DEVAN REED:

For the recording, this is Devan Reed. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP Call taking place on Wednesday, 17th of September, 2025 at 13:15 UTC.

We do have apologies from Tapani and Asteway. 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 at 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 at ICANN, including the session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. And with this, I turn the call back over to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Devan, for the introduction. Devan, could you share -- oh, these other slides. Yeah, right. We have a new design. I almost didn't recognize that the slides are already showing. ICANN have modernized their meeting design, so everybody, enjoy.

Yeah, welcome to the meeting. And I hope you enjoyed the two weeks off and took the time to take a look at the recommendations. And next slide, please. So what happened last time, three weeks ago, we

basically discussed those RECs 7.4 and 5 of the IDN-EPDP and decided to proceed in accordance with the outcome of the ICANN Board decision. So, two recommendations are not yet approved by the Board of the IDN-EPDP. So, we said we just want to follow whatever those RECs will be in the end. And in case that the decision is taken while we are still working, we can take that decision and work this into our RECs. And otherwise, we'll just keep it the way it is to state that we want to have the same RECs as the IDN-EPDP. And with those, we actually finished all the TBD items.

Next slide, please. And as an action item, last time, we asked everybody to take a look at the preliminary RECs and provide any feedback you think is useful by September 14th. And we got quite a few comments, and we'll use this meeting now to go through those comments and to decide how to deal with them in case there's some discussion necessary. So, thanks to everybody for reviewing this and providing those inputs. They were very helpful indeed.

I think we will move to the REC document now. And one comment or a few comments before we start with the actual content. For once, we try to stay consistent with the language of the IDN-EPDP in those cases where we wanted to have the same recommendations just applied to our case. And for that reason, even if you suggested some improvement of wording or grammar or whatever, unless it's really important to change this, we think it's better to keep the same wording as is the case with the IDN-EPDP because that avoids confusion.

If we change the wording, people might think that due to change wording, also our intention might be different from those of the IDN-

EPDP. So, that just as a caveat that even though there might be some improvements, nice to have, we won't do those improvements unless it's really a requirement because it's confusing to leave it the way it is.

Also, the rationales are at the moment not yet in the document. We want to complete the RECs first and have them in a stable condition. And once that is done, we can create the rationales and also discuss where exactly to place them. And another comment, we have quite a few footnotes in the document in the RECs, maybe scroll just to one example here. And these footnotes always refer to the IDN PDP's recommendations so that it's easy to see the original recommendations and our version of it at the same location.

And I see that some people suggested some improvements for those, but those are out of scope because those have already been approved by and are already finished. So, we won't change, definitely won't change anything in those footnotes because these are just copied from the existing document. And then the final comment, we have these preliminary recommendations X and Y.

You might have wondered why they don't have numbers. The reason was that we kept the numbers for those recommendations which have been carried over from the IDN-EPDP and the REC X and Y, those have been new things that are just for our LD-EPDP case and that's to make them stand apart from the others. We called them X and Y in the beginning, but now we have included them in the normal numbering scheme and REC X is now currently shown, REC recommendation one and the Y, I think it was, it's now 39.

Just so you know, I'm not confused when you now don't see the REC X. Yeah, that is a preliminary. Now let's go through the comments. In case you have any questions, additional comments to the comments or to what we discussed, as usual, just raise your hand or put it in the chat, but I prefer the hand because I don't always see all chat messages and we won't go through all previous things. Those have been accepted already. We'll just take a look at the things which are more substantive on the topic.

So, with that, I think the first one was the suggestion in the topic list was that for topic two, we add at the top level, because this is talking about the same entity principle at the top level and not the second level and that makes sense. So, we just use that suggestion. Then I think the next point is on page three.

