JULIA BISLAND:	All right, well, thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP call taking place on Wednesday, the 27th of August, 2025. For today's call, we have apologies from Prudence Malinki and David Bedard. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now.
	And seeing no hands, all documentation and information can be found on the 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 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 with that, I'll turn it back over to you, Michael. Please begin.
MICHAEL BAULAND:	Thanks. So, hello, everybody, to meeting number 18 and hopefully the meeting where we will finish the TBD items. Let's see. Next slide, please.
	So, the agenda is basically the same as it has been in the last week. Nothing new here. Oh, well, that's item four where we talk about the preliminary recs. That's a new one. So, next slide, please.
	And with that, the key outcomes of last meeting was that we agreed on the pricing, no recommendation on fees, but to follow the cost recovery principle via implementation as guided by the AGB. That would most likely be the easiest and fastest approach. And the working group

revisited the TBD items, as has been done in the last week, and filled out the spreadsheet.

And key action items were, of course, to continue to review the remaining TBD items. And we also asked the GDS liaison to obtain info about the IDN EPDP phase one recs 7.4 and 7.5, and then update to the working group on that status. And I think that's the best point where I now hand over to Ariel and provide us with some information.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Thank you, Michael. So, very briefly, for the two recommendations, the two recommendations regarding the annual fees, 7.4, 7.5, the board is still in process deliberating these two recommendations. They have not been formally adopted yet. And the general reason is that ICANN Finance has to conduct analysis regarding these two recommendations and understand their impact, so that without that information, the board cannot take an action on these two recommendations. So, the analysis is ongoing. I understand from my other colleagues on the GDS side, there is some discussion on this recently. So, hopefully, we will see movement on these two recommendations. But so far, that's the general reason why the board hasn't adopted it yet. And another insight is that recommendation 7.4 is the one that's more or less complicated for analysis purpose. But then for 7.5, it's less issue from ICANN work perspective. But we will see the outcome of the ICANN Finance analysis and then the board's deliberation on that following receiving the analysis. So, that's a quick update. And I know it's not super helpful, but at least the information we know is that it's not because these two

recommendations are troublesome or have issues. It's more about the board needs data in order to make a decision. So, that's all from me.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Ariel. That's helpful, at least to some extent for us. So, they are waiting for some background data to take the decision. Yeah, thanks. Then next slide, please. With that, I think we can switch over to our well-known sheet now. And coming back to the topic from last week and what Ariel just mentioned, the question about the registry fees. First, the fixed fee for the gTLD operator, whether they should have one fixed fee for each of their TLD, also the variant TLDs in case of the IDN EPDP, or in our case, for the Latin diacritic TLDs. And the second one, 7.5, is about the registry transaction fee and on what that is based. Let's first get back to the 7.4.

So, basically, I see we have kind of three possibilities to decide on this. One is, of course, to write an according thing here that we also say the registry fixed fee must be the same for the ASCII registry operator plus the Latin diacritic version as if they were just a single gTLD because it's just a single contract. The other option would be to say that there is no extra rules here that every single TLD should be paid just as if they were separate TLDs. And a third option would be to say that we want to follow the outcome of the 7.4 recommendation of the IDN EPDPs. So, we're not explicitly stating that we want this or that. We just say that we are waiting for the board resolution and whatever that will be for this case, we want to have the same thing.

Kind of these three options is what we have been talking about last week. And with that, we can start the discussion. I already see Bill's hand. So, please, Bill, go ahead.

BILL JOURIS: Yeah, this is Bill Jouris for the record. I think an additional option is to say the fee should be no higher than what was used rather than saying it must be higher, it must be the same, it must be lower. If we could also just say it should not be any higher and leave it at that. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, but I doubt that the fees for running multiple TLDs can be lower than the fees for running a single TLD. So, stating must not be higher is basically the same as stating must be the same because unlikely that for a single TLD you pay 25k per year, but if you have two TLDs, the bundle just costs 20k. I doubt that that would work out.

