EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 15 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/DIEFEg

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, 15 February 2024 at 12:00 UTC. We do have apologies today from Dennis Tan Tanaka, Alan Barrett, Zuan Zhang. Maxim Alzoba will be joining us late. 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 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 behavior. With this, I will turn it back over to Donna Austin.

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.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks very much, Devan, and thanks to those that could join this evening. I am a little bit worried that we're attendance light at the moment. We've got Edmon, Manju, Emmanuel, Jennifer, here comes Hadia, Satish, and Michael. So I guess we'll get going and see what we can get through.

So I don't have much by way of updates for what we are going to go through is our timeline overview, just so we can kind of reset and people understand what our goal is in terms of kind of what's left and where we hope to get to. So Ariel, can you pull up the timeline?

Okay, so today is the 15th of February. So we're at meeting 106. We're hoping, I was hoping, that maybe we'd get through enough today that we wouldn't need the meeting next week. But maybe I'm a little bit optimistic on that. We won't have a meeting on the— Right. So let me think about this. So two more meetings, and then no meeting. Staff will finish drafting the phase two initial report and our materials that are required for public comment. And we're also going into ICANN number whatever that is, ICANN 79. And then we'll start once Ariel, Dan and Saewon and Steve have started or provided us with a draft of the phase two initial report. We'll allow some time for the team to review. And with the aim that we will approve the draft report around the 15th of March. And then as most of us appreciate, it takes a while to get documents ready for posting for public comment. Excuse me. So we'll allow a week for that. And then what our target date is, is the 25th of March. So we're almost through the bulk of the phase two work that we need

EN

to get through so we can post the phase two report for public comment.

We may or may not meet at ICANN 79. I think there's a 60 minute session that's been proposed. But I don't know if I've said this before, but I won't be in Puerto Rico. So we'll see how we go. I can always attend remotely if we need to go ahead. But my sense is that we won't have a need to meet during the ICANN meeting, given that we should have all the conversations we need to have done so that we can get the initial report drafted. So Ariel, have I missed anything?

ARIEL LIANG: And there are a couple more slides about the timeline, but they're very late. Basically, if we do manage to publish public comment in March, the end of March, April, it's break time. And then for closing public comment, minimum is 40 days. But we probably don't want to end the public comment on the weekend. So we calculated that if we close on May the 6th, it will be a total of 42 days. It closes on a Monday. And presumably, the team will start meeting again on May the 16th. And basically, we'll start reviewing the public comments. So that's all for the timeline.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So any comments on that? Any questions from anybody? All right. I don't see any hands. Okay. All right. So notwithstanding that I am concerned about the fact that we're pretty light on in attendance, let's see where we get to. Ariel, can you bring up the agenda again?

Okay. Thanks. So I think the preliminary recommendation 12 on the RDAP query, I think at the end of our call last week, there was an agreement that Dennis was going to go back to the registries and see if there's any concern with the recommendation including more specifics about what needed to be or what we think will be good to be included in the RDAP query recommendation. And then number six, the IDN table harmonization update is also something that we've been waiting on an update from the registry stakeholder group. So Jen, I'm just wondering whether you're in a position to help us out with that or whether the registries are still considering those two issues. Go ahead, Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Yes. So yesterday we had an internal registries IDN EPDP call with the rest of the stakeholder group who are interested in it. And we did specifically talk about the preliminary recommendation 12 and also harmonization. So exactly the two items that you're waiting on input for from the registry.

So I guess I'll start with 12. So there was a significant concern after last week's call. There was some back and forth on our internal mailing list. And then we actually talked about it during the call. I think the general concern was that the sense was that RDAP was not the right protocol to use if we're trying to identify a complete set of variants, including the primary domain name.

I think there was concern that when that was used, then the volume of the whole set of the response would be overwhelming. And the second thing was that the idea, and actually this came from a member of the registries who was very well versed in the

RDAP policy development, and he was very concerned that this IDN EPDP group may be overreaching a little bit out of our own scope if we are asking for a specific how it's going to be returned on the RDAP, because there are current processes that inform how RDAP should be updated. And others also weighed in saying that this will affect, of course, contractual obligations when it comes to contracted parties.

I think that when we looked, actually we looked at the red line here, there was suggestion that we do mention that we may want the—We do want to take note that we want certain items or the certain implementation or suggest certain implementation items for this process to look at, but not specify it to be a recommendation here. I don't know if I'm kind of like talking in circles at this point, but I'll pause here to see if there's any additional thoughts because Michael was also on our call yesterday as well. All right, thanks, Jen.

DONNA AUSTIN: Michael, do you want to go ahead?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, thanks, Michael, for the record. I tend to see this a bit different from the registry point of view. First of all, we are not requiring to return the whole set of variants, i.e. the allocatable and blocked and something like this. For this, root zone LGR is a better place to go if you want to calculate a variant set for a given label, but we are requiring to return all existing domains that are in the set. I think that's a reasonable thing to return. I also don't think

EN

this should be a big problem with the performance because the registries anyhow have this existing set linked somehow in the database. They have to have easy ways to determine which other existing domains belong to the same set because they always have to return this information when transferring domains, for example, that the whole set is transferred. For that reason, I personally may not possibly speak for the registrars' point of view, but personally I think this is not too high a requirement to say that all existing variants should be returned. I do think the RDAP is the correct place to do that because it returns the information about one queried domain name and the information consists of the contacts belonging to that domain name, but also the variants that exist and belong to this domain name. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Donna. I was looking for my notes from yesterday's call. Now I found it, which is great. There was -- okay, I'm just going to be a little more specific here with my previous response. I think we also mentioned that the RDAP responses are covered by the RDAP profile and there's already an established process for updating the RDAP profile documents agreed by Org and the contracted parties. It's oriented around -- I guess it's in the context of the EPDP on the registration data policy, but around the RDAP profile documents and not particularly around any EPDP.

