
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group

Tuesday, 19 January 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 agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/8lUmCQ>

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

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP charter drafting team meeting being held on Tuesday, the 19th of January, 2021 at 1800 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you are only on the audio bridge, can 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 raised hand option has been adjusted to the bottom toolbar reaction section. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the

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.

expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to our chair, Dennis Tan. Please begin.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Andrea, and welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. So let's look at our agenda today. We have a small agenda but quite substantive conversations, I expect. We have first, we go through the remainder of the mapping documents. We allow that for, say, 15 minutes and then we turn into the real substantive discussion over to the charter questions. Hopefully, we'll get enough time to go through sections A through E. We have about 40 minutes allotted for that part. Then, just before we adjourn we'll review our homework for next week and at this point, I'd like to ask if anybody has any other business that we want to earmark for the end of the meeting. Seeing no suggestion, let's get right onto it.

So mapping document, I think we left off on row nine right there, so we have now on screen and Ariel has posted the link on the chat room so you can follow at your own pace. So, again, we're trying here to be efficient. We're not going to be discussing the substance of the recommendation but just acknowledging whether there are gaps or overlaps between the different papers that we are looking at and the real discussion that we want to have is into the charter questions themselves. And Jeff notes, okay, so it's a public announcement of sorts, so he's announcing of the SubPro report is now final and has been submitted to the council for consideration. Thank you, Jeff, for that. So it's getting closer to become policy.

All right, so with that, let's [turn to the] document, so row nine and this relates to recommendation four of the staff paper talking about the second level variants under IDN variant TLDs. And no material inconsistency here just on a note that the staff paper talks about these two cases about variant labels under variant TLDs and variant on the second level under variant TLDs as well. We just note that today there are language or obligations requirement as far as second-level variant levels existing today's registry agreements. So however we craft the question, we need to make known explicit that there's existing already obligations with certain registry operators and the RSAP process. So, whatever policy discussion under the variant TLD framework is consistent or takes into account changes as a whole and not just [inaudible].

That's just about the difference there. Any comments there? I see Jeff's hand. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, so I just wanted to comment that the part that's in row nine under the variant TLD management staff paper, the question for GNSO consideration, that question to me seems like an implementation of SubPro, what to use as the definition of same entity, whether you use the registrar ID, registrar organization ID, or whatever you use. To me, that's not something for this group but I do—and I'm still trying to understand fully the difference between 9 and 10. But, I do think there's a gap and the gap is like second-level variants under variant TLDs but I'm just trying to figure out which one the gap is in.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Jeff. So if you're referring 9, 10 on the rows, yeah, they are two different and I can get that in a second. Yeah, as far as you mentioned the ROID as one way to effectuate the same registrar rule. Yeah, I agree with you. That's implementation and that's something that just because a staff paper recommended that I think that's what this Working Group wants to flag as a, again, implementation for the Working Group to consider or find a different way that is more efficient and effective in that way. But, yeah, I agree it's an implementation data point decision to make. So with that, let's go to 10 and I can perhaps explain. We can just very quickly discuss the difference between 9 and 10.

Nine is about the same registrant rule. The second one pertains to when you have different IDN tables in your registry, and this is the case where you have same script tables. For example, when you offer instead of script table you offer language tables and just because of that you have different tables that share the same script. For example, Arabic, the Arabic scripture in many languages. So a certain registry operator instead of offering a one single script table for Arabic they decide to offer tables as the language label, all of which share the Arabic script. These recommendation from staff paper is saying, "Oh, you are doing that and you have same script tables across different language tables then try and make sure that variant relationship across these tables are consistent."

So that if you create a variant under one language, that variant relationship also consistent in other language table as well. Otherwise, you have a case where you can create variants on one place and you can create the different domain but no variants with each other because the variant rules were not consistent across

these same script language tables. I hope that makes sense. And I think we have Sarmad as well. So if you can keep me honest there, please chime in. Jeff, is that a new hand?

