
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening for the recording. This is Devan Reed. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP call taking place on Wednesday, 2nd of July 2025, at 13:15 UTC. We do have apologies from Tapani.

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 on the Latin Script Diacritics Wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript, and please know all chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including the session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you. And over to our chair, Michael Bauland. Please begin.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Sorry. I'm slightly distracted by something messaging here. Yeah, sorry. Just chatting with Prudence. She's joining in a few minutes. Yeah, sorry about that.

Welcome, everybody, to the 11th meeting of our LD PDP. I hope you had a nice break after the ICANN meeting, had some time to relax and think

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.

about other thoughts than diacritics, and now we can start refreshed with a new round. Next slide, please.

What we'll talk about today, welcome and SOIs, recap of what has been achieved in the last meeting, update on the AGB inclusion of the Latin Diacritics PDP, which has been asked a few times, and we are still owing you some answers here, and then we will continue with the charter question work with the IDN EPDP Phase 2 outputs, and then we'll have the next step and AOB. Next slide, please.

Regarding welcome, we do have one to welcome here, namely Alan, who is the ICANN Board liaison, and he's joined us for the good background with the IDN and topics. Maybe, Alan, you can say a few words yourself. Thanks.

ALAN BARRETT:

Okay. Thank you, Michael. This is Alan Barrett. I'm in my fourth year on the Board. I've been liaison to quite a few groups, including the IDN PDP. So certainly not an expert, but I do have some background knowledge. What I'm looking to get out of this from the Board side is a policy that is easy to understand, easy to implement, and hopefully not too controversial. From a personal standpoint, I want Montreal and Quebec to be able to register their names with and without diacritics. I want other kinds of words with diacritics to be allowed as much as possible, and with some kind of rule of the same entity controlling both the versions with and without diacritic. So that's what I'm looking for. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Alan, and great to have you on the team. So next slide, please.

Then we'll come to the outcomes and key action items. As you know, we have finished the IDN EPDP Phase 1 Recommendations during the ICANN meeting. There are still a few to-do left with the Phase 1 Recommendations, which we postponed to the end because they somehow depend on other decisions we made, so it makes sense to reconsider them once we have finalized everything else, so we will revisit them after the Phase 2 answers.

As key action items, we were discussing how to best approach the ICANN legal issues, and there we have set some background discussion. The approach is not to have a meeting with Legal at the moment, which was suggested during the ICANN meeting, but try to get the information from Legal via request an e-mail because that's their usual way how they work. And only in case we find out there are some problems with that way of communication, because it's going a bit back and forth, and we would need to have a conversation to speed things up that might be a way, but at the moment, we are confident that we can get what we need via just text communication.

Another item was to discuss whether the last week's meeting should be canceled. Obviously, it has been canceled. At least I wasn't there, and hopefully you weren't there either, because a lot of people attended the IGF and wouldn't have been able to join. So we thought it better to cancel that one. Next slide, please.

So coming to an interesting topic, the update on the Applicant Guidebook inclusion of our work. The main goal of our work, as Alan

also mentioned, is to have applicants be able to apply for their TLD in their native, correctly spelled version, as well as in the ASCII-only version, which is currently not possible to have both at the same time. And for that, we need the Applicant Guidebook to be changed to allow for our exception process to kick in. This turned out to be a bit more complicated than we at first hoped or thought. Unless we have our recommendations ready, we can't put anything into the Applicant Guidebook that would state that our Recs should take place, so to say. For that reason, the current goal how to best achieve this is to finish quickly, which, of course, we all want to do, and have the scope limited, which also speeds up the process. And then, if we finished in time, use the so-called SPIRT process, which allows us to change the Applicant Guidebook even though it already went through the public comment and has been finalized. That's an official process within ICANN, and we think that this process has the best chance of success. Of course, we can't promise that this will definitely work. Of course, we can't promise we will finish in time, but that's at least to some extent in our own hand and we try to do that, but then we also depend on the SPIRT approval that they can and will accommodate our outcome into the Applicant Guidebook before the next round starts. I see a hand from Anil. Please.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you, Michael. First of all, thank you very much for bringing this particular topic in LD PDP. I also agree that it is important at this stage, especially when the new gTLD round is nearby, that we should have Applicant Guidebook specifically oriented to LD PDP also.

