
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Call

Tuesday, 23 February 2021 at 18:00 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 the agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/8IUmCQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP charter drafting team meeting being held on Tuesday the 23rd of February 2021 at 18:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

Please note the raise hand option has been adjusted to the bottom toolbar reaction section.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN's multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to our chair, Dennis Tan. Please begin.

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.

DENNIS TAN: Hello, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, wherever you are. So we are once again needing to continue our work on the draft charter. Before that, let's check on the agenda. So we are going to discuss sections G through I and post-meeting homework review, followed by AOB. Very straightforward agenda, so let's get right into the documents.

We'll start at section G. Now, we are moving on to the area of ICANN policies and procedures in the context of implications with respect to the same entity principle and the root zone LGR as a source to validate and determine labels and variant labels at the top level.

So, last time, we left off with a notion suggested from Jeff that search engine could be removed in its entirety, and after further reading, I tend to be with him, 90%. I think we can substantially streamline these sections, and I'll go over the details now and explain the rationale and why I believe these sections can be streamlined based on the understanding of our framework and now [inaudible] understanding we have of all those issues.

So with that said, let's jump into it. Here, we're looking at the implications of all the policies and procedures, the implications of adopting the root zone LGR as the sole source for validating and determining variant labels as well as the same entity principle at the top level.

So G1 and G2 are kind of related. If I may summarize, G1 deals with objection process in the four categories that you see listed in the document here, so string, legal rights, limited public interest and community objections were built into the previous round of new gTLDs and most likely will carry on to the subsequent round.

G2 deals with exact match [contention.] So a different type of contention or objection—not objection, exact match contentions as far as they go to similar [inaudible]. In this case, it's exact match strings that are put into contention sets.

But we need to look at G1 objections, source, reasons, grounds for objections as well as exact match contentions through the lens of variant sets. Now we are moving from doing exact match

or putting things into the contention objection, not just based solely on a single label but as far as all the labels are related to a, I'm going to call it, the applied for label. A RALO applies for a label but happens that that label can generate or has variant labels associated to it and furthermore, those variant labels can be allocated because the root zone LGR calculates that those are labels that are allocatable. That means that they have means or they are eligible to delegation.

And so I agree with Jeff that we can streamline all of this, because I would suspect—and Jeff, I will hear you in a bit to confirm—that these objection processes as well as how to deal with exact or contention sets are going to be processes that are going to be taken care of by the SubPro IRT. So really, the gist of this IDN EPDP is to look at the applicability of those processes into existing TLDs or registry operators that want to apply for their variant labels, because it's not clear how these existing registries could apply to their eligible variant labels once all this is implemented and sorted out, whether existing registry operators will be funneled through the subsequent round along with everybody else, or would they have kind of a separate independent track? That, we don't know, and that's going to be up for the IRTs to figure it out, but it is clear that as far as objections and contention sets, there needs to be a consistent approach as far as future as well as existing. And yes, Maxim, exactly, the same legal entity. So all those factors need to be look at and arrive to a consistent approach when we talk about future and existing TLDs. Maxim, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: As I understand, at SubPro, there were suggestions to have different kinds of separate rounds and all those were not accepted. And this, based on different kinds of TLD, etc. And I don't see difference of any separate round from this suggestion. So I think this item was reviewed in SubPro. And thus, my suggestion is to use what they came to as a conclusion and to add that since the same legal entity should be, then the question should be related to how this legal entity applies for TLD during the round, because if we insist that for some reason, such entities should have some separate process, it's no different from a separate round for special kind of TLD. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. I think you are right. If you were [inaudible] for efficiencies and consistency, it makes sense that existing are yes operators should apply to their variant label in an already process. And right now, the closest one is going to be the SubPro process. So it makes sense, but I'm not sure whether this team, what we're discussing, will make such recommendation. We just put the question out there so that both IRT, SubPro and IDN PDP, hopefully reach to a conclusion. And whatever that conclusion is. I think solving for, again, efficiency and consistency.

But I think we'll work on that. That's the question really here, of recognizing that SubPro will already touch and define what this objection and contention process are going to be. It is for this, both processes to look through the lenses of root zone LGR, variant labels, variant sets and same entity principle. Maxim, your hand is up again.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just small notice. Since any new round which is past the previous round were in, I'd say, remit of SubPro, anything which will start in the future will be related to SubPro. It was my thinking. Just for clarity.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Yeah, that's a good point, and good clarification. Thank you. And going back to the chat, Donna agreed that's a problem to be solved by the EPDP. We just recognize that that's the issue here, how do you apply these processes through the lenses of, again, root zone LGR, same entity principle, variant sets, and consistent approach both.