JEFF NEUMAN: No, sorry.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, no, go ahead. Go ahead. I see you have a question on the chat, so okay. So, [inaudible] of doing that, it might be the case today because that was not our restriction in the past. That the harmonization of variant tables. I'm sorry, harmonization of IDN tables is something relatively new, it was also discussed during the IDN Guidelines Version 4 discussion, so there's that as well. But it's relatively new. That's the difference between 9 and 10. Okay, so I see no other comments or questions, okay. And now we move on to 11 which is related to 10. The recommendation of having IDN tables creating consistent variant labels does not mean that those variants need to behave the same. As if, for example, and I think hopefully you can relate to this example here.

You have simplified and traditional Chinese language tables. Right, both are using the Han script so you want, in both tables, define a consistent set of labels otherwise you can be in the situation where one is different labels considered to be variant of each other are going to different registrants and the intent is otherwise. But, if you have a simplified Chinese second level domain name you would want that that label is activated meaning allocated under a simplified TLD. And on the other side, you want the traditional

Chinese second level activated under the traditional TLD, and the simplify in this case would be lock or allocated. So you have two different TLDs, variants of each other, having consistent set of variant labels but the disposition values, how they behave whether they are allocated, meaning that they could be delegated to a registrar or blocked from their registration are not necessarily the same thing.

Right, because registry operators might want to offer different types of variants to different markets, such as in this case of simplified and traditional Chinese. I hope that that makes sense in how this set of recommendations from five, six, from staff paper relate to each other. And, again, I'm looking at Sarmad virtually to keep me honest here and make an observation if I miss anything. Jeff, that's a new hand.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, so on this one like some of the others, because there's no inconsistency and because SubPro is likely to be policy and certainly by the time this group gets together, the question is not to research and redo the policy for this over again, it's like some of the others. Is there any reason why this shouldn't, or is there any reason why it shouldn't be policy as opposed to confirming that it is?

DENNIS TAN:

Right Jeff. Yeah, and like you say it's here in the map, there is no material inconsistency here. I was just going about explaining the different relationship of this staff recommendations and the different

meaning or intent. But, yeah, on row 11 there is no inconsistency. Right, so we can go ahead. And Ariel, please keep me in check for the time, please. We have 15 minutes and I think we have a few more minutes so I'll just go along. Four minutes, okay so let's try to go and focus again on wherever are there are inconsistencies. Row 12, the string similarity review. Okay, so a few hands here, so Jeff, is that a new hand?

JEFF NEUMAN: No, this whole... Sorry.

DENNIS TAN: Sorry. Okay, so I have Donna and then Maxim.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Dennis, can you hear me okay?

DENNIS TAN: Sure can, please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, great. So, a couple of things here. When the staff paper and SubPro recommendations are consistent, I think I have a little bit of a struggle with why we are reviewing them at all, right? So why is this EPDP going to the potentially rehashing? I understand the question about—anyway, I'll just move on from that. But I think Maxim has raised one reason why we would consider the recommendation, and that's in the context of applicability to existing

TLDs. So I wonder if whether it's possible that in the charter question there's an assumption that the recommendation is sound because the SubPro and the staff paper are in agreement. But there's a question of applicability to existing TLDs and perhaps that might be a better question rather than this whether we agree with the recommendation or not.

So maybe that's the outstanding bit and what I wasn't getting previously, is the applicability to existing TLDs. I'm not sure that I'm making a whole deal of sense, Dennis, but hopefully, I've made a little bit.

