DEVAN REED:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP Call, taking place on Wednesday, the 12th of November, 2025 at 1315 UTC.
	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 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 note all chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, concerning statements of interest.
	And with this, I turn it back over to Michael.
MICHAEL BAULAND:	Thanks, Devan, and welcome, everybody, to our first meeting after Dublin. Just a quick thing before we start with the agenda. There was a question since many people just changed their time zone from summertime to wintertime. This meeting is one hour earlier now for some of the people, and especially the US West Coast like Bill and John. This probably means that they have to get up quite

early. Question is, would everybody be okay with moving this meeting from 13 UTC to 14 UTC or quarter past which we always have? I know or think that India doesn't have this time zone change. So I mean Neil and Satish and Harsha might have a problem if it's one hour later.

SATISH BABU: It's fine with me. This is Satish.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay.

LOUIS HOULE: This is Louie speaking. Yes, it's going to be better—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. I am also okay with it. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. Louis?

LOUIS HOULE: It's going to be better for our friends in the West Coast. Five o'clock in the morning? It's quite early to be up and running.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, that's what we thought.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Michael, [inaudible]. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. So to help Bill and John and others who might [inaudible] the West Coast, let's move the meeting starting next week to one hour later. Okay.

Then let's (next slide) start with the agenda. We'll have a quick recap of the working sessions from ICANN. Then we will continue with the stress test of the unresolved cases. And depending on how the timing goes, we'll continue with the charter topic deliberations, namely the charter question four, the impact on other existing policies and of course the GPI/HR impact assessment.

With that, next slide please. Let's go to the recap. As you know, we have finalized the review of the preliminary recommendations. This has all been updated in the doc. And we conducted the case studies and for numbers one through four, we found out that they, though interesting, are okay[.] If they are, they are either not in scope or are already covered by our recommendations. And we then ran out of time when we discussed five and six, and we will continue with those today.

Next slide please. So for the action items, we wanted to update the recommendation language within the PR doc and at footnote for the PR 39. This has been completed. We'll take a look at this next. And then PR 44[;] update the language and/or the footnote. We'll see that too. And then for PR 45, there was the question to have some examples in the rationale, and we are currently working on those. This will be completed too soon. And then there was a topic to shift the order of the recommendations to have PR 45 follow [IG 49.] That makes a bit more sense, makes it easier to understand, and that's also complete and can be seen in the preliminary recommendation doc. And we'll take a look at slide 9. And then the action item 2 was that we wanted to revisit the edge case 6 and come up with recommendations to cover this point if necessary.

So next slide please. For the preliminary recommendation 39, it says building on an ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set as defined in preliminary recommendation one. Then ASCII Latin the diacritic domain set is defined to include one label and all its variants within a given TLD as determined by second-level LGR for that given TLD and to the same labels and all their variants across all other TLDs within the ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set. This was something we discussed in Dublin. I think Sarmad made us aware that the previous wording had some issues, and we came up with new wording (I think it was during lunchtime) and then presented that new wording to the group. And as far as I remember,

EN

everybody was in favor with the new wording. We have a footnote here to the first section, where we say, "For avoidance of doubt, the term 'label' here refers specifically to second-level labels." And in section two, we have a footnote saying, "For avoidance of doubt, the term "the same labels" here refers specifically to second-level labels that were outlined in section one." So it's the label and all its variants.

Is this version now okay with everybody or does anybody still see some issues with this definition? If so, please raise your hand. Or Anil has some thumbs up. Thanks for that. Yeah, I think this covers the requirements we have quite well, so I think it's a good version now and covers some valuable input here.

Okay, seeing no objection, we can continue with the next slide, please. This is regarding the update for PR 45. The option one is to have that included in the recommendation language. And option two is to add the additional information to a footnote. So I will read option one now. "Consistent with final recommendation eight from the EPDP IDN phase two final report, a registrant and its sponsoring registrar must jointly determine the source domain name which must be registered for calculating the variant domain set under a given ASCII gTLD or its delegated Latin diacritic gTLDs, if any.

Now comes the insert. It says, "The source domain name here can be different per TLD in accordance with the ASCII Latin

diacritic domain set defined in preliminary recommendation 39 and the EPDP IDN. The registrants and sponsoring registrars of the accepted domain names pursuant to preliminary Reg 42 are excluded from this requirement."