So G1 and G2 really comes on to that, and we can streamline a lot of this language here just to make that point. So that's the 10% that deviates from Jeff's suggested approach. So moving on, any questions on G1, G2? Does anybody have a different take here?

Okay, hearing none, seeing no other chat comments, let's move on to G3. And G3 is about transfers. And we touch on transfers last week because it really pertains to the lifecycle management of variant sets. And here, we of course need to look at two layers, the top level and the second level domain names as it pertains to domain names. But really, it's the life cycle of the domain name. And if I'm not mistaken, that's the section FX, F7—let me see real quick here. Yeah, F7 and FX deals with lifecycle [inaudible]. So I would suggest we recommend and we move G3 and talk about life cycle management in that section and also recognizing that there's a transfer policy that needs to be looked at pertaining to variants as well. So there's going to be some coordination there to make sure there's consistency in how transfers are dealt with.

Any other opinions? Donna, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. A question out of ignorance more than anything. There's a review of the transfer policy that I think is going to be kicked off pretty soon. Are IDNs part of that transfer policy now, or are they outside of it? I'm just wondering whether there's a question here whether we need to ensure that we're not overlapping or duplicating something that's happening as part of the transfer policy. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna, for the question. I don't have an answer for that because I'm not familiar with what's the scope, but maybe Jeff does have an idea. Jeff, you want to chime in?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, at this point, the charter's being drafted for it, but it's not contemplated, at least from the scope that was discussed at the last council meeting that this particular issue, namely how to transfer variants that are associated with each other or to make sure that variants are also transferred, that's not in the transfer PDP. I think this involves some pretty unique differences here, so I think it's right that this should be considered here with the

understanding that it's not going to change the policy with respect to transfers, it's just going to figure out the mechanism of how to ensure that variants transfer along with any of the linked names.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Those are good points. I think what we need to do is not to mention the implications but how to enhance the transfer policy, because I would imagine it would be difficult for the transfer policy right now to talk about variants when variants are not yet implemented and there are a lot of details that cannot be answered today because it's not being operational deploy. So we'll need to revisit that transfer policy once everything settles down.

So Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think the same entity rule is quite important for the logic of transfer to avoid situation, for example, where something happened with one of two domains belonging to one entity and not to another one.

So since it's not just correction of characters somewhere in the fields, it might be important. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Absolutely, Maxim. It comes down to enforce—so that the same entity principle persists across and throughout the lifecycle of variant sets. So, either at the top level, when you have TLDs that they move to from one, for example, backend service provider to another or from one registry operator to another, and at the second level, domain names transferring from one registrant to another or intraregistrar transfer. So the same entity principle needs to be carried out in those stages, if you will.

Jeff posts a question, [inaudible]. Yeah. I think the devil is going to be in the details, but yes, how do you do that? That's the operational implementation that will need to be discussed and how do you really trigger a transfer with just one [inaudible] one domain name and then you transfer everything and how that conversation happens between registrars and registry as well. So that's in itself a big conversation from the operations standpoint. Agreed, Donna. Yeah, we need to flag this for completeness.

All right. So I think we agree on G3, we need to keep this here. The transfer, we need to keep it in this document and how it implicates the transfer policy, but specifically in the word, does it live in the charter? We might move it upwards where we talk about lifecycle management, because transfer really speaks to the lifecycle management of domain names and top-level domains.

Okay.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry, Dennis, can we also be specific that when we talk about transfer, we're talking about both the transfer between registrants as well as transfer between registrars? Just for clarity.

DENNIS TAN: Sure. Let's take note of that. Moving on, G4 is a catchall—

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry, Dennis, Maxim has his hand up.