Now there are two, three methods through which we can go and try to complete this job as fast as possible. Number one, we have spent a huge amount of time in EPDP IDN. Also, if we can scroll with the speed with which we have completed scanning the Phase 1, I think we can complete this job before October 2025.

Second approach is that we can make a small subcommittee out of this LD PDP, which can have the discussions in addition to the LD PDP. And we can give a timeframe of, say, four to six weeks to that small group to complete this job and come back with the recommendations to LD PDP to have a final recommendation. So these are just my suggestions to go ahead. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Anil. And just a quick question, what was your suggestion regarding the small team? What should be their task? If it is a drafting of the recommendations, I think if I understood the process correctly, we don't have to do that, but the ICANN team will take care of this. Or was it something else you suggested?

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

So you're suggesting about the recommendations and the drafting of those, or was there another task for the small team you mentioned?

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Thank you, Michael. This is on the same line as we—I was part of the SPIRT Working Group also, small group, and I think this is somehow the similar work which we have to do. But if we can spare time from LD PDP main working group, that would be much better. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I'm sorry, but I still don't understand what you think the task of the small group is. Maybe somebody has understood that better than me.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Michael, let me try to explain, in case I can explain again. Here we are looking at the modification of Applicant Guidebook with reference to LD PDP. As I said initially when I was discussing that, a good amount of time was spent in EPDP IDN Phase 1 and Phase 2, and we have given recommendations on the Applicant Guidebook also. So if we can just go through those aspects and look into those clauses which required some modifications with respect to LD PDP, that small team can discuss those and come back to LD PDP, that was my recommendation. But rest of course, all members can think whether it is a feasible possibility, and can we get it done. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. Justine, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: Hi all. I'm sorry, but I still don't get what Anil is referring to specifically. Any modifications to the AGB isn't done by a PDP, right? It's done by

ICANN Org in consultation with an IRT. I imagine that it would be continuation of the SubPro IRT if this modification is contemplated before the Applicant Guidebook is approved by the Board, if we hit that milestone where the AGB is approved by the Board, then we look at—not us, but looks at modification, then it will have to go through the SPIRT—spelled SPIRT but pronounced as spirit—which comes into being after the Applicant Guidebook is approved by the Board. So there is no role per se for this PDP to do any modification to the AGB. That happens outside of the PDP.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks, Justine, for the clarification. So what we should do right now is just to try and finish the work as soon as possible, and then get the background processes started that make our work available for the Applicant Guidebook. As you said, Justine, there's probably nothing we as a PDP group can do there. It's the ICANN team that will have to do the legal and other necessary tasks for that to work.

Okay. Any other questions or comments regarding this update on the AGB inclusion? Seeing none, I guess we can continue. Thanks for the confirmation in chat. Next slide, please.

So we have finished the Phase 1 question, as mentioned before, and we'll now continue to Phase 2. Next slide, please, for that.

Just a very brief introduction of what this IDN EPDP Phase 2 is about, because I think not everybody joined the nice EPDP group. So the Phase 2, we had a kind of similar problem we are having here that we needed to have some results available as soon as possible because other tasks

depended on that. And for that reason, we decided to have a two-phase approach in the IDN EPDP with a Phase 1, all related to top-level policies, and the Phase 2 is then related to all the second-level topics. So it's mainly about the second-level variant management. We had topics like the same entity at the second-level and the IDN Table harmonization adjustment in the Registry Agreement and the processes, and also some adjustments in the Registration Dispute Resolution Procedures, Trademark Protection Mechanisms, all this, and a process for the IDN Implementation Guideline updates. With that, we created 14 Recommendations and 6 Implementation Guidelines, and we'll start looking at those now. So please, Saewon or... switch to the spreadsheet, please. Thank you.

So we'll start with recommendation—the same entity at the second-level and the IDN Table harmonization. It says, “The same entity principle applies to the allocation of future variant domain names at the second-level of gTLD. This means that all allocatable variant domain names from a variant domain set must be allocated or withheld for possible allocation only to the same registrant. Additionally, all allocated domain names must be at the same sponsoring registrar.”

