
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP call taking place on 28 May 2025 at 13:15, UTC.

We have apologies from Amadeu Abril, Justine Chew, David Bedard, Anil Jain, and Tapani Tarvainen. 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 seek 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 know all chat sessions are being archived. Participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you. Back over to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Devan. Hi. Welcome, everybody, to our ninth meeting, the last one before we have the in-person meetings in Prague at the ICANN meeting. Next slide, please.

The agenda is pretty similar to last week's agenda, just that we also have introduced a small overview of the current objection processes that exist in the application process, so that everybody is aware of what

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.

currently is possible. And then we will continue with the EPDP IDN output and discuss how and if they are applicable to our PDP. Next slide, please.

Recap of last meeting. We went through several of the IDN EPDP recommendations and made decisions of how and if they are applicable. We started with the objection in appeals processes, but then there was not enough time left, and there were also some questions of what already now is possible. And for that reason, we have a small introduction into this topic later on in this presentation. Next slide, please.

This is, again, our scope, a reminder of what is in scope and what is not. We—it's more like Saewon, the wizard with the slide, has done a small change here and emphasized that there is the String Similarity Review process, which we kind of hooked onto, in the sense that if two labels are considered to be confusingly similar, then instead of rejecting one or multiple, we can apply our PDP rules so that they are not rejected. And in that sense, our PDP is kind of a way to avoid the objection mechanism that exists there, that if two domains are considered to be too similar and one would get rejected, you could object to that in some way. We see that later. But with the PDP, this objection would not be necessary anymore. Next slide, please.

Then we are still in Charter Question 3, namely, the topics of the IDN EPDP and the SubPro. And as we have done in the last meetings, we will go through those tracks from the IDN EPDP and see how they fit for us. And then I will hand over to Saewon for the introduction of the objection processes. Thanks. Over to you.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Michael. I'm still recovering from my cold, but I hope I'm not stopped in the middle. Hi, everyone. This is Saewon Lee from staff. As Michael mentioned, we're taking a bit of a detour, but I hope this brief overview of the objection process could help our group move faster as we review the EPDP IDN's Phase 1 Section 5. So as you can see from this slide, to understand why we are here providing this brief overview of the objection process. It all starts from this Policy Recommendation 5.1 from EPDP IDNs Phase 1, where we stopped last week. Again, it states that "All applied for allocatable gTLD variant labels must be subject to the objection processes." This whole section, Section 5, was about the objection process.

So if you see in the middle the simple flowchart, however you may call it that I've created for you, let's say that both .cafe and .café with an accent aigu is applied for, and the String Similarity Review Panel does not find them confusingly similar, as you can see in the bottom flow, this will be determined at the initial evaluation stage. Then both strings are eligible to proceed, and a third party would come in here and submit an objection through the objection process, as you can see in the diamond shape. But again, just to note, obviously our policy recommendations would deal with the top part of the flow, which is after the similar case, and when related to the same entity only, where we don't actually need an objection here, but our PDP makes the exception process.

So with that in mind, I've listed all the AGB resources for the objection processes, and I did share them via their mailing list last week, and I

hope you got to review them. But they're also uploaded on Wiki, and you can find them on either today's Meeting page or the Background Documents page as well. If John or Steve could share those pages, that would be great. So moving on.

In this slide, I tried to capture the objection process at one glance like the two-pager document that was shared with you all. The two-pager was titled New gTLD Objections and Appeals. But in a nutshell, objections are those opportunities for communities to basically object against introducing certain new gTLDs into the domain name system. They are filed against new gTLD applications by third parties, including other applicants, based on four grounds, which are string confusion, legal rights, limited public interest, and community. This is obviously to allow for a full and fair evaluation process. So in the guidelines, it does state that applicants are encouraged to identify all the possible sensitivities regarding gTLD strings and their uses before applying, and if possible or where possible, consult with interested parties to mitigate any concerns in advance.

Now, all applied-for gTLDs will be subject to the next round objection processes, which is exactly what the EPDP IDNs Recommendations 5.1 implies. And our PDP cannot change or do anything about that, but it's just a predetermined step. The objections will be reviewed by the Applicable Dispute Resolution Service Providers and/or an expert group, as you can see in the how it will be evaluated part in the middle of this slide. Who is permitted to file each type of objection? The timeframes and the fees can be seen in the draft AGB that I've hyperlinked everywhere in this slide. So I hope you go and review them. Moving on.

