holiday period starts. And it's actually not, unrealistic estimation, because even if you think it seems to be two months away, but it's only just nine to 10 meetings, till the end of this year, and we still have quite a bit off work to finish.

And so, for the scoops three charter questions we're basically halfway through, but a lot of the pressures are still not down yet, because of the string similarity review piece. And there's a few questions were related to that, and we haven't started discussing.

So, for example, there's a consequence to the string similarity review how to deal with varying labels that were not requested by the applicant.

And then there's also string contention resolution, whether you're saying the adjustments need to be made. So, these questions we haven't discussed, and they are parked because of the string similarity review. And also, we have some other question that was not discussed or, even visited yet, but it actually belongs in part one of the initial report.

So, for example, E6, it's about two-character lighting labels, whether variants of these can be delegated. So, this is kind of difficult question to understand at the beginning, but we can definitely prep the team to deliberate on this. But we definitely need at least one or two meetings to get through questions like this. And then we also have another piece. That's the process by which existing registry operators could apply for a variance.

So, we went through the straw man process in ICANN75, I think we have got some sense from the group, what direction we could go. But we need to wrap up that recommendation and kind of give that and develop some draft language pertaining to that charter question. So, as you can see, we have still quite a bit of work, we need to conclude.

And then it's going to be a stretch for the group to finish deliberating all these within just nine to 10 meetings till the end of this year. But we're hoping we could get there. So, we have to speed things up. And because of this change, it basically pushes out the initial a publishing issue report a little later. So, if you look

at this segment, row blends 36 to 144 that talks about the initial report, part one.

So, if we finish the deliberation of all the remaining charter questions for part one, we still need a few weeks to conclude -- to do the first reading and second reading off the draft text. And also, you need to take into consideration the holidays that fall within that period. So that's why I put January 6, as the dates that we can populate the stable draft initial report. So that's our target.

And then, we also need to create some buffer time to build out the initial report and prepare for the public comment proceeding. So, there are some procedural steps that and of course when the report is actually developed, and the group we will need some time to read through it and confirm the content before we can publish it. And then, you can see that when we actually get ready to publish an initial report that push out to February 17, that's the date based on the current calculation.

So, that basically is two months extension from what we originally anticipated. So, that's basically what we will do for part one. I can stop here for a moment and see whether there's any comments or reactions or questions to this part of the project plan update, before we go to the next part. So, I'll pause for a moment.

DONNA AUSTIN: Just a comment from me, Ariel, really, just for folks to think about this as we work through it. And I know, I've had conversations with many of you about whether you're comfortable with the pace

that we're moving forward, and whether there's anything that we can do differently that might provide some efficiencies to our work.

And I'd like to kind of ask that you think about that, as well as we work through this, we are only meeting once a week for 90 minutes. I don't know that adding additional time to the meeting time has value or would provide efficiencies.

But, maybe every three calls or something, we could have an extended call, I don't know, I'm just interested to hear from folks, if you have any suggestions about how we could potentially do things, perhaps more efficiently, that would make up some of the time that we're talking about here.

But I also accept that what Ariel's putting in front of us is, the purpose of doing this is for counsel. And I think what Ariel has done is that it's reasonably conservative, which is good, because we don't want to have to go back to the council, making change requests on a regular basis, this will be the first the first one that we've done, I think.

And this is now based on a better understanding of how we're working through the chatter questions and getting work done. So, if folks could just think about that, and I'd love to have a conversation if folks have some ideas about how it can make up some time. But also recognize that what Ariel is talking us through here is deliberately conservative, because it's better to, I have a promise and deliver earlier. Now I've got that ran the wrong way.

But anyway, to be ahead of schedule then have to go back to the council in 12 months' time and say, look, we really were optimistic. That's it. Thanks, Ariel. We were optimistic when we submitted the last request, so just something to keep in mind. But I really would love feedback from folks, if you have some ideas about how you think we can get through our work a little bit quicker, thanks, thanks everyone.

ARIEL LIANG: And thanks very much, Donna. So, seeing no hands or comment comments in the chat box. One hand. Dennis, please go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you Ariel, and thank you, Donna, for this. I appreciate the review of the project man. And I think -- back in the day, I did some years of project management and not surprised by the initial budget in terms of forecasts and time assigned to allocated to projects, get extended, because different reasons that were not anticipated at the beginning. So, no surprises there.