BILL JOURIS: Yes, but what we were considering was something like say that it must be the same or say that it must be some kind of lower, if I understood you correctly. And this just says that we're leaving it flexible.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, I don't know if I understood Bill correctly. I think what Bill is trying to say, is that, let's say two TLDs, the second one should be no more than the first one. So it's like 25,000, no more than 50,000 is the idea. So it should be something less than the first one. And it could start with

zero. I mean, I'm just saying, but if, Bill, that's what you're trying to say, at least that's what I think he's trying to say.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I think Edmon and Bill just confirmed. Yeah, that makes more sense. Sorry for misunderstanding you, Bill. But yeah. So then we have kind of the four possibilities. One is to say it should be the same as a single TLD. Two would be it should be the same as if they were separate TLDs. Three would then be Bill's suggestion to say it should be not more as two separate TLDs, but possibly less. And four would be to say we want the same that the IDN EPDP gets, whatever that may be.

Any other thoughts, suggestions? Or a fifth solution, maybe? OK, thanks, everyone, for writing down in the chat for everybody to look at, since we haven't prepared slides for this topic.

Quiet group today. No one is in favor or against any of those solutions? Ah, Tapani says.

AMADEU ABRIL: Hello, Michael, this is Amadeu.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Go ahead.

AMADEU ABRIL: OK, sorry. I thought we have somehow already voted on these three options last week, right?

MICHAEL BAULAND: No, I think that last week was about the application fee.

AMADEU ABRIL: Oh, OK.

MICHAEL BAULAND: And this one is for the ongoing regular.

AMADEU ABRIL: OK, then I guess the best solution is to be coherent between both. So I also vote for three, as I cannot write in the chat. OK, thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: OK. Sorry, three, I don't know, because now we have the three is Bill. No, the one that says whatever.

AMADEU ABRIL: Ends up being four variants.

MICHAEL BAULAND: OK. So I want to make it more interesting, mix the number a bit. So that would be one. Currently, we have one is proceed in accordance with the outcome of the board decision, two is same as a single TLD, three is treat as separate TLDs, and four should be not more than two separate

TLDs. And so far, we have one voting for four, one voting for two, and one voting for one.

And so, quite a mix here. And another one for four. And another one for one. Maybe if you vote for one of the solutions, also put up your hand and explain to the group why you think that's a sensible approach that may make finding their own opinions easier for the others. Asteway, please go ahead.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Yeah, thank you. But for me, I see no difference from the way variants are handled when it comes to diacritics. So I see the same fates as whatever the board may decide for variants. So I suggest it would be better to go with that decision. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. So that means that whatever the outcome will be for the IDN variants, they have one contract with several TLDs. We suggest to have the same outcome for our solution because we also have one contract with several TLDs. That was the reason there.

I saw Edmonton very shortly, but maybe I already said something he wanted to say and lowered his hand, I don't know.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, no problem. I was thinking about the issue and was trying to think through whether how second-level registrations are handled play a role in this. For example, in IDNs, the ones who really need it are the

Chinese. And the most likely scenario is that it's just running the same zone. You know, it's a completely replica of the other and no extra charges will be, you know, levied on the registrant. In those cases, then it probably makes sense to not have extra charges. But if the two TLDs are run completely separately, then maybe then that should be considered differently. That's when I put my hand up and then I also thought I was thinking through the difficulty of enforcement. And when it's a mixture, what happens to those scenarios? And therefore, I put my hand down. So I don't really have a conclusion yet. But I was thinking down the path of whether the way the TLDs are proposed to work might play a role in this.

MICHAEL BAULAND: OK, thanks, even though I think those thoughts are anyway helpful. So thanks. Satish also votes for one, going in line with the IDN EPDP outcome. So I haven't counted exactly, but at the moment I see a slight majority for one, followed by, I think, four. Anyone else wants to chime in? Yeah, so one thought about this might be also that we already try to follow several or most of the recommendations of the IDN EPDPs, so why go differently here now? Just a thought.

So seeing no more hands, maybe we can have a very quick, rough vote by a show of hands or green tick marks or in case we can't reach them, just raise your voice.

To see whether we are near a group consensus on not and need some further discussion, so let's start with a Solution one, proceed with in

accordance with the outcome of the board decision, whatever that may be. Anybody in favor of that one, please pick your green box.

