

---

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP call taking place on Wednesday, 19 November 2025, at 14:15 UTC.

We do have apologies today from Sergio and Juliana. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your Statements of Interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the Latin Script Diacritics wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call.

Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript, and please note all chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including the session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct. Thank you. And over to our chair, Michael Bauland. Please begin.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Devan. Welcome, everybody, to our anniversary meeting #25. One quarter of 100. Only 75 more to go to reach 100. Next slide, please.

For the agenda, we will recap last week's meeting, and then continue with our deliberations with this one question still pending regarding the Stress Test Cases 5 and 6. And then we will continue with Charter

---

*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.*

---

Question 4 and the GPI/HR Impact Assessment if we get that far. And then we have the Table of Contents for the Initial Report for your review. We will continue with the next steps and AOB. Next slide, please.

As a recap, we updated PR #45. We introduced Option 2 to adding clarification via a footnote only. The complete PR can be seen in our PR Doc. Next slide, please.

With a few action items, this action item one, the PR #45 I've just mentioned, and to update the PR #18, #19. We will see those on the next two slides. And then we had this discussion about Case Studies 5 and 6, and we postpone the decision because we wanted to gather some more information, so that you can take the decision better informed. And we will present that in the following.

And then we had as action item three, Saewon showed you our analysis of the Charter Question 4, the impact on existing consensus policy, and we asked you to take a look at that and come back to us in case you disagree with any of those decisions or those suggestions, what the impact is we made. And also you can already take a look at the GPI/HR impact which is presented there. So, next slide.

PR #45, we added this footnote, which right now says, "The source domain name can be different per TLD in accordance with the ASCII/Latin diacritic domain defined in Preliminary Recommendation 39. This solution—allowing different source domain names per TLD is consistent with EPDP-IDN. To be precise, the source domain name must originate from the ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set."

---

That was also a question that we should add this to avoid confusion. And with this footnote, the Preliminary Rec 45 looks a bit less crowded. It just says, “Consistent with Final Recommendation 8 from the EPDP-IDNs Phase 2 Final Report, a registrant and its sponsoring registrar must jointly determine the source domain name.” Here comes the footnote, and then, “which must be registered for calculating the variant domain set under a given ASCII gTLD or its delegated Latin diacritic gTLDs, if any. The registrants and sponsoring registrars of the exempted domain names pursuant to Preliminary Recommendation 42 are excluded from this requirement.”

Any questions, comments? I’ve already seen Bill. Please go ahead.

BILL JOURIS:

I wonder if we want to put something in that requires the registrar to tell the registrant that there is a Latin diacritic set that they may be interested in examining to see if there’s a source domain name. I’m not sure I’m expressing this clearly. But it occurs to me that the registrant may not be aware of all this stuff we’re doing, and I wonder if we want to at least strongly recommend that the registrar let them know that this collection of policies exists.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah. Good point. I would hesitate to force registrars because they do not even have to support this LD set. They could just support single registrations without those same entity requirements. That’s up to the registrar and their business models. Therefore, it’s difficult to require this. But we do have a recommendation that asks ICANN to do some

---

outreach regarding both the variant existence and the LD set. This outreach should be done to all different parties, including registrars and registrants. So I think that should cover most of that.

BILL JOURIS:

I guess I'm a belt and suspenders guy on this. I'd like to at least give a little encouragement to the registrars. As you say, their business model may go somewhere else, but if we at least suggest it, it may occur to them it would be a good idea. Just a thought.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Michael. I think Bill has a point here. What is new in this round is that we have the EPDP 2 phases as entirely new, the first time that we are trying out variants. And then we have the Latin diacritics, which we don't know when it's going to get into the round, but at some point this is also going to get in there. So there is a lot of new stuff. And therefore, I would echo Bill's point that in the ICANN to-do kind of a list, maybe we should strengthen it a little bit more so that these new things can be passed on to the end users, the registrants. Otherwise, if the registrar is not going to take any initiative, there's nothing we can do about it. I agree that we have already put it as a kind of to-do for ICANN, but maybe strengthening that a bit may be useful for the end users. Thank you very much.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks. Any other thoughts, comments about this? Saewon just put the Outreach Preliminary Recommendation 50 into the chat, “Consistent with Final Rec 13 of the IDN-EPDP Phase 2 Final Report, ICANN Org must conduct outreach to dispute resolution providers, registries, registers, registrants, and mark owners to enhance their understanding of ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set and domain names of an ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set, in particular, their potential impact on dispute resolution proceedings.”

