EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 25 January 2024 at 14:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/wQGWEQ

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, 25th January 2024 at 1400 UTC. We have apologies from Nigel Hickson. All members and participants will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and have view access to chat only. Statements of interest must be kept up to date.   If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDN EPDP wiki space.

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.

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.

EN

	Thank you, and back over to our chair, Donna Austin. Please begin.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Devan, and welcome back, everybody. I know it's been quite a while since we all got together in KL, and no doubt a lot has happened for you all during that time, including a new year. So, we were a little bit late getting started, I suppose, because it's the 25th of January already. We don't have Ariel with us for now, but she will be joining soon, so you'll have to bear with me while we try to work our way through the agenda. Steve, I wonder whether you would like to introduce Saewon to the team?
STEVE CHAN:	Sure. Thanks, Donna. This is Steve from staff. I think this team knows, but Ariel actually ended up taking a new role with Global Domains and Services, or GDS, and so we're fortunate to have her sticking around to be supporting this group in at least some level of capacity, and hopefully diminishing as we go further into the calendar. So, with that said, we have added a new person to the GNSO support team. Her name's Saewon Lee. And so, in order to try to give Ariel that space, we're adding Saewon to this support team and, like I said, hopefully give Ariel that space to be able to dedicate her time to her new role. So, I just want to let you all know that Saewon Lee has joined the GNSO support team in general, and then also specifically this IDN EPDP. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks very much, Steve, and welcome, Saewon. And while we are I'm sure all of us are a little bit sad to hear that Ariel will be moving on to other things, we will do the best we can to move on without her, but we're not sure of that transition at the moment. So, she will be with us at some point today.

Okay. So, I do have the slides there for us? Okay. We can just move to Item 3, so the IDN tables harmonization. So, folks might remember in KL that we had some further discussion about the harmonization of the IDN tables. And where we left that was that we asked the contracted party members of our team to have a conversation with Sarmad and Pitinan to see if there was a way to address, I guess, concerns that were raised by Pitinan and Sarmad during our KL meeting. So, Jennifer, if you're with us, would you be in a position to provide us with, I guess, a status report on whether that conversation has been had and where you think we're headed on that?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sure. Thanks, Donna. Can I be heard?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, you can.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay, perfect.   This is Jennifer Chung for the record from registries. So Sarmad and Pitinan were really kind to schedule an in-depth call with us, and we've also invited the registrar friends who are on their IDN group as well, and we had this at the end of

EN

last year, I think it was the 20th or before the 20th of December. We had a pretty interesting conversation about it. I think what Sarmad and Pitinan actually presented to us was quite useful. On the actual call, we had the people who were interested in IDNs and follow IDNs quite closely.

There were a range of views on whether or not we thought it was appropriate to "elevate" the root zone LGR tables. I think in general, a lot of people said it was fine as a starting point or a baseline for second level. I think a few of us also identified some cases where it may not be appropriate, where there are some characters or some quote points that aren't really suitable at the second level that may be in the root zone LGR or vice versa. And there's also some concern that was raised where some of us did not want something that was just completely developed by the script communities who may or may not have the registry or industry input during that development.

I think that we had a second conversation. Well, we had a few exchanges on the registries list, and we had a second conversation at the registry stakeholder call yesterday. I think there was some general consensus around the principles where root zone LGRs are excellent for the root, and it can be looked at as a starting point. But there's a lot of, I guess, opinions and wish for, of course, the registries to have our own tables where we can seek consensus with other registries when we're looking at scripts or similar scripts, but we don't have to have this mandated because there will be other registries who may not offer the same scripts. Some registries may not offer variants. But it is also, of

course, to our registrar partners' benefit if we have similar tables when we're looking at it in an operational way.