So the approach taken by the registration data policy, EPDP should also be the approach taken by our IDN EPDP was pretty much the gist of the concern. And then also the rationale is that the elements of the RDDS response is part of the contract. So any changes to the RDDS responses are the changes to the contract and contract changes, contractual changes, is not in scope for policy development.

There was also some concern that Rec 12 is overly specific and should really just recommend a review or update of the RDAP profile documents to address our particular concerns. So listing our particular concerns and then mentioning that we need to recommend a review or update of RDAP profile documents might be how currently the registries view this item. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jen. Michael, is that a new or an old hand?

MICHAEL BAULAND: It's a new one.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So just before I go to you, I just want to cover something. So, Jen, I'm not sure what you mean by part of the contract changes are not in the scope of the PDP. I mean, the reality is that policy development will result in contract changes. That's just fact. So I'm not sure that I follow that statement. The other suggestion that you had that maybe there's a general recommendation that we have the RDAP profile be updated to account for variants is

kind of where I was thinking we might be able to go last week and then perhaps put specifics in implementation guidance to give some flavor of what we think could be done to change the profile. So I think—and Michael, I take on board that you think it's reasonable that the profile can be updated to do certain things and capture the existing domains. So I think what I'd just like to have a discussion about is whether we can come up with another kind of a general recommendation that says that the RDAP profile needs to be updated to account for variant domain name sets. And then in the implementation guidance, we provide more specifics. So within that, Michael, we would include the additional information that I think you were suggesting we add to the recommendation last week. So just if we can think about that, and Maxim, you've got your hand up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking about contractual changes, it's a legal language from the text of contracts for registries and registrars. And PDPs are not the right vehicle to change it. And if we're speaking about policy changes, it is included by the contract, but not directly. And I think we might suggest that if the suggested changes to RDAP response or request involve significant change of the output length or volume, then the SLAs tied to RDAP should be reviewed for if there is a need of change. If for some reason, we have an output of few megabytes, and obviously the current SLAs are for quite short and very short answer of the server. And thus the current SLAs, they don't fit the request with answer of few megabytes. So I suggest we have some language like if the result of such changes lead to significant output changes in volume or length of

EN

output, then the SLAs for the same service should be reviewed or something like that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. So what if we mentioned in a more general recommendation that the RDAP profile be updated to accommodate variant domain names and any related SLAs or something like that? Would that work? Or are you saying SLAs are completely out of scope of what we're doing? And Hadia, I know that you said we're not talking about SLAs here, but I think what Maxim is saying is that there are SLAs that are currently in the contract for RDAP queries. So if we're recommending a change to the RDAP profile, then there probably is a consequence that something has to, might impact the SLAs. Michael, go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes. Thanks, Michael, for the record. I've got two comments. First, regarding Maxim, they said like if the output is several megabytes. I honestly don't see that this would rise to even one megabyte. You would have to have tens of thousands of existing variants. And the registry operator should have some mechanism in place to limit the number of allocated variants. And if they really want to allow to activate tens or hundreds of thousands of variants for one domain name, then I think they should be able to handle those number of variants, including the RDAP. So, it's their choice to say we only want to activate at most 10 variants, for example, and then you would talk about not even a kilobyte of additional data in the RDAP. So, don't really see a problem with the SLAs here.

EN

And the second point was that what we talked about earlier, we're not really requiring any change of the RDAP protocol. We are just saying that registries have to return all existing variants. And how they do that, that is a different question. Already now it's possible, for example, to add the list of variants. As you can see, if you click on the link there and scroll to the very bottom, you see an entry for variants. So, of course, it would be nice to have an RDAP standard so that users of RDAP have a fixed way to see how variants are displayed in RDAP. But that is out of scope, I think. We could just say it would be a good idea to have a standard, but that's not what we are requiring here. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, Michael, would you be amenable to the suggestion that we have a general recommendation that the RDAP profile needs to be updated to account for variants and then we have specifics in implementation guidance? Is that something that would work for you or would you prefer to have the recommendation be more specific?

MICHAEL BAULAND: No, it doesn't have to be specific. I just want to make sure that it's given that if you query the RDAP, you receive all existing variants. Because I think that's the only location for users to find out what other variants exist for a given domain name. And seeing that at some other location of our recommendation, I think it was in the context of URS, we said that you have to put in the URS request every domain where you think there is a problem. And if variants are a problem, you have to add each and every existing variant in

EN

that request, too. And I think the RDAP is the only sensible place to find out that information.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Michael. We've got Maxim, Hadia, and then Jen.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I'd like to say that, actually, we are just representatives of registries. We had conversations with registries, more than a few, expressed their concern that SLAs might change. We're speaking about not yet existing implementation of RDAP. The current SLAs for RDAP are only for the current implementation and might not be feasible for the new one. And all we need is just to reflect that if the output of the service changes dramatically, then the SLAs should be reviewed. That's it. Because if there is no change, there is no need to change SLAs. And I think it cannot be a separate recommendation because it's tied with the RDAP change here, proposed RDAP change here. That's it. Because we're speaking on behalf of registries. Registries have experience of working as a provider of this service. And we would like to have this reflected. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Hadia?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Thank you. This is Hadia, for the record. So I do agree with Michael that the recommendation is about what needs to be

EN

returned, like what does the query return. And it's not really about how the RDAP does this. And I'm not sure even that the how is within scope. And Donna, you mentioned maybe having a best practice, developing a best practice. We could at the end of this phase set a group to develop best practices for implementation. Or maybe this group could look into best practices for implementation. But that wouldn't include only the RDAP part, but might include other parts as well.