AMADEU ABRIL: Mikhail, please, take into account my voice, vote for that, that's Amadeu.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I thought that would be the case. Thanks. So, I see two in favor of that, Amadeu and Asteway. Oh, no. Now I scroll down and I see some more, so five I see in favor of that, for a green tick and Amadeu. Okay, thanks, you can remove the green tick, wait until all are gone, and then the next one has the same price as a single TLD. In favor of that, please check your green box. Waiting a few more seconds. One. Okay. Then clear the box, please, and the next one would be Solution three, treat as a separate TLD. Full price for all of them. Please tick your green box now if you're in favor of that. No one. Giving it a few more seconds. Nope. And then item four, should be no more than two separate TLDs. Green box for that one if you're in favor of that, please. I see Maureen clapping the hands. I count that as a in favor too. So I see three, if Maureen if I understood you correctly. If not, then please raise your voice or write something in the chat if I misunderstood you now. Okay, thumbs up. I accept that. So yeah, with that we have a summary provided by Saewon. We have five votes for one, one vote for two, and none for three, and three votes for four. So a very slight majority voting for going in accordance with the board decision. But the question would be for Satish, please.

EN

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish for the record. I have voted for one because I think the wisdom of the EPDP should prevail for this also. There is not, the difference is insufficient to kind of propose a completely different policy for this one. But I am a little confused or concerned with the fact that this is a self-referential kind of recommendation. So we are recommending that we do as the board does, as the board decides. But the board does not make policy. So we are supposed to provide a recommendation to the board. But now we're saying that, no, we are not providing a recommendation, the board has to provide a resolution to this particular thing. So it is a kind of cyclical logic as far as I'm concerned. So if someone would clarify this, it would be useful. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, thanks. That is an interesting point. I think it's not circular or so because we are not, we are saying that we want to have the outcome of the IDN EPDPs solution, so even if we made no suggestion here, if our PDP wouldn't exist at all, there would be some decision how to handle 7.4, either to go with the written down recommendation as the IDN EPDP suggested, or there would be some alterations, some changes, whatever. But at some point, there will be some decision how to handle variant TLDs with regards to the registry fixed fee, and we just say that we want to have, if we go for Solution one, we say that we want to have the registry fixed fee in the same way that the variant fixed fee is handled. And in that sense, we are not circling on ourselves, but just like following the decision taken for the 7.4 for the IDN EPDP.

So Tapani also said Satish has a point, recommending that board does what it will, in effect. It's in effect as not recommending anything. I think it's slightly different because we are recommending something, but we just recommend that we want to have the same solution that the variants get, whatever that may be. The problem is that at the moment we don't know what the variants will get and that makes it a bit difficult. If our PDP would be happening in a year from now, we would know the outcome of the 7.4 and we could just, if we go for solution one, we could just say the same thing which is already there, but since it's not available, we say like we just want to do the same thing even though we don't know it yet, just to be consistent.

AMADEU ABRIL: May I? This is Amadeu.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, please.

AMADEU ABRIL: Okay, I think the point to what has been raised now is not exactly correct. I mean, I think this is very similar to what happens with the cost of the applications. The policy is that the ICANN evaluation fees should reflect the cost. Now, the evaluation of the financial cost, so the quantification, is something that the different PDPs or working groups cannot do and is then sent to ICANN to make a recommendation to the board that will establish the price. So here is at the end is the same. We are saying, look, there are these principles of cost of recovery, you

should not penalize it. We would like this to be lower, but we defer the quantification of how much is that, whether it's zero difference or there is some reduction on the quantification that staff should do and board should decide. So I think we are exactly in the same position here and we are not, you know, giving a policy decision to the board, just a quantification decision.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, I think one of the differences is that for the application fee, we, the whole process needs to be on a cost-recovery basis, but that's not the case for the registry fixed fee. There's no cost to be recovered in that sense, but, Steve, maybe you can shed some more light on this. Thanks.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Michael. This is Steve from staff, and maybe a way to consider or, I don't know, maybe even proceed. So this is not the first time that a working group has had to try to develop recommendations given an uncertain future with other work underway. And so the example that we have is a recommendation from the SubPro group, or the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. And theirs was in respect of the name collision set of recommendations, and what they did there is essentially recommend a suggested approach, which was to follow the new gTLD collision occurrence management framework that was used for the 2012 round. But they acknowledged that there were still pending work and said, essentially, follow this unless the outcome for the name collision analysis project and the board determined otherwise. So