So, I think the conversation is quite good in the starting point. I did circle back with Ariel, Sarmad and Pitinan saying that after our call yesterday, we might see if there's a need for another in-depth call or a follow-up call with Sarmad and Pitinan and registries, registrars about this. But this is where the conversation is right now. Hopefully, this is beneficial to bring back to the larger group. And, of course, Dennis and Maxim, please jump in if I've missed anything crucial. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Jennifer. So, Dennis, nothing to add? Okay, great. So, I guess, does anyone have any questions for Jennifer. Or Pitinan and Sarmad, is there anything else you wanted to add?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Hi, this is Sarmad. Can you hear me?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, I can. I'm just realizing that I can't see hands, Sarmad. So, I apologize if I missed yours.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, I raised my hand. I'll lower it. So, just that I'd like to thank RrSG for the meeting. We presented the data and, I guess, we left off where Registry Stakeholder Group was going to discuss

EN

this more internally. And we're more than happy to get on a follow-up call as needed. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, great. Thanks, Sarmad. So, I guess we'll just put this on the wait and see list.   But I think it's something that we do need to resolve relatively quickly if we're going to finalize the initial report, which I don't know that we have a timeline for that yet, but it was my fond dream that we would have it out prior to the next ICANN meeting. So, we'll see where we get to in a couple of weeks on that one. Okay, so we'll move. Steve, we might skip over the next item because I think that's something that Ariel is in a better place to discuss than I am.

STEVE CHAN: Luckily, Ariel has joined the call.

DONNA AUSTIN: Well, there you go. We've managed to hold off long enough. Ariel, are you with us?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, yes. Just in time.

DONNA AUSTIN: Just in the nick of time. Okay, great. So, if you can take us through Item 4, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, before I go on, I think I saw Jennifer's hand earlier. I'm not sure whether she would like to speak to the Item 3.

DONNA AUSTIN: My apologies, Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: No worries. I just wanted to double check with you, Donna, if it would be useful for the group for me to send over a set of bullets on our discussion so far, or if we should just hold off until we have a second conversation with some editing.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think if the bullets are consistent with what you've just said, Jennifer, I don't think there's any need to send anything over. We'll just wait for the next conversation and then see if we can wrap it up on a future call.

JENNIFER CHUNG: All right. Thank you, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jennifer. Okay, thanks, Ariel.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. I will move to Item 4. So, this item I understand we talked about it quite a bit during the workshop. And during the workshop, I believe the group reached a certain kind of agreement, and from that, staff updated the glossary and the explanation. And while we were doing that, some questions still kind of hover at least in my mind, and I feel it hasn't been completely resolved, and I'm not sure whether we have addressed it. So, I just want to make sure we bring this back to the group to be crystal clear about what we mean in terms of variant domain sets, because this is such a key term and has significant implications to a lot of our recommendations. So, that's why we're talking about this item today.

And I'm just putting this glossary explanation of variant domain set on the slide. I'm not sure whether everybody has the chance to read the updated draft. I know Michael has, because I saw his edits, but I'm not sure everybody else got a chance to read that yet. So, I just want to show folks what we updated, the explanation. I'll just read it.

The set of variant domain names that are derived from and also includes the source domain name. The variant domain set consists of variant label sets at both the second and top levels. The set at the second level is enumerated from the second level label of the source domain name using the IDN tables of the given gTLD. The set at the top level is limited to a given gTLD and its delegated gTLD variant labels, if any. The disposition values of variant domain names are calculated by the harmonized IDN table of a given gTLD, as well as determined by the registry's variant registration policies. In short, the variant domain set consists of

EN

source domain name plus allocatable variant domain names plus blocked variant domain names.

And then lastly, the final paragraph is just to showcase an example. Assume there is a registered source domain name S1.T1. And the top-level domain T1 has a variant label T1V1 that has been delegated. According to the relevant IDN table for T1, the second level label S1 has an allocatable variant label S1V1 and a blocked variant label S1V2. For simplicity of explanation, S1, S1V1, and S1V2 are also valid variant labels under T1V1, and the same disposition values are carried over. So this is basically just an example and then we provided some assumptions for the simplicity of explanation. So it may not be true. And I know Michael, you're going to talk about this, but it's really just example because we don't know what's a better way to show this.