I understand that you acknowledge this to be there, but you would like to have something more prominent and more kind of forcing registrars to—

SATISH BABU:

Yeah. The point is, the operative verb here is conduct outreach. Now, this is a fairly passive way for saying that ICANN should tick some boxes. So the point is whether we can do it a bit more stronger. So just a suggestion. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. The question is where best this should be located, because I don’t think the Preliminary Recommendation should include something like that. It’s not a real policy requirement. It’s more like should nice-to-have thing. Louis justified in the chat maybe the registry could notify the registrar if there’s a Latin diacritic, but the registrant will probably know also what he wants.

---

SATISH BABU: We can go ahead. No problem.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. We can maybe think about this in the background a bit more whether it makes sense to have something there. But for this Rec 45, I think it should be the way it is, and we can see whether we maybe, as Saewon just put the Implementation Guidance 51, maybe we can adjust this a bit or add something more there. That is a place where we talk about the outreach and making registrars and registrants aware of the fact that these things exist. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Michael. This is Steve from staff. I guess just reacting to the valid concerns raised by Bill. I think there's also a collection of recommendations that would guard against the proliferation. So, essentially, there's some recs that I think disincentivize auto activation of additional domain names, so there's that recommendation. And there's also the fee structure for the domain names that it's essentially cumulative for all the additional domain names added for the registry, and the registrar would also have to pay fees for each registration conducted. I think, in addition to the outreach, there's also measures in place for other recommendations that would likely guard against a number of domain names being registered automatically, essentially. So, I think the collection of things will hopefully make sure that the registrant is making an informed decision before they actually have these names registered. Thanks.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Steve. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: I'm not so concerned about anything automatic, it's more a matter of suppose I come in and I want .jose with an accent, but don't realize that .jose without an accent and possibly other members of the set are available in the kind of diacritic set that we're defining. It isn't a matter of requiring a registrant to do anything. It's a information deal so that they at least make an informed decision. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. Understood. And I think we can take a look at the IG51 and maybe adjust that slightly to puts some stronger emphasis such that registrars should make their customers aware of this. I mean, mostly they want to do this anyway because they want to sell domains, and if they can sell more because there are more, then this might be attractive to them anyway, but still. Saewon just corrected that it's by now IG52 and not IG51 because we had some renumbering. But the one about the outreach, we will take a look and possibly adjust the wording slightly to cover the suggestions by Bill.

Okay. Any other questions, comments regarding this 45? If not, we can continue to the next slide, please, about PR #18, #19.

These are basically just administrative changes in the sense that we now have the adoption by the Board, and therefore we can strike out the part of those recs which were put there by us because the IDN-EPDP Recommendations 7.4 and 7.5 have not been adopted and we weren't

---

sure if they were going to be adopted the way they were put by the IDN-EPDP or whether there might be some changes required by the Board. But since they are adopted, we can just follow this and have the wordings adjusted and remove this unless and until the ICANN Board determines otherwise.

Any questions/comments regarding this one? None. Just some thumbs up. Then we can go back to our open issue, the case study. We combined, basically, Case Studies 5 and 6 because they are similar in the sense that they are combining IDN-EPDP variant TLD sets and Latin diacritic TLD sets. The difference was just with which set you start, if you start with one, because you could also just have a brand new application having both at the same time.

So the issue here is, one, an applicant having an ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set would also like to activate a variant of one of their TLDs. Can they do it? And consequently, an applicant having a variant set would also like to activate a Latin diacritic gTLD for one of their TLDs. Can they do it? I think we agreed that this should be consistent in the sense that we wouldn't want to say no to one of the questions and yes to the other because basically the combination of whether it's possible to combine LD and the variants.

