
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 22 February 2024 at 12:00 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/DoEFEg>

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, 22 February, 2024 at 12 UTC. All members and participants will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have view access to chat only. Statement 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 email 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 before speaking for the transcript. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of

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.

behavior. Thank you, and I will hand it back over to Donna. Please begin.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks very much, Devan, and welcome everybody to today's call. I guess we've got just a few things that we're trying to close out that will enable us to get started on drafting the initial phase two report for public comment that we can post for public comment. So, I don't have anything else by way of updates. I'm sure everyone's getting ready to head to San Juan. So, if we can manage it, maybe we can finish this early and give people a little bit of time back.

So, with that, I'm going to hand it over to, actually, we're going to talk about the IDN table harmonization update. Ariel, how do we want to do this? Do we want to get Jen to introduce her email or did you want to start with some background?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yeah, thanks, Donna. So, maybe just a quick refresher of where we were before today's call. I think we did this refresher a couple of times, but in general, we have preliminary recommendation one on this topic and it basically is agreement that the harmonization means the IDN tables for a gTLD and its delegated variant gTLDs must produce a consistent variant domain set for a given second level label.

So, that's the agreement and we had a lot of discussion of this and I think there was a gap in terms of whether this is enough because as what was discussed in the workshop Sarmad and Pitinan

produced some examples to showcase that there are cross script variant code points that may not be captured in the IDN tables managed by registries. So, this could be a potential issue down the road. And so, in terms of harmonization, there is another aspect of that is to include additional data points, especially the ones that are cross script code points that are variants.

So, following the workshop, there are a few discussions between the work team specifically Sarmad and Pitinan and the registry small team. So, Jennifer, Maxine and Dennis can definitely talk about these and they met a few times and also the registry small team met internally as well. And I think Jennifer just sent a proposed, I think implementation guidance probably to compliment recommendation one. That's a result of these discussions, but I know that Sarmad raised some point with the staff internally that there may be some other points he likes to bring up as well and I just want to leave it as that and probably give the floor to Jennifer if that's okay.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Yes, that is fine. Thank you, Ariel. Hi everyone. This is Jennifer Chung from the registries for the record. We, well, I sent this email several hours ago, sorry for the short turnaround. We also had a short turnaround internally, but this is kind of the result of several calls internally with the registry small teams on IDNs and also with the calls with Sarmad and Patina.

We really took a more high-level approach. We didn't want to in this text prescribe anything yet because there are different ways that registry operators do harmonize their tables and we thought

the most useful thing in this instance is to come up with some principles that can give some guidance when we're going down the line. So, with that, I guess you can take a look at this email. I don't know if you can zoom a little more. Sorry that it's kind of small. Yes. That's perfect. Okay. So, the three principles that the registry small team and also Michael, our registrar rep also were joined on the calls with Sarmad and Patina.

So, the first one I'm just going to go through, I'm not going to read out the exact words, but we want to make sure the scope of responsibilities is quite clear here and maybe it's actually better for me to just read it out because it is small font. So, for the first one, it's ICANN is the manager for the root zone and registry operators are the managers for the second and subsequent levels as such operational aspects in terms of the implementation of IDNs at the second level, including harmonization mechanisms should remain in the responsibilities and scope of each respective manager. So, a little bit of explanation for the first one, it's just delineating WHOIS responsible for which part of it. And for the registries, we want to make sure that it is clear for us as well to lay out this, it might be public knowledge or well-known in some areas, but maybe not to everyone.

The second one is the implementation of IDNs at the second level, including evolving issues such as harmonization and homoglyphs should be undertaken by respective registry operators in an operational process with ICANN org and must follow the IDNA 2008, including any future versions and the IDN implementation guidelines, including any future versions. So, the second principle we came up with is this, and it is currently the practice does

encompass this as well, but it is important for us to note it here because there was a lot of discussion during the calls about what would the process of harmonization look like?

How will we get there? But to point to the reference spots where we can follow rules and find out how we can develop datasets and develop that procedure is actually very important here as well including any future versions is obviously currently it's IDNA 2008, there could be future versions. And then of course, in the IDN implementation guidelines, we're at 4.1, but there will be also future versions. And then finally is the third one, security and stability of the DNS is the baseline criteria. Further details on the procedure scope and requirements should be developed by registry operators, ICANN org and other relevant stakeholders.

So, the third high level principle we came up with is how to get to the nitty-gritty pretty much devils in the details. What are we going to do for next steps in actually building the process for first for the registries to understand how we can get to some kind of assessment or compliance aspect of harmonizing the IDN tables. And also, some guidance here as to who would be appropriate and have the right requisite knowledge to be able to put this together. I'm going to stop here for a bit to see if Dennis or Maxim wanted to add something that I've missed, but I'll pause here.

ARIEL LIANG: Oh, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: This is Dennis, can you hear me?

ARIEL LIANG: We can hear you. Oh, okay.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: Thank you. This is Dennis. So, yeah, I agree with what Jennifer said. I mean, of course, we agree because we discussed it just in the last day or so. So, just wanted to make additional observations and why, I mean, one of the original drafts included a conversation about IDN tables and we want to move away from the conversation from IDN tables per se, because IDN tables is just a representation of an implementation of something, right? So, we want to make sure when we talk about issues, we're focusing and scoping the issue as a problem and not as a solution, right? IDN table is a solution, not a problem.

And so, throughout the conversation that we have had with Sarmad Pitinan, we're looking at a solution to a problem. IDN table might be one solution, but not always going to be the solution. So, that's why we want to put focus more on the higher level and that's why we're referring to implementation of IDNs at the second level and how we tackle this issue that ICANN is raising about cross-creed variance. We can do it in future.

So, what we want to do here is to put a placeholder for a future group under the IDN guidelines process to look at the problem, and then possible outcome could be certain guidelines around IDN tables, but it might very well be other outcomes such as different rules that a registry operator managing IDNs at the second level, regardless whether it is an IDN, TLD or not, but

managing IDN at the second level, will have to implement. So just wanted to, to provide a little bit, a little bit more color as to why the language that we're using. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. And thanks, Jennifer for the overview. I want to hear from Samad or Pitinan their thoughts on this before we kind of move into discussion. So, Hadia, do you mind if I just, if we just hear from Samad first and then we'll get into the discussion. yeah. Okay. I'll leave with that. So, Samad first, and then we'll go to Hadia.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you, Donna. And thank you, Jennifer and Dennis. I guess just a quick background and then a summary of, I guess, the discussion in the context of this I guess the proposed text. So, if you recall what the comment I had originally put on the particular recommendation on harmonization was about that the harmonization talks about a process but it doesn't clarify the data on which data will be used for the harmonization. And I think that's where the whole discussion had started.

