
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 19 May 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/gAB1Cw>

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, 19 May 2022 at 13:30 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please let yourselves be known now? We have apologies from Emily Barabas (staff). We have apologies from Nigel Hickson, Joseph Yee. Hadia Elminiawi will be joining 30 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. Others will remain as an attendee and will have view only chat access.

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

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your Statements of Interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the IDNs EPDP wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you. Over to Justine to begin.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Devan. Just looking for the unmute button. Okay. Welcome, everyone, to this call on the 19th of May. I have the pleasure of welcoming Donna back to the call. But she's asked me to chair this particular call so I'm obliged to do that.

Before we go on to the substance of the call today, let's have a look at the agenda. I'm a little bit disoriented today, too many things going on at work. Right. Okay, cool. Thank you. So, yeah. I'll make some announcements. I think there's a couple on the plate. Then after that, we will continue discussion on charter question D2. We started going through some of the background materials or background information last week. Once we've done with that, then we'll move on to charter question D3.

I'd also like to note that we have now received the feedback from all three Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Generation Panels on

the outreach to them regarding the single character TLDs in Han script. So, time permitting, we will have a look at what I believe is a consolidation of the replies that staff has prepared for us for our easier consumption. Otherwise, you've been looking at multiple documents, I guess.

Okay. In terms of the two announcements on the chair's updates, the first one is there's a last call for feedback on the draft text for charter questions A7 part 1, A9, and A10. I believe they are due tomorrow at the close of business. So once that happens, then the leadership team, with the assistance of staff, will have a look at it in terms of feedback. We'll have a look at what comes back in terms of feedback, and then we'll make a call if there's anything that we need to bring back to the team to discuss whether there's any objections or any proposal for amendments of the draft text. Okay.

The second announcement obviously, before I forget, is regarding attendance at ICANN74. So we know that ICANN74, the preparations are underway, the event itself is looming. I've been asked to remind folks that there have been at least two e-mails, I guess, sent out to the list. We might need people to respond to whether they are going to be attending the EPDP calls during ICANN74 in person or otherwise. Staff can correct me if I'm wrong. I believe that even if you're going to be participating remotely, you would still need to fill in the form and let staff know. Is that right? I understand that's what's happening with the other sessions as well. Can staff let me know whether that's the case? Or is it only people who—yes?

DEVAN REED: Thank you. For the Google Form, you can fill it out if you intend to attend in the room during ICANN74 in The Hague. Or you can just answer no to the first question, and that way, we just have a record of what we're looking for. Because when we're admitting people into the room, we want to make sure that all of you get a seat so that everybody can be an equal participant in person, and then everybody who maybe isn't a member might not get a seat in the room. Does that make sense?

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, it does to me. Thank you, Devan. Basically, even if you're not turning up in person, can you please just go to the link to the form and just answer no to the first question? And then do all that. Okay? So thank you for your cooperation in that. Okay. So can we then proceed to the continued discussion on D2? So who do we have today to support on this? Steve?

STEVE CHAN: I just think indeed, it is Steve.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Go ahead then, Steve. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. Yeah, I don't know if we know that. But Ariel is also an apology for today. So I'll do my best Ariel impression today. So as Justine noted, this is a continuation of the discussion from the last meeting. So as a reminder, this question is really about ensuring

that the same entity principle is maintained for gTLD and its allocated variant TLD labels. And this is in relation to the registry transition process or changes control in the Registry Agreement, Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBERO), and then also the reassignment of a TLD as a result of a Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure or TM-PDDRP. Quite a mouthful.

So you'll see at the bottom, it says that there is an implicit dependency with D1a, should each TLD label be subject to a separate RA with ICANN. And if you recall, the preliminary outcome for this group is that there should be a single Registry Agreement with additional provisions or specification or whatever the case may be to link the primary label and all of the variant labels under that single agreement. So that's the question and a little bit of a context and implicit dependency, as it says here.

So on the next couple of slides, what you'll see is all the things that Ariel went over last week, and I'm inclined not to go over these unless there's questions about that. But you'll see all—well, not all the details but some of the pertinent details about the registry transition process, a little bit about the nuances about how it could happen, why it would happen, the different variations in what can trigger. This one, the slide is about sort of the high-level process of what it would look like.