And then in summary, the variant domain set derived from the source domain name is comprised of the source domain name itself, which is S1.T1, the allocatable domain names S1V1. T1 and S1V1. T1V1, and blocked variant domain names S1V2. T1 and S1V2. T1V1. So that's the whole set based on this example and the assumptions. So, Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, thanks. Michael for the record. There's also something I already put in the comments of the document, namely that I think we can't say about the domains under T1V1 whether they are allocatable or blocked unless we have decided what the source domain name under T1V1 is. Because I think we decided that we need a source domain name under each of the TLDs in order to

EN

be able to determine the disposition values of the variants under that TLD. So with just the information displayed here, we can't say whether S1V1, T1V1 is allocatable or blocked, and the same with S1V2, T1V1.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Michael. That's exactly one of the questions I have is if a registrant only is interested in registering a domain name under a TLD and that TLD happens to have a variant domain name, but that registrant isn't interested in registering anything underneath, what's the reason asking the registrant to also identify a source domain name under that variant top-level domain for the sake of calculating the variant domain set? And I just can't wrap my head around this, and it just seems very complicated to explain. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I think you're right in the sense that if a registrant is not interested in any domains under T1V1, then there's no need for them to decide what the source domain name under that TLD is going to be. But this also means that at that point in time, we don't know about the blocked and allocatables, so the disposition values of those domains. Essentially, at that point in time, any one of them is actually allocatable and none is blocked because you could start with any one of them as a source domain name. But as soon as you decide for one of the names to be a source domain name, then you can say what the disposition value of all the other variants under that TLD is going to be.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Michael. Yeah, I think that explanation definitely helps. And I actually have a couple of more slides, and I have another question about that. But I know Sarmad has his hand up. So, Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. Thank you, Ariel. This is Sarmad. So, I think there are at least two use cases for, I guess, a domain, this broader domain set. One, of course, as we're discussing, is for a particular registrant to register other variants under other variant TLDs, variant domain names under other variant TLDs. But also, this larger domain set would be useful to prevent other registrants to register any domain names within this set. For this second use case, I guess it's not, I guess, relevant whether a particular variant domain name is allocatable or blocked, but because it is just not available for a second or a different registrant. So, in some cases, the disposition value of a variant is useful for the same registrant but may not be relevant for a different registrant because of the use cases. I just wanted to share that. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Sarmad. It actually started to make sense now, and I see Dennis has a comment. The entire set is established by the first source primary domain. I agree with Ariel that if a registrant is not interested in the other variant domain names, then the registrar or registry do not care about it either. When the registrant decides he or she wants any of the variants in the

variant TLD, then the coordination between these parties happens. Yes.

So, based on my understanding, if correct, is if we do have a source domain name registered under a given TLD, at least under that given TLD, the variant domain names as well as their disposition values can be calculated based on the relevant IDN table for that TLD. And then if that TLD happens to have a variant TLD, then the sets will consist of the, I guess, the variant labels at the second level also under that variant TLD, but we just won't know their disposition value unless there is another source domain name being identified under that variant TLD. But again, the set will remain the same. It's just for the disposition value part, we won't know for certain what they are under that variant gTLD.

Is this a correct understanding? Okay. I think Michael said yes, that's how he sees it. Okay. Oh, great. Great, Dennis. Okay. So, this is much better now. And I do have another question. Oh, thank you. Thank you. I do have another question. It's actually on the second slide. Oh, actually, it's not this one, but I will skip this one. But I do have another question, though, is about an example I think Sarmad provided, but maybe Sarmad, you already explained this, and maybe I wasn't just catching up to this.

There could be a scenario where different IDN tables are used under a TLD and its variant TLD. So, in this illustration, it shows that T1 uses a Persian IDN table, but it's variant TLD T1 V1 uses an Arabic IDN table. And the allowable code points are not the same for these IDN tables. So, as a result, if you look at the second level label example, which is highlighted in yellow in the second sentence here, this is a Persian label that's only valid

EN

under T1, but it's not valid under T1 V1 because one of the code points is not allowable in the Arabic IDN table.

