ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub Group B

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. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-sub-pro-sub-group-b-12feb19-en.mp3 [audio.icann.org]
Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p2qwc78izxw/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/j5sWBg
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Julie Bisland: Thank you. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub-Group B call, held on Tuesday, the 12th of February, 2019.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now?

And I believe everyone is accounted for. All right. I just want to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will turn it back over to Christa Taylor. Please begin.

Christa Taylor: Thank you, Julie. Good afternoon, everybody. Hopefully you're in a warmer place than I am right now. This is Christa Taylor, for the record. Thanks for joining us.

As you can see from the agenda, we have, I think, five areas to cover. The first topic is a review of the agenda. And are there any other items that we should add to the agenda? And as always, if anything arises during the call we can add it in Other Any Business.

Not seeing any typing or any hands, next, does anyone have any updates to their SOI? And if so, could you please let us know now?

Seeing no typing and no hands, I'm going to move into our third topic, which is discussion on the public comment on string similarity, which is Section 2.7.4. So, after this, we'll do the IDNs, which is (inaudible) on 2.7.5, and then any other business.

So, jumping right into string similarity, on 2.7.4, I'm going to try – there's a little bit of feedback there. I'm not sure who's not on mute, but if you could mute that would be great.

And the first part of this is going to be a little bit slow, but after that we should go through it fairly quickly, I hope.

So, I'll go through each section, and then I'll stop at the end of each part for any other comments and for discussion.

So, the first one is just some general comments on string similarity. The first one is from Google, and they – their comment is they "continue to support the proposal submitted by the Registry Stakeholder Group as described in the Initial Report to update the string similarity review and string confusion objection process. The recommendations propose concrete steps for applicants who were subject to inconsistent application of standards and availability of review mechanisms during the 2012 round."

The next general comment we have is from the SSAC. Their comment is that they believe that "a clear and consistent set of rules for confusingly similarity should be developed in accordance with the conservatism principle" and "that the resulting rules should be applied in subsequent rounds." It may not be simple or straightforward, as above. And then they go on to suggest that depending on the language as announced, singular and plural forms may or may not be visually confusable. And then they go into trying to define – "to determine confusability based on the meaning of words is fundamentally misguided, as domain names are not semantically words" – I think that's supposed to be "not semantical words in any language." From RFC 5894, international domain names for application, IDNA, background, explanation, and rationale.

Then they go on to suggest that "DNS labels and fully qualified domain names provide mnemonics that assist in identifying and referring to resources on the internet that domain names are not and, in general, words in any language. The recommendations of the IETF policy on character sets and languages are applicable to situations in which language identification is used to provide language-specific contexts. The DNS has nothing to do with languages. Adding languages or similar context to IDNs, generally, or to DNS matching, in particular, would imply context-dependent matching in the DNS, which would be a very significant change to the DNS protocol itself. Finally, it would also imply that users would need to identify the language associated with a particular label in order to look up that label. That knowledge is generally not available because many labels are not words in any language and some may be words in more than one."

Then we have a third general comment, from the NCSG, that suggests that "string confusion objections need to efficient and fair. More time allowed for applicants to submit their string similarity review is to be released and may apply to the objections section and avoid that consumer confusion. The reason proposed for banning singular-plurals of the same word should not be presumed." And it says also that these comments may be applicable to all of the singular-plural words.

So, those are some of the general comments. And maybe we'll see – some of them kind of overlap with some other sections that we're going to see shortly here, as well.

So, I'm going to – seeing nothing really there right now, and there's nothing really to say with that. There's agreement or disagreement, divergence. So, I'm going to move to the first question, which was 2.7.4.c.1, that says, "Work Tracks" – the question is, "Work Track 3 recommends adding detailed guidance on the standard of confusing similarity as it applies to singular and plural versions of the same word, noting that this was an area where there was insufficient clarity in the 2012 round."

So, the first, I guess – National Association of Boards of Pharmacy are in agreement with this.

MARQUES is divergent on this point of view according to the notes but, in actual, when you read the comment they do support it, and then they add a comment that "the international trademark law should be followed in regard to string similarity and rights should not be awarded in a TLD that are available under trademark law." And if anyone disagrees with my interpretation that they are actually agreeing, please let me know.