Thanks, Anil, for the comment. There has been the question about whether we might have overlooked some characters, but that's not the case. We clarified it here. The question was, if you could scroll up to the original comment with the question on the right. The question was about this U plus O42 and O263, I can't pronounce. But I see Satish's hand, please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish, for the record. Just to mention that Bill and I, we have made a presentation to the ALAC Policy Working Group. We have about 23 slides of which roughly about 10 were covered last week. Later today, Bill is going to continue presenting the remaining. So far, the good news is that there are some critical things have already been

placed before the ALAC, one being the pricing, another being a single application for the set of Diacritics.

We don't have any negative comments so far, although we didn't have much time to discuss. But we wanted to avoid any last-minute surprises, which is why we wanted to kind of expose the community to the preliminary findings. And so far, it is going on well. If there is anything that comes up, Bill will be reporting that next week to our meeting. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks, Satish. Very interesting, and I'm glad to hear that that went quite smooth. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: Yeah, this is Bill Jouris, for the record. I apologize if I wasn't paying attention at some point, but I'm not quite clear why we insist that only letters with Diacritics that are decomposable are relevant here. It seems to me if it's a letter with a Diacritic, it's a letter with a Diacritic. Regardless. So, as I say, we may have discussed this and I've just lost track of it.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, good point. I can try to explain this. We are restricted to Diacritics, that's obvious. And there are some letters which may look like having Diacritics or being Diacritics, but they are actually not. They are letters in and of themselves. So we discussed what is a Diacritic, and to decide what a Diacritic is, we took a look at the Unicode tables, and

there, the Unicode actually has a special mark which is called a Diacritic. And only those characters which have one of these Diacritics are called Diacritics in our context. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: It seems to me, just as a personal opinion, that what we're about here is trying to avoid confusion, if that's the way to phrase it. And I don't see a distinction when it comes to confusion between whether it's decomposable or not. But that's, as I say, just an opinion.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, we try to avoid confusion. Not so much. We want to allow certain things that might be confused to coexist. And this exception is currently only for Diacritics and not for letters that are similarly confusing due to other reasons, but not being Diacritics. But maybe Marc can also contribute to this. Mark, please.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: Thank you, Mark speaking. I put it in the chat, but I'll voice it also for accessibility purposes. So essentially, we are looking into the phenomenon that we are trying to define variants beyond the scope of what was set for the Latin repertoire. So, we need to come up with a definition or wrong definition of what that is. The moment that we are talking about composables, that seems clear enough. That is a strict rule that can be applied back and forth.

You can compose and decompose. But when we talk about certain letters that are just a character, we would need to create our own

definition of what that decomposes to. And that is tricky. That would put us in a position where we need to make judgment calls and things like that, where it's way beyond the scope of our competence. So, that is the general explanation as to why we are going this way. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Mark. And we really need a clear definition. And I think Unicode is the way to go. Maybe before I go to Satish, could you say one click on the link, which I put in the comment there? Yeah, that one. And so that one. Thanks. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. So, I think Mark has brought up a very significant point after Bill's question. I've been, of course, tracking Mark's postings on different groups about the tool that he has developed. And I think it is a very good instrument, provided we can standardize it. Now, I am hesitating to recommend that as an official tool, because someone has to clear it.

Someone from ICANN, I suppose, has to officially declare that, OK, if you are in doubt, please use this tool to find out the decomposability of a given label. So, otherwise, it becomes a useful but not binding kind of a thing. So, it would be good to have, in my personal opinion, some way to unequivocally verify this particular condition. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I think that's what I'm showing here currently. This is a page which is within the Unicode domain. So, it's definitely authoritative

with regards to character properties. And with this webpage tool, you can see all the properties of all Unicode characters. And if we take a look at this example, this 0142-character, let in small letter L with a stroke, you can see at the very left bottom, it shows the decomposition mapping. If you could highlight that, thanks. And it just says, well, the decomposition mapping of this is just 0142. So, there's nothing diacritical in this character. If you could now, please type into the input field at the top where we have 0142.

Type, please. What was it? E3, yeah. And there we have 00E3, which is let in small letter A with a tilt. And if you now take a look at the decomposition mapping, you will see that it shows 0061 and 0303. And the 0061 is just the ASCII A character. So, there we have this character consists of a base ASCII character, the A, 0061, and the 0303.