And I understand in this valiant topic in the different aspects that the implications throughout the process, application and management, as we have witnessed throughout our deliberations is very complex. And all of us come from different backgrounds, and we have different opinions. So, it's good that we have this platform to discuss all those viewpoints and come back with or deliver a consensus view of how things should be implemented and from policy operations standpoint. So that's a good thing.

EN

I understand the sticker shock here extended time, but to go directly answer your question Donna about efficiencies. I sincerely don't know how much efficiency we can find and how we want to hear all of the different viewpoints and consider all of the different perspectives, insights, and then come back with a consensus.

And that takes time, as we all are well aware of that. So, I don't think that adding extra time to the meetings will necessarily yield more value and get in quicker. So, I think what I'm going to say, on my personal capacity, yes, I'm with you. This is what we need to run with it. So, thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis, it's nice to have the reinforcement that what we're doing here is an outrageous, and it's that people don't think that we're wasting time in the manner in which we're working through the charter question. So that's comforting as well. So, thanks for that. Arielle, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Donna, thanks Dennis, and also thanks Maxim the common, and appreciate the understanding and the support of this work. And then actually, the actual sticker shock hasn't come yet because we haven't talked about the part too of the initial report and how much time we may need to conclude that. But before I go there, I want to talk about the data collection piece.

So, many of you probably aware that Dennis is shepherding this effort consulting was the CPH TechOps team, some of the data

that may be needed to understand second level related questions. So, thanks very much to Dennis leading that effort and I know that Michael and Clark are also working on that. So basically, during 75 staff, and Dennis had a quick punch point. And then Dennis kind of showed us the draft paper he's preparing.

And then also, he informed us that during the contract party Summit, which will happen in early November, he plans to talk with the CPH TechOps team regarding these potential data that maybe needed for deliberating second level questions. So, that's an ongoing effort on that. And we also know this part of work is really on the critical path for the team to go to the part to our initial report.

So, we have reflected those in the project plan. And right now, what we put here is that, we're hoping some data can be collected by January 6 next year, so that when New Year holiday finishes, and now the group can start working on the part two of the initial report charter questions. But this is really a tentative date that we put here. And then we understand that some dentists will like to get a clearer picture after presenting the paper and requests to the CPH TechOps team during the summit.

So, we'll probably have to wait and update this date based on his input or feedback after consulting with that group. So that's something I want to kind of highlight here. And then maybe, at the same time, we could explore some other venues, thinking about other ways to collect some data, so the group can use those data when deliberating these questions.

EN

And then this is something we probably have to do simultaneously when this group is wrapping up the part one, not the initial report deliberation, because this doesn't depend on other part of the project, but it is very critical for us to get it down in order to proceed to the next step. So this is another critical piece and I just want to pause for a moment and see whether there's any comments or questions about this part.

DONNA AUSTIN: I guess a question for Dennis, and it may be too early to answer, but he's, do you think that's a reasonable timeframe for you or do you think you'll need a bit more time because I appreciate the summit is in November, but it's going to run into the holiday season as well. So, do you have a sense of how much time that's going to take?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you Donna, Dennis Tan for the record. Short answer, no. I think between now and the CPE Summit, what I want to do is, so Ariel, shared with me questions as I jokingly said to her as my homework as to what are the questions that the EPDP has, or at least that leadership has, that we should consider in our data finding and thought process when it comes to operations, so, I have that list.

So, I need to go through that list and incorporate that into our paper and seek input from the CPH TechOps. And we do that through the meaningless as well. So, we're not just waiting for the

EN

face-to-face meeting in November. Because we don't know who at the end of the day is going to be able to attend face to face.

But so, we keep the conversation online as well. And hopefully, the group is very tight and very responsive, as far as providing feedback. So, I'm confident that we can deliver something by end of the year, I just don't know how complete the viewer is or what else we might need to incorporate it into the paper.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Dennis. Back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Sounds good, thank you, Donna. And thank you Dennis, and hope to hear good news from the CPH TechOps team after the summit. So, now we will talk about the part two of the initial report deliberation. So, we have four groups of charter questions kind of put under part two. And then those deliberation kinds of hinges on the obtaining the data. We're even anecdotal from the contracted parties, because they're really into a second level.

So, you can see that to initiate group for travel question we put January 9, still beginning of the new year, if we can get some data, we can get the work started, for a group for charter question. And if you look at the breakdown here, we have six questions in this group. And some of them have a sub question.

