DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Thursday, 8th of August, 2024 at 12:00UTC. We do have apologies from Farell Folly. All members and participants will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDNs EPDP wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you and back over to Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks very much, Devan. So, Saewon, it looks like we're expecting some updates from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

SAEWON LEE: Yes, that's how we will start if they are okay.

DONNA AUSTIN: Jen, Dennis, Maxim, do you have anything for us?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sure. Thanks, Donna. Thanks, Saewon. We talked quite lengthily during our internal call on Tuesday about the list of items, so it's specifically the new text on Recommendation 6, and then we talked a bit more about 10, 11, and 12, and we also touched on 14 and 15. So, I think, and Dennis and Maxim, please add if I've forgotten anything, we had a pretty long discussion about this. We're generally okay with the current framing of Recommendation 6. We like that it has changed to mutual agreement instead of full consensus. We think that this formulation makes more sense because we're looking at registry operators talking to ICANN Org and being responsible for that part about the baseline criteria and the minimum deployment requirements. I don't know if you want me to stop here, if there's anything in particular you want to talk about this anymore, because if I give the updates from all of them, I feel like we're going to go through the entire list of things we will talk about this call, so I'll stop here first.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jen. So, effectively, the Registry Stakeholder Group is okay with the language that is currently on the screen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: That is correct. We also talked at length about the requests that we received, well, the requests that Manju sent over to the Council, so that also took up a part of the call, so I don't know if we're going to talk about that at all, or I'll stop here as well.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, thanks, Jen. All right, so let's just focus on the text for a minute. So, I think this is good news. I know ALAC indicated on the last call that they were okay with this language, and I don't think we had any objections from anyone else. We were just waiting for the Registry Stakeholder Group. So I just want to double check here and make sure that that's the case. So, if anyone has any objections to the language, please let us know, and thanks, Michael, the registrars are on board with the language as displayed at the moment. I don't know if we have Nigel on the phone from the GAC. It doesn't look like it.

Okay, all right, so we're going to move forward with this language, and it will appear in our final report, but we have to go to the other bit. As Jen mentioned, the leadership team asked Manju to send a note to the Council about the request that we received from Sarmad to stabilize this recommendation so that the RSP evaluation process could start work. From a leadership perspective, we were really unsure about this because of, and it's from a process procedure perspective, not from a substance perspective, because there was a concern that this would, if it starts place to implement this recommendation and the Council hasn't reviewed it and agreed to the recommendation and then it doesn't go, then it also doesn't go through to the board, where does that leave us? So Manju sent a note to Council to seek some guidance. So Jen, I think that was the other part that you were referring to that the registries had some discussion on. I wasn't envisaging having a conversation with this group about the note to Council, but I'm happy to open it up to the floor and just see if there's any concerns or, you know, ask us what the heck we're doing. I'm happy to have that conversation. So Maxim, I see your hand is up, so if you wanted to go first, that's okay with me.

MAXIM ALZOBA: There were concerns about the situation that basically changing our process. It's like, you know, in GNSO we have procedures for creating PDP, etc. And the changes to the process are not envisioned because, for example, staff asked us. There are process for that. So basically, we are not sure what prevents ICANN from testing the backends without the final decision, because since nobody understands fully right now how the variant sets are going to be implemented by different platforms, it's not necessarily possible to make testing in a fully automated manner like it was envisioned by ICANN, as I understand. So most probably we do not need to change the process and stop things, because the timeline brought by ICANN, it was developed by ICANN. We don't know how this timing was created. So nothing prevents ICANN from testing the backends, asking to provide their implementation. That's it. And then manually review it, if it fits the requirements or not. And it doesn't require PDP to stop or to change its course. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Maxim. Does anyone else have any comments they want to make on this? So essentially, we will continue with our work. We've now, you know, worked through the recommendation. I think everyone's on board with it. But there's still a, you know, a procedural issue here. And we need some guidance from council on it. So that's what we're seeking, really, before we go any further. So, Jen, go ahead.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Donna. And just to supplement what Maxim has mentioned, we actually talked about this in our internal call and also the RySG call yesterday. And I think some of us are not quite wrapping our head around what would happen if, you know, for example, if council says, okay, we're not going to make an exception for this, like the impact of that. And others understand the well-intentioned meaning behind this request to get work started and in parallel before. But we also want to know what the impact would be should council decide, okay, well, we're not going to make an exception here for this procedural thing because we haven't done it before and we don't understand why we need to make this exception. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, okay. That's fair enough, Jen. I think as Manju's request said, this is unprecedented as far as we're aware. You know, the idea that there's a PDP underway and there's a request that could be interpreted as a request to kind of implement it on a piecemeal basis without it going through the normal approval processes such as the recommendations are considered by council and then considered by the board. So we're just trying to unwrap the procedural part of it. So there's other conversations that will have to be had where we'll just do our best to stabilize this recommendation and then others can work out what can be done and what can't be done and how that would be done. So we're doing our bit. We'll let council work out how the rest of it works because as I understand it, that's within their purview. It's not really within ours.