Any thoughts how and if this relates to our work? Do we need to have the same entity principle for us too? So if you have a TLD example in all ASCII and TLD example with some accent diacritic character. Do we want that test.example and the test.example with diacritics belong to the same entity? All quiet. Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, just to make sure I'm getting this right. So if you have two TLDs running in parallel, Sebastien with and without an accent, if you create test in Sebastien with the accent, you own test with Sebastien without the accent and it's the same entity. If you want to write test with an accent or test without an accent within those TLDs, those are two completely different domains and don't need to behave like that. I don't know. Apart from the top-level domain where we have very specific cases of this equivalency. This is not variation like it is an IDN. So I don't know that we need to impose that in particular. So test.example, like what you've written, yeah, that needs to be the same owner in the same domain name in two different TLDs. What I'm talking about is test with an accent, without an accent. Those, to me, are two complete different names. There's no variation. We're not reinventing variation there at second-level, it was only at top-level that we're talking about. My own two cents here.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. Alan, please.

ALAN BARRETT: Thanks. I'm not sure how much of say I get. I'm a liaison, not a member here. But yeah, I think that the two variants—I'm going to use the term variant even though it's technically incorrect—should both be controlled by the same entity. Otherwise, the public is likely to be confused, and we do have a responsibility to look after the public interest.

Maybe they're not really words, like example with an accent. I'm not aware of any language in which that is a word. Hang on. Or is that in French? It could be. Anyway, maybe you could make an exception. But then you run into problems of how do you define the exceptions? Much easier to just say it's always got to be the same entity.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks. So it seems like everybody is agreeing that we also should have the same entity here. And just quickly to come back to what Sebastien said for test, and test with diacritics doesn't see that this is necessary the case. I think that largely depends on the registry policy itself. So how they define their IDN Table. They are free to design and define it also at the second-level you have the text [inaudible] variant, but they also could say this is not a variant. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

While it's up to the policy of the individual registry, it seems to me that since ICANN has made recommendations on what the policy should look like with regards to IDNs, I think we ought to at least consider adding this to the recommendations rather than just saying we're leaving it up to them. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks. Amadeu, please. If you're talking, we're not yet hearing you. If you're still looking for your unmute button on your phone then—

AMADEU ABRIL: Is it me, Amadeu?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes. Okay. We can hear you.

AMADEU ABRIL: Sorry, I was unmuting, and while I was unmuting, I could not hear that you were calling my name. I think there are two different questions here. First, the text we read refers directly to variants. But for variants, strictly known as variants in the terms we define variants, yes, they should apply. I mean, it doesn't make any sense that example with .example. And .example with an accent treat variants at the second-level in a different way than any other TLD than are variants at the top-level, right? So in that sense, now, what we are discussing here is not variants, but whether the diacritics should be treated in the same way. And yes, these are registry policy. But don't you find it will be quite strange to say that, to give an example, .quebec and .québec at the top-level are the same, but they are not the same at the second-level? Our goal here is to prevent user confusion. And I don't know exactly how to explain a user that .quebec and .québec (with an accent) are treated as they are the same thing, but .quebec without an accent and .québec with an accent are treated differently because at the second-level—well, it depends on the registry that has already told the public that they consider that with and without accent, the same word is confusingly similar. So I think the limit of clearance doesn't harm, frankly.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: The problem I have with this is a question of size of the population. At TLD level, we're talking about a limited amount of applicants by definition, just because they cost that much, and a thorough process of vetting. At second-level, we're not. It's a free for all. And the problem, if we start putting rules that are variant-like is I suspect we're going to have exactly the same problem that the original RZ-LGR groups had, which is it's in Latin, because of the multi-simplicity of languages, of the meaning and usage of accents and all these things, that it's going to be a nightmare. And I suspect that that's why they didn't go there. It's just way too complicated across all languages. Well, not script, but across all languages. So, at TLD level, limited number of applicants, limited number of situation, and more money to go and vet these things and make sure that works at second-level, I think it's going to be too complicated, but that's again my two cents.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Sebastien. I also see in the chat that Satish suggests we need to clearly disambiguate between variant and diacritic, which could be called pseudo variants. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. Yeah, I was actually going to say something similar which Satish put in the chat. So we're talking about at least three different scenarios here, and I think we need to sort of be, I guess, clear which

scenario we're talking about. There's one scenario where we have variants at the top-level and variants at the second-level. We're clearly not talking about that scenario because that's already solved by the IDN EPDP SubPro work earlier by the two policies, and that obviously applies.

