

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is Devan Reed for the recording. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP call taking place on Wednesday, 26 November 2025 at 14:15 UTC. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the Latin Script Diacritics wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript. And please note all chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-harassment Policy and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct. Thank you and back over to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks Devan. And welcome everybody to our meeting 26. Next slide please.

For today, we will as usual do the recap of what has been done in the last meeting. We will check with the open question about these two options we had for the stress tests, examples 5 and 6. And if we get through with that, then we will continue our charter topic deliberations with charter question 4, which has already been shown to you previously, and then the GPI/HR impact assessment. And then we will

---

*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.*

---

continue with the table of contents for the initial report and show you the next steps as planned. Next slide please.

So we stopped last week when we talked about the case studies 5 and 6, the combination of LD, gTLD set with variant sets. We will continue this discussion later on. Next slide please. Then we had the two action items basically. We revisited the preliminary recommendation and readjusted, no, readjusted the language regarding the information to the registrant PR50 and IG52. And there was a suggestion to add IDN to the label of variant, and we have a suggestion and the idea was to move that to the glossary. And yeah, the rest is just what I already said about the upcoming charter question 4 and the GPI/HR assessment. Next slide please.

So, for the outreach, we have the current recommendations 50 and the IG52. These are more or less what's already in the IDN EPDP, but since this is not yet approved or not yet policy, it may not be such a good idea to change the wording already if it's not, if we don't know what the IDN EPDP phase 2 final wording will be. So, the suggestion is to leave it as it is for the moment. We already have stated there that ICANN must provide necessary information to different entities, including registries and registrars and registrants. And there has been some suggestion to make some additional recommendations, some additional requirements, or at least nice to have for registrars to tell a bit more about this to their customers.

So, our suggestion here is if you think these regs are not sufficient, maybe you can come up with some additional recommendations, some additional wording, either while we prepare for the public comment or

---

also in the public comment if necessary, but of course preferable to have it before, then we can already have that included. So, thanks. I knew it was fine with that. Unless there are any objections, we can continue with that. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Michael. I am also fine with this, and I'm assuming that if there is sufficient feedback from the public comment process, then we can maybe discuss this and maybe make it stronger. As far as ALAC is concerned, we will be looking at this particular issue of informing everybody about the nuances of what we're proposing. And if ALAC feels, then they will come through the public comment process. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Sounds like a good approach. Thanks. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, everybody. I just wonder, because we will have to look at this from an implementation perspective, provide necessary information. Is there some detail or specificity about that? I guess it's in the rationale, but I just want to confirm what is considered necessary, what is considered unnecessary or optional, so that we have clarity what needs to be done for implementation. Thanks.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND: Good point. I have to admit, I'm not sure myself what necessary means. If we have clarified that, I don't know if someone or John could ... We're still writing the rationale. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Just to follow up on what Ariel said, this is a must. I think it is probably useful to have clarity on what is the minimal requirement here. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. But I think this is quite the same wording which we already have in the IDN EPDP. We just extended it to include the Latin Diacritic TLD set. The rest of the language is already part of the IDN EPDP. Hopefully, they define what this necessary information is that ICANN must provide. We just want to link into this, so to say, to when they provide the information, they should also include the respective information regarding the LD set. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Michael. I was just looking at the IDN EPDP recommendation. It didn't really have that phrase here. It just says, ICANN Org must conduct outreach, blah. It didn't say information to what extent the information is necessary or optional. I don't think it provides that detail, so it's up to ICANN Org to decide how the outreach may look like, I think. If the diacritic group have this specific requirement about providing necessary information, it will be really helpful to clarify what that information is, as

---

what Sarmad put the minimum requirement. It's a little different, I think, from the IDN EPDP recommendation.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Ariel. I think we included this or made it a bit stronger due to last week's comments that the information, the outreach, need to be done. So we will take a look at this and adjust if necessary or provide some clarifications. Edmon also wrote in the chat whether this shouldn't be determined in the implementation phase, whether it's really our job to decide what this necessary information is or whether that's rather part of the implementation to define the details.