So this flowchart I borrowed from the EPDP IDNs, where it was taken from the 2012 new gTLD round. And as you can see here within the red box, objections only come in after the initial evaluation process, including the String Similarity Review, and basically this is what we refer to as the objection process.

Again, borrowing some examples from the EPDP IDNs, I've modified them to suit and understand them for our working group. So in the left here first, let's say String B1 was applied-for, which is .café with an accent aigu, and there is an existing String A1, which is .cafe. And .café with an accent aigu happen to pass the initial evaluation. And then if you see in the bottom, also both C1 and D1. So this would be .stop and .stöp. And let's say these are applied-for strings which both pass the initial evaluation. As you can see in the note here, the assumption is that the first two operators are different and the latter two are also different. And then the questions you may pose in the middle here may be can the existing TLD A1 one operator be the objector and submit a String Confusion objection against B1, arguing that B1 is confusingly similar to A1? And similarly, can be applied-for TLD C1 operator be the objector and submit a String Confusion objection against D1, arguing that D1 is confusingly similar to C1? Then in the right you can see that the answer to all that is yes. The String Confusion objection can be filed based on the fact that the applied-for string is confusingly similar to the existing TLD or another applied-for gTLD.

But as you can see in the yellow box here, for the LD PDP case, this won't apply as the objection processes will occur prior to LD PDP coming in, at least what we've decided as of now, and if same entities are involved for both existing and applied-for cases, in our case, it will

be another applicant or a third party that will be filing the objection where the LD PDP will be allowing those exception anyways. So moving on, and this is the last piece of the objection processes as detailed in the AGB.

This is related to the appeals process, which can be confusing, but we hope this provides more clarity. But basically it is where the non-successful party of that objection can appeal to this process. So basically, submitting an objection to the expert determination result. And as you can see in the second bullet point, this unsuccessful party will have 15 days from the date the expert determination is issued to provide notice to the dispute resolution service provider of the intent to appeal and 15 days to file such an appeal, and an evaluation process will be followed to respond to this. Then, if you see in the middle, just to reiterate, the objection processes can be subject to the objection appeals procedure, and this again will both occur after a successful completion of the initial evaluation, and both will occur prior to the LD PDP recommendations coming into effect, at least as of the decision now.

I tried to be as quick as possible so that we're not, let's say, spending too much time on this. But I hope this provided a brief overview of the objection processes and clears any questions for Section 5 of EPDP IDNs, but I'm just going to check for any questions or comments, and I think I see some in the chat. Thank you for answering, John, but just for the recording, Bill has asked, "Are there other entities who are allowed to object? Are there not?" The specifics are within the AGB, as John has mentioned. And I hope this answers your question, Bill, but basically how it's answered currently in the chat is there are four specific grounds

for objections, and according to each ground, the objections may be filed differently. Any other questions? Okay. I don't want to cough into the recording, so I'm going to hand it over back to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Philippe has a question. Sorry.

SAEWON LEE: Oh, sorry. Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Saewon. I'm not sure my question has any bearing with what we're doing here, but maybe just being curious. For example, with the two cases that you took, is the notion of precedent important there? For example, can an objector argue that in prior rulings a similar case to cafe and café was ruled that those were confusingly similar so that the case at hand should be equally judged or considered as being confusingly similar? Or is it just a one-off? Is it understood that it's going to be based on the arguments of the case at hand regardless of the prior decisions?

For example, just to take the same language, I'm going to use Louis's favorite example, sale and salé, which mean two different things, which could arguably be considered as not confusingly similar. But you could say in an objection to the latter, to sale and salé, that a prior case based on cafe and café ruled that those were similar, so that sale and salé should be similar, if I'm making sense. Do you see what I mean? Is it just

a one-off, or is it that notion that in every policy channel you may want to take into account the prior decisions.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you for that question, Philippe. I am going to also rely on my other colleagues to answer more specifically. But in my understanding, it's per case. It's basically per case. Because, for example, for application or the applications, it will be reviewed at the initial evaluation stage, and then after that and how it's determined, the objection processes, again, can be submitted based on that individual case. But again, if anyone has more details to this, please, I will refer to them. Sarmad may have something more to say.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you, Saewon. I just wanted to add—I'm not sure whether that directly responds to Philippe's question—but some of these objections are certainly, for example, on string confusion legal rights. But they go beyond what string similarity does, which is very purely visual comparison of two strings and not related to, for example, meaning or sound or any of the other objections which may actually become relevant through some of these other objection processes. So I think when we are talking about objections, I wanted to point out that that's a much broader area, whereas I think what this PDP, at least my understanding, is looking at a very narrow string similarity—

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Beyond string similarity, okay. I think I understand. Roughly speaking, so that's a one-off, although in terms of objection, that's much broader. That's very helpful. Thank you, Sarmad.