(inaudible), I see that you actually agree with my part on that, as well. So, thank you.

We then have the ALAC, which is in agreement with that.

Then we have ICANN Org has got a bit of a longer comment here, which I'll do my best to kind of summarize it. But it says, "Request clarification concerning the requirement to use a dictionary to determine singular-plural form of a word, which limits the singular-plural determination to a single language and not script and concerns about the differing ways that languages form plural, considering whether the contention set should be expanded to the languages of the users rather than the language identified by the applicant. Consider whether to expand the confusability assessment to other forms of inflection, as well. Consider how the rules in this preliminary recommendation may be applied to labels that are not words in a language. And consider sub-categorizing different forms of string similarity evaluation. Consider string similarity in the context of IDN variant, TLDs, vis-a-vis string contention."

There's two comments there that I think we might want to take to the full Working Group for discussion. The one – there's two concerns: the top one and the bottom one. The first one is, "The requirement to use a dictionary to determine the singular or plural form of a word limits the singular-plural determination to a single language and not a script. It would be helpful if the PDP Working Group could provide clarification."

The second one, comment, which is kind of captured in the first part that I already read off, but on the bottom, the third paragraph, you're going to see the second comment, which is, "The PDP Working Group might want to consider whether to expand the confusability assessment to other forms of inflection, as well."

So, I believe these two items we should take to the full Working Group to discuss.

I see Justine agrees that MARQUES should be green, as well. So, thanks, guys.

And then we have the Registry Stakeholder Group. We have the FairWinds Partners. We have IPC, the GAC, and the CCTRT Report all agreeing with this – the question, and on the string similarity of course. And then the CCTRT Report has one other comment, which is Item 3, which says, "Introducing a post-dispute resolution panel review mechanism might" – I guess they're noting that as part of their agreement as per Recommendation 35.

Cheryl agrees to punting it to the full Working Group.

And Anne, I see you have your hand raised. So, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalise: Yes. Thanks, Christa. It's Anne. I just was hoping that on the ICANN Org comment that somebody might be able to explain a little bit further what "other forms of inflection" mean, since I had understood inflection to mean sort of, like, the rising and falling of tone. So, I'm not – I'm just trying to understand what is meant in the ICANN Org comment "other forms of inflection" that should be considered by the Working Group. And I don't know if anybody on the call knows, but I could use some clarification on that. Thank you.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Anne. I see Rubens has added the comment, "Could be gender, cardinal, or note, etc." And Charles says, "That means not a whole lot to me. I would suggest we ask them to explain (inaudible) about plurals, but I'm not a linguist." And Rubens says that's just his guess.

I think there's another comment later on where there's an example with – I think it was Thai and how it is pronounced. And I think it's actually the very last comment under "Other Comments." And it says, "Where there's an application for a dot-thai new gTLD which phonetically clashes with the existing Thai IDN," and there's a script example in there. And it's kind of a little bit off-topic, but may be an example there.

But we can always take that also to the full Working Group. Baron, yes, we can ask ICANN Org to clarify phonetic clashing or something else. Okay. So, capture that comment to bring forward.

Any other comments on 2.7.4.c.1? Anne, is that a new hand or old hand? Old hand. Okay.

Moving to the next question, which is on Line 17, 2.7.4.c.1.1. The question is, "Prohibiting plurals and singulars of the same word within the same language or script in order to reduce the risk of consumer confusion. For example, the TLDs dot-car and -cars should not both be delegated because they would be considered confusingly similar."

We have the Brand Registries Group, the BC, INTA, Neustar, FairWinds, the Registry Stakeholder Group, MarkMonitor, the IPC, and the CCTRT Report all agreeing with this.

There are two or three with a comment. The first one is INTA. They also add that, "Where there are multiple applications for the same term and/or singular-plural, these should be placed in a single contention set. And we also support this applying to full-on equivalence. And finally, where applicants are brands which co-exist in the real world applying for a dot-brand, it should not be assumed that one is plural of another. The nature of the TLD in this case should be taken into consideration in evaluating the string similarity. And the mere addition of adding 's' to an English word should not be assumed to indicate that it is plural. It will depend on context; for instance, 'new' and 'news'."