EN

Okay. So I think it's great that we've been able to reach agreement on this language. It's been the most difficult, I suppose, conversation or charter question that we've had in dealing with phase two. So it's good to have this settled. We do need to make sure that everybody's okay with the rationale language. Saewon, how's that going to work? Where are we with the rationale language? Is it stable as well?

SAEWON LEE: Currently, yes. Well, staff and leadership all reviewed, and since then there hasn't been any comment or let's say further comment. Just the finalization of the language by leadership is currently where we're at because I haven't seen any more comments since then.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right. So that means the rationale language hasn't gone to the team? Because we're waiting to finalize the recommendation before we can make sure that the rationale was correct, is that?

SAEWON LEE: Sorry. So, yes, it has been shared with the team, but we requested the review and comments by 15th of August. So I guess my meaning was until today we don't have any comments, but maybe by next week, once the team has had more time to review the language, we might be able to stabilize it then.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So this is language that's out to the team for consideration as well along with another chunk of recommendations and rationales that we put out as well.

SAEWON LEE: Yes.

DONNA AUSTIN: All right. So I guess we will move on if the intent was that we would come back to that on the 15th of August.

SAEWON LEE: Yes. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. And I had just one question with regard to the rationale. And one of the states, I think the statement really at the bottom says that either way this work should consider the appropriateness of the work of the script communities, i.e., reference label generation rules, as well as other relevant sources of information. So can we give an example of what other relevant sources of information we're talking about?

DONNA AUSTIN: I think one was the IDN 2008 something or other. So I think at one point we did have a list of those other sources. Maybe it was in the implementation guidance. Or am I thinking of something else? Yes.

Okay. Thanks, Hadia. We'll have a look at that and see if we can find anything else. Yes, thanks, Jen. So it was in implementation guidance seven before we rolled it up into just the recommendation. So we'll have a look at that and expand on it. Okay. We're good to keep moving.

SAEWON LEE: Do we want to go back to Jen?

DONNA AUSTIN: What's next on your list of things that we were seeking registry input from, Jen, and we can bring up the relevant. I think we had a recommendation 14 and 15 or something.

SAEWON LEE: Jen, would you want to go to 10 to 12 first?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Yes, we can go to 10 to 12. Thanks, Saewon. So 10, 11, and 12, if you all recall, the registries had a public comment regarding respecting the other current processes, policy development processes. I think we had a good discussion with our registry colleague who is very much involved with the transfer PDP. And I think in the end, and I think we mentioned this once during the call when we were talking about 10 to 12, but I'm not sure if this was captured in, in the notes or the action items that came out of that call in general. I think we're fine with the language of the recommendation, but we really think that in the rationale, there needs to be some reflection of looking at any impacts the IDN EPDP

recommendations will have on current and I guess other policy development processes and recommendations. And II think that is quite important for us to note. And I think it's a good thing for any of the policy development processes to note that. It doesn't necessarily have to be in the recommendation language, but it absolutely needs to be captured in the rationale.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. I think one of the peculiarities of this is that we've got this PDP at the same time that the transfer policy is being reconsidered as well. So. We can certainly note something. in the recommendation that I think if ours is finishing first, then any changes, any of our recommendations should be considered from the context of whether it impacts recommendations from another PDP. Just like I assume that these recommendations will be cross-checked with existing policies and I think we've tried to do that as we go along but you can't always see everything. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think one of the more quite often reasons for the transfers is decisions of courts in different jurisdictions and we since the decisions of courts prevail whatever we create here in policies and courts have decades of historical experience of transferring domains without looking at variants because there are no appropriate legal practice because it's not created yet. We might need to be ready to see the situation where we face new grandfathered variant domain names. For example, court decides that a particular domain name must be transferred to some party and to some