And if you now go up again and type 0303 into this field, you can see the physics combining tilde. And if you look at the block canonical combining class on the left, it says it's combining up a bit. Block canonical combining class. Yeah, exactly. There it says combining diacritical marks. So, this 0303 actually has the property of being a combining diacritical mark. And we decided that the only real clear-cut definition to decide whether a character is a Diacritic and within scope, is this Unicode table.

Whenever you can check any character here, and if it's decomposable into an ASCII character plus one or more characters which have a combining diacritical marks property, then we are talking about a Diacritic and that character is in scope. And if it's not decomposable,

then it's not a Diacritic. It's a character in its own sense, but not a Diacritic. Even if it might look like a Diacritic, it's not.

And Mark just said his tool, what he wrote, is actually doing the same thing automatically, what I've now described manually. But in case you yourself want to take a look at some characters and see whether they are in scope or not, this is a good tool on the Unicode page. And this is a document generated by Mark. And this actually parses that information automatically and lists those characters which are in scope here. And I think this is a new version where we also have the out-of-scope examples here, right?

Yeah. Here, we have some of the examples which are not in scope, even though they might look like a Diacritic. None of those can be decomposed into an ASCII character plus a Diacritic. And so that's why we said these are out of scope. We said it might make sense to look at those in a different EPDP or some other follow-up process because they have similar properties visually, but at least from our type scope, we can't take them into consideration, yeah.

And Anil says the Unicode table is standard, hence we support to use this in our case. Exactly. I think Unicode is one thing everybody can agree to use as a standard. And therefore, that makes the most sense to use for our definition of what is a Diacritic and whatnot. And Bill, thinks, so I guess that this is clarified. Thanks. We can go back to the RECs. So, this clarifies the question by Claude why we can't take those two characters he mentioned there into consideration. They are out of scope.

EN

With that, I think the next one is about Preliminary Recommendation three to five on page four to five. And yeah, there's the one about round. We were told that maybe we should rephrase this because possibly in the future, applications are not done in rounds anymore. But this is not the case right now. And also, the IDN-EPDP is using the word round here.

We think it's better to be consistent with the IDN-EPDP and also talk about rounds here because in case there is some switch to do this without round, there anyway has to be some kind of PDP to set the policies for those applications without round. And that PDP will then have to redo the recommendation in the IDN-EPDP. And if we have the same wording, it will make their lives easier because they can just use the same rewording or changes that they do with the IDN-EPDP.

They can also do with our PDP. So, that's why it makes sense to stick with round for the moment and not change anything here. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Michael. Actually, it was me who raised that point because I was aware of the deliberation from Board side and work side about the future study stay situation. So, I'm just wondering whether it's possible to include some kind of nuances and detail about this in the rationale just to know that the data critics group considered this future possibility of not having rounds as a future study stay. But if and when that happens, then blah, blah, blah.

Just maybe include something in the rationale so that when it gets to the point of implementation, there will be some kind of guidance or clarity so that we don't get into kind of a sticky conversation from work or Board side. So, thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks, Ariel. I'm certain we can include some blah, blah, blah in the rationale. No, I'm missing the name. The explanation was another name, yeah. But it's a good point. But we shouldn't change the recs themselves, but we can put it in the rationale. That was the word I was missing. Thanks for the suggestion.

And then we have the REC4 where there's been some discussion, some confusions about the second part of the recommendation. We write consistent with final REC3 of the EPDP-IDN Phase 1 Final Report applications for corresponding ASCII-gTLD or Latin Diacritic-gTLDs of their existing gTLDs can be submitted during the immediate next application round of the New gTLD program or in any subsequent round.

And then it follows some section. It says multiple applied for ASCII-gTLD and Latin Diacritic-gTLD that constitute a set and any new applications for an entirely new ASCII and Latin Diacritic-gTLD set can also be submitted together during the immediate next application round of the New gTLD program or any subsequent rounds.