SAEWON LEE:

Hi, Michael. Sorry, I'm sharing the screen and I just didn't want to mess it up, so I can't raise my hand. But just to add to that the additional language is from last week's discussion where it was requested that the outreach is made a bit more specific or let's say a bit stronger. To answer to Ariel's point, definitely we'll try to add something to the rationale and the rationale hasn't been formulated yet because this hasn't been determined yet. And then obviously we will have to look into if further details will be something to be discussed during the implementation phase, but any specificity will be added to the rationale. So I do want to mention that.

And another thing that I do want to mention is, as Michael also mentioned in the beginning, I know there's some agreement in the chats about this language, but if this language is not suited for your consideration, obviously please do. There is another working group

---

review period prior to publication for public comments, so please do add your comments there as well. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks for the clarification. So, was that ... Everybody okay with this for the time being? And we can check then once the rationale is out there whether there's still some issues. Agreement with Saewon from Satish and some thumbs up [inaudible]. So we can then go to the next slide.

This was regarding the IDN variant because we had in some recs we mentioned variant and there was the suggestion to rephrase it to IDN variant to make it clear what we are referring here. But we thought that rather than changing every occurrence of variant in the whole document, it makes more sense to put this term variant into the glossary and explain there once in detail what we mean with variant. And then everybody should be clear that if we talk about variants, it's always IDN variants.

And the suggested wording there is a variant refers to different forms of a linguistic label or code point that are treated as equivalent in the context of IDNs. A variant is an alternate representation often arising from spelling or script differences that may be registered, such as used in place of another or blocked because they are considered effectively the same. Here in LD PDP and throughout the initial report, the variants refer to IDN variants. Ariel, please.

---

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you, Michael. I just wonder whether in the definition it should also include in accordance with the RZ LGR because this is something has to be allowable based on RZ LGR calculation. It's not just an alternative form of some random rules. So I think to emphasize that is probably necessary here. And I believe that's the definition in the EPDP report, although I don't have the clear recollection of that. But in any case in the next round, AGB when we say variant for the definition in the glossary, we definitely mention RZ LGR. That's a key point there. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Definitely a very good point. We will adjust that to include LGR. And as Saewon says, we can utilize the definition from the IDN EPDP because that's most likely been checked by a whole lot of people and should be okay. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

I was going to make the same point, but I was actually going to suggest that we should take out some of this language, which is already there being suggested. Normally what we say is that variants are strings, which are considered quote unquote same by the community as defined in the root zone LGR. And we just leave it there. I think saying anything more could actually cause more confusion. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

good point. we'll take a look again at the IDN EPDP and then take your suggestion in mind and adjust the wording. But I think I saw in the chat that the general approach to not put it into every place, but only have a

---

glossary and in the footnote refer here is the acceptable approach or accepted approach. Unless there are any further comments, questions. Then we can go to the next page.

We are at our stress test examples again, the corresponding question, whether we want to allow the activation of variant sets and LD sets at the same time, or whether we want to only allow either the variant set or the LD set, but no activation. We had quite some discussions last week with several arguments in favor of both of the options. I just quickly read what those options are and what the consequences would be.

So option one is the restriction, restrict the LD set activation to single ASCII TLDs and not for variant set, while also prohibiting variant activation in LD sets. So 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. And this restriction will need to be explicitly formulated as a preliminary recommendation. And we saw that last week, how that could look.

And option two is to allow LD set activation for TLDs within a variant set, while also allowing variant set activation for TLDs within an LD set. And there are some examples here of what this could mean with the Straße label is a good example, because it's one of the few variants that exists in the Latin script, the sharp S. That is, of course, there are more labels having a sharp S, but that's the obvious choice here. And we also presented some indication of what that would require if we were to go with this solution.