particular registrar. And it will be done by the registry. They will have to do it because they are obliged to follow the law. And thus we might refer somewhere in our text that there is a chance of creation of new grandfathered variant domain names and that they need to be treated the same way as old ones so we do not create all the new procedures we just say that if it's created by decision of a court or some power equal to that, they need to be treated like old grandfathered domain names. That's it. It will allow us to avoid all the hassle with decisions how to deal in each particular moment. We just say we deal with it like with all other grandfathered names. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Maxim. Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: While I generally agree with Maxim that such court decisions could cause new grandfathered domains to be created, I think the chances are quite slim because the court would have to make a decision that not just one domain needs to be transferred but that two domains need to belong to different entities because if the court just says that one domain needs to be transferred, then even though the court decision just affects one domain, all variant domains would automatically be transferred due to our same entity principle. So only if the court decision disrupts actively the same entity principle, such a situation would occur. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Michael. I think I agree that if the policy says that the set has to be transferred, then even if there is a court ruling that says just one needs to be, then I think from a policy perspective, it would make sense that they all go together. I'm not sure we need to get into a back and forth about this now. I don't know if we have a recommendation about court rulings. I know we've had conversations about it. Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Since there are situations where different companies can have rights for the same names in different trade goods, for example, one company trades cars another company makes books yeah and sell them, we shouldn't create situation where our policy would violate rights of another company. So it should be decided in the courts. We cannot replace them. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks Maxim. And I think, I assume that a court is a court of law, so isn't there an overriding clause in the registry agreement and perhaps even the registrar agreement where the local law trumps policy? So wouldn't that overcome the problem? I mean we can note this down, but I think, you know, local law does trump policy. So maybe that takes care of it as well there. Jen, to your earlier comment about having something in the rationale about ensuring that the transfer policy doesn't undo whatever recommendation we have here about the transfer process or vice versa, I think what we could do is could do is, I guess, ask the transfer PDP whether there's any concerns about this

recommendation as it stands. And we can do that at the staff level. So Saewon, Steve and the team here could have a conversation with the transfer policy PDP and see whether there's any potential inconsistencies or problems with this one. So we can do that from an administrative level and then certainly cover it off. It would be good to try to give it prominence so I guess we don't want to get it lost in the rationale but make a note somewhere that it's our understanding that this recommendation is not inconsistent or would, you know, disrupt the transfer PDP recommendations that are underway. If that sounds okay. All right, okay. Thanks, Jen. So where does that leave us? And I'm sorry, Saewon, you're taking notes and trying to listen.

SAEWON LEE: No worries. Again, back to Jen. I think we'll go on to 14 or 15 now. If that's okay, Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Yep. Okay, when we brought this back up during our internal call, I think there was reiteration from all of the registries in the IDN small group that we are happy to work with what is there in the current recommendation. But again, I think, and you already note that there, we've actually taken out in implementation guidance 15 any reference to RDDS because the first strikeout was already done before we looked at it. And then we noticed 15.1 had a reference to RDDS. So that was the new thing that registries have added to implement guidance, implementation guidance 15. And then the second thing that we were so quite firm on is that any such requirement or any such service will

not have any kind of public, it's not going to be a public service. And I think we had assurances from our discussion within the group, maybe two or three calls ago, that there was no such intention that way. And it's not in the rationale or even in our discussions about it. So I think, by and large, registries are okay with what it looks like right now. Maxim and Dennis, if I've missed anything crucial, please add.

DONNA AUSTIN: I don't see any hands up and Dennis is saying nothing to add. Are there any others in the team that have any comments on this recommendation as we've reworded it? Saewon, is this a chunk of language that's out for comment by others at the moment as well?