So, in this scenario, I'm just trying to understand what the variant set consists of if the variant TLD doesn't use the same IDN table and the source domain name for T1 would only calculate the variant labels under T1, but under T1 V1, it's not even a valid label. So, how do we know what the set consists of if we also need to factor in T1 V1? So, that's a question from me. And Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So, if these two IDN tables are harmonized in some ways, then this last code point in each of these tables would be considered a variant of each other through the broader harmonization process, which we've been discussing. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. So, I'm just to follow up. So, basically, if harmonization is achieved, this type of scenario will not happen in terms of... Okay, maybe not. But Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I think what Sarmad said, that this scenario is possible, but still, the character in each of the table would be a variant of the other one, even if the other one is not available in that IDN table. You can have variants in an IDN table to characters which are not allowed in the table. So, this would be fine, but still, there would be a variant relationship between the two. And therefore, exactly

what Edmon said, it would be an out-of-repertoire variant. And in that context, they would still be variants, but neither one would be available in the other IDN TLD.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. I think conceptually, I've got it. Harmonization will make sure for this kind of scenario, these type of code points, they will still be regarded as variants, but they're out-of-repertoire variants. Although I don't understand that definition very clearly. would like to be enlightened that way. But in that case, what we just talked about still applies, is that if you use the second level label example under T1, you would be able to calculate the variant labels under T1, also their disposition values. And then for under T1v1, the same variant labels will still be calculated, but you won't have the relevant disposition values because they're out-of-repertoire variants. But then the variant domain set will include them. But anyway, essentially, they're blocked. Okay. So, Dennis, please go ahead.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: Yeah. Thank you, Ariel. This is Dennis. Just wanted to observe because I think we're throwing out some LGR RFC 7940 lingo here, out-of-repertoire. How is that out-of-repertoire code point be in the repertoire and do something out of it? But basically, you include certain code points with a special rule. Whenever those special code points what are referred to out-of-repertoire, then that triggers certain rules in the LGR, like whole label evaluation rules that if any of those code points are in using a label, then the whole label is invalid. So, it's just the way you can set up the algorithm

EN

whenever those "out-of-repertoire" code points are in use, because you really don't want them to be used, but because of harmonization and the way you want to study certain consistent rule across certain tables, then you have to do that.

ARIEL LIANG:

Got it. Thank you, Dennis, and thank you, Edmon. That makes a lot of sense to me now, and I think I understand it. So, this slide kind of goes to our Preliminary Recommendation 5. It's about the source domain name one, and it's updated language. So, I'll just read it, and I will talk about the part. I'm hoping the group can provide some help in terms of clarification.

So, it says a registrant and its sponsor registrar must jointly determine the source domain name, which must be registered for calculating the variant domain sets under a given gTLD and its delegated gTLD variant labels, if any. The registrants and the sponsor and registrars of the grandfather variant domain names pursuant to Preliminary Recommendation 3 are exempt from this requirement.

So, I believe when we talked about this one in Kuala Lumpur, there was a suggestion to add bracket with S after source domain name. Because I think that's exactly what Michael just talked about earlier is if the registrant is also interested in registering something under a gTLD's variant gTLD, then the source domain name under that variant gTLD also need to be determined too.

But I'm just wondering whether we believe this is something we should at least address in the rationale portion of

Recommendation 5. Or we also spell this out in the preliminary recommendation itself. I'm just slightly concerned when they confuse people when they read this, and they won't understand there could be more than one. But Sarmad, please go ahead. Thank you.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: This is Sarmad. Just thinking out loud here, but I think we may be talking about two different things or concepts, which it may be useful to address in different, I guess, either recommendation or recommendation plus an explanation, whichever way the working group thinks is the best way. So this is basically saying that variant gTLD, variant domain set is determined by the first registration which happens and that actually is correct. That when the first registration for any label happens, it automatically would create this larger variant domain set.

It's a separate thing that for each variant gTLD, a source domain may still be needed to be identified to determine, I guess, the dispositions of variant labels for within that variant gTLD. But that may actually be a separate second step. Trying to put it together here may complicate things, but again, up to the working group decide. At least the way I'm thinking it, this is step number one, that's step number two. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Sarmad. I agree with you that this recommendation is really honing on the concept source domain name and its significance. But if we want to expand on step number two, that

EN

could be a separate thing. I don't know whether we need to make a recommendation for that, or it could be embedded as part of the rationale language of Recommendation 5. I just want to note Edmon has a comment here, makes sense to keep the flexibility, maybe make it a footnote rather than just a bracket with S. The text may just, without S, but add a footnote to explain the possibility of having multiple source second level label dot TLD.

