ICANN Transcription
IDNs EPDP
Wednesday, 25 August 2021 at 13:00 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/E4FLCg
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: All right. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the EPDP on IDNs call taking place on Wednesday, the 25th of August 2021. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please let yourself be known now? And I'll take a second to just note that we have T. Gopal on the phone only. Anyone else? Okay. We have no apologies for today's call.

All members and participants will be promoted to panelist. Members and participants, when using chat, please select "panelists and attendees," or select "everyone," depending on your Zoom update, in order for everyone to see your chat. Observers will be able to view 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. Seeing none, all documentation and information can be found on the EPDP IDNs wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. And as a reminder, those who

take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you and over to our chair, Edmon Chung. Please begin.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. And welcome again, everyone, for joining. Not really any sort of welcome but just following from last meeting. You can see the proposed agenda in front of you and also circulated via e-mail. The main thing is we are going to … Right after my note, we'll pass it to Sarmad to walk us through the remainder of the background briefing on the subject matter. And then, hopefully, we'll spend a good chunk of the time this week to go through the initial review of the charter questions.

If you have not done so, please take a look at the e-mail that Emily sent around. There is an attachment in it. And that's a very summarized highlight of the charter. That's where we are going to talk about and we're going to, as we go through each of the main items, we'll be trying to set up a poll to get a sense of whether people think it's a very complicated matter or think it's relatively easy. What that does is that it allows us, then, at the next couple meetings, to set a timeline, which we would be able to get back to the GNSO Council on in terms of our whole organization of work. So do refer to Emily's e-mail and take a look at the attachments as we get into that discussion later in the meeting.

Before I pass it to Sarmad, also, this is a GNSO PDP and the only difference between a PDP and an EPDP, really, as I understand it, as that we don't have an issues paper to—before this started. The reason why there's no issues paper is because we have a lot of

EN

background information that is already in multiple documents. That's why the welcome note.

So I noticed. Thank you for all those who have read the documents and have checked in with the Google form to say that you have completed reading those documents. I know there are seven of you, including myself, that have signed up. So that means there are a number of you that haven't. Please do take a look at it and let us know once you have read the documents because I think it's quite important because there are multiple things that are somewhat technical in nature so it will be quite useful. So please do take note of that.

Another item, before I pass it to Sarmad, is this last meeting, we have a vote of the vice-chair, which demonstrates one thing, which is in those votes, where we asked for a consensus, it's only the members who will have a vote, so to speak. But in normal discussions, like the open GNSO working groups, everyone is very much invited to put their hand up and weigh in. So please don't hesitate to weigh in, whether you are a member, or a participant, or even an observer. Please feel free to put your hand up if you wish to speak. At this particular point, there is no particular big difference. But when we actually call for consensus, then it would be like when we did the vice-chair vote, where only the members vote.

So those couple of items. I wonder if, Donna, you have anything to add on top of what I said, as the vice-chair for the group.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Nothing from me, Edmon. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Donna, are you able to speak?

DONNA AUSTIN: Can you hear me, Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Yep.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Yeah. Nothing from me. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. So I did a reasonable job. Thank you. Any questions on what I mentioned? Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Hi, Edmon. Hello, everyone. Yeah. Just a quick question. You mentioned something about writing certain documents and acknowledge those in a form. I think I must have missed that. Can somebody point me to where I need to acknowledge of confirm that I've ready the document? That would be great. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: No worries. This is the first time I see this, too, with a working group. Interesting innovation suggested by the staff team, which I

think is pretty cool. In the welcome e-mail that I sent out, there is a link to a document review form that says, "Please confirm here." And there's a Google Doc link. If you click on that, just say, "I've finished reading this," and that's it. So please do that. Oh. And thank you, Satish, for posting it.

All right. Seeing no further hands, I will pass the time to Sarmad to walk us through the remainder of the briefing. And as I mentioned, as we listen to the briefing, do also take a look at Emily's e-mail, if you haven't done so, because next up would be to walk through the charter items. With that, Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Edmon. And if I can be allowed to share my screen, we'll get started. I'm sorry. I still cannot share my screen.