Now we have a situation where we don't have variants at the top-level. We have strings which are grouped together because of some diacritics. That's what we are trying to address. Possible examples, of course, are .quebec without an accent and other strings. And then we can have variants at the second-level under the same strings and variants under them, and that is obviously something which we want to discuss. How we want to define the policy for it is, obviously I'm not sure whether we're getting into that discussion right now or not, but if we are discussing whether that's a relevant discussion to have, that's certainly a relevant discussion to have.

So we're talking about the two scenarios here. We have the same label under, say, the simple string and the diacritized string. So it's s1.t1 and s1.t1 prime or something. The more complex version is s1.t1 and—sorry. There's also this possibility of variants under that string. So that's one.

The third case is also—I think some people have talked about it, where we have diacritized version at the top-level, they're not quite variants, and then we have diacritized version at the second-level, which are not variants either. I think, to me, the second variants under the diacritized version is certainly something which is in scope. And then the third piece, which is diacritized version, and the second-level which are not

variants under diacritized version of top-level domains which are not variants either. I'm not really sure whether we want to go there, but that's obviously up to this PDP. But in any case, I wanted to lay out that those are three different cases. At least for me, we're more focused on two, the second case. I'm not sure whether the PDP wants to look at the third case. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks. Before I go to Bill, I think those three cases are exactly right, that we need to look at them. And case one seems to be obvious, because that's basically out of scope for our work. Maybe it makes sense to have some visual examples of what those three scenarios are so it's easier for the group to see and make decisions for that. So my suggestion would be to possibly postpone this to the next call and prepare some examples so we can easily see what we are talking about, and so everybody can easier make an opinion of what we should do here. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

To respond to Sebastien's point a moment ago. Yes, the second-level is a lot more complex and a lot more potentially users of various kinds. And also ICANN is not really in a position to mandate what the Registries will do there, but we can recommend what they should do, and they can choose to write that into their software, just as they're writing in how to deal with variants, which, again, ICANN recommend they do, but cannot require it. So I don't really see that that's a special issue. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thank you.

AMADEU ABRIL: Michael, this is Amadeu. May I say something?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I was just going to ask you whether it's a new hand or not.

AMADEU ABRIL: It was the old head, but I want to reuse it, if possible.

MICHAEL BAULAND: You may reuse it.

AMADEU ABRIL: Just as a piece of clarification, a concrete example. Apparently, TLDs like .cat since 2006 or .quebec, which is one of the poster child for this discussion, are enforcing the block or allocation to the same registrant at the second-level or this pseudo, we call that false variants, right? Not just the variant as defined as such, but so to speak, sebastien.quebec with an acute accent and without cannot be allocated as different domains to different registrants. And this is valid for even Sebastien with an accent to the A or any combination of those diacritics. And the reason simply is to prevent confusion.

Once again, we cannot dictate general policy, but here we are making a specific exception, or dealing whether we need to do a specific exception for something that, in principle, is confusing for the customer, for the user, not just for the customer of the TLD, for the users of the Internet. And therefore, exceptions normally come with exceptional restrictions and conditions. So the general rule that registrars decide whether to have variants or not even or how to handle that to the second-level, it's okay, but they think it doesn't bind us, and it doesn't mean necessarily that my approach is correct, and we should request that from the second-level. Simply, this is a special case, and a special case often the server special rules.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah, it makes sense. Thanks. Sarmad, to you. I'm not sure whether we should actually make a decision now, or if it makes more sense to have the example of the cases which Samad provided in speaking, which might be difficult to follow if you're not too deep into the topic, just that as a visual thing, and then come back to that next week. Mark, please.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD:

Thank you, Michael. I was saying in chat that as far as recommendations go, even though we might have a lot of cases and different possibilities, from our group's perspective, we either recommend everything is a bundle or it's not a bundle, right? We can explore all of this edge cases, but at the end of the day, one thing is true, there are variants that are recognized in the Label Generation Rules. So those are variants, and

that probably should have some specific treatment. But otherwise, we are either recommending everything is a bundle or not.

So we can take this to another day and do further discussion. But possibly that's not necessary because it comes to this. It comes to this one thing. It comes to this one conclusion. So maybe it's the best way to understand how the group feels about that. It seems like it leans slightly towards everything should be a bundle. And the question is more about, how do we treat variants within this context? Because if we decide that everything is a bundle, that's a moot point. It doesn't matter. But if we decide that it's not a bundle, then variants should be discussed. So deciding the scope of that seems, I would say, important to move forward, but just trying to bring focus to discussion.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks, Mark. I'm not 100% sure either. I mean, everything that the variant by LGR, of course, has to be within the same entity principle. There's not much we can do about it. Then we don't want to change that's already been decided by the IDN EPDP policies. The question now only remains with the cases where we have nonvariants. We have the diacritic pseudo variant. At some point we should start giving this a name to better refer to that.