Then again, they're slides about the EBERO. And I will pause on this one for a second. Actually, we'll talk about the second because I think this is one of the elements that actually raised questions last meeting. Again, I'm not planning to go over this in detail, but we can of course go back to it if we want to get a little

more detail about any of these processes. And more things about the EBERO. Then lastly about that trademark dispute.

So, the discussion, I guess this is actually more context, really, is that SubPro had recommended that the variants must be linked contractually and it should be considered a persistent requirement, meaning that if there's a change in hands on the TLD, all the variants should also go along with the TLD. And then it actually said specifically that this would impact gTLD registry transition procedures, including EBERO.

Then for the context, and again, as a reminder is that this EPDP is preliminarily saying that they want to provide further detail in saying that all of the primary string and the variants should be considered a single or captured under a single Registry Agreement. Then the staff paper context here, it assumes sort of the same things that all variants in the set should follow the same process for changing control based on the atomic principle, I suppose. So just move on to the next slide and we'll obviously open all this up for discussion.

The question really is how to maintain the same entity principle in the event of a registry transition process with respect to each of the three types mentioned: registry transition process, EBERO, and TM dispute resolution process. I don't know exactly the acronym. But what I really wanted to get to was the question that was raised in the last meeting. It was about whether or not the EBERO process would be triggered for a variant string that a registry operator wants to intentionally retire. The concern, I think—and I believe it was raised by Maxim. Of course, please correct us if we interpret it incorrectly—is that if the EBERO was

triggered intentionally for a variant that just a single variant, which can be amongst many variants, that the registry operator want to retire, that it shouldn't automatically trigger EBERO for all the main string and then variants that the applicant want to maintain. They shouldn't all be triggered by the intentional retirement of a single variant. Thanks for confirming that we've understood the potential concern.

So what staff did was we checked in with our colleagues in GDS. What we've learned is that the EBERO process is actually not triggered when it's an intentional or planned removal or retirement of gTLD. There have been retirements to date. But from what we've learned from GDS, it's always been brands or where all the second level domains are registered by the registry itself or affiliates. Yeah, there's been a single case of intentional where they actually triggered the elements that would trigger EBERO. So you're right. That one was a single one where it was intentionally triggered. But our understanding from GDS is that it's a controlled process when a TLD is intended to be retired. So what is done is there's an analysis essentially to understand the timeline and relevant steps and safeguards that are needed to make sure that a retirement of a TLD is done in a controlled manner. I guess that's the takeaway that we got from our GDS colleagues is that the EBERO got triggered in single case intentionally by the .web registry as we understand it, but in every other circumstance where TLD has been retired or moved, it's been via this other process where it's carefully considered by internal teams and with the registry to make sure that it's done in a controlled manner. And that it's been in cases where there are essentially no second level registrations other than for the top-level registry operator

itself. So I've been rambling a little bit and I want to make sure I turn it over to, I guess, Justine and the group for questions. Oops, sorry.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Right. I see Sarmad's hand. Sarmad, go ahead, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you Justine. Just to add to what Steve was saying there is also one additional requirement which is now part of SubPro, which says that if you have a second level domain registered under a TLD and that would apply to variants of second level as well, then that particular label under the TLD variant must be also registered to the same entity. In the case of EBERO when the change—so suppose if we have a label, my name under the TLD variant, and there is no other registration of my name under any of the other TLD variants which are delegated. And this particular TLD variant is getting retired. My name dot TLD will actually go under EBERO and under another registry operator's control. And then if we split this in the context of EBERO, there is a possibility that my name can actually be registered by some other registrant in the remaining TLD variants which are still delegated. So that in case we allow for this splitting, some mechanism would also need to be, I guess, put in place to make sure that if there is S1 registered under T1, then S1 under T1 TLD variant should only also be registered to exactly the same registrant. Again, as I said, that's also one of the requirements or one of the recommendations in SubPro. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Sarmad. Does everyone follow what's been being shared? I think essentially, we're trying to maintain the same entity rule. Does anyone else have any questions regarding what has been said? I wonder if Maxim has got any supplementary comments. Not to put you on the spot but if you do, then feel free to raise it. If not, then can I ask—okay, I see Dennis's hand. Dennis, go ahead, please.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Justine. Just to get, I guess, the ball rolling in the conversation, because what Sarmad just painted to us is an interesting case. I'm not sure whether he put that into the context, whether it was an intentional retirement goes to EBERO or something different, but I think I get the gist of his example. The purpose of the EBERO is to maintain the critical functions of the DNS, and that's to maintain certain domain name registration's life, if you will, but they will not take new registrations and they do not apply rules that might have been in place with the original registry operator. So the example that he's posting is one where you have a variant under the one that is under EBERO no longer in control with the original registry operator, but you have the original registry operator still operating subset of the variant set and applying the certain rules and what have you. And there could be a case that you have the domain names. We're not talking about variants at the top level but variants at the second level that can be registered that would otherwise be subject to same entity principles by the registrar and the registrant, and then you have—I'm not sure whether it's an edge case or not—a case where