The alternative from having this insert about the source domain name [so] that it can be different per TLD would be to leave it out of the rec and put it in a footnote saying, "The source domain name here can be different per TLD in accordance with ASCII Latin domain set defined in preliminary recommendation 39.   The solution allowing different soft domain names per TLD is consistent with EPDP IDN." Or option three is to have both; to have it in the rec and also as a footnote.

Any comments? Sarmad, please?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Not suggesting on option one or option two but more on the wording itself. Is there a need to say that where the source domain names are different, they must come from the same variant set or is that the larger variant set across the variant TLDs? Or is that understood?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Good point. Since all domains must be within our ASCII Latin TLD domain set, I think it would be obvious that the source domain also must come from this set.   But if you think it's not totally

obvious, it's definitely helpful to at least add a footnote here that of course the source domain name must be from within the set; this domain set which we defined at an earlier recommendation. I don't have the exact wording here, but we find the ASCII Latin domain main set somewhere, and the source domain name must of course be from that set. And then it's clear that it must be within the variants for that TLD. But yeah, good point. I think it can't hurt to I have a footnote here stating that the source domain must be from that set.

Any other comments or preferences regarding option 1, 2, 3? Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. My personal preference would be for the recommendation to be fairly minimalist because the recommendations are going to be processed and translated and all that. If it is very bulky, then it makes it difficult to wrap your head around it. The details can be taken out into the footnote, but the core recommendation is (this is my personal choice) left as simple as possible so that downstream processing is easier and it's easy for end users to understand as well. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. Yeah, good point. And I tend to agree here because the language we have here in the recommendation does not

require them to be the same. So it kind of implicitly already allows different source domain names and different TLDs, but it's not explicitly written here. But to avoid too many sentences to come related [for the] recommendation, it's probably better to clarify this in the footnote. I personally would agree here to have option two.

Other opinions?

No one? Unless anybody wants to object now, we will go for option two and remove it from the rec and keep that "for clarification purposes" in the footnote so that people are aware we do not require the same source domain name, and in the footnote we explicitly say they may be different. Okay, great. Thanks. I see agreement here with Louis and Anil.

Okay, next slide please. This is just the order of the PR. We used to have nine topics here, but it turned out that this was not so useful because topic nine, if I remember correctly, Saewon, was just one recommendation?

SAEWON LEE: Correct.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, okay, thanks. So we said to have a topic with just a single recommendation seems a bit of a waste of space for the recs, so

we included this and renamed topic 8 to adjustments and registration processes pertinent to the domain name lifecycle, which then also includes these dispute resolution procedures. And it's anyway just the headlines categorization. So the recommendations itself remain exactly the same. It's just that they are now at a different location.

Unless anybody has any objections here, I think we can continue to the next slide. Yeah, some good news, at least for the IDN-PDP, is that we have built both recommendations 74 and 75, which up until a few weeks ago had not been adopted by the Board from the IDN EPDP. And that's why we also had some recommendations where we stated that we want to proceed in accordance with the outcome of the ICANN Board's decision. And we can adjust this now, basically because the ICANN Board decision was to take the recommendations as they are. So this would mean we can also leave our recommendations as they are and can remove the reference that we want to stay in line with the IDN EPDP phase one final rec 7.4 and 7.5. That was basically just a safeguard for the case that the Board would not adopt those recs and would have taken some other decisions, and the recs would have had to change to some extent. Then we wanted to change our recs accordingly to keep in line with that, but since that was not the case, we can just keep them so they read as following.

"Consistent with final recommendation 7.4 of the EPDP IDN phase 1 final report, the registry fixed fee for gTLD registrar operator that operates the delegated gTLD label that constitutes the ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set must be the same as the gTLD registry operator of a single gTLD unless and until the ICANN Board determines otherwise." And I think that's the part that can be removed here because the ICANN Board agreed to have this.

And the preliminary recommendation 19. ["]Accordingly set consistent with Final Rec 75 of the EPDP IDN Phase 1 Final Report, the calculation of the registry level transaction fee must be based on the cumulative number of domain name registrations of the combined delegated gTLD labeled from ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set unless and until the ICANN Board determines otherwise." So again here I think we can get rid of this last part ("unless and until") since the ICANN Board agreed to have that that the way. Satish please?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. I'm trying to locate 7.4 and 7.5 in the EPDP Phase 1 report. I know it is about the fees, but I'm not able to locate 7.4. It's implementation guidance 7.4. Recommendations are—

MICHAEL BAULAND: [inaudible]

SATISH BABU: Recommendations are 7.4. The 7.4 is implementation guidance.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Maybe it was 7.3 and 7.5.

