ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 28 July 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/JgYVD

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, 20 July 2022 at 13:30 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. We do have apologies from Dennis Tan and Satish Babu.

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

Statements of Interest and must be kept up to date. If anyone has 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 shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name 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 back to you, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you, Devan. Welcome, everybody, to today's call. It may be a bit of a shorter call today because the only thing that we wanted to go through from an agenda perspective was finalize—well, we won't be able to finalize today but I just want to walk through the remaining text that we started looking at on last week. I say I don't think we'll be able to find most today because I know we have a number of our team absent. So in the interest to give them an opportunity to weigh in on any final text that we come up with, it won't be final until they've had that opportunity.

So let's see where we get to. I thought we had a good conversation with the ccPDP folks on Tuesday. I don't think there's too many areas that we seem to have a problem with. We may look at adopting the stress test approach that the ccs have used. I haven't listened to their session to see how it works. But it might be worthwhile doing for some of our work as we get more recommendations finalized, and as we try to put the pieces together to ensure that some of our recommendations aren't impacting other recommendations or raise other concerns. So we

may do some of that ourselves. So with that, I think I will hand it to you, Ariel, and we'll pick up where we left off on the reviewing of the language.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. Thank you, Donna. So before the call this week, we also sent the suggested edits to the list. It was some rationale why we're proposing those edits. So, hopefully folks had a chance to review that. I'm happy to discuss more today during the call.

The first edits, it's about Recommendation 2.3. So the current revised wording reads, "If the registry operator of an IDN gTLD changes its backend registry service provider, that IDN gTLD and any additional delegated variant labels associated with that gTLD must simultaneously transition to the new backend registry service provider." So that's the revised wording and we hope that this will, in general, encompass the concept of primary gTLD and the variant labels of that primary gTLD without specifying it in the recommendation.

But in the rationale, we have specified that. So it will look at the rationale, we crossed out the last sentence, and replaced that with "To that end, the transition to a new backend registry service provider must apply to the primary gTLD and all of its delegated variant labels at the same time." So here we are using a general sense, we tried to clarify that the transition applies to both the primary and its delegated variant labels as a group.

So this is revised wording. I know the revision mainly originated from Zhang Zuan's comments. So I'm happy to hear from Zhang Zuan and others if you're okay with this revised wording, if any further refinement is needed.

DONNA AUSTIN: Ariel, if I may. It's great that you're now okay with the language so that's great. Just to note that the language we've used in 2.3 is also consistent with the recommendation above. But I also wanted to flag a note on the list from Dennis about the use of primary gTLD and the potential implications of abusing that terminology. I'm very much aware that we're not really consistent in the way that we have used or referenced language within the text that we've drafted so far, and that's something that we know we have to clean up.

I think the other thing we have to do is develop a glossary because I think we do need to define the terms that we have, that we've used. I do think we've adopted terminology that makes sense to us, that helps our conversations, but that terminology may be problematic when we post the draft report and people interpret it different ways. So that is something that we're aware of and that we need to sort out. But I think Dennis has a note about the use of primary and the possible consequence was quite pointed, and we understand that that is an issue. So we'll dig a bit further into that and see how we can resolve it so that the language that we use in the draft final report that we put out for comment doesn't have unintended understandings, I suppose it's a language that we're using. So for the time being, I think we will continue to refer to the primary gTLD and its variant labels

because that means something to us in the discussions were having within this group. Thanks, Ariel. I just want to say that before we move forward.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you very much, Donna, and duly noted. I believe there's a capture-all question in group three, where we could potentially develop a recommendation on what we mean by a primary gTLD, what that means in terms of future new gTLD applications, as well as the existing gTLDs. And if they activate variants, would the existing gTLD be automatically regarded as the primary. So perhaps that could be a good place to develop a recommendation on that, and then also including the glossary as a reference. So thank you for mentioning that, Donna.

Also, I just want to note that Zhang Zuan put a comment in the chat and he's okay with the current wording now, so I appreciate that feedback. If there's no objection or further questions or comments, perhaps we can move on. But, Donna, I just want to check with you. Would you like to give folks who are not in the call today a chance to respond on list whether they're okay with the wording before we regard this as stable?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, Ariel. Yes, it's a short answer. So I think what we can do is once we've gone through the remainder of the language here, we'll put it to the list and give folks an opportunity to review. I know Dennis is on vacation as well. Satish couldn't join the call today.