JULIE BISLAND: So sorry, Sarmad. One second. There you go.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Okay. Thank you. And thank you, Edmon. Just to get started, very briefly, last time we started looking at some background. I'll recap a couple of points before going further. First was that the first time IDNs were allowed were at the second level, following a 2003 standard at IETF. And that basically required registries signing up for what we called the IDN Implementation Guidelines for the second level to offer domain names or internationalized domain names.

EN

Following that, obviously, there was a requirement for top-level domains to be internationalized as well—for, obviously, the whole domain name to be internationalized. That required work from the community—policy work from the community. Initially, this was done through the fast-track process for ccTLDs and through the new gTLD round for the gTLDs.

And while this was being done, the community realized that there is a possibility of what is called the same or variant top-level domains—strings which are considered the same by the end-user communities. And the Board, in 2010, actually said that variant gTLDs could not be delegated and they needed further study. Follow-up work basically led to two questions which had to be answered. First, how should the variant TLDs be identified or defined? And the second was how such variant TLDs would be managed once they are identified.

The solution for identification was done through what is called the Root Zone LGR. The community has been working on developing this Root Zone LGR since 2013. Most of the work is completed by the community, as you can see on the screen, with a few final panels which are still finishing up their work. And most of the work would likely be completed in this calendar year, or certainly in this financial year, hopefully. And then, there may be one or two scripts left, which haven't started work. But I guess we could proceed with the scripts which are available.

One of the things which have been identified through this process is that even though variants seem to be initially raised by only a few communities, especially the Chinese community and the Arabic script community, analyses have shown that variants do

EN

apply to many more scripts. In many of those cases, the variants are across scripts, meaning two different scripts have same-looking characters. But when we are going into the root zone, once a label is delegated, an end user may not be able to tell which script the label is in. Therefore, it is also important to make sure that cross variants have been identified. But many other scripts now also identify what are called variants within a script.

So as you can see from this chart, that it is a reasonably broad problem and we are, of course, glad that this has been addressed through the community-based panels which have been working on it.

And the current status is that many of these scripts have been completed. The list is given on the screen. And then, proposals for at least four more are almost finalized. And then finally, Japanese, Latin, and Myanmar are some of the scripts where are left but they're in final stages as well. So we should be in a good place, hopefully in the next few months.

So that addresses the first problem, which is how to define variants. However, it wasn't clear how variants actually should be managed once they're defined, if they're delegated. And we talk about variant TLDs here.

Basically, there was some work done by the staff over multiple years. And it was published in a six-paper series as what is called IDN Variant TLD Recommendations. And basically, the Board requested that ccNSO and GNSO take those recommendations into account as they develop the policy for variant TLD management. That is the second piece, which has been missing.

EN

We'll go through all the different core recommendations. So this paper or series of papers that staff developed actually had quite a few things in them. One of the main papers actually had nine recommendations. In addition to the nine recommendations, there was actually a detailed analysis done on how those nine recommendations, if they're adopted by the community, could impact the application process and the operations of top-level domains for ccTLDs and gTLDs. And the analysis was published along with the core recommendations. The recommendations are listed on the screen here and the detailed analysis link is provided. It is also part of the same paper but a separate section in that paper.

And then, in addition to that, there were some other papers which were looking at some of the other issues which are relevant. For example, there was an SSAC recommendation that the variants which are delegated should be minimized to avoid permutation problems for variants, when variants are available, both at second level and top level. And one paper discusses on how some of those—how could that, for example, be managed. So these are a lot of analyses and recommendations, which the GNSO would also need to consider as they decide on the policy for gTLD IDN variant TLDs.

In addition to that, basically, since the Root Zone LGR was such an essential piece of this process because it was being considered as the basis for defining variant TLDs and also possibly the valid strings, the Board requested SOs, ACs, and Internet Architecture Board, technical community to look at the

EN

Root Zone LGR and see, of course, how it could be technically employed for this purpose.

And also, this was a technical study group, which looked into the relevant issues and came up with some additional set of recommendations, which were also considered by the Board. And then, the Board recommended that GNSO and ccNSO also take these into account as they consider the policy development process for IDN variant TLDs or IDNs in general. So those are a couple of items which basically were prepared, either through the community or through staff, and requested by the Board to be considered.

