

---

## ICANN Transcription

### IDNs EPDP

**Thursday, 30 September 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/qgBmCg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Thursday the 30th of September 2021 at 13:00 UTC.

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 identify yourselves now?

Hearing no one, we do have apologies from Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Jennifer Chung and Hamza Salami. All members and participants will be promoted to panelists for today's call. 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 the chat. Observers will have view only chat access.

---

*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.*

---

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 no one, if you do need assistance, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the IDNs EPDP 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. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected Standards of Behavior.

Thank you. With this, I'll turn it back to our co-chair, Edmon Chung. Please begin.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you, Terri, and thank you, everyone, for joining this call. The proposed agenda is pretty straightforward. I'm going to give a little bit of an update and then we'll just continue on where we left off, which was at the end of question A3. I was bordering into A4 as well, so I guess we'll start with A3 and A4.

So in terms of update, there are two main updates to everyone. First of all, again, Donna is selected as the incoming chair, and the plan is to transition over to Donna basically in the next meeting, so next week, Donna would take the chair role.

I would continue to stay on to help out, I guess as a quasi-co-chair, if you will, but more of supporting Donna through the transition until the end of October when I'll be officially joining the

---

ICANN Board at that time. So that's number one, the transition which will happen basically starting next week.

The second item is, last week we talked about having a deeper dive into the root zone LGR process. Satish, you suggested, especially from the ALAC team, but I think it's probably useful for everyone to do so, is to take a deeper dive into the root zone LGR process and what that entails, because it seems like the entire A portion, the A part of the charger questions really surround the root zone LGR and later on, there are implications with the root zone LGR process itself as well.

So the suggestion is to actually schedule an information call with Sarmad and his team during our normal meeting times. If this makes sense to everyone, we could try to schedule that as soon as next week, because we haven't scheduled Sarmad's time yet so we can't guarantee, but I guess the first question to the group is whet her that makes sense. I understand that some may be more familiar, less familiar with the topics, but I think the root zone LGR process itself is core enough.

Satish, I note your point in the chat. I'm suggesting actually to have a session at our normal meeting times. So it's not separate, just as a normal meeting time because I think most people would gain in getting the information.

So my first question before we start today's deliberation on the questions is whether that is a good idea. If so, it could be as soon as next week, we will take a deep dive into it and we can all ask questions to Sarmad and his team, or whenever we could schedule the time. I'll stop here and see if there are any thoughts,

---

questions or support for having a deeper dive information session on how the root zone LGR works, especially as it relates to the questions we're considering in probably A1 through 5 or 6. Thoughts, questions? Sarmad.

**SARMAD HUSSAIN:** Thank you, Edmon. Yes, we can certainly provide an update. Just one question to clarify. Would you want to have technical details about the root zone LGR included, or just overview some of the procedural details? I also note from the chat that there is maybe a request to share maybe a demo on how that works. So it would be useful to maybe specify the scope of things we should cover, and we can certainly make that happen. Thank you.

**EDMON CHUNG:** Thank you, Sarmad. I would say a little bit light on very technical, but focus on the procedures which are relevant to the considerations of A, especially 1 to 7 I think, but be prepared to answer some technical questions as they arise. But I think how it actually works, how would the root zone LGR be updates, how the original ones came about and so on. So more on the procedural and process so that we know how our policy deliberations should add on to that. I see Jeff's hand.

**JEFF NEUMAN:** Thanks. I'm going to go a little bit different direction, Edmon, and ask for more on the demo side. So if we could run something like someone proposes a script or maybe two scripts, one they know that's invalid, one that they know is valid, have Sarmad

demonstrate what it would be like to run that through the LGR rules and how it would come out valid or invalid, and then also a list or something of variants of that string just so we can actually see it in front of us.

I think the history and the process of how we got there is okay, but that's not going to help us with our work because most of our work here, the way I see it, is more on the practical side. What do we do with the results? Is there an appeal from the results? What is it like if there's a trademark? All that kind of stuff.

I think the history and other stuff, we can basically read that if we really wanted to. But I think the practical application is going to be incredibly important for us, and I would put that at a higher priority than how we got here. So that's just my opinion.

