EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNS EPDP

Wednesday, 17 July 2024 at 12:00 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/FIBFF

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page:
https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is Devan Reed for the record. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Wednesday. 17, July 2024 at 12:00 UTC. We do have apologies from Maxim Alzoba. All members and alternatives will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have view access to 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 over to our chair, Donna Austin, 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.

DONNA AUSTIN: Welcome everybody to today's call. I don't think I have any updates. I don't know if anyone wants to raise any issues, but I think we could potentially spend a lot of time on trying to get through preliminary recommendation 6 and IG 7. But what I'd like to do is just if we can keep the clock on the conversation and go for about 30 minutes. And I'd like to pull the conversation up there if we can and to focus on reviewing some of the other comments. So that's our plan for that. And then we'll get through the rest of the items. Peter, you had your hand up.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah. I was thinking we're going to start from preliminary recommendation 13 and 15. Because I said, I'm going to get back to the group based on the rationale of NCSG comment.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I think we can probably do that now, Peter. Saewon, can you bring up the relevant comment?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Thanks so much, Donna. So, based on preliminary recommendation 14 and 15, from the comment, we just want some clarity on how RDDS will be used, because the preliminary recommendation 14 said the minimum requirement in we don't want any expansion to RDDS and we don't because of [privacy] reason. And preliminary recommendation 15 says that a registry or registrant may choose to enhance the behavior of the service

[inaudible] RDDS or other [inaudible] to provide additional information, enable other method to provide the following [inaudible]services. We want to understand why this is proposed. That's why we're seeking clarifications and to be able to understand better on what the recommendations seek to achieve. And we don't want anything that will expand RDDS. And if the recommendation seeks to expand RDDS, the NCSG actually object to that. And we just want for the clarification on that from the group to know the directions. And we don't want any additional because the wording suggests that expansions can happen to RDDS. So I just wanted more clarification on that. And that's the basis of the NCSG comment. And my colleagues also here, Emmanuel also can also include based on the rationale because we actually discussed that. Emmanuel, if you're on the call, you can jump in.

EMMANUEL AGBENOMWOSSI: No, I think you are right. Peter is totally right. So Emmanuel for the record. So first of all, apologies. I was not able to join the other meeting because I follow this conversation in KL. Peter was not there. So our conclusion from a call we had yesterday was to seek clarity on how the RDDS would be used as Peter actually captured it. So as we stand right now, the language that is used in both the 14 and 15 is a bit vague for us. So we want to really get clarification on how that will be used. And I think if we have an answer to that, we can actually give our conclusion and our conclusion to that recommendation.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks for that, Emmanuel. So I see Michael's hand up. So go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Michael for the record. I just wanted to clarify myself that I understood that correctly. You're opposing putting that information into the RDDS, even if the registry wants to do that on a voluntary basis, or are you just opposing it if we in the IDN EPDP make it mandatory? Thanks.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: If I can respond to that. Michael, we just want to know what will be added and what kind of information, is this statement actually expanding the RDDS and how RDDS is going to be used? So we are careful of our expansions to RDDS because we sort of like trying to understand how that would be used because the 15 actually make reference to RDDS and then how registry and registrar actually use that and then have access to those information. So we want to know if it's going to be some things that we expand RDDS. So we need to discuss that [inaudible] see how that is impacted. And we understand that this can lead to privacy reasons. And we just want to know who have access to that and how that will work.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Peter. So, Michael, did you have anything to add or are you okay with that answer from Peter?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I'm not sure yet. It seems like you have some privacy issues that may arise if a registry voluntarily adds that variant information to the RDDS. If that's the case, I tend to disagree because I would still make it optionally possible for registries to publish this in the RDDS and I don't see any privacy issues because it's just linking two or more domains without further information about those domains. Not who is having it or no contact data, just saying these two domains exist and are variants.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, Peter, quick follow-up and then we'll try to wrap this up.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Michael, you said voluntarily adding. So, voluntarily adding in what sense? So, that simply means registries ... they can voluntarily add any kind of information that they needed, right? So, we, because RDDS, it's something that can expose people's data, information, and so we're careful on how this will be done. And we're concerned with a registry or registrant may choose to enhance the behavior. That word is too vague and we need to do something about it because different stakeholders can interpret that information differently and they can leverage this to have whatever information to the RDDS. So, we just need to be careful in our words. Okay. Thank you, Michael.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Peter. So, we'll go to Nigel and then wrap this up. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much. I had exactly the same point, I thought really this is not unusual at all. This is just putting information about the variants into a process. And clearly the contracted parties concerned have to respect data protection as they do in any other operation. It's not unique to this particular exercise. So, I think we have to note these concerns, but I don't think they affect recommendation anyway. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Nigel. And I think from Peter and Emmanuel, I get the sense that whenever there's a mention of RDDS and how it impacts existing recommendations that may have come out of the GDPR EPDP, then there's a concern of impacting in some way those recommendations. And I think we're cognizant of that. And it's not our intention to negatively impact that or unsettle, I suppose, for want of a better word, the recommendations as they are. I think when we had the conversation on this last week, there was some concern about the implementation guidance and the reference to the suggestion that RDDS could be one way of recording the information. So, I think that's still unsettled and it's something that we're working through. But, Peter, I understand that what you're seeking is clarification about what we're trying to do with this recommendation. So, if it's something that you would formally want us to respond to, we can do that. Or if you're satisfied with the conversation we've had here, that would be good if you could just let us know and see if there's more that we need to do here too. Because I guess what I don't understand is even with the clarification, are there still concerns from the NCSG with

