

DEVAN REED:

For the recording, this is Devan Reed. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP Working Group call on Wednesday, 15 October, 2025 at 13:15 UTC.

We do have apologies today from David Bedard. 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 in 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 and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct. Thank you, and back over to our chair, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Devan, for the introduction. And welcome, everybody, to our last call before the ICANN meeting in Dublin next week. Next slide, please.

So today, similar agenda as last time, but we'll start with some information, action items for the ICANN meeting, which we intended to have on the last meeting already, but the discussion took a bit longer, so

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.

we are making this before we start the discussions, and then we'll continue with our discussions and go to the next step and AOB. Next slide, please.

So as a recap, we were talking about the Preliminary Recommendation 35 to 38, and the key outcomes were, first, that per the same entity principle, blocking of a TLD and or re-assignment period should only apply to entities wishing to apply for the removed TLDs outside of the ASCII TLD set, ASCII Latin Diacritic Set.

So the idea was that we wanted to have some kind of safeguard that TLDs that used to be run within a set and having the same entity requirements should not be allowed to run separately for a certain period of time. That's a new thing that is not the case for or not necessary for the IDN EPDP because they are the variant relationships defined by the LGRs already take care of this automatically. So we need some rules for that. And secondly, considering the creation of a special reserve name category for subsequent bound to block those removed TLDs. Next slide, please.

So as action items, we discussed those preliminary recommendations last week and came to a conclusion that everybody seems to agree with, but we didn't have the wording. So we created a wording based on the group's opinions and we'll go through this later on here. Then action item two is that the working group is asked to review the rationale as they have been and continue to get updated in the preliminary recommendation doc. And finally, the last call, so to say, for the edge case examples, which we want to discuss during the ICANN meeting as part of the stress test that was requested by several members to see

whether our recommendations are sane, and are applicable, and viable also for edge cases. Next slide, please.

With that, we'll go to the preliminary recommendations 35 to 38 and also PR#1. And we adjusted the wording according to the option two, which we discussed last week and the majority of people was in favor of that. And the new wording, I will read it now for PR#35, looks like this. An ASCII gTLD that is removed from the root zone, either voluntarily or involuntarily, will result in the ASCII Latin diacritic gTLDs have no longer meeting requirements as described in the preliminary recommendation 1.

The removed gTLDs shall not be available for re-assignment or selection by an entity other than the one holding the remaining IDN gTLD in the ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set for at least XX years following the removal. The gTLD registry operator may retain a single IDN gTLD and shall no longer be considered an ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set. So, that's the language we agreed on. What we didn't agree yet was for how many years we would like to block this for other entities to have some kind of safeguard that users are not confused by a TLD suddenly appearing out of the TLD set. Any opinions or suggestions? Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

Yeah, this is Bill Jouris for the record. Just to help my thinking on this, how long do we expect it to normally take for an application for a new gTLD to get processed? Is that something that the Org turns around in a month or a year? Can I get a feel for the order of magnitude of how

long that takes? Because at least for me, that will inform how many years, how many multiples of that I think is reasonable. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. First of all, applications can only be applied in rounds. So, it's not possible to have them anytime. For the timing, I think last time in the 2012 round, it took at least a year and sometimes more, but maybe someone from ICANN staff can have some more definite answer to that about the expected timing is to process a TLD. If it's not available right now, we have to get back to that.

To Bill's question around going to be a permanent feature, I think Ariel already mentioned a few weeks ago that this might not be the case, that there might be a change sometime in the future, but it's not decided yet. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Michael. This is Steve from staff. I had to do a little bit of internet research before I could answer. For the 2012 round, which is the only one I'd prefer to speak about, if we want to talk about the next round, that's definitely better for Ariel and team to talk about. But for 2012, I believe the round launched in January of 2012. And then the first delegations from that round were in October of 2013. So, I guess about 20 months or so.