domain names that should be deemed the same and expected to behave somewhat consistently. Now, they are registered by different or they're not longer required or subject to the same rules if they would have been under the same registry operator.

I know I'm going around circles and trying to make sense as I'm going through. But I wish we had a whiteboard here so we can paint the whole picture. I get to wonder ... I do understand the concern here that where you split domain names that would otherwise have been treated as variants and subject to specific rules or policies that we are trying to figure out. You have, again, a set that is a split because of the EBERO case. I wonder if that's an edge case or that's very possible under the new reality that accepts variant TLDs and domain names and so on, so forth. So, I'm going to stop there because I'm just trying to make sense of it. It's very complex, but I appreciate the concern, which is trying to process all of these in my head now. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Dennis, for the intervention. Look, folks, I'd love to try and keep the conversation simple so that people don't get lost. In a sense that can we try to consider EBERO separately in terms of a controlled retirement as opposed to a forced retirement by way of a trigger or something? So I think maybe the discussion should focus more on what is expected in terms of the controlled retirement through EBERO rather than the forced one and see whether the forced one really is really like an edge case where do we really need to consider that possibility. I see Maxim's hand up first. Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: First of all, I'd like to underline that EBERO is unlike usual registries created with ICANN. If they do not care about policies we have for registries, first of all, it's not a normal registry. It's not a registry at all. It's an emergency operator.

The second, if we cannot change something which is frozen inside of EBERO, what we can do is to apply the requirement for all variants of those frozen strings to be in the same hands. So only the same entity which is in the registrant record of those frozen domains should have all others. Or if it's not possible, then all other variants are not accessible until that frozen item dies with the TLD after EBERO process.

I think it's quite simple. If you can't change something, then you try to copy its features. And even if you give all the variants to EBERO, they do not follow registry policies or ICANN policies for registries. So it's even worse. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: That's an interesting observation, Maxim. Thanks for that. Donna, please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Justine. When I have the mic, I'm just going to thank Justine and the team for keeping this process moving while I've been out of pocket for a couple of weeks. I'm still not fully caught up. So that's why I've asked Justine to continue managing the process while I get back up to speed. And please bear in mind

that I am trying to get back up to speed so I may have this wrong. I think it's correct. We need to separate the retirement of a variant from the EBERO process. And I think if a registry operator that has a group of variants and they want to retire one of them, that's a very different conversation to talking about EBERO. So if the gTLD and its variants that operate under one Registry Agreement, there are reasons that the EBERO process would be triggered.

And if I look at the .web case, even though you could say that it was voluntary, that the organization voluntarily went into EBERO, the primary reason was financial, that they did that. But most of the reasoning that EBERO is related to the ability of the gTLD operator to operate the TLD, and I would think that we have agreed previously that, as it says here, there's one Registry Agreement for the variant and its TLDs. I couldn't imagine a situation where just one of the variants would trigger an EBERO process, it would have to be the gTLD and its variants that fall into that category and it must have not complied with some element of the Registry Agreement to end up in EBERO. It sounds like to me that we are confusing two concepts unnecessarily. So the retirement of the TLD, whether it's a variant or otherwise, is a quite different conversation to something that triggers an EBERO process. I'm sorry if I've made that more confusing. Thanks, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

No, that's fine. Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Actually, Donna, I don't think it was confusing. It was right on the spot. In my point of view, I actually wanted to say something very similar. I think we can keep it simple and do not need to consider a special case where intentional retirement of variant TLD needs an EBERO. If you just want to retire one of your variant TLDs, you can just retire them normally and just have it at the end of the retirement process, have it removed from the root zone. There is no need to go into EBERO to retire your variant TLDs.