---

And what I would like to do now is to gather the arguments we had in favor of one of the options in a new sheet. If someone could open up a blank sheet so we can write down the arguments and check whether anybody has additional arguments. And once we have gathered all the arguments, we would have an unofficial vote to see what the group leans to, which option we should go with. I will try to put down some arguments which I still remember from last week and then I ask you to provide further arguments which we haven't heard yet or I forgot to write down.

For option one argument was it's a conservative solution. We currently have no experience with variant sets or with LD sets. Rather than combining these now right away, let's go with a more conservative, more secure solution in the beginning. Second was this is a less complex solution. There are no special cases to consider, no corner cases. This is a simple solution, so to say. Another argument was that no use cases are expected because of at least for the stress test example five, it's currently not possible. It's not possible to activate variants for any LD set because no variants of an LD set can exist with a Latin root zone LGR. It's unlikely that someone with a variant set would also want to activate an LD set. It's not impossible, but unlikely. The fourth reason was it's always possible to extend this in the future if demand occurs. There was on the contrary, if problems occur and we open it up, it's more difficult to take away this freedom. That were the benefits or the pro arguments for option one, which I remember from last week.

For option two, this is a more natural solution. Why would we suddenly want to disallow the activation of LD sets within a variant set if it's allowed on a single TLD? This is a more complete solution. Even if

---

---

currently not possible, we should still have a policy that covers all possibilities, so to say. This is what I remember from last week. Please, anybody, chime in if you have additional arguments, reasons, which I forgot or which we haven't mentioned last week. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

I don't know if this is a reason so much as a counterpoint to one of the reasons. Under option one, the second point is that it would be simpler or straightforward. It occurs to me over the years I've been on a number of projects where we got to the point where we had two options, the simple straightforward one and the more complex one. But unfortunately, the simple one wouldn't quite do what the customer, the client wanted. So we ended up doing the harder one. It seems to me that this applies here as well. it would be more complex. it would be simpler to do option one. But I don't think it does what we, or at least I, actually want done. So basically, that's an argument against option one, argument two. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Maybe we can make this a bit more open here and have in option one have pro and con arguments and option two also have pro and con arguments and we can add that argument by Bill as a con argument for option one. So one could do this. So pro and cons in each of the two columns here, option one and option two. And the pros would be the four which I already mentioned and the cons would be the one which Bill just mentioned. While you do that, maybe we can already listen to Anil, please.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you, Michael. I referred my suggestions in the last call also. We have already noted down, you have already noted down what we discussed again for option one and option one is very easy to implement. Now, we have never put a set of LD with the IDN variant which we are doing now here because any string is attached with the variants as per the root zone LDR. Now here in option two, we are not following that particular thing but at the same time, if we go for option one, we are not allowing to activate variants which may be large number. So this may be a demotivation for the registrant or the registrar to do that. So option two, we can go provided we get the stability and security verified for option two because there may be a possible DNS abuse possibility in option two. That is the only concern. Otherwise, option two gives more flexibility and more options to the applicant. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. While I, in theory, you are right that option one would restrict the activation of variants but with the current root zone LDR, there is no restriction because currently no variants, no allocatable variants can exist with any label that is in Latin script that diacritic set. All variants of a label within an LD set are all blocked at the moment. But it's true that if the LDR would change for the Latin script, then this might cause an issue.

---

AMADEU ABRIL:

I will try to briefly restate what I said last week. One, from an intellectual and operational point of view, I would prefer option two because why not? What's the reason not to allow that if that's possible? But I am in favor of now implementing option one for the following reasons. Two, this is not a realistic case. It's not only unlikely, but it's simply not realistic that such a thing would happen now under the current rules for IDNs. B, even if we could just, let's say, legislate for the future, this probably will take us some significant effort. It's a wall we have to climb. It's not an impossible wall to climb, but certainly not an easy wall to climb. We need to revisit a number of things that probably will delay our work for something that, 2.3, is not likely to happen unless the LDRs are changed. And at that point, this should be revisited. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

Now, you may remember better than I do, but my recollection is that while the vast majority of variants in the Latin script were blocked variants, we did have a couple of cases where they were not in fact blocked. The dotless I and the I, as I recall, were allocatable variants. I can see a case where a, say, an I with acute accent might well fall into the same set as those two.