DENNIS TAN:

Sure, Donna. Thank you very much, and I think you put it in a very good way. I think it bodes well with our principle that we don't want to recreate the wheel. We don't want to revisit policy, as in you put it nicely, that's what this Working Group is looking at. It's just build upon SubPro but then ask the question as far as applicability to existing TLDs in the places where that needs to take place. When we go back to the charter, that's where we need to be looking at how we word those questions without suggesting that the policy recommendations need to be revisited rather than how does that apply to or is there any other discussion to apply for existing TLDs. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Yeah, we had a lot of conversations during the scoping team efforts about unification among ccTLDs and gTLDs and I think it's a really good idea to start with gTLDs so we ensure that people ... actually,

average end user, I'd say they don't care about the variety of contracts we have as registries so most probably it's reasonable to expect that they will not have to check it on IANA or ICANN and just use the same approach in all gTLDs they have. So, I think we at least need to underline that in situations where SubPro is not applicable or if not applicable, there should be similar items for the existing TLDs or something. I'm not a good writer so the idea is we need to ensure that if any gaps occur due to, for example, not all council voting or having 50/50 votes instead of two-thirds in case where SubPro is not a consensus policy we, at least, have an applicable to new gTLDs. We at least can ensure that it's applicable to the extent possible to old and existing TLDs more or less in unified fashion. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Maxim. You're right, I mean that's the intent, that the policies are consistent for future and existing. All right, so I think we've run out of time to do the mapping but I think we have went through enough information here, at least for what we are trying to achieve today. Sections A through E, because recommendation eight and nine from the staff paper deals with other procedures, policies that need to be revised. So, we'll come again to this mapping document when we need. So, right now what I want is to go to the charter document and start looking at section A, I think, that's where we start. Before I do that, Maxim, is that a new hand?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Old, sorry.

DENNIS TAN: Okay, no worries. Just looking at the chat. Yep, so Donna agrees with Maxim, harmonization of policies with [subsequent procedures] should be considered. Yes, that's where we are. I think we're honing into the purpose of this Working Group and how this charter document needs to come up. All right, so again, just recapping what the principles are. Before that, Donna, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. This is just an overall statement with the way the charter is currently worded and perhaps this is something we can work on. I think it's too long, for one, so we're going to have to find a way to reduce it. But I feel like the questions are leading the witness. I don't know if that makes sense to people, but the questions seem to be assuming an outcome and I'm not 100% sure that that's what we should be doing. It's just an overall comment that I wanted to make before we started running through this. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Okay, so with that in mind, I think we can work on how lengthy this charter's going to be. I think we're going back and forth as to how much context we introduce and then post the punch question about the policy question that we want to ask. I think we'll try to find a balance in there. All right, so the first one, so the first question is in the overarching question about using a one and only source to validate TLD labels and calculate their variants,

including the disposition values of those. This question as we saw in the mapping document have been answered or discussed by SubPro so we are just repeating it here. If we can highlight the question again, so where A1 basically gives all the introduction about the past work, but the question is right there when you see the highlighted. And I give you a few seconds so you can read that section that is highlighted now. In my screen, it's in blue, and you can see this is a two-part question, one that recognizes SubPro recommendation and putting hopefully a high bar to challenge that recommendation for new TLDs, and the second part of the question is about applying the roots on LGR to existing TLD labels so that we can determine and calculate their variant TLDs for registry operators whether they want to indicate they are allocated variant labels they can apply for those variants. I see Donna's hand up. Please, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. I think the question is very open. Given SubPro's staff paper and the study group are in agreement, I think I'd like a higher bar to be set to be opening this back up, because if you say, "Is there any reason the Working Group should revisit this recommendation," then that's a pretty open question. So, I wonder if there's another way that we can phrase this that would minimize the possibility that this would be challenged in some way.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Donna. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I agree with Donna. I mean, I know I had suggested some of these words, but in looking back on it, I think we need to be more definitive. So again, by the time that this group is constituted and does its work the policy is that compliance with the RZLGR and any future is required. I think we should be more definitive, and then we really only ask for, well, at least a policy for subsequent TLDs. Then the question is for existing, does this apply? I don't even think we need the second part of it. That sentence that starts, "Is there any reason?" I think we just state the policy as it applies to new TLDs, because by then it will be policy, and then ask the question on existing TLDs. And that's it, it could be made shorter and we don't need to ask whether they agree or revisit, or anything like that.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Others? Donna, again. Go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Dennis. I think I agree with Jeff's approach, and I think in considering whether there are any problems for existing TLDs, that's where you would come up with, or that's where reasons for revisiting the existing policy would come up, I think, so what you're looking at is whether this policy will hold for existing TLD labels, and if it doesn't, then that's where your problem is going to be identified and you'll have to find a solution that fits across the board. Yeah, I think I agree with Jeff. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: I don't disagree with what Jeff and Donna said. I wonder if it's useful to, since we went through the mapping document, I wonder if it's useful to bring those parts into this document because we started off with the mapping document almost as separate. But, the insights there is that they're identifying the gaps and this is an example of which the SubPro and staff and others are agreeing, then less ... the EPDP doesn't have to consider so much. And this is just one of the questions, and many of them would probably fall into this situation. I don't have an immediate solution to it but there might be some activity that needs to be done between—as we go along to bring those insights from the mapping document into this document to achieve what Jeff and Donna's saying.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Anybody else? Okay, seeing none or no chat. I think we have an action item here so I think we're leaning towards this two-part question. First part, make it tighter. Not even asking the question whether it's our reason. To increase the bar, to make it tighter as an assertion that that's the only way for future TLDs to be validated and the only open question is whether it's applicable to existing TLDs. Edmon, is that a new hand? No. Okay. All right, so I think we have an action item here to make this tighter, higher bar on the first question. Basically making an assertion and building on SubPro not even opening a window to discuss that. Shares applicability on the second one.

