DEVAN REED:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is Devan Reed for the recording. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Thursday, 25 July at 12:00 UTC. We have apologies from Maxim Alzoba, Jennifer Chung, and Manju Chen. 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, Devan, and welcome everybody to today's call. I see that it's meeting 111. I wonder what number we'll finish on. Okay, so a few updates for this week. So, Michael, if we finish on 222, that means we've got three more years of meetings to go. I'm not sure that we're all up for that. Okay, so just by way of an update, so we've gone back to ICANN org on a couple of things, some related to comments, some related to process. So, you might recall that ICANN org recommended a change to the use of the word grandfathered.

And, well, Steve and the team have been in touch with ICANN org. They'll do a separate analysis and then they'll come back to us and see whether we need to adopt that recommendation or whether it's something that we can except for now that grandfathered works in for our purposes. But we should have more information on that in about two weeks' time on the call of the 15th. Maybe that's three weeks' time.

We're also we had that request from Sarmad and there's also to pull, basically pull recommendation six out of our work and start, essentially adopt it now in some respects and start work on it. And we're just getting some advice from ICANN org and then the GNSO Council on whether we can actually do that, because I think it would be pretty unusual to implement a recommendation before the PDP has actually been finished and approved by council and the chair and the board. So, we're following up on that as well. And just before we kick off, Michael Karakash has an announcement for us in relation to the implementation of recommendations from our phase one work. So, Michael, did you want to?

MICHAEL KARAKASH: Sure. Thanks, Donna. Hi, everyone. I just wanted to announce that we're ready to kick off the SubPro IRT IDN sub-track on the phase one recommendations. So, we have the first full IRT meeting where we're going to go over some of the recommendations on August 1st. And then the first official sub-track meeting for the IDN IRT is on August 8th at 18:00 UTC. And if you would like to join this IRT, you have to sign up for the full next round IRT and you can send an email to this email I'm

putting in the chat, nextround_policyimplementation@ICANN.org. And we would love to have you on to provide your expertise. Thanks, everyone.

DONNA AUSTIN: And so, Michael, or does anyone on the call have any questions for Michael in terms of process or administrative if the calls are at 18:00 UTC, is it intended that they be an hour call each week or do you have any other information in that regard, Michael?

MICHAEL KARAKASH: Yes, I do. Definitely. So, the IRT calls are one hour. And so, they rotate from the morning slots to the-- we rotate for the different time zones. So, one week it will be in the morning for PST and then it will switch. So, everyone is accommodated for, we haven't worked out the full schedule yet. So, these are the first two calls on the agenda. And once we know more information, and if you subscribe to the calendar, you'll get all of the invites so you can plan accordingly.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Michael. It's pretty exciting that the phase one implementation is going to start. So, that's good news. Just out of interest, are there folks on this call that intend to join that IRT? Some of you may already be on the UTCLT one, but just curious as to how many folks we would have from the team actually on the implementation review team. Yeah, we'll be an open group, Satish. It's normal IRT. So, it's led by ICANN, but open to anyone to participate. Okay. Alrighty.

So, the only other thing I wanted to mention is on recommendation six, implementation guidance seven, and the conversations we've been having around that, Saewon sent some revised language to the list.

I think it was in the last 24 hours. And we will come back and discuss that next week in the hope that we can agree the language and move on. It would be helpful if folks have some thoughts between now and our call next Thursday, if you could post those to the email list, so that we've got a little bit of a heads up about what's coming. That would be really helpful.

All right. So, with that, we're going to continue our review of the public comments. And we're going to get back to recommendation 14, implementation guidance 15. So, we've had a bit of a conversation around this already. But and now we'll go back and revisit and see where we get to. So, Saewon, can I hand it over to you?

SAEWON LEE: Yes, you can, Donna. Thank you. Hello, everyone. This is Saewon Lee from staff for the record. I've just shared the tool spreadsheet in the chat. And hopefully, you can all see the screen as well. So, yes, as Donna just mentioned, and also shared through the agenda with you all, we'll be revisiting preliminary recommendation 14 and implementation guidance 15, because we didn't conclude the discussions and hopefully to reach a conclusion today. I won't read the charter question again, or the outputs again. But just to recap, the question was asking what updates are necessary to the registry agreement to ensure the same entity rule, and also about the mechanism and services to consider.

The team's outputs in preliminary recommendation 14 guided that a service must be enabled to discover the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name, and that ICANN org and relevant stakeholders must consider ways to enable such a requirement. And in implementation guidance 15, it presented what information could be provided through a service or a method. And I know I'm only showing you 14 in the screen. But obviously, I want to go through 14 and 15 together to open up for discussions. But to highlight each group's perspectives and what we went through in the comments, as well as initial discussions.

Generally, there seemed to be an alignment that the service provided or the operational process should be consistent and uniform. And this was raised or supported by the registry stakeholder group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group and ICANN org. But there is a division on whether the service should be public or not. For example, registry stakeholder group was, it should not be public and ALAC public. And also, just to emphasize again, in the rationale, there wasn't any mention or motivation for a public service. But at the time of discussion, leadership also suggested that we revisit this issue, which hopefully we will do today. And for the registries' stakeholder group separately, they did suggest a new language or they proposed a new language, which again, I want to share with you in the chat.

So, this is their proposed language. Basically, it boiled down to getting rid of any wording that suggests a requirement for a public service and also to accept and support the future collaborative work, development of the stakeholders to ensure the same entity rule. So, to this new

EN

wording or proposed wording, the Registrar Stakeholder Group had no problem.

