
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Thursday, the 1st of August 2024 at 12:00 UTC.

We have apologies from Nigel Hickson and Jerry Sen. All participants and members will be promoted to panelists for the call. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have the 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 e-mail the GNSO secretariat. All documentation and information can be found in 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 multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you and back over to Donna. Please begin.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Devan. Welcome, everybody, to today's call. We will continue our discussion of Recommendation 6 and IG 7. I think I did ask at the end of the last call that if folks had any comments on the text that we circulated that they provide any concerns or support from the list, but I don't think I saw anything. So I'm assuming that it's all fabulous and we can just sign off on it. Well, at least the ALAC team supports it. So that's something. Then we'll try to work our way through our review. So we've done an initial review of all the comments and now we'll work through

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.

and see if we've understood correctly what we think we've heard in terms of how folks feel about the comments, and then we can go off and draft a language. I will note that Saewon is not feeling great today, which will be obvious when you hear her talk. So we will get as fast through the call today as we can. If we need to call it quits early, we will. So we'll see where we get to. I guess with that, I better check. Are there any updates that I was supposed to provide that I didn't? Anything from the team? No? Okay.

All right. With that, I think we'll get into our discussion of 6 and 7. And just for folks' information, we are still having some conversations in the leadership team about the request that we received from Sarmad about stabilizing this recommendation so it can be implemented ahead of everything else. We're still having some conversations about that and what's our best path forward. But notwithstanding, we need to reach agreement on this recommendation. So that's what we're going to try and do here today. Saewon? I guess if you could language.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you. Thank you, Donna. This is Saewon Lee from staff for the record. Now that Donna has mentioned that we will be looking into Preliminary Recommendation 6 that's been circulated with the team first and which is also in our agenda item number three, I will share the language again in the chat for you all. As Donna mentioned, we did get—I won't say last minute but we did get a support from ALAC. But other than that, we really haven't heard anything. So leadership and staff does hope that we can have some progress on this today. So with the language shared and the updates that were circulated based on not

only our discussion last week, but also how leadership and staff tried to revise the language accordingly, I'll open up the floor for any discussions, but even just some agreements or objections.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Saewon. Thoughts from folks? We've had this language out there for a week so I'm hoping that you had time to take it back to your groups and chat about it. Dennis, go ahead, please.

DENNIS TAN TANAKA:

Thank you, Donna. I recognize that and appreciate the language was posted in the mailing list and we have some time to think about that. I'm going to speak personally because we tried to get the small team within the Registries to kind of think about it and express opinions. But unfortunately, that did not happen. Different priorities in work happening at the same time just make coordination really difficult. That said, personally speaking, I think the revised text, and perhaps we want to put in front of the screen, the revised text directionally it's consistent with the original version, if you will, if I can say that. I think it's appropriate. It looks like a good revision. But again, this is me because I have been involved in the conversations from early on. So I think it captures the spirit of what we intend to do. So I'm just going to say that. But again, the Registry Stakeholder Group was not able to come together and have a conversation on this one. So I'll pause there. I see Jennifer is having something on the chat as well.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Thanks, Dennis. I appreciate that it does take time to get groups together. But it's encouraging, Dennis, that you think it's a reasonable representation of what we're trying to achieve here. We have ALAC's support.

I know we don't have Michael with us this week, who normally does the talking for the Registrars. But I guess even if there's non-objection to this language, that would be good to know whether this language is still problematic. I don't see any other hands.

So, depending on whether and notwithstanding that the registries haven't formally taken this back to that group, and notwithstanding that we still have to work out how we deal with this in terms of Sarmad's request, we will still come back to this. Obviously, Dennis and Jen, if you think there's a chance that we can discuss this next week, or even if there is support from the Registries group, once you've had a chance to discuss it with them, if you can let the team know via e-mail, that would be really helpful. And then we can try to get this recommendation wrapped up if we decide, well, I guess responding to Sarmad's request and how we go about that from a procedural perspective, it may be that we'll do a consensus call on this specific recommendation ahead of all the others. Just to try to have this wrapped up in the event that it's in a position to be considered, I guess, by Council ahead of the rest of the report.