The other comment was from the IPC, and they made the comment that, "There were inconsistencies addressed with allowing or not allowing plurals and singulars." And they also add in that "the singulars and plurals of the same word within the same language or script in order to reduce risks."

And finally, we have the CCTRT with a comment that – you'll see it in Item 2 – "avoiding disparities in similar disputes by ensuring that all similar cases of plural versus

singular are examined by the same expert panelist" and that "introducing a post-dispute resolution panel review mechanism should be considered." I'm sorry. Just I'm – I didn't really capture the first part of that, which was that "the singular and plural versions of the same gTLD string should not be delegated."

So, that's all of the comments for 2.7.4.c.1.1. Any comments to that?

I see Justine's typing and stopped. So, I'm just going to move to the next section. And as always – oh, Donna, I see your hand. Go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Christa. Donna Austin, for Neustar. So, this is just I guess a clarifying question. One of the comments mentioned that a singular and plural should be part of the same contention set. I probably said that incorrectly, but I think you read it out. And I'm just wondering, I think that it seems like that's sensible. So, I'm wondering at what point in the discussion do we address that. So, this section is about string similarity, and depending on what we agree here will have a consequence, potentially, for contention set resolution. So, I'm just wondering how that – from a process perspective how do we manage that. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Hi, Donna. Thanks. I think it needs to be checked to see if it's actually in the resolution of the contention set. This is I think a little bit off-topic on this for it. So, I actually haven't checked to see if it's already noted there, but maybe we can add that to the note and as an action item to make sure it is there. And if it isn't, it should be brought up to the full Working Group.

Maybe Steve or one of the Julie's can confirm it might be there and/or can help me out? Not to put you on the spot, of course.

Steve's typing. (inaudible). Okay. Maybe we can just add that as an item in the action list, just to make sure.

Okay. In the meantime, I'm going to move to the next section, which is 2.7.4.c.1.2. The question is, "Expanding the scope of the string similarity review to encompass singulars and plurals of the TLDs on a per-language basis. If there is an application for the singular version of a word and an application for a plural version of the same word in the same language during the same application window, these applications would be placed in a contention set because they are confusingly similar. An application for a singular-plural variation of an existing TLD would not be permitted. Applications should not be automatically disqualified because a single-letter difference with an existing TLD. For example, 'new' and 'news' should both be allowed because they are not singular and plural versions of the same word."

Pretty much everyone agrees with this, which is the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, the Brand Registry Group, the Business Constituency, INTA, the Registry Stakeholder Group, and the IPC. The BC provides a background and a link to their earlier position. INTA suggests – adds another comment that it would also perhaps depend on the context. And the IPC also ties into the ICANN comment that we saw in the initial ones that, "Some languages share certain scripts and recommends the Working Group consider this in further developments." So, we're already taking that forward to the full Working Group. So, that one should be covered.

Justine, please go ahead.

Justine Chew: Yes. Hi. This is Justine speaking. Just wanted to point out that ALAC's strong support for 2.7.4.c.1 covers the other sub-points; so, c.1.1 to c.1.3. So, if Steve or someone could just add ALAC's strong support to these three sub-bullets that would be great. Thank you.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Justine. Steve, maybe you can help me out on that? Or Julie? And Steve, I see you have your hand raised anyway. So, please go ahead.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Christa. This is Steve, from staff. And yes, no problem on that. I'm just acknowledging it in the chat.

Actually, from the staff side we were a little confused on the action item for c.1.1, and we're theorizing that the issue is the statement – or the part of the statement from INTA where it says, "Further, where there are multiple applications for the same term and/or its singular-plural, these should be placed into a single contention set." And I believe that's actually addressed in – I think this was the question you actually asked me, Christa. But that concept is actually captured in that c.1.2, about putting those type of strings into a single contention set. So, I think it's actually addressed there. I'm not sure if there's actually an action item, but if there is hopefully you can articulate it to us so we can capture it properly. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Yes. Thanks, Steve. I think – as I was reading it, I was thinking that, too. Donna, maybe you can let me know if that addresses it enough or what your thoughts are.

Donna Austin: Christa, it's Donna.

Christa Taylor: Yes, go ahead.

Donna Austin: I had the same thought. So, I think Steve's right. I think it has been addressed. So, the action item can be removed. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Perfect. Thanks, Donna. Justine and Steve, I see you have both your hands raised. Are those new or old? Justine – okay. Both are gone.