They also suggested that this could be done as an EPP query to a registry service. For ICANN org, consistency was more of their focus and they don't oppose to the registry stakeholder group suggestion. But they did need to understand the role assigned to ICANN org and what role it will play, so that if it were to work with these relevant stakeholders, then they needed more information.

For ALAC, they were also actually okay with this new language, but the condition was that as long as it's public service, and that all the necessary information is provided. And obviously, they also mentioned that they did want to know which service will be provided, but did not really care for which one. And I think Hadia also mentioned it last week.

Just to continue with 15 as well, as I just mentioned, so that we could open up the floor for discussion altogether. The registry stakeholder group does not think implementation guidance 15 is necessary. If for 14, the language is updated, but if we were to keep it, then they had requested that some parts in the rationale be deleted, as you can see here. So, for example, and I shared this in the chat as well last time, but they requested that this is deleted in the rationale. And this was actually repeated language from implementation guidance 15.

So, I guess they just wanted this deleted. And then the next part that they want deleted in the rationale was this paragraph. We did get an update from the non-commercial stakeholder group last week. And as Peter and Emmanuel also shared last week, I know Donna was asking if

the clarity was provided or not. And I don't know if they have updates today. But the main issue with the non-commercial stakeholder group is, again, where they require clarity on how RDDS will be used and object to the expansion of RDDS. They did also suggest that the desired outcomes in both outputs 14 and 15 are very vague and wanted a bit more specific guidance. And then they were also concerned about the privacy issues which the Registrar Stakeholder Group responded to.

Other than that, if they were concerned about the privacy issues, Edmon did suggest that perhaps we include a wording to address the personal identifiable information that strictly prohibits these registries or registrars disclosing any personal privacy issues that may solve the concern. And I think that pretty much sums up the comments as well as discussions that we've been having for the last two weeks. And so here I will like to pause and open up the floor for continued discussions.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. Devan, so, can we just go back to recommendation 14, please? So, it seems that on the surface, we have no objection to the revised wording from the registry stakeholder group, but we do have two things that we need to work through. First of all, we need to understand what excuse me.

SAEWON LEE: Are you okay, Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Kind of. Excuse me. So, we need to-- Oh, dear. I'm so sorry. First of all, I'd like to, if we can try to have a conversation around the question from ICANN org, which is about what is foreseen as ICANN org's role. And it seems to me from the revised wording suggested by the registries is that ICANN org would lead it and if it and also, I don't know, almost be the provider of a service that would enable allocated variant names for a given name to be discovered.

So, I think we just need to work through that part first and see what the registries had in mind. And we did say that, well, I think the registry language is a little bit more nuanced in that it puts more of an onus on ICANN to lead this work than the original recommendation. But if we could just have a bit of a conversation about what we think the role of ICANN org is in this, and then we need to think about what we mean by public service.

So, I think what Satish was getting to with the public service is that anyone must be able to see whether a variant domain is part of a set because of the same entity principle, but I think there seems to be some hesitancy for the registries to have anything that's a public service. So, we need to kind of sort that out as well. So, does anyone have any thoughts on the ICANN org's role? Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes. Thank you, Donna. This is Sarmad. So, I just wanted to also add that perhaps one solution, possible solution is to create some RFC, which means that this work really needs to be done at IETF and not at ICANN. That is one of the reasons I guess we've requested clarification,

EN

because in that case, of course, I guess we'd like to know how or how would the group team want ICANN to support that process at IETF, if that's the way forward. And if this, if the team's thinking something else, I think that would also be useful to know. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So, I'm struggling a little bit here with options. I guess it could be that ICANN org and the relevant stakeholders, if they consider ways that could enable such a requirement, then they could decide that it goes through the IETF and that would be the path forward. I guess that's an option, but we wouldn't necessarily prescribe that in the recommendation. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, just a short comment. So, is the team suggested ICANN set up a working group here and discuss this or some other mechanism? So, again, I'm just requesting some clarity. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think that's what's being suggested here. So, the registry language, the revised wording is to account for the same entity principle and its implications for variants domain names. ICANN org should work with relevant stakeholders. Well, that's a little bit different, isn't it? So, it's, it's saying that. Okay.

SAEWON LEE: Donna, I think Satish would like--

DONNA AUSTIN: Please go ahead. I can't see hands. I'm sorry.

SATISH BABU: Sorry, I'm not able to raise my hand. So, apologies. I think this wording, it's okay with us basically. Now, I'm not sure why there should be a pushback against the public service because this is not secretive information. We already have a tool that will give us all the variants and the disposition values, which is already available, I think. What is not available from a single place is which of these are delegated and which are not.

I'm sure there's some other way to discover that, but for an end user to get it, that get that information from multiple places would be a hassle. That's why we have recommended that there should be an official source of this. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Satish. Any thoughts from the registries on this? So, Satish, just to pick up on your comments. So, the IDN tables, I think are public, but I'm not sure how public the other info is. So, the tables are public, but it would take a reasonable amount of investigation to work out what the variants might be of a source domain name, because you'd have to know who the registry is and what the table is. I'm not sure how public that information is and the search capability, but Dennis and Michael are going to have a better idea than me. So, Dennis and then Michael.