The question is now, in both cases, what policies apply, LD PDP, IDN-EPDP, or both. We have some scenarios here. Suppose an applicant that owns .strässe and .strasse would also like to activate a variant of one of their TLDs. Or, on the other case, suppose an applicant with an existing variant set .straße with sharp s and .strasse with double S would like to



---

add strässe to its existing as the .strasse TLD, thereby invoking the policy of our PDP. Next slide, please.

We have these two options. Option 1 is restrict LD set and variant set activation. Restrict LD set activation to single ASCII TLDs and not for the variant sets and vice versa. Also prohibit variant activation in LD sets. And the Option 2 would be to allow LD set activation for TLDs within a variant set, while also allowing variant set activation for TLDs within an LD set. For Option 1, the consequence would be, if you have a variant contract, you cannot add any LD TLDs to that contract. And if you have an LD set contract, you cannot add any variants to that contract. This restriction will need to explicitly formulate it as a Preliminary Recommendation, and we have a suggestion on the next slide.

For Option 2, the consequence would be that .strässe with double S could be added to the variant set .straße and .strasse with sharp S and double S, and also .strässe and .strasse could activate one of their variants. This is currently not possible due to the way the Latin Root Zone LGR has been defined. There's no real example here to provide, but still, our roots must be in the way that they covered this because we don't know that all future LGRs would be in a similar way. This would mean that we would need to examine the current recs and see how and whether they work for a combined variant and LD set combination, and we'll take a look at that on the following slides, 13 to 34. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Michael. When we are putting down policy that restricts the registries or registrars, when you have a prohibition, we need to say

---

why. What is the rationale behind this prohibition? What is the problem if we have Option 1? I'm not very clear about that. Option 2, of course, is more liberal kind of a thing. But what is wrong with Option 1? Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Good questions. Maybe we can come back to those once we went through the required changes for Option 1 and 2 so you all have a better view of what these options mean, and then we can start the discussion which option do you prefer, and also what the consequences would be. Anil, please.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Thank you, Michael. Now, to solve this particular problem, I personally feel that let us go back to the principle of TLD and their variants. Basically, any domain and their variants have the similar Root Zone LGR, which is defined by EPDP, as well as in the similar recommendations. Now, if we look on both the cases of this, #5 and #6, if we go for Option 2, then we don't follow that particular principle. So if we go for Option 2, then there may be problems in the original recommendations for a domain and their variants. So, I personally feel that it is better to go for Option 1, although it has some restrictions and number of domains delegated may be less as compared to Option 2. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Anil. But before we start the discussion, whether we want to go for Option 1 or 2, I think it's better to first see what this actually means

---

---

and maybe what the consequences of that will be. Let's take a look next slide what would it mean to go with Option 1. We would need to have some kind of recommendation that basically prohibits the simultaneous use of variants and LD TLD. So we could add something like in PR #1 another 1.5 saying all gTLD strings that constitute an ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set shall not be associated with, overlap with, or included within an existing variant set. That's a one direction. And then have another Preliminary Recommendation, maybe two, which could read something like further to Preliminary Recommendation 1.5 which requires that no gTLD strings that constitute an ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set shall be activated within an existing variant set. The activation of variant strings shall also be forbidden for all gTLDs within the ASCII/Latin diacritic set.

As said, let's not discuss now whether this is a good solution or whether Option 2 is a better solution. This is now just to show you what we would need to have in place to go with Option 1. And this would require these two additions to our recommendations, which basically makes sure that if you have a variant set, you cannot activate Latin diacritic versions of those TLDs, and if you have a Latin diacritic set, you cannot activate variants. That's Option 1. One second, just reading in the chat. Okay. As I said, let's go back to the discussion of pro and cons once we've seen those two options in more detail, and then we go back to the slide 10, and can start the discussion. Next slide, please.

Just to show you what this could mean for Option 2, if we combine variant sets and ASCII/Latin diacritic set, this is a hypothetical example, because currently the Root Zone LGR does not allow this. But as I said, we can't make policies based on the current state of the Root Zone LGR, the policies we make have to work for all future cases, of course.