So I'm not going to spend any more time on this. We're going to move on. And hopefully next week we'll have some more news for you on how we're going to deal with this procedurally in light of Sarmad's request. Maxim, I appreciate that. Yourself, Jennifer, and Dennis are

representatives for the stakeholder group and your individual reflections don't substitute the SG opinion. But as you three are the representatives that have been here from the get-go, I have confidence in your individual abilities to take back to the full SG what's happened here and where we're headed. So I do take a level of comfort in Dennis's reaction, and Jen's.

All right, so let's not belabor this. Let's move on and see where we can get to and see how Saewon's voice holds out for us. So with that, Saewon, are you okay to continue?

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Donna. I know you're sick too. So I feel bad that you're just letting me off the hook. But yes, thank you. I know that there are some issues that we may need to come back to. But we will get back to it maybe next week after we have further confirmation from maybe the Registries' as well as the Registrars' reps attendance next week. But as you said, we'll move on.

According to the agenda item, as everyone saw, we were going to go through reviewing the public comments through the text today. Again, unfortunately, due to many circumstances, we were not able to share the revised text yet in the sense that it's been in progress in the background. But there just needs a bit more discussion among leadership and staff to get this out to the team for your review. So, unfortunately, we were not able to share this with the team yet. But just to go through the language in the text that the team had agreed

with or were in agreement with, we will try to start with confirming the terminology and the glossary comments.

If you all remember back to June, we looked through the terminology changes that we needed first, and one was grandfathered and one was the registry operator that needed to change to that was requested by the Registry Stakeholder Group to be changed to gTLD registry operator. As you were all informed last week, grandfathered will still wait for the Org's preliminary assessment, which hopefully will be done by the 15th of August, and we'll see, A, if it either can be changed, and B, if it needs to be changed one by one by reviewing the language itself. But the registry operator one, which was only related to IG 2 and Preliminary Recommendation 6, staff did try to incorporate it into the text as we saw fit. I know that the Preliminary Recommendation 6 is still in progress and we still need to discuss. But at least for IG 2, which again, we'll get back to when we look at agenda item number 4b, we try to incorporate it into the language that we thought we saw fit.

Again, I'm so sorry that this wasn't circulated with the team first, which would make much more sense when you look at this language. But as you can see in the screen right now, staff has tried to incorporate in those places that we saw fit the gTLD registry operators as the Registry Stakeholder Group had requested. Other than pointing this out now, I don't know what more I can do in the sense that we haven't really circulated this language with you yet. Donna, would you like to add anything to this?

DONNA AUSTIN:

No. I don't have anything to add. Accept my apologies because I wasn't able to review the language because it must be that time of the year, I wasn't feeling all that well either. So we're a little bit behind the eight ball here, but we're doing the best we can. So I apologize to the team as well.

SAEWON LEE:

Okay. Again, this will be circulated with the team soon. But just to show to the team that according to what was discussed, we try to incorporate it into the text as requested. And we'll be doing so after the Preliminary Recommendation 6 is also confirmed.

The other three terminologies that we needed to see were in the glossaries and just to, again, share with the team. I know this hasn't been shared with the team, the document itself, and it will be. But the first one was this initial source domain name that was requested by the Registry Stakeholder Group to be included in the glossary related to Preliminary Recommendation 8 and 9. Again, it was more to clearly define and distinguish the source domain name and initial source domain name. And also to include this terminology and exceptions in the operational uses within the rationale of Preliminary Recommendation 9, if everyone remembers. So at least in the glossary, that's what we have done so far to include what was requested. We have also added this in the source domain name section, as again requested by the Registry Stakeholder Group.