So, what I have allocated is 60 working days to complete the deliberation for this group, and 60 working days, it's actually 12 weeks. But we have quite a bit of work for this group of charter

questions. So that's basically on average two weeks per question, we have to wrap it up. So that's something kind of keeping in the back of our mind, even it looks long, but it's really not a long period for us to complete deliberation on that.

And then if we could finish that, by April 7th, this group should be able to wrap up group for charter question. So that's the kind of projection and then if you recall, we have a public comment going on at the same time for part one of the initial report. So this is the publishing date after the public comment, its initial report, part one, that's February 17. And then we also have a 40-day public comment period to receive inputs.

And then by April seventh, it's the closing day of the public comment and that point size was the day week have wrap up group for charter question. And then, in an ideal world, it will be great if the group can simultaneously review that public comment. And then also preceding with deliberation of charter questions. But we know this is not a big group. And we have so much complicated important topics at hand.

So, it's very likely that we need to pause the deliberation on part two of the charter questions, and then just focus on finishing review the public comment, after the public comment forum closes. So that's why you see in row 155, that's the review period of public comment.

And then it's from April 10th to May 19th, we allocated 30 working days. So that's six weeks. It could be a stretch, to be honest, because sometimes the review could go on longer but this is our reasonably conservative estimate. And hopefully, we don't

receive too many comments that are that can cause substantive changes to recommendation. But this is what we could have projected at this time.

So, by May 19, we can finish the public comment review, and then we can resume the work. The charter questions belong to part two of the initial report. So that's why when you look at the project plan, you see the initiation dates for group five, charter question, deliberation is May 22nd. That's after the review of the public comments.

And also, this group has quite a bit off of questions underneath. It's also six questions, and some of them have sub questions. And the current estimators do like use two weeks per question. So, we can hopefully finish deliberation by August 18. So that's the target date for wrapping up a group five charter question. And following group five, it's a group six.

So, this charter question is regarding the TMCH, and the registration dispute resolution procedures, we only have two charter questions. But I imagine this subject is not familiar to all of the folks in the group. So, we may need to do some kind of education session and just make sure everybody knows what said these dispute resolution mechanisms are about.

And also, as a heads up, there's research already done by ICANN work, they helped looking to the TMCH and tried to find out the language or scripts, they already dealt with in terms of the registered marks in the TMCH, and whether they have taken into consideration variants already.

So, they have some data related to the charter question F1. And I imagine this group definitely need to read the research, ICANN work already prepared, so that we can deliberate on this charter question effectively. So, what we have allocated is 25 working days, that's five weeks to wrap up these two questions.

So, then that will kind of push our timeline to September 29, to wrap up this group of question deliberation. And finally, we're going to the last group of charter question, that's IDN implementation guidelines. And we only have one question pertaining to this topic. But as we know, this is a contentious issue.

And basically, the registries had a quite a bit of back and forth with the council and also with the ICANN Board regarding the IDN implementation guideline update. And we imagine this would be something requires substantive discussion by the group. So, we allocated four weeks to wrap up this group charter question. It's reasonably conservative, but we may be surprised. I just want to kind of warn a group, even though this seems long, but it's really not that long for the extension.

So, after we wrap up everything else for the charter question that will be November, next year November 3rd, and then we will have to prepare for the initial report part two. And then we have to go through similar kind of processes. So, basically drafting the text. So, this date coincides with the last day to wrap up group seven charter questions on November 23rd.

And then we need some period of time to review the text and confirm the report, prepare the public comment, and then that

goes to January 4th 2024, to publish the initial report. And then we will need to have a 40-day public comment period. So, by February 22nd, we can conclude the public comment for part two of the initial report.

And then we'll proceed to review the comments received. Right now, we still allocated 30 working days, so that's six weeks to review the public comments. And after that, we have to finalize the recommendations. So here we have provided some buffer, we allocated 90 working days to this period of time, so that's 18 weeks.

So, just in case, some new issues arise as a result of public comment, we could use this period of time to develop new recommendations, for example, there may be comments that will dramatically impact the existing language of the draft recommendation, and the group have to go through a process for updating them.

So that's why we tried to create some buffer here to give 18 weeks of time to consolidate the recommendations and finalize them and then develop the final report. So that will push us to August 8th, 2024 to have this part of the work done. And then we prepare for the finalization of everything and then we submit the final report to the GNSO Council by August 29 2024.