DENNIS TANAKA:	Thank you, Donna. This is Dennis for the record. I'm not sure I'm going to have a better idea. I just wanted to state. So, the registry stakeholder group agrees there's some level of support for variant registration, and as provider of the variant domain names, we need to provide enough or sufficient information to our customers, meaning the registrars, in order for them to register domain names in our systems.
	So, that's part of the variant discovery feature that's covered. What we don't understand, it's not being elaborated here, is the need for a public service such as RDDS, because with a public service comes SLAs and there is unknown demand for this information. I mean, again, today we offer variants and I don't think I can speak to any sort of demand for discovering variants as of today.
	I would question hard why the need for public service later. And since we're working on minimum requirements, again, we agree with providing that such information, ways for registrars to discover variants and how they can allocate them to their customers, the registrars. But as far as expanding that functionality to the public, that comes with other types of considerations that I don't think we fully appreciate. Thank you.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Dennis. So, just, and I may be way off track on this, but bulk registration data that the registries have to provide, and I think this can be requested by interested parties and the registry has the option to say, yes or no, we can give you access to that information. I don't know, but would variants be captured in that set of data? You can take that on

notice and come back next week. I'm not really sure that it's relevant here, but it just kind of a thought. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. Michael, for the record. I don't want to comment on whether it's sensible to have that public or whether it's needed to have the public. I just want to come back to Satish's argument that the privacy thought that this might cause privacy issues. It's actually not an issue because as Satish said, all the information is anyway more or less publicly available, maybe through some more work, but it's not really hidden because as you said, with the IDN table, anybody could in theory calculate the variant set and with access to zone files, which basically everybody can get access to because registries hardly have any chance to say, no, you don't get access to the zone file.

You just say, well, I want to have it because I'm interested in it and the registry more or less has to say, okay, you can get it. So, with the zone file, you can find out which of those variants actually exist. And with that information, you can get for any domain all the existing variants too. So, privacy, I think, shouldn't be an issue in this discussion. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. I had a thought then and then I lost it. Satish, what kind of information do you think should be available for a user to be able to retrieve? Are you just looking for what's the other domains in the set or are you looking for who owns a certain domain? What kind of information is it you're looking for?

EN

SATISH BABU: Very minimal information, nothing to do with ownership or who's registrant, no. Just given a particular domain name, we want to find out which are the other activated variants of this one. So, that is just to cross check if an end user wants to do that.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, it's some way that ties the source and the others together.

SATISH BABU: Right.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, Michael, you're basically saying that that information would be available if you knew where to look?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, exactly. That's more or less publicly available. Anybody with some expertise on how to read IDN tables and also how to get a zone site would be able to obtain that information.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So, that being the case, and I'm sorry, I don't recall what's in the rationale, but I wonder if we can possibly get some agreement to accept the registry's revised wording with the understanding that it's explained in the rationale that the intent here is to be able to identify the-- have a

link in some way from the source domain and the other variant domains that would be in that set. I'm sorry if I'm using the wrong terminology here. Satish, would that work for you or for ALAC or not?

SATISH BABU: Yeah, I haven't really cross checked this back with our team there, but I think tentatively we are fine with this.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, just one thought. If registries don't want to offer this service publicly because of SLA problems that this might cause, which I totally understand and agree we don't want to cause issues there, would it be possible for ICANN to provide this service because ICANN can and will have access to the zone site so they know what domains exist and they also should be able to read the IDN tables of the registries so they could in theory offer such a public service so that everybody interested in, I see this domain and I want to know which other variants of that domain are active, they could go to that service. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. I kind of think that the way that this has been re-worded by the registries is that's the intent. So, it says ICANN org should work with relevant stakeholders to develop and enable a service. To me that seems like the responsibility in enabling is on ICANN org.

That's my reading of it. But maybe I've misread it. So, I would expect that would be some of the discussion once it gets into implementation. Because I think does ICANN currently have a web interface for WHOIS that there could be a parallel to? Anyway, maybe I'm speaking out of turn. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN BARRETT: Thanks, Donna. This is Alan. Yeah, I can't speak to the board, but if this were to come to the board, I think I would argue that it's in the public interest for there to be an easy way for anybody to figure out which variants are associated with each other. Now, I guess it doesn't matter who provides the service, whether it's ICANN or the registry or the registrar, whether it's a web page or whether it's RDDS. Those details don't really concern me, but I think it is important for the public interest that there should be an easy way for anybody with one domain to figure out whether there also exist variants that are associated with it.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Alan. Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes. So, I guess there are two different layers or levels of information here. One, of course, is given a domain name, what are its allocatable variants? That's a more generic information, which would be based on the IDN tables for that particular registry. And it would list all the possible allocatable variants. The second information is the subset of

EN

those allocatable variants, which are actually registered, of course, to the same registrant. And that, of course, is not discoverable by the IDN tables, but the actual registration data with each registry. And I think what is probably being requested is that second, smaller set of labels or variant tables. And sure, I guess, again, we'd request that, I guess, please do clarify what is being requested from ICANN in this case.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. I think we've got in principle agreement on the revised wording from the registry. So, I think we need to have a look at the rationale and see if there's a way to ensure that the intent of the recommendation is clear, or the reason for the recommendation is clear. And now I think we have to go to 15, Saewon and see what we do with this part.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Donna. So, in 15, as I mentioned, it was mostly to do with the RDDS and what kind of service or mechanism we could provide. I don't want to recap everything again, because I already gave the summary.

DONNA AUSTIN: That's fine. Okay, so I guess we've got a recommendation on the table from the registries to delete implementation guidance 15.

SAEWON LEE: So, if the wording is updated in 14, yes, the registry stakeholder group wanted 15 deleted. As I mentioned, there was a bit of opposition on RDDS from NCSG for the expansion of it. And there was a suggestion that we could add in some wording to address this privacy issue that was of concern.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Saewon. So, if we get rid of this implementation guidance as it is, then I think that RDDS problem goes away. I don't think we have that problem. What we could do with implementation guidance here is pick up a couple of the things that try to provide guidance on some of those questions that Sarmad had about what's the role of ICANN here and what's the intent. So, maybe we can flesh that out a little bit. And also, to make it clear what we're actually trying to achieve with the recommendation, if that's not coming through clear enough in the rationale. So, do folks have thoughts on that? Are there concerns about deleting implementation guidance 15 as we currently, have it? Is that going to create angst for people? Yeah, Saewon?