---

---

So if we have a ASCII/Latin diacritic set here shown as .strasse and .strässe, what would it mean that the registry could also activate variants? It means that they can activate variants on one of the TLDs in the Latin diacritic set, .straße with a sharp s, but they could also activate variants on the other or multiple other TLDs in the Latin diacritic set, so sträße. So then we have in this Latin diacritic set, we have multiple sets of variant TLDs, and each of those sets have a primary TLD. So one of the big changes would be the change that now it's possible in a single contract to not only have one primary TLD for the variants, but we have multiple primary TLDs for the variant. And this would then mean that some of the recs would have to be adjusted accordingly to work with this.

Any questions regarding this example case here? Bill says, "But the question is what if the arrows go the other direction?" Well, the variants always work in both directions. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

The fact is that variants, in this case, do not work in both directions from the sharp S to the double S is allocatable variant from the double S to the sharp S is a blocked variant. We had some arguments about that in the Latin earlier, but that's the rules that got laid out. And what I'm trying to say is, okay, you have the one on the lower left, and then because it's allocatable, you have the one on the upper left. Now, if you want the one on the lower right, what I think I hear you saying is, okay, if you want the one in the lower right, you cannot get the one on the upper right. Perhaps I'm totally misunderstanding you, but that's what it

---

sounds like you're saying, and that's why I'm carrying on about this. I'm not understanding what you're trying to say here.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Sorry for the confusion. What I'm trying to say here is if you want to have variant TLDs, you need to define a primary label. If we not look at the Latin diacritic case, but just at the IDN-EPDP, you start with one primary label, and then you can activate variants for that primary label. But if you now want to allow—

BILL JOURIS: The lower left one, then, is the primary? Is that what you're saying?

MICHAEL BAULAND: No. This example, the primary would be the upper ones because just start with them.

BILL JOURIS: Okay. Well, those are blocked. So I don't see that that's possible, even.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Exactly. That's what I said. That's why I said this is a hypothetical example. With the current Root Zone LGR, it's not possible, but we can't make policies based on the way the current Root Zone LGR is defined. We have to have policies that are well-defined even if the Root Zone LGR changes. So we can't assume that there will never be an allocatable variant to an ASCII label.

---

BILL JOURIS: Okay. I got that. I think maybe we need to rephrase this so that it's a little more clear what it is we're trying to say. I may just be exceptionally slow in understanding, but I'm a little concerned that I may not be the only potential registrant who reads that and goes, "What are they saying here?" Perhaps the leadership team and the staff can look at that and say, "Can we explain that a little more clearly?" Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: At the moment, we're not talking about registrants. This is far away from this example. In the moment we are trying to find out what TLDs registries would be allowed to activate. Samad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Michael. I'm just going to add a little bit here. One of the, I think, underlying properties of variants is that they are transitive set, which means that if A is a variant of B, and B is a variant of C, then A is also a variant of C. So, that's something around which then the whole structure of how variants at the top level, how variants at the second level, all come together. And the policy recommendations obviously have that underlying assumption as they put together.

In this case, what we are, I think, potentially seeing is that we can get into relationships because now we're adding this ad hoc LD TLD in the mix, in addition to variants, we can get into potentially situations where if A is a variant of B, and B is a variant of C—or let's not call it a variant. If A is related to B, and B is related to C, A may not actually necessarily

---

end up being related to C. So, A is related to B, and B is related to C, but A is not related to C anymore. So that transitivity relationship inherently is not there because of this, I guess, arbitrary addition of LD TLDs in the variant mix. I guess the question is then we need to go and look at where inherently these transitivity relationship plays a role in defining these sets at the top level, and then the, I guess, corresponding recommendations at the second level, and where those get impacted.