And then just to confirm the comment about the rounds, there is a round, a recommendation that applications, sorry, that the new gTLD program should be operated in rounds until otherwise determined by

the GNSO. So, for the foreseeable future, unless something changes, likely via policy recommendations, future new gTLD instances will always be in rounds. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Steve. I guess that answers Bill's question. So, any ideas? From last time, we had the numbers 2 and 10 in discussion for 2 being the time until a brand TLD is re-appliable in case it gets removed, and 10 years was the blocking period for IDN ccTLDs. Bill suggests 10 years. Any agreement or different opinions? I don't see Amadeo right now, but I remember he was also in favor to have a rather long period. Anil, please.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Thank you, Michael. I suggest that we can keep like this, 10 years or next round, whichever is longer. It means that in case the next round is before next 10 years, then 10 years is the period. But if the round is beyond 10 years, then we can take up in the next round. But definitely, in case it is round is before 10 years, then it has to be the next to next round. So, this is my suggestion. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. It's a good point. Although, I think if the next round is further away than 10 years, there's no need to extend it to the next round because there's anyway no chance to get a TLD out of the round. So, if we just leave it with 10 years, that should be fine. Even if the next round is in 15 years, it just means that at the next round, they could

apply for it. But it seems like I only see longer periods here forever or long. So, let's make it 10 years, unless there's anyone objecting to it, please raise your hand or speak up. Otherwise, we'll use 10 years here.

And while you're still thinking about the years, I can go to PR#36, which is basically a similar case. PR#35 was the removal of the ASCII TLD, which would then destroy the set, so to say, because the base ASCII is a requirement. And PR#36 is about the removal of a gTLD, of an IDN and gTLD and non-ASCII one.

And it says, delegated Latin diacritic label that is voluntarily removed from the root zone will not require the removal of the associated ASCII gTLD or its other delegated Latin diacritic labels. The removed Latin diacritic gTLD shall not be available for re-assignment or selection by an entity other than the one holding the remaining gTLDs in the ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set for at least 10 years following the removal. The gTLD registry operator may retain a single ASCII gTLD and shall no longer be considered an ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set.

So, that's basically just the other side of removal, but of course it makes sense to have a consistent blocking period here. So, seeing no other objections, I think we can take this as an approval for those preliminary recommendations. The other ones, 37, 38, there's no change. And in the PR#1, we just want to add a footnote to indicate that provisions for the removal of the ASCII gTLDs are specified in PR#35. So, in case people are wondering when reading PR#1, what is this?

Okay, I only see agreement to 10 years and to those recommendations. Great. So, we can then go to what is planned for next week's in-person

meeting in Dublin, the action items for ICANN84. So, we have two sessions scheduled. One is at half past 10 local time and the other is quarter past one local time. And the goal is to deliberate any unresolved issues we might still have on the preliminary recommendations to develop the initial report and then do stress tests on the various edge cases.

We decided beforehand that we want to start with a stress test only once those recommendations are in a stable format because only then we can really test whether any edge cases are covered and solved in a reasonable way. And after that, we will continue with the remaining topics of the charter, namely the charter question four, which is that we should look at other existing work and see how and if that impacts our or is impacted by us, how those relations work. And then, of course, the GPI/HR impact assessment, which we will do after that. Yeah, with that, next slide, please.

We have created some examples, I have to say, so that maybe those inspire you to think of other similar or different edge cases. These are three cases we came up with in the past. On the left, you see the case an applicant having an LD TLD set would also like to activate a variant of one of their TLDs. Can they do it? What policies apply? LD PDP, EPDP-IDNs or both? So, the case is someone citizen using an LD TLD set, are they able to activate a variant of one of the TLDs within the set?

Second example for stress test is similar, but basically the other way around. An applicant that has a variant set would also like to activate an LD TLD of one of their TLDs. So, in that case, they have an existing variant set defined by the IDN EPDP. What happens if they want to

activate a LD gTLD of one of their ASCII TLDs, which is not a variant, so not in the variant set? What policies apply? LD PDP, EPDP-IDNs or both?

And the third example is if multiple applications are in contention with at least one LD TLD set application. Are resolutions of that contention set viable? So, for example, we have one application of .renee and .renée with an accent, which constitutes a Latin diacritic TLD set. And then there's another application, which is just for the ASCII version and a third application, which is just for the Latin diacritic version. Does this work out? Will this work? So, this is just three examples we have been thinking of.