So when SubPro started—during SubPro's work—they looked at the initial set of recommendations, which were developed by staff. And they've actually integrated those recommendations in the IDN part of the work already.

So SubPro actually has a dedicated Section 25 on IDNs, which focuses on supporting IDN gTLD applications. They also, through that section, support IDN variant gTLD applications and provide some implementation guidelines in Section 25. There's also a separate Topic 11 on universal acceptance. And then, there are some additional implementation guidelines and recommendations which are spread across different parts of the document. And I have listed them here and how they may actually relate to IDNs as well.

So SubPro largely focused on the core nine recommendations which were presented in the staff paper. And they've discussed

EN

that and decided on which to support and which not to support for some reasons.

Followed by SubPro, IDN Scoping Team actually started looking at … This was a team which was set up by the GNSO to prepare or see how to move forward with IDN variant TLDs or IDNs in general. And they looked at a couple of things—IDN Guidelines, new version, which has come out, which is also under consideration by GNSO, as was shared last time. And also, IDN variant TLD recommendations.

Basically, the GNSO team suggested that there should be two tracks—one which would be looking at some of the operational aspects of IDN guidelines and then there should be a policy track, which would look at how to define, manage, and coordinate IDN variant TLDs and how the IDN guidelines should be revised in the future. So that sets the initial basis of the IDN EPDP, which is obviously now currently underway. And we're part of that.

So that's some of the background, just to summarize what has been done before and what needs to be done now. As I shared, there's already work done by the SubPro Working Group. And you'll see there's a couple of columns there. And then, there is the work which should be done by IDN EPDP Working Group, based on the charter. And that's the next two columns in this table.

So if you look at each of the rules, we obviously would be talking about implementing IDNs. So there could be some general issues which may come up. We obviously need to address some of the IDN variant TLD recommendations which need to be addressed. This is, more generally, in the context of making a policy. And

EN

then, as I said, beyond IDN variant TLD recommendations, there was actually a detailed analysis—set of analyses—which were presented. Those need to be discussed. We also have the recommendations for the technical use of Root Zone LGR by the technical study group, which need to be discussed. And as per the IDN Scoping Team, there as also some discussion on how to update IDN Guidelines and that needs to be discussed.

All these need to be discussed in the context of the existing gTLDs—these are gTLDs which are already delegated—and then the future gTLD applications. And as you can see, the IDN implementation and IDN variant TLD recommendations were already largely discussed by the SubPro Working Group for the future gTLDs. For the IDN EPDP, those may be taken up in the context where—in case SubPro didn't look at a particular item, that could be picked up. But largely, for IDN implementation and IDN variant TLD recommendations, per se, SubPro work, obviously, will move forward. And if there's any, as I said, remaining work, IDN EPDP Working Group could pick that up.

But in the case of existing gTLDs, of course, that still needs to be done by the IDN EPDP Team. And then, in addition to that, the variant TLD analysis, the recommendations by the technical study group, and the updates on IDN Guidelines, as they apply to both existing gTLDs as well as future gTLDs, is what would be in scope for the IDN EPDP Working Group—this working group.

So basically, coming back, just to summarize. We'll obviously be looking at this in much more detail. The current EPDP is now underway. It has two items, as per the documentation, on the charter. The first is the definition of all gTLDs and management of

EN

variant labels to facilitate the delegation of variant gTLDs in the root zone, while achieving the security and usability goals of variant labels in a stable manner. The second one is how the IDN Implementation Guidelines, which Contracted Parties are required to comply with, should be updated in the future. And then, it also suggests that the scope of this IDN EPDP may be expanded specifically as a result of operational track on the IDN Implementation Guidelines 4.0.

So that's the baseline of what the IDN EPDP scope looks like at a more detailed level. The IDN work is divided into separate sections. So we have the first section, which focuses on the questions [certain questions about] the Root Zone LGR, a1 through a10. Then, there is work on how to define "same entity" at the top level, at the second level, and how to consider impact on variant TLDs, for example, on Registry Agreements, registry services, how that impacts objections, and then eventually, dispute resolution and trademark issues. And then finally, there's a section on IDN Implementation Guidelines and how they should be updated.