The reason I had put that comment in was because harmonization the really two concrete parts of harmonization, which are needed, otherwise, obviously harmonization cannot be done. One is the process, of course, on what is a mechanism on how IDN table should be harmonized, but also in addition to that, separate from that is the data which is, what is the data which will be used in the harmonization process. And I guess my original comment was

that the current recommendation does not clarify what the data is and then if the data is then arbitrarily different, early chosen, then of course, harmonization becomes less effective.

In absence of any other data, which is generally agreed upon by the script communities, we'd obviously suggested reference LGR data, which I guess is derived from the roots on LGR data, which is developed by the communities themselves, which use the scripts, but then adds on additional code points like digits and so on. So, that was a good reference point for us because it was actually developed by the communities. We actually don't have any other reference. So, that was sort of the fallback for us. So, just to then summarize I guess a discussion we had with the RySG small team here yesterday I think, was that generally these principles were high-level principles were shared by the team. I guess we shared that of course what we are trying to achieve here through harmonization is to make IDNs, they use secure and stable for the registrants and end users.

So, obviously they are a stakeholder in the process and their viewpoint obviously comes into the whole picture through the work done on homoglyphs and variants, which has been done by the script communities because I guess they're closer to how the scripts are used from the perspective of registrants and end users.

Eventually, I guess what is needed and what I guess at least my understanding what we discussed yesterday was that registry team thought that the baseline we are referring to the reference LGR data, which is derived from foo zone LGR, maybe a two "conservative" and may not be, I guess it's good for top level, but maybe there's I guess some changes needed for second level,

which is generally okay because top level and second level are different and for that purpose, there may be smaller or different set, maybe possibly a subset of variant sets, which are included in the reference data we're using which could be used for harmonization, which could be used as a baseline for harmonization.

And, I think again, my understanding was that one way to get to that would be to actually have a possible, if we can't refer to a data, then maybe if we can determine a path to get to that data that could generally be good that if registries are not comfortable with the current set of variants cross script and others in script, then maybe we can have a follow-up action, maybe through an implementation guidance that was suggested yesterday to that data. And again, our understanding was that the implementation guidance would provide that part to the data. The current language of course is fine. It's too high level, but it doesn't really provide the path to that data. So, in a sense that doesn't really address the original question, which I'd asked. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks so much. Hadia, did you still want to speak or are you okay now?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yeah, thank you. This is Hadia for the record. I just wasn't sure. So, this language proposed, is it supposed to substitute the response that we have now? So, where does this fit in? Is it instead of what we have now or in addition to? Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. I think that's what we're going to have to figure out because when I read this, I was thinking it doesn't necessarily fit as a recommendation. I'm not a 100% certain it is implementation guidance, but in hearing from Jen and Dennis, I'm starting to think that maybe depending on how this conversation goes, there's a possibility that we could pull out the second point and make a recommendation that says something along the lines for the time being harmonization is discretionary for registrar, registrants, registries but we think there would be value in this being subject to consideration by a future IDN implementation guideline working group or something like that. So, that's part of the conversation we have. We need to have Hadia, because I'm not a 100% clear either. So, that's what we need to work out. Jen, go ahead.

MANJU CHENG: Thanks Donna. This is Cheng. So, the texts that you see before you, were not intended to replace the current response. However, as I was listening to Donna, I think that might actually be important for us to tease out something for C5 and then have this as part of either implementation guidance or-- I don't really want to call it rationale, but something on those lines, because originally the, when we looked at the current response on C5, the registries were pretty happy with how it was drafted and presented.

So, we didn't really want to touch the language there either, but as we were looking into and trying and memorializing what we discussed internally and with Sarmad's team, we realized quite soon that these, we didn't want to leave it completely blank and

we needed to give a little bit more detail when we're going into implementation and subsequently any next steps or when we're going into IRT. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Cheng. So, I appreciate that we haven't had a lot of time to review this and I do certainly appreciate the work that the registry small team and Sarmad and Pittman have done, been doing over the last couple of weeks to try to come to provide a path forward that would make hopefully most people happy. So, and I guess Ariel and Steve, I'm interested to hear from you two but, Steve probably has had no time whatsoever to get up early this morning and check email before he joined this call, but just some suggestions for ways that we could possibly incorporate some of this text. I think, and I could be wrong Jen and Dennis, but interested on your thoughts, but I think the important or the thing that we could most likely do something with is number two.

I think that number one is kind of a statement of fact two is possibly something that we could draft a recommendation around that along the lines that I suggested and whether that replaces. Well, it would have to replace what we currently have for C5, but I don't want to lose what we have in C5 either. So, we need to find a way to sort that out as well and three, if we take two up as a recommendation, then I guess three is the more of a starting point for future work that's done by the IDN Implementation Guideline Working Group. So, Maxim, what do you mean by a clear demarcation line with one it's just kind of stating the fact and providing certainty on who does what. Go ahead, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Do you hear me?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's meant that the responsibility on second level is on registries. So, there is no reason to use rules from level one on the second level. And it's important demarcation. IANA is responsible for the root zone, that's why IANA established rules for the root zone. And so, omitting it, we will just make it less clear for the reason why the rules from the root zone shouldn't be blindly applied to the second level. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: All right. Thanks, Maxim. So, okay. I understand what you're saying. So, any further thoughts on this? Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. also, please forgive me. I just read this, maybe an hour before the call and I haven't completely kind of have my thoughts organized, but I think I agree that we could develop some language around two and even three to make that either into a recommendation or implementation guidance and then my understanding is the recommendation one, what we have before still stays because registries, they express their content with this language and I haven't heard this is intent to replace it.

So, that's my first thought and then second thought is just to take into account what Sarmad said in terms of the additional data points identified by the script communities and like potentially create a path to include at least some part of those data. I just wonder whether there's any kind of willingness to incorporate some of these points in, for example, point two here and I was just thinking kind of out loud in terms of there's this phrase, this harmonization should be undertaken by respective registry operator in an operational process with ICANN org, and maybe we can add something to allude to like including the consideration of data points identified by script communities, where identify a path to get to that data points, just include some of the details to capture what Sarmad kind of mentioned. And I just wonder whether that's something okay, but I will stop here.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Donna and Ariel, and thanks for this discussion is actually very useful for us to look at how we can incorporate these high-level principles as well. Regarding Sarmad's concern about the clarity, originally, the third point is really the point that we were trying to outline some sort of process to get to eventually the data set, but because during our last call, we also identified that there could be other ways to address these or mitigate these issues. And we didn't want to specify that it is purely for IDN tables harmonization.