EN

the recommendation as it is? So, Peter, I don't know whether that's an old hand or a new hand.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: That's an old hand, but let me just speak to that. So, good for us to be having these conversations and thanks for the clarification, Donna and everyone. I still believe that the wordings actually can be interpreted wrongly. I would ask if we can revisit that or if possible to drop that to avoid any confusion and any further interpretations on that.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, and just the process that we're running through here, Peter, is to run through all the comments we've received. And we'll get together to work out whether we need to make any changes. I think where we were heading on this, and my memory might be a bit spotty, is that implementation guidance 15 might be changed in some way or we might move away from it entirely. So, and if that's the case, the NCSG concerns might fade away with that. So, we still have a little bit of work to do based on the last conversation we had with the team. Edmon, I think you had trouble raising your hand and you had something to add.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, hopefully you can hear me. I think I understand the concern. Again, Edmon here speaking personally. I understand the concern and maybe part of the wording adjustment can address PII, personal identifiable data, specifically, and maybe adding a sentence that... I don't know whether adding a sentence

that specifically says registry or registrar should avoid disclosing personally identifiable data would be the right way to go. Because overall, the intent is to provide technical data so that the management of variants and IDNs could be more, quote unquote, user friendly, as in users such as zone managers and DNS managers and hosting providers and those kind of things. So, the intent is to provide additional information that supports the technical operation. So, what we can probably add in the explanation is to specifically call out to avoid additional kind of exposure of personal identifiable data. And that should address that particular issue.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon, for that suggestion. It seems pretty reasonable. I don't know what we have in the recommendation, but I think we could, if that would satisfy the concerns of the NCSG, then I think we can certainly add that to the rationale in some way. Sorry, Peter?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: I was thinking, do you want a response? Because I thought you wanted an agreement on that line. So [I thought] there is a clarity on that. If there is no clarity on that, then we can totally drop it.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, so we've had this conversation, we understand, we thank you for clarifying the concerns. And we've still got to wrap up our thinking about where we're headed on this recommendation. And as I said, it may be dropped, but we still need to review that and

see where we are. And then there's also Edmon's suggestion that we could add some language to the rationale about the privacy data. And I'm not keeping up with the chat very well today, but it looks like we've got some agreement in that regard already.

Okay, thanks for that, Peter, and thanks for coming back. I must admit I'd forgotten about that, so that's great that you've come back to us on that. All right, so what we're going to go to now is recommendation... Don't have it in front of me. I think it's 6 and implementation guidance 17. I don't know. But if you can share on the screen the request we got to this group from Sarmad. Okay, thanks.

So during the week, leadership received a request from Sarmad in his role as ICANN org that it's... I'm going to try to be objective in this, that some of our recommendations around harmonizing IDN tables are seen by some as a dependency for the RSP program, which is the Registry Service Provider Program, which is intended to launch in November. So there was a recommendation that came out of the new gTLD PDP that there be an RSP program that enables RSPs to... I'm going to get the language wrong, but they certify that they are [inaudible] ahead of the opening of the new gTLD program. And that program is due to launch in November. Sarmad is suggesting that some of our work is a dependency on that. So he's requesting that specifically around the harmonization of IDN tables. Those questions that we have in front of us, can we get those, stabilize that language so that ICANN can kick off some work to try to develop the tables, I suppose, or the data that's required for the tables.

So notwithstanding that, I personally am not sure whether it's appropriate for us to go this way because we're in the middle of doing a PDP that has certain processes that our recommendations need to be considered by the GNSO Council. And if approved, they will go to the board for approval. And then if the board's okay with that, they will request that work be done to implement and implementation review team will be set up. So there's a long tail to this process. We are aiming to have all the recommendations for this PDP to the GNSO Council in October. So we don't intend to finish our work. It's unlikely that we'll finish our work before that. So this is a request we have from Sarmad. And to be honest, I don't even know if it's appropriate for this group to have a conversation about the request or whether it's something that we should get guidance from Council on. But this is a request we have.

So first of all, I want to see if there's any reaction to the request, if there's any concerns about the request, and then we'll get into the recommendations themselves. So that's my first question. Does anyone have any concerns about this? Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Hello, Donna, everyone. Dennis here for the transcript. So I echo your concerns in terms of process. But let's put that aside. And for a minute, I just want to understand, makes me uncomfortable, the wording of dependency of each other. That means that one's needs to end in order for other to begin. So I really want to understand, because there are dates thrown in here, dependencies. Taking a step back, I understand Org's request, having the data and ready for something. The timing makes me a

EN

little bit uncomfortable. So maybe Sarmad, if you're on the call, can you clarify? The question is, do you want these data to be ready for the RSP program to start? Or do you just want to get a head start so that you don't have to wait the process that Donna laid out in terms of how PDP, all the phases of the recommendations actually become consensus policy and contract requirements? So if you can help me clarify what dependency you see. I see that you want data in order to improve process upon, but not sure there is a dependency here that we should be focused on. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Go ahead, Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Donna. And thank you, Dennis. So I think we've actually been talking with the RSP team. What they're doing is they're automating the testing completely, or at least that's what they're attempting, which means that they would not want to do any manual testing. They would, in this context as well, what the intentions are that given the data, we develop the test cases. And then once the RSP applications come in, the tests are run automatically and the evaluation is done quite efficiently.