SAEWON LEE: Just to kind of add on, Mark has mentioned in the chat, in the past, based on the ones I've read, each case is an isolated process, which, again, is kind of going with what I mentioned. Obviously, though it might be isolated, I'm sure the panel is working based on a consistent manner, and I believe that's what staff believes as well. Again, I hope this answers.

Mark, is your hand a hand? Would you like to speak? No? Okay. Any other questions or comments? Okay. I'm going to hand it back over to Michael. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Saewon, for that presentation. I think it was really interesting and helpful to see what exists out there. And with that information, we can hopefully look at the charter questions from the IDN EPDP with new background information to help us make the decision. So I think we should go to the Excel sheet now. Thanks.

We stopped with the objection process. Rather than going through all those Recommendations 5.1, 2, 3 and so on, I thought maybe we could discuss this topic on a more broader view, so to say, and see whether this is actually applicable for us or not, in the sense that the reason these recommendations are in the IDN EPDP are that with the

introduction of variants, suddenly, all those objection processes with which up to them only looked at the applied-for labels and nothing else suddenly had to be extended to also or it needed to be discussed in the IDN EPDP whether and how variants of those labels should be taken into account of those different objection processes, and that was the reason the IDN EPDP looked at those and made some recommendations to how variants are included in the objection processes. So the question is now do we, for our PDP, need any changes to the existing objection processes? And if so, what changes are these? If you think there are any, please, let's discuss them. Or if you think that the current objection processes as they are now are sufficient and we don't need to do any changes, then that's also a possible outcome. Any thoughts on this?

Edmon says, "No changes needed I think." Okay. First opinion. Anybody agreeing or disagreeing? Thumbs up by Philippe. "Changing would be very hard," says Satish. Yeah, especially as we cannot do changes that are not related to our work, and it doesn't make sense to do that.

So the question is now is there anything in our work that you think that would need additional objection processes or changing the existing ones? So far, I got Edmon, Satish, and Philippe stating that we don't need anything here. I tend to agree here because our policies are not anything subjective where you could say like, "Oh, there's been a mistake or this decision was not correct." We don't take any decisions, so to say, we just work on decisions that were taken by other processes. So unless there's any objection, I think we could write to all of these Final Recommendations 5.x that they are not applicable for our PDP in the sense that we just keep the current policies and don't make any changes. Seeing and hearing no objections to the objection processes,

so I guess we can quickly finish this as they are basically all the same topic. Okay, great. Thanks.

So next is a string contention topic, and we have two recommendations here. Final Recommendation 6.1. “An applied-for primary gTLD string that is also a variant label of another applied-for primary gTLD string is calculated by the Root Zone LGR must be placed in a contention set.”

I have Mark’s hand. No, that’s regarding this or the previous topic, but please go ahead.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: Thank you, Michael. As I was reviewing the table, this one in particular is one that we need to be a little careful about. Because it’s kind of at the heart of what we’re doing, in the sense that we have discussed in the past, we are not discussing variant labels. The variant labels are already defined in the Latin subset. So however we want to word this or whether to adopt or not, this needs to be a little more tailored to our case if we’re going to do something. Because, as it is, it makes a lot of sense for Han and for other scripts, but for Latin, this would not exactly make a ton of sense. So just cautioning the entire team that whatever we do, we can’t just use this. We would need to tailor it to our specific case. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks for the input. Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Mark, for bringing this up. I would say I'm not clear enough and kind of looking for a clarification for this working group and its scope, because, Mark, if that is what you're saying, then this group will potentially look into the moderation of process of the Root Zone LGR, which determines the variants. I'm not saying that I actually don't know, but my impression is that we were not touching that. And so if it's actually determined as variant, it already has a disposition. And if it's blocked and not allocatable, then the activation of which will have to change the LGR, which goes to the LGR process and not the policy process or the new gTLD application and evaluation process. So if my understanding is correct, then this should actually be a continuous supply. And if anyone wants to challenge it, they go through the Root Zone LGR process rather than any other process that we create with this group.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Edmon. Mark?