And similarly, we also didn't want to list out a non-exhaustive list of what may become reference data sets or points that we can take documents or processes where we could take the relevant code points or decide on what sort of code points. I think it's important for us to be able to do that, but I also understand if the language currently is a little too high level, I would point us to looking at adjusting three instead of two, because I think two is also quite clear at this point where we, we want to leave it as. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Thanks, Jen. So, I kind of think what we have at the moment, the kind of problem is it's a procedural one in terms of we're here to develop recommendations that become policy. So, I think I'm just and my brain's trying to just wrap my head around how we can possibly do that. But I think, and maybe leadership can have a discussion about this and propose a path forward as to how we incorporate the registry comments here and hopefully find a solution that can work for everyone. I appreciate that we don't have everyone on the call this week. And most of us have only seen this in the last hour or so.

So, I think I'll just give, maybe we'll just draw a line under this and give people time to noodle on this. And in the meantime, leadership will have a thought about what we can do with this language and how we could potentially do something for our response to C5, because I appreciate that these are principles that the registries have come up with, but I'm not sure how we-- I don't want to lose the importance of the principles just by sitting in the rationale in some way. And I think it rises above

implementation guidance. So, that's the kind of balance I'm trying to think through in my head.

So, folks can have a look at this as well and if you've got any suggestions, please add them to the list. I know we're going into a really busy time for people where you don't have a lot of time because of the ICANN meeting that's coming up. We do have an hour on the schedule for San Juan. So, maybe this is something we can loop back in and discuss. And if leadership's in a position to come up with a suggestion for a path forward in time. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. So, I'm not sure, do we have a standalone recommendation that says that harmonization needs to happen? Because I was thinking if not, that maybe, and we are saying in this recommendation that there is no recommendation coming out of C5 as is, but maybe there could be a recommendation that spells out that registries need to harmonize IDN tables. We do acknowledge in the charter question does acknowledge, of course, that there is existing practice by registries to harmonize IDN tables. However, I'm not sure that we do have a recommendation that says it clearly, or do we?

DONNA AUSTIN:

We do. Okay.

HADIA ELMINIAMI: So, if so, then this is just an addition on how? And we reached the conclusion that the how is kind of like, we will not tackle the how and we will put some like more general bullet points in that regard, right?

DONNA AUSTIN: So, what's going through my head, Hadia, is that we have this recommendation that the tables have to be harmonized. We agreed that we wouldn't specify the how, and I don't think that what the registries have put forward is actually suggesting the how, but it's principles about future work that could be done by registry operators and ICANN org and other stakeholders. And that leads me to think that perhaps we could have a recommendation that suggests that the how is something that should be done by a future IDN Guidelines Implementation Working Group, which comes together on a semi-regular basis to discuss IDN related issues.

So, it seems that this might be something that would be worthwhile, the IDN Implementation Guidelines Working Group working on if obviously if the registries agree with that. I don't know that they do, but that seems like a reasonably pragmatic recommendation for us to make. And then that overcomes the uncertainty around the how it can be. And it also takes, I guess what I'm a little bit concerned with is what happens when it gets to an IRT. And this is a topic that could be rehashed again by an IRT.

So, the same conversations will go back and forth and the same challenges, whereas if we have a recommendation that says this

is something that should be considered by the IDN Implementation Guidelines Working Group, then that kind of shouldn't hold it up within the IRT. And I also don't believe that this is something that is a dependency for phase one or a next round. So, there is not that problem as well. So, I see somebody has their hand up, but I'm trying to work out who that is.

DEVAN REED: It's Nigel. Nigel has his hand up, but he's an attendee and he's not accepting the prompt to be promoted to panelist.

DONNA AUSTIN: Oh, Nigel, I don't know if you heard that, but if you see a prompt to promote you to panelist, I think you need to accept that before we're able to hear you. Is that right, Devan?

DEVAN REED: That is right.

DONNA AUSTIN: And I don't think you can use the chat either.

DEVAN REED: No.

DONNA AUSTIN: If anyone has a back channel with, oh, the hand's down.

DEVAN REED: Nigel just moved over to panelist.

DONNA AUSTIN: All right, we'll wait for Nigel to.

DEVAN REED: You might have dropped. I think you dropped from the call. I'm going to send him an email.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Devan. All right. So, does that sound reasonable, Jen and Dennis? I know it's hard to do these things on the fly and maybe we'll just leave this to see how the leadership team can come up with something. But if you have any knee-jerk reactions that that's a stupid idea and way off base from what you were suggesting, then I guess it would be good to know that too. Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHENG: Thanks, Donna. This is Jen. I think your proposed way for next steps here, I just want to clarify a little bit more. We're not really, I don't know who's controlling the current screen. We're not really trying to add, oh, sorry. No, we can go back to the pro menu recommendations. I was going to say scroll down a bit more. We were trying to look at how to complement C5. So, if we can scroll down a little bit more. C5's response is the language that we talked about during our meeting in Kuala Lumpur, and then

subsequently, this was also the language that the registries were quite happy with.

And we were trying to supplement this. But I, of course, understand with the principles, if you want to make sure that they stand in a way that can be interpreted correctly by any IRT that follows this process, it is important to transform this language to either a recommendation and then implementation guidance or rationale. With what Hadia mentioned earlier about how, I think we attempted and maybe we failed to address that in our second and third points.

Basically, we want to make sure that the mechanism can be listed or described in a way that it's clear. And we're happy to have the leadership team and staff to take this language back to see if it can be reworked and repurposed for C5, or if you think that it's necessary to collapse it into C4, we'd like to see if it's possible. But we don't really want to lose that connection there, just a little bit of clarity. And then finally, Donna, I mean, I know we do have the hour scheduled and we're happy to try to close out there as well. If it's a timing issue.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, thanks, Jen. I'm kind of hoping that this is the-- we've still got a couple of revised recommendations to go through here today. But I think this will be the only thing that's standing between us and getting our phase two report out. So, I don't want to undermine, no, that's the wrong word too. I want to respect the work that the registries have done and see if there's some way that we cannot lose the importance of it and even if we put

something in here with C5, if it's not a recommendation or implementation guidance, then it doesn't have the weight that I would like it to have. So, I guess that's the balance I'm trying to get here. Alrighty, so we'll leave that one there and I think Ariel will move on and go through the other recommendations.