SAEWON LEE: No, I was just trying to raise what Satish said in the chat.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Excuse me, guys. Oh, dear. Sorry. All right. So, in principle, Satish supports removing IG15, but some wordsmithing may be required for 14. So, I think we have to maybe have another look at that and see where we end up based on the discussion today. What I'm

EN

really after is if there are any objections to removing implementation guidance 15 now that we've in principle agreed to accept the registry's language for 14.

Okay. I'm not seeing any hands or anything in chat that there's any objection to removing implementation guidance 15 and reconsidering that we may want to still have an implementation guidance 15, but we need to think about what we want to say in there. So, Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes, I also wanted to share in case the team's considering ICANN to provide such information. I'm not really sure if ICANN has like live data access for this purpose. ICANN may have access to historical data. But that would then obviously be not in sync with the actual live status of registrations. So, those are, if it's possible for the team, we can obviously go back and get more information on what kind of data we have and what kind of information ICANN could provide if that is the direction this team is going. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So, I guess that might be helpful to know, but on the other hand, if the recommendation is that ICANN and the relevant stakeholders go away and look at how they can provide this, and if it's not something ICANN has access to now, then maybe the discussion has to be, well how can we make this happen? I accept what you're saying, but there's a policy recommendation here that has to be implemented, then that might change. Okay. Any other thoughts on implementation guidance 15 from anyone? Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Donna. This is Steve from staff. And unless there's objections, I would like to give staff a little bit of homework, because I think there's a little bit of a nuance that we want to make sure that it's appropriate from a registration data perspective. So, I think it's one thing to be able to figure out what are the domain names in a domain name variant set, but I think where we want to make sure it's appropriate is if you're able to identify that there's a set of domains assigned to a specific registrant, not knowing necessarily who the registrant is, but that they're unified under a single registrant, if that makes sense. So, unless there's objections, we would do a little bit of research with our colleagues to make sure this is an appropriate thing to be able to provide to end users. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Steve. Okay, what's next, Saewon?

SAEWON LEE: The next one I wanted to look into was implementation guidance 17, but again, this was subject to 14 and 15. And I don't know if we can actually look into that today if we still need to revisit 14 and 15. So, I will skip that for now, because I did introduce this last week. And if everyone's okay, I'll go back to the general comments again. So, last week, we completed the review of the glossary related comments. And not that everything has concluded, but we'll go back to some of them again, through the working documents, after revisiting some outputs that are linked.

So, today, if we continue with the general comments, we will be going into the Teams Charter questions that didn't provide any outputs in order. So, there were two general comments by NCSG, but we did actually touch upon them last week as well. So, one asking for specific examples in scripts where different words spelt the same in different languages are not considered variants of each other and the other asking the report itself be written for the broader community in an easier readable manner. And again, we dealt with this last week, in the sense that it was brought up. So, I just wanted to mention that this was the next that we were supposed to see. And I know there were some suggestions and we'll get back to this when we go through the working document.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, I'm not sure if there's a question or a suggestion in there, Saewon.

SAEWON LEE: It wasn't really a question, it was more that I wanted to share with everyone that this was supposed to be the next in line today, but because it was briefly brought up, I just wanted to mention that it's something that we may need to consider when we look back at the working document, but based on the suggestions brought up last week, it seemed like, at least for the readability issue, there wasn't something that we could really change, but the examples that we could maybe give that I think through the working documents we can consider, but I think there's nothing that we can really do today about this, but I did want to

EN

share what was discussed last week and that this is a part of, let's say, homework that we would need to do.

Moving on, the next general comment is by Registrar Stakeholder Group. Let me just point out the easier one first, that does not require any action. This is in relation to the C4 charter question comment, where the Registrar Stakeholder Group is endorsing the recommendations in the report. And just because it is just endorsement and no action needed, let me read out the comments for you.

The Registrar Stakeholder Group supports the recommendations in the phase two initial report, in particular C4 charter question. The Registrar Stakeholder Group supports the EPDP team's conclusion that variant domain names under any gTLD should not be required to act, behave, or be perceived as identical, and notes that ICANN policy should not stray into issues of content regulation.

Again, I don't think there's any action or response needed, but I just wanted to share this comment by the Registrar Stakeholder Group with you so that it's all noted that they support of this charter question. And then to move on to the more complicated general comment from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Which was related to the charter question C3. This was in relation to the registrar identification for the same entity principle. And the team did not provide any outputs related to this, and the Registrar Stakeholder Group asked for the team's further consideration related to this question.

And similarly, ALAC also raised concerns on the absence of guidance, or lack thereof, on the same charter question C3, but also ALAC raised a request on C3(a) as well, which are about the registrar identification and how to uniquely identify a registrant so as to be able to implement the same entity principle. So, here, ALAC is requesting for some implementation guidance that could benefit all stakeholders. And the Registrar Stakeholder Group thought that there should be clarity on which model is in use for a TLD to avoid any question.

So, to start the discussion or build any sort of output for these two charter questions, I think it is important to recap the charter questions C3 and C3(a) again. So, first, let me read parts of the C3 charter question for you. For C3 charter question. What is the appropriate mechanism to identify the registrant as the same entity at the second level for future and existing labels? The working group and the IRT to coordinate and consider the following question in order to develop a consistent solution. Is ROID a reasonable mechanism to determine the same registrant at the second level for both future and existing labels or if not, what mechanism or functional definition can be used to ensure the second level variant labels are allocated to the same entity for both current and future TLDs.