The second thing is, perhaps I have misunderstood, but what seems to be happening in the Strasse example you put out is that if an allocatable variant exists anywhere in the label, then the Latin diacritics anywhere else in the label are excluded from consideration. That seems to me, if

---

that's what you meant, to be very much overly broad. If somebody has Strasse with a sharp S and wants to allocate Strasse with a double S, I don't see why that happening would impact the A versus the A with cum laude. I just don't see why those are an issue. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Maybe to your first point, it's true that the Latin script has two allocatable variants, the sharp S and the two S, and the dotless I and the regular I. But since when dealing with LD sets, you always have to have a base ASCII version in the TLD set. When starting with ASCII, there is never an allocatable variant going to other Latin scripts. Due to the requirements of having a base ASCII version, there can never be an allocatable variant of any of the LD set labels.

Regarding the second point the letter I is ASCII, but the variant relationship between I and the dotless I is that only from the dotless I you have an allocatable variant. It's not both ways. The other direction is blocked. Starting with an ASCII, there is no allocatable variant. That's the issue here. That's why this situation with variants currently is not possible to occur with the current version of the root zone LGR. Any more arguments, pro or con? A comment by Tapani. that would require a change in the root zone LGR, which is out of scope for our topic. It's an interesting case, definitely worthwhile to look into, but that's not part of what we want to, with what we can deal with. That's not our mandate here.

I'm seeing no further comments. Maybe it's a good idea to have an unofficial vote here and see what the majority of people are in favor of.

---

But first I see now a just said vote and suddenly all the hands go up.  
Don't vote. I want to say something. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you, Michael. I'm filibustering. I was just trying to help with the brainstorm, but I don't know whether this is helpful or not. I think one of the members brought up a point about potential security stability, usually, if we go with option one, but not option two in the event that someone wants a variant. Latin diacritic set option two will make sure the same entity principle can be maintained and help maintain the security stability concern. I think that was one of the arguments for option two.

I was just thinking out loud here, wouldn't it be possible, if we go with option one, wouldn't it be possible that someone has the Latin diacritic set already and then another entity wants to apply for the variant label? Wouldn't that be a coding string similarity review or something? I don't know how that's going to play out, but I feel like even if we go with option one, it's not an absolute situation where different entities may get hold of these strings that could create that potential security stability concern or user confusion. Maybe there are other guardrails in the program that could help prevent that from happening. Option two is the other end of the spectrum. Make sure the same entity gets hold of all of these things, but then that creates a lot of complexity, as folks have been saying, in terms of implementing that. Option one is the other end, but maybe there are other options in the program that can prevent the user confusion situation from happening. I'm just thinking out loud here,

---

but I'm sure there are others who have much better and smarter ideas than I am.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

No, you have smart ideas always. Regarding your point, I don't think it's an issue here with option one, because there is already the string similarity rules. They already say that when you apply for a TLD, you check all the variants of all existing TLDs. Even if there was an LD set existing, all variants of that would still be checked with the string similarity panel review thingy. I don't see an issue with causing additional fusibility problems being introduced by this. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Michael. This is Steve from staff. At the risk of maybe making this even more complicated, I'm going to also brainstorm for ... Actually, it's not really brainstorming, it's really making sure that the group is aware of the options available at its disposal. In terms of recommendations that a PDP can make, it can also recommend future work. Why I bring that up is because what we're talking about here is, in very large part, a theoretical outcome or solution, or scenario is a better word. Largely a theoretical scenario. So what you could do is potentially build in a trigger mechanism and say, future work should be undertaken if the environment changes. For instance, the RZ LGR is changed dramatically for the Latin script, where now this is no longer a theoretical example, it's a real example. So what that could look like in practice is you could potentially, if you went with option one, is build in a future work clause that says if the circumstances change, the council

---

should consider undertaking this work or something to that effect. So maybe that's a way to accept, or make a recommendation that is cognizant of the current state of affairs, but also has some future looking contingencies to make sure that if the situation changes, now you have a solution in place for the future. Thanks.