EDMON CHUNG:

Okay. I stand corrected. I think, Jeff, you make a good point. But I will add this also. I feel that we are probably going to need to ask Sarmad and his team for more than one of these as we consider the different issues. You talked about the trademark stuff. I would maybe for the time being ask Sarmad to focus on the A questions. We might have to call Sarmad and his team back when we get to D or E or as it comes. I hope that makes sense. And Sarmad, I hope that doesn't scare you away. But if you will, could you perhaps add to this?

Jeff's point is to have a "demo" or really walkthrough what happens when an application comes in and stuff, and then augment that with how the root zone LGR works today and how

that's updated and how it might fit into what our policy discussions are going to be. Sarmad, do you want to take the mic?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Sure. Thank you, Edmond. We'll develop a short presentation. We'll probably add in some predetermined examples into the presentation itself and we'll also organize a demo and focus on the A questions. More than happy to come back and do more, I guess, subsequent presentations on additional questions later. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Perfect then. Yes, I think because this working group was straddling between technical and policy issues, I think that makes a lot of sense. And thank you, Sarmad, for making the commitment to come back every now and then when we need it. I think it's going to be extremely important.

Okay. Actually, why don't I take this opportunity to see if next week at the same time, it would work to at least have a first session? If so, then let's mark that in and go from there. If you're not sure yet, you can let us know too.

Okay, Sorry for putting you on the spot. I guess we'll confirm whether it's going to be next meeting or potentially the meeting after. I saw Donna's hand flash up momentarily. I was going to ask you to add a few words as the incoming chair as well anyway, so did you want to add to this? Please jump in before we go into the

...

DONNA AUSTIN: No, it was Donna looking for the wrong button. Apologies, I wasn't putting my hand up. But yeah.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. So as mentioned, Donna will take over the chair next week. I'll stay on to help her through the AGM, the next ICANN meeting, and then thereupon.

So let's jump right into—"We would prefer for next week." Okay, if that's the case, then I take it that we will spend a good portion of next week going through the presentation from Sarmad and asking lots of questions. Please, even as Sarmad is preparing the presentations, do read the background documents background it's going to be important because if you want to ask questions next week—of course, it's not just next weeks, but a good opportunity to ask questions to clarify the concepts.

All right, so let's keep going. Last week, we were straddling between A3 and A4. A3 is about a challenge process if an applied for TLD is deemed—sorry, Jeff, did you have particular questions to document? I didn't quite understand that.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Sorry. I was just asking for a link to this so I can read it on my screen.

EDMON CHUNG: Oh, this is the charter document.

---

JEFFREY NEUMAN: I know. I cleared my cache so I can't find it. So if someone could just post the link. Apologies.

EDMON CHUNG: No worries. I'm sure staff would be able to shortly. Okay, so A3 is really about if an applied for TLD string is deemed invalid based on the root zone LGR and if the applicant wants to appeal, whether we would utilize the SubPro appeals process to at least trigger the appeals. And as mentioned last week, it's most likely, even if it's triggered, the appeal might have to depend on the root zone LGR process further.

I'll also talk about A4. A4 is when you apply for a string, if the root zone LGR is not ready or maybe you wanted a variant and it's not considered a variant yet, both situations, the question is once the application comes in, it may have to trigger an update of the root zone LGR process and the applicant will have to wait for the root zone LGR process update before knowing whether or not the application could move forward.

A3 is the applicant initiating appeals based on existing LGR. A4 is if the LGR doesn't exist for that particular script and it wishes to utilize the ability to apply and then trigger that process, how we should actually deal with those issues. So that's really A3 and A4. And I see Jeff's hand up.

---

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks. I think for this purpose, we really should separate A3 and A4, because I think they involve two very different things. And in my mind at least, I would propose that they be handled differently. I'll explain. So for A3—and I sent around an e-mail I guess it was earlier this week, or I can't even remember when, and then I think Nigel or Michael responded to it.

But basically, it set forth just kind of taking the notion of a challenge—and in the terminology SubPro used, it was challenge for an evaluation. An appeal is something that is from an objection decision. So you appeal an objection decision. So this is an evaluation, so we called it a challenge just to separate the two out.

I recommend that in essence, this be treated just like any other kind of DNS stability challenge and set forth a process in there. I know that Michael responded yesterday and disagreed, and I'd love to talk about that a little bit further if we think that that proposal was a good idea. So I don't know if someone can bring it up or you just want me to kind of go through it.