So, with all this time at it, you can see originally, we anticipated, but submitting of final report by April 2023. Now we're pushing to August 2024. So that's basically 17 months of extension of our total timeline. So that's the actual sticker shock is really 17

months, but if you break it down, it's really not that long, based on all the pieces of work we have to complete to get to that stage.

And it's also not a luxury of time, because if you look at the actual allocation of each charter question, by average per two weeks, we need to wrap up one. So that's kind of a stretch and a goal we have to kind of meet. So, that's my rundown of this update. And I know it could be a little overwhelming or shocking to folks, but I hope it's clear and reasonable. And I'm happy to take any questions or comments for this.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So, Ariel, could you just run through what the process is to submit this to council, so folks understand that?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, of course. So, basically, after the initial report part two, public comment, the group needs to review the public comments, we have the six weeks allocated to that. And then after the review of public comments, we need to continue deliberation of policy topics towards the final report.

So, what this means is that, if there are some comments that was substantively changed the recommendations from the group, we need to use that period to update the recommendations. And if there's additional topics that rise as a result of public comment, then we need additional time to deliberate on those topics and develop recommendations. And then based on our experience with other PDPs it's very likely to happen. We have seen that in

other PDPs so that's why we have allocated 18 weeks for this group to complete this man work.

And then of course, we need some time to build a final report. Of course, we can do that along the way when the group is deliberating. But definitely for staff, we still have to prepare other pieces of the final report to put the actual report together. So, we only allocated one week to do that, I think it's reasonable.

And then, the group have to do the consensus call, which is actually a very important part. It's extremely important, because before the final report, nothing is settled, until the group conducts the consensus exercise, and then determine whether they agree, disagree, support or not support the recommendation. And that will actually be the consequential step for policy development.

So, we allocated two weeks for doing the consensus exercise consensus call, it maybe longer, but we do have this buffer period of 18 weeks before that. So, if we can finish the deliberation shorter, earlier then we could use a little bit longer time to do the consensus call. So that's a very critical piece.

And then after the consensus call, we will have the adoption of the final report and the recommendations. So basically, that's more or less to administrative staff by the working group, you definitely have to take a look at the final report before we submit that to the council. And then finally, we submit that to the GNSO Council, the final report.

DONNA AUSTIN:
Sorry, Ariel, I wasn't clear. What I was asking is the process to submit the PCR to -- Sorry.

ARIEL LIANG:
My apologies, I should have taken a look at the chat. So, this is what we kind of thinking at this moment, because we know this is a substantive change to the project plan. And this is your first chance to take a look at this. So, what we have planned right now is we'll give the group some time to digest and look at this updated project plan.

And then we also develop this document, it's a form that we need to submit to the council. That's the actual form the council will look at is highlight the major changes to the project plan. And what we're requesting is basically, 17 months extension, compared to the original plan, and then publishing an insurer reporting two parts. And we have laid out the reasons why we need to do that.

So, right now, this is the first time you look at this, and then we imagine probably, it's not going to be ready by the document deadline for the October council meeting which is October 10th, it's Monday, next week. So, maybe likely we can't submit this month. But we still have next month to submit the project change request, and then also the updated project plan.

And the plan right now is that during the October council meeting, Donna could provide an update to the council and then give them a heads up what is coming and basically give them a preview of the project change request so that the council is prepared and not

to get the sticker shock. And then by the November document deadline, which I believe is November 7th.

Basically, Pharaoh which was our council liaison to the EPDP team, he can submit this document to the council mailing list and with cover notes that staff can help. And then we also need to include the project plan the updated version. And then by November, the council meeting, they can officially approve it, hopefully, they can. So, I think that's good prototype and happy to have Steve or Emily correct me if I'm wrong or missing any details.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. Just a note for folks as well is one of the reasons that we went down the path of doing this chunking is in recognition that the SubPro working group recommendations are currently sitting with the board. And some of you may be aware that ICANN staff is doing an operational development phase for the recommendations that came out of the SubPro working group.

Our consideration of the questions in part one is really connected to the SubPro work and I don't know for sure whether the board would say, well, we can't move forward with this until we have the recommendations from the IDN EPDP. So that's another reason why it's good for us to at least have draft recommendations for part one that we're talking about here, because it directly relates to the SubPro work, and potentially when the next round could kick off.

So, the other thing that we were wondering about was whether we could do an initial part one report, and then a final part one report

rather than hold up a final report with two parts, until August 24, we're not sure whether that timing is going to be problematic for the SubPro work moving forward.