HARSHA WIJAYAWARDHANA: I'm sorry, I can't raise my hand. I don't know where.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I will put you in the queue after Satish. Thanks. Steve. That's a good point. And it's a bit related to the point four on option four that it's possible to extend for future work, but it's even going a step further, not just stating it may be extended in future work, but already putting a trigger here saying that what could trigger this, that the future work should be done. So yeah, thanks for that. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish, for the record. I think Steve has asked most of my question. I was about to mention that on the one hand, we are unable to get a real live example of such a case. On the other hand, we are circling back to the root zone LGR as perhaps something that will change the situation and give us some real examples. If there's a future change in the root zone LGR, so the sensitivity towards the stability of the root zone LGR is a concern. And if you can build in some mechanism that if there is a significant change in the root zone LGR, then we can do

---



---

further work on this, I think would be my recommendation also. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Satish. Good point. Harsha, please.

HARSHA WIJAYAWARDHANA: My point, Michael, is that I was actually preferring, I preferred option two, because the option one seems to be very restrictive. But anyway, the way that I understand is now Strasse with the one that you brought the example, and it's not actually the with the umlaut one is the, I don't think it is accepted. So that is something that I mean, there can be any letter that you can change and make it a variant in that case. But Strasse with the umlaut, I don't think it's a correct one. So I don't, I seem to find why that you need to go with option one instead of option two with the restrictive. So the, so it will be limited number of diacritics that you can use anyway, according to the LGR. So I, the way that I look at it is actually anyway, you don't have the numbers won't come. So you can go for option two has a much more much, there is a, for, there are a lot of options that have been available, even future forward and backwards. So that's my argument. So maybe that I'm coming from an IDN background because of that, I think this, rather than looking at the diacritic way. So anyway, that's why I didn't want to say anything at all, but anyway, I thought I should record it.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Harsha. Edmon, please.

---

---

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here. I don't really have a strong opinion one way or the other. I agree with you, Michael, that it's really what materialize in the current state. I put my hand up to talk a little bit about, I recall when we were talking about IDN, when we were at the IDN-EPDP and we were talking about potential future changes in the root zone LGR, one of the things that we talked about is that when, if and when that happens, some impact analysis needs to be done and to inform further work, including grandfathering or those kinds of things. So maybe the same could apply here so that we address this situation where a change actually affects the stress tests and scenarios that we can think of right here.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Edmon. We already have such a recommendation about changes in the root zone LGR. I think that should cover it. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Michael, everybody. So what Steve said made me think of another principle that was discussed during IDN-EPDP deliberation. It's the conservatism principle. So basically for folks who are not familiar, it says it advocates for adoption of a more cautious approach as a way to limit any potential security and stability risks associated with delegation of varying labels in the absence of data or information in support of a more liberal approach. And this is something consistent with RFC 6912, which also says doubts should always be resolved in favor of rejecting. I will put the language in the comments so folks can take a look at it.

---

I think this is in line with what we're discussing here. It's very possible someone wants both Latin diacritic set as well as variants. It's an edge case. And in terms of instead of developing a mechanism that allows both to be possible, which will be very complicated to implement to begin with, maybe we can see the real demand for that and see what actually is requested by the community. And if that's something that's a real case or real demand, we request rather than an edge case or a theoretical case, then we can consider future policy work to make that happen. So in line with the conservatism principle, to be more cautious than liberal may be a way to go. But I just want to remind folks that this is something that was explicitly discussed during the IDN EPDP. A lot of recommendations were developed based on that principle. So maybe this is something this group can also reference. But I will put the wording in the comment for folks to see.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Ariel. That's basically the point one in the adoption one. It's a more conservative solution. And we currently want to create an exception process for actually demanded TLDs to coexist. And we already had a few cases where we said, well, in theory, this might also be a good idea to have solutions for that. But we postponed that and tried to stay as narrow as possible on scope and not allowing too many exceptions here. So this might be another situation where that's a good approach. But with that and having no hands up, Devan, could you please bring up the poll? And we can ask everybody please to voice your opinion via the poll. What should be the option we are going with?