SATISH BABU: It is 5 and 6 if it should be in the same chapter, D1B, the same charter question. It should be five and six, not four and five as far as I can make out, but please check this. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. Yeah, good point. We can check this later offline and adjust the slides and/or our recommendations accordingly, but there are those recommendations in the IDN EPDP, which are … Oh, okay, Saewon is already moving there. Okay, 7.4 and 7.5. Okay. Maybe … Yeah, let's—

SATISH BABU: Please check the report itself. Phase one report. This is a Board resolution. I was referring to the phase one report. But it's not important right now. It can be checked later. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, thanks. It's a good point. We will do some checking in the background and discuss this and then come back to you next week with either with an explanation or a slightly fixed version. But independent of the numbering of the content, it should be clear that there are two on recs here. Okay, Saewon is already … Okay, there's a final record 7.4 and 7.5.

SATISH BABU: Okay, so that means I have a different version of this final report.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. Maybe you have a working version which we have been working on. I also have like five or ten different versions of this on my PC.

SATISH BABU: Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. So these are the recs from the IDN EPDP. So the first one just says that the fixed fee should be independent of … The TLD labels you have should be the same as if you were operating a single TLD.   And the second one says that, to calculate the transaction fees, you just sum up all the numbers of registrations in all TLDs and then have the combined number of transactions, and those are the transaction fees. And for our case, we said it

makes sense to be in line here with the IDN EPDP and also say that the fixed fee for a Latin ASCII set should be the same as for a single TLD, and the transaction level fees should be the combination of all domains. Since we want to be in line with the IDN EPDP as much as possible, it makes sense to have the same rules here. Okay, so that means for this Rec 18[/]19, we just removed this "unless and until" and according keep the footnote that explains this since it has been resolved by now.

Okay then I think we can go to the stress test and go to the unresolved cases next. And here is just a quick overview where we see we have four of the six cases we checked, and they are fine. And then we can go to [inaudible] … [Four] was okay. The scenario five where we have the situation where an applicant owns an ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set and whether they should be allowed to activate a variant for one of their TLDs. So in the example, we have the ASCII TLD Strasse with 2 S's, and the Latin diacritic TLD Strasse with 2 S's, and the r with an umlaut with two dots—a diaeresis, I think. And the question would be, could they activate a variant of those? And we found out that this is more of a hypothetical case because there is no allocatable variant of any ASCII TLD. And since we have to have an ASCII version in our Latin diacritic set, there is no set that can exist where there is an allocatable variant. So this is more of a theoretical case, but still it could be different if the LGR changes and at some point the variants get introduced. But [it's] the more important case right

EN

now, and I think if we have a solution for that, we can apply the solution also for this case study 5. It's example 6, which can actually happen already right now with the current rules. So an applicant having a variant set would also like to activate a diacritic gTLD for one of their TLDs. Can they do it? And if so, what policies apply? So here we have a similar example, but suppose we have an applicant who has an existing variant set of [dutchgrafa] with the top F and [dutchgraffa] with the double F. This is a valid variant TLD set that potentially could be applied in the next round and would be okay to proceed. And the question is, would someone be able to add a Latin diacritic version to the ASCII version here? So could they add the Strasse with the double S and R umlaut to their existing variant set? And if so, what would be the consequences? We discussed this in Dublin shortly. We didn't really have time to conclude it, but basically there are two options here, yes and no.

Next slide, please. So option one would be to restrict the LD set activation to just single ASCII TLDs and not for variant sets. So if you have a variant contract, you cannot add any LD TLD to that contract. If you want to go that way, we have to explicitly formulate our recommendations to make it clear that activation of a Latin diacritic TLD and creating our LD ASCII set is only possible if you have a single ASCII TLD.

And the other, option two, would be that we allow for activation of such a TLD. So Strasse could be added to the variant set. But that would mean that we have to work through the recommendations to see how and if they might need to be adjusted.

One point that comes to mind, for example, is that the variant set always has a primary TLD. In this case it would be dot-Strasse with a sharp S, and the LD set always has to have a kind of primary TLD [steward;] the ASCII TLD. So that then would be Strasse with the double S. So we would in this combined set have to have two primary or two special TLDs. One is the one that is relevant for the variant and whether variant can be added or removed, and the other is rather relevant to the LD set. And that is dependent on the LD domains to be removed. So some consequences would be that while for the variant set, Strasse with 2 S's could be removed without causing issues in the variant set, this would not be the case for the Latin diacritic set.

