

---

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP call taking place on Wednesday, the 21<sup>st</sup> of May 2025, at 13:15.

We do have apologies from Sebastien Ducos, Asteway Negash, Juliana Harsianti, Prudence Malinki, and Satish Babu.

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 in the Latin Script Diacritics Wiki space. Recordings 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. Thank you, and back over to our chair, Michael Bauland. Please begin.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Devan, and welcome, everybody, to our eighth meeting. Next slide, please.

So we pretty much have the same agenda like last week, since we're still working on the IDN EPDP outputs and see how relevant they are for our

---

*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.*

---

PDP. That's what we'll be doing this week too. Next slide, please.  
Thanks.

Key outcome from last week are, first of all, that question regarding the Recommendation 7.1, whether we need to go into legal wording choices, and the decision was that there was no need to do this. And since at this point, this will be dealt later outside of the PDP, we just do a general recommendation and don't bother with the actual wording of the result. And then we continue to examine the IDN EPDP Recommendations, and that's what we'll be doing today too. Next slide, please.

Here's, again, the scope of work with no changes from last week, so I'll just skip over it. You should know it by now, and if not, you can look at the slides in detail. Next slide, please.

So we are again with the Phase 1 and Phase 2 IDN EPDP, and how relevant those are to our PDP. Next slide, please.

So we can now switch to the Excel sheet and continue with our work. Could you scroll up a little bit to—no, the other direction, to the previous. Right, exactly. There. So we talked about fees last week and decided that the decision whether there's something free or how the fees will be applied. In our case, we wanted to postpone until we have actual recommendations and have a better view of what we are going to do in these cases, and then look at the fees in the last part, revisiting this.

So we now continue with final Recommendation 3.13. "A future registry operator applying only for allocatable variant labels of its delegated

---

primary gTLD must incur a discounted base application fee.” So this is all about fees. So I suggest this follows the decision for 3.11 and 12 that we look at the fees at the end, unless there’s any objection. It doesn’t make sense now, from my point of view, to talk about this if 3.11 is not determined. So please put the TBD later in the red color here too.

The next one, 3.14, is basically also with regards to this for allocatable variant labels. I think it makes sense to look at the whole group of questions at the same time once we dealt with the rest.

3.15 is now “As a one-time exception for immediate next application round, application for allocatable variant labels of existing IDN gTLDs from the 2012 round must receive priority in processing order ahead of all other new gTLD applicants, including The IDN applicants that elect to participate in the prioritization draw.” This is not exactly fees now, it’s giving preference here. Any thoughts about this one in our context?

Mark says, “This one could go either way.” Any other thoughts or suggestions? Claude agrees. And Edmon has no strong opinion. Anil suggests to have no priority for such cases. Yeah, I see no real suggestion to have any priority for these cases, so maybe we just say it’s not applicable unless there are opposing views. I see no opposing view. So let’s have this out of our recs.

Then final Recommendation 3.16, “An applied-for allocatable variant label must be subject to the same application requirements and evaluation criteria as the associated primary gTLD string. Specifically, the same documentation requirements apply to both the primary gTLD string and its applied-for allocatable variant labels with respect to the

---

three non-standard application types of gTLDs as identified by the SubPro PDP.” This means that the community base, the geographic name base, and the .brand TLDs. Any thoughts about this point?

Justine says, “This should apply.” An agreement on Edmon and Claude. I guess with some rewording, since we have not variant labels, but in our wording, we can say that those also must adhere to the same application requirements, the group that will be defined by the diacritics. Okay, great.

So next one is final Recommendation 3.17, “The EPDP team affirmed that Recommendation 25.4 in the SubPro PDP final report that single character gTLDs may only be allowed for limited scripts and languages where character is an ideal graph.” Since this is not applicable for Latin, and we only talk about Latin here, I think it’s quite obvious that it’s out of scope because there is no such thing as a Latin single character TLD to be built out in the root zone. I see agreement here.