We would like the group to look at these and think whether you have similar or other examples that you would also like to be discussed during our stress test in Dublin. And since we would like to prepare for that, it's requested that you provide those examples by the 17th, so in two days. So, we have still time to prepare slides and make that more smooth discussion.

So, I already see some comments here from Bill also. We don't want to discuss those cases here right now and how they should be. So, if they are sensible, it's just meant as a brainstorming and some help for you to think of inspiration. Thanks. That was the word I was looking for. Very helpful. Thank you, Saewon. It's just meant as an inspiration. So, yeah, please do take some time today, tomorrow, and send some examples to the list, and then we can add them to our set of examples and start discussing them next week in Dublin. With that, next slide, please.

We will continue to review the recommendations, and we have finished the first part of the TLD, and we still have a few recommendations where we receive comments which are related to the second level. Because there have been quite some understanding issues how this all works together, we have created a graphic for you. Next slide, please.

I won't go into detail now, but just as a reminder, when we have an ASCII LD TLD set, this would look a bit like this. We have one ASCII TLD, a TLD, at least one Latin diacritic TLD, LD TLD, and then we can have registrations under one or the other TLD, and there are variant relationships within a TLD due to the LGRs that are being used by the TLDs, and we have required the same entity for all domains within the whole set. So the same second level label under all TLDs and all variants within a TLD for each of those second level labels. So that was what we came up with. And next slide, please.

Just as a brief reminder for the LD PDP set, we have that variants can only exist within a single TLD. There are no cross-variant relationships, whereas in the IDN EPDP case, because the TLDs are variants of each other, we also have variant relationships across TLDs. And that's what's the big difference here. But still, in all of those cases, independent whether LD PDP or EPDP, all domains within this set have to belong to the same entity. So even example V1a TLD and example V3 LD TLD, those are not variants of each other, but we still require them to be assigned to the same entity.

With that background information, I think we can jump to slide 17 and take a look at the recommendations where there have been still some questions or comments. Let's start with a preliminary recommendation

39. It says building on an ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set as defined in preliminary recommendation 1, an ASCII Latin diacritic domain set on the second level is defined to include, first a label and all its variants within a given TLD as determined by the second level LGR for that TLD and the same label, and all its variants across all other TLDs within the ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set.

So this defines the term of an ASCII Latin diacritic domain set. And this includes all those domains which we have just seen on the previous slide. Are there any questions or comments regarding this recommendation? So it's not actually requiring something, it's just defining what we mean with a Latin ASCII diacritic domain set, because we will need that definition for the later recommendations when we require a same entity principle. Everybody okay with that definition? Thanks, Anil.

So building up on that definition, we can then create preliminary recommendation 40, which says consistent with final recommendation 1 from the EPDP-IDN Phase 2, final report, the same entity principle applies to the ASCII Latin diacritic domain set as per preliminary recommendation 39, the previous one. This means that all allocatable domain names of an ASCII Latin diacritic 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.

So this is basically copying the requirements from the IDN EPDP, which says that all variants must belong to the same entity and must be registered using the same registrar. We also want to have a similar

requirement, but we can't restrict it to variants because our requirements are a bit broader because we need all Latin ASCII diacritic domains. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Michael. Sorry, I raised my hand a little late. My question is about recommendation 39, actually. So 39.1, a label and all its variants. So we're saying a second level label and all its variants, right? And then 39.2, the same label and all its variants. That's still talking about second level label, right?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. I think it would be helpful just to insert that second level or something in the sentence to make sure there's no confusion when other people read it because I wasn't completely sure.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, good point.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you for confirming.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks for that comment. It's a good point. We will note that down. So, yeah, it's about the second level label and all its variants. If you could quickly jump back to 12, please, Saewon. The overview there, we see what is meant here. We have the example label, second level label at the ATLD, and we have all variants of this example label, namely example V1, example V2, and example V3 at the ATLD.