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay, sounds good. And thanks again to Jennifer, Dennis, Maxim, Sarmad and others in the registries for working on this. So, we'll get back to the group on some suggested text, incorporating all the input. So, maybe we can take a look at the ones that we intend to close the loop on. And let me scroll down to the right place.

So, let me also blow this up a bit, and I'll put the link in the chat. So, the first one we'd like to close loop on is about the RDAP related recommendation. And if you recall, in the last call, we had some discussion about the previous text, which seems to be a little--, I don't know what's the right word to say, but in the recommendation itself, we spelled out what is expected of RDAP response to curate domain name, what should be show in the result. And I think based on input from the registries in particular, we understand this is something a little bit of overreach, maybe that's the word, because there's another process going on to review RDAP.

And maybe the right way to capture this is to create a high-level recommendation to explain what we'd like to see as an outcome, but still is to basically ask that particular review process to consider ways to make sure the variant domain names can be

shown as well for curate domain name. And then in the implementation guidance, we can spell out what would be a desired outcome for RDAP response. And I know, Dennis, you have put a comment there. I just, like, try to show it. But I think your point is RDAP is not the right word here. We should use RDDS, which is Registration Data Directory Services. But I will stop here, and Dennis, please go ahead.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA:

Thank you, Ariel. This is Dennis for the registries. Yeah, more on that. So, RDAP and WHOIS, which is not mentioned here, are protocols to deploy instances of the RDDS, the Registration Data Directory Services. I think we should focus on that, not the protocol per se, but the service. And so, I think for discussion purposes, it's okay, RDAP is familiar, WHOIS is familiar, but I think we should frame the conversation around what RDDS services behavior should look like in the realm, in the context of binary domain names. So, that's one. So, in that line, I propose to even the recommendation 12 to elevate it even more higher level. Again, along the same lines, not focusing on the protocol, but on the services and how the behavior should be shaped. I just want to note though that registration data services, the principle is that returns information on register and domain names, so existing objects.

So, the notion of getting information of unallocated variants, that is a concern. So, I think we can find ways to work around that notion, how to return information. I understand that there may be value in understanding whether a domain name is a variant and what is the source primary domain name and maybe that use

case can be worked around. But again, don't expect that RDDS is going to be a tool to calculate variants or whatnot. Its purpose built around information about registrations, not an existing domain name. So, happy to take questions or clarify, but I think that those are the points. Focus on the service and also setting expectations as to what the service does today. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Ariel, what's that chat I questioned? What's the question we're answering?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, this is Ariel. So, there's no specific travel question for this topic, but it's like placed on their DA because this is like a catch-all question. And then the specific question I think was posed by admin about what needs to be adjusted for WHOIS, including registry WHOIS, and IANA WHOIS. I think that was the original wording when admin asked the question. So, yeah. So, WHOIS was the term that was used as the original context.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. And then we decided that we should use RDAP because that's the replacement protocol for WHOIS.

ARIEL LIANG: Right. Yes.

DONNA AUSTIN: And Dennis, I understand what you're saying about the registration data directory services. So, we need to take the time to get the terminology correct. Yeah, WHOIS, is still working. But there are plans to replace that with RDAP, correct? In about 18 months' time, it's going to be a requirement for all registries.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: Hi Donna. Just quickly respond. So, I'm not intimate, familiar with how the roadmap for WHOIS. I understand there is a sunset period expected, but I don't think that's going to be even mandatory, but again, don't quote me here. I'm not intimately involved. I know RDAP is the next generation service, but I'm not sure that whether WHOIS, is going to go away either. So, thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So, what we're talking about here is that second dot point. So, when a user queries a domain name, so when they query a domain name, are they using RDAP or WHOIS? And that was a question for you, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: I'm sorry, Donna, I missed it. I was chatting in parallel. What was the question?

DONNA AUSTIN: I'm not sure that I can remember. So, when a user, so the second dot point, when a user queries a domain name using RDAP, is

that still correct? Or is that the registration data X, the registration data directory services?

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: So, there are ways in which user queries registration data. So, WHOIS is the most common. RDAP, you need to use a specific service or like the find the implementation of the registrar or the registry, or even ICANN has an own instance for RDAP. So, it depends. It might be transparent for the user, because some of the services are web-based, but what happens behind, it might be RDAP, it might be WHOIS.

So, the user really doesn't know unless they are using APIs or different ways to pin the databases of registries and registrars and I think that's why, depending on, I mean, I think the intention here of these conversations or recommendations for the broad audience and not just registrars pinging information from the registries, which we understand we need to provide. The registrars are our customers right from a registry standpoint.

So, we would want to provide them with the information they need in order to register domain names and variants and so on and so forth. And even in that case, maybe RDAP and WHOIS, is not the response because we transact on EPP basis. So, that would be a solution for us to provide information to registrars, but for a general audience, probably is going to be a web-based interface and behind the scenes, could be RDAP, could be WHOIS.

DONNA AUSTIN: All right. So, putting all that aside understanding that we need to replace RDAP with probably RDDS, but maybe not in all cases. So, we may need to be judicious about where we use that. And I also take your point that RDAP isn't fully in use yet. So, it's still not inappropriate to use WHOIS. Is the recommendation in principle okay? Maxim, sorry, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think the reason to use RDDS here is that recommending to change something in WHOIS, is bit pointless because a recommendation to change dying protocol is just a waste of time, because it's up to a requester, which service to use, WHOIS or RDAP, because of obligations the contents should be the same. Also, the RDDS is safer to use because if something replaces RDAP in some time, it's going to be RDDS anyway. Like currently the WHOIS is being retired formally and RDAP basically, it works and shows the same contents, but differently.