To Maxim's point about the SLAs, again, because this recommendation is not particularly about the changes that need to happen to the RDAP, it's about what the query is expected to return ... I do understand that Maxim thinks that SLAs will need to be updated. But would the SLAs need to be updated only because of this recommendation? Or maybe there are other parts or other recommendations that would at the end of the day also require a look into the SLAs? This is a question I don't know its answer.

And then finally, I have a question, and this is apologies, because I wasn't with you on the last call. So I'm not sure why the responses to queries regarding grandfathered variant domain names are exempt from this requirement. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, Hadia, what was that last question?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: My question is with regard to the grandfathered variant domain names. And they are exempt from this requirement, from the

EN

requirements of what the query actually returns. And I'm not sure why are the grandfathered variant domain names exempt?

DONNA AUSTIN: The grandfathering is pretty consistent for—Because we can't change what's happening at the moment. Right. So there are second-level variant domains in existence at the moment, doing their own thing, they don't have any requirements on them at the moment. So it's difficult to retrospectively require them to do certain things. So I think our approach to most of the policies at the second level is that we do have grandfathering in place, because it's hard to achieve some of this, most of this retroactively. And as Ariel says, one of the reasons is that there might be different registrants for the variants, and these things may not be tracked, but in the future, they will be because of the policy that we're recommending. So, Jen, and then Michael.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Donna. Jen for the record here. I think earlier, Donna, when you mentioned that if we make the recommendation that RDAP profile should be updated, or the RDAP, I think its working group needs to look at it, I think we're fine with that. If we put the more specific items in implementation, I think registries will be much more comfortable here.

One more item that I wanted to add, and in our pretty lengthy discussion yesterday that we had was, I don't think the registries don't agree with—So we do agree that if the community wants to have a complete set in a search that is made known to them, I

EN

think that is something that we do agree that we should make this recommendation, but more on the set of a more general principle saying if we are looking up a primarily domain label, then it should be in the response that it is a primary label, and if we're looking at a variant, then, and it's not a primary label, then obviously we need an indication that there is a primary label, and it is allocated, etc., that way, and in a simple query response. In other words, in a searching principle, instead of being very specific that the RDAP profile specifically needs to return certain things. I don't know if that makes it clearer or more complicated if we are going to put that into the implementation guidance, but maybe we should say it must be possible to search for the complete variant set in our recommendation, and then put the rest in implementation guidance.

When we're talking about changes to the RDAP response profile, I think I mentioned before, it is covered by another process right now, and I think it is important for us to take note there as well. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Jen. Michael, I know you had your hand up, but it's gone again, so did you have anything else?

MICHAEL BAULAND: I just wanted to answer Hadia's question, and I put it in the chat already.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN:
Thanks, Michael. All right. So, I think where we are, and please, if anyone disagrees, now would be a good time to say, is that what we'll do from, unless, Jen, the registries have come up with some draft language for us to consider, leadership will go back and have a look at this recommendation and just come up with a generic recommendation, and I don't mean—GENERIC'S the wrong word, a more general recommendation with some specifics in implementation guidance. So, I think what we're really trying to achieve here is, because of the introduction of variants, we think there is a need to update the RDAP profile so that any response query identifies the fact that a label that's been looked up, if it's part of a domain variant set, then that's pretty obvious when you do the query, and it's also obvious how you find out the rest of the variants in the set. So, I think that's the important part of the recommendation, is that we're pretty clear about why we're making the recommendation and the intent, and then to provide a little bit of clarity, we can, in the implementation guidance, say these are the things that we think should be obvious or returned in a query for a label that is part of a domain name set. So, does that make sense to folks? Is that okay? Is that a path forward, way forward? Okay, Satish is okay, Jennifer's okay, Nitin, Michael, and Hadia.

Okay, all righty, and Edmon's okay. So, thanks for that, and thanks, Jen, for, and Max, for taking this back to the registries and having the conversation so that we can—I'd rather try to resolve these issues here than have one of our groups come back through public comment. So, I'm pleased to get this done. All righty, so I think we can move on to whatever's next,

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Ariel. Thanks, Donna, thanks, everyone. Since we're looking at the hard stuff first, I think we should just go straight to the IDN table harmonization topic, and sorry for making Jennifer talking so much, but I think it probably makes sense to tackle these two first, and then we can look at the easier stuff after.

JENNIFER CHUNG: No problem, Ariel and Donna. Donna, do you want me to just go ahead?

DONNA AUSTIN: Ariel, can you just give us a little bit of a recap, and then we'll get Jen to give us an update from the registries, if that's okay?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, so I think Pitinan is also on the call, so Pitinan, if I'm missing anything or mischaracterizing anything, please feel free to chime in. I think in the workshop, the group did have a quite intensive discussion about this preliminary recommendation one. I guess just based on observation, there are some unresolved issue with the meaning of harmonization. So, one is to create a consistent variant domain set, and that's agreed upon by the team, which is the first component of harmonization. But the second component of harmonization is something not reflected in this recommendation explicitly, but is something noted in the IDN implementation guideline version 4.0, one of the deferred guidelines, is to basically, including additional code points that

EN

were identified by the script communities. Specifically, those variant code points are the cross-script variant code points. So, based on, I think, input from Sarmad and Pitinan, currently a lot of IDN tables, they haven't looked at cross-script variant issues, and those code points were not identified as variants. So, that's a missing part, basically.

And so, I think the goal is to get to the same page with the EPDP team to include these additional variant code points that are cross-script code points. And one way to do that is to reference the existing work by the community, and I think specifically the reference LGR, which is basically the same as the RZ-LGR, but it's used for the second level to include these additional ones. But I think the understanding is this is not some kind of trivial task, that it requires a significant level of effort from registries to do that. And following the workshop, I believe the registry representatives, I think they met with Sarmad and Pitinan on a follow-up call, and then later on, the small team in the registry stakeholder group met several times to discuss this issue. So, I think that's why we're here, again, to talk about this topic and see whether there's an update from Jennifer about this. So, hopefully I didn't misspoke or miss any important detail, but if I did, please feel free to chime in, especially from Jennifer and Pitinan. Please go ahead.