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: Thank you for the clarification, Edmon. Yeah, exactly, because we're dealing with both the variants and not the variants at the same time. Whatever we do, we need to clarify the scope, because, as you say, there is already a subset of variants defined which don't cover our use cases that we're contemplating. And the only thing that I would focus on is that we don't end up with language that later on, when people are reading this, they will go like, "Oh, but what they mean is that everything is a variant or nothing is a variant." Whatever language we

arrive at, we need to be conscientious of the fact that we're both working with within the limitations of the scope of the Latin RZ-LGR, but at the same time, we are contemplating all of these different characters that we are working with. I don't think there's anything objectively wrong. I'm just saying let's word this carefully to avoid any weirdness in the future. But we are talking about the same thing. We're not opposing ideas.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks, Mark. That's what I also got from your comments, that you're not really contradicting each other here. So for the string contention, Edmon kind of suggested that we don't need any recommendation our own because the rules are already there defining that variants are also to be put into contention set, and this is kind of before our PDP comes into action, so we don't change anything with those variant contention sets. As we saw in the earlier scope slide, everything defined as variant by the Root Zone LGR is out of scope anyway, so the suggestion here sounds like not applicable, as this is an output and we just work with that. Thanks. Unless if there are any objections to this, then we can continue with 6.2.

"If an applied-for primary gTLD string or the variant label is found to be confusingly similar to another applied-for primary gTLD string or variant label, the entire variant label sets in the affected application shall be placed in a contention set together. This applies no matter whether the primary gTLD string is an ASCII string or an IDN string."

Again, similar to the one above, this is talking about variants, and that they must be put into the string contention set as a whole and it's not possible to have something like one label being in contention with another, but a variant of that one label is not in contention with that other label. So all variant sets are always the same, so to say. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

It seems to me that something similar to this, at least, is something we will need to include. At minimum, if two items are found to be confusingly similar, we will need to look at everything else in the contention set. I don't know if we want to go so far as to say they're automatically confusingly similar, but at the very minimum, the process needs to have something to look at all of those. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Bill. I agree, but I think that already exists because there's already the policy that strings are compared visually, and if they are confusingly similar, they are put into contention set together. So I think there's nothing new that we need to invent here, but it's already part of the existing policy.

BILL JOURIS:

I'm not sure I read the policy that way, but I'm willing to be persuaded.

MICHAEL BAULAND: No, maybe we are misunderstanding each other. So could you maybe provide an example of what you mean that is currently not covered and that we should take a look at or make policies for, maybe that becomes clear of them.

BILL JOURIS: Okay. Let's take a ridiculous example. There is currently a gTLD of ooo. Just hear me out. So suppose we decide that that is confusingly similar to something where one of the o's has a diacritic say .below. I don't know if that even exists off the top of my head, but suppose that it does. Does that mean that it's confusingly similar if the first one has a dot? Or do we need to look at not only would it be confusingly similar, no matter where the dot exists, but also is it confusingly similar to something else that if there was no... I'm not sure I'm explaining this clearly.

MICHAEL BAULAND: No, I think I understand what you're getting at. But the thing is that the decision whether those two labels you described, the triple o and the o with a dot below at one of the locations, whether they are confusingly similar, this is nothing that we decide. This is out of scope for us. There is this review process that looks at this and makes decisions, and they also then possibly, based on that decision, make other similar decisions. But this is nothing we deal with or we decide, we just work with the outcome. If they decide this is confusingly similar, then we can apply our recommendations if it's coming from the same entity. But if not,

then that's it. So I don't see at the moment how our policy would be or would need to be adjusted based on this example.

BILL JOURIS: Okay. I hear what you're saying.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Any other comments here, or questions, opinions? Hearing none at the moment. So I think this is also similar to the one above, that there are the processes which are in place right now, which we have to work with whatever their outcome is, but we are not in a situation to change any of these processes. We just work with whatever is their outcome. And if they put something into string contention set, then they do, and if not, they won't. But our PDP is not really changing this.