So, that's something else that we want to leave the door open to, that we can do that if we need to. But of course, we need to be mindful that nothing that we're looking at in part two could potentially impact the recommendations in part one. So, if the time being the final report would contain two parts. But it may be as we work through and we get a better understanding of where the SubPro work is?

And where it's working its way through the process, whether it might make sense to do a final report for part one, so that we can bring that to council and have counsel consider the recommendations and then take that to the board, because the recommendations can't be implemented until the board has approved them. So, there's some nuances in the process that we need to be mindful of. So that's another advantage of the chunking.

And then we could make a decision at some point to do a final report for part one, if we think it's going to impact that SubPro work or timeline. And obviously, the council has to approve any final report that any PDP, final report, so they have to consider the report and decide whether they're going to support the recommendations and then it goes on to the board.

And then there's pretty sure most of you are familiar with processes. But once it gets to the board, there's another I think it's a 60days comment period. So, there's a lot of different timings

associated with different processes that, so we're just, we're mindful of that. And if anyone was at the ODP session that Karen Lance had during the ICANN meeting, it was I actually raised it, that we need to have a little bit of coordination, because I'm pretty confident that our recommendations could impact on Karen's current work.

And that's one of the reasons we've got Michael, in our group from ICANN Org, so he's following this so just a note that we're aware of that. And we do have in the back of our mind that we may need to do a final report for part one and then do a part two separately. So, we need to find a way to flag that in the report, we put the council.

As Ariel said, that's a lot to digest. We'll give folks time to consider it but with the current plan is that I will give a heads up to the council on the call of the 20th, I think. And then we'll submit the PCR for council consideration in November. So, Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: And Thanks, Donna, and I'm noticing Justin's comments in the chats. So, I think it will be advisable in the PCR, we stay clearly what direction we're going, instead of giving the council a choice, because we're to consider because council probably wouldn't be able to tell us they were laying on us to decide what's the best way forward. So, I think if this group decides to do two final reports, then we have to make that decision and then put that in the PCR.

And then if the group decides just two initial reports about one final report done, that's the direction we're going and then we put

EN

that in the PCR. So definitely, Justin yes. We're deciding what goes in the PCR, but maybe we don't give them other option to consider because I don't know what the council going to come back with, they probably don't know, either, they will ask us. So, it's better we decide what to do.

And then I did some kind of rough calculation, if we go list the two final reports option, what the timeline may look like? So, if we do the initial report, part one in February, and now we use kind of similar logic, review the public common and deliberating on the policy topics, arise out from the public common and viewed the final report, it probably will take us till September 2023, to wrap up the final report, part one.

And then, I imagine during that period of time, it's very unlikely the group will have energy to deliberate on part two of the total questions. So that part of the work has to pause. And then we can resume that after the final report, part one is submitted.

And then if we use the same kind of time allocation in this project plan, it's very likely we won't get hard to wrap the final report submitted by December 2024, if we proceed speedily, based on the project plan. So that's some kind of rough calculation I did. But maybe it's a good reference point for folks to consider.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So, it seems this if based on Ariel's understanding if we want to make that decision, then we should be trying to make that sooner rather than later. Ariel had a conversation with Karen Lance. So, Karen is responsible for the operational design phase

of SubPro recommendations from ICANN Org, and their timeline to provide that assessment to the ICANN Board is December of this year.

So, the 12th of December, I think is the target date. We don't know, I think initially, it was intended that the board would take about three months to consider that. So, Ariel has had a conversation with Karen to just flag what it is that they would potentially need from us. But my sense is that given our recommendations are going to impact on processes for the next new TLD process, that they are going to need some information from us sooner rather than later.

So, I think providing a final report in 2024 is not going to be optimal for the SubPro work. So, that's something that I think now that we were discussing, and I think it is something that we might need to factor into our thinking here.

And that question is what would be the consequence of delaying even further the consideration of the second level questions? And I think my understanding is the second level questions aren't going to kick in until there is a next round with the exception of guidelines version four because I think that's an outstanding tasks that the board would like to have finalized sooner rather than later.

So that's probably the only thing in part two that has some kind of urgency from perhaps a board perspective rather than a contract or party perspective. But that's the only thing that I can think of that there would be a consequence if we delayed part two. So again, this is a preset, this is a lot to take into, think about it at this point.