So, moving to the next section, which is on Line 34, the question 2.7.4.c.1.3, "Using a dictionary to determine the singular and plural version of a string for a specific language." So, it's not really sounding like a question, but I guess it's a dictionary is sufficient.

And everyone agrees with that, which is the Brand Registry Group, the BC, INTA, the Registry Stakeholder Group, and the IPC. The IPC adds one further comment, adding that "sharing the same script and the need to consider this in further development."

Any comments to c.1.3?

Seeing nothing there, I'm going to jump to Line 40 on the next section, which is 2.7.4.c.2. The question is, "In addition, the Work Track recommends eliminating the use of the Sword tool in subsequent procedures."

And all comments pretty much say that "the Sword must die," with INTA, with ALAC, the Brand Registry Group, INTA, Neustar, and Registry Stakeholder Group all agreeing

with this. And INTA says also it was just basically "unsatisfactory and unhelpful in the 2012 round."

Any comments to this section?

Seeing no hands, I'm going to move to the next section, which is Line 46, Section 2.7.4.c.3. The question is, "The Work Track also recommends that it should not be possible to apply for a string that is still being processed from a previous application opportunity."

And we have the ALAC and the Brand Registry Group agreeing with this, along with the BC, INTA, Neustar, and the Registry Stakeholder Group. INTA adds, too, as a new idea in there that, "To facilitate the next round, INTA suggests ICANN publishes a list of pending applications or implements a process during the application that will not permit an application to be made, so that applications don't apply for the same string."

And then we have the RrSG that has a divergent point of view, saying that, "There is some support to allow subsequent applications for strings who are denied or withdrawn. Not all registrars who provided input agreed with this recommendation. However, some felt that it should be permissible to allow a subsequent application to be submitted in the case the first application was denied or withdrawn. Others were opposed to this idea and felt it created too much risk and uncertainty within the application process."

Any comments to –? Thanks, Rubens. "Part of that is in agreement, and part of that is divergence." So, the RrSG isn't completely divergent; it's kind of a mix. Any comments to that section, on c.3?

Seeing no hands, I'm going to jump to Line 54, on Item 2.7.4.e.1, with the question, "Are Community Priority Evaluation and auctions of last resort appropriate methods for resolving contention in subsequent procedures?" And, "Please explain."

The ALAC supports the CPE and opposes auctions of last resort, and they note that it always favors applicants with deeper pockets, not to mention being open to abuse if not conducted openly.

We have INTA that "does not believe ICANN should play favorites based on purported community interests, nor should gTLDs be sold to the highest bidder at the first measure." And they could be given to, as with trademarks – priorities as between two brand owners could be given to the senior user. As between non-brand owners, first-come, first-served may be a reasonable solution for rolling out application periods or arbitration, allowing applicants flexibility to amend applications. For example, that for a small additional fee they could adopt an alternative string. It could also reduce the need to resolve contention. Otherwise, as a last resort, auction may be the only option."

We have the RrSg, which they're in agreement, and they also note that, "We believe that CPE as a de-contention process could benefit from the introduction of models that were not all-or-nothing."

And then we have the IPC, who agree with it.

And we have the GAC, saying "auctions of" – with a divergent point of view, saying that, "Auctions of last resort should not be used to resolve contention between commercial and non-commercial applications. As to private auctions, incentives should be created to strongly disincentivize that instrument."

Any comments to Section 2.7.4.e.1?

Justine says "d.2, going back," adding clarification that ALAC doesn't disagree with the elimination of the Sword tool.

Seeing no comments on e.1, I'm going to jump to e.2, which is on Line 60, which is the question, "Do you think rules should be established to disincentivize gaming or abuse of private auctions? Why or why not? If you support these rules, do you have suggestions about how these rules should be structured or implemented?"

The ALAC has a concern that suggests, "Research of private auctions or expiration of alternative contention set mechanisms needs to be undertaken."

The ICANN board agrees, and they also add that applications – they have a concern that, "Applications should not be submitted as a means to engage in private auctions, including for the purpose of using private auctions as a method of financing other applications and that" – finally, in the last sentence – "can be reconciled with ICANN's commitments and core values."