So if you do go to EBERO, as Donna said, it's usually because you have some problems keeping up running the TLD, even if it's just for the remaining weeks or whatever. So in this case, if you do go to an EBERO, all of the variant TLDs should go into EBERO because you've got a problem. And if you do not have a problem, you certainly retire it normally. So that's why I think don't do special cases with retirement. Just say that if a variant TLD goes into EBERO, all of the variants go into EBERO without exception. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks for that, Michael. Satish, go ahead, please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Justine. I generally tend to agree with the previous interventions. For me, a planned retirement of a domain name should not at all trigger an emergency procedure. So a planned retirement should be smooth and we don't even have to refer to EBERO. I also agreed that if the EBERO was triggered on

account of some kind of breach or voluntarily, then, as was just stated, the entire domain label set should move over. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you for that, Satish. Any more comments? I think what I'm hearing, at least from a few people, is consistent opinion that we should maintain the same entity principles. So if one variant goes, then the other variants in the whole set also go together with that particular variant. That's putting it simply. Basically, just maintaining the same entity principle.

Does anyone else want to agree or have a different opinion? I am not seeing any hands or any other messages in the chat. So I can assume that the team is more or less in agreement and we can move on. Okay. I think we have a winner. Can we move on to charter question D3, Steve?

STEVE CHAN:

Sure. Thanks, Justine. Moving on to question D3. It's a pretty short and simple one. We'll see if the discussion itself is simple. But the question is quite simple. So it's again about maintaining the same entity principle. So that's asking, "What are the operational legal impacts to the data escrow policies, if any?" Like I said, a short and sweet question.

Like usual, we have a little bit of context and background. This PDP has impacts and considerations from a number of different processes and that applies here too. So the background here is the what: it's an act of storing data with a neutral third party, and it's intended to help guard against registry or registrar failure.

So that also touches the why. So it enhances the stability of domain name registrations in gTLDs and essentially makes sure that there's a backup copy of the registration data. So it ensures that that data is never at risk of being lost or inaccessible because it's backed up.

The how is that it requires all gTLD registries and registrars to contract with the data escrow provider. The timing of this is that they must do a full deposit of data on each Sunday, and then partial deposits on all other days when there is new data to be deposited. And then that cycle starts again on each Sunday.

So the Registry Agreement has a specification too that provides data escrow requirements. And then the Registrar Accreditation Agreement also has a requirement section, and that's 3.6. So the staff paper had made an assumption that, essentially the data escrow requirements would automatically be required for each variant of the set because the assumption there was that each registration of a variant would be treated as an individual application and then delegation and be considered like any other registration of a top-level domain. So the natural assumption in that case is that the data escrow requirements and policies would naturally apply because it's each individual delegation to the root and an individual agreement. We know that the interim or preliminary agreement from this group is that it's actually the primary and variants would all be considered a set under a single agreement.

So the question for discussion is, since the EPDP is preliminary recommended that each gTLD and its variant labels, if any, are subject to a single Registry Agreement, is there any reason that

the data escrow policy and requirements for gTLDs would not apply to the variants and/or would there be any adjustments needed to account for the possibility of having variant labels? So essentially, is there any reason why the data escrow requirements would not apply to the variances a central question here? So I'll stop there and pass back to Justine. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Steve. So, does anyone have any comments? I'm wondering whether it's the answer, it's as obvious to me as to anyone else. Maxim, yes? Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, which particular EBERO is approved, the question is in hands of ICANN because to pass the backend test—yeah, actually, it should be just a notice that all TLD which are in the same variant set should have agreements with the same escrow operator. There is nothing on technical side, it's just operational and bureaucratic thing, and it's quite simple.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Justine. So I have a clarification question here. I know that the infrastructure level, each variant is an independent TLD. So they are automatically kind of handled as was stated here. But I also note that the actual date of activation of variants could be

different from the primary label because maybe it is applied for later. So I'm not sure what is the final use of this data? If the final use of the data requires that the entire set be treated as one, and you have different life cycles for different variants, then I'm not sure whether there is a problem there. But my question is, basically, what is the end use of this data? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: What is the end use of the data? Is that the question?