DENNIS TAN: Oh. Sorry, Maxim. Didn't see you there. Go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I have a question. I don't remember we had the only registrar. The same entity means that all those rights for registration or contracts for registration belong to the same entity, not necessarily with the same registrar. And I wonder if we had such agreement or we need to—maybe we might need to question if it's necessary to demand that all such domains are to be registered with the same registrar, because if something changed with EPP deeply, it will be way better to have it from the technical perspective, not from the legal, in the same registrar, because if for example we have an entity with three domains in three registrars and you want to check things with EPP with particular registrar, it might be, I'd say, not so perfect. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim, for that. That's an actually very good point. But the beauty of it is that we don't have to deal with that, not in this working group, but the next working group will have to deal with—to translate the same entity as registrant, what does that mean? And here, we have a glimpse of what they're going to be discussing as far as, are they going to be using the contact RO ID in order to validate who the registrant is, or are they going to use a different method to check and force that the same registrant is the one that is being allocated all the variant domain names? So that's the working group that would need to deal with that, operational details as to how do they translate same entity principle to the actual day-to-day operations. So, good points, but yes, that's a discussion that will happen later in the future.

All right, so where was I? G4 is a catchall of any other same entity implications as far as policies and procedures. So unless we come up with anything new by name, this is really a catchall for anything that might happen between today and the next working group starts looking at the issues.

So, any other question before moving on? Looking at the [chart, on the chat,] my question is, should we have this question [inaudible]? Well, not sure if we need to put it here. We can note, though, that today, there is existing language in our registry agreement—not in every single registry agreement, but those registry operators offering IDNs and allowing to activate variants in today's registry agreement, the language is that they must be registered by the same [inaudible] registrar.

So if something changes, then those provisions in existing registry agreements will need to be changed, adjusted or grandfathered or something. So maybe we can note there is a difference, or depending on the operational implementation of the same entity principle at the second level, how do those impact current registry agreements? And registry agreements and the RSEP process which has the standard language so that registry operators can use to apply for variant activation. So, good point, Maxim. I think we can put that in somewhere here in the footnotes or context information so that the next working group is knowledgeable about that potential changes or something to note.

Okay, so anything else there? Seeing none, let's move on to section H. Section H is about adjustment to string similarity processes. Now, I put my note here because you have, in previous section, we have objection process, contention sets and now string similarity process. So all of these really go into the reevaluation of an application. So that's what I put it here, that this may be merged with G, and also, this, we can take the same approach because string similarity is something that's going to be very probably built into the SubPro process. So we just need to make certain or as a question about applicability to existing TLDs and how that's going to play out in the future. Does that make sense?

The only aspect here that I want to call out and make sure that you all understand here, what is different is, again, we're looking through the lenses of root zone LGR, variant sets, and so you need to understand when we're talking about objections, contention sets and string similarity review, you are comparing all the sets, so even though an applicant chose to apply for one label, but because it could have the potential to have multiple allocatable labels, the process should be one of—or maybe that's a question for the next working group to really deal with, but because of the other variant labels have the potential to be validated, you should check for objections, contentions and string similarity of all the potential labels that are associated to one, and then make a decision about which ones can be moved forward, which one can be blocked or whatnot. I hope that makes sense.

Because that's a very important difference when we are talking about variant sets here and how that impacts all these processes that in the past were not—well, I think they were somewhat built in. I don't know how intimate you were familiar with the previous process, but a [inaudible] could apply for a TLD and self-identify variant labels to that TLD and those self-identified variant labels were used into the string similarity process, contention objections and whatnot.

This time around would be somewhat more official, if you will. So I just wanted to call that out because that's reality that's what is going to change here. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. I got a little lost with what you just said there. I understand comparing for string contention an actual variant that wants to be used with other strings that are out there, but why would you do an analysis of potential variants that nobody is suggesting being used?

DENNIS TAN: Because they have the potential to do so.

JEFF NEUMAN: That's the part I—why do they have potential to do so? They would still have to apply to use it, and it would be the second one that wanted to use it that would be blocked by the first one that wanted to use it. In other words, just because something is a potential variant shouldn't block someone else from using a variant of their TLD, because it's almost like a first come first served type thing. First one that wants to use it is the one that's allowed to use it. The other one's not.

DENNIS TAN: Good points, Jeff, but that's what I'm calling out, that's the thing that needs to be defined, how registry operators—new TLD or new applicants will apply for their variant labels and the existing TLDs, registry operators, how they're going to apply with them, that's ...

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, so then there's two different things, though. The initial string contention evaluation is done by staff or evaluators to what's existing already. That's different than an objection being filed after the fact. So I think we need to be very clear that the string similarity evaluation is not done against potential strings, but an objection may be filed based on potential strings. That needs to be kind of clear. They're two different things. There's the upfront string similarity evaluation, then there's the backend, you can object as well.