Sarmad put something in the chat here. Variant.variant and variant.LDalternate with LDalternate being the Latin diacritic version of the ASCII. And then also we have LDalternate.LDalternate. Okay. Since we have it here in the chat, we can also talk about this now. So the first case variant is obvious. This is not our work. This has been decided.

The second case is where we have TLD and LD alternate version. What would happen with domains in those two and with variant in those two. As far as I can see from the chat and the comments, this should also adhere to the same entity principle because we take the ASCII version and the LD alternate version as kind of the same as pseudo variants, and therefore those should also be subject to the same entity principle. The question that remains is what we do with LD alternates at the second-level. Should those also adhere to the same entity principle? Should this be something the registry is free to decide their policies? Is this something we at least suggest to do? That's basically, as far as I can see from the discussion so far, the point where we haven't agreed yet. Any thoughts?

Claude says, actually, diacritic. Quebec.ca and .quebec with diacritics .ca, and both are allocated to the Quebec government. Both are ending on the same website, so they belong to the same entity. I also note that for the Quebec TLD, all those Latin diacritic versions are considered to be variants based on their LGR tables. But this is not something for which there's currently a rule that this is a must. And the question is, do we want to enforce a similar behavior? Do we want to leave it open to the registry, or do we want to suggest something but not enforced it? Mark, please.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: Maybe we get a general sentiment on this. We've heard a lot of different things, but I'm finding it hard to place quite correctly where everybody's opinions are because a lot of discussion in the chat. And so if the members who feel strongly about this could just put on chat real

quick or something for us to get a feeling of where this is, that would be helpful, so that we know at least where the majority of you is or where the general sentiment is because that would help us move forward with this.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, good suggestion. Thanks. Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You were suggesting earlier to go to share examples, so that everybody fully understands what we're talking about. I think it's going to be very easy to find positive examples, Amadeu was using before my name, Sebastien with or without an accent. And all these seem very logical. I think that the devil is in the details. And for each positive example that we're going to be able to build a role on, we're going to find 100 counter examples with Sebastien with accents going in all sorts of directions that are not properly spelled, and so on and so forth, and how we want to handle that is going to be the bigger problem. So, we can show of hands. I think I've given my views. And don't get me wrong, everything that has been said about actual variants still applies. None of this in question, which is putting a question using Latin diacritics or applying variant rules wholesale to Latin diacritics, I think, it might be a bit dangerous. Again, I suggest that we go by example in the mailing list, and we get a better sense of the size of the problem that we're talking about.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. So if anyone could just quickly state in the chat whether they want to make a decision now, or whether we should have some examples for the next meeting and look at those, and make a decision once we have the examples. That would be appreciated if you could quickly put in the chat right now or examples later, or something like that. Or nothing at all.

Okay. Mark says now, not as a co-chair but as his personal opinion. Bill says, "Wait." Alan also says, "Examples would be useful." Satish, "Later with examples." Okay. Prudence, also example. I see more examples at the moment. So let's come back. We will discuss some examples in the leadership call, and then prepare one or two slides with those examples. I think that makes it easier for everybody to see exactly what we are talking about. And we come back to that next week then.

Okay. So that was Rec 1. Let's go to Implementation Guidance. I think since that is usually related to the Rec. It makes sense to talk about that next week, too, once we have the Rec ready. And we go to Rec 3 then, the same entity at the second-level and the IDN Table harmonization. It says like, "Immediately prior to the policy effective date of the same entity principle as set out in Rec 1." At least we have the same entity for the variant cases. So we can talk about this because we have that already more or less geared up. It says, "The existing variant domain names that do not confirm to the same entity principle must be exempted. This means that there will be no change to the contractual or allocation status of such existing variant domain names. The requirement of having the same registrant and the same sponsoring registrar will not be applied retroactively. gTLD registries must determine variant sets for each exempted label as if it is a soft domain

name and protect from registration all variant labels in all such variant sets in all variant gTLDs, as appropriate.”