That obviously is dependent on the final set of data which is decided against this requirement. As you can imagine, this requirement is on IDN tables and IDN tables are, I guess, part of the process for RSP evaluation. So idea eventually is that if this recommendation is stable and we know how, for example, an

expert group constitution and aim is, then we can set up that group and they can develop the data, we can get some head start. Obviously, pending GNSO and board consideration of these recommendations. And if those are done, we would have a head start on data and then, and the test cases which are developed and that will help automating the RSP testing. If it's not done, I guess we can still do RSP testing. So it's not dependency as it's written, I think it contributes to the efficiency of the RSP testing process. It's just the, I guess, timelines we have, we thought if this is something which the group could take up and if this is something which you find reasonable, we can move forward with that in that direction. Otherwise, of course, the fallback is that some of that testing would potentially be manual. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Sarmad, the email isn't explicit about the recommendations, but I assume what you're talking about is recommendation 6 and implementation guidance 7. Are they the only two recommendations?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes, they are. So these are the ones which, I guess we've been discussing on developing the minimal set of variants. And since there is, I guess, test data dependency on it, we would need to develop those tables to find out what the test data would be to put into the automatic testing process. Again, as I said, it's an efficiency thing. If we have the data, we can automate the testing. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Sarmad. All right. So it kind of seems that it would be a nice to have, but it's not actually a dependency and it's not going to hold up the RSP program if we don't have this recommendation language in a stable position. Peter?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: What specific language changes do they want? Do they propose a kind of what are you looking at and what do they want to see in the recommendation? I just wanted to know to be able to determine whether it's a significant change and is going to require efforts. And I'm concerned about the process as well and how that will work out.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Peter. So I don't think there's any suggestion from Sarmad about what the recommendation should look like or what the language should be. I think that's still for the team here to decide. This is more about a request that if there's some way that we can, I guess, prioritize our consideration of recommendation 6 and IG7 and try to finalize that language so that maybe some work can commence, that would be very helpful to the RSP program in the work that they're going to kick off. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. I was wondering if it's enough if we end up with a recommendation that says that IDN tables need to be harmonized. Is that enough for the RSP program to go ahead?

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: To be honest, I don't know, but I suspect that everybody on this call is aware that recommendation 6 and implementation guidance 7, it took the registries and Sarmad and some of the registrars a long time to come up with the language that we had in the draft report. When we had a conversation about it and the comments that we received, it seemed to me that there was still work to be done. And that's what we're trying to work through now. So I don't want to presuppose anything because we haven't finalized the language in the recommendation. So that's up to us. That's the responsibility of this team to come up with recommendation language that we are comfortable with. And it may be that depending on what that recommendation language is, there may be nothing that has to be done for the RSP program. So if we went back to where we were before the face to face meeting, I think the recommendation was harmonization of tables was at the discretion of the registries. And that would have been it. But thanks to conversations that have been had since then, we're at a little bit of a different place and we're trying to sort that language out so that we've got a recommendation that everyone's comfortable with.

Okay, so with that. And I'm really sorry, but I'm not doing a very good job of keeping up with the chat. So if Steve or Daniel is able to do that, that would be really helpful. Saewon, can you bring up the spreadsheet and the language that we originally had in the final report for 6 and 7?

So preliminary recommendation 6, which we discussed quite a bit on the last call. So the baseline criteria for implementing IDNs at

the second level must be security and stability of the DNS. Registry operators, ICANN Org and other relevant stakeholders must develop minimum IDN variant deployment requirements, in brackets, i.e. variant sets, that do not compromise the stability and security of the DNS. And then I think implementation guidance 7 speaks to the how.

So in that conversation that we had last week, actually, no, bring the implementation guidance up now, Saewon, sorry. Okay. So the how is that ICANN Org, gTLD registries, and other relevant stakeholders should collaborate to develop minimum IDN variant deployment requirements, i.e. variant sets at second level. This should include blah, blah, blah. Okay. So if you can take us back to seven, six, please, Saewon. Okay.

So there are a few things that came out of the conversation that we had either last week or the week before. Satish raised concerns about i.e. variant sets, because there was some misunderstanding about what that meant. So I think we reached an understanding that what it means is that it would include variant sets, but not necessarily limited to that. So we've tried to address that.

Dennis was concerned that generally what happens at the second level is the responsibility of the registry operator. So there was concern about if there is a group put together to do some work in this regard where does that responsibility fall? So he thought that implementation guidance 7 might be all right, but wanted to see some revised language from the leadership team.

And then we had this request from Sarmad. And for me, if we can reach a level of comfort that we stabilized some language with the understanding that work may start on that before we complete our normal running of a PDP, then we'd have to come up with language that couldn't or wouldn't be ambiguous in the event that that it's not going to go through council, the board's not going to look at it, it's not going to get to an IRT. So how do we fashion a recommendation that will provide a level of comfort that if this is picked up and dealt with before that, would that provide a level of comfort for the team and also those that would be impacted? Dennis, did you want to go ahead now? Okay. We'll move on and maybe Dennis will come back.

So the recommendation, so leadership played with the recommendation a little bit to try to make it a little bit, I don't know, more succinct and less ambiguous. So the proposed recommendation that we've put up for, and look, this is only for a conversation. We're not wedded to this. We're trying to find a path forward. So we would have recommendation 6, but we would lose the implementation guidance recommendation.

So 6 would be the baseline criteria for implementing IDNs at the second level must be security and stability of the DNS. ICANN Org and gTLD registry operators in consultation with other relevant stakeholders, including ICANN accredited registrars, are responsible for developing and reaching full consensus agreement on a minimum set of IDN variant sets at the second level that will satisfy the baseline criteria of security and stability of the DNS.

So, looking at 6 and implementation guidance 7 and considering the conversation we previously had and also the request from

Sarmad, this is a proposal that leadership is putting forward for discussion. So I'll open the floor up now and see if we've got any reactions to it or any other comments that you wanted to make, because I know this language only hit your mailboxes probably less than 24 hours ago. So, Dennis, did you want to go ahead?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna and Dennis for the record. Yeah, thank you. Yeah, as you said, we just got this language in the morning, a few hours ago. My first reaction, the main things that I think we agree with Org [inaudible]conversations. So I'm curious to hear Sarmad's reaction to these and whether notwithstanding all the conversation that we've had about process and whatnot, whether this satisfies his need for specific data points or requirements in the pursuit of seeking efficiencies in developing these minimum requirements.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So I'll go to Hadia and then Sarmad would have only just seen this language in the last 24 hours too, so it's probably news to him too. So Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. So the language seems okay, but my question is in relation to when. So when will this happen?