Final Recommendation 3.18. “The New gTLD Program Reserved Names List must not be expanded to include variant labels.” Any thoughts here? Yes, Justine, please.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Hi, everyone. If I’m not mistaken, the reference to Reserved Names here is now known as Blocked Names. And Blocked Names is a finite list so it’s not relevant to us, really. So I would say 3.18 is not applicable as well.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. Mark's hand is up then lowered it again, and Bill also. Probably you just wanted to say the same thing, I assume. Yeah, this is a sensible thing to state. But since we are not working with variants here, it's not really applicable to us. I would agree there.

Final Recommendation 3.19, "No application for a variant label of a New gTLD Program Reserved Name is allowed." Any thoughts? Yes, Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Same principle along the lines of what I've said before, it's Blocked Names. Blocked Name doesn't really apply to us.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I would agree here. Since the application anyway has to be a valid non-blocked label, it's not really applicable to our policies here. Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: Are there cases where there's—I'm just throwing something out—I can with an accent at A where it can mean a completely different thing, and it should be allowed? Or are there any of those scenarios? I don't remember the reserved things. Of course, they're the country names or the IGO names. Are there situations where some form of exceptions should be considered?

---

MICHAEL BAULAND:                      Okay, good point. I'm not sure. Basically, if the base ASCII string is already reserved—or maybe Sarmad can come in here, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:                      Thank you. I guess as long as we're not saying—obviously, we're not saying that we are overriding this recommendation so it will continue to apply. So I guess in this particular case, we don't provide any specific advice around it, but this will continue to apply for any application. I guess that's my understanding. And if that's the case, then that's fine. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:                      I think that makes sense to have no exceptions here with regard to what labels are allocatable, registerable. In the first place, we don't want to suddenly allow labels to exist that wouldn't have been allowed to exist without our PDP. Our policies are just with regards to labels that could exist but would be rejected due to being confusingly similar to other valid labels.

Amadeu had his hand up but also lowered it, maybe he wanted to say a similar thing. Okay. Unless there's any disagreement, it sounds like that this is not applicable for us. We don't make or change any rules with regards to ineligible labels. So 3.20 should also be not applicable.

Then up to 3.21, "Only the protected organizations on the list of strings ineligible for delegation are allowed to apply for the allocatable variant labels of their protected strings at the top level." Any thoughts? None so far. But it seems like this is also talking about the ineligible delegations

---

and who should be able to get them. And since we are not changing anything here, it seems to make sense to also not applicable. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yeah. I'm just thinking there may be a cross between this and the current work, in case there are some of these organizations which have accented versions and unaccented versions in Latin script. I guess the question is that do we just leave it as is and through other recommendations that would apply, or would we need any special treatment in these cases? Just to note that it would apply in these cases as well, as long as it meets the, I guess, eligibility through other recommendations this particular PDP is developing. And somehow, because this is not applicable, such organizations do not have access to the output of this PDP.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah, sounds reasonable. I see Edmon. Edmon agrees here with what you're saying. Any other thoughts?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

One option is that instead of just being agnostic to this or saying not applicable, one could say that if this case comes under the consideration through the recommendations this particular PDP is developing, then those apply here as well.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Edmon also suggests to park this one for the time being. Justine seems to have the same idea. So, yeah, let's wait until we have the recs ready and check back afterwards. Thanks.

Final Rec 3.22, "Only an applied-for gTLD string that conforms to the mandatory string requirements, including IDNA 2008 for IDN strings, as well as the Root Zone LGR, can be submitted through the new gTLD application submission system."

So this basically just states that you shouldn't be able to have variants that are not otherwise legal TLD strings. Justine says mandatory string requirements must apply. Mark, please.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: Thank you, Michael. It might be the case that for every instance where it basically says, "Respect the IDNA rules or similar," we might want to keep by default, probably, unless there is any overwhelming reason for us not to do that. Because if it is to the point of basically us enforcing script mixing rules, basically us enforcing IDNA patterns that have been identified in 2008 as opposed to 2003, so there are relevant new rules. So probably would just want those by default, but if anybody finds reasons why we wouldn't, please do express those reasons. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. Justine, please.