---

AMADEU ABRIL:                      Sorry, this is Amadeu. Could somebody just put me on the option one as I cannot?

MICHAEL BAULAND:                I can do that since I as a chair should not voice my opinion. So I will ...  
Devan or somebody, please just put that on behalf of Amadeu. I will  
record. I will put down your opinion and thereby being neutral myself.  
Devan, how are we going with this?

DEVAN REED:                        We have nine votes. Now we have 11.

MICHAEL BAULAND:                That's not bad. Anybody needs more time or wait a few more seconds?  
Not bad. Could you please present the outcome here?

DEVAN REED:                        Here are the results.

MICHAEL BAULAND:                So with nine votes and we have 64% for option two and 36% for option  
... 64 for option one and 36% for option two. So if I'm not mistaken, that  
means three for option ... four, no, I don't know how many. Do you know  
the counts? Could you present the numbers of votes for option one and  
two, please?

---

DEVAN REED: So for option one, seven out of 11 people. You can see that number. It's to the right above the bar for option one. And then for option two, it's four out of 11 people.

MICHAEL BAULAND: It's quite close. You are counted in because I voted option one and otherwise I would have abstained from the vote. So my vote is included, but it's actually not my vote, but your vote. So it's a close call, but on the other hand, it's almost double the number of option two that voted option one. So it's strong, but not very clear in favor of option one. Since it's hardly possible to do a compromise here, I think the way forward, the majority is in favor of option one. We should do the option one. And in the final call, there's always a possibility for a minority opinion to be recorded. I'm not 100% sure of the process. Maybe Steve can explain in more detail how this will work. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: I'm not entirely sure how this works, but I'm wondering if there is a way to put something in our preliminary report before it goes out for public comment to at least note the two options that we considered. So that when we get public comments, it at least occurs to people that there might be two options there. Just to perhaps get somewhat more focused public comment on that specific point. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. I'm handing this to the ICANN team. Can anybody answer the question from Bill? Is there a way to mention this somehow?

---

SAEWON LEE:

I can answer to that, Michael. Thanks. So first of all, Bill, great suggestion. In the initial report, we'll try to describe the options that went through and at the end, what recommendation was produced out of it. Secondly, related to the consensus call. So consensus call is conducted prior to the final report publication. So that will only be done after near the end, after the public comment. So obviously you also have options to, through your respective groups, to submit any public comments and add any input there. But during the consensus call, obviously, I'll go through the consensus designation again at the end. But if it's not a full consensus, so for example, either a consensus level or let's say a strong support but significant opposition, there is an option to submit your minority view, which will be all recorded in the final report prior to publication. Does that work?

And I think Bill says that works. Obviously, we'll go through the whole specifics at the end prior to final report publication. It's not a process that we do prior to initial report publication. But we will, we as in the leadership team and staff will try to record it in the initial report and hope this answers your question.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

thanks, Saewon, for the clarification. Very helpful. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Michael, Satish for the record. So I'm also fine with what Saewon has proposed. No issues there. But I am wondering if the work

---

done on the pros and cons, are we obligated to share it with a wider group? Because otherwise, what would happen is a person who's looking at this option one that we select may not be aware of the nuances of the differences between this and another existing option. We have put our heads together here, but this work will go waste if we do not capture it in some way, so that new person reading it can relate better to what we are proposing here. This is a suggestion. I'm not sure if it's possible. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Good suggestion, Satish. Maybe we can put something of that in the rationale of the adjusted recommendations to put in the reasons provided here, why this was a preferred solution by the majority, if not all of the group. But we should definitely not lose the work we have here. So please, Saewon, save that sheet here.