DENNIS TAN: I'm with you, Jeff. I don't think—all of the [processing above,] objection, contention set and string similarity, have the same processes and outcomes. I think what we're finding here is that they need to look at this in a holistic way and how they're going to treat those cases, looking through the lenses of variant sets and how that's going to play out. Maybe there's [inaudible] because the previous round dealt with some level of variants.

JEFF NEUMAN: All I'm saying here is that we need to do a note to the working group that they're not to look at revising this process but they are trying to figure out how variants fit in with the SubPro process.

DENNIS TAN: I think that's the way to put it. Are there any other opinions on this matter? And just want to refer to Donna's question. Is it because there are maybe variants [inaudible] applicants? In part, yes. In the previous round, registry operators self-identified variants, but the root zone

LGR may come up with different sets that may be unknown to the applicant because of the algorithm used by the root zone LGR. So that's what just needs to be taken into consideration whenever the SubPro IRT is implementing all these processes and how do you compare labels in each of these procedures, contention, objections and string similarity. I think that's all that we can say here.

Okay, I think that's the way to go then. And again, we can streamline all of this text here. Let me see if I have other suggestion. Yeah, okay. So that's H1. H2 is just—let me see again—what we just talked about. So we need to find a way to put this into a shorter contextual information, how this new layer of variant sets will have or how does that fit into the future processes, objection, contention set and string similarity here, because the way root zone LGR will calculate those labels again.

Okay, moving on to H3. H3 goes along the same way, but talking in the area of visual similarity. So again, this is, how do you look at, do the analysis within a set and how do you come up with a resolution for each label or as a block of labels? That's something that we need to streamline. So H1 through H3, we need to do that here. Looking for any hands up.

So H4, this pertains to the two-letter TLDs. I make a few notes here. I would imagine that SubPro has a recommendation about how to deal with TLDs—there are [certain TLD labels that you cannot apply for,] right? For example, the ASCII two-letters, that's reserved for country codes and therefore those are prohibited from application. So there needs to be a provision or a guideline, rule or what have you, that will prohibit at the onset if someone has a label that calculates variants with two characters, especially in the ASCII world. They need to be blocked. Even though they are valid labels from a root zone LGR standpoint, they're not eligible to be applied for, if that makes sense. So really, the question here about two-letters is that if the SubPro recommendation or the implementation extends to existing gTLDs. I would imagine it does, but I think that's the question that we need to map on this issue.

Okay, I see no hands, so I'll keep moving then. Section I, string contention resolution in gTLDs. The question here, again, SubPro, if you have a way to deal with string contention resolution. So

I put my notes here whether issues arise due to visual similarities, SubPro [inaudible] control. I think the question is yes or no. I think the answer is yes. I'd like to, if any other—if someone objects to that ... No, so I think we're on the same page.

As far as string contentions, SubPro will control and just need to do whatever process is defined for existing registries to apply for variant labels, then they need to follow a consistent approach as far as string contention resolutions. And Jeff agrees. Thank you.

Okay, so we flew from sections G, H, I. We actually made good time here. I'm happy for that. So we have the opportunity to continue, so we can pick up some of the time for later. Do you feel good to continue? Or first, let me ask, any questions as far as sections G through I? Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. So just for staff's understanding, the approach is that we consolidate section G through I with the previous section into a bigger section, and streamline the questions in terms of checking what SubPro has recommended and then convert the question into how does the SubPro recommendation extend to existing TLDs. And then if some question is related to implementation, then we will ask how SubPro IRT and this EPDP should coordinate for new TLDs. Something along that line. Is that what the drafting team is getting at? Just want to make sure we get it so we can do the rewrite.

DENNIS TAN: Sure. Thank you, Ariel, for the question. Just slightly different. So section G through I deals really to policies and procedures. So those things, we can put together, bundle together into one section. Section F is really about registry agreements and registry services, so let's leave it on its own for now, but G, H and I because they're all about policies and procedures, let's put them together with exception of transfer policy, which we can move up to lifecycle management. Yeah, I think that's the way to go. Was that clear? Okay. I see.

So if there are no questions on previous section, do we feel good to keep going? I think we can at least look at J, which is the dispute resolution procedures and trademark protection mechanism.

Yeah, let's keep going. So Jeff, Donna, yeah. So J, we're moving into new territory here about registration dispute resolution procedures and trademark protection mechanism. I really think that this is an area where, again, we're talking about processes that are going to be applied to the SubPro round and therefore, whatever the existing gTLD registries are going to do, need to be consistent with that.

Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I think we're way complicating this issue, because first of all, it's such an edge case, and we don't want anyone to actually look into the UDRP or change it. I think the simple question is, when the UDRP orders a transfer, it's no different from the transfer of any other type of name, right? So whether it's a UDRP-ordered transfer, a voluntary transfer, it doesn't matter. It's still the same roles. So I don't think they need to look at the UDRP separate, the working group would just need to say this is what happens upon a transfer for any reason, whether it's voluntary, involuntary, or UDRP-related. I just think we're overcomplicating this.

DENNIS TAN: So a question to clarify, Jeff. In your remarks, were you considering the persisting of the same entity principle in the case of transfers? So if you are over—

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I would just, in the transfer section, make it clear that when we're talking about transfers, we're talking about voluntary or involuntary and the involuntary, you could put a parenthetical around UDRP or other dispute resolution. I don't think there's any need to look into the UDRP at all. But Maxim's got his hand up, so maybe I'm missing something.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it's a bit different. UDRP and URS are the methods for the domain to change hands. For example, some entity which has no legal rights for some domain registered [a] domain and its variant. And in case where this entity loses URS or UDRP, most probably, the same should happen to other variants of the same string. So URS and UDRP are the process where, I'd say, the rights change hands. And it's a bit different from the domain. Domain is the second effect to what's happening to the rights for registration. So it should be reviewed in both transfer and URS, UDRP. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, I guess—operationally, they're going to be different, but I don't think from a policy perspective ... I don't think this EPDP should look at the UDRP at all. I just think that it's an involuntary transfer to a different registrant and it should be handled that way. And if the UDRP PDP wants to take it up separately, they can do so, but this PDP shouldn't mess with the UDRP or—well, URS is a little bit different, so we'd have to think about that one, but definitely for the UDRP, that's just an involuntary transfer from one registrant to another.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: I think there are two important differences. One is the UDRP or URS could be lodged, whether it could be lodged against a particular variant, and the other part is if it's lodged to a particular variant, then the transfer is not the same because when you transfer, the primary

IDN would be different as well, because you have the transfer and then what was originally the primary now becomes a variant, what was a variant now becomes the primary, and therefore, the calculated dispositions of the variants could be different as well. So there are some complications to it, although I agree with Jeff that overall, we shouldn't touch the kind of structure of UDRP, there are some—I think not just technical or operational details but have policy implications on whether this can happen that needs to be ironed out.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Jeff, is that a new hand, old hand?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, again, I don't see that as being different. What if we allowed the transfer—if we allow transfers between registrants under the same entity rule, couldn't the new registrant then switch the primary and secondary name as well, or secondary names? I don't see it as different, is really what I'm trying to say. And I think if the UDRP review team will have to treat it differently, they should, but I would strongly suggest that this working group not look into legal rights and UDRP or anything like that and just when it talks about transfer between registrants, there's a note that basically says transfer between registrants includes voluntary and involuntary transfers. And if the UDRP—if someone wants to take that up, they can, but this group shouldn't.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. I have Maxim, and then Edmon, and then Donna.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we have an issue here, because it's a completely new legal principle of the same entity. It's about ownership. Because due to this moment, nothing was done from the review of this legal aspect in the preparation for all the papers used in this process. It was completely missed. And if we miss it here, we might face quite unpleasant consequences. Even

simple example where two entities have trademark rights for the same word but in different classes, like one is for boots and the other is for cars. Yes, and one has currently domain with one of the domains which is variant for another which belongs to another entity. And one of those just starts a UDRP. Who will lose it all? It's completely new principle. If we don't review it properly, we will have issues later in the process. it's [not] technology. And this item was one of the items why I insisted in the past that it's a situation where the set of technical persons reviewed something and came to the legal conclusion, and it's quite wrong. So it should be reviewed in this very PDP, because if we miss it here, it'll be missed in other items and we will have a pandora box of lack of understanding of what's going on to the inherited domains which are variants, one to another, for example. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. I have Edmon, then Donna, then Jeff.

EDMON CHUNG: I agree with Maxim that we should include this. In many ways, I think I would agree with Jeff in the conclusion of the discussion, but nevertheless, even if that is the conclusion that would be written into the final report of the EPDP, this topic itself should be included, and that's my point.