That was a good conversation, so let's keep moving. Then, comes to implementation question here. So, of course, the overarching

question is [the root zone] LGR and introduction of variant TLDs as a concept and a reality. The implementation question is about, “Okay, so how do existing or future, or existing policies procedures need to be adjusted so that they can work?” And to name a few, just EBERO, UDRP, as far as how you transfer variant domains and such, and other examples. Well, for future TLDs that I think SubPro and SubPro IRT will look at this, and not sure whether they’re going to be looking at existing procedures as well. Donna, your hand’s up. Please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, Dennis, just a little nitpick. I mean, do we really need the, “To what extent,” at the beginning of this? Can we just say, “Should the TLD policies and procedures be updated?” If they need to be updated then you’re going to determine how that’s going to happen, so I think the, “To what extent,” is not necessary.

DENNIS TAN: I’m sorry, I was on mute. Yes, I think you are right. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, this is another area where I think we need to really just focus on existing TLDs because, first of all, I don’t even know what it means to update policies and procedures. But to the extent that this rule is being implemented for future TLDs then that’s up to the IRT. So, I’m not sure we need anything other than, should the TLD policies be updated for existing IDN TLDs, our existing TLDs? That’s it. I mean and the rest of that. But I don’t think we need it for going forward.

DENNIS TAN: So, would the question be more appropriate if we work on the SubPro IRT will look into this going again to the applicability question, right? Make sure that those policies are being revised [inaudible].

[ARIEL LIANG:] [inaudible] on mute.

JEFF NEUMAN: I heard Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. So, the question is whether the SubPro IRT policies recommendations or implementation directions are applicable to existing TLDs as well. So shift focus of the question about applicability to existing TLDs.

JEFF NEUMAN: Right. And I'm assuming that the future TLDs will have to use a formula, would have to use the same calculations to look at past existing TLDs because the variant rule applies to existing or future TLDs. Right, so if someone applies for a TLD, the way you calculate what is a variant is important because you don't allow variant of existing TLDs. So, I don't know what I'm saying. Sorry. I mean, I know what I'm saying but the future TLDs need to consider how to calculate variants of existing TLDs in order to look for things like confusing similarity and other stuff.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, and collisions or contentions or what-have-you. I think you put it, that is spot on. They need to consider, even though they are looking at future rounds of TLD they need to consider the existing delegated TLDs in the root zone so that there is no contention in the future or if there are any contentions, how they're going to solve for those. So, as far as looking at the TLD procedures—yeah. But is that something that the SubPro IRT will actually do? Do we need to ask this Working Group, to ask again?

