

DEVAN REED:

For the recording, this is Devan Reed. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP Working Group call on Wednesday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> of December, 2025 at 1415 UTC. We do have apologies today from Anil Jain. And 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. Please note, all chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct. And with this, I turn it back over to our chair, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Devan, for the introduction, and welcome, everybody to meeting number 27. Next slide, please.

So, the agenda to the last week, we have a recap of previous week meeting. See the outcomes and action items, and then we will continue with the charter topic deliberations, which we have the GPI and HR

---

*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.*

---

impact assessments left. And once that's done, we'll take a look at the next step for our working group and any other business. Next slide, please.

So, for the recap, we had big discussions regarding the case studies number five and six. The question whether we want to allow the combination of LD set domain TLDs and variant set TLDs. And the majority, even though there was some disagreement, was in favor of option one. And we also looked at the charter question four, whether there was any impact on existing consensus policy. Saewon already suggested the impact assessment two weeks ago, and we asked whether you were all in favor of that assessment and there was also agreement. Next slide, please.

So, for the action items, we had the section item two provide some clarification and the rationale for what constitutes necessary information that's regarding PR50 and the action item to simplify the definition of the variants and considering the language from EPDP, IDNs and AGB that was part of the draft document. Then the action item two was about the case studies and the option one. We can see that on the next slides. And action item three was the request that you prepare for this meeting by taking a look at the suggested GPI and HR impact for discussion later on. Next slide, please.

So, for the discussion about LD set and variants set, we had some arguments and wrote them down to make it easier to make up our minds and then we had a vote. And the majority, around two-thirds were in favor of option one, which means we are going to restrict the LD set and variant set activation to single-ASCII TLDs and not from variant

---

---

sets. And while we also prohibited the 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 just maybe a short explanation also to maybe help the people who are not in favor of this option to at least accept it is that for the second point, if you have a LD set contract, you cannot add any variants to that contract. This is a theoretical restriction, but in practice, it does not affect users at all because with the current root zone LGR version, this is not possible at the moment anyway. So, there is no bad effect on users. And the first one, if you have a variant contract, you cannot add any LD TLDs to that contract. What we should also keep in mind is that when talking about variants here, we only refer to Latin script variants because all other scripts are anyway not possible to work with LD TLDs because that's of course restricted to Latin.

And unlike other scripts like the Chinese or the Arabic, which have a whole lot of variants and which have wide usage for variants, the Latin script almost has no allocatable variants. So, honestly, I would be quite surprised if any TLD in the next round will apply for a variant set TLD using Latin script. It's not impossible, but I think it's quite unlikely. And then there would have to be the chance that this registry would then also want to add an LD TLD to that variant set is quite unlikely. So, it's a restriction, but I honestly think that in practice, it will have no effect and no one will actually be bothered by that. Next slide, please.

So, what do we have to do to make this option one part of our policy? It's basically quite simple. We have this PR1, which defines what TLDs

---

can be considered an ASCII [inaudible] diacritic gTLD set. Up to now, we have four requirements for that. I won't read them all now. It's basically the standard stuff we have been discussing in the previous month. And we only have to add a fifth item to that PR1, stating none of the gTLD strings that constitute an ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set may be part of a variant set.

So, this on the one hand says that no variants can be activated for LD sets because then that LD TLD would be part of a variant set. And at the same time, no LDs can be added to a variant set because then it would also be part of variant set. So, that's our suggestion to have this option one where we don't allow the mingling of variant set and LD sets. Anybody has any comments here, sees problems with that addition apart from what Bill said that he's generally against option one. That's totally understood, but this is now under the assumption that we are for option one. Do you think this addition covers the requirement. And Bill seems to agree here. I see Satish's hand. Please, go ahead.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Michael. Satish here. I agree with this. I just would like to check if 1.5 as it stands currently, is it kind of redundant, meaning you cannot have with the current root zone LGR, this 1.5 is a hypothetical situation. In practice, are we saying that this cannot be as of now? Just checking.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah, not exactly. If we could go back one slide, please. There are basically two things which this restricts, as you can see on the left side. The first one is if you have a variant contract, you cannot add any LD

---

---

TLDs to that contract. And this in theory can happen even with the current root zone LGR. There are situations where you could have a variant contract where one of the TLDs is an ASCII TLD and that TLD could then have Latin diacritic versions of that. So, this one is possible.