Yeah. I think we're kind of converging on a similar setup, I guess, instead of footnote, just thinking maybe in the rationale for Recommendation 5, we could provide some kind of explanation of this possibility as a second step, as what Sarmad put it. And then I think also in this recommendation, it's probably a good place to really explain the concept of variant domain set and how it is calculated and by capturing what we just discussed in terms of what are the labels and then with their disposition values, the known ones and the unknown ones. And I think this could be a good place to capture that.

And I think my questions have been addressed and I have an idea of how to deal with this in our draft text. And I think probably what I would do is to revise the glossary explanation for random domain set and also capture that in the rationale portion of Recommendation 5. Satish said, so the variant domain set changes between the two steps.

So my understanding, Satish, is that the set doesn't change in terms of the composition of domain names. Basically, the second level labels under both the given TLD and its variant TLD, they are the same. But the disposition value is only known for the second level label registered under a given gTLD using that IDN table.

EN

The disposition value for the variant domain names under the variant gTLD wouldn't be known unless the registrar also figure out what is the respective source domain name under that variant gTLD. That's my understanding.

And then there's a second scenario that we just talked about is if for the IDN table harmonization, there's out-of-repertoire variants identified under the variant TLD, those are regarded kind of like blocked, essentially. So yeah, maybe I will try to figure out a way to explain this. But anyway, there's some chatters in the chat. Sarmad, Edmon, Satish, would you like to speak up to your comments? And Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, so I'm happy to talk about it. Edmon here and speaking personally. So yeah, I think, Ariel, you had it quite correctly. And in my mind, as Sarmad has mentioned, the ultimate set is it doesn't change. But for different variant TLDs, if the source domain for calculating the allocatable variants in that particular TLD is different, it may have different allocatable variant second level domains based on that particular variant TLD. And yes, I think this is a bit of, in many ways, an edge case, although I think in the Arabic situation, it would be slightly more prevalent.

But for clarity, though, I think, yeah, as mentioned, and as we discussed, it's probably for the main text to focus on the source domain and its calculation. And for a supplementary explanation that additional source for calculating variant TLDs, calculating second level allocatables in variant TLDs could potentially be

slightly different. I don't know if I've confused people more or clarified it.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Edmon. It's very clear to me because I have exactly the same understanding after all these discussions. And I think maybe Satish's question is about the new source domain name under the variant gTLD. And I believe that source domain name still has to be a label within the variant domain set. It cannot be outside that set, basically. So, the composition of the set is unchanged, and you pick a label to be the new source under the variant gTLD and then using that new source and the variant gTLD IDN table, you can figure out the disposition values of the relevant variant domain names under the variant gTLD.

That's my understanding. So if you're picking a completely different source domain name on the variant gTLD, the whole set will change, of course. That's how I see it. And also, yes, Satish also agreed that this may leave as a footnote, seems like an edge case. Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah. So, I'm trying to understand. I personally don't see it as an edge case. I think this is the usual case where step one is that somebody comes and registers under TLD, and with that registration, it does two things. It defines the variant set within that TLD with allocatable and block variants. But it also defines the broader domain, variant domain set under all variant TLDs with their dispositions under specified, meaning it's not specified

whether variant set is complete, but it's not specified whether that particular variant is allocatable or blocked.

As a second step, if somebody goes and registers another domain name, while the same registrant registers another domain name under a variant of that TLD, for that variant with that registration, it completely specifies the allocatable and block variants under that particular variant TLD. But there could be more than one variant TLDs. So, a registrant would need to register one "source domain" under each variant TLD to be able to specify completely the allocatable versus block variants for that variant TLD.

So, there is a source with a capital S, which is the first one, which really defines the variant domain set across all variant TLDs, and then there are additional source domains, maybe with a small s for each variant TLD, which defines the allocatable variant block dispositions within that variant TLD. But to me, that would be the normal case, not an edge case. At least that's how I see it. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Sarmad. And I think that's probably one of the reasons why the Arabic script has a permutation issue, because it's just used in so many different languages. And if you're using the variant TLD under different rules, then yeah, there will be a permutation. But anyway, I understand your point of view. And I just want to get the group's input in terms of, do we want to just leave Preliminary Recommendation 5 the way it is?