SAEWON LEE: No, we haven't really shared 14 and 15 yet. The staff, and as Jen mentioned before her discussion with the group, just started working on the language to see what we could follow up with from the review of the comments. I know Jen just said that she's okay or the group is okay with the language, but one of the requests was that the 15 was just struck. But if not, in the language, sorry, in the rationale itself, if we are keeping 15, there were these requests of getting rid of anything related to RDDS. So again, that's what's done so far, but it hasn't been flagged to the team to review it yet, which will be done after today's call.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks. So I see Satish and Sarmad have their hands up. So Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU: So first, there seems to be a typo there after develop. There's an and there. I am assuming it is develop a service. So that's one thing. Secondly, if there is a service like this, then how does a person get to use it if it is not public? I mean, there must be some way to kind of use it, right?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. So I guess the recommendation here is to develop a service that would allow you to discover the allocated variant domain names. How somebody would go about that, I'm not 100% sure. But if somebody, registries and registrars might need to help me out here, but if somebody is looking for details about a domain name now, I guess there's processes or there's ways that that can be done. And I'm assuming that what we intend here is it would be similar for whatever services developed here. So maybe we need to cover that off Satish in the rationale or perhaps that's how it might become our implementation guidance is—or maybe the recommendation needs to cover how the service could be used. So we may need to do a little bit more work on this one. So Sarmad, Maxim and then Alan.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Donna. This is Sarmad. So I'm actually just, I guess wondering, and this is something we need to check, if ICANN actually has the information which is needed to implement this recommendation. And as I said, I actually at this time do not know. But one level of course is that try to find out what given a label, what are

allocatable variant labels that of course can be found using the IDN table for that particular registry operator. But I guess we're going two layers deeper than that. One is to find out not only what are the allocatable variants, but which of those are actually allocated. That's a second layer. And then the third layer is whether that is allocated to the same registrant. So that's a third layer. And I'm not really sure. Again, as I said, I would need to go in and see the data ICANN is getting and whether we actually even have the data to implement something like this. I don't have an answer yet, and then the other obvious question is that the data which we have, whether we have rights to use it in this way. So in any case, a few questions here, but just raising. Again, I don't have answers. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: So Sarmad, my take on this is that the questions that you're asking is specifically what will be dealt with in the recommendation. So I don't know that anybody has the data that you're talking about because there hasn't been any policy to say that this has to happen before. So I would assume that all will be revealed once the work starts on seeing what's possible in terms of developing a service that would allow or that would make it possible to discover the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name. So I'm not sure that much needs to be investigated at this point. I think it's a case of that investigation would take place come implementation of this recommendation. But others may have thoughts. Maxim and Alan.

EN

MAXIM ALZOBA: First of all, I think it was said before the RDDS is the service for existing domain names, not for something potentially existing. So it's not fully applicable here. The second, since the service could cause quite huge load on database. I mean, the, for example, attempt to get all the variants of some complex string, it shouldn't be a public service because it will allow a third party or maybe some script or not even a human to cause material, I'd say, okay, loss of performance to the registrars or registries who are the part of the internet infrastructure and security and stability of the internet infrastructure is important. But so like it's done now for many years with reserved domain names, if a third party wants something, to check something about reserved domain names, they go to registrars. So it's logical that this kind of service is going to be accessible as an authenticated service to known parties, not to all third parties via registrars. Also, it's logical to say that since all variants have to be allocated to the same party, the registrar has to allocate it to the same party. And RDDS already give you ability to check if it's registered or not. And if ICANN wants to check if it's allocated to the same party, they have mechanics, it's audits, and it's already in place. It doesn't require to create any kind of public service. And thus, it was discussed in registries meeting, it's definitely not going to be a public service. We have quite enough things to provide, and it's not necessary to be accessible to any third party causing unnecessary load to services. And yeah, basically to infrastructure. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think what's important here is that whether this is a public service or not, the intent of this recommendation is to enable a service that allows you to discover the information we're looking for. And to Satish's point,

I think maybe we need to give some thought to the how and the who in this recommendation as well. So Alan, go ahead.

ALAN BARRETT: Yeah, thanks Donna. I was going to say that I think it's probably in the public interest for it to be a public service. However, I listened to Maxim and I found his arguments about performance reasonably persuasive. So I'm going to change what I want to say. And instead of asking that it be public, I'm going to ask that there be a rationale listed some somewhere in the recommendations explaining why it's not going to be public.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks Alan. All right, so I think we still have a little bit to unpack in this one. I don't think we're quite there yet to everybody's satisfaction. I think everyone agrees that the intent of this recommendation is to develop a service. Who can access that service and how is I think where we have the differences of opinion and what we mean by a public service or not a public service. Does it mean that if it's a public service that means you don't have to pay for it or if it's not a public service, then ... Anyway, I think that's where we are. I think we still have a little bit to think about on this one. So where are we next, Saewon?