---

JUSTINE CHEW: I had a question, maybe a slight kind of question, which is, we know that the RZ-LGR is the authoritative source for any possible strings and variants that can be applied-for, right? Do we have in mind to be able to provide the list of all the possible diacritic versions of Latin strings that would be available for application?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Well, we have a list of diacritics based on a character basis, which had been created by Mark. Is that what you were referring to? Or do you mean—

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Well, no. The finite list of what is possible. I mean in terms of the combination of what you said applicable to a Latin string, for example. Because then people would know what is possible to be applied for and what is not possibly applied for, right? That finite list would also have to go through or meet the mandatory string requirements for eligibility as well.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, we have Mark just put into the chat, to his GitHub too, that generates the list. Just note that the list is not authoritative. It's just generated from the rules we made. Yeah, we intend to... The note, "This exists, but this is a guide." What do you mean with that, Justine?

---

JUSTINE CHEW: As you said before, this is not authoritative, right? It's not authoritative like the way the RZ-LGR is authoritative, because there was a policy recommendation to say that RZ-LGR is authoritative source. Unless we're moving towards something like that in this PDP, then it's what Mark has generated. It's still just a guide.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, it's a guide so people can look at the characters that would fall into our PDP rules. For the authoritative definition, we decided to have the Unicode table and the Unicode definitions to decide whether it's a character in scope or not. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I'm just trying to understand the question. Justine, are you saying is there like LGR which has all the variants listed in it, or do you have a different question?

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, I'm basically asking, Will there be some kind of way that, similar to the RZ-LGR, people can insert something and find out whether that's eligible or not. I mean, it possibly may not be needed for diacritics per se, but I was just curious as to whether there would be some kind of authoritative guide for applicants in the future. But I think whatever it is, to me, 3.22, right, the mandatory string requirements has to apply because you cannot go outside of that, really.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I agree. We don't want to extend anything and make strings available that are not available, but the current mandatory string requirement. Regarding your question whether we will have a similar tool or something, Mark wrote that some software that generates the code points, I think it wouldn't be too difficult to also have it input two labels and check whether they would fall under this category. But all of this, I think it wouldn't be as authoritative as the Root Zone LGR tool, but it would just be some optional help. To have the authoritative answer, I guess people would have to look at the Unicode code point definitions of the label, and see whether those code points are compositions of some ASCII character with some diacritic combinations. Mark, please.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: In essence, in relation to the list generated by the two, save any potential bugs or anything like that. The real question is, if we are in full agreement with Unicode, which usually we are, there might be cases in which that's undesirable for one reason or another that's specific to the DNS and to the root zone. So the real question, I guess, underlying all of this is, are we in full agreement with Unicode? Because if we are, then the list is sufficient because it's literally pulled from there. So, are we in agreement? That is what's fundamentally we should be asking. And the standard answer for that is usually we are. So how do we table that? I don't know precisely, but at least that's how it works. Thank you.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks. With regards to this question, I think the majority have the opinion that this is applicable in the sense that we do not change any requirements, but I'm not sure if we actually have to make a recommendation for this, or whether it's possible to just not write anything and then implicitly this means also all current string requirements are in place. Maybe ICANN staff, Steve, also can chime in here. My understanding would be that if we don't say anything, the general rules are still applicable, and so we don't have to copy this recommendation, but if it makes sense to clearly state that we are not changing it and helps understanding and avoid misconceptions, then it would also be fine to carry this one over. Steve, please, and sorry for putting you on the spot.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks. No problem, Michael. This is Steve from staff. I think I concur with your assessment. The recommendation starts with an applied-for gTLD string. In the Venn diagram, it's basically an overlap. ASCII, in the diacritic version of it, they would, in that case, being applied-for gTLD. Therefore, it seemed to have to apply or this recognition would be applicable to that sort of string then. So I think I concur with your assessment that it would already apply based on how this is written.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. So we would just state like, "We don't need this. Not that it's not applicable since it's automatically applicable." Maybe have another rainbow color? Fair one? I don't know. But we don't have to write anything. We don't have to copy this rec for us since it's automatically

---

the case, as we are only dealing with strings that are applied for and thereby meet or conform to the string requirements.