I think we do not need this last part, starting with multiple, because this is just something that is already included in the rest of the recommendations particular REC5. And so, this makes the whole REC

more complicated. So, I guess it makes sense to remove this and REC4 is just talking about adding something to existing gTLDs and REC5 is then talking about a Complete new set without an existing one. And we don't need to have that part also included in REC4. So, unless there are other opinions, Satish agrees. I think we can remove that. That makes the whole recommendation clearer and easier to understand and not. So, yeah, thanks. That I think the next one was about the recommendations six. And the-- one second.

Oh, yeah, maybe specify this as an application for an ASCII and Latin Diacritic set, exactly. So, this is also from Ariel. Thanks for the work and all those comments. So the question just now, we are just talking about an application and do we need to specify that this is an application for an ASCII and Latin Diacritic set? Or is it within the context clear that when we talk about an application, it's always about the set because we don't make any rules for standard applications.

So, any suggestions whether we should leave it just the application or adhere some wording about application for an ASCII and Latin Diacritic set? Bill, please. Bill, if you're talking, you on mute.

BILL JOURIS: Sorry, I thought I cleared that. It seems to me that if it was unclear enough that somebody felt compelled to comment, even though they had been involved in this whole discussion, it's probably worth putting in a few extra words to make sure that people who have not been involved in our discussions understand immediately this is what it is. It may be redundant in some fashion, but it's still worth putting in a little

redundancy so that future readers are absolutely clear what we're talking about. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. Yeah, that's one point. I mean, Anil suggests to leave it as it is. I'm personally torn between the two. On the one hand, it's always helpful to say a bit more to avoid confusion. On the other hand, the more we put into a recommendation, the more-wordy it gets. And if it's too much, it can make it more complicated to understand because there are so many things there. So, I'm unsure. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish for the record. Two quick points. First is regarding Bill's point to clarify the actual point. And we have this concern that we should not unnecessarily make the recommendation longer. But if we all think that it is important to mention, maybe we can move it to a footnote so that the main recommendation is not made any longer. And my second other comment is, I'm not clear about this. We have granted an exception for a dotBrand TLD, which is one of our three special category TLDs. Why is it that only the dotBrand TLD has inception and not the other two?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. First, I think it's a good compromise. What you suggested to leave the recommendation as succinct as possible, but put some explanation in the rationale. And once you read the rationale, it should be clear that we are talking about applications referring to the set. So,

maybe that's a good compromise to avoid confusion, but also not to make the recs unnecessarily long.

Regarding your second question, why we have some special handling for Brand TLDs, the reason is that there is also a special handling for Brand TLDs in general applications. So, there's some kind of exception process that if you apply for a Brand single label TLD, not our EPDP or with variants, then there is some contention going on. You have the possibility to change your label to a completely different one, but still related to your Brand. And that's an exception process that's already existing for all general applications. And we just thought it makes sense to have the same exception process in our rules too. So, it's nothing, in addition we do, we just copied this exception process.

Okay, Ariel just tried to raise the point as it may encounter some confusion question when the initial report is published for Public Comment, let's careful reader may not realize that this is specifically regarding an application for Diacritic ASCII set. Having a footnote of some explanation comments will be helpful. Yeah, I guess that makes sense to have it either in the footnote or in the rationale, but leave it here in the short version.

And I see confirmations to handle this. Thanks for the suggestion, Satish and thanks Ariel for bringing this to our attention.

So, with that, I think the next comment is on Preliminary Recommendation seven. This is a bit justification about the mission and purpose of those TLDs which the applicants are applying for. The current wording is, in addition to explaining the mission and purpose of

the applied for ASCII gTLD string or existing gTLD, the applicant seeking one or more Latin Diacritic gTLD labels will describe the justification of such need.

In line with final rec 3.5 of the EPDP-IDN Phase 1 Final Report. The justification given by the applicant shall at the least or minimum provide the following information. And then we follow with the points which are there. Is this already the change cleaned up version, say one or is it the original one?