The other two, as I also mentioned, while we were looking through it all, was pretty straightforward. The ROIDs being updated to repository

object identifier. And then the last part was RPM, where the NCSG had requested that the RPM PDP Working Group was included. Again, it is kind of meaningless right now because you haven't seen the text itself, but it's been incorporated into the glossary as how we saw fit. And we'll try to update it a bit more before sharing it with the group. But yes, this is currently in progress with the leadership.

So these three terminologies as well as the registry operator one, other ones that's been incorporated into the text so far, going back to the agenda item 4b where we were going to revisit the comments that have been included in Section 4 for Preliminary Recommendation 1 to 9, I was wondering if it's better today just to kind of summarize what we have incorporated into the text to see that everyone's in agreement with what had been discussed, if everyone's okay with that.

DONNA AUSTIN: Assume that they are, Saewon.

SAEWON LEE: Okay. For Preliminary Recommendation 1—thank you, Dennis. And again, this will be definitely circulated once every leadership and staff have confirmed each language. While we were going through the text, we did see some that needed further alignments or further discussion. But, basically, based on what was discussed for Preliminary Recommendation 1, there wasn't any significant concern or objection. It was more a confirmation asked by the Org if this was just the same entity rule was just at the second level. At the time, the discussion was that we will try to clarify the language so that it defines the second

level, and that's what we tried to do in the language. We added at the second level, just so that it adds further clarity. Other than that, there were certain questions from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, not that they were not in support of the recommendation itself, but just asking some questions about the implementation aspects of this recommendation. And at the time, our discussion was maybe we will add another Implementation Guidance or we would maybe add it to the rationale. Thank you, Maxim, for confirming or supporting the additional language. But I think the more that the leadership and staff discussed this recommendation, we will further gearing towards maybe adding it to the rationale. And further as we went through the recommendations, we saw that this recommendation itself or the questions that were asked by the Registrar Stakeholder Group, it may be more linked to answering Preliminary Recommendation 14 and 15 that we still haven't concluded. So while we are pondering on the language and how to fix the language for 14 and 15, we were thinking maybe this is the place that we could answer those questions that were asked by the Registrar Stakeholder Group. So that's kind of the summary for that, but no updates on the rationale yet.

For Implementation Guidance 2, if everyone remembers, it was about trying to make sure that the request itself or the significant concern itself was from ICANN Org, and it was just about who decides the automatic activation and activating a variant label, and trying to redefine the language so that it's a bit more clear and making sure that it's not just dependent on that. Right now, we haven't really confirmed on the language. There are some suggestions from staff and it still needs to be confirmed by leadership. So I really don't have much more to say

on this. If Steve or Donna, you would like to chime in. But at the time, the few suggestions were maybe adding at the request of the registrants, maybe adding an explicit guidance related to the Chinese character, and maybe adding a clearer language to automatic activation. And we kind of, let's say, played about with the language but haven't really reached an agreement. And currently, we are still waiting leadership confirmation on this. But in the rationale, there were a bit of explanation on the Chinese character, but maybe we're trying to figure out a way to make it a bit more explicit. So that's all right now. And while I'm talking, seeing that Donna and Steve don't have anything to say, maybe I'll just move on to Recommendation 3.

For 3, we have added new language, but basically it was from the Registry. I'm so sorry about the pause. I keep on sneezing or trying to sneeze at the same time. But the Registry Stakeholder Group had suggested an additional line that has been added here. At the time, there wasn't much of an objection. Obviously, the grandfathered part has to be reviewed because there were not much objections. We kind of just went ahead and added it to the language. Then 4 is just related to grandfathered. And then we come to 6 and 7, which obviously we're still working on. We will confirm or try to come back to next week in our next meeting.