JEFF NEUMAN: I think we should make sure that the SubPro IRT does this and so we don't want to lose any of this stuff. We want to make sure that they cover it, but I don't think it's for this Working Group to do.

DENNIS TAN: Then let's—because we are talking as if SubPro is only IDN. It's not only IDN. They have a suite of things that they will look at and this group that is only focused on IDNs want to make sure that SubPro IRT have the tools, data, and metrics that they need to make their job more easier, or efficient, in that sort. I think that's where our sweet spot is going to be. So, okay, so I think the action item on this and limitation question is just to make sure this working group provides the data metrics that SubPro IRT can find helpful when they're looking at future changes of TLDs in the context of variant management at the top level and those policies changes or recommendations are applicable or taking into account existing TLDs. Does that make sense? Is that where we want to go?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, but I don't think that's for this Working Group to do. In other words, we need to make sure that the SubPro works on it and if they want to set up a work track that that's made up of IDN experts to do it, they can do that. But it doesn't make sense unless it is delegated by that IRT to this group. So, it's not something that should be in the charter unless IRT, for SubPro, asks specifically that this group do it.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, Donna brings a good—yeah, the timing. I mean, the timing I think is unfortunate, I guess, or unfriendly to our goals. Jeff, is that a new hand? No, okay. Okay, so I have Donna and then Edmon.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. I wonder if we can just put a pin in this and just note that we need to think about it a little bit more. I mean, I think we understand the issues that Jeff has raised and I think they're reasonable but perhaps in the interest of time we can just put a pin in this and agree to come back to it and let's go through the rest of it and see how far we can get.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: I think I agree with what Donna said and I understand what Jeff's saying, but the interdependency that it then creates, it's probably

too complicated. I don't foresee it, I mean the reasoning of it is understandable but the practicality of it, just keeping it in this group I think would—the future group, the EPDP would probably make it work the same unless there is a strong feeling that it might diverge.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, I have a strong feeling against it because this group is in the policy-making phase, not the implementation phase. So, before, if another group is in the implementation phase and this group is in the policy phase, it does not make sense for implementation to kick it back to a policy group. Now there's no question that they're going to need help from experts, but those experts need to focus on implementation as part of the SubPro program, not as part of this PDP which, again, has to go through council and has to go through the board, etc. Whereas an IRT doesn't have to go through council again, it doesn't have to get approved by council. It doesn't necessarily have to get approved by—I guess it does get approved by the board.

But it's in a very different phase. And so it would slow down incredibly to make that part of this PDP. We need it, this question, like other implementation questions, to be answered in an implementation phase. And where it makes the most sense is the implementation phase of SubPro. Now, if you want to develop a different policy for existing TLDs, that gets decided here. But this is an implementation question, not a policy. We've already decided the policy.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Just reacting quickly to that. Yeah, I understand the alignment of these two policies because this EPDP will have also in IRT and I think at some point new TLDs and existing TLDs need to be consistent in some ways, so I think that's where we need to find the language so that the scope and purpose of this EPDP is clear on the timing of, to some extent, works. Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. I see where Jeff is going. I think some wording here might be useful as something like the accepting that the future SubPro IRT would take on this and not bar them from considering it. That should address the issue that Jeff is talking about because then if I understand Jeff correctly, the IRT goes to that point and say, "Whoops, this is being taken care of by the EPDP. We've got to stop work here and wait for them." If we have specific wording here that says, "No, don't wait for us. If you're already there and you should continue down the path of implementation and considerations." That should address the issue.