DEVAN REED: No, this is the original one. The clean options are on the side in the comments.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, so two suggestions how to rework this are, one, the applicant shall explain the mission and purpose of the applied for gTLDs that constitute the ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set. In addition, the applicant must describe the justification for the applied for gTLDs in line with final REC3.5 of the IDN-EPDP Phase 1 Final Report. The justification given by the applicant shall at the minimum provide the following information.

That would be one option or the other one is in addition to explaining the mission and purpose of the applied for gTLDs that constitute the ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set, the applicant seeking multiple gTLD labels within the set will describe the justification of such need in line with final REC3.5 of the IDN PDPs Phase 1 Final Report. Justification given by the applicant shall at the least or minimum provide the following

information. Any thoughts about this? Any preference for one or the other?

So, the reason we are discussing it is that it was found that someone just put it in the chat, leadership and staff found the current language is more complicated than necessary. So, we came up with a different version, different wording. The thing we want to do here is to say that whenever you want to apply for such a set that you need to provide mission and purpose explanation for the new strings which you want to apply for. But there's no need to describe mission and purpose for the existing spring because that already exists. And why should you explain the need for something that's already there?

Any thoughts, or if this is too much text to process now, we can also postpone this to next week's call. Then you can all read those versions in your own time. I think it makes more sense than just reading it now together because it's quite some text and the nuances are maybe small and may help.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Michael, this is Anil. I'm a little bit confused. First, because we talk here about if there are multiple TLDs in a set. Well, I think that the set of one is not a set, but there will be a linguistic question at least in part of my poor English.

Now, the question is that you don't need to restate the mission and purpose of the already applied for TLD. I am not completely sure because if you have a set, you need to explain how the set works. And

this implies, this could imply changing part of the purpose of the existing TLD.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, yeah.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: I'll give you an example. I'm not saying that I am sponsoring that idea or that I think it's a good idea or anything but imagine that to take the usual example of Quebec and dotQuebec. And we say, well, dotQuebec in ASCII should have from now on, just ASCII second levels while anything that's in the new one with the Diacritic should have the ASCII in it and the IDNs because otherwise it will be confusing to have Quebec with an accent dotQuebec without the accent, et cetera. It could be something like that. So, it could be, I'm not saying that necessarily but it could be that the mission is somehow changed. And in any case, what's important is the mission and purpose of the set not just of the new TLDs.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, yeah, interesting point. I haven't thought about this to be honest but I think this might make sense to always explain the whole set because even if the TLD already existed you might need to change the mission and purpose of that TLD to go with the new ones. So yeah, I think we should go back to this next week so we can also discuss this again in the leadership team. And you can also as a group take a look at the wordings and then next week, we can decide on what the best

wording for this should be. If you agree with that approach, seeing no objection, no approval.

Okay, Satish agrees. So, that's enough for me. Thanks, Satish. With that, we'll go to the next item that is the IG 8. There's been the question by the bill whether we should be making provisions for the applicant to appeal the decision of the evaluation panel. And Ariel already provided some context here while there's not an appeal process per se there is the so-called extended evaluation process.

And that one also allows the applicant to so to say contest the decision that has been taken here. So, if they have not passed this but they think that they should have passed it, they can go into extended evaluation and thereby solve that problem. So, I guess that's what the intention of the bill is to have something to counter the decision even if it's not the appeal process.

Is that okay with you Bill, or is there still a question or comment? Okay, Bill says maybe a footnote to mention that. Yeah, good point. If you have the question, probably other people will have a similar question in mind. So, we can put this in the rationale so people are clear that there is a way to deal with this if you think the evaluation was incorrect.

Thanks, Bill, for the comment and Ariel for clarifying the process here. Then we are going to Preliminary or Implementation Guidance 11. And there's a comment by Juliana. What kind of input will take into action in the future Public Comment, regular webinar or other format and what the impact into ongoing application process.