SATISH BABU: Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. I would like to ask if staff can try and provide some insight into answering that question. But in the meantime, Maxim, would you like to make a comment? Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: There are two ways to use the data for ICANN. First is one of the methods during audits, in particular, to ensure that the data is stored properly and things like that. The second way is to handle the data to the next registry operator. So the basic idea is to keep it somewhere safely. In case the previous registry operator dies and all copies of data destroyed, etc., etc., to avoid that, to avoid loss of data, of records of registrants, to protect their rights, the idea of escrow operators in the past. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you for providing that explanation, Maxim. It's always good to have contracted party reps in the team. Donna, please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Justine. I think Maxim's right. This is about ensuring that the data is available in circumstances where something goes astray with the registry operator. But I wanted to pick up on something that Maxim said in his previous comment, and I think the question for us here is that the registry operator can decide who their escrow provider is. And I think what's probably important for us here is that the registry operator has the same escrow provider for the data to the primary TLD and the associated variants. So I think we've agreed to one Registry Agreement so it seems logical to me that there would be just the one escrow provider, but perhaps we need to make that explicit. I don't know how others feel about that, but I think it was a fair point raised by Maxim that the registry operator can choose its escrow provider, and I think in the case of a TLD and its variants, that it should be the one escrow provider. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Donna. I noticed Maxim is also saying that having the same escrow operator makes it easier from a technical perspective as well. So yeah, I mean, as I said, I think the answer to me at least looks obvious. But yeah, I'm happy to hear views in support or views in opposition. Michael, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. I also agree that it should be a single escrow operator. As Maxim says, it's far easier from a tech perspective. But I'm just wondering, will it be a single escrow file for the TLD and all its variants, or should it be one escrow file for each of the variants? Is that something that we need to decide? Is it something that someone else decides? Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. My gut feeling would be that it's an implementation issue, but I'm happy to stand corrected. Does anyone want to weigh in on Michael's question? A bit quiet today. Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So I guess from perspective again, yes, it could be something which could be discussed in implementation. But if each TLD is technically unique from a root zone perspective, it may actually be useful to consider a separate escrow file for each TLD variant. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you for that input. Maxim, I see your hand up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: The current design is each TLD has to have a separate escrow contract. It means, for example, if you have an organization with two TLDs, you have two escrow contracts. And in this situation,

it's the number of contracts for the same set of variants should be with the same escrow operator. There are separate escrow files. Nothing bad in it, it works. And we shouldn't mingle with the process, trying to squeeze all the data of all variants into the single file. Basically, it's just a small files on SFTP. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, that makes perfect sense, Maxim. Thank you. Why would you want to force anyone to merge files into a single one? It also makes sense from integrity point of view, if one file fails—hopefully not—then that failure shouldn't affect another file per se. Michael, I see your hand is still up. I'm not sure whether there's an old hand or a new hand.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Actually, it was an old hand but I just remembered something so I might as well use the opportunity, if I may.

JUSTINE CHEW: Go ahead, please.

MICHAEL BAULAND: In the escrow definition, there's a special field for variants, it's an NNDN. I'm wondering if a registry runs their TLD variants in such a way that, for example, whenever you register a domain under the main TLD, you automatically get assigned the same labeled under the variant TLDs, they might want to use this special NNDN element to report their variants. In which case, they probably

would need to have a single escrow file. I don't know if that's really an actual use case or just a very hypothetical and whether we need to discuss this or whether it's something that the registry just decides for themselves. I just wanted to mention that. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Michael. I have to confess that going a little bit above my pay grade, really. I don't know whether it's worth actually having us address that particular issue per se. I wonder if we can generate something in terms of implementation guidance just to cover the bases in terms of keeping the current practice or having separate data escrow files for each TLD. Thoughts, anyone? The recommendation that potentially comes out of it, it would be that we don't see any major changes to the current practice even if it's one Registry Agreement for all variants and each variant has to have its own data escrow. And just to make sure that each data escrow provider is the same for the variants in the set. I hope I got it right.