essentially, they laid out a path and said, however, we recognize that there's pending work that may impact and be better for our purposes, and we want to be consistent with that. And so what we could do here is essentially, maybe do something similar, which is because this work has been so consistent with the outputs of the IDN's EPDP, a potential path forward could be essentially to say that we would want to pursue essentially the same direction as 7.4 and 7.5, unless the board determines differently for these recommendations. And so that could maybe provide a bit of more certainty for this group, but still acknowledge that there's still uncertainty with the consideration of these two recommendations from the IDN's EPDP perspective. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Steve, for that information. That's helpful in the way that we know that we wouldn't set any precedence here if we were to go with that decision. So, how to proceed? Any other comments? Not. I would like to ask, since we had a majority for one, if it wasn't a strong majority, the question for those four people who did not vote for one, would you be against one or do you think, OK, you could also live with one? Any thoughts? Bill? Can live with one? OK. And Tapani also says if the wording is clarified to refer to the variant label treatment, then. Edmund suggests we should know about the board's decision before we end our work. Maybe we should circle back then. Interesting point. I don't know how long it would take. I don't know if someone, Ariel or anybody else has a rough estimate of what the time frame could or would be for this. OK, no rough estimate.

So, yeah, since we currently do have a majority for one and there's no hard contra of that, I would suggest to go with one. But we can, of course, always change this to the actual outcome should the board adoption happen before we have to publish our final recommendation. So maybe go with the suggestion to follow whatever the decision will be for that in the IDN EPDP, but adjust the wording to the actual wording of the 7.4 should that be available in time.

No objection here. I guess we have a way forward for the time being and we might reword this once the 7.4 and 5 have been adopted by the board. And if it's not happening, then we would still go with the wording we are writing down here about that we would like to follow the same decision.

Great. So this was basically about 7.4 at the moment. 7.5 is very much related, but it's not the fixed fee, it's a registry level transaction fee. And there it is set the calculation of the registry level transaction fee must be based on the cumulative number of domain registrations of the combined delegated gTLD labels from a variant label set. So this just says that for the transaction fee, we just sum up all the registrations across all TLDs and those are the transactions that should be counted. And again, this is not yet adopted by the board, but do you think we should follow the same principle as 7.4 and state we want to have the same outcome, the same recommendation or do you think we need something different here?

Any thoughts? Bill, right. There's much to be said for consistency here. Thanks. Any other thoughts, objections, approvals? Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Edmon here. If I recall correctly, there was quite a discussion at the IDN EPDP, and we explored the wording of billable transactions, domain creates and so on, and we left it general, less specific because it's at a policy level. And I think that's, you know, in terms of the registry agreement, it defines this as a billable transaction, that's what you're billed for, and whether it's the minimum, whether it's whatever, that's actually what's kind of being used as well. Here, we have a, I think, a very reasonably similar situation. So, it seems to me that if we are going with one contract, did we, did I correctly remember, if we're going with one contract, then it makes a lot of sense. If we're going with multiple contracts, then it makes it very complicated. I think that's where the relationship, that's probably the key linkage.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. And we are going for one contract, that was already decided, yeah?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, in that case, then it's one contract, and it's, you know, should be the entirety of that contract then.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. So, since in both cases, the IDN-EPDP and our case, there is a single contract between ICANN and the registries containing more than one TLD, the suggestion is to also have the same regulations regarding the calculation of registry transaction level fees. So far, I only

saw, yeah, approval to go in the same way, Satish also agrees. So, unless I hear any other voice, I think we can write here a similar wording as for 7.4, that we also want to have the same outcome that the IDN-EPDP will get for this. And similarly, should the 7.5 recommendation of the IDN-EPDP be concluded and adopted by the board before we present our final recommendations, we would, of course, reword our rec to be in line with that. Thanks. So, with that, I think we have finished the TBDs in phase one. At least one. Yeah, we, this is about the, the final Recommendation 1 and the corresponding implementation guidance 2. In particular, that implementation guidance says gTLD registry operators should take into account Recommendation 14 in the SAC 60, as well as language or script communities, widely acceptable practices among Internet users and established conventions and consider 2.1 setting a maximum number of allocatable variant domain names that can be allocated to the same registrant of the source domain name and 2.2 limiting automatic activation of variant domain names to the extent possible, including in instances where the language script community believes automatic allocation and activation is needed.

So, this is not very strict in a sense. It's just a suggestion should consider. And it's about the number of variants that are activated to the same registrant one to both to restrict the manually activated variant and to restrict the automatically activated variant, but not to have a hard cut number here, but the registry should have a maximum number in place if needed. Sometimes there are just a very limited number of variants possible, but if, for example, for the Arabic script, you could have in theory millions or billions of variants, in that case, the registry should set some upper limit for this. And the question is now, do we

EN

want to have a similar implementation guidance that we also want to have that number of allocatable variants restricted but decided by the registry?