So we'll just give additional time for folks to have a look at it and see if they're okay with it. Okay.

So, Hadia, I just want to pick up on your comment in chat that we always thought the label and the label variants. I always thought it was the label and the label variants primary suggests that there is a secondary label. I appreciate what you're saying and I understand what you're saying, and this is why we need to develop some kind of glossary because I think we are speaking perhaps in a shorthand and we need to make sure that everybody understands what we're talking about. So the glossary will become important and also ensuring that we have consistency of language throughout any report that we publish. So we agree with you, Hadia, we need to be consistent. Okay, I'll hand it back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: All right, sounds good. I think that's all for this Google Doc. Then the next revision we did is regarding Recommendation 2.5. So if you recall in the last week, Sarmad had a suggestion of including "during the same rounds" at the end of the recommendation, but at the same time, there's still some pending discussion about whether activation of variant labels is allowed between rounds, where it's only limited during application rounds. So it's still pending at the moment. So that's why some members who are suggesting that perhaps we don't specify it currently, and that's why the revision right now is to take out that redline, and then keep the recommendation language as is based on the original text.

The only thing we changed is to add a sentence at the beginning of the rationale for Recommendation 2.5. So we added, the EPDP team noted SubPro PDPs recommendation that future applications of new gTLDs must be assessed in rounds. So the reason we added this is because in the rest of the rationale, we did mention application rounds and subsequent rounds, and this is to provide a context where that expectation comes from. So basically, the expectation right now is that future new gTLD applications will happen in rounds, and that was affirmed, were recommended in the SubPro final report. So we'll provide that context, and then it will probably be clear of why we are using the rounds reference in the rest of the rationale.

So that's the only change we made for Recommendation 2.5. I recognize that in the future, when the group revisits the question about activation of variant labels, there may be additional recommendations that need to be made. Then if required, then we probably have to look at the existing recommendation the group already developed, and then see whether any additional updates are needed. So basically, that's the extended update for this recommendation. I will stop here for a moment.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. So I just wanted to make a short comment since I suggested that text earlier. I think the motivation for that particular text was that we need to somehow specify which I think what this

EN

recommendation is saying that we're specifying which variant labels to activate. Even if there is activation possible in between rounds, that I guess requests would need to come separately, unless what the working group is currently thinking is that all the possible allocated variants will be requested for activation at the same time. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, Sarmad. I'm not following. Could you just repeat that? I'm sorry.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sure, no problem. Suppose a label has 10 allocatable variant labels. One option is to submit one application which says that "We are going to activate all the 10 allocatable variants." I think that is not the intention. The intention is that the applicant is going to say that "We would like to activate two variant labels at this time." And then, at a later stage, whether that is in the next round or between the rounds, whatever the mechanism, the working group decides they will then identify that they would like to activate another one or two labels, and so on. So every time there is going to be a new application which will identify which variant levels to activate.

So, I guess the way at least I was reading it, there will be one application for activating a subset of variant labels for, I guess, each round—or maybe "round" is not the right word. But if we leave it open like this, it may actually mean that you're applying to activate all the 10 variant labels at the same time. So I guess the

EN

idea is to find some language which doesn't tie it with rounds but still suggest that there will be multiple requests for a subset of those possible allocatable variant labels. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Sarmad. I think the intent with this recommendation was just to capture that rather than submitting individual applications that an IDN gTLD applicant can submit one application that covers the IDN in any variants that they're looking to activate. I understand that if they seek to activate too in round one, and then there's additional variants that they seek to activate at a later stage, we haven't really accommodated that. Is that an accurate understanding of what you're saying?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yes. Currently, it's saying that whatever the set of allocatable variants are, they will need to be done in one application. I guess what I'm saying is that there may be multiple applications at different stages to activate some smaller sets of those allocatable variants. So it's not a single one application. I think it could be read in that spirit or in that context as well. But what I suggested, I realized that it was tying it to the round, and maybe that's not correct either because the working group hasn't discussed it. But the part which I wanted to perhaps highlight was that there is more than one instance of these applications.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Right. So the original application may need a supplemental application at a later stage if the applicant wants to seek variants