DENNIS TAN: Is there reaction from other members to Edmon's suggestion? Yeah, I see a reaction in the chat. Yeah, I think agree we want to avoid gaps. I'm just imagining—sorry. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: The problem here is it's not a gap in policy. The policy's already been decided. The question before asked about the policy. This is, as it's labeled, an implementation. How do we implement the

policy? And if the council or if the IRT for SubPro wants to do some more work on it, then it's free to call in other experts. But I think this will completely delay, derail or could be used to derail those that may not want to go forward. I really think it's important to just that the council make sure that this group has come up with—this meaning the charter drafting team has come up with some questions that we need answered but it's more appropriate to be answered in the implementation effort that SubPro is doing so the council can make sure that the IRT answers these questions. But right here we're not talking about policy. We're talking about implementing the policy that was in the previous question which we've already stated for future TLDs is what SubPro decided.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Well, we haven't exactly said that, Jeff, where that's a question of whether the policy would be applicable for a future TLDs, and if it is not, then there's a problem there that needs to be resolved. I don't know that we're saying that what the staff report says and what the SubPro says that that's fine for future TLDs. But we haven't exactly said that it has applicability for existing TLDs until that question is considered.

JEFF NEUMAN:

But then that would be its own implementation effort after this PDP. So how do we implement it for existing TLDs if it comes out with a different policy?

DONNA AUSTIN: Well, the policy for existing TLDs may need to be—so it comes back to that harmonization piece I think we were talking about. SubPro and the staff paper had considered future TLDs but we haven't considered existing so that we need a harmonization of those two policies.

JEFF NEUMAN: Perhaps, or maybe not.

DONNA AUSTIN: Perhaps. Right, right. But we don't know the answer to that question yet, do we?

JEFF NEUMAN: But Donna, think of it this way. Think of it in terms of something completely unrelated to IDNs but which happened. So, new rights protection mechanisms like the URS was developed. At that time, they didn't say, "Well, we need to consider it for existing TLDs before we can allow it to be implemented for future TLDs." They didn't even ask that question as to whether it should be applied to existing TLDs until basically this year when it was answered by the rights protection mechanisms. I look at it like that. So, if the group, which it didn't, but let's say the group of rights protection mechanism said, "Yes, the URS needs to apply to existing TLDs," if that were the case it would set an implementation team up now. It was okay 10 years ago that it wasn't worked out or wasn't sure whether it would apply to existing TLDs. It was okay to just implement it moving forward. Similarly, this.

DONNA AUSTIN: Can we just put a pin in this and come back to it? Let's work through the rest of the charter and come back to this because I'm not convinced, Jeff. But it's something I need to think about. I'm not sure where others are on this. But can we just put a pin in it and see how we go with the rest of this?

DENNIS TAN: I agree, Donna. Let's keep thinking about the dependence in the relationship between SubPro and these EPDP effort and welcome others to [inaudible] their opinions as well on the mailing list. So, okay, time check is 1:49 PM. Let's keep going. This is another implementation question that has to do with the self-identified variants. Now, just a bit of background where this is coming from. This is from the TSG paper. And to clarify, the TSG paper had to look at both ccTLDs and gTLDs in that context, and that's useful. And the self-identified variants, this is a term that was used in the last round in the applicant guidebook where applicants applying for an IDN TLD, they were asked to self-identify the variant labels based on whatever IDN table they had available to them.

As far as I know, when the staff's reading [or] my reading of the applicant guidebook and other sources do not give these self-identified variant labels a legal status of any kind. So, these were more of a for your information purposes. But there's no pending of status as to allocation, delegation, or any reservation status. So, looking again in that context, these question tend to—I think it's a moot question whether then they need to be, something has to happen with those because, again, there's no legal status or any

binding status between ICANN and the applicant about the self-identified variants. But there are different opinions here whether they need to be deleted or undeleted. So, I have Edmon and then Jeff.