AMADEU ABRIL: Michael, this is Amadeu.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes.

AMADEU ABRIL: Okay, two things. Limiting to one, I mean, I think that we need to allow some multiple IDN variations of the domain name according to different diacritics about the number. Well, in our experience for the registries we manage with this, we set that to four or five additional domains with IDNs, with diacritics in Latin, in concrete. I don't think we have any that have more than one or two in practical terms. But I think we should set a proper recommendation for a limit in this area of four or five. Beyond that, I think only gaming is possible in real terms. Second, regarding automatic activation, in principle I'm against because what I've seen is some kind of confusion on the registrants. Registrants should know what they have and not have surprises about thinking that they have one domain and in fact they have another different domain also activated.

EN

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Just some background information that even though we are talking about Latin script only at the top level, this does not mean that at the second level also just Latin script would be allowed. So it would still be possible to have, for example, Arabic script second level labels together with our Latin script TLDs. And in that case, basically the same variant rules that exist for the IDN EPDP would exist for our case too because we decided to have variants at the second level defined by the LGR and the variant rules and not have any additional rules regarding Latin diacritics.

Any further thoughts? No. Feeling the group get quieter with each meeting. Very relaxing. Oh, sorry. Ariel just reminded me that folks are thinking. Oh, go ahead. Satish, please. Go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish, for the record, I'm not an expert in registry operations, but the underlying concern here is very clear that there should not be too many instances of variants in the case of EPDP. And for us, diacritics, diacritic versions, there seem to be two points here. One is capping the maximum and the other is the automatic activation. My instinct is to go with the recommendations of the EPDP on IDNs as it is because it is perhaps a bigger problem there than here. And this is their considered opinion. So my recommendation would be to go with this. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Satish. Sounds sensible to have the same rules here because the same things can happen, basically. Edmund, please.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmund, here. We're talking about second level registration. Are we? If that's the case, then maybe we can just be silent about it because the IDN EPDP would have covered it in terms of the policy. As you're saying, if it's registering Arabic or Chinese or whatever in the second level, then whatever is said there is already covered.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, mostly yes. One could argue that since we have cross-TLD variants, or in our case, it's, yeah, are they called variants? We have cross-TLD same entity requirements, which are not based on variants because the TLDs are not variants. They are just Latin script diacritic groups. And across these, we have also same entity requirements. And therefore, there could be made an argument to say we should write something because we want to have the same requirement not to allocate too many domain names to the same entity, even though not all are variants, but some are based on the Latin script diacritic groupings.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay, understandable. So that is in the scenarios where there are more than one diacritic TLD because we start with one ASCII and one diacritic. And if that's the case, then it doesn't really apply because even if it's cross, it still really just applies from what the IDN EPDP already says, I think. But I get what you're saying. And in cases where at least there are more than one diacritic, so there are three or more TLDs, then there's the cross-TLD IDN issue that we might want to talk about. And because they're not variants, they're not covered within the IDN EPDP, that's

probably correct. Interesting. I think, given that something very similar, I think would suffice. Again you started the conversation by saying this is kind of not a hard requirement, but something that needs to be considered. Maybe it's something that the applicant will be asked how they're going to be dealing with, but not like a hard requirement, so I'm good with that approach.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. Yeah, and I think even with two we have this kind of problem, so to say, if in the variant case, a registry would make a maximum of, I don't know, let's say, five, and we have a base ASCII and a Latin diacritic, this would mean that you have five in the base ASCII and five in the Latin diacritic, thereby already doubling the number and with each further diacritic number you would add another number. So, in that sense, I think it makes sense to have a corresponding version here with adjusted wording.

So far I only heard voices to be consistent here too. So unless anybody suggests differently, I think it makes sense to have that implementation guidance to transfer it into our case.

No objection? Five more seconds? I mean, we can always revisit this once the preliminary recommendations are worded, then we can still see if the wording matches what we thought the outcome should be. So this is not a final thing yet, but at the moment seems like I see in the chat some agreement to have this also in our case.

Right. And with that, we have managed to visit all the TLDs and can go back to the slides, please.