But I see a hand from Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: I just wanted to repeat what I said in the comments. I think Option 2 is definitely the way to go. I think we actually open ourselves up to more problems if we decide to restrict the activation than we do if we decide to allow it because the restriction then would require a whole new review to see what else needs to go on. I

think option two is the default, if you will, way to go. And I think that's the way we should go. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. I see Louis agreeing to your suggestion to go with option two.

Any other thoughts, arguments, comments? Anil asks, can LD be treated as a variant of ASCII TLD as per option two? It ca[n] be true.   Yeah, we cannot call it variant because variant is a very strictly defined term. We would still have to call it LD alternative or whatever. The question is how the behavior would work and how the variant sets would then work out because we have variant domain sets across all TLDs which are variants, but we have a Latin diacritic domain set across TLDs which are Latin diacritic and the base ASCII one. So we would have to extend this towards a new kind of domain set which would include all the variants of the variant TLDs plus the diacritic ones with reference to the ASCII TLD. And it would mean that while the ASCII TLD is a variant, it's also the primary TLD for the Latin diacritic.   So according to the IDN PDP, the single ASCI TLD could be removed without affecting the rest of the TLDs. But if this is done, then the Latin diacritic version would have to disappear too. And contrary to the recommendations we have now that allow people to keep one of the latent diacritic ones if they remove the ASCII, that

wouldn't work anymore because the Latin diacritic can't exist with the primary variant TLD because it needs an ASCII TLD.

So it's technically definitely possible, but I don't think this is the easier solution. I think option two is by far the more complex solution because there are several things we have to change within the recommendations to make them work in this way. But it's definitely possible, yes.

So any other opinions? I think this is quite an important decision, and I would like to get as many opinions as possible. So at the moment we have two people in favor for option two. If the others in the group can put it at least in the chat or if you want also raise your hand to voice your opinion if you're also with option two or option one. Saewon is writing in the chat, "We must also consider the charter non-variant. The set [inaudible] requirements for limited recommendation one, the application process fees and the registry agreement." Yeah, this would mean that our current recs all work when deciding to this option. Yeah, we definitely need to look through all the recs and see if they are okay with this or whether they need some adjusted wording to work with the case that there are variant TLDs included in this TLD set.

Everybody is thinking or everybody is still undecided? Satish, please?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. I'm even now undecided. I just want to ask you if option 1 and option 2 are really plug-and-play options or if they are different (if they are not really options) because option 2 sounds more complicated, which means other parts of the recommendations require change if we go this way. In that sense, they are not really options or alternatives. For me, it looks like, if you choose option two, then we have to make a bunch of changes in other parts of the report, whereas option one is presumably logical and simpler. If it is simpler, I would go for that, but I'm still undecided. So just to let you know that. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. Yeah, I think, either way, we have to adjust the recommendations because currently our recs don't really say whether it's possible or not possible. So, from my point of view, as far as I see it, option one would be the simpler one because we just have to write that we do not allow the combination of variants set and Latin diacritics set and would disallow the activation of variants in case you have a Latin diacritic set. But option two is of course the one that gives the registries the most freedom to use their TLDs and to activate potential similar TLDs, be it variants or Latin diacritic set. But that would require some more changes. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So I was trying to think of option one but in the other direction; that if a TLD label has variants, why should that be a deterrent to do Latin diacritic sets? And is there is a motivation why you want to do Latin diacritics, and does that motivation really go away if we have variants? And I can't make that connection, meaning I can't find a reason why the Latin diacritic requirement should go away if we have variants. So that's one thing.

The other thing which just came to my mind was that if there can be variants of the original string for which we have Latin (this diacritized version), then is it also possible for the Latin diacritized version to have variants as well? And is that something we should also consider? Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, thanks. Currently that case with the current AGR is not possible because there are no variants there, at least no allocatable variants. All the variants are blocked since the only allocatable variants are the Turkish dotless I and the sharp S. But in theory, there could be of course.

And regarding your question, there is of course in our charter the requirement that we look at non-variant cases, but that could be understood a different way.