And then we also need to include the same label at the other TLDs and the variant label of that label with the other TLDs. So all these four, eight domains need to belong to the same entity. And that's what we are saying here in this preliminary recommendation 40. But yeah, we are talking about the second level labels here. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I guess implied here is that any variants of these TLDs will obviously have the same considerations because of existing policy, of course. We're not saying that out, but that gets implied that ATLD and all its variants, if there are any variants and LD TLD and any of its variants, they will also have similar second level rules. And then they'll jump across to LD TLD kind of constraints as well through this connection, right?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, that's a good point. That's basically what we had with the stress test examples we displayed earlier that we want to look into how this works. If also some-- okay, right, I understand. You're not saying that somebody would apply for the TLD, but even if it's not applied, then it still needs to be, well, if the TLD does not exist, we don't have to reserve

for the same entity. So it only occurs if there would be an allocated variant TLD of those TLDs. And that's the question which we want to take a look at the stress test, whether that's possible and under which rules. But basically, you're right. The variant TLDs are already covered by the existing IDN EPDP rules and we don't need to have specific rules here, I think.

Okay. Back to slide 70, please. So with this, we have recommendation 40. I already see Bill's comment regarding 41, but let's wait for this for a few seconds. And any other questions, comment regarding REC39, which defines the set on the second level, as Ariel points out, and REC40, which requires the same entity for all domains within this ASCII Latin diacritic domain set. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

So in, I guess, IDN EPDP, I'm just trying to think, do we define any relationships at the second level or the relationships are defined at the top level for variants? Here we are actually defining them at second level. I guess I'm wondering whether there should be a LD Latin diacritic domain set, which includes the ASCII Latin diacritics and their variants at the top level, or is that not needed?

MICHAEL BAULAND:

I think variants, this kind of goes into the stress test example, but at the moment, if you have an ASCII Latin diacritic TLD set, no variant exists with the current LGRs. This might change, of course, with future LGRs, but at least no allocatable variants, because allocatable variants in the Latin case only exist for the sharp S and the dotless I case, and you can't

have an ASCII TLD with a sharp S or dotless I, because that's not an ASCII TLD. So for that reason, we can't have any variants of that TLD set. But yeah, if there were to be variants, we might need to have rules for that, but I don't see that at the moment. Does that answer your question or?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: It does. I just need to think about it a bit more as well. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, and I think this is a good topic we can also discuss in the face-to-face meeting in Dublin when we look at those corner cases and stress tests where we have the examples. Okay. Any other comments regarding 39 and 40?

If not, we can continue to 41, which says, consistent with Implementation Guidance 2 from the EPDP-IDN Phase 2 Final Report, gTLD register operators should take into account Recommendation 14 and SAC060, as well as language or script communities' widely accepted practices among Internet users and establish conventions and consider 41.1, setting a maximum number of domain names that constitute a the ASCII Latin diacritic domain set and are reserved for the same entity at the second level, and 41.2, limiting automatic activation of domain names that constitute a the ASCII Latin diacritic domain set and are reserved for the same entity at the second level to the extent possible, including in instances where the language script community believes automatic allocations and activation is needed.

I just see that the wording is slightly wrong, I think, because we don't want to restrict the set itself. We just want to restrict the number of domains within the set that can be allocated. The set is already defined by the LGR, by the variant rules, and there's no need to change the size of the set and remove some domains of the set.

I think this is also what Bill mentioned, that it's in conflict, of course the set needs to be the way it is, and all domains within the set need to be reserved for the same entity. What we want to do here is just setting a maximum number of domains within the set that are allocatable at the same time. This is based on the IDN EPDP set rules, where they also have a rule that even though a variant set might have millions or trillions of domains within it, the registry should make some rule to not allow the activation of a trillion domains within the set, so to say, and we want to have a similar rule here. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

My question is on 41.2. So, I guess, certainly I think for IDN EPDP, the scope was much broader than Latin script, it encompassed all the different scripts, and there are some scripts where automatic activation is perhaps something which the community may want. I guess the question is that, given this is very limited, in a sense, this is only Latin script, right? So, whether this is something which is needed, is there any desire in the community to actually do this or? I'm just wondering what the motivation for this is? Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thank you. Even though it's just Latin, isn't it still possible to have lots of variants if you start with a label like this? Wouldn't all of these and all combinations be variants and any—