SAEWON LEE:

Yes. Michael. Sorry to not put my hand up. I suddenly can't find it again while sharing the screen. I'm happy to do whatever color. That's no problem. But just kind of going with the discussion on how we will be following what is already determined, and obviously it's applicable to our working group or our PDP, and there's nothing to change. I just kind of wanted to remind everyone that if you see in final Recommendation 1.1 here, because it's already applicable, we had actually, at the time, determined grey, meaning that there's nothing to change. And if everyone agrees with this, then I'm just going to follow this rule. Okay.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Sounds good to me. Good suggestion. Thanks for that. These are already general law, so to say, and we don't want to change anything, so we just don't talk about them, and thereby they automatically still apply for our case.

The next one is Implementation Guidance 3.23, "The new gTLD application submission system should issue a disqualification warning to the applicant who applied-for string conforms to the mandatory string requirements when the initial algorithmic check finds the following. The applied-for gTLD string is deemed invalid and/or the applied-for variant label is deemed invalid or blocked. This warning recognizes the unlikely but possible situation that the Root Zone LGR was programmed or

---

incorporated in the application submission system incorrectly, and it allows an opportunity for correction.”

Since it’s just an Implementation Guidance of the previous one, and the previous one is not applicable, it seems sensible that this is also not applicable for us. The already existing checks in the application submission system are sufficient for us, and there’s no need to add anything here unless there’s any objection. I think we can just copy the grey from above. Thanks.

Final Rec 3.24. “An applied-for gTLD string that has been accepted through the new gTLD submission system and correctly assessed by the DNS stability panel as invalid or blocked where the applied-for string is a variant label is disqualified unless and until such a string is being developed and allocatable in a future version of the Root Zone LGR, if any.”

Any thoughts or questions if this is not clear, please. Always raise your hand in case anything is unclear and you want an explanation. Don’t be shy. Let us know, and we’ll try to help you. Philippe, “Seems reasonable to relitigate.” Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

I think what we’re potentially discussing here is the case in this PDP is where the label becomes potentially ineligible due to string similarity, and whether how it can move forward. But some of these recommendations are not related to that step in the process, but other steps and other checks, Root Zone LGR, of course, is a more fundamental check, which comes much before string similarity. And I

---

guess that's not perhaps relevant to string similarity, I guess, discussions we are having here. So in that context, obviously the Roots Zone LGR continues to apply, and all recommendations pertaining to it obviously would continue to apply unless this working group thinks those need to be overwritten. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. I have to admit, I don't know the word relitigate. Maybe some native speaker could explain that to me.

JUSTINE CHEW: We argue.

EDMON CHUNG: I guess it just means that this should apply. No need to rediscuss it.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. So I think we're in agreement here. I think we have finished the Section 3 part. Could we scroll a bit to the left? Interesting. String similarity. But first, Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I was just wondering whether that should be grey instead of green.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND:

The one before, since we are not changing anything? Yeah, I think makes sense to have the same grey color. We keep the current rules and won't change anything there. Thanks for pointing this out.

So now we are up with the String Similarity Review. This might be interesting since this is also an important part of our PDP. So final Rec 4.1, "The String Similarity Review must be modified to compare an applied-for primary gTLD string no matter whether it's an ASCII string or an IDN string and all of its allocatable variant labels against the following."

I won't read now the whole 12 points that follow now. It just states that the String Similarity Review Panel must not just look at existing or applied-for strings, but also always incorporate the allocatable and blocked variant labels when they do the comparisons. Any thoughts here? Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

I'm thinking that if we do this, we're opening up to a range of this ASCII gTLD is similar to gTLD with one diacritic, and it's similar to another gTLD with a different diacritic. Are we making those two with diacritics confusingly similar, or do we need another set of criteria? And my thought is this is something that we need to talk about once we get finished with this whole section of looking at separately PDP rules. We're going to need to talk about this again later, I think. Thank you.