SAEWON LEE: Yeah, so noting that the language or the outputs as well as rationale may need to be re-discussed and updated. I think all the updates from

the registries stakeholder group is done unless you have anything else to add, Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Nope, those are the things we talked about. And I think unless we've missed anything, those are the feedback items that we are bringing to this call.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you. So yes, the updates have been provided and obviously leadership and staff will take it back and try to update the language accordingly and share it with the team once it's updated. To move on, if that's okay, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: So we've got a leadership chat in the background here and I forgot something and Steve had mentioned a while ago. So I think where we thought this recommendation could have some applicability is if somebody wanted to lodge a UDRP action or URS. And I think the intent with our recommendations is that UDRP or URS should cover the full variant set. So I think one of the thoughts we had is that if this service was available, then that would allow somebody looking to lodge a UDRP or a URS would be able to find out what the variant set is or if there is, or whether indeed it is part of a variant set and potentially make that part of the UDRP or the URS. So I guess that's one area where this, or at least the use case for where that would make that applicable. Maxim.

EN

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually nothing prevents URS or UDRP court from asking registry or registrar to provide this information. And like it's done in some particular situations in URS now, when they send you a clarification as a, when they send to a registry clarification request about additional domains. So it should be done in that particular PDP because we're not all experts in the trademark disputes. We cannot understand all the subtle things. I have already asked people who were in RPMs and have legal background. And it was confirmed that there potentially could be situation where two variant strings the same time could belong simultaneously to two different parties. And it could be that in the first domain name, the first party has it registered for them and for second party. And it's quite troublesome and it should be decided in either in URS or UDRP or the real court. We cannot decide for legal rights here as the registries or registrars because we are not the court. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. I'm not sure we're trying to decide the UDRP or the URS. We're just trying to make sure that there's a way that if somebody wants to know what strings are in the variant set, and now because we'll have this same entity principle, what's an easy way to do that. So I don't think we're looking to usurp UDRP or URS decisions or the investigation process, but this is just at the beginning you have to identify the strings. If they're part of the variant set, how do you find that out? So that's what this service would provide or enable. Edmon, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yep, Edmon here and speaking personally. So on this issue and I think I mentioned on chat and others as well, this one is focused very much on allocated variants only. And so it's not an unbounded number and it's most of the cases, in fact, a super, super majority of the cases would be less than a handful of additional domain strings. So I think the argument on performance or existence or all of the response can be pre-created and therefore shouldn't have—and it's probably just two or three more domains. So in the most cases, I think the performance or the unbounded issue doesn't exist.

However, I understand the concerns for edge cases. So I wonder if it is possible. Yeah, the edge cases where hundreds of thousands or tens of thousands of names are being generated or even hundreds or thousands, that could be prohibitive. And I understand that. But if that amount of domains are allocated and activated by the registrant, those records still need to be returned by the registry first of all. But maybe in the cases where really a large number of response domains results, could we provide exceptions? Like if it's beyond a reasonable response, then registries can point people to a different tool or so that the performance and the security and stability aspect is not affected. But in the normal cases, which is which is the super, super majority of cases as mentioned, the functionality would be there and everyone would be able to easily use it and there would be no concerns. So if the policy allows that in edge cases, the registries basically truncate the response, then we can probably address this issue on the registries and also registrars' concerns.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. Then we'll go to Maxim and we'll move on.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we do not need to create recommendations which cause edge cases because, for example, for registries and registrars, when compliance comes to them, they do not care about our discussions in PDP or some text on the internet. They just read the text of policies and text of agreements. So if we come to a situation where the registry or registries or registrars have to do something, they will demand it. They will not care about the number or the load cost. They will demand it. And all additional services, right now, there is a process with ICANN where a registry requests allowance to launch a particular public service. It's not prohibited. So I do not see the reason why we should enforce creation of some public service which could be replaced by a simple request to registrar. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Maxim. So Saewon, if we could just scroll back up to the charter question so we can remind ourselves why we're having this conversation. But I think we'll take on board what's been said on the call and just revisit this and see whether within the rationale we talk about the who and the how and see where we get to on this recommendation. But as I said, I think there's still a little bit to unpack here, but hopefully it's not too hard and we can find a way forward. So what's next, Saewon?