at a later stage. I can't remember what the question was, Ariel, that we're trying to solve, but I understand the point that Sarmad is trying to make. Right. So it's that middle question, right? What should be the process by which an applicant applying for a new IDN gTLD could seek and obtain any allocatable variants? So I think we need to put a note perhaps in the rationale for 2.5, something to the effect that we haven't addressed when and how an IDN gTLD registry operator can apply for additional variants. Hadia, sorry. Go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. But I think we have said here that the EPDP team agreed for the next application and each subsequent round an applicant … So that suggests that an applicant will be applying during a round, right, for the label and variants?

DONNA AUSTIN: For the original. This is where our language gets a little bit confusing, I think.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Some or all of its allocatable variant labels who applies. The EPDP team agreed that for the next application round and each subsequent round, an applicant who applies for primary new IDN gTLD and some or all of its allocatable variant labels and the same set will only be required to submit one application. That suggests that we are sticking to rounds.

DONNA AUSTIN:	But I still don't think it addresses the issue that Sarmad has raised, Hadia, in that because we haven't discussed what happens when the IDN gTLD operator wants additional variants. We haven't come to any agreement. Actually, I don't know that we've discussed how that would happen. Sarmad, and then Justine.
SARMAD HUSSAIN:	Slightly different comment from the current discussion, but still just reading it again, Recommendation 2.5 also suggest that every time we will be applying for the primary IDN gTLD along with its variants. But that will only be true perhaps in the first case for the new application. But in the subsequent cases, the primary will not be actually applied for even though primary will be identified, but only the variant labels will be applied for.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Correct. Justine?
JUSTINE CHEW:	I wanted to say what Sarmad just said. So I think the focus here is whenever someone applies for both primary and one or more variant labels, that's what we're addressing. So it doesn't matter whether it's rounds or whatever. The event that we are focusing on is where the primary is applied for together with allocatable variants. But your point is also important that we haven't discussed the situation where someone who's already gotten a primary gTLD wants to then apply for the activation of additional

EN

variants. So I think that's probably something that we need to make clear here. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Justine. In some respects, Ariel, can you just go back up to the question? Maybe this is my incorrect reading, but how we deal with variants, if there's an additional variant that an IDN registry operator wants to apply for and how that process would work, we will cover that in our conversation around what should be the process by which an existing registry operator could apply for or be allocated a variant for its existing gTLD? So that's the question that we haven't addressed yet because we were waiting on the results from the survey that we put out to existing registry operators. So we'll cover that situation when we deal with that question. It's good that we're having this conversation now because it's not just for the existing IDN registry operators that exist right now, but in the future, how are we going to handle that as well. Does that all make sense? Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: I think just to clarify. I think we were focusing on D1b Part 2 now. So the situation where someone has already gotten the so-called primary label and wants to activate additional variants. I believe that falls under Part 1. Well, not quite exactly because Part 1 speaks about existing registry. But if you interpret someone who's already gotten a primary as existing registry, then it applies.

DONNA AUSTIN:	Yes. In the future, we will have more existing IDN registry operators. So while that 2.5 one was specifically for the current tool of IDN registry operators, when we think about the question, we should also think about in the future there will be IDN gTLD operators that already have variants but they may want to seek more. So I think that's where we need to talk about that.
	Okay. So we're okay to leave 2.5 as it is? Is that the sense of the group? I don't know if we have checkmarks or not. That's an answer—and, Nigel, if you're listening in, I don't know whether Devan sent you the prompt to join us, but if you see it, please do. Okay. I think we're good to move on, Ariel.
ARIEL LIANG:	Thanks, Donna. I just wanted to confirm. So the recommendation language stays as is. And for the rationale, we're adding the suggested sentence but do we want to change anything else in the rationale based on what Justine proposed in the chat, as she proposed some revised wording for that, where the primary label is sought with one or more variant labels at the same time. So incorporate that. I just want to clarify if we want to consider that suggestion.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Where would that language from Justine be inserted? Sorry.
ARIEL LIANG:	I think maybe it's this sentence here, maybe we can change it to basically "who apply for a primary new IDN gTLD and one or more

of its allocatable value labels at the same time." So basically, they replaced this with the wording suggested, and then "will only be required to submit one application for the set."