So, in this case, I guess, to just illustrate what I'm talking about, it is not clear what is the relationship of A v1 with LD v1, right? They are operating through the relationship from A and LD, but the relationship between A v1 and LD v1 is not clearly defined on what that relationship is. Obviously, that needs to be brought into the mix in case this is the option we want to take, and then also see how that impacts the other potential recommendations at the top level and second level. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Good point, Sarmad. This, basically, what we wanted to say here, that when you start with a Latin diacritic set, you have all TLDs in that set are related to each other, namely by the LD PDP. But then you can start adding variants. You can get a variant of one of the LD TLDs, but if you allow this, you could also add a variant of the other LD TLD. And then you have two variants in this set which are neither variants of each other, nor constitute an ASCII/LD TLD set. So they are basically totally independent of each other, but due to the combination of ASCII/Latin diacritics and variants, they would still end up in the same set of TLDs,

---

and we therefore need a new definition of what this TLD set is we are talking about.

Maybe let's start looking at some of the recs there where we think we need to make some adjustment to cover this Option 2. The goal here is not to discuss what we want to change in this recs or how we need to change them, but it's because that would take too long, and we can do that if and when we decide to go with Option 2. At the moment is just to see what recs will be affected by Option 2, and will need to have some adjustments. Some might be small adjustment, trivial ones, and some might be bigger ones. Next slide, please.

For once, we have this question whether it's in scope here. The scope is this PDP is limited to examining a single issue in circumstances where a base ASCII gTLD and the Latin script diacritic version of the gTLD are not variants of each other. So it requires them to be not variants but it doesn't necessarily require that variants of those TLDs are excluded. So this sounds like we can take a look at this. It's not out of scope here.

We have the IDN-EPDP Phase 1 Rec 3.4 which says, "A future applicant applying for a primary gTLD string together with its allocatable variant labels in the same round is required to submit one application for the primary gTLD string and the variant label." This would need to be adjusted somehow because now we don't just have a single primary gTLD and variant labels, but we could have multiple primary gTLDs and variant labels. And similarly, our version of this says, "Consistent with Final Recommendation 3.4 of the IDN-EPDP Phase 1 Final Report, a future applicant applying for an ASCII gTLD string together with its Latin diacritic gTLD labels that constitute a set in the same round is required

---



---

to submit a single application for this set.” This also would need to be adjusted to cover this multi-set combining those. Next slide, please.

Then we have this possibility to withdraw something during the application phase that in the variant case, variants can be withdrawn. In our case, all labels could be withdrawn, but the base ASCII must still exist. So this would also need to be revisited if we have a combination of the variants and LD TLDs, what can be withdrawn and what would be the consequences if one would be withdrawn. So this is another topic we have to revisit. Next slide, please.

Then we have the requirements in both the IDN-EPDP and our recs that the applicant must be able to demonstrate the ability to manage this set of TLDs. This would have to be adjusted to work with both sets at the same time. Next slide, please.

Then we have this IDN-EPDP which says that up to four variants of a primary gTLD string must incur the same base application fee as other TLDs. But now we don't have one primary TLD but we could have multiple primary TLDs. Does this mean that four variants per primary TLD are free or same cost, or is it that the combination of variants of those primary TLD must, at most, be four? So that's another question we have to talk about. Next slide, please.

Then we have the topic about the application fee, if applying only for allocatable variant labels of its delegated primary gTLD must incur discounted base application fee, then the IDN-EPDP case, and in our case, we say that it must incur an application fee consistent with the principle of cost recovery reflected in the AGB. This would also need to

---

be combined somehow in a recommendation that covers both sets at the same time. Next slide, please.

Then we have the Recommendation 3.16 from the IDN-EPDP, which requires that all TLDs, the primary and the variants must have the same application requirements. And in our case, we say that the ASCII and the gTLDs must have the same application requirements. So here we would also need to have a small adjustment to make sure this is covered and that this combined set somehow also needs to have the same requirements. Next slide, please.

Good point, Saewon. Not just the requirements but also the evaluation criteria. Then we have from the IDN-EPDP that any future gTLD, along with its variant labels, must be subject to one Registry Agreement with each variant labels having the same Service Level Agreement and a new Specification or an amendment to the Base Registry Agreement for any future gTLDs, along with its variant label, may need to be developed. So here, again, we need to take care that we now must be able to work with multiple primary TLDs, and that most likely all of these will also have to be subject to one Registry Agreement. Next slide, please.