Okay. So we can continue with the next one, which we already looked at an earlier call when the order of the recommendations was different, so we can continue to the next white one, please. We have the Implementation Guidance 7.2, "A new specification or an amendment to the Base Registry Agreement for any future gTLD, along with the variant labels, may need to be developed to incorporate variant management provisions." Any thoughts on this one? Mark, please.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: Thank you. I look for our Contracted Party House friends to illuminate whether this is needed or not, this being a more of a contractual thing. Here's my question. Do we? That's basically open-ended to me at least.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: This seems to be one of those that the principle could apply. We might want to talk about how we do this a little bit. I know that the IDN EPDP we eventually left it to implementation. Here is a situation where we probably need an addendum and might be useful to add additional Implementation Guidance as well. I think the principle makes sense, as in there should be some consideration or a new specification or some sort of documentation that these two are, well, there is some kind of relationship between two or more of the TLDs that we're talking about.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Edmon. I agree here that there needs to be something written in the contract that states that those two or more TLDs are in somehow relationship with each other, and there are certain restrictions that apply, and for that we will likely need some amendment or new specification. I agree with your suggestion.

Okay. I think we can continue to the next one, Final Recommendation 7.3. "Any existing registry operator that is successful in its future application for its variant label must be required to adopt contractual terms to accommodate the newly approved variant labels by way of a new specification to its existing Registry Agreement."

Any thoughts here? It's basically asking if there is—yeah, that one says this follows from the previous one. Mark says, "It seems the same idea."

Just kind of clarifying that if there is an existing registry operator that later on applies for a variant TLD, that they must be required to adopt the new terms. I think something similar will apply to our case. If there is an existing TLD and now a diacritic, similar version is added to that, then also the contracts need to be changed accordingly.

Okay. Final Recommendation 7.4. “The registry fixed fee for gTLD, registry operator.” Mark, was that to the previous?

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: I didn’t mean to interrupt you midway.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. If it’s a previous point, I should stop here. But if it’s this one, then I’ll continue.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: No, no. It’s basically 7.4. As far as I understand, it belongs to this broader bucket of financial discussions that we seem to have wanted for further down the road. Is that what we’re going to do? Are we going to discuss them as a block, or are we going to tackle this as individual?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah. As you said, this is the registry fee, and we said that we will look at the fee decisions once we have all technical policy decisions in place, it doesn’t make sense to talk about this earlier so we will postpone this to the same time when we look at all the financial topics. And the next

one is the calculation of the registry level transaction fee. This is slightly similar, slightly different because it's not about the application fee but the transaction fees. But I think it makes sense to also include this in the talk once we discuss all the financial topics. So unless there's any other objection, we put this.

Steve says, "Note that 7.4 and 7.5 from the IDN EPDP Phase 1 final report remain pending with the Board. They are the only pending recommendation from that report." Okay. Thanks, Steve. Important point here that we cannot look at those and see whether they are applicable for us, but we don't even know whether they are applicable or will be policy for the IDN EPDP. So let's postpone that one together with the other fee and financial topics.

Final Recommendation 7.6. "The registry service provider for each one of the critical functions as defined in the Base Registry Agreement for an existing gTLD must be the same for its delegated variant labels. The critical functions are DNS service, DNSSEC proper resolution, EPP, RDDS, and data escrow." Any thoughts here?

No thoughts? So I can put my registrar hat on and not as a chair. I think this makes sense that also in our cases, all the those connected TLDs are operated by the same RSP that makes it easier for registrars to connect to these services and don't have to look at different technical infrastructure that could complicate work. And also for user experience, this sounds like a good approach. And also the registry, I think it's easier if they don't have to have different parties take care of this. Edmon, as a registry operator, may have a different or the same view. Let's hear.

EDMON CHUNG:

In general, I think it makes sense. The question is whether the policy should dictate that. My feeling is that the critical part here is did we already establish that if the same entity principle is established and we think that makes sense, then this probably should apply. If the same entity principle does not have to apply, then this should be called into question in a sense. So I'm sorry I missed a bunch of meetings, but if we are taking the same entity principle and flying it across the board, then I think this applies, but I am wary to preempt that particular discussion.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Thanks, Edmon. At least for the top level, we already decided that the same entity principle is applicable for the second level. This will be part of the Phase 2 report, so we will look at those recommendations later on. But yeah, for the top level, we have the requirement of the same entity. And as a consequence, I agree with you, we should have this enforced too, because otherwise, it gets technically complicated to have same entity requirements if it's not run on the same RSP. So unless there are any other opinions or objections, this should be a green one where we say yeah, we want that too.