And for C3(a) charter question, the question was, if the working group determines to use ROID as the mechanism to identify the registrant as the same entity at the second level, are there additional requirements to ensure the same entity principle is followed?

So, these were the questions that the team did not respond to and the team is seeking some response or outputs or guidance to. And for C3, it

EN

seems that at the time of the response, the EPDP team agreed not to prescribe any specific mechanism to identify the same registrant in order to enforce the same entity principle. And at the time the rationale of the team was that how the same registrant is identified, verified and enforced should be determined by the registry operator and the sponsoring registrar based on the agreed method of their choosing.

Also, the team identified some specific drawbacks of ROID based on the feedback by registry and registrar representatives at the time, it seems. And also, when reading the response, there were two options that were shared by TechOps, which was model one, registry and registrar enforce the same registrant and model II, the registry and registrar split the responsibility. And for C3(a), the response at the time was that they were not to recommend ROID as the mechanism to identify the same registrant. And the team believed that this question was moot and no output was needed at the time.

Again, I know this was long because we were trying to look at the two questions together, but I would now like to open the floor for discussions and seek any input or the need for providing an output for these two charter questions.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Saewon. Satish, I see your hand is wanting to be raised. So, go ahead, please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Donna. So, just to clarify the last suggestion, we certainly are not insisting on ROID because we saw the drawbacks of ROID. It's not consistent across different registries. We do not want anything to happen right now, but our problem or concern is that if you leave it completely open ended without any direction being set, then it becomes too kind of all over the place because everybody can follow different systems.

We're not saying that there should be a consistent system right now, but if there is an indicative timeline of who will work together and when will they come out with a solution? Because there has to be a solution, obviously. Just that each registry combination may be following a different system, which is not very scalable. That is our concern. So, what we're asking for is some indication on how this is going to be resolved eventually. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Satish. So, just to clarify, is ALAC looking for a uniform solution by the registries and registrars at some point in time, or just that however this is done by the registry or registrar is published in some way?

SATISH BABU: So, in both these C3(a) as well as C6, what we're asking is some kind of a future standard on evolve with everybody's inputs. That can be followed by everybody. Then things like transfers become simpler, and there's a uniform way. Now, we understand this is an internal thing to registries and registrars. And as an end user part of ICANN, we have

EN

really no stake in how this is implemented. But what we're saying is only that there should be some kind of lighted into the tunnel, where there is someone who's going to come out with some standard or an RFC, which can be followed by different people. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Satish. Dennis?

DENNIS TANAKA: Thank you, Donna. This is Dennis for the record. Just wanted to build upon Satish's comments, the need for a uniform solution. And staying aside of whatever wording we put in the recommendations on implementation guidance, I agree, there's going to be a need for an interoperable solution for those registries, registrars that want to support variant activation and allocation. So, there are some folks in the registry stakeholder group already thinking about that kind of work, future work that needs to happen. Because if we want this to work, there has to be an interoperable way to do it.

I think I'm agreeing with Satish. Yeah, there does need to be a-- I don't want to say standard solution, because even standards are not mandatory to follow, but there's going to be a future work on interoperability, taking into consideration all the business models that registries, registrars have, such that at least there is a common language, but there is also flexibility as far as final implementation. So, yeah, I just wanted to add that for the conversation. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. That's helpful. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, thanks. Michael, for the record. While I also think uniform solution might be good, I think it's a bit difficult in this circumstance, because registries are having quite different policies, just with the changes, with the data that is going to happen within the next year. Some registries go to the minimal data set, which means they don't have any contact data at all. So, there's no way for them to do this same entity check while other registries will retain some registrant data and for them their policies are very different and for them it might be easier to just check whether the right is the same, which is one of the suggestions and I don't think we should rule out that possibilities for registries if they want to apply that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. I guess we don't have a recommendation. We probably have language that says we didn't think we needed a recommendation, but I wonder, would it be acceptable to try to draft some language along the lines that at some point in the future.

I remember in implementing the IDN, when we did phase one, I think we've got in that a recommendation that after a period of time, some research be undertaken on how the variant TLDs have been implemented or whatever, and so I so I wonder if this is one of kind of a bit of a catch-all that we could do here after a period of time, after these recommendations are implemented, which could be, I don't know, two years off, that research be undertaken to look at the

EN

possibility of whatever this was in charter question C3 and C3(a). Dennis?

DENNIS TANAKA: Thank you, Donna. I just wanted to add that I can't remember now the recommendation. I think five or six when we, ICANN org and the registries discussed what was the future looks like in terms of implementation models and whatnot, and the language that the registries propose is to use minimum IDN variant requirements or some sort of that. So, not just exclusively to minimum variant sets but deployment requirements which one of these is the registration model, it's one of those.

I mean, that work will start with the IRT, but considering the complexity might be in multiple phases or multiple layers as the conversation evolves, but I think that captures the desire to work on an interoperability model including variant sets. So, I just wanted to add that, that was the spirit of choosing those words because we recognize it's not just about variant sets, but also other operational aspects that we need to work through.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, all right, so maybe we need to-- notwithstanding the fact that we haven't agreed on the recommendation language for recommendation six and whether we need implementation guidance seven or not but I think I understand what you're saying, Dennis, is that because the language is a minimum set of IDN variant deployment requirements which include variant sets, but could be more than that, that this would

fit into that category of a minimum set of IDN variant deployment requirements. So, we need to link C3 and C3(a) to recommendation six is what I think you're saying, Dennis.

And Satish and Hadia, would that work for you? As I said, notwithstanding, we still have to agree on the language for recommendation six, but I think the intent with what Dennis is saying, is that that would be picked up, C3 and C3(a) would be picked up under recommendation six.