DONNA AUSTIN: What do you mean by when? What's this Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, when is ICANN Org and gTLD registry operators and other relevant stakeholders, including ICANN accredited registrars, when are they going to develop together and reach for consensus on a minimum set of IDN variant deployment requirements?

DONNA AUSTIN: If we get consensus on this recommendation from the group and we follow the normal course of PDP, then the work would start on this when the IRT starts. So whenever the board approves recommendations and says CEO, instruct your team to implement these recommendations, so the work would start around then. What Sarmad seems to be suggesting is that the RSP program is looking to kick off in November, so there seems to be some urgency to kick this off whenever this group reaches agreement on we're we think that this language is in a good place and it's stable. So it could be if we finalize this language in the next two weeks, then maybe everyone's comfortable with the process of doing this outside process, then it could start in in a couple of weeks or a month. Peter and then Sarmad, I'd really like to—if you have—what's your thinking on the question of timing that Hadia has raised. So Peter and then Sarmad.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Thank you, Donna. Yeah, sorry, my apologies if this has been discussed because from the wording, so minimum set, right. So is there a reference to any documents that really define the minimum set?

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: I think in the original implementation guidance, which we could keep as implementation guidance, I suppose, there is a reference to a set of documents. Saewon, could you quickly flick to IG7? So this should include respecting IDNA 2008 IDN implementation guidelines in any future versions of the two documents. And I guess could also include those other things. So we could keep that in the implementation guidance. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right, thank you, Donna. So in, I guess, trying to respond to Dennis. The language is fine. My only, I guess, concern was about reaching full consensus. Some of these discussions are, I think, based on experience we've had supporting the generation panels. Some of these discussions are difficult and full consensus may actually— if we can get it, that's excellent. But sometimes if people come from different perspectives, for example when you're considering minimum requirements, some people may have a more conservative perspective. Some people may have a more liberal perspective. So normally a rough consensus generally works, but full consensus becomes more difficult. That's the only concern from a procedural perspective when we run the panel. But again, I'd leave it to the group to decide what's the best way forward. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Donna. I do have a question about the new text and I'm reacting to it. I just looked at it probably an hour before the call started. If this is already defined, what is the in consultation part? Can I get a little bit of clarity maybe from staff?

DONNA AUSTIN: So this is the challenge we have, right? So some of this is going to have to be decided by ICANN Org and the gTLD registry operators. And this is just me putting a process hat on. Normally this would go through the IRT and they would sort that out, but if this gets taken out of the process, then we need to think about what would work.

So the way that this is structured, it's done so that the onus is really on ICANN Org and the gTLD registry operators to sort out how they're going to take this forward. So they will need to consult with these other relevant stakeholders to include registrars. And they will decide who's going to be involved and how they're going to be involved. So some of it is deliberately a bit vague so you can kind of work it out.

To Sarmad's point about reaching full consensus, yeah, I know it's a high bar and it's a difficult bar to reach, but I'm also aware that the concern that we discussed last week, or the week before, about ultimately this will fall on registry operators to implement. So there has to be a level of agreement for registry operators. So what's the best way to achieve that? So I understand that that is a high bar and probably something we need to talk about. So Jen, it's hard, and even in Sarmad's email that came through, he's talking about setting up a panel and I don't know what Sarmad

EN

had in mind when he put together that email about what form that panel would take.

So some of this, if we need to get really detailed on it and prescribe how this is going to happen, we can do that. Or if we decide that we want this recommendation to follow the normal course of any PDP, does that mean that the recommendation is okay as it is because it will go through that implementation review cycle? So it's a little bit of a challenge and a few, I don't know, needles we're trying to thread here, which makes it hard.

SAEWON LEE: Donna, there is a question in the chat. So relevant stakeholders and registrars will not be counted when assessing the full consensus, correct? And that is a reading that some members are also getting from this language.

DONNA AUSTIN: It could be. And it might not be. So, I guess my thinking was that the ICANN Org and the gTLD registries would definitely have to come to a full consensus agreement because otherwise it's not going to work. But you would hope that in the consultation along the way, or Sarmad suggested that they set up a panel, then that consensus would include everybody else. So if we want to get prescriptive about how this happens, then we're going to have to tidy up this language and make it really prescriptive. And I think that's probably applicable if we want this to go, if we're comfortable with it being split out from the other recommendations and considered earlier.

EN

So some questions for the group. Is there a level of comfort that ICANN, or the gTLD registry operators would be the, I guess, the primary stakeholders in developing the IDN [variant] deployment requirements? Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right, I think another potential relevant stakeholder is the end user script community, which is going to be using these variants. And I'm not sure what role all of you are thinking from their perspective, because eventually the impact is on the potential confusability between two labels, which are I guess, variants of each other. And getting that perspective, I think, from the script community is also important. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So they are relevant stakeholders, but are they—this is where it gets really hard. Because from the conversation we've just had, I don't feel comfortable sending this—I don't think there's a level of comfort with what we have here that work can start on this, because of these unknowns. So we either have to get really prescriptive about who would be involved in this group and how it would work, or we leave it kind of as it is and we wait for the end of the, we agree that this stays in as a part of the PDP and is not to be considered earlier.