Since it seems like that most people haven't really made up their mind yet, maybe it's worthwhile that we as leadership go through

the recs during the following week and provide some more detailed information of what recs we think would require some changes in case we go for option two to provide you with some more information to make that decision. If that's okay with you, then maybe we postpone this case, study it again next week, and continue already with the next section. But, Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: I'm still half asleep. If I remember correctly, you said there might also be some changes made if we went with option one. And so I would suggest expanding that to have the leadership and the staff go through and check what changes would be made both for option one and option two, just so we have a complete set of what changes would be made either way. I'm not sure if I'm making sense, but …

MICHAEL BAULAND: No, no, makes sense. Totally understand that. I didn't mention it because, from my opinion, the changes for option one are quite clear in the sense that we require a single ASCII TLD for the activation of LD TLD and not allow variants. And that's basically it. But definitely if we go through checking those recs for option two we will also check for option one too. Good point.

BILL JOURIS: Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Fully agree here. Okay, so I see some voices that we do it this way and gather some more data of what changes might be required and then present that for next week's session. And that will hopefully give people a better background knowledge of what option is the best to choose.

Okay, I think then we could move on to charter question four. And I will hand over to Saewon if you're okay with that.

SAEWON LEE: Yes, thank you, Michael. I hope everyone can hear me. I mentioned it to Michael earlier; I'm a bit sick today, so I won't turn on the camera. I'm so sorry. Hopefully it won't distract you from the screen either.

MICHAEL BAULAND: You can see me instead.

SAEWON LEE: Yes.

MICHAEL BAULAND: You can try to move my mouth while you're talking. I don't know if that works.

SAEWON LEE: Even though we haven't finished all the case studies yet, meaning we still may have to do a bit of changing to the preliminary recommendations, putting that aside, we are now at the last question within our charter. I won't congratulate all of you yet, but hang in there. We just have a bit more to go. So if you see in this slide, I would like to start off by reading Charter Question 4 to remind us all what the question is. And obviously, please don't mind the grayed-out parts because those are the questions that we've already dealt with. And obviously, I wanted to highlight Charter Question 4. So the question is, if a solution is needed to this issue, will it have any impact on existing consensus policies?

First of all, I would like to provide you with a brief background and then we'll go on to how to tackle this question. In this slide, you will see just as a brief background. The working group is expected to consider the potential impact that our recommendations will have on the existing consensus policies. And so why do we need to consider this? In dealing with this question, we need to stay in alignment with the existing consensus policies when formulating our recommendations. I'm just going to finish my part before I go to Bill because I do see a hands up. But just basically we would like to say that we are trying to deal with this question because we need to stay in alignment with the existing consensus policies when formulating our recommendations. And after even

formulating our recommendations, we need to make sure that our recommendations have no conflict or any negative impact on the current existing consensus policies because if there is, and if during our formulation of the recommendations, if our GDS liaison or the working group chairs or any of our members perceive a need for an amendment of the recommendation or to address specific aspects of the existing consensus policies, this concern will need to be promptly raised through our GNSO Council liaison to the working group for discussion at the council level.

Before I go on, I do want to check in with Bill.

BILL JOURIS: I confess I'm coming from a place of massive ignorance here. Do we have a hopefully compact list of what those existing consensus policies are? Because I wouldn't know where to start in considering this otherwise. Thank you.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you for the question, Bill, and obviously I'll get into that. So hopefully my next slide as well as sections will help you with that question.

So just to move on from this background, I just wanted to mention that this charter question)so for us, charter question four) is new to all future PDPs, including ours. And this is based on reviews and amendments suggested at the council level so that the PDPs make

sure that this part of our work is done. And obviously, again, it starts with us. But this does not mean that this kind of activity was never done in previous PDPs or that previous PDPs never considered existing consensus policies. It's just officially included in the charter for us and moving forward. I'm mentioning this because I remember specifically for EPDP IDNs, also we made sure that some recommendations particularly went through review or assessment by other ongoing PDPs or went through review and examination with the existing consensus policies. So this kind of activity isn't new. It's just something that's officially included in our charters moving forward.

So with that, to answer Bill's question, in this slide, you will find the list and the details of all the existing consensus policies. And I did actually circulate this through the mailing list prior to ICANN 84. So I hope you all received it and had time to review it. And for those that did not, I am going to share with you. It's also in the slides, but as Bill asked, this is where you find the list of the existing consensus policies. As I said, I've also shared with you not only this list but the analysis as well as … Well, this list and the analysis have been shared with you through the mailing list, but also it's been always with us in the working group meetings where here, if you see the existing body of work, in the last part, we have the existing consensus policies also linked to this list.