Also, it's up to a requester to use a WHOIS or RDAP or even both. So, RDDS is a term from our contracts and it refers to both protocols. So, restricting ourselves to a particular protocol just makes our work harder. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Maxim. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, thanks for the discussion. I prepared this slide for the workshop, but I don't think we really used it when we talk about this. So, there is some terminology basics for all these terms and I just wanted to quickly show everybody and as Dennis correctly put it, so RDDS is the service for registries, registrars to provide registration data. And then RDAP is the protocol that delivers the registration data. And then there are some specific elements to it. So, I think just, if we get the terminology clarified and I think it is right that in the context of our recommendation and implementation guidance, I think RDDS is the right term here. So, I just want to quickly show everybody the terminology.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Ariel. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: Thank you, Donna. This is Dennis. So, I just want to react to a question that or a comment that Satish is posting on the chat and I responded, but I want to expand on that, because things that in some of our minds are something different. Satish is asking, what is the authoritative mechanism to-- I'll call it a second. Let me just read it. What is the authoritative mechanism for an end user to determine the complete balance set? So, two parts here.

So, first authoritative source would be the registry because they control the rules to calculate the variant set. So, the registry will be the authoritative source to know what the variant set is. RDDS only, I mean, in terms of mechanisms, there are different ways, but RDDS is not one of it. If we want to know, if the user wants to

know what's the complete set and the set, if we understand it correctly, the components could be registered domain names and unregistered domain name.

Those unallocated binary domain names have not been requested by the registrar, not being delegated, activated, or what have you. So, RDDS is not even an answer for that because RDDS again is a query response service for existing objects. So, if we really want to understand the information about the variant set, that's a different story and we should focus on the problem that we want to solve even without now removing RDDS from the picture. I mean, that could be a component of the solution, but it's not all of it. So, I think clarity as to what information we're really asking here, it will be important to really understand. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. So, my recollection of the conversation here, which could be off the mark, but I think what we're trying to address here is not-- So, a registrant, potential registrant, wants to see whether a name is available. They don't, and they either get back the name's available or it's not available. But we said in the case of a variant, there needs to be a way to show that the name that they're looking up, that it is part of a variant set. So, that information has to be part of the response that that person gets for the query. So, it's not necessarily someone goes in and wants to know what the complete variant set is.

They may be absolutely clueless. So, what we wanted to overcome is the possibility that a Name is part of a variant set, so how do we display that to ensure that whoever's looking up that

information gets the full picture? So, I think that was the context, and that's the problem we're trying to solve, is with the introduction of variants, I think Michael said that currently some registrars do have a mechanism that will display all that information, but others may not. So, I think we've identified the problem we're trying to solve, and now we're down to what's the correct terminology to use. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, this is Hadia for the record. I was wondering if Dennis is actually referring to some other registration data system, because we don't know anything other than WHOIS and the registration data directory service, the RDDS, and WHOIS is going away, and the registration data directory service is the only registration data going forward that we are aware of, and for end users, at the end of the day, they will be using the registration data service that is offered.

So, I'm not sure if Dennis was suggesting that there could be something different, or in addition, because if the current registration data service will not be able to provide the answer for the primary and its variants, then how can the answer be provided to the query? Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Hadia. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the record. The thing is, even currently, an end user not necessarily has ability to check which names are available, because some registries, they will show it by WHOIS or RDAP, but most, they will just say that information is not available. The only party which can check if the name is available for registration, it's registrars, because they can check it via EPP, and EPP is not available for end users. It's protocol between registrar and a registry.

I'm not sure we need to demand something which is not available now. It's nice to have this information, but it's possible that due to a large number of-- I'd say, yeah, a large piece of information in the answer, that the full answer could be provided by a registrar somehow. That's it. Because for a registrant, EPP is not available and the information in RDS is not necessarily contains bits about availability. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: This is Dennis.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, you muted. Dennis, before we go to you, Ariel, can you bring the recommendation back up, please? Go ahead, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN TANALA: Yeah, thank you, Donna. I just wanted to react to Javier's. So, I think there are two things here. Registrars are offer variants at the second level now in the future. I mean, they have an inherent interest to incentivize allocation registration of variant domain names. So, in their interest, I believe they will provide the best services that they can in order to achieve that objective. Being providing tools to users of variants how they can find variants, what variants are available and whatnot.

I don't think the role of this EPDP is to try to create, develop products and services that the registries will eventually do. I think what we want to do is to set minimum standards, such as, for example, how the behavior of RDDS in order to incorporate variant relationships in that. But again, the expectation, I just want to set the expectation. RDDS is a quite a response service for registration data, not is a tool to provide anything about a string.

It has to be a registered object. And of course, when we talk about unallocated variants, there may be some narrow use case in which you can find what the source domain name is that variant for. So, again, it's about expectations. So, we're not solving all the problems with RDDS, but I believe registries who are interested to promote their businesses, they will provide the services. But I don't think this EPDP needs to solve for those services. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So, I think maybe I'm hearing you incorrectly, but it seems that the registries may be moving away from the preliminary recommendation that we had for 12. And if that's the

case, it would be good to know that. I think we tried to take the specifics out of the recommendation by having implementation guidance, which is more about the specifics. But I'm also wondering now whether there's a move away from actual recommendation from 12, notwithstanding that RDAP be replaced with RDDS. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Okay. So, I do understand. This is Hadia for the record. I do understand, Dennis, when he says, well, the registration data directory service is supposed to provide information about data. So, let's talk about protocols. What are the protocols available now that would allow the registrant or the user to see the name and the primary label as well as the variants?

So, I heard also at some point that maybe RDAP won't do that and maybe WHOIS protocol remains, but how is this? Because if we go ahead with a recommendation that in the implementation phase, well, they say, well, this cannot happen, then I'm not sure that this recommendation would mean anything. So, maybe we need more clarity. And now we've been told that we cannot use RDAP, we cannot use WHOIS, we cannot use RDDS, but those are the only systems and protocols that we know about. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Hadia. So, Dennis, I'm just looking at, and I'm sorry, I hadn't seen the suggestions you've made. So, the revised language for consideration. So, ICANN and relevant stakeholders

shall review the RDDS to consider ways to allow a user to search information about domain name vis-a-vis variant domain name set if applicable. Is that a suggestion for recommendation 12 or is that comment to something different?

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: No, not this. Dennis. Yes, it's for your consideration to replace Recommendation 12. And again, and maybe add a little bit more clarity, the expectations of RDDS, registration data directory services. So, it's for existing objects, but we can look at RDDS, how it should behave for variant domain names.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right. So, any thoughts from folks on that, on Dennis' suggestion? Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Dennis, for your suggestion. But then the recommendation is only saying that stakeholders shall review the RDDS to consider ways to allow a user, which does not actually say that the relevant stakeholders will allow user to search information about a domain name vis-a-vis a variant domain name set. And a domain name and a domain name set, I mean.