Right, so Nigel says, so I see it as a discussion that leads to an agreement of full consensus of registry operators, but perhaps need to discuss more. And Jen said the script community would be a relevant stakeholder, but not the stakeholders included in the

EN

full consensus call, as suggested in this proposed text. So if ICANN Org and gTLD registry operators in consultation with other relevant stakeholders, including ICANN accredited registrars—and Sarmad, maybe we can add in script communities are responsible for developing a minimum set of IDN variant deployment requirements, including the rest of it. Full consensus, the ICANN Org and gTLD registry operators must reach full consensus agreement on the minimum requirements or something to that effect. So we identify Basically that ICANN org and registry operators are the primary leads on it in consultation with other stakeholders. They'll develop a minimum set. And then there's something in there that says that it is intended that ICANN org and gTLD registry operators are to reach consensus agreement on the requirements or something like that. Or full consensus agreement. So we can break it down that way.

Okay. And Satish is saying full consensus is between ICANN Org and gTLD registries. The others are consulted. Which I think is what I'm trying to say, but I'm bumbling along here. Okay, so does that provide a level of comfort with folks that we could potentially do some more noodling on the language, or if anyone else wants to suggest any other language? Dennis and then Sarmad.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. I'm sorry, I was distracted with the keeping up with the chat. Where is this last line that is being put in the below the recommendation in black letters that says script communities are responsible for developing a minimum set of IDN variants?

EN

DONNA AUSTIN:
So I'm not sure who's typing, but I think it's Saewon or something trying to keep up with what thoughts are going through my head. I think what we're trying to do here, Dennis, is from the conversation we've just had, I think there's agreement that ICANN org and gTLD registry operators are the primary stakeholders in developing and agreeing the minimum requirements. But they have to consult with other relevant stakeholders, which includes ICANN accredited registrars and script communities. But ultimately, in order for any of this to be adopted, full consensus has to be reached between ICANN org and registry operators.

DENNIS TAN:
Thank you, Donna. Yeah, I'm fine with that. It's just the characterization that script communities are responsible for developing the minimum set. I don't agree with that. They have developed a version of IDN variant sets, but not sure I agree with minimum set. That implies that is the standard or something along those lines.

DONNA AUSTIN:
Got it. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:
Yeah, I just wanted to flag that of course, as you would appreciate as ICANN, we don't have expertise in all these scripts. So that's why we consult the script communities. And so in any case, if you see an ICANN's role here, that would be not based on their direct expertise of the script. But of course, information they have

coming in from the relevant stakeholders. I just wanted to flag that. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks. Okay. So I think we'll do a little bit more noodling on this. And if folks sleep on it and come back with some other thoughts. Jen, I appreciate that this came in late and the registries haven't had a chance to look at it. So that's another conversation. So we'll try to get something done. We may not get it done in between now and the next meeting, but the one after that, maybe we'll come back and discuss this again. And see where we get to. And then in addition to that, maybe we'll try to start a conversation on the email thread, but I'd like to get some thoughts about what the preference is for how we respond to someone's request. Okay. So let's move on, Saewon.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you. And I should have done this earlier, but I guess the order of things kind of threw me off. I just want to share with you all the spreadsheet. And again, so sorry that I didn't share this earlier. We do seem to be on track in the sense that I think this discussion, though not concluded, at least finished within the time that we had set. And I know we kind of touched upon the recommendation 14 and IG15 in the beginning of the call, but I did want to mention that we also note that this discussion has also not concluded and it will pick up again, but the leadership and staff have decided to come back to this at the next meeting or the next ... So we'll just start picking up from implementation guidance 17 per the order of our comments in the output.

EN

So again, picking up from where we left off on implementation guidance 17. And similar to before, let me recap everyone on the charter question as well as the output. But this charter question was actually relevant to outputs, the preliminary recommendation 14, 15 and until 16. So maybe I won't read everything and only the output that follows.

And as you all remember, the charter question D8 was asking what additional updates to the registry agreement are necessary or if there are any that are not included in the list of examples provided in the screen that you can see right now to ensure the labels under variant TLDs follow the same entity rule. And the implementation guidance 17, registry operators should publish policies in a transparent manner that reflect their implementation of the EPDP IDNs phase two recommendations. In particular, such policies should reflect the implementation of preliminary recommendations 1, 3 to 5, 14 and implementation guidance 2. So that was the output. O that was the recommendation, the guidance.

There was a non-substantive comment from the Registries Stakeholder Group, as you can see in the screen right now. And for this implementation guidance, the suggestion was to revise the wording. Let me read the new wording that they have suggested, as you can see in C9. They suggest that... So new wording is asking to drop preliminary recommendation 14 from the list. So changing the wording to everything's the same for the first sentence and then the second sentence changing to. In particular, such policies should reflect the implementation of preliminary

recommendations 1, 3 to 5 and implementation guidance 2. So deleting preliminary recommendation 14, as I just mentioned.

The rationale that the Registries Stakeholder Group gave was to drop this recommendation from the list of policies to be mentioned here so as to be consistent with Registries Stakeholder Group's response to recommendation 14, where it was asking to change the requirement to be a future work development with relevant stakeholders. So here I'll pause to open up the floor for discussions or any additional information from the Registries Stakeholder Group representatives. And I know we have to consider that we haven't really concluded our discussions for 14 and 15. But we did want to get the sense of how the team considered this suggestion. Yes, please, Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks. I think it actually does make more sense for us to finish 14 because 14 is in our comment to recommendation 14. It is to do with, let me just go back to the matrix. I'm trying to do this mobile. Yeah, this is regarding additional work and also our clarification that it is not a public service. So if you're looking at the text in 17, I mean, it would make no sense if we didn't finish 14 [inaudible].

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Jen. Donna, would you agree? Should we just come back to this after we conclude?

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah.