That just a brief update on where we're coming from and what the scope of this working group is, as per the suggested charter. Let me stop here. Happy to answer any questions. Otherwise, it's back to you, Edmon. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Sarmad. Any clarification questions for the time being, both what Sarmad says or anything that came to mind? I note that there is a question on the chat about some of these things. I sent

EN

a link, which is a mapping document. It's also on our workspace and also listed on the documents from the workspace. That actually gives a matrix in accordance to the charter sections versus some of the previous work, like SubPro, and the Root Zone LGR work, and so on. So do take a look and see if that suffices to some of the issues that were discussed in the chat. But I see Justine have your hand up. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Thank you, Edmon. I had a question pertaining to the scope of work for this EPDP—in particular, item G, the process to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines. My question is, for that, would we be looking at the IDN Implementation Guidelines 4.0 at all? If yes, then can I just get clarification that version 4.0 is the authoritative version? Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Justine, for the question—a very relevant question. In fact, that was the particular issue that the scoping team was grappling with earlier on—basically, last year. The way that I see it—and Dennis and others who was actively participating in that group, please chime in—the idea right now for this EPDP is, first of all, focused on the process to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines. So it's not specifically touching on the substance of the Implementation Guidelines.

However—I'll give a "however—" the issue is not as straightforward. The idea is that the Guidelines 4.0 is not fully-adopted by the Board at this time. The idea for an operations track

EN

is for the Contracted Parties to see if there are minor tweaks that can be implemented into the Guidelines 4.0 to allow it to be approved and used by registries and registrars. If that is not possible, then it will be punted to this group to consider what the process should be, in the future, to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines, as well as what the process should be to get the 4.0—or at that point, maybe 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, or 4.5—to actually be put in place.

I don't know whether that makes sense for you and others but that's how I understand it. I see Donna's hand up. But I want to make sure if, Justine, it makes sense what I just explained.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. It does. Thank you very much.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. I think there was a question in there from Justine about whether 4.0 is the authoritative guideline. And Dennis Tan and others can correct me if I'm wrong by my understanding is it's not, at the moment, because it hasn't been ratified by the Board. The Board was going to do that some time ago but there were concerns raised about process. So 4.0 is not too authoritative at the moment. And I think most registry operators are still using the prior version. But Edmon or Dennis, you can correct me if I'm wrong on that.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Donna. I think that is correct. That's accurate. That's the situation. And the operations track team should be looking at that. And if, once that is done, then whatever this group needs to deal with would be more clear. The reality is that right now, G is … There's some uncertainty with the exact scope of G, if that makes sense to everyone. Thank you, Sarmad for the clarification on the chat. So right now, it's version 3.0. Version 4.0 has been there for a few years but has not been fully adopted at this point.

Okay. Seeing no further hands, this is … I was just going to say that this slide works just as fine. But that's fine, too. The next item is a similar slide that is from the document that Emily sent out. I think that would probably be more useful if can bring up. But it's essentially A, B, C, D, E, F, G, which is the structure of the IDN EPDP Charter that we're working with.

So I'd like to spend the next 20 minutes or so starting down. We probably won't finish all this, this meeting. I'll leave about five minutes to try to get us organized in terms of the timing of the meeting because I note that this particular timing is problematic for some people, which would clash their regular meetings. So I'll leave five minutes on that. But the next up, in terms of the agenda, would like to go through the charter from A to G. I don't know who's controlling the share screen thing. But if someone can pull up Emily's document … Perfect. Thank you.

The idea is that, at least as a beginning—as a starter—the suggestion is that we would go through A to G in sequence. In many ways, I think it makes sense. A and B sort of forms the basic

EN

principles, which is the utilization of the Root Zone LGR and the same entity principle. C is an extension of B, a little bit, whether it's called second-level or registration-level. And then, D, E, F are more of the administrative and process for gTLDs and new gTLDs processes. And then, G is what Justine raised. It's a separate out, which is focused specifically on the IDN Implementation Guidelines and how they are updated.

So this is the general flow of what we envisioned, which just basically follows the charter. So I'd like to get a sense whether people think this flow makes sense or think it needs to be shuffled around for whatever reason.