PITINAN KOOARMORNPATANA: Thank you, Pitinan here. Hope you can hear me okay. Ariel already addressed everything correctly and perfectly. Thank you. Just a little add on that on the last call that Sarmad and I attended with the RySG small group. So, I guess we presented the data and some of the examples that already have the community input

to the group. But just to, I think, from what I understand, is one of the positive, perhaps, feedback to also include the data is the clarity on what would be the expected when we say the harmonize. And this is something already data provided by the community. So, it's kind of a single source that brings the transparency and consistency to the process. So, I just wanted to note this as well. But I guess, yeah, it still haven't concluded and the continual discussion is still going on. We do have a plan to discuss again, I believe, this next week. But that's all I have for now. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Pitinan. Jen, go ahead.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Donna. Jennifer, for the record, from registries. Yes, we do actually have a scheduled call with Pitinan and Sarmad's team next Tuesday on the 20th. And I think we also invited our registrar colleagues as well to the call.

A little bit of an update regarding the harmonization discussion. We did have several calls in the small group of registries with the larger stakeholder group and then separately as well, just the IDN EPDP reps. I think we have coalesced around several major principles here. We actually did take a look at the recommendation language, both in C4 and C5 and the rationale for implementation guidance as well. We don't actually have any problems with the way it's currently formatted. That being said, the conversations that we're having surround more of the idea of how

we're going to achieve harmonization. And there was discussion whether we're looking at the RZ-LGR, the reference LGRs, especially when we're looking at in-script and cross-script variant code points that were identified.

I think one of the first things we agreed on within the registry is that [inaudible] what repertoire would be, and then for the second level, it should be on the registry operators. And we are supportive, of course, of the concept and the idea of harmonization as a final goal. Getting there is the million-dollar question, and we are definitely going to be looking at respecting the RDNA 2008 and any future versions thereof, and of course, the IDN guidelines.

I think in our conversation previously with Sarmad and team, there was a suggestion from staff that RZ-LGR, the root zone LGR, should be the starting point when we're looking at it. I think a lot of registries express some different concerns about that. I think we can look at it kind of as a whole, as a collective, when we're looking at respecting the IDNA 2008 and future versions, the IDN guidelines, the RZ-LGR, and also any the reference LGRs when we're looking at the cross-script variant code points.

I mean, the fact of the matter is we do probably, if the root zone has identified variants, there is no real reason why we registries have any real reason to not absorb these identified variants in our IDN tables, especially if we have to broaden the repertoire. But I think the detail right now we wanted to work out when we have our call with Sarmad and team is the more specific implementation processes and what we're looking at.

So, just to recap, I think we're okay with how C4 and C5 look. I don't think the registries have anything additional to add to any of this language or suggest any additional language. We're quite happy with the way it's formulated right now, but we understand there is going to be a process that we need to work out, especially hammer out with Sarmad and team when we're looking down the road, when we're looking at implementation. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, Jen, just on that last point, and I appreciate that you've still got another call to go with Pitinan and Sarmad, but whether there's any value in some implementation guidance that we could provide as well, or whether the preference is just to stay with the recommendations that we have and the registries will continue to work with Sarmad and Pitinan on the harmonization issue, but it's outside the scope of what we're doing.

JENNIFER CHUNG: So, I think Dennis, Maxim, and I are going to try to circulate some language internally because we just had the call yesterday, and then we'll try to get that nailed down after the call after confirming during the call with Sarmad and Pitinan next Tuesday. If we are able to supply any implementation text here, I mean then we will. If not, then of course we will let you know. But I just want to reiterate that currently we're still quite happy with how the language appears in these preliminary recs. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Jennifer. Edmon, and then Hadia.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. Thank you, Edmon here speaking personally. So, just on Jen's point about the root zone LGR as a reference or as a starting point, I do think that as I hear from Ariel and Pitinan as well, I think we need to reframe that a little bit because the root zone LGR is probably not the right starting point and reference point because there simply isn't any numbers and hyphens in the root zone, and therefore the tolerance level for confusion is very different than in the second level. So, I think the methodologies that the root zone LGR used in terms of harmonization is profitable. It's useful, but the actual tables themselves are, we need to refrain from using words like starting with and as reference. So, I guess I would just add at that point.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Edmon. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. So, I guess if we are to reference the root zone label generation rules, that means that one needs to be a subset of the other. So, based on Sarmad's comment, he says, make it a bit more explicit that the variant relationships are those identified by the community for a script, not limited to those defined with the IDN tables of a registry. And if we are looking for any kind of relationship, that means that either the IDN tables developed by the registry need to be a subset of those developed by the community or vice versa.

And I don't think that this is possible. As Edmon says, the requirements for second level domains are different. But then again, this is just a thought that if we are to look into implementing sort of what Sarmad is saying, then there needs to be a kind of a relationship between both. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Hadia. So, I think what we'll do here is, and just to, I guess, go back to where we were in KL. So, this recommendation C4 and C5 were pretty much done, and we kind of opened it up at the request of Sarmad and Pitinan. And following the conversation we had in KL, I asked Sarmad and Pitinan to go back and work with the registries and registrars and see if it was possible to— whether we wanted to revisit the recommendations or whether they would stay as they are. I think I'm hearing from Jen that the strong preference at the moment from the registries, at least, is to keep the recommendations as they are. There might be some additional language or suggested language that might come forward from the registries, but I'm getting the sense that that's unlikely. So, I'm not sure that we're going to have a great deal of movement on this unless others in the group have a different view to where the registries are going to end up on this.