SAEWON LEE: Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. So recommendation 14 basically speaks about two things. One is providing a service that enables discovering the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name, including an indication of the source domain name. So I'm not sure, are we dropping—So I think it doesn't matter whether the service, there are much details about the service itself, about the service that discovers the allocated variant or the allocated set. But I think it's important to mention that there needs to be such a service. So what this service returns, like the details, maybe they're not important at this point in time. And I think the discussions we were having were about what exactly the service will be returning. Is it the variant? Is it the variant set? Is it the variant set and the source? But we agreed that we need to have such a service. So, I would say we stick to whatever that assures the existence of a service. The details of the service does not really matter at this point. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. So, we've got other comments that we can look at that's not connected to 14, is that correct?

SAEWON LEE: Yes.

DONNA AUSTIN: Let's move on and do that.

SAEWON LEE: The next two outputs with comments, which are preliminary recommendation 18 and preliminary recommendation 20, which is the last one, they both have the same charter question G1 related to idea and implementation guidelines. So, I'll read them all together for recap purposes and then look into the comments one by one.

So, charter question G1, what should be the proper vehicle to update the idea and implementation guidelines? Preliminary recommendation 18 states or advised the existing process for developing and updating the idea and implementation guidelines that includes establishing a working group of community experts and ICANN org staff under the governance of ICANN board IDN UA working group, or its relevant successor in the future must be maintained. The process for developing and updating the idea and implementation guidelines must be formalized and documented to enhance its predictability, transparency, rigor, efficiency and effectiveness. The ICANN board IDN UA working group, or its relevant successor will be responsible for documenting the process in consultation with the ICANN community. The documented process must be approved by the GNSO council, the ccNSO council and the ICANN board.

Recommendation 20 says any future versions of the idea and implementation guidelines must be approved by the GNSO council and the ccNSO council prior to consideration and approval by the ICANN board. The comments for both outputs were from Registries Stakeholder Group again and let me go back to preliminary recommendation 18.

So for 18, the suggestion is to revise the wording related to who is in charge of the process and what, while 20 is about the ratification of the process when updating the idea and implementation guidelines. I do want to call Donna for more background related to previous discussions on this within this group. As well as Steve to provide some historical background in the ICANN Org procedures.

But before doing so. just to present the comments and suggestions from the Registries Stakeholder Group. So for 18, the suggestion for the revised wording is deleting the working group, so it becoming the existing process for developing and updating the IDN implementation guidelines that includes establishing a working group of community experts and ICANN Org staff under the governance of ICANN board must be maintained.

So when seeing the rationale, I do want to get more clarity from the Registries Stakeholder Group if the suggestions for the next three sentences are also to get rid of with the working group and for the third one to get rid of ccNSO as well. But no other suggestions or revised wording was given to those, but in the rationale, they want the revised wording to reflect the board oversight on this process as the working group is not a permanent structure. I do see hands, but I'll just finish until the end of 18.

And then as the Registries Stakeholder Group—And my mentioning of the ccNSO issue was because in the rationale, the Registries Stakeholder Group also mentions that the policy recommendations coming out of the IDN EPDP should not direct what the ccNSO must do with respect to IDN implementation guidelines. So I know Donna and Steve may want to provide some more background on this, but I'll go to the hands or the queue first if that's okay. Alan, please.

ALAN BARRETT: [inaudible] for myself, I can't say what the board would say, but I would support removing reference to any board substructures. And if you want board oversight, I think it's good to refer only to the board as a whole.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Alan. Edmond. Yeah, kind of likewise as what Alan said, speaking personally, that I think makes sense. I would, however, also like to raise one particular issue. I see that the response from the RySG seems to put a little bit of focus on the ccNSO and how they are part of the process. I actually think that is not a problem. We're not dictating what the ccNSO does. What we're saying actually is that let's say the GNSO agrees and the ccNSO does not agree, then the IDN implementation guidelines are not updated. But if they are not updated, the gTLD registries and ICANN can still update the RA, the registry agreement, to put additional things in. So that actually does not limit or dictate what the ccNSO does or not do or what the gTLDs do or not do.

So I think I would encourage the registries to go back and rethink this because we're saying that if the IDN implementation guidelines, which currently has some implications to both gTLDs and CCTLDs, when it is updated, I think it is correct that both councils should be okay with it for the entire thing to be updated, but if either side doesn't agree or if either side wants additional stuff, they are free to do so. There's nothing in the recommendation to bar that, whether it is the ccNSO going further or the GNSO going further. So I feel that it might have been a bit of a lack of a better word to say it, a bit of a knee-jerk reaction, say, hey, we are not subjected to ccNSO. But actually, it does the other way around. So, if both SOs agree, then the entire guidelines get updated. But if one side doesn't agree, it doesn't stop either side pushing forward the best practices for IDN implementation. I want to clarify that and I want to encourage the RySG to rethink this.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. So, just a little bit of context on the, and just thinking back to when we had this conversation, which we spent quite a bit of time on. So, we did talk about whether it was the ICANN board, because what we were trying to do here is just simply replicate what happens now. Because there is a process that happens now, but it's not documented. Currently, it's not the ICANN board big ICANN board. It's just the ICANN board IDN UA working group that currently oversees it. So, that's why we put that in. But I can see that really, there's not much distinction. So unless anybody has any strong objections, I think that it's okay that we

EN

just take out the reference to the IDN UA working group and just leave it as the ICANN board.