Then 8 and 9, again, this was a request from the Registry Stakeholder Group asking for the update in the rationale related to the domain name lifecycle and the initial source domain name that I just mentioned in the glossary. So based on what the Registry Stakeholder Group requested, staff tried to add in a section to, let's say, make sure that the exceptional use was explained or the exceptional operational case was

explained so that even though the current rationale were the Registry Stakeholder Group pointed out to that may not explain the full lifecycle to explain Recommendation 9, we tried to incorporate the language based on what the Registry Stakeholder Group recommended. So that the initial source domain name, which seems to be the baseline or the initial source domain name that seems to be, let's say, the biggest umbrella that affects the allocated or the variant domain names, so that in order to explain the levels of initial source domain name, then the source domain name, and how each variant domain names have their lifecycle, and how these operational uses or these exceptional cases could be explained was incorporated in the last paragraph according to how the Registry Stakeholder Group wanted the language to change. Again, obviously, this needs to be reviewed specifically to see if this fits the Registry Stakeholder Group's request.

So that kind of covers until Preliminary Recommendation 9. I just want to stop here for now, especially because I know this isn't as effective if the team hasn't really reviewed the language yet. So I just want to stop here to see what the team would like to say or if Donna has anything to add.

DONNA AUSTIN:

I don't have anything to add except the reason that we can't look at the text that's been drafted by Saewon is that I haven't been in a position to review it. So what we will try to do is I'll try to get to it by early next week and have the language circulated to the list so that we can go through that, what was our two-week cycle previously. We've had a little bit of a bump in the road but we'll get back on track. Saewon, I

think the plan was only to get through to Recommendation 9 for today. Is that where we're at?

SAEWON LEE:

It was in the sense that, A, I thought we would have more discussions on 6 and 7, especially to, let's say, stabilize language today. So yes, that finished earlier than I expected. Then secondly, I was hoping that 1 to 9 would be a more heated discussion in the sense that everyone would have reviewed the language. But yes, that's kind of where we're at right now.

DONNA AUSTIN:

All right. I think what we're going to do, folks, is we're going to finish this call really early this week. I thank everybody for joining the call. And I'm sorry that we don't have enough to keep us occupied for the full two hours. But I don't see any reason to keep everybody on pretending like we're doing something. So with that, unless... Saewon?

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Donna. One thing that I do want to add, just in case, we do have time to go through all the updated language next week. There was the Preliminary Recommendations 10 to 12 that the Registry Stakeholder Group also wanted to go back to their team on. So I know that Jennifer just wrote that they'll be meeting and having some feedback for us next week. I was hoping they could add 10 to 12 to their agenda as well. This was related to the Transfer Policy language. So yes,

I would just like to request that the Registry Stakeholder Group also takes this back.

DONNA AUSTIN: Go ahead, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Donna. This is Jen Chung for the Registries for the record. I see you've also put a note in the chat, in addition to Recommendation 6 and 7. My initial note in the chat is looking at the new language that Saewon was just going through. So if we wanted the feedback from the Registries, we would have to have that before our internal group call, the stakeholder group call before any meaningful feedback can be given next Thursday on our call here.

I note Saewon's reminder about 10 and 11. We actually did have some discussion two weeks ago in our small group call about that. I will circle back again, because we had a discussion. We don't think we reached any such conclusion. But we did have a pretty good discussion, especially with our colleague who is participating in the Transfer Policy PDP. So I'm happy to bring all of that feedback back as we discuss it next Tuesday. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Jen. So what we will try to do is—that language is sitting with me, just going through it, 1 to 9. So I'll try to get that to folks, to the list. We'll try to get it in agreement among leadership team so that we can get that to the list in a Monday, U.S. Time. I guess we can discuss

it again next week to see if there's any initial reactions to it. But generally, what we would do is put language out for a two-week period and then come back to it. So we'll have a chat among leadership team and just see what our process is moving forward. But certainly, Jen, we would give adequate time to get review back to whatever respective groups has to be done. Okay. Is there anything else, Saewon?

SAEWON LEE:

Related to our agenda items? No. I don't have any other business either, unless our staff has anything to add. I don't think so.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Thanks, Saewon. I know it's hard to get through this stuff when you're not feeling very well. So I appreciate your efforts. Thanks to the team for your understanding. So we will see you back here next week. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]