So, I think it would be better to just not mention anything, RDDS, RDAP, WHOIS, just mention nothing, but say that the registries will actually allow users to search information about a domain and a domain name set. So, maybe we don't care about how this happens, but we care that it happens. But if we say we shall

review to see if it will be possible, then we are not saying that this will happen. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Hadia. So, I think part of the discussion we might have already had was this is very much something we would like to see happen, but we didn't know whether it was possible. So, I think Michael was saying that, yes, it's absolutely possible, but others were saying, well, no, it's not. So, I think what we were trying to get to here is that whether it's RDAP or whether it's RDDS or whether it's WHOIS, that there has to be a review to consider ways that when a user does a query that information about, that they get the complete picture about whether the domain is actually part of a variant set or whatever.

So, I don't necessarily agree. The language that Dennis is suggesting is a little bit light, but in some respects, but I think the intent is the same that we were only suggesting a review because we didn't know what was possible. And some of the challenge here could be that different registry operators and different registrars have different software. So, it's hard to get something that's same-same. So, we were just asking for a review. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, usually registrants, they do not interact with the registries. They work with the registrars. And I have a question, why do we insist that registries should provide this information directly and not via registrars? Because registrars have means of interactions with the registry, which are not limited

to RDAP or WHOIS or any RDDS because they can interact by EPP system, some other means and yeah, at least EPP system.

And for the potential registrant or a user, I don't think it's a much of a difference if they request some particular webpage. Yes, they usually do not care if it's a registry or registrar, but many chances that they will see and know registrar because they try to get information to end users that it's possible to register something. Not many registries say that you can come here and register something, but they do not do that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah. Thanks, Maxim. And I don't think we're trying to be prescriptive about the registry has to provide the information. I think we're pretty clear about what we want and why we want it with the introduction of variants, there's more information that it would be helpful for somebody who queries, whatever it is they, they understand that if, if they're, if it's, if the domain they're looking up is part of a variant set that means that they can't register it unless they happen to be the same entity. So, I don't think we're overreaching here.

I think we're being reasonably pragmatic in saying that we've. We're creating all these other recommendations about second level and invariant sets. So, why can't we display that information when somebody makes a query, whether it's IDDS or whether it's WHOIS, or whether it's something else. So, I don't know that we're being over prescriptive.

So, I think the intent is pretty clear of what we're trying to achieve here. We just have to go back and make sure we're using the same terminology, or if there's some way that we can make it really clear about what we're trying to say without mentioning whether it's RDAP or WHOIS or RDDS, as Nigel said a while ago, keep it generic, then that's the path we should go down. So, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG

Thanks, Donna and everybody, this is Ariel. I'm just listening to everything and I try to summarize what I heard. And I'm proposing this kind of draft language on the spot, but of course, we're going to work this with leadership and present it to the group when it's fine tuned. But I think what I heard is this recommendation would say something like a user must be able to see allocated variant domain names of a curated domain name as well as the source domain name used to calculate the variant domain study applicable.

And then that's the first part, it's the outcome we want to see. And then the second part would be, ICANN and relevant stakeholders must consider ways to achieve that outcome. So, we don't mention RDDS, we don't mention RDAP or WHOIS, but we just have this requirement that ICANN need to work with relevant stakeholders to find a way to achieve that outcome. So, I wonder whether that captures the essence of our discussion here and kind of make this even more generic. But at least we make it clear what we want to see is to allow users to see the variant domain names. But we don't know what exactly is the way to do it, but we

will ask ICANN relevant stakeholders to work on that. I see some support in the chat.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Ariel. And I think it's a potential path forward. The only concern I had is the use of the word must. So, I think it's probably a should, because we don't know it's doable. So, we need to guard against making something. We'll be cautious in our use of must, but that's a conversation we can have. So, Dennis, to your question about what's the demand for those services, we don't know. I guess we're trying to kind of future proof a little bit.

We acknowledge that these variants are now in existence. We've introduced the concept of a variant set. So, for completeness and for the benefit of a potential registrant or somebody else who's looking to understand whether a particular domain name is part of a variant set, surely it would be a reasonable thing to expect that if you did a lookup of some sort that you would get the information about the variant setback, because that is probably important information. So, we don't know what the demand for those services are. We don't know how many IDN variant gTLDs that people are going to apply for.

So, we don't have data that we can rely on, but I think in the spirit of what we're doing here, we need to acknowledge that this is a possibility. So, why shouldn't we have a recommendation that supports investigation of how it could be done? Maxim, is that a new hand or an old hand? Okay. All right. So, I think we've got a little bit of work to do at leadership to see if we can thread the

needle on this one as well. So, Ariel, I think there's one more, is there?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes, indeed. So, the next one is about the IDN implementation guidelines. And we have put some new language to it. And that's mainly to address ccPDP4's comments that some of our old language was unclear. But I also know that Dennis has included some additional comments. So, I will defer to Dennis to talk about his comments. But just to give a quick overview of our proposed new language. Basically, we have a recommendation that says that the existing process must be maintained, but also must be formalized and documented because it wasn't done before.

And this will help enhance its transparency, rigor, efficiency, effectiveness, et cetera. And we also clarify that the ICANN ID and ULA Working Group or its relevant successor will be responsible for documenting that process in consultation with the community. And eventually the documented process must be approved by the two councils as well as the ICANN Board. So, the recommendation itself is to require documenting, formalizing the existing process for developing IDN implementation guidelines.

And then we separate out the kind of a specific aspect of documenting the process into implementation guidance 18, which talks about as part of this process, consideration should be given to establishing a formal charter or something similar that includes several elements, such as purpose, scope, membership, and

working methods. So, the reason that this is separated out is because the process is what I think, essentially care about.

The charter itself can leave some flexibility in implementation, how it looks like exactly. And I think, actually, maybe Donna can speak to this. When the recommendation was initially drafted, there are some different understanding with regard to the charter. For some people, I think the understanding is it will look like something like a GNSO PDP charter. But at the same time, there are other type of charters out there too. For example, the CSC, Custom Standing Committee, they have a charter that's not down to the great detail like a PDP charter, but it's more like a principal document that governs the group, but also includes these elements too.