And given this, now that we're discussing the viability of a part one final report and a part two final report that could potentially impact what we're discussing here even further. So, I don't know if folks have any thoughts I'd like to share.

Now, we will put this out to the list so that folks can have a think about it. And maybe we can have a quick conversation about it when we get back on the call next week, or folks can respond on the email list. So, any thoughts from folks? Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Donna; Satish for the record. So, I generally agree with the direction we are taking, especially that we are planning for a conservative project plan with a single PCR. Or if we have two pre-planned and pre announced PCR's, that's also fine with me. I'm also okay with two final reports if we can partition our work into two parts without interdependencies between the two parts, because then it allows us to sequence our work.

And I also know that this PDP has a representative structure with all major SOs and ACs having the representatives here. So, we have a direct connection with each of the AC-SOs. So, I was wondering if there's some way to elicit comments directly from each of these without them having to counsel the gently heavyweight public comments process that might make our work slightly simpler. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: And Satish on the representative model thing I would hope that the comments that we receive would be from the different groups,

would be consistent with the conversations that we have during these meetings. But there's always going to be outliers in our public comment process. So, we don't have a sec on this call, for instance. So it might be that, a sec has substantive concerns about some of their recommendations.

So, when we come back to think about those comments, it could take us some time to consider. So, I agree that hopefully, because we do have a representative model that the public comment review isn't going to be a heavy lift, because people have been involved along the way. But we can't guarantee that. So, we could just be hopeful. Ariel, you had your hand up?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, I put my hand up. If someone wants to chime in, he is welcome. So, I just want to note in this pearl, there are three recommendations related to second level for IDN. That's the same entity principle at the second level, and then there's also the IDN, at the second level, do not need to behave the same, I think. I'm simplifying the recommendation, but they do have a few second level related recommendations, and those will be addressed by this grouping part two after the initial reports. I just want to note that. So, it's not like we're daunt top level and we're dauntless, the SubPro stuff, it's not completely. I just want to know that.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Ariel. So I don't see any other hands. So, a lot to digest. We were going to go through some language. We'll put this aside for now. So, Ariel, if you wanted to take us through that.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna. I think the next is the quick update on the Chinese, Japanese, Korean GPS.

DONNA AUSTIN: Apologies.

ARIEL LIANG: And no problem. So just let folks know that during 75, the leadership team had a meeting was the chair. So, for Chinese, Japanese and Korean generation panels, because we had that two previous interaction, asking them, whether they could develop some kind of guidelines or list of 100 characters, that could be allowed as a single character TLD's.

So that engagement was happening in May, actually a long time ago. And it seems that they had the willingness to do that additional work. But we have to confirm that and then also discuss with them the scope of work that we expect for them to do that. So that's why the meeting was held during 75.

And the good news is that they are indeed willing to conduct this work and look into the possibility of identifying the characters, but they have some very clear kind of expectations is they basically want to look at the technical aspect of that, and not missions,

scope creep in a way that looking to, for example, confusing similarity kind of issues, that's outside their expertise were limited.

So, they have indicated, what is possible for them to look at is, instead of developing inclusive list of characters that can be allowed for single character TLD, they can look into a list of characters that should not be allowed as a single character TLDs. So that could be characters or not ideographs. So that's clearly aligned with our recommendation is only ideographs can be a single character TLD, so they can look into the character down not ideographs.

And then also characters that are symbols, and that could cause a lot of confusing similarity to especially, for example, some characters written in one stroke, look like a zero or look like one or something like that symbol, so they could look into that to include in this prohibitive list. And then another thing they are willing to check is the ASAC advice on single character TLD. It's an ASAC052.

So, Tech has developed a series of recommendations, what to consider if we allow delegation for single character TLDs in the future. So, the DCE generation panels. When we when they deliberated on this topic, they are willing to take a look at these recommendations.

So that's the outcome of the discussion is they're willing to conduct this work. And we're not able to provide them a specific deadline, when to finish, because it's really depends on their internal process and procedures to conduct this work. And they

may need to consult with local communities and additional experts.

So basically, it's out of our hand and when we outsource this work to none, but we did communicate the importance of not negatively impact the implementation planning for subsequent procedures or causes delays for the next round. So that's the general timeline consideration they have to keep in mind.

So, another important point is that since the generation panels they take on this work, then the EPP team do not need to develop a specific recommendation on this topic, it's outside the expertise of this group. So, in order to provide some types of checks and balances, the outcome of this work will be subject to public comment.