There’s the question about exempting cases that already currently exist before the policy comes into effect. And the IDN EPDP said that those should be exempted. There’s no retroactively thing that would make them force one of them to be deleted or to force them to be combined, but they may coexist until such a case that the exemption is done because only one entity exists or they all belong to the same entity. Is this something we would want to do, too? Bill already said that he suggest to use the same Rec because we don’t want to do anything retroactively. Any different opinions than to choose that? I see none. So let’s put there that one and give people a few more seconds to think. And if not, we can...

Satish says, “Retroactive cases have been labeled with grandfathering.” That’s right, although we had to use a different name, it’s not called grandfathered anymore. It’s now called exempted. Yeah, it makes sense to have the same policy for our cases to exempt any existing cases in them.

Okay. Then Rec 4, this is about same entity at the second-level and the IDN Table harmonization. It says, “Any allocatable variant domain names of exempted domain names pursuant to Rec 3 cannot be allocated unless and until only one registrant and one sponsoring registrar remained for the exempted domain names from the relevant variant domain set.”

This says that as long as there's still some exemption going on, no further additional domains can be registered in the same set. The reason for that was because it's not obvious to which exempted domain this belongs, and also we don't want to increase the number of exempted domains. And therefore, in the IDN EPDP, it was decided to not allow further exemptions and only to wait until the current exemptions hopefully solve themselves. Any thoughts how we want to do this here? Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

As a case for previous one as well, if we are wanting the LD alternate at the top-level to potentially, I guess, behave in a similar way as the variants at the top-level domain, then the second-level recommendations of which are under variant TLDs, this group may need to see how this could be extended under LD alternate TLDs as well. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. Alan writes that, "If test and test, one with ASCII and one diacritic exist and are exempted, then têt can't be allocated at all until the situation changes to only one entity. I support it." Support from Alan and Sarmad. Any objection? Anil also agrees. We can use that. It also makes sense from an operation point of view if we have similar or same rules as the IDN EPDP because then registrars and registrants and end customers don't have to learn two different approaches how this is handled. Yeah. So green here.

Final Rec 5, “All of the existing and future IDN Tables for given gTLD and its delegated gTLD variant labels, if any, must be harmonized. This means that all of the IDN Tables for gTLD and its delegated gTLD variant labels must produce a consistent variant domain name set for a given second label registered under that gTLD or its delegated gTLD variant label.”

So this says that for TLD and the variant TLD, the IDN Table used for those TLDs don’t have to be exactly the same, but they have to be harmonized, and they have to produce a consistent variant set. Question is, do we want this for our ASCII and Latin diacritic version too that the IDN Tables under both or more TLDs are harmonized and produce a consistent variant set? Amadeu, please.

AMADEU ABRIL:

Okay. I’m not sure whether I am following exactly on what’s here, but let me give an example in which I think it could be possible. Again, my goal is to reduce user confusion where this would not apply. Let’s imagine that we have test and test with an accent, or Quebec and Quebec with an accent. It could be possible that the registry decides—I mean, one question is whether we should allow the location of names in ASCII and Latin in with ASCII+ Latin diacritics with different parties. But could it be possible that the registrar says, “Okay, test in ASCII. All we have ASCII versions and all the diacritics and all the special characters and IDNs will go only to the diacritic version.” That is test.quebec without an accent would be that, but test with an accent will all belong to the IDN TLD version.

I'm not saying that this makes a lot of sense. It makes some sense in some cases, and certainly it prevents the question of confusion of the same names being to different parties, simply saying we have a Latin version and we have a Latin plus IDN version, and names belong to one or the other TLD. In that case, the IDN Table will be different because one of them will be purely ASCII, and the other one would be the one with diacritics.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Perfect. Thanks, Amadeu. Before I go to Sarmad, yes, I think that's a viable use case, but I don't think this contradicts the harmonized IDN Tables. If you have the ASCII TLDs and TLD, and only allow ASCII second-level there, and all IDN second-level must be in diacritic TLD, then those are different IDN Tables but there's no problem with—

AMADEU ABRIL:

Okay. They are different but they are harmonized. Then I accept that. My point was that perhaps it could be different. I'm not saying that I sponsor that solution. I'm saying that this would not create additional confusion. Okay. Then this is still compatible, in the sense that's harmonized, I accept that this is the case here.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah. They won't contradict each other, so to say. They are still consistent. Okay. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

What I was, I guess, going to suggest was that second-level IDN Tables are those which are eventually designed by the relevant TLD registries. There's a baseline, of course, which is suggested through the reference LGRs, but they can always make it more conservative and add more variants. So I think that option is not excluded. What this recommendation says is that whatever eventually the TLD registry decides, if they have multiple IDN Tables, they must be harmonized, meaning that they create a consistent set of variants based on whichever IDN Table is being used.