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right, but I guess the question is, would the community want to automatically activate them?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Automatic activation is probably not needed. I guess more for Chinese ones where they have that, I think. But is it forbidden for ASCII or Latin TLD to have automatic activations of their variants?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I guess if generally Latin community thinks that's a solution, of course. But I think the initial background of that recommendation in IDN EPDP was obviously coming from the Hand script community.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I understand, thanks. I would also be fine with removing 41.2 if you think that's not necessary because automatic activation is anyway not a topic for Latin. We can also leave that out and just have the 41.1 where we say that the number of allocated variants should be limited to some kind of maximum to be defined by the registry, but it in a sense that it's stable and not a security issue. Anil also agrees that we probably could get rid of 41.2. Satish also agrees to this. Okay, I'm fine

with removing that as automatic activation is not really a topic in the Latin case and therefore there's no need to copy that requirement.

Can we stick to what IDN EPDP suggests? What exactly do you mean with this? IDN EPDP also has this section about automatic activation. Asteway saying that you want to keep it here. Please, go ahead.

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

Yeah, thank you, Michael. I think the IDN EPDP has suggested a few things about automatic activation. First off, it said something about automatic activation to be led by community needs. But at the same time, I feel like some resolution has been passed on the IDN EPDP that corresponds to not allowing it or reserving it in some manner. I wasn't there when the IDN EPDP was defined, but something corresponding to that might be helpful. That's what I mean.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. As Samad said, the automatic activation is a thing that's more useful, prominent in the hand script communities and it's not really applicable to Latin. And for that reason, while the IDN EPDP is for all scripts, but our is just for the Latin script. Therefore, the suggestion is to get rid of the 41.2 because it's not applicable for Latin. Does that make sense to you or do you still think that? Okay.

Okay. I think we have major approval to keep 41.1 with the rewording, which I just mentioned. I unfortunately just realized that when reading, there's a little doubt now that we are not want to set a maximum number for the set, but only for the domains that are allocated in the

set. So we will fix the wording after the call, but otherwise leave 41 as it is with removing 41.2. Any objections or further comments? None.

I think we can continue to the next slide with preliminary recommendation 42. That says consistent with final recommendation three from the EPDP IDN Phase two final report immediately prior to the policy effective date of the same entity principle as set out in preliminary recommendation 40.

The existing variant domain names that do not conform 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. The gTLD registries operating in ASCII-Latin diacritic gTLD set must determine ASCII-Latin diacritic domain sets for each exempted label and protect from registration all labels in such ASCII-Latin diacritic domain sets as appropriate.

To maybe visualize this recommendation a bit better, we can jump again back to our page 12. Thanks, exactly. So let's take as an example that the example.atld already exists. And we have registrations example V1, example V2 at this TLD, but even though example V1 and V2 are variants of each other, they do not belong to the same entity because the rules that require the same entity brought in by the IDN EPDP have not been effective at that point. Then someone, the owner of the ATLD also applies for the Latin script LD TLD.

And then as a consequence, first of all the owners of example V1 ATLD and example V2 ATLD can keep their domains even if they belong to different entities. There's no requirement that one of them has to remove one of those domains. We just say that until this is resolved, all those domains, example V3 ATLD and also all domains in the Latin script TLD, they cannot be applied for until this exemption process has ended and all domains within the set only belong to a single entity. So that's basically what this preliminary recommendation is about.

You can go back to slide 18 please. Sorry for making you jump around all the time. So yeah, that's what we say here. Part of this is already covered by the IDN EPDP, namely that those variant domains that already exist, they are exempted. But what we need to have a new recommendation here, which is not covered by the IDN EPDP is that this process extends to all domains within the ASCII Latin diacritic domain set because those are not variant but still require the same entity. And for that reason, we have to extend this to those two. I hope that makes sense. Satish please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks Michael. Satish for the record. While I do not have any issues with the wording presently, if I recall right in EPDP, originally what we call the grandfathering and now what we call is exempted was a transient Phase. It was a temporary Phase in which some time was given to kind of handle the situation in an exceptional manner so that after a while, the situation resolved itself.