EN

We can include some elaboration on the variant domain sets, what that consists of and the meaning behind it in the rationale, and then also include another paragraph in terms of the possibility of identifying more than one source domain name within the set based on what Sarmad explained. Or do we believe we need to create another recommendation to kind of elaborate on the scenario that Sarmad talked about in terms of identifying more than one source domain name in the set due to the variant gTLDs? I just want to get the input from the group and see what's the best way forward. And I see some chats.

DONNA AUSTIN: Ariel, it's Donna. So based on the discussion, I don't know that I'm hearing anything that suggests that we really need to change Recommendation 5. But I think additional explanation, whether that's in the rationale or somewhere else, is probably warranted. But I don't, I'm not seeing any real need to change the recommendation at this point.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, I understand. And that's my understanding. I guess it's just Sarmad might disagree with the categorization of the edge case, because that may not be an edge case, at least for the Arabic script case. But happy to just include a paragraph in the rationale to explain that. And I think just to make sure we're covered here. And for this illustration, it's actually part of rationale language, I believe, for Recommendation 5. And I'm just wondering whether you believe will be helpful to include the term out-of-repertoire variant or something to say, yes, even the allowable code points

EN

are not the same, but due to harmonization effort, they will be categorized as out-of-repertoire variants. Or do you think that's just overly complicating things? And Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Just that this is a term which is used in the root zone LGR. So, if you would like to use it, there's probably a place there which you could refer to. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thanks, Sarmad, for the pointer. I will definitely take a look at it. And also, please feel free to suggest language because this is the example that you and Pitinan developed for the group. So, if you'd like to help out with the language, I'm definitely appreciative of that. I see some questions. Source domain name decided based on the choice of the registrant. I think that's a joint responsibility. That's how the recommendation language put it. It's between the registrant and the registrar. And it could be active choice, or it could be a passive one, just based on which domain name is first registered. It really depends on the registrar's policies and practices, but it's not solely determined by the registrar. And that's how I understood it.

If there's no more comments or questions, I think we're good. This one is making me lose sleep. So, I'm happy to understand this much better after talking with the group and I know the next step forward to refine the rationale language for this one. And with that, Donna, would you like to take this item or? I'm happy to drive if you prefer, whichever way you want.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, I haven't reviewed the slide. So, whatever comes next is going to be a surprise, but I'm sure it's consistent with conversations we had. So, can you just give me a sneak preview of the slide, please, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Oh, yes.   So, it's just basically talk about in Quorum 4, we reviewed the deferred guidelines from implementation guideline version 4.0. And we're just trying to figure out what to do with these deferred guidelines. Is there any specific actions for the EPP team to do? Or we just say, the EPP team has considered this, and this is what we put forward as recommendations, and then the Board can look at the report and decide what to do with these deferred guidelines.   So ultimately, it's not EPP team's responsibility of telling the Board what to do, it's for the Board to consider what the EPP team has analysed and developed. So, that's basically the gist of that.

DONNA AUSTION: Yeah. Thanks, Ariel. So, this is a little bit of a tricky process question because I don't know that in the scheme of, I don't know, ICANN land that this kind of thing has come up before. So, if folks recall the IDN implementation guidelines version 4.0, there were items that were deferred in that by the Board because the EPDP was potentially considering charter questions that were connected with those recommended guidelines.

In KL, I was certainly unclear about what the ask was from our perspective. I think what we've really done is more an analysis of whether there's overlap or duplication or whether something has been -- we've developed a recommendation that may be consistent or inconsistent with the guidelines. So, it's a question, really, what's the ask from us, what was the intention in deferring the guidelines and what was the request for the council to our team about what we needed to do. So, I'm just trying to get some clarity if anybody else has a view on this and how we can--

Because what I'm concerned about is that if we just provide an analysis of whether we've covered a similar topic or something different, but don't actually develop a policy recommendation, then have we done our job or is there something further that we need to do. So that's what I'm trying to understand. So, Edmon, I see your hand is up.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. Thank you, Donna. And speaking as board liaison here, although on the topic, I don't think I can represent the Board at this time because the Board has not talked about it. But in response to the question, I would see it as in a combination of what Ariel have on screen plus, Donna, what you said, in a sense that each of these, I think will be useful to identify one of three statuses as in like I have in my mind, two of which would be saying that the guidelines are okay.