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Donna. So yes. What Michael raised in the chat actually does tie into what we were going to look into next. So we were going to suggest, as you all saw in the agenda, to go back to implementation guidance two, but through the working document to settle the language. One, because this section of the working document has already been shared with the team for your review and we wanted to make sure that the language is stable enough for you to review and provide comments on. And then secondly, because there seemed to be a bit more discussion to be had with this. So before the team completes the review, we just wanted to go back to this. And I believe this is what ties into what we were just discussing and what Michael also raised in the chat.

So basically, and before actually we go into reviewing the language, I just want to again remind everyone that this working document as well as section three working document have all been circulated with the team via email, requesting comments on mainly the pages related to outputs one to nine, just because the 10 to 20 are still a work in progress. So if you could review the language and provide comments by next week's call, that would be great.

And again, just to circulate back to IG2, which is related to the automatic activation. We already completed the whole summary of the public comment discussions last week, so I'm not going to go into that now, but staff has since added some language and wanted to make sure that the team was okay with the updated red lines. And this was incorporating everything that was discussed through the public comment review, limiting the automatic activation, but also—so the suggested language covers the automatic activation concerns and script

community practices and also included in the language, which we pointed out and which was also requested through the public comment discussions that a Chinese script case was included. I don't know if the team has all reviewed the language yet, but I just wanted to stop here to see if the team is generally on board with the updated language.

DONNA AUSTIN: Have folks had a time to look at this and are there any concerns with this? Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, this is Edmon. No concerns, I just want to raise one thing that that Michael mentioned in the in the chat earlier. This is the recommendation that bounds the number of allocable variants to what the registry can handle. And that basically then allows, by being able to handle means basically they can supposedly can provide the list of allocatable, the allocated variants alongside the source domain or primary domain. So I think this is related to what we just discussed just earlier.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. That's a big yes from Saewon.

SAEWON LEE: So I know that the team may not have reviewed all the language yet. So maybe if it's a bit too early to discuss this today, again, I would like to flag this output to the team so that we could confirm next week while

we go through the document. Yes, and Jennifer says it's too early. So maybe it is too early. So Donna, then again, I guess we just wanted to flag this to the team that it's been updated again since the circulation of this document. And if the team could review this, and then we could review the comments or any feedback next week.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, sounds good.

SAEWON LEE: Okay, so again, just because the language for the later part of the outputs have not really been updated in the sense that it hasn't been flagged to the team for review, the staff thought it may help the team just to kind of summarize or go through the public comment discussions for 10 to 20 so that while we are working on it, that there are no big concerns related to the changes that we've made. And again, once that's done, I think now it just really depends on going through the working document together. So moving forward from preliminary recommendation 10. Just because this has been, because we were waiting on the feedback from the registry stakeholder group and it's already been covered earlier in the agenda, I'm not going to go into that now because there are no updates yet. So that's 10 to 12. 13 there wasn't any. 14 and 15, again, leadership and staff need more discussions to update this.

Which kind of brings us to the last three outputs because there was nothing for 16 and 17 depends on 14 anyway, so again, it's kind of useless to look into that today. And again, 18 to 20 was quite

straightforward, where we had decided that though the registry stakeholder group had requested for the preliminary recommendation 20 to be deleted or eliminated—And actually, so just to summarize a few comments for preliminary recommendation 18, the suggestions were that the board substructure is deleted, and it remains as the board as a whole, because it's more of the permanent structure. The ccNSO is struck. And once those updates are done, that preliminary recommendation 20 is also struck.

The discussions through the public comment review was that in updating the IDN implementation guidelines, the 18 focuses on the process and 20 focuses on the approval step that through this also it does not dictate or limit the ccNSO through this language that we do keep 18 and 20 as it is with only the board substructure being deleted. So that's what's been incorporated into the language so far, as well as the rationale following. So that's kind of what's been updated so far. And with this, it's actually quite shorter this time, just because there's more work to be done for what was discussed today.