Then also, there could be another suggestion—I think staff and Justine are chatting in the background—is to add the suggested sentence at the beginning of 2.5. So maybe I can just show how it looks like here so we're on the same page. So it will look like this. "Where the primary label is sought with one or more variant labels at the same time, future IDN gTLD applicants will be required to submit one application covering the primary IDN gTLD and corresponding allocatable variant labels that applicant seeks to activate." So that could be another place to incorporate that suggestion.

DONNA AUSTIN: This is a personal preference, but I prefer the language as it was without the qualifier. We do a better job of explaining what we mean in rationale. I think the recommendation language is good. It's just that we need to flag somewhere that this is D1b Part 2. And maybe when we get to D1b Part 1, we won't have so much finishing with this.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. That sounds good. So, I guess action item for staff is to look at the rationale again and see whether we can clarify the language by including qualifier and also considering Justine's suggestion and see whether we can incorporate some wording there. Note we will get back to the group for another review.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Even if there's a note in the rationale, Ariel, that just says this language may change depending on the team's discussion of D1b Part 1.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. Also, I just want to note that we have another charter question that's specifically dealing with the timing and sequence for applying for variants, and that one was also parked as well. So that's very much related to the Part 1 D1b.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. I guess we can move on to the next one. The next one is Recommendation 2.6. Last week, there's no revision or input for the recommendation itself. I think folks were mainly okay with it. Then the only part that received some suggestion is regarding the rationale for Recommendation 2.6, specifically the sentence as well as how it plans to manage the sets operationally with a view to ensuring a secure, stable, and consistent user experience. So the RySG feels a bit uncomfortable with this sentence because it sounds like the Registry will be responsible for ensuring secure, stable, and consistent user experience. But at the same time, we haven't really clarified what that means. And of course, variant gTLDs do not exist at present so there's a lot of unknowns there. So that's why RySG was suggesting to delete

this sentence. But at the same time, we note from the ALAC that they felt the sentence still serves an important meaning, and then it should stay in the rationale. Also, it's the rationale and it's not part of the recommendation. So it may not be construed as implementation guidance. That was one of the concerns from RySG. So there are some divergence of opinion regarding the sentence.

What staff has suggested is that we replace the sentence with "As well as how it plans to manage the staff operationally to achieve the security, stability, and usability goals for IDN variants." The reason we proposed this sentence is that this is a general goal for IDN variant management and it's already iterated in the charter. It shouldn't be controversial because that's the goal of variant management. Then included here seems to be a fair assessment what needs to be validated to achieve this goal, and then it doesn't really specify the registry will need to ensure consistent user experience and those type of requirements that we haven't clearly defined yet. We hope this can be a compromise in a way that's taking into account the concerns from both ALAC and RySG. We will reach this more neutral statement here and put that in the rationale. So that's our suggestion and open to comments/questions.

DONNA AUSTIN: I guess we're particularly interested to understand from our ALAC groups whether this is okay. Hadia says it sounds good to her. Yeah. It is unfortunate that Dennis and Satish aren't here. So I think, in particular with his language, we will highlight—I know we have other Registry colleagues on the call that may be able to

speak to this. But this is one that we'll go back and give some more time for the teams to make sure they're okay with this. Thanks, Hadia. I understand that you need to consult with the rest of the group. So, Ariel, I think we can move on this one, noting that it's not set in stone yet.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Actually, we finished. That's all the second reading for these recommendations. I believe we have two that's relatively okay, and then we will wait for further input from folks not in the call today, and then circulate on the list. Then for rationale of Recommendation 2.5, we just didn't have a little bit additional work to do to refine that but we'll also get back to the group on this. So we are done for this part.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So we don't have anything more in today's agenda. We appreciate that folks attended a call earlier this week with ccPDP. So I'll give folks an opportunity to—if there's anything else you'd like to talk about today, now's a good opportunity. But if not, we can give you back a chunk of time. I can't do the math. More than 30 minutes anyway. 48 minutes, okay.

All right. Thanks, everybody. I know it's a short call but I appreciate everybody getting on. It's another chunk of work that we've more or less completed, so that's always good. All right. Thanks, everybody.

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 good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]