The top one would be the guidelines are okay as is, and it's consistent with the identified response or implementation guidance or recommendations. The second one would be it would

EN

still be acceptable given the scope. I don't in the immediate top of my head know C6, 2, 4, and 16. So, but there may be a case where you would identify that, yes, the guideline makes sense, but within the scope, that is better described in the recommendations or implementation guidance.

And then of course, the third one possibly would be no, the guidelines need to be, is not consistent with the recommendations and probably need to be re-read about. So, off the top of my head, at least that would be most useful if it is part of the final report. Does that make sense?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, yes, it makes sense and seems a pragmatic approach to what we're doing. So, the other hesitation I have is that this is probably something that we need to discuss with ccPDP people, because obviously that implementation guidelines do have an impact on CCs or potentially the guidelines of developers of CCs as well. So, this may be something that we need to discuss with ccPDP people, but another 100% sure that. Does anybody-- Yeah, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: If I may jump back in quickly. So, I think, as I mentioned those three scenarios, if it is the first scenario that it's all completely fine, nothing needs to be changed, nothing needs to be noted, then I think it's quite straightforward because the CCs have not raised an issue of stopping the identification guidance in the first place. So, in those cases, then nothing further needs to be done.

In the cases where it has to be re-read or re-drafted or taken out, probably that will need to, or if there's a scope issue that is more narrow down by the recommendations, then probably that that should trigger at least a coordination, much like previously when we looked at things that might have diverged between the ccNSO and the GNSO and to document that divergence and have rationale for, even though there is a difference, it should be acceptable as a different implementation given the context. Does that make sense?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I think so. I think so, Edmon. Anybody else have any input on this or, Ariel, if I mischaracterize anything?

ARIEL LIANG: No. Thanks, Donna and Edmon. And initially, I thought we probably want to include a section just like what we did for phase 1 in terms of talking about the divergence between or difference between the GNSO and ccPDP 4's output, but I guess if we use a similar approach, we'll talk about the potential difference between the phase 1 recommendation and the deferred guidelines.

So, is this what the group also think will be appropriate to include in the report having a section focusing on that? Because initially, I think the leadership and staff, when we talked about this, we were just saying, let's capture how the group considered these deferred guidelines in the rationale portion of relevant recommendations and also have a high-level overview of that in the executive summary. But based on Edmon's input, maybe having an

EN

individual section just to focus on that topic would be more helpful for the Board. So, I just want to gather some sense on the group, what do you think, what is the best approach.

And so, Hadia says having an individual section, and also Satish supported this too. Okay. No other comments. So, I guess, Donna, maybe after the call, we can talk about this again and then see what to do next. It seems there's support to develop that section. And I'm also happy to just touch this with the ccPDP 4 support staff and see whether they had any discussion about the specific guidelines. But my understanding is the group believe the second level topics are out of scope. But I haven't been following lately, so happy to be corrected if other folks on this call is aware of their progress so far, whether they actually had any in discussion about second level topics. Oh, thanks, Michael, for confirming second level is out of scope. Yeah.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Ariel, I guess. And this may be out of our scope as well, is that while second level might be out of scope for the ccPDP 4, the guidelines intended to be relevant to ccTLD as well. So, I guess where there's a difference between our recommendations and the guidelines, then what's the consequence of that? I think I'm just complicating things unnecessarily. So, I think we'll try to go down the path of Edmon's suggestion and see where we end up. Because perhaps at the end of the day, it's not for us to decide how, the Board will decide what to do with the guidelines and what to do with the policy recommendations. So, I may just be thinking about this too much. Okay. Thanks, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you, Donna. And I guess we can just pick up on this after and no urgency for make a decision now. But at least I'm capturing the consideration the rationale wouldn't hurt. So, if the group is okay without approach, at least we can include some brief response to the guidelines in the relevant rational portion of the recommendation language if that's okay.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. We will go back to this. Any other comments or questions about this item? I'm not seeing or hands or chats. I think we could move on to the next one. And, Donna, would you like to take this one?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Ariel. I'm just trying to recall the conversation we had. Okay. I know a recommendation for this one. Okay. All right. So, if there's a slide you can bring it up. Okay. So, this is about our recommendation for team, which was related to the charter question of whether the IDN guidelines shouldstay the same or should continue as they are or began differently or whatever. And we've recommended potential process for future development of the IDM guidelines. So basically, we're saying keep it the same, but document how it's done, and a working group charter would be really helpful.