And then the broader community can provide input for that. And then eventually, these guidelines to our list of prohibited characters can be something the future evaluation panels can rely on when they evaluate applications for single character and new TLDs. So that's the kind of summary of what the meeting happened or discussed.

And if this group is okay with the direction and approach, then we need to send official request to the generation panels and this is what the staff have drafted. We can circulate this to the group for review and input and then if we're okay with that, then this request can be sent to the generation panels so they can officially initiate the work on that.

And then at the same time for our charter question, probably some draft tasks need to be developed to indicate that the charter question A7 part two is basically outsourced to the generation panels and they will conduct the work based on their existing processes and procedures and the important items that we note in this request, we probably need to capture that in some kind of draft when watching the in our initial report. So that's a quick update on that. If I missed anything, please feel free to chime in Justine, Steve, Emily.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks for the update Ariel. I don't see Justine. Doesn't seem to have any comments. So, nothing to add. So, it's interesting. So, this is Kenny actually, during the session that Karen ran on the ODP, in at ICANN 75 actually asked a question about the impact of this work on the SubPro worker, there was a little bit of confusion about what was going on. So that's what kind of got my mind started thinking about the impact of our work and what's happening with the SubPro ODP.

So, in terms of a timeline, there is some urgency to get this done. But I also appreciate that we need to be respectful of the time that these groups have available to them. So, we need to get this time to answer our questions. So that the time they need is the time I need. And Ariel lost the internet apparently, which is why the screen just changed. Looks like there she is, she's back again.

So I think the plan is here. Ariel the plan is we'll put this out to the list to see if folks have any comment. And if not, within a week,

we'll get this off to the generation panels. Maybe Ariel doesn't have audio at the moment.

ARIEL LIANG: No, I didn't realize it's my queue to talk but yes, sounds good. We can send the draft to the list ASAP and hopefully we can send this request to the generation panels this month as quickly as possible.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. So, we're getting a little bit pressed for time. I was a little bit optimistic about how long it would take to get through the project change request. So, we'll see if we can get through at least one of the questions on the language if we can Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, sounds good. So, what we're doing now is to basically confirm the language is stable for the Chatto question, D2, D3. But actually, it's going to be easier than we originally thought. Because most of the comments were pretty straightforward. And I have already adopted the right line suggestions, because that was already confirmed during the last meeting when we discussed these items.

So, this is basically a quick reminder for the group what has been updated, and then maybe we'll also put this on the list. So, folks who are not on the call will have a chance to check the language and confirm they're okay with that. And then we will regard the updated language stable. So, D2 this kind of question is about the

registry transition process, a barrel and reassignment of TLD as a result of TMPDDRP and the recommendations are not controversial at all.

And then the main update is basically to note the process of the registry transition or change on control need to encompass the primary or the source TLD. And also its allocated delegated variant. And the change process needs to happen at the same time encompassing these labels. So, we just added at the same time, kind of strew out these recommendations. And then there's something pending, that we haven't resolved yet, is regarding whether the process of activating alocatable variants need to be frozen until the transition is done.

So, we didn't develop new recommendation for this yet, because we need to resolve the issue regarding whether activation can be done between rounds or not. So that's related to the strawman process that we talked through during 75. And then pending the recommendation regarding that we will see whether additional recommendation is needed. So that's the part we didn't resolve, but I think it's okay, at this point.

And then for these three, the change is basically about the terminology we use for data as squirrel requirements originally, we use policy that wording but it's not accurate to were using requirements. And also, its data escrow agents instead of providers. So, there's some terminology clean up.

And also, there's another recommendation, it's just 3.9. As basically, to emphasize, it's the escrow data needs to be stored in separate files. That's the emphasize of this recommendation

EN

before we kind of made it as if it's a recommendation for the data escrow agents to do certain things. That's not the emphasis. So, we just changed it to this wording. So, nothing very substantive. So just want to quickly remind the folks of what has been updated.

And then the other item that we haven't resolved is regarding the rationale for recommendation 2.6. And this will probably have to come back, hopefully next week, is about whether we can mention usability, goals and consistent user experience in the rationale part. Because we understand the registry stakeholder group, they have a bit concerned about mentioning that and potentially expand the scope of this recommendation. So, we need to resolve this.