EN

Yep. And here I want to take the time to come back to this chart or this sheet we've brought up a few times, but not recently. It's a summary of what we have been considering and what the outcome of these were based on the existing body of work. We have first the ccTLD fast track process, which we should have taken a look at. And we looked at it and found that mainly the same entity management would be something that could be applicable in our case. But since that whole topic is covered more thoroughly in the IDN EPDP, we said like we won't transfer anything directly from that because the IDN EPDP would be better suited to get the required routes for us.

And then with the IDN EPDP, we have the phase one and phase two reports. The phase one was basically about the root zone LGR being taken as a basis for the variant determination. We have the same entity principle at the top level, the application requirements, some contractual requirements and delegation and removal decisions. And we basically used most of those recommendations. The root zone LGRs is, of course, irrelevant in our case because we are not talking about variants on the top level, but something different. But the rest of the points, same entity principle, application process, contractual requirements and delegations, we transferred most of the solutions from there. And details will be seen in the chart we have just been looking at in columns F.

And for the phase two, the IDN EPDP was about the same entity principle and exemptions on the second level, IDN table harmonization, domain lifecycle, transfer policy adjustment to registry agreement and services. And again, most of those recommendations we have

EN

transferred to our PDP with some adjustments of wordings. And again, the details are in the cheat and in columns J.

The next thing we were to look at was a SubPro topic 24 on IDNs. And that's mostly about the root zone LGR to take that as a base and also to have the same entity principle. And right when we started with the deliberation of the IDN EPDPs, we already looked at what SubPro recommendations are there and how they led into IDN EPDP recommendations. And so by looking at those IDN EPDP recommendations, we automatically, so to say, also took into account the SubPro recommendations on the root zone LGR and the same entity principle. So this is basically distributed in the Excel sheet in the columns F and J, depending on whether it's top level and application process or second level operation.

The other thing we have to take a look at is about the existing consensus policies. This is still a topic we will take a look at later. Next slide, please. Was that already Saewon or was it still me?

SAEWON LEE: Yes, I can jump in. Thank you, Michael. So yes, this is Saewon Lee from Staff for the Record. Unfortunately, I won't be a team player and join you on camera. So sorry for that. But first of all, yes, joining in, I would also like to congratulate everyone for completing the Charter Question 3 discussions. I know that was the biggest hurdle for us. So, again, congratulations. Thank you, Michael.

So, as Michael just shared, and as we've also shared in the previous weeks, prior to going into Charter Question 4, which is the existing

consensus policies, we will be drafting or crystallizing the preliminary recommendations. So technically, we'll be asking the working group to review the language that's currently been drafted by staff based on the discussions and agreements. And it's basically after the discussions on the three Charter Questions and reviewing the relevant existing body of work. And obviously, you'll know that we've been doing this for the last few months.

If you can see here on this slide, you'll see that currently the layout of the preliminary recommendations that's been drafted, it follows the topics and sequence of the EPDP IDNs phases one and two. And as Michael also mentioned in the table, especially because the recommendations from the EPDP IDNs are and were the most transferable. So when trying to get to grouping of the recommendations or laying out the recommendations, we did take the time to consult ICANN Legal on the best way in which to present them. And we were advised to leave no room for interpretation during the implementation stage. So we just simply clearly mapped out each relevant recommendation, according to what was relevant to us. And that was advised the best way to go. So here you can see that we have 54 outputs or preliminary recommendations and implementation guidance. And it's laid out under, they are laid out under seven topics which follow those recommendations relevant to or transferable from EPDP-IDNs. And if you see here, there are still those to be confirmed through your review, but also that were determined or confirmed today through the discussions and some recommendations that are not numbered, which I'll get to in the next slide. If you see in the bottom here, you will be able to access the mapping document where it shows

which EPDP-IDNs recommendations corresponded to the current LDPDP recommendations.

And here in this slide, I'd like to point out those unnumbered recommendations. So basically I'd like to point out that not all EPDP-IDNs recommendations considered or produced recommendations, which us as a working group had agreed upon in the beginning during our scope establishment phase. And those were, for example, requirements to be qualified as the ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set, or those limitations that we didn't put on to the types of TLDs or the number of diacritical marks on a character, et cetera. So, and another one, I guess, a little different to the EPDP-IDNs is the base ASCII as a requirement aspect, where it's not considered primary, but how we consider it as a base. And so these recommendations, either we try to fill in, which as you can see in this slide are marked as X and Y. And I marked it as that because we may decide to replace them or put them under a separate topic, et cetera. And you'll see when you see the draft and or detailed through EPDP-IDNs more specifically, for example, through recommendations three, four, and 28. But basically when you get the draft again, which I'll mention in the next few slides, we ask that you also, with your eagle eye, try to see what may be missing, if it is sufficient or need anything more. And basically that's probably going back to our charter question one, where we are trying to answer under which circumstances should this be allowed and what measures should be put into place. So I will talk about the timeline and work plan through the next agenda item, but I just want to pause here to see if you have any questions before moving on.