But going back, this is the list that Bill was asking about. And these existing consensus policies are the procedures that require compliance based on ICANN's agreements with the accredited registrars and with the gTLD registry operators. Obviously, these policies have been adopted by the ICANN Board in the dates shown per policy as you can see in this page, and I've also summarized this for you in the spreadsheet that was shared with all of you through the mailing list. As I said, I don't remember the date, but it was in the list for you prior to ICANN 84. Again, if you see in this list, you'll see that majority of these have been updated, as of here, 21st of February 2024. This was to reflect the changes that were required for the implementation of the registration data policy. According to this agreement, the other policies should have been or were implemented by the contracted parties this August 2025, as you can see also on this page.

So I would like to now show you the spreadsheet that was shared with you. Just in case, I'll also share this in the chat. So here, I'll just show it to you at one glance first. So here you can see the list of existing consensus policies are on column B. They are themed in topic in column A. And from columns C to G, I've summarized them so that you can see the dates, the responsible parties, a brief summary and additional background information. And obviously columns H and I are our ("our" as in the leadership team and the staff's) analysis of the impact of our recommendations on the consensus policies. So if you see here in this list itself that we

have analyzed for you, you'll see that the archived policies were not dealt with as obviously they're irrelevant to us. And that leaves 15 existing consensus policies. And on the page itself, you will actually see 14, but that is because the transfer policy is listed as one in the page, whereas here I've actually divided it into two; the transfer policy and the transfer dispute resolution policy. And this was done per recommendation from our transfer policy expert colleague.

Just to give you a brief summary of this analysis first, if you see in rows … I'm so sorry. It's very small but I wanted to give you a once-glance effect. But if you see in rows 18 to 21, there is a section about temporary policy and obviously an archive policy section, which goes against what I just mentioned that I wouldn't be listing. So this work, this analysis from the leadership team and the staff, has actually been ongoing in the background for a while now. At the time that this was being drafted and also reviewed by our relevant Org functions, the interim registration data policy for gTLDs was an existing policy at the time, and it only expired recently on 20th of August 2025 that I just mentioned before. That is why I moved it to the bottom, row 20. The temp policy section just aligns with the policy page where they have a temp policy section. And that's why it's shown here, but these will not be relevant to us. I won't go into detail line-by-line per policy because many reasons. One is to save time. As I said, I did circulate this in the list a few weeks ago for your review. But also,

I'm not an expert in all these individual policies, and it really does not make sense for me to explain each one at this time, where some of you may actually have more knowledge in these policies than me, but especially because if you see in the column H and the impact result, our policy recommendations are clearly low or non-existent at all in its impact. And that's why it actually doesn't make sense to go through each one line by line. But obviously, I'll provide a high-level overview of the methodology that we took as well as the result of our assessment and the rationale for this analysis. Again, I'm hoping that you did go through this spreadsheet that I shared with you a few weeks ago.

So if you see down here in rows 23 to 26, you'll see that I've color-coded the level of impact that was categorized. And the distinction that we made was obviously high, medium, low, and X. And obviously X means it's irrelevant to our recommendations, with low having maybe minimal impact.

I have a question from Claude. "Was this impact analysis done by IDN EPDP 1 and 2? And if yes, is this spreadsheet available?" So to that question, no. As I mentioned, this activity itself as well as this template was made especially for this PDP, and hopefully this template will be utilized as well as re-adjusted as well as improved moving forward in new PDPs. But as I mentioned in the beginning, this was never adopted as a charter question. It was done as an activity in the background to ensure that the recommendations

aligned with the existing consensus policies, but it was never done as a formal activity as a part of a charter question. And that's why this template was made anew. As I mentioned, staff has been working in the background with relevant Org functions so that this template could be of use to the future PDPs and also formalized in the future.

I think Michael has answered Satish's question where … I guess? Yes.

So anyways, going back, as I mentioned also, if you see, low is marked as blue, and irrelevant is marked as green. And if you see our assessments, most of them are blue and green. Actually, most of them are green with some blue, which for us meant that most of our recommendations had minimal to none impact on the existing consensus policies.