All right. So, I don't think we have anything else on this at this point, but I do hope that by the time we come back to this next week, we'll have a path forward. And whether it's status quo, we stay with what we have, or we have a little bit more in terms of implementation guidance recommended for the registries to consider. Okay. So, let's go back to the easy stuff, Ariel.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Yep. And thanks very much for everyone, especially the registries group, devoting so much time and effort on addressing these hard topics, and really appreciate that we can potentially see a movement on this. So, thanks, everybody, for the effort in this. So, I guess we oh, actually, not a super easy step, but I do want to go to the part of the closed loop discussion, which is the recommendation, I'm just quickly scrolling down to the page about the IDN implementation guidelines. So, recall that we had the action item to consult with the ccPDP4 on this recommendation. And indirectly, the ccPDP4 will also recommend something to the ccNSO Council their take on this recommendation and see whether they have any significant concerns, because ccNSO Council is explicitly named in this recommendation language.

So, the group graciously gives us time, especially for me to talk about this recommendation in a couple of meetings. And in fact, they spend about more than half of their meeting this week to discuss their recommendation. So, the good news is that they didn't see any significant concerns. I don't know whether anybody was on the ccNSO Council meeting that—actually supposed to happen today. I don't know whether it already happened. But I think what they're going to tell the ccNSO Council in general is they don't have significant concerns about this recommendation. So, that's the good news.

And I don't think it's a bad news, but they did raise a couple of questions about the language of the recommendation 14, because some of the language seems to cause a little bit confusion. So, I just want to raise that with the group and see whether there's any

EN

possibility for us to refine it so that prevent further confusion from other readers.

So, the first point of confusion is in the recommendation. Thank you, Hadia. So, it will happen today, but later. So, Hadia, if you're going to be on the call, please keep us posted about their discussion about this recommendation. But hopefully, they won't say anything contrary to what they said on Tuesday about no serious concerns.

So, the first confusion is they noticed the word "working group" is mentioned in two different contexts. One is the working group that tasked to specifically develop the implementation guidelines. And then the other working group is in the context of the IDN, UA ICANN board working group. So, they got a little bit confused, like, which working group we're talking about here. And I wonder whether we can do something, for example, using an acronym when we mention the ICANN board working group. And then when we say "working group," it's specifically talking about the working group that tasked of developing the IDN implementation guidelines. So, that's the first point of confusion.

And the second point is in terms of 14.1, they noticed there is this process for establishing the working group to develop the guideline. And then there's also a charter. So, there are two elements that require approval by the councils of GNSO and ccNSO. So, they're a little confused about the difference. I mean, definitely there is difference. It's just in terms of process, it's a little vague in their view. They don't really know what exactly goes into it because for the charter component, it's pretty clear what is expected to be included in the charter. So, they would appreciate

EN

a bit more clarity around this. And also, who is responsible for basically drafting this process document so that it can be approved by both councils and the ICANN board. So, they're not sure who's doing what in this 14.1, which is not as clear as the other items because basically the group recommends the ICANN Board UA IDN working group to draft the charter. So, they're wondering who's going to draft the process for this one. So, that's the second point.

The third point is about this sentence or this phrase here in 14.1. They thought that the GNSO council, ccNSO council also need to approve the actual IDN implementation guideline, each version, because it makes it sound like this needs to, the directly related outputs, and make it sound like the both councils needs to approve the guideline itself as well. But I don't think that's the intent of 14.1. So, it's still ultimately up to the ICANN board to approve the IDN implementation guideline, not for the councils to do that. So, I just wonder whether we want to still keep this phrase here or delete it to avoid any further confusion around this. So, that's the third point.

And the fourth point is regarding 14.2. So, they understand the concept of establishing a formal charter for this working group, but they were a little confused about the chicken and egg scenario in 14.2 is as if the working group has to exist first in order to establish a charter, because that's how it sounds like in 14.2. But in fact, the charter exists before the working group is formally established, because part of the board will establish the charter, and then there will be call for volunteers and those process of getting the working group formalized and going. So, it comes after.

EN

So, basically, we probably want to tweak 14.2 a little bit, and possibly combine with 14.3 just to say the part of this ICANN board is responsible for developing the charter, and then the charter must include these elements under 14.2, so we can combine these two items and make it clearer.

So, basically, these are the four points I heard in terms of their confusion, and I think they're not extremely difficult to fix to make the language clearer. And I know that Hadia and Michael, they were both on the call, so if I miss anything, please feel free to chime in, and hopefully I have addressed all the points they raised.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel, and I think that's really good feedback from the ccNSO, so thank you for following up with them, and please thank them for the feedback. I can see that there is some ambiguity and confusion in what we've recommended. You know, and some of the challenge here is the chicken and egg scenario, so, yeah, I don't know if anyone has any immediate thoughts or reactions here. It would be good if we can capture those. I need to think about this a little bit more. But I'm pleased we took the time to go to them, and this feedback is helpful, so we just need to tidy this up, which might be difficult to do, because there is a bit of a chicken and egg problem with this. I think there probably is an existing working group now, or maybe not. Anyway, we'll sort it out, and if anyone has any thoughts, by all means put them into the document or send an email to the list, but we'll have a look at this from a leadership perspective and see if we can make this

less ambiguous as to - I think our intent's pretty clear, but it's a bit messy in the way that we've drafted the language. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. So, recommendation 14.3 is actually very clear, where it says that ICANN Board IDN UA working group will be responsible for developing the charter. So, this is clear. I think the clarity comes from 14.2, where it says the working group must establish, and there it does not specify which working group, while 14.3 does specify. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Maybe 14. Yeah, that's a good point, Hadia. All right. Good catch. So, we'll have another look at this with the fresh eyes of the ccNSO, and we'll figure this out. Thanks, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna. Yes, Satish put a comment to merge 14.2 and 14.3. Yes, it's indeed my understanding as well. We could definitely clean this up and actually put a suggested wording in the comment here, looking at the merger of these two items. So, if no more comments or questions about this one, I think we can truly move to the easier stuff. It's still not super easy, but at least I don't think it's going to make our heads spin. Hopefully, that's not the case.