Similar to what Edmon has just said about the ccNSO. So I appreciate that this is a GNSO council process. We did receive a request from the board that the ccNSO also has an effort underway that relates to IDNs. Can you make sure that the two efforts are aligned? We had a conversation with the ccNSO IDN PDP about this particular issue and there was no objection. They were supportive of it. And I think the other thing to keep in mind is, I think some of the concern is not only is this not a ccNSO process, but I think it's well understood that CCs have discretion as to whether they adopt ICANN policies or adopt IDN implementation guidelines. But I think it is fair that, or reasonable that the ccNSO Council, in addition to the GNSO Council, actually signs off on the process. I actually think it's good for governance and as ccTLDs will likely be involved in any of the implementation guidelines work, then you know, that seems to be a good thing to do as well. So I agree with Edmon, and I just wanted to make the point that we also did consult with the CCs on this, the group is involved in their IDN, and they were supportive of the approach. Hadia, you had your hand up? Is there anything you wanted to add?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No, no, thank you, Donna. I just wanted to stress on that this is only about processes and whether the implementation guidelines are adopted or not or by the ccNSO or GNSO, the recommendation basically speaks to the process and not to the outcome of the process. Thank you.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: That's correct. All right. So I think Alan's comments and Edmon's comments, and also what I'm seeing in chat is that I don't think there's any objection to just making the reference, the ICANN board do away with the IDN UA working group and all relevant successes. So I think we can delete that. But I think there is support for leaving in the reference to the ccNSO council. Interested to hear from the registries whether this is something that is really important to them. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. So I'm still not liking the idea of having in the policy recommendation given the ccNSO a say on our policymaking process. I think I would be comfortable with giving that oversight to the board and the board decides whether it's appropriate to call for any consultation observations or whatever they want to call it for the ccNSO. But let's put the oversight in the hands of the board. And the board will decide what is appropriate process to finalize, approve and get these IDN guidelines published. But given explicit role for the ccNSO council, which by the way, we know they don't issue policy for second level domain names, then I don't think that's appropriate. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So this recommendation, as Hadia noted, is specifically related to pretty much confirming the process that happens now for the IDN implementation guidelines. It's not about adopting the guidelines themselves. That's a separate

recommendation. So this is really just about agreeing the process. And I think it's probably good governance to have this ccNSO Council [inaudible] at the moment because I know that Jen agrees with you is that we could be in a position here that we don't have full consensus agreement on this recommendation, but we do have consensus agreement. And we would note the registries' view that ccNSO council should not be included in the approval process. So that's how I'm reading it at the moment. So unless anybody has anything else to add, I think we'd probably move on.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Donna. So we'll move on to recommendation 20. Again, it's in line with 18. Registries Stakeholder Group simply believes that if preliminary recommendation 18 is updated, then preliminary recommendation 20 is unnecessary. But I understand that there's some processes involved where Steve may want to provide some background on this. So I'll hand the floor over to Steve or Donna for more historical background and procedural details.

DONNA AUSTIN: So I think this is really about the point that Hadia made. So recommendation 18, the one we just looked at, is about formalizing and documenting the current process for developing IDN implementation guidelines. Recommendation 20 is about how future versions of the guidelines themselves must be approved. So it's a different topic. So I think we do need a recommendation here for how future versions of the IDN guidelines should be approved. So any thoughts around this one? Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. Again, as you mentioned, Donna, so recommendation 18 is very different than recommendation 20. And I do think we need them both, because one sets the process, and the other is about the approval. And putting them together, I don't think is a good idea, because if you want to change something in the recommendation 20 related to process, you can do so without actually touching the recommendation that speaks about approvals. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Hadia. So I think the conversation we had around 18 and the concerns that whether the fact that CCs—even though they can be involved in the development of the IDN guidelines, it doesn't become a requirement for them. At any point, it's discretionary. They can adopt them if they wish. But they don't have to. So Jen and Dennis, I don't know whether the suggestion here from the registries is that we remove recommendation 18. I don't think there's support for that. But maybe this is where we should have the discussion about whether it's appropriate for the ccNSO Council to approve the IDN implementation guidelines, or whether that should simply be the GNSO Council and the board given the concerns about setting policy. Any thoughts here, anyone? Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes. I'm just wondering, it seems like not the whole ccNSO is affected by these IDN guidelines, but only the ones that applied

EN

for IDN version. Would it be possible or does it make sense to only include those part of the ccNSO, those registries that have actually signed up to follow the guidelines? Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. I kind of think from a practical perspective, that's difficult to do. So I think that the ccNSO Council is probably simpler and would have the same effect. I don't know when we had the discussion around the IDN implementation guidelines about when the group that's put together, how they reach agreement on the guidelines themselves, whether that's consensus or full consensus agreement. I can't remember whether there's a standard there about what would constitute agreement that something makes it into the IDN implementation guidelines. So it may be that we can, as I said, remove the ccNSO Council from this recommendation and just leave that the future guidelines must be approved by the GNSO Council prior to consideration and approval by the board.

But it looks like I'm drawing blanks on this and nobody wants to have a conversation around it. Bottom line is I don't think we have [support] to remove [recommendation]20 as suggested by the RySG. All right, I think we can move on.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you. Okay, so I know that we still have to come back to some outputs for further discussion and obviously resolve some of them through the working document itself. But this does conclude the public comments that were linked to each specific output. And so with the time remaining, I think we have around 25 minutes or so we'll move on to the other section, which does include

comments on glossary, general comments and those charter questions without the team's responses. So among the other comments to see the glossary related comments first, which I think we may only have time for today.

So this was section three of the report and the submission guide form, guided submission form requested any comments for the glossary section, if any, to those commenters. There were three groups that commented on the glossary. And the first one was from NCSG. So the comment from NCSG related to the glossary was requesting, for consistency and accuracy purposes, adding rights protection mechanisms, PDP working group to the glossary, just like the SubPro PDP working group is set out. Maybe it's, I think, easier to show through the working document. So let me just share with you the working document of section three.