That means one particular party withdraws and the other one becomes the sole custodian of all these kind of things. But here the wording is a bit stronger. It says the same entity principle must be exempted. It doesn't talk about the temporary nature of this exemption, but almost as if they have a right to be arbitrarily kind of exempted. I'm not sure whether that is an issue, but I just would like to flag it. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. While it's true, it's a transient thing, so to say. Even in the IDN EPDP, there was no timeframe or whatever. It just says that they can keep their domains for however long they want to. This transient state could also, in the IDN EPDP's case, exist forever. There's no force in forcing one of them to remove their domain or change ownership.

Saewon just posted the corresponding language of the IDN EPDP. It says immediately prior to the policy effective date of the same entity principle as set out in final REC 1, the existing variant domain names that do not conform 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 registry must determine variant sets for each exempted label as if it is a source domain name and protect from registration all variant labels in all such variant sets in all variant gTLDs as appropriate.

We try to stay very close to that wording with the necessary changes due to the fact that we are not talking about variants across TLD, but we

have this Latin diacritic domain set we have to talk about. So with that, I think Satish is agreeing to this, if I understand that correctly. Thanks. Any other comments, questions regarding this recommendation 42, or are you okay with how this was translated, so to say, from the IDN EPDP to our case? Asteway, please.

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

Yeah, thank you. Does this mean that the set now belongs to two different owners or registrars, or the set becomes, is it something divisible, like do we divide the set to belong to two different users or the set remains as it is? But what will happen, what is the cumulative effect to the variant set? That's one.

And the second is, what confusion factor will this have on the end-users? This have more confusion and we tolerate it because one of the variants already belongs to some users, so what is the effect of this? Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. Good question. To your second question first; there might be, of course, some confusion because variants belong to different entities in this example case, but since this has been the case before the policy came into effect, this confusion is already now the case and there, it might be a problem, but we don't want to take away one of the domains from one of the registrants because which one would you choose to take it away from?

So they made a contract with the registry to buy that domain and this contract must be upheld and not be destroyed retroactively by some policy that comes into effect afterwards. So that's why we say even though there is a small chance of confusion that already exists now, we don't increase this. Therefore, we say it's more important that people can keep their domains.

To your other question, the set itself is not partitioned, so to say, it's not separated, it's still one set. It just means that even though in general, all domains within the set must belong to the same entity, we here have a set where this is not the case and this problem is exempted from the current rules, but no new registrations can be made of any domain within that set. So that's similar to the IDN EPDP case.

As long as there are exempted domains, no new domains can be registered, so not to increase the problematic cases. And this blockage of this set will stay in effect until the same entity principle applies again, which means either because only one domain within the set is registered and all others are deleted, or in case all existing domains are transferred to the same entity, then also the exemption process stops. But the set itself is not partitioned. It's not that one part of the set belongs to the one exempted user and the other belongs to the other, so it's still this one single set.

Any other questions, comments, or are you okay with the current version of REC 42? Thanks, Asteway. Anil agrees. Thanks. Satish agrees, too. I think we can continue to preliminary recommendation 43, which says consistent with the final REC 4 of the EPDP-IDN Phase 2 final report, any allocatable domain name of an ASCII Latin diacritic domain

set containing exempted domain names pursuant to preliminary recommendation 42 cannot be allocated unless and until only one registrant and one sponsoring registrar remain for the exempted domain names in the ASCII Latin diacritic domain set.

That's basically what I already said before, so REC 42 just establishes the exemption process and the set, and 43 now says that until this exemption process ends, we do not allow any further registrations in the set, so not to increase the number of exempted domains. As mentioned before, this is a transitory state or should be a transitory state, and the only direction is to remove or reduce the number of exempted cases. There should not be a possibility to increase the number of cases.

Bill also agrees here, and 44 is also related to this consistent with final recommendation 5 from the EPDP-IDN Phase 2 final report, all of the existing and future IDN tables for a given ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set, if any, must be harmonized. This means that all of the IDN tables for an ASCII gTLD and all its corresponding Latin diacritic gTLDs must produce a consistent variant domain set for a given second-level label registered under that gTLD or its delegated Latin diacritic gTLD labels, so this is also basically copied from the IDN EPDP Phase, which requires that all variant TLDs have a harmonized IDN table, so we also require this.