SATISH BABU: This is Satish jumping in. Yeah, so I think the reason why we raised this was that by not mentioning the need for kind of interoperable modeling, we are leaving it completely open but even if it's a implementation guidance, if that point is mentioned that okay, eventually you have to come out with a kind of model that integrates all this, then it is there in the text and anyone who's going to read it later will realize that there is a need for working on it. So, we are fine with the suggestion to link the previous one and these two so that it is visible to everybody what we're talking about. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks Satish. So, we'll find a way to make sure that the ALAC suggestion isn't lost anywhere. So, either we'll have a recommendation in C3 and C3(a) or what we currently have in there will specifically link this question back to whatever we end up in PR6 or implementation guidance. Okay. What's next, Saewon?

EN

SAEWON LEE: So, we'll go up to seeing the comments in order again. So, now we go to the business constituencies general comments. So, none of them were really tied to an output, a preliminary recommendation or an implementation guidance and just to check the two easier ones first. The first one was just the BC supporting the team same entity and conservatism principles. And I think as you can see in number one, it was just BC showing supports of the principles with the same entity principle expanding to the same registrant and same registrar.

And then the second comment was BC encouraging that the ICANN board and the GNSO should proceed immediately to update the IDN implementation guidelines. And I think that was this third comment. Again, no response or action necessary from the team, but I just wanted to share that comment with you as the easier ones just to go over. And then now for the more complex one, number two here in the BC comment C3 cell, as you can see, but their third comment, I'll just read briefly.

They say, for the existing IDN TLD registry operators and the 1.5 million IDN gTLD domains they serve, BC strongly supports the idea of allowing them to maintain the existing policy implementation if they choose to do so. It means that (a), introducing IDN variant TLD is an option not mandatory to existing IDN TLD. (b), IDN.IDN variant domains should be implemented without over-complicating the domain name lifecycle that the domain name industry has defined and implemented for years.

EN

And (c), if the existing IDN TLD operator decides to implement IDN.IDN variant registration, a consistent IDN registration policy is introduced and implemented. And (d), based on the conservatism principle and for security consideration, mixing IDN source and IDN variant script at the same or different TLD level should not be allowed until a proper policy is introduced.

So, before we go in further, they do again and this comment with the variant or the variant set should not be independently created. Oh, sorry. No. So, they do. Sorry, I'm just going to show here. Since activation of an IDN.IDN variant domain is not considered as a new create, the registry registrar should not charge additional fee to its user. And before we go into discussions on this item, I just want to note that this item seems to be related to charter question D5, which was raised by many other groups, which asks the question that for reporting and fee purposes, whether the variant domain set should be treated as a single registration.

So, the many other groups like ICANN org, here, ALAC, and GAC. And again, excuse my scrolling fast, but I just wanted to note that these groups also raised comments on this charter question D5, which seems to relate to the comment that BC has raised, where again, the EPDP IDN's team did not provide any to outputs to. So, I think it may be best to deal with the BC's general comment together with the D5 charter question relevant comments all together.

So, with this, let me share the question to the team, the charter question D5 for recap purposes. So, D5 question asks, for reporting and fee actual purposes, should each variant domain name be considered an

independent registration or should such variant labels be considered as an atomic set? Rationale for such definition must be clearly stated, should any specific implementation guidance be provided, for example, what would be the impact to the registration payment at the registry operator level and at ICANN org?

And for this, the summarized response to this question from the team at the time was that the team tried not to dictate either model of variant domain name activation, as well as the associated annual fee expectation. The two models being EPP create and EPP updates and how the variant name is activated results in whether the annual fee is charged based on the respective registry operators' policy. And this was not to impose on the existing rights of registry operators related to their contractual agreements with sponsoring registrars.

So, just going back to BC's comment, the BC is concerned that the EPP IDN's team chose not to provide a clear recommendation to one key fundamental question in the report and asks, is an IDN.IDN variant domain a newly created separated domain from its source IDN.IDN domain? And through the comments, it seems like BC, GAC and ALAC root for the EPP update mechanism. And specifically, I will get into the comments related to this question so that we can again deal with all this together, but ICANN org comments that this question may require additional consideration during implementation as the org is in the process of analyzing the implementation aspects of phase two initial report outputs.

And as for ALAC, they feel that a single registration is more desirable and that this should be provided for not only from a cost perspective,

but also in terms of the ease of operations, such as registration, renewal and transfer. And so, ALAC suggests that the team should provide guidance along the lines of, and they suggest unless there are significant contractual restrictions, the entire variant domain set should be treated as a single registration through the EPP update mechanism.

And then lastly, from GAC on this cost issue, they comment that the costs for variants should be kept as low as possible, given that the cost of IDNs are likely to mainly affect underrepresented regions and groups. They also mentioned that the EPP update should be used as the preferred means to activate variant domains to minimize costs.

So, again, I wanted to share all the comments related to charter question D5 and the cost element linked to BC's last comment. And just to point out, ALAC's last suggestion does seem more for implementation guidance or the implementation stage, but just related to the D5 question, I think we should open the floor to discuss this together. And I see Michael's hands.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, thanks. Michael, for the record. I tend to disagree that we should enforce or prescribe one of these models, whether it's an EPP update or EPP create command. I think the registries should be free to decide how they handle this. And the reason for that is that already now there are registries offering variants and there are registries offering those variants using EPP create command, so that each variant costs money for each year.