It's just not extremely detailed. So, there are different templates out there in terms of a charter. So, that's why creating the implementation guidance 18 is to provide some flexibility in implementation, how to develop this charter and what kind of level of detail is required. So, that's the general thinking behind these two. And Dennis, I can defer to you for your comments.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA:

Thank you, Ariel. So, well, let me start with the first one. I contend that the process is not the same. So, we're not talking about maintaining the same process. I mean, we're maintaining the same vehicle, which is a convened group of volunteers, but the process itself is changing. We're suggesting a rigorous process with Board oversight, which it did not happen last time.

I mean, the Board was informed that that was happening, but was not consulted or asked for a charter or what have you. So, just a cosmetic change of language there, but just optics. On the second one, I guess, supporting your question about should we make it explicit who's doing what? And I think that that should be the case. We should not assume that the IRT will know who we were assuming to do the approvals and oversight. So, just agreeing with you, I guess.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. So, I think what we're trying to convey with the first part of the recommendation about the existing process must be maintained. I mean, what we're talking about is that it's a working group of community experts and ICANN org, and it's under the governance of the ICANN Board, currently UA working group. So, I think that's what we're saying needs to be maintained, but there is no document of process, so it needs to be formalized and it needs to be documented.

So, in that process of documenting it, then I think that by itself will enhance the predictability and transparency. So, I don't, unless you have a serious reservation with just saying that the existing process must be maintained, and understanding that in the rationale, we've basically covered what the current process is. And I'm not sure that it warrants changing it. So, and then the whatever the process looks like has to be done in consultation with the community.

So, we've been seeking that box, and then the documented process has to be approved by the GNSO Council, ccNSO and

ICANN Board. So, there's an opportunity there to change things up, if that's the will of the community. So, that can happen by whatever means, the Board wants to document the process, and then the implementation guidance is to give some kind of structure to how the group operates. So, no strong feelings that we're okay with that.

Alrighty, so we can, any other thoughts on this? Well, what we were trying to overcome is that the ccNSO had some really good feedback for us. There was some confusion, ambiguity about working groups that we're referring to. And then when the leadership had a conversation about it, we there was some real confusion about what we meant by charter. And for me, the charter that I was thinking about was more a governing document for the implementation, the working group. It wouldn't be a charter that's developed on an issue-by-issue basis, like the GNSO PDP is. So, we just thought, we move it into implementation guidance, and there's some freedom for the IRT to work out what they want to do. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Donna. And this is Ariel. And I just want to make sure everybody caught this comment, and I think Dennis mentioned it, but I'm not sure people actually caught it. So, in the implementation guidance, I had a question about whether we should make it kind of explicit expectation that once this charter is developed, it also must be approved by the two Councils and ICANN Board as part of the documented process. So, just make sure people know that's the expectation as well.

So, I just wonder whether it's okay to spell this out a little bit in guidance 18. And I think Dennis agreed with my comment, but I want to make sure everybody also see it. And I know Dennis has another comment, and it's also related to this implementation guidance 18, but it's actually part of the rationale language. So, I will try to find it. What was it? Yeah, I think. Oh, yes. Okay. So, this is the kind of a new paragraph here, and which was regarding the documented process and approval of that. And I think this is the sentence that Dennis may have a problem with.

So, I just put it out there, but happy to hear input from the group. So, what is written here is this approval process is expected to be like a one-time effort, and it should not be the case where approval is required each and every time the group needs to be conveyed for updating the IDN implementation guidelines. So, Dennis, if you want to speak to your comment about this, please do so. But I want to make sure we don't miss it.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: Thank you, Ariel. Dennis for the record. Yeah, so that last statement threw me off in terms of what is being described. So, maybe help me clarify. So, we're talking about having a better process how to update guidelines, and that's going to be documented and approved by whoever is doing the oversight of that process, and that's going to be memorialized. And then the actual updating of the guidance will happen eventually and we'll use that process.

And I imagine or anticipate that that process will envision certain checks and balances in terms of whether that's being done the

way it's supposed to be, and not just, yeah, we're going to, I mean, for example, who can initiate the update of the guidelines, and is it going through the right process? And I would imagine there are going to be some approvals along the way as the new version.

I'm just picking, making up my a number here, version five of the guidelines it's called for an update, and there's going to be a new version five, and so it goes through the process, and has to be agreed, I mean, the scope of the issues that's going to be discussed at that working group, it's going to be approved by the GNSO Council, potentially ccNSO, the ICANN Board is also chimes in as well. So, maybe help me clarify here, what do you mean by, it's a one-time approval, and then it looks like, it sounds like anytime somebody wants to update the guidance, they just do it and run with it without any checks. So, maybe that's what it's, it seems odd to me, as I'm reading it.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: I hope that makes sense.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Dennis. So, I don't think that's the intent, and I appreciate that you weren't in KO with us, but when we came to this charter question, Sarmad gave us an overview, well, actually, a pretty detailed description of what happens now with developing

the IDN implementation guidelines, and that is a pretty, it's a reasonably detailed process, but it's never been documented, and that process, as I understand it at the moment, does have that how the IDN guidelines be approved, and I think it's currently done by the Board.

So, I guess in what we're saying here is that once the process is documented, it has to be approved by the NSO council, ccNSO, and ICANN Board, and as part of that process there, that it should be covered in there, who has the authority to approve future versions of the IDN guidelines. So, I would hope that that's covered in through the implementation process, but if you want to specifically call that out, I think we can probably do that in the recommendation, or at least in the implementation guidance to make that clear. And Ariel, is that a new hand?

ARIEL LIANG:

No, it's not really, but also, I just want to say this sentence can be removed, because we can also just leave this, how the approval going to look like to implementation instead of dictating whether it's a one-time thing, or it has to be done every single time, I mean, this is like an add-on sentence, but if the group doesn't agree with this, I don't think it has to be there, and also, I don't think it will change the recommendation if we remove it, so that's my thought about this.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Ariel, and I think that approval process that we're talking about is actually the documentation of the process. So, not

actually work in if, so that documentation process will also include what triggers, what's a triggering event to constitute the IDN implementation guidelines working group, but it's what we're not talking about is the approval of when there is a version 5, it's not talking about that approval process, we're specifically talking about the documenting of the current process. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN TANAKA:

Thank you, Donna. Yeah, I put that in my comment as well. So, I was thinking in terms of, I mean, I know that the process for the guidance is not a PDP, but just wanted to think in terms, there is a PDP manual, which informs governs how PDPs can be created, chartered, and what have you elements membership, and that's one document that governs all the PDPs that are created, and the PDPs by themselves, they have these checks, for example, going back to the GNSO check, we're good, I mean, we are drafting recommendations are going to be implementable, not going to be rejected.