Then we have the IDN-EPDP 7.3. Any existing registry operator that is successful in its future application for its variant labels must be required to adopt contractual terms to accommodate the newly approved variant labels by way of a new Specification to its existing agreement. And we have a corresponding version here, but those Specifications are not necessarily the same. So here the question would be, do we need to have a new Specification that combines this, or would there be two

---

separate Specifications which would be applicable at the same time? So that's another question we have to talk about. Next slide, please.

Then we have the question about the fixed registry fee and the registry and transaction fees that this is same as for single gTLD. We here have to check whether that's still the case if we combine variants and LD sets. Next slide, please.

Then we have the Rec 7.6, 7.7, 7.8 from the IDN-EPDP, and our corresponding Recs 20, 21, and 22, where we say the registry service provider for each one of the Critical Functions as defined in the Base Registry must be the same for all TLDs in the set. So here we have to also have a small adjustment that covers both sets or combination of the sets at the same time, and the others just related to changes and transfers of TLDs. Next slide, please.

Then we have the requirements that the Preliminary Recommendation 23, for example, consistent with Final Rec 7.9 of the IDN-EPDP Phase 1 Final Report of the Registry Transition Process or Change of Control process is completed for a gTLD and its corresponding ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD labels, the successor gTLD registry operator can apply for the other non-delegated Latin diacritic label. So it just says that if there's a change, then the policies remain the same. But we still have to look at this in the context of recommendation. Rec 25 says, "Consistent with Final Rec 7.11 of the IDN-EPDP Phase 1 Final Report in the event a gTLD is reassigned as a result of a TM-PDDRP determination, that reassignment must include all the corresponding gTLDs." So these are most likely minor changes, but they have to be adjusted to cover the fact that we are not just working with a single LD set or a single variant

---

---

set, but we may have multiple variant sets and one LD set. Next slide, please.

Are you moving in the right direction? Yeah, okay. I was a bit further already on my slide. Sorry. This is about the same data escrow provider. Basically, also small changes, but we need to make sure that it's consistent with a combination of sets and Recommendation 7.14 sets. Similarly, any allocatable variant label sought by an existing registry operator will be bound by the same restrictions as the existing gTLD upon execution of the new Specification to this existing Registry Agreement. Here, again, we need to make sure that these recs work with both the LD and variant sets in combination. Next slide, please.

Then we have the topics about the number of variant labels and the Terms and Conditions for the evaluation and the sequence. So here, again, minor changes would be required to make sure this works with the combination. Next slide, please.

And then we have the questions of removal and what happens with the TLDs. This is likely a bit more complex to discuss, because if you remove LD TLD, which is also the primary TLD for a variant label, there might be requirements to block also all variants of that. At the moment in 36, we just say that the removed TLD need to be blocked by 10 years but this would require to have some adjustments to that to also include variants, and we need to make sure that the removal process is clear and what the consequences are and how these TLDs can be removed since there are interrelations between those if we combine LD sets and variant sets. Next slide, please.

---

---

This was basically the topics about the Phase 1 recommendations, but there are also some implications on the others. I see Pitinan's hand. Please go ahead.

PITINAN KOOARMORNPATANA: Thank you, Michael. Pitinan for the record from staff. Just on the previous slide, I just wanted to note that the one related to removing the primary, that's also affected the Preliminary Recommendation 1.4 on the LD PDP. As of now, ASCII gTLD has to be identified. And right now, if the ASCII gTLD is removed, the LD still remains as a single gTLD. So this is also something will be affected if you combine the two sets.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Good point. Thanks for that. We have to then just pass in more detail. What happens if in such a multi-set certain TLDs are removed, what are the consequences of the other TLDs? Can some of them be retained? Or does removal also require the removal of others? Maybe all, maybe some. This would need to be discussed. Alan, please.