EN

And there are registries offering it with an EPP update command, so they offer those variants for free to the registrars and thereby maybe possibly also to the registrants, but that's not a given either because just because the registry makes it free doesn't mean the registrar will have to make it free too, because they may have some additional costs involved if they have variants so that they might charge the registrants independently. And on a second note, to dictate the price the registries should charge for variants is also out of scope for this group. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Michael. So, I think this is a-- it's basically a business decision for the registry and then subsequently the registrar. And as Michael has put better than me, I think this is probably murky water that we don't want to get into exactly. What Nigel has said is that there's no good dictating a price point. That's a business decision by the registries and the registrars.

So, I appreciate that the GAC has made some comments about price and ALAC has some issues with it as well, but I, this may be a recommendation where we converge and we don't have full consensus, but I think we probably do have consensus to stay with what we have. Any thoughts? Satish, any thoughts from you? I know I don't think we have VC.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Donna. So, we're just wondering, what do we tell our end users how this is going to be? Is each variant going to be priced separately or each, the whole set is going to be priced as one? We need a single

EN

consistent answer. Otherwise, we are kind of basically stating that we don't have any convergence on this. So, I mean, this may be a kind of wish list from our side, but we need some consistency on how we're going to tell the community how this is going to work. That is why we have made this addition. And this is not a recommendation. It's only implementation guidance that we had asked for. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Satish. So, I mean, it's a little bit like there is no consistency on how much a domain name costs across the board, whether it's a ccTLD or a gTLD. There are whether it's a premium name or whether it's just a regular old name, there is no consistency. And at the end of the day, it's a source domain that may have some variance with it. So, depending on the, whatever the business model is of the registry operator and consequently the registrar and how it goes about its business, they will set whatever the market decides really.

So, that's a business decision based on market, I guess. So, I don't really know why IDM variants are any different from any other domain name, really. There is no consistency across the board with registries as to how they go about their business and similarly with the registrar.

SATISH BABU: Thanks Donna, this is Satish. So, we're not saying that the pricing should be uniform or anything like that. There will be variation in pricing, premium pricing, all that, but the way the model works is what we're talking about, but we don't want to kind of push it beyond this point. We are happy to go with the system of the group.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks Satish. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, just one more comment regarding this, especially on the registrar level. Many registrars provide additional services with their domain registration. They provide DNS services, they provide web space, they provide emails. So, even if at the registry level, those variants would be for free, it's not really defined or must not be forced upon registrars to make them free too, because it may just not their business model. And for that reason, the registrants would, or the end users would anyway, have to deal with different prices, wherever they go, whether they take registrar A or B, and also whether they register domain on the TLD A with registry A or TLD B with registry B.

So, all the pricing, it really depends on what the registry or registrar wants to do as a service or what they think the cost involved in running these is to them. And for that reason, they should be free to choose either of those models. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks very much for that, Michael. Alrighty, so I think we're okay to move on, Saewon.

SAEWON LEE: Okay. So, noting that we probably won't be providing any outputs for the Charter Question D5, which had the most comments, and the BC's

comment also related to that. I think we actually have reached our last general comment. And I think that kind of goes back to ALAC. And again, I'm so sorry that I kept on scrolling back and forth. I did want to link certain comments together, related to certain charter questions and see them all at once, but now that we have come to the last one, it's comment related to Charter Question C6 from ALAC. And this was related to IDN table formatting. And just to recap on the charter question again, for the team and also the team's response on this.

The question asked to facilitate the harmonization of IDN tables. The staff paper recommends that IDN tables for the second level be formatted in the machine-readable LGR format specified in RFC 7940, representing label generation rule sets using XML. However, each registry operator can harmonize the IDN tables today via software development solutions or are already in the process of doing so.

The working group and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following question in order to develop a consistent solution. Should registry operators be required to use the machine-readable LGR format as specified in RFC 7940 for their second level IDN tables, or should registry operators have the flexibility to resolve the harmonization issue? So, long as it can predictably and consistently produce the same variant labels, albeit with different disposition values across the same script IDN tables.

So, that was the question. And the response that the team gave or had not recommended was the machine-readable XML format as the required format for IDN tables. So, the team had not recommended this as the required format for IDN tables. And the team had also

agreed at the time that existing and future registry operators should have the flexibility to determine the appropriate format of their IDN tables. And this recommendation, as Michael had pointed out earlier in our comment review, was that it is inconsistent with the IDN implementation guidelines.

ALAC's comments related to this was that ALAC thought that the standards-based approach that is machine-readable would be forward-looking. And ALAC still believes that there is a need for guidance, that registries should be shepherded into transitioning to a standards-driven approach in a reasonable time frame, and rather than be left to depend on multiple approaches to make it more resilient and improve manageability. So, with this, I think I would like to open the floor for any additional input by ALAC or suggestions.

DONNA AUSTIN: Satish has found his hand.

SATISH BABU: I've just discovered that alt y will get you the hand up even if you don't have that icon. So, I just discovered it. Okay, C6 is pretty much like C3 and C8. We are not saying that anything should be done right now, but we do feel that we have an RFC, which is a standard, and we choose not to follow the standard. Okay, we can understand that for the time being, we cannot do that because of the whole transition to variance, but are we saying that there is no need to transition at all, even in the future, maybe two years or three years later?

So, that's why we thought it is important to flag this issue, that the standards-based approach, I think, or we are not experts at this, so we think that it is a better approach. It provides resilience, and we are talking about managing the whole system. And we also recall that the staff paper had pointed out, or suggested that we follow a standard-based approach. So, therefore, we wanted to kind of raise this as an implementation guidance, saying that sometime in the future, you have to think of some kind of a transition into a standards-based approach. We are not asking for anything right now.

We are not asking for a recommendation. And we are aware fully of the kind of problems right now to do such a transition. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Satish. Dennis?