If we could again please jump back to 12, I can explain this quickly. So, this means that if we have an LGR for ATLD and this set that variants of example are example V1, V2, and V3, then it's okay that the LGR in the Latin diacritic TLD does not make example V2 a variant of example.lgtld, but it must not, the only possibility is that this label is not valid at all, so

must not be built out is that suddenly exampleV2 is outside of the variant set and available, so the only possibility is if it contains a letter, for example a code point that's not allowed at all in the LD TLD, then that's okay that the LGRs are not the same, but they must be harmonized, so the variant set they create must not contradict each other.

Back to slide 18, please. Yeah, that's what preliminary recommendation 44 says, similar to the IDN EPDP, those LGRs, if not the same, must be harmonized to produce a consistent set of variants. Any comments, questions, objections, agreements? Well, I need at least one person to agree to continue. Thanks, Satish, no objections. Yeah, then I think we are in favor of keeping those recommendations as they are. And yeah, with that, something I haven't done in a long, long time, I can hand over to Saewon. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Michael. I thought you would continue, but happy to take the floor. So, I think it's actually good to go through the next steps, because the next meeting is at ICANN84. So, as you can see here, a few things to point out is next week we are off due to travel week, and then we resume on Saturday, 25th of October, as Michael mentioned in the beginning. So we look forward to seeing you either in person, on the ground, or online.

Again, as you mentioned, we will try to resolve all the preliminary recommendation language and the comments that were received, go through all the stress tests, and then even after all that, if we have more

time, then we will continue directly to deliberating topics for Charter Question 4 and the impact assessments on the GPI and human rights.

Again, seeing how we do in ICANN84 during the working sessions, I think 12th of November is the next meeting that we will have once we come back from ICANN84, if there are any unresolved issues to proceed with. I would just like to note that if we do conclude everything by ICANN84, then the initial report draft will be finalized and hopefully by then will be circulated to the working group for review before publishing for public comment.

These were all mentioned by Michael, but first of all, we would like to stress again, please, please send through the working group mailing list the stress test examples that you would like us to conduct by this Friday. We would need next week to prepare this, and my meaning of we is in leadership team and staff, so please do send them by this Friday.

Again, please go back to the slide where any examples are shown, where it hopefully inspires you to send some in. Number 2 and 3 are just about the next portions of our work, as I mentioned before. The leadership team and staff have done some analysis, and these working documents will be shared with the working group prior to ICANN84, in case we get into this during ICANN84. I'll hand it over to John.

JOHN EMERY:

Thanks so much, Saewon and Michael. Outcomes for today, we determined for preliminary recommendation 35 and 36 that we would set a timeframe of 10 years following removal, reached consensus on a number of preliminary recommendations 39, 40, 42, 43, and 44, so

bravo everyone, way to get through that. Consensus to delete 41.2 as it does not apply to the Latin script case, and leadership and staff for some action items will continue to reword 41.1 to accurately convey its meaning and perhaps include the term second level and preliminary recommendation 39.1 and 39.2.

So again, the big action item for everyone in the next two days is to get those edge cases on. I know we've been discussing edge cases all throughout, but it's good to get them on paper now that we're finalizing it. So please, please, please send those to list within the next two days so we can get those organized and have a fun time doing what you all love most, stress testing the most edge case that you can imagine. So looking forward to doing that at ICANN84 in Dublin. Back to you Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, John, and thanks, Saewon. Yeah, I also just want to repeat what John said, that please take a look at edge cases. Think of anything which could break our recommendations or which could cause problems or whatever, because that's the best thing to check whether it actually works, whether the policy we create actually works or whether it has some loopholes or whatever. And discussing those cases in Dublin face-to-face is a really good opportunity to come into discussion. And so, yeah, please do think of this.

And then I hope to see many of you next week on Saturday in Dublin. And after taking away one or two minutes last week, I'll give you back a

few minutes this week. So we are even now, I guess. Thanks all, and see you next week. Bye. And Devin, you may stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]