Okay. Any other comments? Okay. I got an agree from Zuan. Zhang, thank you. We seem to be going along quite quickly today. Right. Steve, was any more discussion needed on this particular topic or charter question?

STEVE CHAN:

As far as I understand, this was the—yeah, that was actually the conclusion of the discussion or at least the conclusion of the slides. And it seems like you recounted what could be the shape

of some preliminary recommendations on this question. Yeah, nothing else in the slides.

JUSTINE CHEW: All right. Thank you. I wish I had the ability to be bit more articulate in summing up things. So I'm a little bit feeling under the weather a little bit. Anyway, if that being the case, then we have time to cover the additional item on the responses from the CJK Generation Panels. So can I have an indication of who's going to take us through this? Is it you, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: I am the lucky person again.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, great. Go ahead. Thanks.

STEVE CHAN: I've already hinted to Sarmad. He wants might want to jump in here because some of the elements in here are, like you said a second ago, above my pay grade as well. So definitely looking for help.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, no worries.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Justine. So the reminder on the question here is that this is in relation to charter question A7. It's about single character TLDs. So what happened, of course, you'll all recall is that we sent a short questionnaire to the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Generation Panels. And so what we're doing here is we're taking a quick look at the summarization of the responses that were provided. I think the important context here is that these are sort of preliminary responses that are, I guess, in advance of more detailed work that they might undertake, relay to the questions that have been asked to them. So with that, we can take a quick look at what they've said so far.

The first question was to help us understand whether or not all the CJK characters or the Han characters are actually ideograms. As a reminder, the SubPro recommendation said that it must be an ideogram or ideograph to be able to be applied for as a single character gTLD. So, in summary, the response from Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Generation Panels was yes, they're all ideographs. So it's a pretty simple summary of the responses. Any questions? Of course, Sarmad, obviously, if you want to add anything along the way, please do. All right. It seems like that one's pretty simple.

So the next one—and this is where I guess it goes above my pay grade because it goes into linguistics elements that I'm not fully versed on. So the question here to the GPs was whether or not they can identify a subset of Han scripts that would be allowed for single character gTLDs. But alternatively, whether or not it might be possible or maybe easier to develop criteria by which Han characters should not be allowed because they have confusion

risks that rise above commonplace similarities. So it's either a specific subset that can't be allowed or maybe more appropriate and maybe easier to identify criteria that helps identify things that are single character strings that should not be allowed.

Then there's also a question about coordination between the three GPs to help answer this question to be able to develop that criteria. So the preliminary responses from the Chinese chair, it's difficult for coordination but I think there's still a willingness to try. That's the first part of it. He also stated that the development of the rule set was intended to try to reduce the possibility of confusion. So that's kind of inherent to the Root Zone LGR already is, I think, the understanding.

Another point here was that in many cases, it would be a family name or geolocation that what would be most appropriate or most likely to be applied for as a single character gTLD. Then I think something that we've touched on here is that there are some characters that do not seem applicable or appropriate for single character gTLDs because they are base radicals rather than full characters, which I understand they're sort of a foundational part of a more complex character, and that this is exactly where I get out of my element beyond my pay grade. So, Sarmad, please feel free to save me on that one. But essentially, they don't have a full, meaning they're intended to be sort of a building block for larger character. So therefore, they would not make sense as a single character TLD. So that's the Chinese response. Any questions or additions from folks?

All right. So the Japanese GP response. They say it's safer to disallow Han characters that are defined as visually identical to

Kana characters in Japanese, but is ultimately up to the Integration Panel and ICANN to decide. So this answer trends more towards identifying characters that should not be allowed, so the disallow criteria. It's a pretty short response.

Then lastly, the Korean GP response is that several Hanja characters have the same pronunciation and there may be risk for confusion. And then they note their willingness to participate in further discussion. Presumably, that's about the coordination with the other GPs. And then I guess the reminder I would make is that these are preliminary responses with an eye towards future coordination work to develop more full answers. But these are just the preliminary responses from the GP chairs. Any questions or comments about this? Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you, Steve. I probably just make a couple of observations here. I think what we're getting from the three Generation Panels is a couple of things. Some general principles. For example, one principle is that if there is a character in Han script which may actually look similar to another character in another script, example being, Han or Kanji character, looking the same as Kana characters in Japanese. There may be a motivation to not include those characters in single character TLDs because since there is no context available, there is a possibility that that single character can be interpreted as the character in the other script, which means that we are through that process, possibly at least visually allowing a TLD, which is a non-ideograph from a visual point of view, of course, from a technical point of view with ideographic code point. So, that's one, for example, principle.