And then, we'll go into each one of them and do a little poll. The idea for the poll is that we'll touch on A a little bit and get a sense of what people think about it. And then, we'll do a poll on how complicated A might be so that we can budget the right time. And then, B, C, D—each one of the big-topic items. Again, please refer to the charter on your own. Give it a read. That's when we do the poll. The poll will give us an idea how we should set an overall work plan and timeline so that we can report back to the GNSO. This is the general approach. Any questions or clarification? Is it making sense for everyone?

Okay. All right. So with that, the first question is … The basic idea is just to go in terms of the sequence of the charter. Any thoughts on that? I see Maxim's hand up. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: A note about the definition of variants. Since we're talking about policy, and potentially contractual language, the situation where the definitions vary per IDN table, basically, is not nice because it means inclusion by the reference of some technical … Definition cannot be included from something else. It should be in the main body of the document for the legal reasons. Thanks. So just we need to note this and to return to it later. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maxim. In fact, I think, to me that is A. A, in terms of the consistent definition and technical utilization of Root Zone LGR, to me, is the first time we will have a very definitive definition of IDN variant, especially IDN variant TLD. And so far, the general direction is that it's defined by the Root Zone LGR. However, I don't want to jump into that particular discussion but I note what you're saying. If I understand it correctly, that's actually what A is about. So that's going to be front and center. The first thing we discuss is how we define IDN variant. Does that make sense for others? And, Maxim, hopefully that notes your question. It's definitely part of the plan.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Okay.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Any other thoughts in terms of going by this sequence? Of course, we can keep going and then come back to it. But at least for the time being, that seems to be agreeable. I see chat. Thank

EN

you, Dennis, and Satish, and Nigel, probably, in terms of the general approach for things. Thank you.

With that, then I will go on to the next part, which is to do a poll for each of A, B, C, D, E, F, G. I'm really bad at counting. So that's seven—seven big items. The idea is that we will go through each of them and do a quick poll. Both members and participants are welcome to do the poll. The idea is that we will talk a little bit about each of them and then, as you see in the bottom of the screen right now, I guess from 1 to 10—actually, in terms of number of hours we think we need to talk through the issue, high, medium, and low. And from there, we will start to develop a work plan and estimate the time we will need to complete the work. Okay?

So with that, A is … If you look at the document, A has, actually, 10 components—pretty dense work. And it does cover a lot of things that has been covered before by SubPro and by the Root Zone technical group. But I think it's important for this group, as Maxim has suggested, to either confirm or make sure that we have a consistent understanding of what we mean by IDN variant and how that relates to the Root Zone LGR. That's really the core aspect of A.

So please think about it and see if—from 1 to 10, take a quick look at the charter right now and get a sense of whether you think it's going to take more than 10 hours, 5 to 10 hours, less than 5 hours, and so on. And give it some thought because we'll open up the poll. But before that, please feel free to put your hand up. I see Maxim's hand up. But please feel free to put your hand up to weigh in, both in terms of whether you think it is very complicated and you want other people to realize that or you think it's very

simple and you want to advocate that and swing the vote, if you will. But first of all, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: From the formal perspective of how this group was chartered, I suggest we call it a collection of opinions because polls are for members, not for participants. All decisions are made by members but we should take input from all participants. There is a subtle difference and it's important. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Thank you, Maxim. Let's not call it a poll. It's just a temperature of the room, if you will. Get a sense of what people think—there would be a lot of issues that would be raised and we would need more time versus we think it would be a more straightforward issue. So correct the terminology. But I do want to have everyone's input, not just the members, because throughout the working group, the idea is that participants should be free to put their hand up and weigh in as well. Any other thoughts? Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Edmon. I'd like to know if, from A to G, at this point, are there any dependencies on any external entities, like language communities or the EPDP Implementation track, that can change our perception about the workload?

EN

EDMON CHUNG: That's a very good point. Thank you, Satish. I refer back to the mapping document that I listed as well. So in the mapping document, if I remember correctly … I have to admit that I haven't looked at it for at least three or four weeks now. But the mapping document should list out what the different groups have already considered.

And especially for SubPro, that also means that it is going into the Implementation Review Team. So I don't think it's a dead dependence but I think the matter is that if it's something beyond the recommendation, then we can each go on, on our pace. But what is important is that this group does not override what is already decided by SubPro for the scope within the SubPro.