This is with regards to maybe quickly read the IG 11 consistent with Implementation Guidance 3.9 of the IDN-EPDP Phase 1 Final Report within 15 months of the delegation of the first ASCII gTLD string or the Latin Diacritic gTLD labels that constitute the ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set and every 24 months thereafter, ICANN Org should conduct research in order to identify whether any additional criteria or tests should be used as part of the application process to evaluate the technical and operational capability of an applicant to manage the ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set at the registry level.

ICANN Org must offer the community an opportunity to provide input on the scope of the research to be undertaken as well as any proposed outputs and additional criteria or tests and such output should not be applied retroactively.

So, the question is here, what kind of input this is? And this is the exact wording which we also have in the IDN-EPDP. So, there's also no specific explanation of the input but it will be handled in a similar fashion.

And Saewon put here in the comments this discussion would be for later for and or post implementation and upon ICANN Org analysis. But the types of input could be Public Comment opportunities and I would like to invite my colleagues and leadership to share knowledge on any potential impact and possibilities into this ongoing application process. But operationally, I could imagine that the spirit process may need to be involved, if at all. I don't know if maybe Ariel could say something regarding this, or Sarmad, please. Go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes, thank you. This is Sarmad. So, I guess my question was that if this is already being asked from IDN-EPDP and for I guess for Latin Diacritic labels, the technical setup would be technically, I guess the same, then we may not need a separate report, right? Because if this is put in, it is probably suggesting a separate report from what is being suggested by the implementation guideline at 3.9 for IDN-EPDP.

So, would it be useful to maybe rewrite this in a way that says that similar kind of, that the report which is done for the IDN-EPDP may actually be also utilized here or I guess if, or are we really looking for a separate report in this context? Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Good point, thanks. So, the suggestion is to maybe say that the report that is to be conducted for the variants should maybe be adjusted to also include our cases instead of creating a new report that might be a possibility. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish for the record. So, I know that there are several, very large number of dependencies for us on the IDN-EPDP Phase 1 and 2 reports. I'd like to know if this is a kind of static dependency, which means tomorrow, since there are some open-ended aspects of the IDN-EPDP.

IDN-EPDP goes its way and we will continue the way we have formulated these recommendations right now. Or if they change, we

are also dependent on those changes and someone has to then make the appropriate kind of modifications to our report as well. In other words, is this link static and it is kind of broken and they're on their way and we are on our way or is there a kind of umbilical cord that connects the two? Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks for the comment. And I guess this also goes in the direction which Samat mentioned that it might make sense to combine these things here. Yeah, interesting thought. Any other opinions, suggestions here? Do you think that's-- oh, Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: Yeah, I think it does make sense to combine them as long as we say something in here about it should be combined or something. But given that we do that, I think Sarmad's correct. It's not useful to require a second report. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. Yeah, especially since the technical handling of variants and LD sets is most likely going to be similar if not even the same. I mean, we both require the same entity and these have to be checked by registrars and registries. So most likely, there won't be any technically different implementation for those solutions. And therefore, it could make sense to combine this here.

Anil also agrees that we may use the same report outcome and Satish says a single report makes sense if the topic is aligned. So, it looks like

we have an opinion to try to rephrase this in a way that we are not requiring a new report, but we are trying to get into that report and have a common report. Is that a new hand bill or? No, I guess. Okay.

Then we'll get back to you with a suggested wording where we rewrite this in that sense.

With that, I think the next one is the Preliminary Recommendation 13 where there's a question or comment by Bill to add for the additional Latin Diacritic gTLDs to the word discount. So, this is about the application discount here.

We write, ICANN Org will decide the discount based on what it considers to be proportionate to any cost associated with evaluating the application and consistent with the cost recovery principle. This is not really just for the additional Latin Diacritic. It could also be for the additional ASCII gTLD in case you start with the Latin Diacritic. So, I think it's not necessary to adhere any, can you say some clarification is useful. What kind of clarification, if we say, yeah, Bill.