ALAN BARRETT: Thank you. My comment is on Recommendation 39 on the next slide. Talking about variants, I suggest we explicitly use the phrase IDN variants so that people don't mistake it for Latin diacritics.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Alan. Good point. Especially in that context, once we allow the combination, it might. Alan? Okay, sorry. Generally, it should be clear

---

that variants are only IDN variants because that's how they are defined, and our same entity requirements are not based solely on variants, but that's where we define this ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set. But yeah, maybe to make it more clear, that makes some sense too. Thanks. Here we would need to have a revisit too, that we need to define a new ASCII/Latin diacritic variant domain set, which includes basically all required second level label, but this also needs to have some clear up of how this will work in this context.

Maybe in the interest of time, we just quickly skim through over the Phase 2 recs where we have similar requirements that we need to make sure that if we extend this TLD set to include both variants and LD set that our definition of saying entity and related concepts are still same, and therefore some of those recs also might be reworded. Alan says, "My concern is that people might misunderstand the term 'variant' to think it refers to one half of an ASCII/Latin diacritic set. Using the phrase 'IDN variant' instead of just the word 'variant'."

Okay. I think that's an easy change, which we could even do, independent of whether we go for Option 1 or Option 2, to make it more clear that we are talking about IDN variants in this Recommendation 39.

Back to the question, Option 1 or Option 2? There are benefits for both of them. Option 1 is clearly the one that is less work, that is clearly defined what this is. Option 2 might be the one that is more natural by allowing this but it's a bit complicated in all the side effects.

---

Yeah, I've been talking for quite a while so I'll open the floor to you for discussions. Option 1, Option 2, questions, comments? Votes in favor of, votes against. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Michael. I'd like to know if the problems with Option 2 are security and stability-related or contractual or the usability of the outcome? What exactly is the problem?

MICHAEL BAULAND:

I think, in all those areas, we have effects. It's definitely contractually-related because we need to have a single contract that would combine the use of multiple primary TLDs and their variants, as well as LD sets, but it's thoughts about security and stability when you talk about how many or what combinations may be activated, but maybe ICANN staff can say a few more words to this. I see already hands by Sarmad and Steve. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you. I was just going to add that, I think, at this time, one would really need to get into that analysis to actually figure out that answer. Obviously, clearly from what Michael presented, there are implication on a host of recommendations. Some of them are more straightforward changes. Some of them require more discussion. But I think through those discussions, one would also find out that whether there are implications on just contractual or security and stability aspects, there is

---

obviously a potential to impact all those areas, but it does really require discussion and a deeper dive. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks, Sarmad. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Michael. You have a collection of staff in line here, and I think there's a reason for that. It's obviously not our role to influence the outcomes, but it is our role to highlight concerns that we might have and considerations for the group to take into account. We've been doing policy development for a long time, and there are things that you want to look out for.

So I think what Michael demonstrated by going through all those recommendations is that this represents a ton of complexity. And so what that means is it's complexity for this working group to adjust its recommendations, but that also has to carry on and knock-on effects. So assuming adoption by the Council and Board goes to implement this, that's an enormous amount of complexity for the team to implement as well, which means time and confusion on that aspect. And then also, once you actually get to the applicants and registrants, you also have introduced another level of complexity for them as well. So the issue that Bill mentioned about potential confusion for end users, you're actually compounding that confusion now by introducing another layer of complexity.



---

So, I guess just a reminder that there are impacts to adding complex things to recommendations. I guess a reminder is that policy development is not absolute. What I mean by that is if this group sees a potential need for this additional layer, you could proceed with Option 1 now, and then determine at a later date that you need to allow for Option 2. So, future policy development can overwrite past policy development.

I say all this because one of the core principles of this working group is that it is an exception procedure, and in that respect, a conservative approach is generally advisable. And so all this is to say that Option 2 and its complexity does raise alarm bells for the staff team. We're not trying to put our finger in scale, but we do want to make sure that it's known that this is at least concerning from our standpoint based on our experience. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Steve. Valuable input. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Michael. I guess I'm in line with the other staff members just spoke on this issue, because, from my perspective, my head is spinning by thinking through all the possibilities, scenarios, and then trying to figure out how to explain that to the implementation side of things. Also, Alan probably can fill this, like to explain to the Board what this recommendation means could be very complex if we go with Option 1.