INTA is shown as an agreement, but it doesn't really seem to be applicable to the question, saying that there's further discussion being – taking place.

We then have the Registry Stakeholder Group that has the concern that, "Additional discussion and analysis on the issue needs to be undertaken"; that there is, "Insufficient analysis has yet to have taken place in the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group that includes auctions of last resort, private auctions, and other alternatives through a lottery solution seems to have been rejected but without sufficient explanation as to the basis." They also suggest "the legality of such auctions as part of the work, going forward" and "may need additional transparency processes to be put in place."

They give a bit of some known issues that have been discussed, with a list in there. I don't think I need to read them out. Or maybe I should, quickly. But it was that, "The private auction process wasn't created until the applications were submitted"; that, "There's concerns that they're not in the public interest"; "They favor the well-funded applicants, and legality hasn't been considered"; and, "We need to be mindful that private auctions have been submitted, competitors have split amongst themselves hundreds of millions of dollars that might otherwise have been used to the public benefit." They also add, finally, "The Registry Stakeholder Group observes that several CC2 comments have been filed, but they don't believe sufficient investigation or deliberations have been undertaken," which I captured initially.

The last two comments are from the IPC and the GAC, who both support "the study of abusive behavior, gaming of resolutions outside of auctions."

Any comments to Section 2.7.4.e.2? Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalise: Hi. It's Anne, for the transcript. And I've seen this term used by the GAC more than once, and that is they make a distinction between "commercial" and "non-commercial" application. And I'm not sure that we have such a category. And I keep wondering how does the GAC propose or what does it mean in terms of defining "commercial" versus "non-commercial." I don't know how we incorporate that sort of comment when we don't have those categories in gTLD application. So, I'm wondering if we could – so, I'll probably rue the day I ever said this, but I'm wondering if we could ask the GAC for a clarification of "commercial" versus "non-commercial."

Christa Taylor: I don't see why we couldn't. For me – sorry. It's Christa, for the record. For me, I think it's more of a – could we say brands or perhaps non-commercial (i.e., the intent of owning an application is some kind of revenue opportunity). But as you say, it's not clear. So, I think we should bring it forward, and we can always ask. There's no harm. So, unless anyone disagrees or (inaudible) to comment.

So, on that point, Donna agrees. "Maybe that's a fair point to raise."

And there's a comment from Justine: "Can we revisit 2.7.e.1 and e.2 when we review the Supplemental Initial Report (inaudible) comments to the Supplemental Initial Report." I think we could. And she goes on to say that, "Maybe we mean 'profit' versus 'non-profit' might make it –." And Andrew is on the same mind frame with you on that, but we can still take it forward and at least ask. And Rubens says, "If I recall correctly, I believe such clarification was suggested during the first phase of the Working Group, but the decision was not to go there."

Is there any reason we shouldn't ask?

I see people typing. "Asking seems smart." Thanks, Cheryl. And we'll add that to our task list.

And then I'm going to jump on to Line 67, which is 2.7.4.e.3, with the question, "Should synonyms – for example, doctor and physician – be included in a string similarity review? Why or why not? Using the string similarity review standards should be different when a string or synonym is associated with a highly regulated sector or is a verified TLD. Please explain."

We have the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy who agree with it, and they also provide an example that – NABP mentions that, "Synonyms should be included in the string similarity review in the case that the string or synonym is associated with a highly regulated sector or is a verified TLD." And they also add, in the third paragraph, "Where a level of consumer trust is implied and public safety is at stake, such a TLD should be held to higher standards than others."

We have the ALAC that agrees, that they should have different standards for highly regulated sectors.

We have the RSG that opposes the idea, that, "Where the TLDs are highly regulated, there would be sufficient differences," and that, "This is more of a business decision, that the difference between the two can make important relevant issues across differing markets."

We have INTA that does not support including synonyms in string similarity review, along with Neustar. The Registry Stakeholder Group also have a divergent point of view on that.

And then we have Valideus who is also – opposes the idea and adds the new idea that, "We believe that a new objection right is a given to verified, validated TLDs which can be used to allege that allowing a synonym or a foreign translation of an existing verified TLD would likely confuse end users and potentially could cause harm." Then they also go on to say, in the last paragraph, "We understand that this may be on a case-by-case scenario and that ICANN has no objection process for these claims to be made and heard. We are not saying that synonyms of verified TLDs should not be allowed; we just believe that if they are allowed there needs to be a similar level of verification requirements."