The second one, if you have a LD set contract, you cannot add any variants to that contract. That's currently not possible with a root zone LGR as it is now. So, it's not purely hypothetical or theoretical. The first point is actually possible at the moment. But unlikely, as I said, because there are not a lot of variants in the Latin script at all.

SATISH BABU:

Right, thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Next slide, please.

Going back to the suggestions. So, I see a lot of agreement that this addition to PR1 should cover the option one restrictions which we agreed upon last week. Anybody disagreeing? Just raise your hand up. Write something on the chat. Seeing none, so I think that's a good way forward. And with that, we have actually finished our recommendations. Next slide, please.

This was just for reference in case there were any questions regarding this. But we're not yet done with all of the topics of the working group. I see Saewon is already preparing herself to take over for the charter question deliberations, the GPI and HR impact assessments. And I will hand over to Saewon. Thank you.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Michael. This is Saewon Lee from ICANN org for the record. I just sent a small congratulations to everyone for coming this far. And hopefully, this concludes at least the preliminary recommendation part of our report. So, from there, this is really, really the last piece of our charter, I promise. It's not really a question, but it's a task that we need to fulfill. As you can see from this slide, actually, I'm going to go on to the next one. It's the global public interest assessment and the human rights impact assessment.

I know Satish asked about this last week, so we will get into this today. Just like charter question four and the impact on existing consensus policies, this is also a newly adopted task for our PDPs. And it's starting from our PDP. So, hopefully, trial and error will get us somewhere in the future. But let's see where we get to at this stage. So, this task has been advised by the board and the community. So, we are advised to conduct this as we formulate our recommendations. And now that we have pretty much shaped up our preliminary recommendations. This is where we are at.

So, like the time that we did for charter question four, I'd like to refresh our memory by reading this section in the charter. So, if you see the left box, this is regarding the impact on our GPI. I'll refer the global public interest to GPI from now on. The working group is expected to consider the potential impact of any recommendations on the global public interest. In order to facilitate this analysis, the working group may wish to consult this checklist and may also benefit from consulting the GPI toolkit wiki page.

---

The right box, you'll see this is about the impact on human rights. The working group is expected to consider the potential impact of any recommendations on human rights, whether there is a likely human rights impact, and if so, who are the groups expected to be impacted and the expected severity of the impact, high, medium or low. If an impact is anticipated, the working group is expected to address the following questions.

One is the proposed action necessary to achieve the desired outcome and two is the proposed action. I must have missed a part. I'm so sorry. Now I don't know what it says in the charter, but basically, it's asking the appropriateness or if our recommendations are suitable. But I'm so sorry, I don't know why I wasn't able to finish this part in the slide. So, I hope if John or Steve could share the charter again for us in the chat, that would be very helpful.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

We also have overlooked it, Saewon, so it's not just your fault. We also didn't recognize it.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you. Thank you, John. So, if you go into this slide. So, for both the GPI and the human rights impact assessments, as I also shared in the email yesterday, and as you can see in this slide, we have conducted a preliminary analysis and obviously, they were shared. First on 22<sup>nd</sup> of October prior to ICANN84. And I think I've been constantly sharing it over the last few weeks. So, I am going to go into that. I'll exit from the slide. So, if you can wait for me.

---

So, this is the GPI checklist and this is the human rights impact assessment checklist. Again, obviously they're in your inbox as well. But if we go into GPI first. So, similar to the charter question four and how we did that work, I'm not going to go into too much detail per checklists. Instead, I'm going to provide a high-level overview of our, as in the leadership team and the staff's initial assessment, the rationale for this analysis and obviously afterwards, we will seek any feedback and go into discussions from there.