So, I just put the glossary document in the chat. We wanted to talk about this last call, but we ran out of time. So, hopefully, today we can at least address these items, especially the yellow ones

EN

highlighted in the document. Also, I'm hoping we don't have to read line by line. These documents were circulated to the group for a while now, and hopefully, everybody has a chance to read through it. So, the highlighted yellow ones are the key glossary terms, and you probably see there are some red lines here, and mostly from Michael, his input.

So, basically, what staff did is to apply red lines to kind of reflect what Michael was suggesting, and I'm not sure whether we have to go through every single thing, but maybe I can pause for a moment and see whether there's any items that the group really wants to focus on, or whether you have any confusion, concern, or question about any specific terms so we can focus on those all together. So, I'll just pause for a moment and see whether there's any hand raised.

DONNA AUSTIN: I don't see any, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. So, Donna, would you still like me to go through these yellow ones one by one, or what's your suggested approach? Because I also don't want to just read and thwart everybody with my monologue either.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Ariel. So, I think the approach is, given that this has been out for folks to look at and comment on, if there's no substandard comments, then we're going to assume that the text

EN

is okay, and that's what will appear in the report. So, I see Michael's made some more editorial, I think, than substantive in most cases, and probably happy to accept those. So, if there's any substantive comments, Ariel, we can pick up on those. Otherwise, let's just assume that this is okay. So, Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Edmon here, also speaking personally. The only kind of nitpick that I usually talk about for this glossary thing, and it might be a big change depending on the document, is the word "variant." There are many different uses of the word "variant." I know we try to define it, but if we consistently use "IDN variant" in most cases, that might be better, because we have the brewing discussion about Quebec and some other issues in terms of variation of domains, but if we fix it into IDN variants rather than the more generic term "variant" or "variant domain," it usually is clearer. So, that's just an overall suggestion. If it's too difficult to change at this point, I can understand. I made a similar suggestion when we had the discussion about the IDN implementation guidelines, and I think that is consistent now, avoiding just using the word "variant" for domains to avoid those nuances that other people try to use the word for.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. So, Michael has a suggestion that could we just add an entry that "variant" and state that we always mean "IDN variant"? I mean, that's a way that we could do it. Edmon's okay with that approach. Ariel, do you have any thoughts on that approach?

EN

ARIEL LIANG: I definitely understand Edmon's point that we probably want to explain "variant" in the context of our EPDP deliberations. I just have a question about adding IDN to this, because I recall clearly that phase one, we eventually decided to remove IDN from a lot of recommendation language because we don't know whether in the future, the Latin GP may want to include additional variant code points that derive from ASCII. For example the Quebec topic, the example. So, that's why to be future-proof, we removed IDN, and then I just don't know whether it's kind of contradicting our position by adding this back to phase two. But I definitely see Edmon's point, and I think maybe we can try to explain it in a different way just to say what we say about "variant" or the variant code points as defined by IDN tables in the domain name context or whatever, like maybe try to explain this way. I don't know whether the group will be agreeable to that approach. And I see Hadia has her hand up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Ariel. Yeah, this is Hadia for the record. So, yes, I am now quite confused because actually in phase one, when we decided to remove the word IDNs, I always thought that we were talking only about IDN variants. But then, as you mentioned, we removed it for flexibility. And now, in phase two, we deliberately say that we are only talking about IDN variants. So, I'm okay either way, but which way do we want to have it? This is the question, you know. Do we want to speak specifically about IDN variants, or do we want to keep it open? Thank you.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. So, it seems this is one of those things where we could do it one way or another way, and there'd be challenges either way. I'm leaning towards deferring to Ariel, given that she's been the primary drafter of all our documents so far. So, if it doesn't cause too much heartburn, for consistency, we won't introduce the IDN variant idea. So, sorry if that causes a bit of heartburn for you, Edmon, but I think that's the way I'd like to go with it. Okay. All righty. Ariel, you have the pen, so you have the power.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, everybody, for entrusting me with this task. So, I will develop some draft language around this, and thanks to Edmon for bringing this point. I think it's definitely important to clarify this in our context, so I will work on something and then circulate that with the group for next week, for sure.

And maybe we can probably just look at a couple of items from a substantive point of view, and I think the ones that Michael commented on, I tried to reflect them in the red line, especially the ones that are not super difficult to address, so I entrust the group to look at this on your own time and make sure you're okay, or if you do have final concerns or questions, please raise them later in the next call. That's the hope from me.

And I think probably the difficult ones are really at the end of this document, so if you look at variant domain name and variant domain set, I think these are the two most difficult items, and we

did spend a lot of time discussing this, so I just want to make sure everybody has seen the red lines here. So, for variant domain name, the main part of this didn't really change. The part that was added is with regard to the disposition value part. So, basically, what I wrote here is that under a given gTLD, the disposition value of the variant domain names can be calculated based on the IDN table used for that given gTLD, but we also know that the variant domain names need to account for the domains under a given gTLD's variant gTLD if it's also delegated, but then under that variant gTLD, the variant domain name's disposition values, they cannot be automatically calculated just based on the one source domain name, so a different source domain name has to be identified as well under that variant gTLD, but it's from the same variant domain set, so that's the kind of additional paragraph that's added with regard to the disposition value discussion, and the part you see in the additional notes, this is not new language. It's basically moving the last paragraph in the second column to the third column because this is to provide some kind of concrete example how a variant domain name may look like based on the Chinese script, so this is not new language, but welcome the group to make sure to take a look at this and see whether you're okay with how the example is put in here.