In the Japanese case, I think there was one more point which is not included here. There's a second principle which is also common with Chinese that there are some other characters which may not qualify for single character TLDs for various reasons. One reason provided by Chinese case is that there are some basic radicals which don't have a semantic meaning. So they're not really ideographic in that sense.

So the other example, which is not here but shared by Japanese, was their iteration mark. Iteration mark means, of course, that it says that the character before it should be repeated. So it has to come after a character, it cannot come by itself, because then you don't really know what is being iterated. So you shouldn't really make a single character TLD with an iteration mark. So that's another kind of principle which is coming out.

Korean case is a little more challenging because in addition to visual sort of string similarity is largely motivated by visual sort of analysis. But they are now, I guess, going into pronunciation, which is not entirely visual. So that's sort of a discussion which I guess we need to have. Also the GPs need to have that whether such a criteria should be eligible for string similarity cases or not.

So those are, I guess, some of the points, looking at it from a big picture point of view. And to conclude what this also means is that there is really work which needs to be done by the GPs by these communities, as well as perhaps GNSO, this IDN EPDP Working Group to either document the principles or document the data or a combination of both to guide the string similarity review process. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks so much. Sorry, Justine. Go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry. Sorry, I forgot you were running the—

STEVE CHAN: I'm happy to turn it back to you, Justine. Anyway, I was just saying thanks for your wisdom and linguistic expertise, Sarmad. That's helpful to me at least.

I think there's just one last slide. This was about whether or not it's possible for the three GPs, Generation Panels, to reconvene and conduct the work mentioned above in which they have at least opined on preliminary, and then level of effort. So there was actually only one substantive response, it was from the Chinese GP. It was a six-month period would be needed to generate a list of allowable single character strings. That is means a conservative approach.

That was the entirety of the responses so far. Again, repeating, this is really preliminary because of this last question. It's envisioned as plenary responses in the context of a longer set of work that would be needed. So with that, now we'll turn it back to Justine. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Steve. So my question would be based on these preliminary responses. Do we have enough information to go back

to charter question A7 and answer part 2? Satish, I see your hand up.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Justine. My answer to that is that we seem to have part of the solution or the answer to that question, but I don't think at this time we have the full picture or the process by which we can arrive at the answer because we don't have the response on the third question. I do have a comment, however, on the fact that the Japanese GP has pointed out the role of the Integration Panel. Since that's where these three get merged, they must be surely aware of some of these issues. And I was wondering if we should involve that group as well, in addition to ICANN and the GPS. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Well, I'd like to redirect that question to Sarmad, if I may, because he would be the best person to answer in regards to GPs and IP. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

So, IP is certainly knowledgeable and they will certainly have an opinion. So it may be useful to get their input as well. But that's, of course, up to the IDN EPDP Working Group. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Sarmad. Does anyone have an opinion about the suggestion raised by Satish to contact the IPs? Do people feel

there's a strong need to contact the IP to do a similar outreach to the IP, similar to what we've done with the CJK GPs? In the meantime, I'm also trying to think about how to handle the fact that, although it's preliminary responses and I get the sense that the work can be done by the GPs, but apart from I suppose what the chair of the Chinese GP said, six months, we don't really have a proper indication of whether the work to come up with a mechanism or criteria is definite per se. So I'm wondering whether we can consider having an implementation guidance or even recommendation in principle—this is just thinking out loud—to support the efforts of the CJK GPs, and perhaps there's a role for the IP as well, to go ahead and come up with this, develop the criteria in order for the evaluation to be done prior to the next round so that there is a mechanism by which the evaluators can rely on to evaluate whether a particular application for single character TLD is allowable or not. Can I have some inputs from people, please? Steve?