And I think whether we consolidated this into the transfer section or this being a separate section, I'm easy with either way.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. I do agree with Jeff, and perhaps what Edmon is suggesting that perhaps it sits under transfer policy or what to do, maybe this is more about what to do in the event of a UDRP decision, but Jeff, my concern here is that this PDP looks at the UDRP process, and that's a concern for me, that I think it's more related to the UDRP decision and what happens, rather than the UDRP process itself.

Also bearing in mind that a review of the UDRP is going to be undertaken by a separate PDP in the near future as well. So maybe there's a cross-reference there. So yeah, I'm a little bit hesitant for this PDP to start monkeying with UDRPs. I think it's more about what happens in the event of a UDRP decision. And to some extent, I think that's going to be resolved in the question, as Jeff said, what the working group decides with respect to same entity.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. I think that's a good direction that we are heading there. It's about the action, not the policy, how you initiate the UDRP, but more about the implication of the action when you transfer a domain name that has variants associated with it. Jeff, go ahead, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, for purposes of this, I think the easiest thing to do is when we talk about the transfers, just put in a simple question that says—not all this background but a simple question saying, “Should we treat transfers as a result of the UDRP in the same way?” So under transfers, it's as simple as that. I think any more detail or the legal rights as Maxim is talking about, that should be addressed when this working group—if this working group approves the same entity rule. But I don't think this should require a separate analysis. I think it 's a simple one-line question after the transfer section that says, “Should transfers ordered by or through the UDRP or any other dispute resolution mechanism be treated the same?”

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. I think that's the question. We are aiming to be very focused, very specific questions, so I think we came from all the way UDRP policy and really hone into the issue, which is the action and how you treat the transfer of a domain name and a set. So I think that's what ought to be on the paper. I think we want to capture that for the rest of the working group to review that.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. And I think with the URS, the only question is if you suspend one, do you suspend them all? I think that's the only question for URS. I think it's written so complicated here because it tries to get into much more—it's just too complex. So I think, again, if you transfer one—if you suspend one, do you suspend them all? And then the PDDRP, I think, is irrelevant to all of this.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, we will need to look at that. I'm just doing a time check here. Three minutes. So [inaudible] various steps. I think we went through the UDRP questions and I think we nailed it to a point where we are comfortable as a group to focus on the transfer question, the action question, and then we look at URLs [inaudible] suspension, and I need to be more familiar with the details of those. So I think we're going to stop here and we'll pick up on our next meeting and talk about the other processes and really look at PDDRP and TMCH. And I understand TMCH already has some language on variants there. So we don't have to do anything about it. But we'll bring that information into the discussion next week in order to [inaudible] as to whether we really need to ask the question or just leave it out there.

and then J5, this is more operational protocol stuff as far as DNS labels. Okay, so [inaudible] TMCH level. So we'll look at that. Thank you, Maxim. So we're going to stop here. Next week, we're going to pick up on the rest of J and move on to section K as well. And if we have time, we can move on to section L, which I believe is going to be a quick conversation as well about the evolution of the IDN implementation guideline at the second level.

So there we have it. That's the homework for next week. So the rest of section J, all section K, and time permitting, section L there. So with that, Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry, I meant to put it down. Never mind.

DENNIS TAN: Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry, Dennis, I can't raise my hand.

DENNIS TAN: Go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: I just wanted to confirm, for J1, the part that Edmon added, is the drafting team not going to ask this question, or is this still going to be included? It's about the disposition change related to transfer as a result of UDRP.

JEFF NEUMAN: But I don't see the difference of—so on this one, I think it's a general transfer question. What if the new registrant—whoever it is—wants to change the primary and secondary strings? I don't see ...

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. And really, the [disposition] pertains to the registry operator policy. And yes, that's ultimately the decision of the registrant, I would suppose, what's a primary [inaudible] and whether—you start with one primary and then you decide to [pay off] and make the secondary a primary. Yeah, I see that that's more fluid than what a TLD could be.

So let me review that. I'm not sure. We can add the disposition, but I tend to think that that's more on the registry policy side and that's very fluid. Yeah, let's revisit when we talk about the transfers about dispositions.

So with that, I think we can wrap up today. Thank you very much. It was a good conversation. We made good progress here, even we jumped in a little bit on next week's work. So, thank you for that. So we'll meet again next week. Thank you very much, and have a good rest of the day.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]