EDMOND CHUNG:

Yeah, I'm not sure. I'm not following what you're saying a little bit here. So, I do think legal status or otherwise, whatever. But I do think whatever was identified is used for string contention purposes, for objection processes and so on, right? I mean, all of those in the last round were provided publicly, and if someone wouldn't have launched a string contention or—Objection, sorry. String objection or whatever objection, they would've used that identified variants to do so. So, I think we have to consider those issues. I'm not sure whether you're saying that we don't have to include this in the EPDP for some reason but I do think it requires some attention to what was done and a policy to harmonize, if you will, from last round into the future round.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Edmon. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, so this is purely a historical question which, to me, doesn't have applicability in the future since we've decided already what the policy is for the future. So the policy for the future doesn't allow for self-identification of variant labels. So if the policy in the future does not allow for self-identified variant labels then the only thing that needs to be looked at are existing TLDs. But my understanding is that what someone self-identified as a variant in their application

doesn't have any effect since, at the end of the day, the variants that were actually delegated had to comply with certain rules and they couldn't just be self-identified.

So I'm confused as to why this is anything more than a historical-philosophical question. Edmon, help me understand. What is the issue that can come up? Maybe that's what I'm missing.

DENNIS TAN: Okay, maybe Edmon has the answer. Edmon, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, so I'm looking at it and saying the study hasn't been done. So I don't think anyone has done or maybe there has been. But someone has to go, and I'm expecting that this is going to be covered in the data collection part where someone goes, staff or otherwise go and check all the existing IDN TLDs and create those variants with the now existing regional LGR, compare them with the self-identified variants and identify if there were any discrepancies there, and I don't know whether there is or are. And if there are, then there might be something that the EPDP needs to do, grandfathering or whatever that needs to be done. So that's the piece of work that I'm looking at and unless this has already been done, someone should be doing it, and if there are discrepancy, making policy decisions on it.

JEFF NEUMAN: So, but if someone self-identified something in an application but never implemented it. If they implemented it, it's going to be in their

contract, isn't it? Or it's going to be a table that was filed. So if that's the case, if it's a table that was filed or it's in the contract, that would be part of a previous question to look at it. This one talks about how should we address future labels that are self-identified when the future's not going to ask for applicants to identify.

DENNIS TAN:

Sorry to interrupt, Jeff. Yeah, if there is any notion here about future, yeah, we need to strike that because this self-identification as you explained is not part of the SubPro. It is more about the past. Let's focus on that and how we address those issues whether they have legal standing or not. Ariel put in on the chat the part of the former AGB explaining or disclosing what variant strings or declaring variant strings as informative only purposes. So, the applicant has no right or claim to those declared variants. So, let's focus on that. It's about the past, not the future. I think we can all agree with that. So, just doing a time check here. It's two minutes to the top of the hour so I think we should stop here because we will not have enough time to go through in-depth discussion on the next item.

But we have a few queued items that we need to think about, so I welcome your feedback, comments on the mailing list so that we keep the discussion alive. And the next thing that we need to do is look at the action plan, that's correct. Our next meeting day is next week on January 19th. Sorry, today is January 19th. So next week January 26th. I think we need to adjust the—can we go back one week earlier? Because that's where we see the post-meeting homework. Thank you. Yeah, we're still on section A, so the post-meeting homework we need to adjust here. We are not quite there yet to move beyond section A, so we need to come back where we

left today and continue the conversation here. Yes, I agree. Yeah, we need to rework our action plan and see how we need to revise it. Edmon, I see your hand.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, I wonder if my suggestion earlier would be useful between now and next meeting if staff or someone can help us put the gaps that were identified in the mapping document and the notes into the charter document so as we go through it then we don't have to go back and forth between the two documents and the discussion might be a bit more efficient.

DENNIS TAN: I think that can be done. So, yeah, we'll look into that, Edmon. All right, any other comment, observation before we adjourn? Okay, seeing none, thank you, everyone. Before that, Edmon, is that a new hand? I don't want to—oh, good. Sorry. All right, that's it, folks. Thank you very much, it was a good conversation. A good discussion. We might need to catch up next week on homework. But with that, thank you very much for joining today. Have a great 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.

DENNIS TAN: Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]