And we're also having the action item for the ALAC team to propose an updated wording. Hopefully, we can resolve these issues quickly. So, just a quick reminder of the updated language and we can post that to the group, the mailing list and for folks to take a closer look. And then if no concerns, we will record the recommendation at least under D2 and D3 stable and we can come back to D1 part two, so that's all I need to update.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So, on recommendation 2.6. I think we should have language from   ALAC team next week, is that the?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel, I guess Satish, Satish has his hand up.

DONNA AUSTIN: Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks Donna. Yes, we should be ready with our population by next week, next call.

DONNA AUSTIN: Satish could you give us a sense of where you think you are on that? Just to give us a little bit of a heads up. If you can't, that's fine.

SATISH BABU: So the two phrases, which are kind of controversial, both of them come from the charter itself. So, I have actually sent a mail to Ariel stating where this can be found in the charter. So, we don't want that point to be lost. We don't mind changing the words, if some of us have difficulty with it. But the core point that is raised in the charter, we don't want that to be lost, because there is an end user component there. So, actually, we need to kind of formulate the proposal, and write out give it to you. That's where the delay is.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Satish. So just coming back to my question earlier in the call about the people in a position to give a sense of where they are on string similarity. Is that possible now, because it will determine whether we go ahead and do the work that we need to do for the risk assessment, whether we need to do it or whether

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna, Dennis Tan for the record, speaking on behalf of every stakeholder group.   So, the stakeholder group has discussed this point on the hybrid model.   And we're coming to consensus position, that means we're supporting the hybrid model, with a caveat if you will, and I'll be happy to meet that in writing so that it's clear what the position is.

But basically, we agree that we are in terms of allocating, delegating to the strings into the roots, and we should take a conservative approach.   So, in that sense, the hybrid models aspire to be a conservative approach.   So, we lean towards supporting it.   We do have some observations which are I'll just quickly go through those.   But again, I will submit those in writing.

So, the first one right there, I think we talked about these that the root on the JR is not or the objective of the root zone on the JR rather, was not to find a string computability.   That was not the primary intent.   But it's a something that it certainly is useful for it, but you will not find a complete set of computable labels.

The other item is that and I think the small team acknowledged that there was no consideration of the operational and implementation implications.   And we talked about how blog variants, some of those blog variants are invalid due to, for example, the commingling of scripts.   And so, we observe that

adding those to the mix of using those bases of comparison might make the process overly complex and more costly.

And so, our observation would be to find a process to remove those type of labels from the block set and not taking those into consideration. So, in general terms, that's our position. And again, we'll submit those in writing. So, have those available to you. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Dennis. Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks Donna. Satish for the record. So, from the ALAC team's perspective, we are also in favor of the hybrid model, especially since two of our members were in the small but we need to have some more discussions to formalize our response. So, in general, we are getting towards the hybrid model. Thanks

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Satish. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: This is Hadia, for the record, I just raised my hand to clarify what Dennis just said. So, I understand he's leaning towards or they actually favor the hybrid model. But my understanding also that they are favoring a modified hybrid model, where he mentioned, removing some of the blocked variants if he can elaborate a little bit on that. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: So Hadia, can I in the interest of time, Dennis is going to follow up on the email list. So, can we wait for that? And then we can discuss further when we have that. Great. Michael, do you have a sense from the registrars? I don't want to put you on the spot. But if you do, it would be good to understand where that is.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Michael, for the record, actually quite undecided, so to say that they just follow my lead, and I'm in favor of the hybrid model. So, they just seem to follow along there, no objections.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. I don't see anyone from GAC with us. So, that's probably the best we can hope for today. So, thanks for that. That was helpful, if not a little bit surprising. So, we'll look forward to, so Dennis is going to follow up on the list with positions. Satish is that the -- I like preparing something in writing, or was it?

SATISH BABU: Yes, we will also give something in writing.

DONNA AUSTIN: Great. So, we'll put this question out to the list as well, just to give us a sense, and then we'll work out where we go from there. All right, folks, we're right at time. So, thanks for today. We'll put the PCR out to the list, leadership level, we're going to have another

conversation about whether we do a final report part A and a final report part two, I think that's pretty important.

And we may need to have a conversation with Karen Lance and her team just to see if she has a recommendation for us. And then we'll come back. We'll see you back here next week. I don't know what's going to be on the agenda. But we'll sort that out this afternoon where we have a leadership call. Thanks, everybody.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you all for joining. Once again, this meeting is adjourned. Ariel Liang recording and disconnect all remaining ones.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]