Okay, 7.7. "If the registry operator changes its gTLD registry service provider for any of the critical functions, the variant labels of that gTLD must simultaneously transition to the same registry service provider for that critical function." So basically just looking at the difference between 7.7 and 7.8. Is that the same? It looks very similar. Maybe we

have to look up that later on, whether there's some copy-paste problem. But let's first look at 7.7. Thanks, Saewon.

This is basically the question, not at the point in time when the TLD gets active, but if later on the back end, change is created. Any thoughts on that one? Yeah, John, confusingly similar to me, definitely. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

I would say there's no obvious reason why we wouldn't apply the same principle as applies initially. Somebody may dream up one, but I certainly can't see it.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

No, I tend to agree. If we have the requirement that it must be the same RSP. In the beginning, it makes sense that during the whole lifetime of the TLD, this must be the same entity. Okay. Unless there are any other opinions, objections, we apply this 7.6, also to the 7.7, since it doesn't make sense to suddenly in the middle of the lifetime change the requirements of the gTLD. So it's applicable and we have the same entity principle.

I see Saewon copied a new version of 7.8. Is that the correct one? Thanks. Not similar, yeah. Thanks very much for this quick fix, very much appreciated. "In the event the registry transition or change of control process is initiated for gTLD, the process must encompass the gTLD and all its allocated, delegated variant labels, if any, at the same time." Oh, Steve, it has to be. Thank you, Steve.

So this is similar to the one above, but not confusingly similar, just similar in the sense that the 7.10 talks about the case where the registry operator remains the same, but they change their RSP. And in 7.8, we talk about the case where the registry operator changes so the owner of the gTLD changes its entity, so to say. And the question is does this same entity principle and the same RSP backend still apply here, or should we lift it for some reason? Any thoughts?

Everybody's quiet because it's too difficult, or because it's too easy, or because you're bored with the whole topic, too obvious? Yeah, I tend to agree with you, Bill. It's quite obvious that this should be the same, but if I don't want to enforce my own opinion here, so I'll wait for your input here. Bill says, "It's too obvious." "Two same entity principles," says Ariel. Edmon is just having fun. That's good. Having fun is always important. So yeah, this sort of to be applicable here because it makes no sense to suddenly change that requirement.

7.9, "After the registry transition process or change of control is completed for gTLD and it's allocated and delegated variant labels, the successor registry operator can apply for the other non-delegated, allocatable variant labels of that gTLD in accordance with the same entity principle pursuant to Final Recommendations 2.1."

So this basically says we already have the policy that the registry operator can apply for more variants later on, and this says just like this. Possibility is also transferred to the owner of the new registry that they still have the possibility to apply for new variants. I think this makes sense to have it here to that. Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG:

I think the basic principle kind of applies that. I don't know if you might want to have further specification on this case. This is not exactly an activation of a variant, right? I mean, there's some difference to this. So I think the principle kind of applies, but I don't know if we want to come back and think through whether there are further things we might want to say. I guess, in this case, it would be kind of different diacritics. I mean cafe and café with that kind of accent, or the accent going the other way. You know what I mean. But none of them being actual variants, and we might need to deal with it on a case by case basis. Rather than in the case of the variant situation where it's really just looking at the disposition and basing decisions on the RZ-LGR.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. Edmon, yeah, I agree we. We have to look at the exact wording here. In our case, it's not those variant rules where you see, okay, this is a clear variant so I have the right to apply for that. But we have this with diacritics, and we have to make sure the wording is consistent with our policies which basically just say that if the same entity of an existing TLD applies for a diacritic version, then this entity can get that even if it's confusingly similar. This policy is transferred to the new entity in case the TLD is transitioned to a new entity. Because we don't really care about the path of the TLD, we just say that in the current cases, the same entity principle must be upheld for that reason.

Yeah, I agree. Edmon, we have to make sure the wording is consistent with our policies. But in general, it makes sense that also the new owner

has the right to kind of activate diacritic in the sense that they can apply for it, and if it's confusingly similar, they can use our policies to get it without it being rejected. Does it mean yellow, Edmon? I would say it's green. We want that the new entity also has the same rights the previous entity has. We just have to take care that we use the correct wordings, but we can check that once we write this down and have all the policies and see that our version is consistent with what we are saying. So I suggest using green here, unless you prefer to have the yellow.