So that's for this item, and then the last one is the variant domain set. So basically the change here is to reflect our discussion that knowing one source domain name, you can calculate the entire composition of the variant domain set under a given gTLD, and its delegated variant gTLD, so you can figure out the entire composition of the variant domain set, but for disposition value, that's what we just talked about in the previous entry. So that's the

EN

new kind of item that we added here. And in column three, this green text is basically to provide example. Like if we have a source domain name, S1.T1, and T1 has a delegated variant top level domain, T1V1, then how the variant domain set will look like. So that's the calculation of the variant domain set.

So basically these are, I guess, probably the most difficult entries, like from my point of view, so I just want to make sure everybody's aware of the red lines applied here, and so that you can review it again. And if there's any question or concern about the wording, please raise it as soon as practical. So that would be very helpful. So that's the only two I would like to highlight to this group, and the others I think are probably pretty straightforward, so I won't belabor on the other entries.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So is there anything that folks want to call out that they were concerned about as they read through the glossary? Now is the time to have a conversation about it, but if not, then that's great, means we're okay, and thanks, Michael, I appreciate that you've done a thorough read through the glossary, so I certainly appreciate that. All right, so I don't see any hands up, Ariel, so I think we're okay on glossary.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thanks, Michael, in particular for sure for reviewing the document, and next week we'll come back to this just to talk about the new variant entry. So I think we can close this one off quickly. So just back to the agenda, I think we addressed most of the

things we intended to address, and I just want to make sure, I guess as a final reminder to the group that we still kept the red lines for the draft recommendations in the document, and as the other document, this has been out for a while, and we won't go through the red line, line by line, like last call, so if you do have any concerns or questions about any of these suggested changes, please raise it now or no later than next week, because we want to close everything in preparation for public comment, so that's just a final reminder for the group. But we do have 40 minutes left. If there's any recommendation text you want to talk about or have questions about, please raise your hand or put in the comment, and we can still have a bit of time to talk about these. So that's from me.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel, so I think everyone would be happy to probably get some time back from here. If there's nothing else to discuss here, just one thing under any other business, and I think we discussed this at the leadership level, but we didn't come to any conclusions, but it occurred to me that because we're still working on phase 2, the board currently has public comment open on our phase 1 report. I haven't been paying attention to it. I don't know whether any comments have been received. But I did wonder, maybe Edmon, you have some thoughts on this, is if there are any comments that come in that perhaps as a group we are concerned about whether it would be valuable for us to respond to the public comment process as well. I think it's generally out of scope of what a working group usually does, because it's once the work is done, the work is done, but we're still active and still working, so

EN

it's something that we could think about. So, Edmon, I don't know if you have any thoughts on that.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Edmon speaking here, and it's okay, and speaking as board liaison, I think it makes sense. I actually haven't looked at the public comment so far, and not sure what has come in, so I'm not speaking with that intelligence in mind, but I think it makes sense, right, because since the group is still working, I think generally we would defer to the working group, unless it's closed down, then usually that would allow us to do the same. So, I think in this case, it makes a lot of sense if something substantive comes in, that we probably would have a question to the working group.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Edmon. So, maybe that's the way to approach it. I think there's still 30 days or something to go on the comment period, but maybe if there are substantive comments and the board has questions for us, then we're still active, so we'd be happy to consider those and take them on board. And Satish says that ALAC is making a submission, so that could be interesting. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Donna. This is Hadia for the record. And maybe I can mention, so Satish did mention that the ALAC is making a submission. So, we are making a submission with two points, maybe one, but I would like to discuss one of the two points with this group, and it's basically about the implementation guideline.

EN

So, implementation guideline 25.3 of the subsequent procedures PDP report says that applicants can apply for labels whose scripts are not yet in the root zone label generation rules. However, they can apply, but it will be pending delegation.

However, the IDN EPDP recommendation says, implementation guideline says that applicants cannot apply for IDN labels of variants unless those scripts are included in the root zone label generation rules. And, of course, this makes sense because variants are calculated based on the root zone label generation rules, and practically speaking, if the script is not included and there is no included in the root zone label generation rules, and there is no self-determination, how would you identify the variant that you are going to apply for in the first place?

And so, the group was thinking that there might be a contradiction between those two recommendations. However, there was another view that says, well, we could consider the implementation guideline 25.3 provided by subsequent procedures PDP that pertains to all scripts. It's not limited to IDNs, it's not limited to variants as a bigger recommendation. And we can consider our recommendation as a subset of the wider recommendation with more stringent requirements.

So, our recommendation speaks about IDN labels and variants. So, the idea would be, well, you cannot apply for IDN labels or their variants if the script is not included in the root zone label generation rules because this is according to our recommendation. However, if you are applying for something else other than IDN labels or variants, then according to implementation guideline 25.3 of the subsequent procedures, you

can go ahead and apply for it, but it won't be delegated. So, this was the discussion that we were having, and we have not yet reached a conclusion which way to go. Thank you. So, any thoughts?