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Justine. Steve, I would just maybe suggest another way to look at this or approach this is that the EPDP now has these preliminary responses from the 3 GPs. There's an indication at least that they seem to be willing to work on the topic and willing to work together even if it might be a little bit difficult. So one of the plenary outcomes of this discussion, it could be that yes, indeed, the EPDP wants to request the GPs to undergo the more detailed work rather than just these preliminary responses, and then with the knowledge that it's going to take a little bit of time. But basically, the conclusion could be that the EPDP team likes the

preliminary direction of the analysis but is now requesting the three GPs to undertake a more rigorous analysis work to be able to develop full answers and possibly the criteria. So with that, I'll actually stop there and you run the [inaudible]. Sorry.

JUSTINE CHEW: No worries. It's nice to have suggestions to the team for them to consider how to move forward on this. Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. I agree with Steve that the possible way ahead is to actually go back to GPs and request them to conduct that extra work. But when reaching out, I think it may be useful to make it clearer what is, I think, needed or the scope of the work is. I guess the question is that is pronunciation, for example, a factor in determining confusability between two Hanja characters. I guess a question is that something EPDP Working Group should decide or would decide, or is that something which should be left to the Generation Panel? So some of this discussion, I guess, also would be helpful here so that when we reach out to GPs, we reach out with a clearer scope of work. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. Okay. So I'm wondering whether this is something that folks want to provide an input on. My personal inclination would be—I don't claim to be a linguistics expert in Chinese, Japanese, or Korean, so matters of linguistics I think is best left to the GPs per se. Does anyone object if staff and leadership were to go ahead and develop something to progress the outreach to the three GPs

based on what Sarmad has outlined, and Steve has outlined as well? Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much. I don't actually get the difference between part 2 of question two and question three. So question three asks about criteria for the evaluation of future single character gTLD applications in order to ensure no confusion, and part 2 of question two asks about the possibility of developing criteria to identify a list of characters that may introduce confusion. So part 2 of two and three are almost the same, but they're like one says, what's allowed and the other says what's not allowed.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I think it's nuanced. One says, "Is there anything that is disallowed?" And then the other part of it is, "Do you have a criteria by which somebody can use to evaluate what is allowed and what is not allowed?"

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yeah. But it is also a criteria. They're both criterias.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Right. Look, the thing is this outreach has gone out. I'm not sure whether it's worth debating that particular—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No, no. It's not. It's not but maybe there is—yeah. It's not, definitely.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. What I'm suggesting now is leadership and staff have a look at what's been provided in terms of input today, and to see how we want to scope the further outreach to the GPs to elaborate on what we think they need to do. Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Justine. I will attempt to answer the question. I think the difference, as Justine noted, is a bit of nuanced. So I believe the difference between two and three is that two is looking at specific list from two angles. So two is a specific list of allowable or potentially a list of not allowed, whereas three is more about general criteria that would allow for single character Han script strings to be accepted and delegated. So I think that's the difference. Two is about specific list of strings, either allowable or disallowable, whereas three is more about general criteria. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Steve. So back to my question. Does anyone object to the suggestion that I put forward earlier that leadership and staff have a look at how to scope for the intervention with the GPs based on the discussion today and based on the team's consideration of their preliminary responses? If anyone has any concerns about that, then please raise them. Okay. I see two "no objections". Three "no objections" and one "no concern". Okay. All

right. Sounds good. Great. Thank you. I was getting a bit lonely speaking to myself. Great. So let's, let's proceed in that respect.

Okay. So we have 15 minutes left before the top of the hour. I'm not sure there's anything else we have on the agenda to cover. Can I get an indication from Steve that we have gone through everything that we have on the agenda for today?

STEVE CHAN: That was correct. Just AOB left.

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. Okay. Is there any AOBs?

STEVE CHAN: Nothing that we specifically identified ahead of time.

JUSTINE CHEW: Great. Yes. That's what I thought as well. Okay. That being the case, then I'm very happy to give you back 15 minutes of your time. Thank you very much for your attendance. And don't forget to submit your responses for the draft text of A7 part 1, A9 and A10. It's due tomorrow.

I've just got a message that Devan has got some housekeeping questions. So I will turn the floor to her, please.

DEVAN REED: I'm sorry for the confusion, Justine. I only meant for the leadership team. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. Okay. No worries, right. In that case, then I have taken an extra minute unnecessarily. So thank you again for being part of the call and your contributions. We will catch you again next week. Thank you. Goodbye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]