So, there's some checks there along the way to make sure that things are progressing and working as expected. The last sentence is, I think I agree with removing, because it's--, maybe as you are explaining, you and Ariel are explaining, it's not going to affect the overall, what I think the overall outcome, but it just seems odd, so if it's not material, I think removing it will add clarity if that's okay with you, thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Dennis. Any objection to removing that sentence that Ariel had highlighted from anyone? Okay, I'm going to say we delete it. okay. All right, where does that leave us, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Oh, so, sorry, I think I did the wrong thing by asking two questions at once. So, the first question I had is, can we spell out the expectation that the charter also should be approved as part of the documented process to spell this out in implementation guidance 18? I just want to make sure we capture that, or if the group doesn't agree, we don't have to.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, I guess the challenge I have with that suggestion, Ariel, is that this is only implementation guidance, so it can be rejected by the IRT if it wants to. So, if we want to, then we're back in that position of having to prescribe a formal charter and who it's approved by, which is what I was reluctant to do.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, not seeing other comments.

DONNA AUSTIN: And this is going to go out for public comment, folks, so if people have second thoughts about it, then the public comment process is there. I would prefer that we iron all these things out before we publish the report, but I also am pretty keen to get this out. So, if people are on the fence about it, then they can take it back to their

groups, and then we can review any new comments through public comment. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. This is Hadia, for the record, and I was just wondering, what do these details about the charter add? So, why don't we start by saying consideration should be given to establishing a formal charter or similar standalone document for subsequent IDN implementation guidelines working group without that includes, because it is well known that the charter always, not usually, contains the purpose, the scope, membership, so, like, by definition, charters do include all of this, like, why are we, like, why do we need to spell out those items? Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

So, I guess, because we were just trying to provide some outline of what the expectation was when we talk about a charter and the charter is intended to be a standalone document that really governs the working group. It's not intended to be every time that the group gets together, because of a triggering event, that they would develop a formal charter of some sort to do their work, although they may choose to do that. But the risk of getting so prescriptive, I just, I'm sorry, but I'm getting a little bit deflated at the moment, because we've had good conversations around this with where I thought we were on a good path, and now it's kind of come back again.

So, I think I just want to leave it where it is for the time being. And everybody will have a chance to review this before we publish the

initial report, because you'll see the draft. But I'm not really hearing anything that convinces me we need to change what we currently have. Okay, thanks, Hadia. And I'm not trying to dismiss your comments, but we could work this to death and still not. Anyway, whatever, I'm feeling like I'm a little bit overwrought here. So, I think we're going to leave this as it is. And I appreciate that you've only seen this language a few days ago. So, Ariel, what else have we got?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yeah, so in the spirit of moving on from this conversation, I'm just bringing up the last light-ish item which is, I think, Adam's suggestion to add an entry about variants in the glossary. So, I want to make sure everybody sees it as well. And it's on this document, and I just put it in the chat. And so, basically, I drafted this based on what was written in the IDN implementation guidelines version 4.1. They actually have an entry about variant. I just borrowed some wording there. It says the term is generally used to identify different types of linguistic situations where different code points or labels are considered to be the same as one another.

And then I added another clarification that in our context, variants refer to different code points or labels considered the same in accordance with the RZ-LGR at the top level and registry, IDN tables at the second level. So, hopefully, that helps kind of explain what this term means. And then with some additional notes in the second column or the third column here, I just noted, because there's a lot of wide-ranging understanding of the term and to avoid confusion.

Usually, we don't use variant by itself. It's used in the context of variant domain name, variant domain set, variant label throughout the initial report. So, hopefully, this is satisfactory for the team for this explanation. But if you do have comments, please, including the Google Doc, speak up now. So, that's basically the last comment. Oh, Donna, I see your mic is unmuted, but I'm not hearing you speaking.

DONNA AUSTIN: That's because I'm not saying anything, Ariel. So, I was just waiting for all the hands to fly up to see what people had to say on this. But it looks like I'm not seeing any hands. So, I assume we're in a good place on this. Alrighty. I think we're okay, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, I think variant is an ambiguous term. It can be a variant code point or a variant label. And those two obviously mean different things. So, normally, our, I guess, suggestion and practice has been that we don't use variant word by itself, but along with the code point or label to make sure that it is clear to the reader, whether we're talking about a variant label or a variant code point. So, I guess that's sort of just a bit of context. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Okay, anything else?

ARIEL LIANG: No. Thanks, Sarmad. This is Ariel. And I think we covered everything in the agenda. And I guess the action item following the call is to incorporate Registry's small team's input, as well as Sarmad's and Pitinan input for the IDN table harmonization language. We'll see what we come up with. And then also revise the WHOIS, RDAP, RDDS related recommendation language to make it more generic. And then for IDN implementation guidelines recommendation, I think we have addressed basically Dennis' comments.

I don't recall we have to make substantive changes to the recommendation and implementation guidance language. We did delete the problematic sentence in the rationale. So, maybe not much change to 14 and 18. So, that's my recollection. So, that's the action items. And it seems like we still have to hold that session and so on; that's my impression. But we can discuss with the leadership team and get back to the group to confirm.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, I'm just trying to-- Okay. So, the session in San Juan is on Saturday, the 2nd of March at 9am. In San Juan, it's a 60-minute session. So, do folks know at this moment whether they are able to attend that or not? So, if we went ahead with the meeting, what kind of attendance will we have from the members of this group? Okay. So, we've got Jen, Satish, Dennis. Maxim will be remote. Saewon would be in person. Michael Bauland isn't on this call,

but we'll assume that he'll be there if he's attending. Nitin, Alan's not sure.

All right. So, the leadership team will try to have a call in the next few days and sort out what we'd like to achieve if we do have a meeting in San Juan. I think I've said previously that I won't be there in person. And it doesn't look like Ariel can attend either. So, Steve and Dan in San Juan will be covering. So, we'll work it out. I think there might be some value in trying to see if we can close the loop on the harmonization discussion. So, if we did meet, that's what we'd be talking about. So, we'll stand by, but at this point in time, I think we'll try to go ahead with it. Okay. So, with that, I think anything else, Ariel, or can we close this one out?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. I think we can. And that's all.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, everybody. I won't see you in San Juan, but I might see you online. So, we'll see how we go. Thanks, Devan. You can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]