---

Also, another thing I want to mention is that my understanding is if the group do go with Option 1 and potentially kind of including diacritics, like additional ones, into the set, the limitation of restriction on that is much less than RZ-LGR based on my kind of understanding. Because for RZ-LGR, there's a clear rule about what are variants, what are blocked, what are allocatable. But then for diacritics, it's probably more lenient in that interpretation, so it could be a potential risk for proliferation of strings that requested to be delegated to the root zone and could have an impact on the DNS stability and security. So, I'm just thinking that could also be a concern. But in any case, I'm in line with other folks that spoke to this. I'm just thinking the complexity of this will be really difficult to explain to all the affected parties, so it will be something for the group to think about.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Ariel. All good points. It still doesn't really help us with a decision in the chat. I see a few voices in favor of Option 2. I see some Option 1 in favor. Any other comments, thoughts?

Amadeu, please go ahead. If you're talking, we still can't hear you. If you're still looking for the unmute button then you haven't found it yet. Still on mute. We can hear you now.

AMADEU ABRIL:

Is that me who has the floor?

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yes.

AMADEU ABRIL:

Okay. I was silent, which is something very strange for me. I have an opinion, which is a clear opinion about being strongly favorable to Option 2 as a question of principle, but I am not in favor of making rules about what would happen if a pink unicorn comes in front of me and tell me that I don't exist. That is, I really think that what you're discussing here is not just hypotheticals but very unlikely hypotheticals in any short term. We had made some decisions that are arbitrary. Sorry, it's not pejorative, and not in the sense that they are not justified or not reasonable. In the sense that they are decisions we made for certain reasons. What's a variant? What's not a variant? What's a diacritic? If we take languages and history, it could be discussed in any term, but we have those decisions now.

I am not sure I am completely convinced about the level of complicity that Steve has described before. I think that we have a way to describe what we want for what's a set, or a set of sets, or a combined set, or a complex set. But I'm not in favor of making things unnecessarily complex for things that won't happen. So I am in favor of Option 2, but I vote for Option 1 because of what we are and where we are and what we are trying to do. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Amadeu. Without voicing an opinion either for Option 1 or 2, I think I agree that the chances that people having a Latin diacritic set also want to activate variants. Well, it's not possible with the current LGR, but the other way around. People having a variant set might also

---

want to activate Latin diacritics is quite slim, because honestly, I don't think so many LD set applications will be there in one of the next rounds, and also not so many variant application sets will be there probably. And the combination of those are even more unlikely from my point of view. But I didn't make an—what's the word? When you ask many people and find out the opinion? Whatever. I didn't make a survey of it.

Seeing that we've got two more minutes, I think I can still give the floor to Asteway, and then we can continue the discussion next week. Asteway, please.

ASTEWAY SHOAREGA NEGASH: Thank you, Michael. Just a quick note before we all depart and seeing that we are about at the peak of the time. With all these recommendations being affected with Option 2, I'm actually wondering if we still have the same entity principle. Because now I'm seeing that there is a chance that we are affecting the integrity of the set itself. So since we are mixing up between variants in LD labels here, will the sets remain intact or not? I'm wondering. It's a stupid question. Sorry.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Good point. I think it should still be intact or we have to take care that remains intact. But it indeed might require some adjustments to the recommendations to ensure that this is still the case. Sarmad, very quick.

---

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you. Just quickly on that. When we go into Latin diacritics, you're going from one variant set to another variant set because the relationship between the ASCII and the LD is not a variant relationship, which means that each of them have their own variant sets. So when you actually combine them, you are actually, in some ways, combining two variant sets to create a larger variant set if you're really looking at the variant.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah. Looking at the chat, it seems like a few more people voted for Option 1, but I think this is very complex topic, then we shouldn't hurry the decisions. So maybe it's good that we have a one-week break. You can all revisit those slides. Maybe take some time to think of what your preferred option is, and then we can next week maybe take a quick vote and see, and if necessary, continue the discussion.

So, thanks, everybody, for your time. We will then send out a new meeting invitation for next week. I think it hasn't been sent out yet. Let's continue the good discussions next week. And sorry for running slightly over. Devan, you can stop the recording. And see you all next week. Thanks. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]