BILL JOURIS: This is Bill, if what I hear you're saying is this kind of discounting is applicable both to the Latin Diacritic case that we're discussing and to some other cases, that's fine. But I think it would be useful to make it clear because I was confused here about what exactly we were talking about and maybe the rest of the world is more capable of figuring it out than I am. But I think clarification there would help, thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, maybe we can put it in the rationale to make this a bit clearer, but I would prefer to have the Rec clear of this because we don't know what discount and if a discount will be applied here and therefore it's not really possible for us to describe it here what kind of discount, but if we can add some wording in the rationale, maybe that helps. Amadeu, please.

AMADEU ABRIL: Okay, so I'm not sure that what I'm going to say is necessary because I cannot read the recommendation itself and I don't remember the exact wording, but we're talking about 'discount'. I would really warn about the use of the word 'discount' even in a footnote. It's a commercial decision. Here, we're not talking about a commercial advantage for any reason. We are talking about perhaps a reduced price but always based in the cost analysis. So, that was just a word choice question. Let's be sure that we don't use 'discount'.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, interesting point. Just for your benefit, I'll read the rec it quickly again, consistent with final recommendation 3.13 of the E-EPDP IDN Phase 1 Final Report and Preliminary Recommendation 12 of our EPDP. A future gTLD registry operator applying only for the corresponding ASCII gTLD or latent Diacritic gTLDs of their existing gTLD must incur an application fee consistent with the principle of cost recovery reflected in the AGB.

ICANN Org will decide the discount based on what it considers to be proportional to any cost associated with evaluating the application and consistent with the cost recovery principle.

AMADEU ABRIL: So, I would prefer the fee reduction instead of discount. But again, perhaps is that I am translating from English into my Latin languages and then I am putting some weight to the 'discount' word that doesn't carry that weight in English.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, maybe we can get some help from some native speakers. I'm also not native. Is discount too much related to some commercial incentive, or can and should we therefore use a different word here that's more to the meaning that it's a reduction based on the cost recovery principle or is discount, okay? Bill, you're an American. That's quite close to a native English speaker, I guess.

BILL JOURIS: Monolingual English speaker even. 'Discount', I think can be used in the way it's used here. However, there is something to be said for, if another word would be clearer to those who are not native speakers of English, that might be useful as well. But this would be a normal English-based use of the word.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. So maybe we stick with 'discount' for the moment, but if somebody comes up with a better term, feel free to state that, say, right, or if not, we keep discount for the moment. As Bill said, that's quite a common and usual word also in this context. Yeah, with that, Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. Definitely not a native speaker, so I cannot weigh in on the word 'discount' here, but I do remember from the implementation side of things, the EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 12, oh, sorry, is that the Recommendation 12?

Anyway, that recommendation did raise some concerns or discussions, at least on the work side, and I'm happy to check with Michael Karakash, who was the liaison for the IDN-EPDP, so that he can remind me what was the discussion or conclusion of the implementation for that recommendation, and just to check whether there's any further info on the word discount and how that is interpreted and whether that encountered any issues. So, I will put this as an action item for myself and make sure I get back to the group on that after I check with him, if that helps.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Definitely. Thanks, Ariel. That's definitely helpful, and looking forward to your report maybe next week. Mark, please.

EN

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: Yeah, I'm wondering if the word 'deduction' would be better, because in Latin base, that's deducir, it's to take tens away, so it's literally talking about taking away a value. It's not like discount, which is more of a commercial term, so I wonder if 'deduction' would be the way to go. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Mark. Sounds good to my non-native ears, but let's wait for Ariel's report, and then next week possibly change it to deduction based on what she reports. Thanks.

The next one we have Preliminary Recommendation 14. This is a comment by Anil, and we need maybe some clarification on that comment about established institutions. If you could, maybe you can provide some context here, and just for the benefit of-- I still can't read this at the moment. This is a recommendation stating consistent with final REC 316 of the IDN-EPDP Phase 1 Final Report, all gTLDs that constitute an ASCII Latin Diacritic set must be subject to the same application requirements and evaluation criteria with respect to the three non-standard application types of gTLDs as identified by the SubPro EPDP.