SAEWON LEE:

Sure. And definitely, we will be going through the table of contents for the initial report. I don't know if today, but anyways. But during that time, I will share what sections we have for the initial report. And obviously, the working group members are obviously welcome to suggest where you would like this information. But currently, we do have a section for the stress test. We do have a section related to, obviously, preliminary recommendations. And obviously, we also have our working groups approach and executive summary where this can be highlighted, as you suggest.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. Good points. And with that, we can close this topic for now. We will adjust the recommendations to cover option one as proposed last week. And with that, we can go back to the work. To the slides, please. And I think, charter question four is the next point we were going to talk about. Saewon already presented the suggested outcome of the impact analysis. And we asked you all to take a look at those outcomes and see whether you're okay with that. So the question now would be, does anybody disagree with any of the impacts we put down on? Charter question four. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Michael, Satish, for the record. I don't disagree. But last week, we had a session in APRILU on the global public interest. And we discovered that ICANN has a checklist for this. And it was pointed out by Justine that the GNSO has been trying to push in both the global public interest and the human rights into the PDP process. And that we are the first to, which has been tasked with checking up with both these aspects, human rights and public interest. So I'd like to know if the ICANN toolkit on the public interest was consulted at some point, or this is entirely our work from ground up. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

No, this would be after this section, we have the section about GPI, global public interest and human resource, human rights. And this is the next section. We will go into detail and answer your questions or comments. Thank you. This first is about the impact on the existing policies. And we found out and so on, showed that last week that there



---

was either no impact or very minor impact. And there was nothing for us to do with regards to the existing policies, everything had been covered.

Question is now, does anybody disagree here? Do you have any information, knowledge, or whatever about some of the existing policies where you say, oh, no, you haven't thought about this or that our PDP would impact the existing policy XYZ because of this or that. If so, please raise your hand or write something in the chat. It's not a comment from Satish. So I think it's okay to say that the group agreed with this assessment and that there is no impact that we still have to deal with. Thanks. So 13 more minutes. Saewon, do you want to start with the HR or GPI impact sheets?

SAEWON LEE:

Sure. Just time-wise, I was wondering, do we ... No, we can go through with this.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

If you have a better suggestion, if you want to go through the other points, the structure of the public comment document, I think it's more sensible to do that in the remaining time that's signed with me too.

SAEWON LEE:

Sure. And that's what I was wondering. If just time-wise, it's better to finish with the table of contents and the initial report, maybe we could conclude what we were discussing before and then we can save the GPI

---

and HR human rights impact assessment for next week. Not that I wanted another meeting, but just time-wise.

So let me share with you. So this was the question I think Satish was raising about the table of contents and the sections that I was mentioning before. Obviously, we still need one more meeting, probably to conclude everything. And maybe it's actually a good time to tie the knot in everything we've discussed today. But basically, once we are ready, we will be drafting, we as in the staff will be in the background drafting the initial report according to this table of contents you see in the screen. So here, you'll see that we have six main sections, and the rest of the items are supplementary. So they're all appendix. And the report will have an executive summary, followed by a detail of our working groups method of work, or let's say an approach to this work. Section three will have the glossary, which we discussed in the beginning of this meeting. And this will obviously list any terms that may be unfamiliar to the broader community.

Section four will be our main output with the preliminary recommendations which have been circulated and being worked on for the last couple of weeks. And section five will be the GPI and human rights impact assessment analysis that we haven't done yet. And just for clarity sake, I want to mention that the charter question four on existing consensus policy analysis, because it is still a part of our charter question result, that will be a part of section four. And then last but not least, section six is just a short next step, next steps that we will be sharing with the community. And then annex A, B and D are pretty much self explanatory. So I won't go into detail. Annex C will be where we will detail the stress test and the results. And that's where I was mentioning,

---

---

where we will illustrate all the steps that we took and the options that we landed on. And then last but not least, again, annex D, sorry, annex D. Sorry, no, annex D, I said I don't need to go into detail. Annex E is just going to be a page of how our membership has been working. And then annex C, which is just going to be a page of how we have been working. Before I go on to the next slide, I think Michael wants to mention something.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Just for Amadeu's sake, as he can't see the slide. Oh, sorry. Maybe quickly read those annexes, A, B, D, which you mentioned.