---

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. So you suggest to postpone this? Justine and Edmon suggest that this should be great. Do you want to reason this? Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: I'm trying to digest what Bill was saying. My initial reaction is that this should be applied to any applied-for string. So this PDP would not change this recommendation. We're just saying that the String Similarity Review itself, after it applies, there might be certain other things that we would do. But if we're saying that if this causes the situation that it is listed as similar and therefore blocked, then maybe yes, what Bill says is applicable, and we certainly should say something about it. So, now that I think about it, maybe the principles and stuff don't change, but we might actually have something to say about it is that this PDP actually creates an exception, whereby even if it's identified as viscerally similar, there might be exceptional remedies that could be applied to it, if that makes sense.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I guess my understanding is that this is a recommendation which actually feeds into the process, which creates the reasons, I guess, for this PDP. So it's more of into the PDP rather than actually PDP trying to... This applies to PDP and not the other way around. I guess this is motivating the PDP. At least that's how I was looking at it. Thank you.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Sarmad. Anil, in my view, we may follow this recommendation as it is, hence no changes. I tend to agree here since this is not stating what should happen after the String Similarity Review did its work. It's just stating what labels are in scope of the String Similarity Review Panel, what labels they have to look at, what labels they have to compare. As we stated earlier and found at the beginning, the String Similarity Review as well as Roots Zone LGR are given text for us, with which we have to work with, but which we don't want to change as such. So, for that reason, I tend to agree with Anil and Sarmad and some others that this is describing the process of the String Similarity Review Panel and not what happens as an outcome of it. So grey makes sense to me.

Let Bill or someone else who suggested to postpone it disagree here, and please do speak up. Okay. Bill is okay since it's just a description of the existing process and it's not changing any outcome here. We work with this as is and won't do any recs to change it. Thanks.

So next one is Recommendation 4.2. "As an exception to the proposed modification to the String Similarity Review, in accordance with final Recommendation 4.1, the String Similarity Review Panel may decide whether and what blocked variant labels to omit when conducting a comparison. Any such decision by the String Similarity Review Panel must be based on guidelines and/or criteria that justifies such an omission on the basis of a manifestly low level of confusability between the scripts of labels being compared."

Justine and Bill say it's also just another process item and should be grey since we are not changing anything with the String Similarity Panel.

---

---

That's different to the IDN EPDP where it was actually a requirement to adjust the String Similarity Review process, in the sense that it also looked at variants and make decisions, whether it's just the allocatable variants or the blocked variant, and this was all part of the IDN EPDP, but for us, the String Similarity process is a given text, and we just work with the results but won't change it.

So 4.3 is also suggested by Bill to have grey because it's also describing what to do during implementation. The guidelines and/or criteria must be developed for use by the String Similarity Review Panel to decide on the omission of blocked variant labels when conducting a comparison. So, yeah, this is just like 4.2. We won't change anything here.

4.4. A whole lot of text there. I hope I don't have to read that all. "All labeled from a variant label set comprising the primary gTLD string and all of its allocatable and blocked variant labels must share the same outcome of the String Similarity Review."

This means the String Similarity Review in accordance with final Recommendation 4.1 through 4.3 determines that now come the whole list of things. So basically, it says that it shouldn't be possible for String Similarity Panel to say that one variant is okay, and then another variant would be rejected due to being too similar, if I understood that correctly.

Bill says it's a pity they didn't include a summary of 4.4. Yeah, that would have been helpful. Any other thoughts here? Or do you want me to read that if we still have time today? Want some time to read it

---

yourself? Or just want to end this call? All quiet. Please stop this. No more.

So since no one is voicing any opinion, I think it makes sense to also put a grey. Oh, it's too small for Justine. Can't read it. So my suggestion is to also have the grey. Now it's going to the chat. Or what is Saewon doing? Don't put it in the chat. Spamming the whole chat. John put a link so everybody can read it on their own screen and font size.