EDMON CHUNG: Is Michael here and could speak to it? if so, please add to it.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, my disagreement was mainly to the fact that if someone applies for a TLD string in one round and it turns out the root zone LGR is not complete in that sense. For example, because they applied for a label in a script which is not yet within the root zone LGR. Then I don't think that they—even if they challenge, they should wait until the next round and apply again, because it might

---

mean they have to wait an additional ten years and they possibly have to pay the application fee again. So I would rather say that if they successfully challenge it, they should be able to go through in the same round. Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Go ahead.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks, Edmon. I agree with you, Michael, and that's why I said it should be kind of separated out. I think if someone applies for a string where there are no label generation rules, I tend to agree with you in the sense that that should be somehow handled in that same round. I think if someone applies for a string that's declared invalid, then—well, what I've put in here is that it should be run again through the rules, and if the same result occurs, that it's still invalid, then at that point—invalid because it is for a script that does have a label generation rules, it just didn't follow the rules—that's where I'm saying that should be—because that'll be kicked out, essentially, and they'll have to work through the challenge process of the label generation rules in general, that should be one that might have to go through a subsequent round as opposed to someone that applies for a string that has no label generation rules yet.

---

I don't know if we're going too much into detail without going back to what it says in the e-mail, but yeah, so I don't know how you want to approach this, Edmon, but I put a strawperson out there just so we can put something on paper.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. And I've put myself in the queue, so I have an opinion on that particular topic, but I'll go to Maxim and Michael and then I'll put myself in the queue.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I'm a bit confused here. Do we suggest that if the particular language or script is not in LGR, they have to wait for the next round?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Can I clarify, Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Please.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Okay, so if there is no label generation rules for that script, then I think they should be able to keep their application in that round and work through the process. It just gets put on hold, I guess, until it can get worked through—if it can get worked through.

I see that different than the situation in which someone applies for a string where label generation rules do exist and it's declared invalid and they want to challenge that and they lose the challenge. At that point, the application should not be kept in that current round. I hope that makes sense.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Short item. In first situation where language doesn't exist in LGR, I think it's a good idea to allow them to keep it on ice until the table arrives, but there should be some text saying that such process shouldn't be unnecessarily delayed or something. So in the end, someone starts the process for their language, for example, Basque language which might not be in LGR now.

And for those who apply with the script which is contrary to what is allowed under LGR, I suggest they're given opportunity to update the technical part of their application, because basically, they can make mistake with one character, like printing from one table to another, and it's uploaded and then it's final, which I believe is wrong. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you, Maxim. I think you make a couple pretty good points, so I'll use my time when I'm actually in the queue to respond further, but Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Edmon, you can go first if you want to reply directly.

---

EDMON CHUNG: No, please go ahead first.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. My point is that, okay, Jeff agreed that if a script is not yet in the LGR, then they don't have to wait for the next round, but in that case where they challenge the LGR, I think that if it's decided that yes, there maybe was a mistake in the LGR or there was something wrong, I do hope that these cases not too often occur, but if the LGR has to change due to that challenge, I still think that they should be able to still get that TLD label within the same round. So then it should also be put on ice until the LGR question is solved, whether it's successful challenge or not. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Michael. I'll go first, and I see Jeff has a new hand, but—so I very much agree with what Michael said, actually. I think the reality is that we at least at this particular point don't know how often and frequent the rounds will actually come. If at one particular time when the rounds are more consistent, we could more readily punt to the “next round.”

For the time being, I think it makes more sense that if there is no particular LGR for the script or that they would be put on ice or in a holding pattern so that the LGR process could go through, and then at the end of that, there would be a decision on whether they would qualify or not.

Similarly, if they put an application in and it essentially challenges the root zone LGR, then I think the same holding pattern should be put in place and then it triggers a review of the root zone LGR.

But the review of the root zone LGR can take a number of possibilities, which next week, I think Sarmad would take us through, it could be completely denied, it could be that the generation panel takes it on and decides ultimately to accept or not accept.

But the point is that I think it should make sense in a fairness, if you will, point of view to take this at the same approach whereby someone challenges the invalid situation response from the existing root zone LGR and puts forward a convincing argument that perhaps the root zone LGR is the one that's supposed to be updated. Then they could wait until the conclusion of that process before being punted to next round or not. So that's my view.

Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yeah, so I think we need to play the scenarios out and maybe it becomes easier to think about and why I kind of proposed why I proposed. So the way I understand it is that the scripts that have LGRs right now, an application would come in and you'd run it through this automated process, and the result would say valid, yes valid, or no, invalid. That's pretty much the result of what would happen.

If it is invalid, I would say that the applicant could challenge that to say, hey, maybe it's a problem with your automation, maybe you

---

---

misread it, maybe there was a typo, whatever it is, and if it's rerun through the process and it's still declared invalid, at that point, if we're saying, okay, now you can go to the label generation panel and say to that panel through the regular process, "Hey, this character should not be invalid" or "this string should not be invalid and it needs to be reconsidered by the label generation panel," I think that could be a quite lengthy process and I would think that if that application is on its own and there's no other applications that would be considered in a contention set, then maybe it could just be put on hold for a longer period of time.

But I think we need to avoid what happened in the last round, which is that things were put on hold for indeterminate periods of time even though there were other applications in the contention set. And that is not great for predictability.

And also, yes, I know it's going to be more than a decade between these rounds. In fact, more than probably 12 or 13 years at the pace we're going. The proposal is—if the Board accepts it—from SubPro is that we have continuous rounds and not that there are delays in-between for reviews and other stuff.

So assuming that is adopted, I think we need to get out of our minds that it could be 10-15 years between rounds, because that's not the proposal. So I think there's a number of factors that need to be considered, but certainly, if someone applies for a string for which there are no LGR rules for that script, I think that is a situation where the applicant should not be punished for that application. And yes, it should stay within that round.

But if someone has applied, the LGR automation tool—it goes through the process and it's found to be invalid, and then they challenge and it's found to be invalid again, we can decide whether they can correct—and maybe change the string. That's a separate discussion. But if they fail again and it turns out they have to go to the panel to discuss whether those original label generation rules were all right, personally, I don't think that that should stay within the same round.

I think if there are other applications in a contention set, those need to move forward and can't just wait forever for this one application that's declared invalid if there's a contention set. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. I think I understand where you're coming from. Let's go to Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: From the operational point of view, if there is no tool or mechanism for applicants to check if the script they're suggesting has high risk of going to the next round, I think it will be quite less predictable, the process. So if there are no current suggestions to have a tool in current environment for holding information about LGR of checking the status of the suggested script, we might see quite disparate situation. Maybe with some smaller nations who are trying to apply, etc. Thanks.

- 
- EDMON CHUNG: Sorry, Maxim, did I understand you that you're saying that if the applicant is coming from script communities that are less used script and it's not in the LGR—that's the part I didn't quite understand.
- MAXIM ALZOBA: Some languages, they use Latin script. Some of them have ideas—anyway, the idea was to recommend to have in LGR environment there are tables kept, etc., some kind of either test tool or something for the script. So you upload generic script and you have, okay, it's there, no, it's not there, or yes, you might have issues. That's it.
- EDMON CHUNG: So ICANN should put in place a tool that applicants or prospective applicants could put their string in and get a response ahead of time. Is that what you're suggesting?
- MAXIM ALZOBA: Not just the applicants. CcNSO, potential ccNSO member [inaudible] if they're trying to apply with one of the local languages, etc. So it's going to be quite simple, and it will save lots of nerve and time. Thanks.
- EDMON CHUNG: Okay. I see Tomslin in the queue, but after Tomslin, I want to get to Sarmad on this particular question, I guess. So Sarmad, please prepare, if you will. Tomslin.
-

**TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:** Thanks, Edmon. For the two scenarios we're discussing, one where there exists no script to generate the strings and one Jeff has been talking about, if it's invalid and the applicant needs to challenge the whole generation, like Jeff said, it might take a long time. So I'm trying to understand how long for each of the cases we've discussed, because we're trying to put one on hold, how long—where no script exists—will that take for the process to have that script before it's available for that same round? And compared to where the script exists but it has been invalid even after the challenge but the applicant wants that some changes be made. Thanks.

**EDMON CHUNG:** Thanks, Tomslin. I think that's the million-dollar question which goes to Sarmad. But that's part of I guess what Sarmad and his team will prepare for us in the next meeting to walk us through the root zone LGR development process as well as if it needs to be updated or reviewed, what the process might be and what the expected timeframe might be. I don't know whether Sarmad would be able to respond immediately, but I think that's a very good question for our decision on how we deal with the process, but that's what I think the staff team would prepare to brief us on further.