So there is some quasi-dependence in the way that I see it. And we should keep track of those. I somewhat depend on staff. And I guess myself and the leadership group from the team, we'll try to keep a close eye on that development. But I would say it's more of keeping an eye out rather than a dependency on that work.

The only dependency, I would say, is G because we're dependent on the operations track to see whether the current scope, which is only to look at the future development of IDN Implementation Guidelines, or whether we need to have something to complete the version 4.0 as well. So the only dependency, I think, is G. But the other ones, we should keep tab on the others. But we can work in parallel with them. Does that answer your question?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Edmon.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: And Donna or others, Dennis, since you've been participating in those, please correct me if my interpretation is incorrect or you want to clarify on that.

Okay. so that was A. Hopefully you had a chance to look at the questions under A. We can at least try the … I'll still call it "poll." I don't know how—or "survey." Okay. Let's call it "survey" to avoid the issue of "poll." So let's try the survey. Just give your thought on whether you think it's a very complicated issue and we need a lot of time or not. And we'll keep going and then see if it gives us a useful result. I want to see if the staff team is ready for it. I'm guessing we're using the Zoom thing to do a quick survey.

JULIE BISLAND: Edmon, yes. I can go ahead and launch the first poll, topic A, right?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. Let's do topic A. This is a first try. So just give your thought. And then, if you feel strongly against what the result is, we can come back to talk about it before we go to B. So please put your thoughts in and we can get a sense and then potentially come back. And then, the idea is to run through A to G. How are we doing in terms of getting everyone's input?

JULIE BISLAND: We have, as far as participation, 18 of 28 participating right now.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Anyone need more time or is it an abstention for those who haven't put in yet? Please put up your hand if you need more time. Or if you don't put up your hand, I guess we'll try to close this and get a sense of where we are with the results and see where we go in like five seconds. Okay. I see no hands. How are the results?

Okay. So it looks like most people think it's important and it's medium. So 5 to 10 calls would cover it. Any thought? Those who think they're low or those who think they're high wants to jump in and add to what we see here? No? Okay. Looks like this is a reasonable approach so we'll keep pushing ahead. Please feel free to stop me because I don't know. I think this is a somewhat new process—at least it's a very new process to me as well. So we're testing out if this works well. So please jump in if you have concerns. Joseph?

JOSEPH YEE: I put in medium so I don't mind showing that. But I want to point out that the last question, a10, which covers about the status with the same entity, I hesitate. I don't think we may not need 10 more hours. But that may be a mild concern that there may be some dependencies when we talk about same entity—when we talk about it in B. So I just want to call out that that particular topic could have some potential blockers.

EDMON CHUNG: Yep. That's well-taken. In fact, that was partially by design to make it the last item and then flowing into B because they are

EN

interrelated. And point well-taken. So as we plan, we will plan it somewhat together with B as well. But that's a good point. Thank you, Joseph.

JOSEPH YEE: Thanks, Edmon. You guys already [thought of] the consideration already.

EDMON CHUNG: So moving on to B, this is another really core aspect of IDN variants because this really defines what IDN variant is all about. And from the very beginning, in terms of thinking about it as the same domain in many senses, except that technically, they're different. But policy-wise, they should be the same. Hence, the idea which is put forth as what is called same entity.

And under B, there are actually only five items, if I remember correctly. I'm trying to click to my … But they are quite fundamental questions about how we deal with this concept of making sure that it's the same entity that runs the IDN variant TLD versus the primary IDN TLD, if you will, in terms of conceptual-wise.

Any thoughts on this before we go to poll, or questions, or highlights that you want to put forward before we go into a quick survey? No. Then let's do one more, and then we'll draw a line from this for today, and then go into some organization for the next meeting and so on. So please take a look at the charter document and put in your thoughts for the survey.

As you are thinking, the next item before we close the meeting today—we have a few minutes—we'll come back to the scheduling issue. I note that … I think it's ALAC or some other group that has a consistently conflicting time with this particular time. So we are looking at potentially setting another time for the weekly meeting.

So that's next up. But please fill in the survey. How are we doing with the survey?