Philippe says, "As of principle, this seems to makes sense, but grey is okay." Unless there is any objection... If you read this until the next call and decide that grey is not the right solution, we can always revisit this. Just mention it at the beginning of next call and we can take a closer look. But so far, it seems that we put a grey decision here. This is also not applicable because we won't change any rules here.

Okay. We managed to go through point 4. Thanks. So now we come to the objection processes and with final Recommendation 5.1, "All applied-for allocatable gTLD variant labels must be subject to the objection processes." Any thoughts?

BILL JOURIS:

I'd say we may have our own objection process or something similar, but probably not the objection process that is envisioned here. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. Edmon says it's a very grey day today. Anil says, "Continue same as 5.1. 15, also suggest putting 5.12. Great." Pitinan, please.

---

PITINAN KOOARMORNPATANA: Thank you. This is a little bit late to comment on 4.4.

MICHAEL BAULAND: No, it's not late. It's never too late.

PITINAN KOOARMORNPATANA: I might be misunderstood, but my understanding is, in 4.4, it's something like if this string being compared with different categories, and if it's found confusingly similar, then it's resolved in the different actions, for example, ineligible to proceed. And I'm wondering, isn't it the items that need exception from this PDP, because the diacritic will be deemed as similar to non-diacritic ones, for example. Then perhaps this is where this PDP might need to look into detail. But that's what my understanding is. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah. I see what you mean. But at some point we have to make our own rules and get away from the IDN EPDP recommendation, and this might be the place for it, if that's what I understood you meant. Maybe. I mean, this is talking about the variant labels here, of course. So I'm wondering if we should create a new section at some point for this, or whether this is the right place to make those rules. Any other thoughts? Sarmad, please.

---

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I guess I'm going to say the same thing I said for the previous one, that these rules are the ones which are actually feeding into the current PDP, and then the current PDP says, given these rules, and then the outcome, how to deal with a particular subset of that outcome. So these rules would probably apply, and then the current PDP is more on how to deal with output or outcome of these rules, I guess, and not to change the rules themselves.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. This is still input of the String Similarity Review Panel describing what they have to do or what they don't have to do, and we don't want to change that. Justine, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: Hi. I tend to agree with what Sarmad said. I think we just have to be careful that we're not changing the base rules that need to apply still. I'm looking at this 4.4 and I see a lot of IDNs. IDN is not really within the scope of our PDP because we're just dealing with Latin script diacritics, right? So maybe what we can do is for those ones that we've discussed and said that we kind of accept the base rule but we should be looking at creating exceptions, because that's the purpose of this PDP, right? Maybe just an indicator or some sort, don't necessarily change the color or anything like that. Maybe just a marking somehow to when we do create the exception, to see if the exception applies effectively to those ones that we are marking, if you catch my drift.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. Just one thing you mentioned that IDNs are not for us, we just look at Latin diacritics. But of course, Latin diacritics are IDNs, right? So in that sense, we will deal with IDNs.

JUSTINE CHEW: I believe IDNs are not Latin diacritics. I'm getting confused. I'm not going to answer the question.

MICHAEL BAULAND: The difference between IDN and non-IDN is everything... ASCII is non-IDN, which just has A to Z, and zero to nine, and dash or hyphen. And everything that's not A to Z, zero to nine, and/or a hyphen, that's already an IDN, because in the DNS, you can't write that label. You always have to use puny code representation with a xn dash, dash and everything with a Latin diacritic needs to be puny coded into an xn dash, dash. But it's a common misconception that IDNs are those for Latin language speaker, strange language.

JUSTINE CHEW: That's fine, Michael. I was thinking of ASCII, but misspoke about Latin.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Saewon kept the color grey but wrote here, "The base rules not to be changed, but exceptions to be created." I think that covers your point, Justine. There are no objection. So I think we can leave it that way. As said, if you want to come back to that next call because you

---

read it more closely and have some new thoughts or opinion, just let me know and we can revisit this.