I do want to flag that the additional parts to the working document that has been added is the public comments review discussions that's also been added at the end of each rationale. So please do also refer to them too. Other than that, I actually don't have anything more to discuss today, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Saewon. So because we've got a little bit of time left, and we're going to share this with the team soon anyway, we have had a reply

back from ICANN Org on their suggested changes from grandfathered to something, a different term or wording, because of the concerns about using grandfathered because it can be pejorative, I suppose, in some contexts. So we do have that work back from ICANN Org. And Saewon, would you mind just bringing it up so people can get a little bit of a look at it? We won't have in depth discussion about it. But I just want folks to know that we do have it back. Leadership hasn't discussed it yet. From a language perspective, I'm not sure whether just replacing grandfathered with exempted works in all cases, but just to note, particularly in this first one, that there is suggested alternate language from ICANN Org, which may be more appropriate. So I just wanted to give folks a heads up that we do have this work back from ICANN Org. And I think it's probably pretty good. So we will get this out to the list probably on Monday so that folks have a chance to review it. And maybe we can work through this for our next call. I'm not sure what we have lined up for the next call, but maybe this is something we can focus on because there's a little bit that we need to go through here. But I think as Hadia said, I think using exempted works, but just from a language perspective, I was a little bit uncomfortable with it, but I've been thinking about it and I think we'll see where we get to. So Satish, when you say we've used transitional exceptions earlier, what do you mean?

SATISH BABU: There is a presentation. If you look up, look in Google about transitional exceptions and grandfathering, the first link is a presentation that this EPDP has made in December, 2023. Sorry, it's not this EPDP, it is a presentation in At-Large. So we have used this term there. So I'm not sure whether it's appropriate for us, but it has been used earlier.

DONNA AUSTIN: Oh, okay. So you mean ALAC in another body of work has come across this problem before with grandfathered and used—

SATISH BABU: Not really. Actually, what happened was we, the ALAC team from the EPDP had made a presentation to CPWG that we had used this phrase.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right. Maxim, what do you mean? It's not appropriate for us.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I meant that GNSO has own procedures. We are working as a GNSO group. If somebody somewhere use some term, some particular way, doesn't necessarily mean we have to do the same. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Right. That's right. But it's also helpful to know that where other parts of ICANN have used a term to replace another term. So I don't think there's any harm in mentioning it. So once leadership has had a chance to review this more thoroughly, which shouldn't take too long, we'll get this out to the group and if folks can work through it. I know ALAC is not part of the GNSO, Maxim, but they are part of ICANN. So consistency across the organization doesn't hurt either. And that's quite correct, Hadia. No one said they had to use the ALAC term. So thank you to ICANN org for working through this for us and coming up with a

terminology that is acceptable from ICANN Org's perspective. And the reason that's important is because it was ICANN Org that submitted the comment, sharing their concerns about the term grandfathered. So that's why we're considering this. So we'll share this with the group on Monday, and then we can have a conversation about it next week. So Saewon, that's filled in another two minutes. Is there anything else that we wanted to go over? Is there anything that anyone from the team wanted to discuss?

SAEWON LEE: So while we wait for the team members to think of more discussion topics, for the outputs themselves, we've actually now, A, reviewed them, obviously, through the public comment review tool. We've started incorporating them into the working document, which for next week, once the team has provided input for the first half of the outputs, we'll go through them first. And then during next week with the grandfathered term, we will also be sharing the updates for the later half of the outputs, which I think we'll be giving the team another 10 days to two weeks after that. So I don't anticipate the team meetings to go for the full two hours, if there aren't enough topics to discuss. It's more about working on the working documents and getting them stabilized at this point.

There are the general comments that we haven't fully incorporated into the working document yet. But as you'll remember, most of the charter questions without responses we had, the team had decided not to incorporate them, and there's a few things that we might need to still stabilize through the leadership staff meeting first, which are the cells

that are highlighted in yellow here. But other than that, I think we are kind of in good shape to finish everything within the time that we have set. So with that, I actually don't have anything more to really discuss or announce. And again, I don't know if that has given the team more time to think what they might want to discuss.

DONNA AUSTIN: So I think we might call an end to this call. But if I could make a request for the leadership team and staff to stay on the call if that's possible, or perhaps if we could drop off this call and rejoin another one, seeing we've got a little bit of time, if that's okay. So thanks, everybody. We will see you same time next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]