DONNA AUSTIN: So, this is an inconsistency that we missed in our consideration, I suppose. So, anyone have any thoughts? I have some personal thoughts, but Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Hadia, for bringing this point. And actually, what Hadia said made me think it's probably good to, if the board, for example, asks the group to provide clarification on this recommendation we have that seems to be inconsistent with the SubPro implementation guidance, then maybe the response would be in the event that a script has been incorporated into the RZ LGR and the applied for string is in that script, then it must comply with the RZ LGR calculation, and only the valid and allocatable labels can be applied for. So, it's basically set the condition what this recommendation applies is for the labels that in the scripts that have already been incorporated in the RZ LGR. So, the separate implementation guidance addresses the gap, basically, for the scripts are not incorporated in the RZ LGR, what to do with it, and it's basically outside the general condition of the EPDP recommendation. So, that kind of separate them a little bit. So, maybe that's one way to respond if the board come to GNSO asking for clarification on this recommendation.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So our PDP was dealing with variants, and variants are derived from the root zone LGR. So, I guess it's possible that somebody could just apply for an IDN gTLD that hasn't been through the root zone LGR process. So with just the IDN gTLD, it could be applied for, but it can't be delegated until such time as there is a root zone LGR associated with it. So, maybe they're not as inconsistent at all, but personally, I'd have to see the two recommendations or implementation guidance side by side before I could really understand whether there's an issue or not. So, Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Donna. This is Hadia again for the record. So, personally, I don't think they are inconsistent, as I mentioned before. So, my view that we were specifically speaking about variants, and again, variants are determined by the root zone label generation rules, so practically speaking, you cannot apply for something whose script is not there, because how will you produce the variants and their disposition? So, it makes sense that we say that you cannot apply for the variant—Or the IDN, we can keep it or take it out, but it does make sense to say that don't apply for variants if the script is not included in the root zone label generation rules.

It did make sense also for SubPro to say, well, go ahead and apply, but it won't be delegated. So, SubPro, we are specifically saying only if it's IDNs or variants, you cannot apply, and then if it's anything else, then you can apply based on SubPro's

EN

recommendation. So, I personally don't think they are inconsistent. I do think that each of the recommendations serves a purpose. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, Michael, for the record, I just quickly wanted to add to Hadia's thinking that this is not just related to variants, right? The LGR, one purpose is to calculate the variants. The other purpose is to define the repertoire. So, without the script being in the LGR, you can't even apply for a TLD without variants because no one could decide whether the characters you use are actually valid or whether they are not included in the repertoire.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Michael. All right. So, I don't think there's anything for our group to do on this right now, but I appreciate you raising it, Hadia, and maybe Edmon, this is something that if the board agrees there's inconsistency here that they might come back to us to see what our views on it are.

The other thing that occurred to me, too, because I was part of the SubPro working group for a while, is one of the reasons for that recommendation that would be withheld for delegation, there was a discussion about whether it would be rounds or a single round or first come, first served. So, maybe part of the discussion was, well, are we going to have -- when's the subsequent round going

EN

to be after the next one and what time is involved? So, I think the intent is probably that if somebody wanted that string in the next round, they could apply for it and it would be put on hold until such time as there was an opportunity to, I don't know, formally verify that the string was okay. So, there could have been some different thinking going on in the SubPro and why they came up with that guidance. All right. Okay. So, anything else?

ARIEL LIANG: Donna, this is Ariel. I do want to give back the team time, but I just want to talk about a quick reminder. This is the third Google Doc that was circulated on the mailing list about the assessment of deferred guidelines from implementation guideline version 4.0. So, since this is just drafted last week, I just want to make sure the group is going to review this and if you have any concerns about the content, please raise it no later than next week. And I just want to note that there's one entry about the IDN table harmonization, it's item 4. We haven't filled this entire table yet, pending registries group's suggested new text. So, if there's any proposed, we can incorporate that in here. So, that's why we haven't dropped this part, but hopefully we can fill this content very soon by next week. So, that's basically a final reminder. There are three documents that's out for your final review. Of course, it's not the final-final review, but we want to get them into a steady state so that the staff team can incorporate that into the initial report. And thanks, Jennifer, for noting this.

Sorry, just one last thing. I realize I have some additional slides, but they're pretty quick. It's basically talking about the initial report structure. We're going to use the same structure like what we had

in phase one. So, executive summary, the approach, the glossary, the recommendations, and the preliminary assessment. So, these are the main body of the initial report and we have some annexes. So, basically using the same content with some small tweaking from phase one initial report. So, that's already under development. And actually Dan is doing the heavy lifting for these sections. So, we should be able to present this to the group very soon and hopefully before ICANN 79. But we probably won't go through these on a call, but it's more like for your offline time, review the whole report together. And as Donna went through the timeline, we have carved out about two weeks for the group to conduct that review for the whole document.

And this slide, basically talking about our public comment approach is we will use the same method as phase one initial report. And for each recommendation, we're going to ask targeted questions from commenters in terms of their level of support for each recommendation and whether they suggest any wording change or if they do not support a recommendation, what's their rationale and any other issue they like to raise. So, for each recommendation, we're going to ask these sets of questions and that's the same format as the phase one.

And finally, we have a catch-all section in the public comment asking any other comments they have and also in particular, any comment they have for the glossary, or any issues that the group didn't address they like to raise. So, they will have opportunity to provide those more open-ended comments towards the end. And phase one is actually taking the lead on getting these public comment materials prepared, including this guided input form. So,

I just want to give the group a heads up that all these are in progress. So, if you have any suggestions or comments about doing it differently, please do let us know so that we can course correct. But hopefully, everybody's okay with this approach. So, that's my last slide. And Donna, back to you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So, we're really getting close to the end of our substantive work on phase two, at least for getting the initial report drafted and out for public comment. And then we'll take a break during the public comment period and then we'll come back and it'll all be downhill slide to the end because we won't have any comments and we won't have anything to discuss. So, it'll be pretty groovy from there. That's Donna's hopeful hope, anyway.

So, thanks, everybody. Another two weeks of some hard work and then some dedicated work from the staff to get the report in good shape so that we can do a final review and get that out for public comment. So, I appreciate that everyone's come back together after a bit of time off and well-earned time off from this effort. But we're getting close to the end. So, which is pretty exciting, really. So, thank you. All right, Ariel. So, back here, same time, same bat channel next week. So, thanks, everybody, and have a good week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]