Okay. Seeing 12 more minutes, I think we can continue with one or two, maybe. 7.10. "Emergency transition of a gTLD to an EBERO provider must include the allocated and delegated variant labels of that gTLD, if any, all these labels must be transitioned to the same EBERO provider at the same time." So the question here is what to do with those diacritically linked versions. If one of them is an EBERO case, do all of them need to be an EBERO? Mark, please.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: I know we know what an EBERO is, but maybe we should just spell out this one acronym, because I don't think anybody outside of this group knows.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. EBERO stands for Emergency Back End Registry Operator. So this is kind of a mechanism within ICANN to make sure that gTLDs, once they have become active and are actually used, won't just disappear from the DNS, so to say, because the current operator has no more money

and can't run their technical infrastructure or whatever. So there are the SLAs in place which the Web 3.0 operator has to adhere to, and if they breach that, ICANN have the right to take away, so to say, the TLD from that operator. And there are worldwide three of these EBERO provider that must be able to run any of the new gTLDs on their systems in case of an emergency within a few hours. So ICANN would then give that EBERO the escrow site and the zone files, and they have to start up the TLD so that users of the TLD won't have an outage because the current provider is unable to run it anymore. So there's just a safeguard to have gTLDs not disappear from the root zone. Mark, please.

MARK WILLIAM DATYSGELD: That was an outstanding explanation. I was expecting a three-liner. You gave us a course. So all the better. And with that explanation, this seems like a yes probably, because it would be consistent with everything else that we have been saying in terms of keeping it whole and cohesive and not splitting it accidentally, at least my opinion.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Mark. I tend to agree since we want to uphold the same entity principle. If one of them is going to an EBERO, the other needs to be there too, because otherwise, we'd have two TLDs which are confusingly similar, but they are run by two different entities which would cause problems. It sounds good to have this, the green one too. And with that, I think we should finish this. We won't get through the whole list today, and we will continue with those in Prague, I guess.

Saewon, could you please come back to the slides? And with that, I hand the mic over to you. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Michael. We went through a lot today, and yes, as Michael mentioned, we will continue in Prague. Related to the coloring of the yellow, lime, orange, whatever, again, I'll follow the rules and make sure to mark it or change it, if necessary. Basically, as you can see in this slide, for the next steps, please be reminded that we will not be having our meeting next week due to Travel Week, but we will be meeting in ICANN83 in person for those that are traveling to Czech Republic, and here we'll be holding two working group sessions. Hopefully we'll get to finish reviewing the EPDP IDNs Recs there. So please continue to review the documents. And if time, we'll continue on to Charter Question 4. So also please refer to the existing consensus policies.

Just before I go on to the next slide, Edmon is saying, "Somehow I don't see it on the agenda," meaning our ICANN83 schedule agenda? Yeah. So no, it's not on there yet. So the schedule is there. We have two working sessions but we don't have an agenda yet. This leadership and staff will be discussing next week. But for those, just in case, I am going to share the link to the schedule the two working sessions and the full agenda or the confirmed agenda will be listed as soon as we have that ready.

I hope you can see my link. It should be there. So again, if you see the next slide, it's Wednesday, 11th of June, two sessions in the morning. Okay, great. So in this slide, you'll see three things to point out. First, again, next week, no meeting, so please, again, make sure that you're

not ready for the call next week. Secondly, two working sessions during ICANN83, as I mentioned. And again, please do check out the links that I've just shared in the chat for you. And then lastly, we will be resuming from 25th of June after ICANN83. So for those of you that have not received meeting invites yet, again, please reach out to us support staff through the mailing list or the GNSO sec e-mail address. I think that's all I wanted to point out in this slide. I'm just checking for any more questions. I think Prudence—no? Okay, I think everything's good. So if no questions or comments, again, back over to you, John.

JOHN EMERY:

Hi, everyone. Really easy outcomes and action items today, outcomes where we filled out the spreadsheet. And only action item, if you're still confused on the objections process or want to understand it a little bit better, please review the resources as outlined on the Wiki page for today. It looks like somehow with the scheduling, it's not showing up on the schedule, but maybe refresh and it should be there for everyone. The refresh magic hopefully should work for everyone. But that's all I have for today. I'll be sending out the notes shortly. And over to you, Michael, to send us off to ICANN83.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, John. I can confirm that I can see the events in the schedule. So maybe just hit F5 on your browser until you see it. I don't know. Glad to have you all here for today's meeting, and I'll be looking forward to see many of you in person in Prague. And the rest who can't be there in person can of course join remotely. So everybody have safe travels to

Prague if you do, and see you in two weeks. Thanks all. Devan, you can stop the recording now. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]