DENNIS TANAKA: Thank you, Donna.   I just wanted to mention that the current implementation of IDN tables follow-- the registries follow current standards available, and those are RFC 3743 or RFC 4290, as well as 7940. So, there are three standards to represent IDN tables. It happens that 7940 is the preferred method chosen by ICANN org, but there is other two available standards in order to represent IDN tables. So, I just want to stress that researchers are following standard-based approaches and not their own implementation. This is just the desire for ICANN org to move to a single standard, so I just want to make that clarification. Thank you.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, so just to add that obviously we continue to support all the three RFCs. The reason I guess we are suggesting or we have suggested RFC 7940 in the past is that it's a standard stack, but more so because it's machine processable. So, it allows us to automate processes on our end versus the other two. Some of the information actually is textual and therefore not machine processable. Given that, I think I also wanted to share that there are two different aspects to this. One is representing the IDN table data and the other, which is I think a separate part of it, is the internal implementation of that data by the registries. And the internal implementation, of course, would depend on the registry itself.

It's just that the representation of data when it's shared with ICANN, we suggest or we prefer 7940 because it allows it to be done more, I guess, in a machine processable format and leaves it, I guess, less open to interpretation. I just wanted to clarify that, but we do support all the three versions based on, I guess, current services. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So, I'm not sure that there's anything for-- Dennis, I don't know if you can speak to this, but is there any sense that registries will be looking towards consistency in this regard in the future?

DENNIS TANAKA: I don't know. This is Dennis. Some registries have been transitioning to 7940 on their own timetables. Just imposing that from a requirements time point seems unjustified, I guess. But, yeah, there is some registries already transitioning as they offer new IDN tables. They just want to do the other one.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. And the IDN tables in the past have been-- it's pretty much been a manual process for registries. So, I guess there's challenges involved with anything with updating and going to another system. Okay. So, I guess we could cover off that ALAC comment in, I'm not sure how we'd reflect this, maybe in-- I'd have to talk to staff about this, whether we can reflect something in the rationale where we've received comments. Excuse me, I don't know how we've responded to it.

That's my first year on tonight. But, yeah, otherwise, I'm not sure what to do with this. I think, so Satish looks like he would be happy with us to do that. So, maybe that's how we deal with the comment is, make the point in the rationale that the comments were made and some of the discussion we've had here. Okay. Any other thoughts on this one? Okay. Anything else for this evening, Saewon or this morning or today?

SAEWON LEE: There's two more. I did say the C6 was last. And I promise the last two, again, doesn't really need a response. It's more of an update. And I'm so sorry, today I have a bit of background noise. I do apologize. So, first of all, the last two comments were by GAC. And we did look into D5. So, it's about the first two. And the first one was actually also

mentioned in one of the recommendations, but the second general comment, which was, again, not linked to an output, they mentioned, not sure if there's space for it in this document, but it might be worth encouraging alterations to services such as the RDRS and WHOIS to proactively provide variant domain names when one name is queried, noting they should all be controlled by the same owner and registry.

And again, I know we dealt with the first two, but again, I just wanted to conclude the comments to be shared with the team with what GAC had shared. So, I think this kind of concludes all the comments that should be shared with the team, which does conclude all the initial reviews so far. I know we have to start going back to concluding discussions for each output, whereby I know the first one would be related to the IDN tables next week. Before I go, I do want to let Donna speak first about this.

DONNA AUSTIN: That's the language that you circulated to the group in the last 24 hours or so, Saewon?

SAEWON LEE: Yes.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So, as I mentioned in the chair update that our latest attempt on language for recommendation six has been circulated. We will come back and talk about it on the call next week, but I'd also, if folks have thoughts about it ahead of time, it would be really good if you could

contribute those to the list before we get on the call. So, this is our trickiest recommendation that we're trying to resolve, I think. So, any early heads up about whether this is acceptable or not would be very welcome.

And then implementation guidance seven, I think we're moving away from having implementation guidance seven. And the only thing that we-- well, we might have something next week is the question as to whether we can pull this out of the PDP itself. So, have it considered separately or implemented ahead of time. So, we're also having some discussions going on in that regard as well. So, hopefully we might have a, an update on that next week. So, is there anything else you wanted me to say, Saewon?

SAEWON LEE: No, that was pretty much it. I mean, other than the fact that we've concluded the initial review of all the comments and starting with six and seven next week, and then reviewing one by one, I don't think there was anything else to proceed with today.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Saewon. So, just from a logistics perspective, so folks are aware that we have the draft initial report that we put out for public comment. And now that we've been through the review of the public comments, we will start working to put, I guess we will start amending the language in the report itself. So, I think we're almost getting to the stage where we can share that with folks as we start to update.

So, that's something we'll start to share. And I think what we did last time is that, when we start updating language, we will try to do it in chunks so that we can give you guys two weeks to review it, and then hopefully sign off on it, but there will be a walkthrough of that. The revised report language as well. So, we've had all the discussion here, we've taken the notes and we'll try to craft the language where the comments have suggested that we need changes to recommendations.

We'll try to draft that language and put it into the document. And in addition to that two weeks that we'll give you to review, there'll also be an opportunity on a call to walk through the language and make sure that we're all on board. So, I think that's it for today. Does anyone have anything else they wanted to raise? I think Dennis has said he has a conflict in the second hour of our next call. And unfortunately, Michael's not available for the call next week.

So, Dennis hopefully will do recommendation six in the first hour of the call next week, but this is where it becomes important to get some feedback via email ahead of time if you know you're not going to be on the call. So, we'll look for that. Alrighty, thanks, everybody. We will see you same time next week.

DEVAN REED: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]