EN

So given that the guidelines do impact ccTLDs as well, we did think that there is value in having a conversation with the ccPDP 4 about this recommendation to see if they have any concerns or objections to it, and particularly because we've suggested that the ccNSO Council, GNSO Council and ICANN Board our decision makers that we've identified in the recommendation. I'm not sure whether we still have a liaison to ccPDP 4. I know Neal is the liaison that goes the other way from the ccPDP to us, but we may not still have a liaison going the other way. But I really do think this is something that we need input from ccPDP 4 so that we can kind of, as part of the recommendation, as part of our rationale, we can say that we've discussed this with ccPDP 4 and there's no objection to the process that we've suggested.

So, I guess we just wanted to see whether you all thought that was a good idea or whether you disagree with this approach. So, Dennis may still with the liaison for ccPDP 4, Edmon, but I think Dennis let us know a while ago that he was stepping down as the registry rep for this group. So, I think that's where we might be unclear about whether we have a liaison or not. So, any thoughts on this from folks? And of course, this preliminary recommendation is actually in the text that is out for consideration by the team as well. So, this is just a draft for new recommendation at the moment. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna. This is Ariel. Just to supplement what Donna said. There are a couple of items in this drop text that I voted on the slide. And you probably see there's mentioning of ICANN Board here in a 14.1, 14.3, 14.4 and 14.5, especially pertaining to

the IDN UA working group. So, although this is not part of the consultation with ccPDP 4 but since we do have our liaisons from the Board on the call, maybe this is something, I guess, Edmon and Alan can take it back and consider whether there's any inputs from the Board perspective that could be provided for this suggested language. So, I just want to kind of flag it. And I see Alan has his hand up.

ALAN BARRETT: Yeah. Thanks. I think the Board could probably comment on this, but my comment here is it's probably not appropriate to mention individual Board working group in these recommendations because that could change. It's not necessarily stable. Maybe mention the Board as a whole or any working group the Board may choose rather than specific working group, which could possibly disappear.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. That makes a lot of sense.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, it does make a lot of sense. I think this is the working group at the moment that has responsibilities. I don't want to assign it to the ICANN Board as a whole because that could create some challenges for us. But if there's a way that we could identify that it's currently the IDN UA working group or any of it's whatever becomes the success of working group because I don't want to really give suggestion that it's the ICANN Board as a whole that's

EN

responsible. But I take your point, Alan, so we'll just have to craft and manage about that.

Because I think the current practice is with the guidelines that it is the working group that's Board, not the Board as a whole. Okay, so we'll find a way to capture that. Okay. So, I'm assuming that the silence means that nobody has any objection to us raising this with the ccPDP 4, and at least seeing if we can get some in principle support for this recommendation because I think the ccPDP 4 support is probably important. Okay. Anything else, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: I think that's all we have slated for today's discussion. So, we're going to finish early today.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, that's great. So just a reminder that we have draft text that is out for consideration by the group. And what's the expectation on timing of that, Arie?

ARIEL LIANG: Actually, I'm just checking my email. One second. I believe it's next Thursday, but I could be wrong. Just give me one second.

DONNA AUSTIN: Next Friday, Michael is saying.

ARIEL LIANG: Oh, next Friday. Okay. February 2nd.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. So, if we could have input from folks by the next Friday, given everybody is looking at the text. We probably won't have a call next week. So, I think we'll pick it up the week after and we'll go back to the usual time for our calls, which is a bit of an exception this week because I'm in Los Angeles. It was hard enough to get up at 6:00 AM. I don't think 5:00 AM would have been working. Okay, so with that, I think we're done for today. You can end the recording. Yeah. Okay, great. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]