Steve, and then—yeah, Sarmad, thank you for putting your hand up, I was going to call you anyway. But Steve.

---

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Edmon. I was, I guess, kind of picking up on a point that Jeff made that might help this group think about these two issues. His suggestion had been to maybe think about these two issues separately, which might make some sense.

So the question about if someone applies for a string in a script that is already part of an RZ LGR and it comes out as invalid and there's the challenge mechanism question, that applies to A3. And then the question about applying for a string in a script that is not part of RZ LGR yet, that is A4.

And I think as Jeff noted, they're quite different questions. And I think the intention is from having Sarmad and the team explain how the RZ LGR process works, including creation and updates, those I think will help inform the discussions on the challenge mechanism about timing and implications of whether or not it's actually feasible to have that within a round or if it would cause a challenge to extend to a new round. Essentially, it provides information about the feasibility of a challenge mechanism. So as said, I think it might be helpful to think about these two issues separately as Jeff noted. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you, Steve. I guess I stand corrected then. Somehow, I thought it would end up being the same, but I think Jeff and you are right. We shouldn't be assuming that. So yes, let's treat it separately. One is that when you apply, there is a root zone LGR portion for the script and you violate or somehow are invalid based on that, and you can go through an appeal's process.

A4 is a scenario where you know that there wasn't one but you apply and you know that you would trigger and wait for a root zone LGR for that particular script to be developed before you would be handled. Okay, so yeah, there are two questions in the charter and they should be treated differently. But I think they touch on some similar points. But I'll take that back. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you, Edmon. There are a couple of questions. One was whether there is a tool available, and we've shared the link of the tool. This tool was developed in a different context to support the generation panels to develop their LGR proposals. A similar tool would likely be available. Of course, this is still in planning, so what I'm saying is tentative. But I think that tool really needs to be designed, from a purpose of an applicant and an application process. The current tool which is available is more from a design perspective. But in any case, it can still be used to validate labels [inaudible] root zone LGR.

The second part, there was a question on how much time a generation panel may take. And there are actually multiple answers to that question. It really depends on the complexity of the query, but one way to estimate it is to see—if it's a small piece of work which needs to go through the process, it can potentially take as long as maybe the quickest generation panel work, which has been in some cases less than a year. But again, as I said, that comes with some disclaimer that really depends on the panel, the complexity of the query and some other factors. But we can discuss more about it in the next call. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you, Sarmad. I guess the latter part of what you said, we would cover part of it next week. The first part of what you said I guess is the tool that Jeff has suggested. So I guess the general tool right now, just for Jeff and others' benefit, the tool right now is much more for how the registry receives an application and generates variants and determines whether it's valid. It wasn't designed—any tool right now wasn't designed for the applicant to try to run through. What Sarmad is saying is that it's possible to have some sort of tool, but it will need some customization. I think that's what I'm understanding.

I see a bit of chat going on, and so yeah, noting all of that. So it seems to me at least A3, we are quite clear of what A3 is. And we will wait for Sarmad's presentation before further considering it. In fact, A1, A2 and A3 seem to be in that same boat.

I'm hoping to take A3 a little bit more forward. The big question in A4 is really whether or not, at all, we should accept applications. I know SubPro suggests that we should and we should wait. I guess what this group also needs to think through is whether we should accept at all or just kick it out just like A3 and so on.

I see Jeff's hand up, but I want to also mention that really, as we go through A5, A6 and A7, many of the discussions are also dependent on how we understand the root zone LGR and its outputs. So please do take a look at that as [inaudible]. Jeff.

---

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks, Edmon. Just to go back one second to A3, and then I'll push ahead. The reason is, can we just see—is there agreement—which I think there is—to have a challenge mechanism like the ones provided in SubPro? I know we haven't decided the standards and the outcomes, but I think just to kind of put some decision in there, are we agreed that there should be that challenge process? And then we can go on to A4. But I just thought we should get that down, that we agree, and then we can kind of move on. Sorry.