So, in that sense, I guess what I was going to say was that this recommendation still holds, but it's not really relevant here because that's a recommendation which is already approved, and seems like there's probably no implications on our work on updating the recommendation. So it's not relevant in that sense that it holds and probably no further changes are needed or no further considerations needed. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks. Yeah, exactly what you say. The thing is, if labeled A and B are variants in one of the TLDs, it must not be the case that A and B are both available in the other TLD and not variant. If only one of those labels is available in the other TLD, then there's no problem because it doesn't contradict the variant relationship of the first one. It's just that if both are available there, they also must be variant.

I think I see agreement that this makes sense here too. I'm not 100% sure with what you, Sarmad, said, it's not applicable? Don't we also

have to have this here? ASCII TLD and the diacritic versions have IDN Tables, then those should be harmonized, shouldn't they? Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yes. I guess that part, yes, I agree with you, that there may be some extension for TLD alternates, which should consider this. I agree. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks. Looking at the time, I think we can possibly make that one still, Rec 6. "The baseline criteria for implementing IDNs at the second-level must be security and stability of the DNS. ICANN Org and gTLD registry operators shall be responsible for reaching mutual agreement on a minimum set of IDN variant deployment requirements, including the variant sets at the second-level. In developing the minimum set of IDN variant deployment requirements, ICANN Org and the gTLD registry operator shall consult with other relevant stakeholders, including ICANN-accredited registrars and script communities."

Any thoughts here? So this is basically stating that there should be some baseline minimum requirements and that those should be developed by ICANN and the registries, and that other parties, including the registrar, should be included in this. Philippe says this makes sense to him. Some agreement. Any objection? Seeing none.

The thing is that the baseline rules will be developed for the variant, and I think it's automatically is applicable to us because we also have the harmonization here. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

I was going to say the same thing, that this is just developing data for variants, which will be done by the IDN EPDP Phase 2 work once those recommendations are implemented, approved, and implemented. So that part's covered. I guess the question is, is there anything extra which we need to do here? If not, then that part's already covered from EPDP Phase 2. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

I tend to agree here that the task, the Rec 6 is already covered by the IDN EPDP, and I see no additional work at our PDP here. We just worked with what's there because we won't change any variant rules here. They will remain in place. So possibly we put in something like this, determine prior or outside. Yeah.

And with that, I'll head over back to—I never remember whether it's Saewon or John. Sorry about that. One of you, please go ahead.

SAEWON LEE:

It's me. Thank you, Michael. I was just changing my screen. So sorry for the pause. I hope everyone can see this.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, we can.

SAEWON LEE: So I know we got stuck in the first recommendation, but I think we proceeded well in finishing the section, at least, so well done, everyone. Obviously, we'll be continuing next week. So as you can see here, the next step is to still continue with reviewing the EPDP IDN Phase 2 recommendations, as well as the spreadsheet, obviously.

So here please pay attention to the fact that we only have two more meetings scheduled until 16th of July, as we do still anticipate the discussions on Charter Question 3 to be done by then. But obviously, if the discussions prolong, we'll most probably resume with the calls on 30th of July. So we might be missing 23rd of July, as our chair will not be available then. But either way, after the Charter Question 3 discussions are done, we will, as discussed in the beginning, take a short break while the preliminary recommendations are being drafted. If no questions related to the next steps, I will hand over to John.

JOHN EMERY: Thanks so much, Saewon. So the main action item for today is that the leadership team and staff will get together to prepare some examples of the robust discussion we had today so we can really have a little bit better and more concrete discussion about it next week. So that's the only action item from today. Michael, back to you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, John, for the summary. I agree we will welcome those examples, and I guess that makes it much easier to decide what we actually want to achieve with our policy when we see those cases on the screen. With that, I will end the call and give you back two or three more minutes. Thanks, everybody, and talk to you next week. Have a great week until then. Bye. You may stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]