And in column I, you'll see the rationale that we have provided. So we actually didn't go through each recommendation. We actually grouped them into topics. So for us, we had eight topics, and we grouped them per topic. Here you'll see actually it's not adjusted yet. We actually have nine topics here because, as I said, this was shared with you prior to readjusting the topics and the recommendations. But basically we analyzed the recommendations per topic and gave rationale per topic as most of the topics basically deal with the same issues where the recommendations can be, let's say, aligned within a single …

Sorry, going back. The recommendations didn't need to be checked individually, but they could just be checked per topic as the topics pretty much grouped the similar recommendations.

I see lots of chats going on, and hopefully I think Michael is answering for us all. Okay, great.

So again, because most of our impact were none, as you can see within the cells of column H, we found that our policy would only kick in after the existing policy requirement is met, or if not, again, it will only have minimal to no impact at all.

The three cells that you see in blue (so, for example, this UDRP and the transfer policy ones) we graded as low impact. We assessed it as low because if the LDPDP rules had any impact at all, it may be on these three. So starting with transfer policy, as you can see in rows 16 and 17 … And I will enlarge it for you a bit. So related to this transfer policy first, the recommendations that needed or need alignment to these existing consensus policies are recommendations 47 and 48 for us. And they explicitly refer to the transfer and dispute process. And that's why we mentioned these recommendations. And if you see in the rationale though, you'll see that we have written in that recommendation 47 currently aligns with the existing policy once adopted and in effect. And for recommendation 48, which is related to UDRP, which is this one, you'll see that we've also written in that this recommendation itself is aligned with the transfers policy.

And another thing to note here is that as many of our recommendations are remaining aligned with the PDP IDNs and its language, the concerns that we may have or those possible conflicts that we may have were actually reviewed during EPDP IDNs, as I mentioned before, by the Transfers Policy Review Working Group at the time. And they found that there were no conflicts or any impact or let's say no notable impact and, if there were any concerns, that they can be readjusted or adjusted through the implementation phase.

Just going back to the UDRP again, just to mention, transfer policy I didn't need to go into detail on because the name itself can be understood obviously, but UDRP here as you can see is short for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, and this policy is to resolve those disputes over domain names where someone believes a domain was registered under bad faith. And it covers issues like when someone complains or claims that the domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark that they own. And obviously, again, this being relevant to our recommendation 48, we assessed minimal impact from our recommendations on this policy as I mentioned before, that they will align with this once adopted and in effect, meaning that our recommendations will have no impact in its substance. But because of our PDP itself, there may be increasing concerns that confusingly similar ASCII and Latin diacritic gTLD strings, though for us they constitute a set, may create legal challenges or

a need for stronger UDRP or prompt a stronger UDRP to evolve and adapt to such scenarios where these complaints may occur. In those cases, we believe that these challenges have been addressed through our preliminary recommendations, again, meaning that ultimately our recommendations will have low impact on the existing consensus policy.

So for those low-impact that we assessed, I hope our rationale makes sense to the working group and that, with this, hopefully we have addressed all those existing consensus policies and the impact that we may have. As I mentioned, at least from the staff and the leadership's point of view, we believe that what we are formulating here (and I know we still haven't concluded; we still have a bit more to go with the stress test), basically what we have so far, have generally safely aligned with the existing consensus policies, meaning that there's no high-alert impact that we need to address at the council level at this moment.

With this, I would like to hand the floor over to Michael, but if there's any questions on the current policy or our impact assessment, please do raise your hand.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Saewon, for this very helpful and extensive background research. This helps a lot to decide how this charter questions four should be responded to by the PDP. And as I said, this is very extensive, and the impact is most likely very low. It makes no

sense to go through all the previous PDPs in detail and discuss what they were about and then start discussing whether they are impacted by us. Therefore, I would kindly ask you all to take another look at this sheet, look at the policies. Maybe you know them even better than we or I do. And then for next week, I would ask you to come back with any concern, with any objections to our ratings here, and we will then discuss any objections. And if there are none, we can keep it the way it is.

Yeah, and with that, we are almost at half past. We will, as said, prepare, for next week, the consequences of the two choices for the combination of variant and LD to make decisions for you easier. And once done, we will then continue with the GPI/HR impact analysis, unless there are any things to discuss for charter question four.

And yeah, then still the reminder that next week's meeting will be at 1415 UTC. So we moved it one hour in the future to better help our US West Coast or America West Coast people due to the time change from summertime to wintertime.

And if there are no more questions, then we can end the meeting here. Thanks, all, for being here and contributing.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]