And then for A4, yes, so SubPro considered this issue extensively. They considered also the paper from the technical group and the others. And SubPro came out overall with the recommendation that yes, they should be able to apply and the applications should be processed to the extent it can be and go through contention sets if that's even possible, but that we should not prohibit someone from applying just because there isn't a label generation ruleset for that script.

And I would think that this group would need a pretty compelling reason to overturn that. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. I think that's a good point, but I also note Justine is not prepared to say either way. But I think for A3, I see that at least Tomslin says he agrees. I want to get a sense of—again, this is a first pass of this, so we're not going to hold you to it, but does it make sense generally for people that if the immediate response is invalid, should the applicant be able to trigger an appeals

process? I think that's really the main first question of A3, and then how we deal with it, we still need to consider.

But if I take Jeff's question correctly, the first thing that we need—I guess the stake in the sand that we want to take is whether or not we want the applicant to be able to have a challenge process and utilize a similar framework of the SubPro appeals process.

Okay, so Justine is pretty keen that we shouldn't put a stake in the sand yet. Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

That's fine and we can have the presentation. I just think you sort of have to—in order to move down a path, you have to agree to take the path. If we can't even agree on the first step, then we shouldn't be spending so much time talking about the rest of the steps.

So I think waiting a week for the presentation is fine. I'm not sure what Sarmad would say to provide any reason why an applicant shouldn't have the ability to challenge a result, but I guess it's fair. Sure. But you can't go down the road if you don't start, right?

EDMON CHUNG:

Understand, Jeff. My feeling is that as we go through this, as the group becomes more familiar with some of the technicalities of it, people would become a little bit more comfortable with it. So appreciate, Jeff, your point and I also appreciate Justine's concern or uncertainty.

---

So A3 and A4, I think that's where we are. I'll quickly just raise what A5 means so that it leaves in people's mind, unless anyone wants to put up your hand as I speak, I'll come to you.

But A5 starts down the path of a slightly different scenario, but hopefully, Sarmad can cover this a little bit in the presentation next week as well.

A5 takes on a different situation. A5 asks a particular question that says that in the root zone LGR or LGR in general, some languages—and I can say that for sure, Chinese is one of them—has a situation where by permutation, a lot of variants could be generated and a lot of allocatable variants could be generated in a way such that a particular application would have multiple, let's say 8, 10, 15 variants that could be put into the root. The reality, though, is that usually, the most useful or the most usual variant may be just one or two or three.

The question to this group is a policy question. Technically and linguistically, once you generate the variants and use the permutations, it could quickly reach a large number, but the actual use of usable or meaningful string might actually just be two or three.

And the main question in A5 is whether policy-wise, we should set a ceiling so that the root zone management process could be more predictable, whereas if you purely take it as a technical or linguistic situation, once you have multiple characters in a string and then multiple characters as variants, it could quickly reach a big number as, let's say, four characters with two variants, two to the fourth power is what you get. So that's the main question of

---

A5. So I'll leave that for your thoughts and hopefully, Sarmad could include that a little bit as well. Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Thanks. Why is there an assumption that all the variants have to go into the root as well? Why can't there just be a list maintained by IANA, whatever, that these strings can't be delegated? I don't understand why all of them need to go into the root.

I understand why that would have to happen at the TLD level, for variants of a second-level string, because obviously, there's automated registrations and registrations happen so many every hour every day, but having an entry go into the root is a once-in-a-blue-moon kind of thing. I don't understand why they all have to be in the root.

EDMON CHUNG:

You raise exactly the question that A5 is asking. But technically and linguistically, those variants are generated blindly and all of them are "allocatable." Allocatable doesn't mean that they are actually delegated eventually. Right now, we are talking about whether we should policy-wise set a limit to it, which is what you're saying.

The reality is that the short answer is no, I don't think in most cases that all of them need to be in. But all of them by the root zone LGR may be allocatable. So the question is whether policy-wise we should set some limits. Does that make sense, Jeff? And then we'll draw a line here and close the meeting.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yes. That makes sense.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. So that's where we'll leave off. Any urgent questions before we close? Seeing none, so we'll close the call now and next week, we'll start with Sarmad's question and hopefully, that'll give us better information for A1 to A5 and then we'll be able to resume in those deliberations. Also, Donna will be taking the chair at that point.

With that, thank you for bearing with me one minute over time. This is an improvement from my previous track record. Thank you, everyone. Bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. I will stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Stay well.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**