SAEWON LEE: Sorry, sure. So section one is executive summary. Section two is the Latin Diacritics PDP Working Groups approach. Section three is glossary. Section four is preliminary recommendations. Section five is the GPI and Human Rights Framework analysis. Section six is next steps. Annex A, Latin Diacritics PDP Working Group charter. Annex B, existing consensus policies. Annex C, stress test edge case studies. Annex D, background. And annex E, Latin Diacritics PDP Working Group membership slash attendance. When I mentioned the annex B, existing consensus policies, this will not be our analysis. This will be just the list of these existing consensus policies where it's shared through the ICANN org web page.

So just one more thing in this section is related to our preliminary recommendations because this is the core of our output. So here in this slide, you'll see what I've also shared before. It's the list of topics and recommendations according to the document, again, that we all are

---

quite familiar with now. So we have eight topics with 54 recommendations so far. Based on our discussion today on the stress test, or let's say options one and two, we might have a bit of adjustment, but I don't foresee any additional. Actually, we might. But anyways, currently, we have 54 recommendations, or let's say outputs because 54 includes the implementation guidance as well. Any questions so far? I don't see any. Then, Michael, if you're okay, I'll just go straight on to the next steps.

Basically, the next steps that I had prepared was on the basis that we will be concluding today. But because we will not be, I don't think it's necessary to share the whole calendar, other than just mentioning that we'll resume again December the 3rd. And we don't have that in our calendars yet, but we will do so after this meeting today. And by December the 3rd, if the working group can review the leadership teams and staff's analyses on the GPI and human rights impact on the preliminary recommendations, hopefully we can conclude all the discussions next week. Any questions? Michael, I'm going to leave it to you prior to moving on to your next steps. I'm going to leave it to you prior to moving on to John. So the floor is yours.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

No, thanks. I think you mentioned all the important points and I can hand over to John.

---

JOHN EMERY: Thank you, everyone. It feels like it's been forever since I shared it because we've always gone to the last minute or a minute over, but a hand from Edmon real quick.

EDMON CHUNG: Sorry. I was just, as Saewon was talking about, it came to mind that whether this might be a good time to call on our, I forgot who the board liaison with us is, to call on, to take a look at what we have and maybe bring it to the board and see if there might be any issues that is that could be of concern to front run some of these things. I think that's the part of the board readiness process that GNSO is talking about as well. Maybe it's time to call on him to take a look. Because we're coming to a point where we're finalizing things. Thanks.

JOHN EMERY: Thanks for that, Edmon. So, outcomes from today. Option one received a majority of the working group consensus, and the group has agreed with the assessment for a charter question for that there is no or low impact on existing consensus policies. So there's a number of action items for leadership team and staff to review preliminary recommendation 50 and provide some clarification on what constitutes necessary information for ICANN Org the rationale. Also, leadership team and staff to include the definition in accordance with the RZ LGR and the glossary. And look at the definition from variants from IDN EPDP and the AGB. Leadership and staff also to update recommendations, based on the decision today of option one. So all members, your homework for December 3 is to read the staff analysis of the global public interest in the human rights impact

---

assessment for next week and staff will send out a calendar invite for our meeting December 3, so you haven't gotten rid of us yet, we still have one more meeting, at least to go through that. Michael, back to you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Sorry, and just at least one more meeting, at least for this part. Once we have created the public comment and have to work through those and there will be further meetings, of course, but for this year, most likely, we should be able to finish next week. Thanks everybody for the good discussions and the arguments provided in favor of option one or option two and see you all next week. Thanks and bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]