Any comments to that section, which is 2.7.4.e.3?

Seeing no typing and no hands, going into the "Other Comments" just at the end of the document, which is on Line 75, and this is that Thai comment that I initially brought up, saying "support for homonyms being considered in string similarity reviews. And we'd like to emphasize the importance of the homonym which can cause confusions to the user community and must be avoided, particularly at the TLD level. An example would be found in the first round, where an application for the dot-thai new gTLD, which phonetically clashed with the existing Thai IDN ccTLD. The application was not approved in November 2013. From this expensive exercise, we'd like to request that homonyms be explicitly included in a similarity to existing top-level domain consideration and new gTLD Application Guidebook to prevent future confusions and costly disputes." I'm going to throw that out that we should perhaps take that to the full Working Group.

And then the last comment is from the ccNSO, with a new idea that they believe, "It would be appropriate to design a common approach at a minimum to ensure that there is a mutual understanding of the need for and different methods of evaluation for confusingly similarity. And perhaps as a first step, the aforementioned small working group is created to analyze the current state of affairs and existing requirements." And (inaudible) "would be more a efficient and productive approach over time."

Any comments on the "Other Comments"?

Do we want to take the homonyms idea to the full Working Group?

I see Justine is typing. Other people are typing. So, I'll let everyone type for a minute. And as Steve says, it's all going to the full Working Group. So, yes. Steve says, "Do you mean immediately, Christa?" I think I do mean immediately, unless there's a reason why it should wait for a review beforehand. I'll let everyone else chime in. I'm just moderating. Cheryl says, "Yes, Steve, but I think the intention has indeed (inaudible)."

So, I'll let everyone else comment on that. And in the meantime, I'll turn it over to Rubens to do the – start the section on IDNs, which is 2.7.5. Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Christa. Here we have almost 80 degrees Fahrenheit. For those that you are suffering the cold weather, just move to the southern hemisphere.

We are going now to 2.7.5, which is the section of the report on IDNs. We can start at Line 4, where we have general comments from the SSAC, agreeing with the overall sentiment of the resolutions.

But in the next line, we have a comment with a new idea, which is from the government of India. They proposed "lower application fees for strings in multiple IDN scripts." They mentioned particularly where (inaudible), and that is required in countries of greater linguistic diversity, which it happens to be the case of India. But while this is a new idea, this might be better focused on viable fees. But perhaps the Work Track that works on viable fees took that possibility of (inaudible) TLDs into account. So, they could look into that, as well.

Next, we have comments coming ccNSO, with some concerns regarding single- and two-character IDNs that, in the case of Fast Track or, again, ccTLD policy, the single- or two-character thing needs to be a "meaningful representation of the naming controlled territory."

And the other concern was about the development and impact of IDN Variant (inaudible) framework, which is relevant for both new gTLDs and ccTLDs. And this actually has been addressed in the meantime between our reports and now. ICANN now published the IDN Variant TLD framework after consultation and public comment, etc. And this has been included in the – as inputs to the report as you'll see very soon.

And we have mostly an overview statement from ALAC, expressing overall support of ALAC for IDNs and how they would be treated. But mostly in agreement of what the overall strategy for IDNs. But they have some specific comments for each question and item.

And we can now go to Line 8. We can have the question 2.7.5.c.1, that "IDNs are considered to be an integral part of the program, going forward."

And I only see agreements in that. That's easy. So, ALAC, Brand Registry Group, Business Constituency, Registry Stakeholder Group, and MarkMonitor all expressed their agreement.

So, let's go to something more controversial, like 2.7.c.2., General Agreement that Compliance with Root Zone Label Generation Rules, and that the current version should be required for generation of IDN TLDs and valid variant labels.

We had agreement from ALAC and from Brand Registry Group.

But we have a new idea from the Registry Stakeholder Group, where they're focusing in on the possibility that for some specific scripts that they could be not yet supported at some point at the root zone label generation rules, that ICANN should have an alternative procedure until that group is supported by such rules. So, this is an addition also to be sent to the full Working Group.