This means that 14.1, an applicant for a community gTLD string that constitutes an ASCII Latin Diacritic set is required to submit a written endorsement for each label that constitutes a set from established institutions. And here there was a comment by Anil, and just please. Go ahead, Anil.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you, Michael, Anil for the record. Every country has a different set of institutions which are responsible for giving the community a collective statement about a particular language. So, if it is possible to include some examples in the footnote, that will be quite helpful for the applicant that which are the institutions or established institution where they can approach to get the report. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. Yeah, maybe we can possibly add some in the rationales. Apart from this, this is also the wording we have in the IDN-EPDP. So, they also talk about established institutions. So, similar to other reasonings, I think it makes sense to be consistent here and also keep the wording here in the recommendation itself, but possibly add some more information in the rationales.

And Saewon says the EPDP team affirmed that this term originated from the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and was reaffirmed by the SubPro PDP Final Report. And there's a footnote in the EPDP IDNs on the meaning of reference to the established institution. And we can use that here too and we'll put that in the rationales or footnote.

And with that, yeah, maybe we can quickly go to the next point. This is about some legal topics on page 9, the Preliminary Recommendations 15 and 17. There was a question whether we should actually refer to registry agreement here or whether we should maybe just talk about contractual obligations. And since I'm not experts on that legal topic, we decided to go back to ICANN legal and check with them what the best approach should be in this case. But we have not heard back yet.

So, hopefully we can come back next week with some additional information.

And with that, I think I'll head back to Saewon, since we just have three minutes left for the next steps.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Michael. This is Saewon Lee for the record. And just kind of ending on that note, we did actually get a preliminary response from legal. Again, it's preliminary, so they are still confirming which maybe might be a better thing to respond to next week. But basically, as of now, the response is that there is a preference from the legal team to keep things or the terms broader and avoid committing to a single RA. And again, for the new spec as well, they would like to follow the IDN policy and how it's recommended there.   But again, this is just preliminary response for now. So, whatever's confirmed will be shared next week as Michael shared.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks.

SAEWON LEE: With that, I'll go back to the slides and then share the next steps. Before the next steps, I would like to mention that any comments that have been resolved today or those grammatical issues or non-substantive issues, they will be cleared from the document. Just to note, whatever general rules that Michael shared in the beginning, they will be cleared as of today.

EN

With that, as you can see in the screen, this is the work plan for the coming September and October. We'll continue with the review of Preliminary Recommendations Language. As you can see, it's going a bit slower than we anticipated, but we'll get there. So, if you can continue to review the Recommendations Language, that would be greatly appreciated. And once stable, the working group will tackle Charter Question 4 and the global public interest and human rights impact issues.

I know there were questions about Dublin in the beginning of the call, ICANN84 sessions, and it is still early days, so who knows. But as Devan shared in the beginning through the chat, we do have two meetings scheduled for Saturday, 25th of October. If Devan could share them again in the chat, that would be greatly appreciated. But we will let you know as we come nearer to the ICANN84 period.

Here, as you can see, for the immediate next steps, again, please continue to review the draft language. And obviously, the second point is a bit too early for now, but we will be suggesting, we as in the leadership team and staff will be suggesting to the Working Group, as you go through the document, if you find any edge cases that we would like to stress test against, please do leave them in the mailing list so that we could compile them together and have a session dealing with those.

With that, I will hand it over to John. I know it's top of the-- I know it's near the end, but John.

JOHN EMERY: Perfect. Everyone will see the action items and notes in email shortly. Just a reminder to the group, take an in-depth look at recommendation seven to determine correct wording. There're a few other action items for leadership and staff and Ariel as well. So, we'll leave it there so we don't run over. Thanks, everyone. Back to you, Mike.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, John and Saewon. And with that, thanks all for the great contributions and talk to you next week. Devan, you can stop the recording now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]