Okay. Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Saewon. First of all, thanks for the great work on these infographics. They are quite easy for us to understand. Can you move to slide number 12? The next one. Yeah, so here, the middle button, I would think that this is about what we call in the PDP as, EPDP as the manageability constraint. What is to stop a registry from having too many of these variants delegated? And the criteria, there was criterion, main criterion was the manageability, saying that the need and the ability of the registry to manage these numbers. So in this, I see that there are two statements on allowing multiple application styles. I'm not sure if I understand what is style and also the next recommendation on having no limits to certain TLD types. So I'd like some more clarification on what are the certain TLD types. Thank you so much.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you Satish for your question and apologies if the wordings are not appropriate, but you'll understand when you see the draft, but basically the certain TLD types, to answer that first, is referring to when we did not limit our boundaries to real words, those words that you can see in dictionaries or geography, et cetera. So I hope that answers that. Yes, and Michael also mentioned it in the chat. And then for the first one, the style, again, apologies for my misuse of language, but basically it was talking about the applications that we did not limit. So for existing TLDs applied for and new applications, if that makes sense.

EN

SATISH BABU: Okay, so I am assuming that down the line, we will be going through these in closer detail. Thanks very much for the clarification.

SAEWON LEE: Yes, so those you will see through the recommendations three, four, and 28. And as I also mentioned through this slide, you'll see how each EPDP IDNs recommendation is mapped out corresponding to our LDPDP. And obviously we'll go through them once we resume. Any more questions? Okay, then I'll go through our work plan through the next steps.

So before going straight onto the next steps, I do want to share the work plan ahead. So for the next month, if you see here, we will have two weeks of no meeting and we'll resume on 17th of September. But this by no means is a real break, but homework time for everyone. So if you see in the next slide here, to get a clearer picture of the coming September work, we will be on a so-called break with no meetings. But this time will be spent where we ask the working group members to review the preliminary recommendation language. And as you can see in the calendar, we are planning to request this by 14th of September so that the leadership team and staff can prepare what feedback you have provided us for our next meeting on September 17th.

Currently, the leadership team is in the process of reviewing the language for the preliminary recommendations. And once they are done, the draft will be circulated with you all through the mailing list by either the end of this week or early next week. So at the latest by the 2nd of September. And I know on this slide, I've marked it as from first,

but because that is a day off for the staff, if it's not shared with you before, it will be done by the 2nd. So as you can see here, the immediate next steps will be that there are no meetings for the next two weeks, but we ask that you review the draft preliminary recommendations during those two weeks while we have no meetings. Any questions on the timeline and work plan? Okay, if not, I think we were hoping that we would be done very quickly today, but I'm happy that we actually fulfilled the 90 minutes. So I'll hand the floor over to John.

JOHN EMERY: Thank you, Saewon. As you were all on the call, we made a decision on 7.4 and 7.5 to proceed in accordance with the outcome of the board decision on EPP IDNs. And we will review that if the board makes a decision in a timely manner. Saewon just gave you all of your homework for your quote unquote break. So please be sure to review the preliminary recommendations by the 14th of September so that staff has time to get it together for our meeting on the 17th. Back to you, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Saewon for the great summary of the next steps and what's going to happen. And John, for the summary of this meeting's outcomes. So yeah, I basically can just repeat what Saewon said. We will provide you with the preliminary recommendations within the next few days, either this week or beginning of next week. And then you have two weeks to look through those, make comments. Whatever you think

is incorrect or not well phrased or if there's something missing or something like that, provide comments. Also, of course, minor things like spelling or whatever, and we will incorporate the minor things before the next meeting in three weeks, and then discuss all the major topics within the group and how to proceed with those.

Yeah, with that. Thanks, everybody, for the great work. Good to have finally the TBDs finished and hope to see you all in good health in three weeks. Thanks. Goodbye. And Julie, you may stop the recording.

JULIA BISLAND: Thank you so much, Michael.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]