JULIE BISLAND: I think we can close it.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. So let's see what the results are? Wow. That's a very close one. So it's quite interesting that if we look at the pure numbers, you have most people thinking it's a very quick item and low—just under five hours discussion—but many people thinking it's high and medium as well. It's a pretty even split, as Nigel mentioned.

But if you look at it in the other way, that also means that about two thirds are thinking it's not as simple as one third who's thinking it's a more simple and straightforward item. We'll probably need to think through this as we think about the budgeting of time. But this gives us a good idea of where we stand.

This is the kind of thing that we are going to do for C through G as well, as we start the next meeting. But before that, in terms of the next meeting, if it's okay, can I pass to Steve or team from the staff to see what …? We have a couple of suggestions to see

EN

which time is actually better for everyone. What's the latest suggestion at this point?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Edmon. We had tried to take a look at some times that might serve as an alternative to help avoid the conflict with the Consolidated Policy Working Group meeting that At-Large conducts on a weekly basis that conflicts with this exact time.

Some of the options that we had looked at is actually to just shift the day. I'm not sure if that's going to work—shifting the day but keeping the same time—so 13:00 on Tuesday or Thursday. I think we were looking at Thursday as the preferred day. So Thursday at 13:00, potentially, as the new time on an ongoing basis. I'm not sure if we're in a position to make that decision now but I think we just wanted to float that as an option, to help avoid that conflict and see if there's any major objections, at least, on this call.

And then, we could potentially do something similar to what we did for this call—just schedule the next one. Make sure that folks that have a concern about the time raise it on the e-mail list. But if there are none, then we can maybe switch to Thursday at the same time on an ongoing basis. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Steve. I see Tomslin prefers Tuesday but Satish and Anil preferring Thursday. Maxim's suggesting that we go to the e-mail. I guess that makes sense, overall, when we confirm. But does it make sense to do a Doodle for either Tuesday and Thursday and then we'll go from there? The same time, 13:00

UTC, and we'll do a Doodle poll for Tuesday and Thursday and go from there. Okay? All right. So that's the plan.

Any other burning questions before we close the meeting? Again, please do take a look at the documents, especially charter. As noted today, you would see this is the plan, at least for next week, to go through A to G and then we'll have a sense of how we plan our work and how we report back to the GNSO.

My particular situation, I thank everyone that have a bit of trust for me to continue this work. I will, as mentioned … Actually, I haven't mentioned it. But I will mission that I will be meeting with the legal counsel from ICANN about my situation of moving to the ICANN Board at the end of October and to see how both the transition and all also should work in the next little while. But for the time being, I'll keep pushing forward because we haven't gone into the substance yet, anyway. So we'll keep everyone updated on that as well.

With that, I run a minute over the time. But we'll go to a Doodle for next week. And seeing no hands for burning questions or comments, thank you, everyone. Oh! There is one hand. Anil, very quick one, please.

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, Edmon. Yes. I will be quick. I just wanted to ask. I guess Doodle will be there and there will be a survey. But are we fixing the next meeting?

EDMON CHUNG: The next meeting will be either 13:00 UTC or Tuesday or Thursday next week. But we are fixing it. We will have a meeting next week. But we'll send out a Doodle immediately and confirm end-of-the-week. That's the idea.

ANIL JAIN: All right. Thank you, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Thank you, everyone. Oh. Justine, quick comment.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Sorry. Just checking on the chat. Nigel suggested something interesting. I was wondering whether we could do that as well.

EDMON CHUNG: Suggest another time for Wednesday? Because of the diversity of the time zones of the group, this seems to be the better time for most people. And suggesting another time would be a bit more complicated. Let's try for this week, Tuesday and Thursday, 13:00 first. If it's hugely split, we'll come back and touch on this again next week. How about that?

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. I thought we could possibly look at moving forward one hour or something. I don't know. But yeah. Let's look at the Doodle and see what happens. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: All right. So I guess the staff team is clear about the direction. Okay. Sorry. I'm now four minutes over. I apologize for taking over time. Thank you, everyone, for joining. We'll talk to you again in a week's time. Good-bye.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Edmon. Thank you, everyone for joining. This meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines. Have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]