So, 5.1 I think we already had some suggestions to also use grey here. There was also the opinion that we need our own objection processes. But the question is, what would be the objection to our rules? Because we don't change anything in the String Similarity Review process, so any objection that is due to the outcome of the String Similarity Review Panel is out of scope here. We won't change it. We just indicated that if it is rejected due to String Similarity Review and it's a diacritic, then we'd make some new rules. Justine, please.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I guess the principle in 5.1 should apply. Of course, it says variant labels, right? So we're not dealing with variant labels per se. As I said, the principle should apply. I think any string that is being applied for should be subject to objections. I'd like to hear what Bill has in mind in terms of the type of objection that might arise from a diacritic that is not already covered by the existing four objection processes.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. I was wondering, is there anything that our PDP creates that would need a separate objection process, or are the existing objection processes enough to deal with everything? Bill, please?

BILL JOURIS:

What I was thinking of was someone applies for something on the grounds that it's confusingly similar so they should either block it or

---



---

allocate it to them, and someone else wishes to say, “No, it’s not that confusingly similar.” I would think there ought to be some way to address that objection, that it is or is not confusingly similar. If there may be something in the existing process that I’m not familiar with, but that’s the sort of thing I was looking at. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. That would be an objection to the outcome of the String Similarity Review Panel decision, but I think that already exists.

BILL JOURIS: No. I’m sorry. Michael, no. The String Similarity Review, it’s the confusingly similar, which my understanding is is a separate process, but I may simply misunderstand the process we’re looking at here. Sorry. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Justine, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: Can I suggest, Bill, if you have a look at the string confusion objection scope and see whether you believe that covers it or not? Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Justine. Okay. Since we just have eight minutes left, maybe we leave that for next week’s call, and I ask everybody to take a look at the objection processes that already exist. And maybe Saewon or John

---

---

could provide a link or summary or something for the team to find what objection processes exist. So we can take a look at those in the next week, and then come back to this question next week. With that, I think we can return to the main slide deck, please.

I will hand over to John, who already made himself visible. Thanks, John.

JOHN EMERY:

Sorry, I was hiding the whole time, Michael, leaving you on camera alone. Obviously, today we made quite a bit of progress again on the spreadsheet. Some action items for next time, staff will provide links to what objections processes currently exist, and working group members will take the time to look at the objections processes and study them for next time. Also take some time to read 4.4 ahead of next call. So that's all we have for action items, but we made a lot of progress today. Back to you, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. I just realized I should have gone to Saewon for the next point and not to John. Sorry for that.

JOHN EMERY:

It's okay.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

I didn't want to omit you.

---

JOHN EMERY: Ready to jump in. Back to Saewon.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Michael. Yes, you missed me. Upset now. I'm so sorry I still have a cold that I'm not overcoming yet.

As you can see in this slide, next step is still light as we still navigate through the EPDP IDNs recommendations. So again, please review the recommendations in Phase 1 and Phase 2 as we deliberate on the outputs. And as John also mentioned, the objection mechanism was actually shared by Ariel last time, and it's actually on the Wiki page but we will also share again.

Next, if you see in this page, we have three announcements. I'll be reminding everyone until the time comes, but again, reminder that 4<sup>th</sup> of June is Travel Week, so we won't be having our working group call. And then 11<sup>th</sup> of June, Wednesday, is where we will be holding two working sessions in the morning during ICANN83. And as I mentioned last week, the agenda will need to be confirmed as we get nearer to ICANN83 maybe by next week. But it really does depend on how our discussions go. But currently, as you can see in this slide, those are the tentative agenda items.

Then lastly, a new set of meeting invitations for post ICANN83, so for June and July, have been sent out, and I hope everyone's received them. And if not, please do contact us, support staff, or through the GNSO sec's e-mail address, and we will be resuming from 25<sup>th</sup> of June. Okay. I think that's all. I'll hand it back over to Michael.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. Edmon said in the chat, "I was not skipping you. I was sparing you that you didn't have to talk so much with your still ongoing cold."

Thanks. So yeah, that's it for today. Thanks, everybody, for the contributions, great discussions, interesting points, and I hope to see you all next week. Thanks all. Devan, you may stop the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**