So currently in the glossary, there is a rights protection mechanism RPM entered in the glossary list, but not any mention of the PDP working group. But as you can see here, the SubPro mentions the PDP working group. Let me just also show you RPM just in case. Okay. So this is how it's entered currently, and it doesn't show the PDP working group. And as this working group and its results are also referenced throughout our report in the context of URS and TMCH, they suggest that the working group must be referenced as well.

So the way that NCSG suggests is to place the RPM PDP working group under this RPM entry or just after, similar to the SubPro PDP working group and how it's entered. So I'll just open the floor for any feedback from the team or if anyone agrees with that.

DONNA AUSTIN: Any objection from anyone to adding RPM PDP to this? It's like it's only going in the glossary. I think, Saewon, you said it is mentioned in the text when we talk about rights protection.

SAEWON LEE: We got an "I don't mind" from Michael. Okay. So I think more and more we're getting no objections. And if so, then we'll try to incorporate the PDP working group into this entry itself, similar to how it's done for the SubPro PDP working group.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yep. Sounds good.

SAEWON LEE: We do have Peter in the queue. Would you like to go ahead, Peter?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, thanks,. You captured that accurately. However, the second part is what we're concerned. We know that this is technical and we just want a situation where that can be simplified for all those people that are less technical to be able to understand. It's just like a kind of consideration for less technical. Well, it's actually so we just want that because from the noncommercial perspective, we don't really have technical background, like others that would be able to understand it for people that needs to pick that they need to be able to understand basically in a simplified manner. Okay, so

EN

if we can find the way to craft some world in some language that will be less technical, that will be great.

DONNA AUSTIN: Peter, do you mean throughout the body of the document or are you talking about the readability of the document as a whole?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, the readability. Yeah. And the glossary, the way we describe some technical language.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Peter. I think unfortunately that's just a challenge of the subject that we're dealing with. We've tried to be pretty conscious of making this making the readability as best we can. But it is it is confusing and it is technical. So we've done the best that we can. So I'm not sure what improvements we could make. So unless we see some suggestions, I think that the suggestion is difficult for us to respond to. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. I'm not really sure what Peter is asking for because, well, they say in the comment that we need clear confirmation, the different words spelled the same different languages, including with diacritic marks may coexist. And we have clearly stated that the variants are defined by the root zone label generation rules. And so this can never happen unless the root zone label generation rules allow it. So I guess this is the answer. Thank you.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. And thanks, Michael, for the comment that, you know, the topic is rather complex, so it's not easy to remove complexity from the document. All right. Let's keep going.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you. And thank you for raising that, Peter. I did want to go through the glossary first and come back to the general comments, but thank you for providing clarity from the NCSG. And maybe we'll come back to it again, or just move on from that.

There is a comment in the chat from Alan suggesting that examples may be useful. So, maybe that's something that the leadership and staff could consider when circulating the language. So, again, thank you for that. So, the second, again, just moving on with the glossary comments.

So, the next glossary comment was by the Registries Stakeholder Group, and we did actually deal with this before. So, this one is related to the preliminary recommendation nine, requesting an additional entry of the initial source domain name. So basically, the Registries Stakeholder Group also commented on the glossary section, requesting that this needs to be defined within the glossary, maybe adding a row for this term with the definition, maybe [inaudible] domain or somehow linked to source domain and entering the initial source domain name into the glossary.

They did also suggest language, which we did go through with when we were looking through preliminary recommendation nine, and I'm not going to read it. I'm just going to share what they

EN

suggested for the initial source domain name in the chat for you, as we went through this. So, if the team recalls for preliminary recommendation nine, which was related to the domain name lifecycle, the Registries Stakeholder Group requested for some clarity in the rationale language, asking for an input of this definition to make clear the source and the exceptions of the operational use. Which they've also mentioned in the glossary. So, I don't know if we want to go through this now, or maybe we just go through it while we look at preliminary recommendation nine again. What do you think, Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: What's your recommendation, Saewon?

SAEWON LEE: I mean, it is easier to go through it with recommendation nine in the sense that it is very much related.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, let's do that.

SAEWON LEE: Okay. And Jen also agrees. So then this, we will come back to after preliminary recommendation nine. The last comment in the glossary is from ALAC. I believe it doesn't need much discussion because I think the entry was incorrect. So, they pointed out that the acronym was wrongly listed within the glossary. And I believe that is so, unless there is any objections, but let me get to that. So,

currently, ROID is listed as registry object identifier, but I think it should be repository object identifier. So, if no objection, I think this can just be an easy fix within the working document. And one of the background would be through this appendix B, as you can all see. So, unless there's any objections, I think we can just make an easy fix within the glossary.

DONNA AUSTIN: I love an easy fix. So, everyone agrees?

SAEWON LEE: Okay. So, that does end the glossary comments. We do have 10 minutes left. We can continue with the general comments, but I don't think... What do you think, Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: I just lost the tail end of what you said, but I assume you're saying that 10 minutes isn't going to be enough to get through them all. So I think we'll call it, guys. I think we've had some good discussion. The leadership will go back and have a look at that recommendation 6 language, and see if we can tidy that up. I'm really interested to hear on the list how the groups feel about the requests we've received from Sarmad, because I think that impacts a little bit how we move forward with recommendation six. So, if folks can give some thought to that and respond on the list, that would be really helpful. And also the recommendation 6 language will have a bit of a... See if we can have another noodle of that in the next week with the intention that we'll come back to it in two weeks' time. All right. So, I think we're good. So, thanks,

Saewon, for taking us through today's call and thanks everybody for your contribution. I think we're getting there. We're almost over the difficult bits so that we're on a good path. So, thanks everybody and we will see you next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]