And we have a comment that was a comment initially from ICANN Org, but in the context of their mostly GDD comment. And they suggested that they would like to make the PDP aware of the questions raised by the study group of root zone label generation

that the Working Group should take into account. And they also mention that this would have impact on the variant labels.

Which leads us to the newest addition to this comment, which is in the line below, in Line 19 of the Google doc, which is that IDN Variant TLD framework, which is comprised of nine recommendations. So, they are split in this comment in each part where they belong.

The first one is that the root zone label generation rules must be the only source for valid TLDs and the variant labels, which is basically in agreement with what is in the final report.

Any comments, concerns? Seeing none, let's move to 2.7.5.c.3, where there is in the report, general agreement that 1-Unicode character gTLDs may be allowed for script/language combinations where a character is an ideograph (or ideogram) and do not introduce confusion risks that rise above commonplace similarities, consistent with SSAC and JIG reports.

And we have agreement with that from the Brand Registry Group and Registry Stakeholder Group and from ALAC, although there is also a concern from ALAC, where they mention that, "Additional input from the Chinese/Japanese/Korean community would be useful to confirm if they see any language-related risks in 1-letter IDN labels beyond the technical risks that have been filed by SSAC and the Joint Implementation Group." I believe that at some points we had members of the Work Track 4 (inaudible), but we can indeed verify that.

We also had a comment from ICANN GDD, with a new idea, actually most of all asking for clarification, that the use of 1-Unicode character is ambiguous in capturing what is intended. They mention that SSAC prefers using the term "single-character," but that's easier to define for some scripts than for others, and single-character could be interpreted as single-aspect character. That's why the report needs to single-Unicode character. And it also does not correspond to Unicode code points, because there is the possibility Unicodes (inaudible) and all the characterizations, that it still makes for one, single character but with some specific attributes of differentiation.

A comment from (inaudible) about aligning with SSAC 52, but that probably needs to be taken to a different level of consolidation in order to not – eliminate the confusion that Work Track 5 avoids. So, probably needs to consolidate in some other manner.

And we had also concerns from AFAC that, for instance, "For ideograph groups such as Hangup, only can a single character represent a complete new word or idea. But in some cases, different single characters can represent the same word or idea. Were ICANN to delegate such different single characters as a (inaudible) label, users would likely to be subject to confusion depending on how it's deployed." Which is sometimes a discussion that goes more to variant TLDs and sometimes it goes more to the discussion that we were having at the last minutes about string similarity. So, they are raising that concern that it was not split between those two different areas. But this is also a concern to be referred to the full Working Group, not immediately, but in due time.

And as Cheryl mentioned, "more a caution than a concern." But considering the taxonomy we adopted I think concerning this, probably we should go into for the time being.

At Line 26, we have 2.7.5.c.4, implementation guidance, general agreement that to the extent possible, compliance with IDNA2008, with RFCs or its successors, and root zone label generations to be automated so that compliance should be automatically verified.

ALAC agrees with that.

The Brand Registry Group agrees with that.

And the Registry Stakeholder Group, while agreeing, they had some concerns. Mentioned that the label generators are complying with (inaudible) by design, but they asked a few questions. Who's going to be responsible for (inaudible) the automation of root zone label generation rules? How can future applicants and other users of the root zone label generation be assured that the validation calculation of documents follow the application? And who would manage that? Would it be ICANN Org or a third-party provider? And they reserved the possibility of going back to this (inaudible) after someone answered those concerns.

And at next line we had other comments from ICANN Org (inaudible), where they mentioned that some manual processes might be maybe requires additional technical requirements. They mentioned that possibility. They mentioned that (inaudible) technical use of the label generation that (inaudible). So, they are mentioning that an effort that could bring new ideas to this topic.

And considering we are at two minutes before our end time, I think that leaves us at Line 31 to start the next call, which will be 2.7.5.c.5.

So, that ends this item of our agenda for today, which we'll resume next session. And we go now to any other business, if there is something. Is there any matters anyone wants to raise? And if we can fast matter, because we only have a minute now.

Julie has already posted that our next Sub-Group B call is February 29, 17:00 UTC.

Seeing nobody typing any other substantive matters, I wrap up and jump back to Julie for ending the call. Thanks, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rubens. All right. Well, this call is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines, and have a good rest of your day, everyone. Thank you.