Obviously, I don't need to give any reasons. It's the same as the charter question four. These checklists have been shared with you over the last few weeks. So obviously, I know that you've probably done your homework and I think a high-level overview will suffice, but also because the impact wasn't as severe, just like charter question four. There's no necessity to go into detail.

So, if you look at this spreadsheet first, so we'll start with GPI checklist. And I think this will again answer to Satish and what he asked last week, but this checklist is the template provided by the board. And obviously, when it was provided to us, there was no prescriptive way in conducting this analysis or there wasn't a mandate to use this checklist. But when going through this work, the staff and leadership thought that this checklist was most convenient for us to fulfill this task. And this was again revised and confirmed by our relevant org functions that are in charge of this work.

So, if you actually see the checklist, and I will be scrolling up and down like I did last time, I'm so sorry, because I know it doesn't all fit into this screen, but you will see that there are three main categories. So, there's



---

this overall ICANN categories that align with its mission and objectives, the public interest categories, and these fall under these ICANN categories. And lastly, the bylaws considerations which present those bylaws that are pertinent to the former two categories. And the light green and orange, as you can see here, so there's a light green, orange and gray, but the light green and orange represent the potential positive and negative impacts, and the light gray represents irrelevant, so not relevant.

And then if you see down here, you'll see the summary of the checklists. I'll enlarge it a bit. So, you'll see that there's a number of checks that were marked in each category, and you'll see that there were no checks made under negative impacts. And obviously this is our preliminary assessment as of now. And then if you go into columns M and N, and I mentioned this all through the mailing list as well, you'll see that I've listed the topics and the recommendations that follow. So, that's in column M, and then the rationale to that impact choice that we made.

And I use the term choice here because obviously, unlike the existing consensus policies, impact analysis, we didn't really differentiate this by high or low impact, and this was how it was provided to us as a template, and that's what we followed. Continuing on, so if you actually see this template, you'll see for all categories that we listed all topics had potentially positive global public interest, and I'm hoping you all agree that our work that's being done is to allow for more diversity and language in the DNS. And obviously, while in the process, we're trying to ensure fairness, accountability, and transparency.

---

And I want to highlight here that this tool mainly focuses on issues that are relevant to our PDP topics and preliminary recommendations, and it does, but when we were doing this analysis, we were not really focusing on the structural or procedural aspects of GNSO or this PDP, as it's not really applicable for us or the work of our PDP, but there is a category here that does deal with that issue. So, for example, you'll see ICANN's policies and practices category in relation to the public interest categories. It does mention some procedural issues, but I believe that our recommendations, again, as we saw through charter question four, align with the existing consensus policies and that we, as in working group, considered those aspects during these deliberations.

So, I see Bill mentioning some typos. And again, this is a work in progress and it will continue to be revised, but if you do see any typos, do comment on them and we'll take that into account. So, just to kind of go back to the sheet again. As I briefly mentioned in the beginning, this GPI checklist, as we have counted that we have no negative impacts, but potentially positive only. And this, as you can see here, so obviously we have none that fall short of the total.

And basically, our recommendations and our PDP work tend to—again, we believe that we have positive impact on public interest that allows for diverse and multilingual internet while also aiming for stability and security. There's nothing to really point out or that stands out in columns M and N like how I pointed out during charter Question four topic. So, I'm not going to read line by line within the rationale or the topics that I've listed, because as I mentioned in the beginning, I've kind of listed all the topics. But generally our conclusion from this checklist is that we have a general positive impact on global public interest.

---

---

So, I kind of want to stop here for the global public interest part before I move on to the human rights impact assessment. Are there any questions? Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG:

Yeah, Edmon here. Thank you, Saewon. And I think I'm especially excited about seeing this in action for the first time. I think you've done a great job of summarizing many of the things, and this sets a good precedent for future PDP work as well. And also, that's the thing that maybe I am thinking about as well, because this is going to kind of set a precedent. Nit-picking a little bit, I think in column N, each of the items you have all the topics in, but then in column N, not all the descriptions cover exactly all the topics. So, just nit-picking, maybe we either want to cover it or make it consistent, so that on M—which one is M?

So, the one on the left should reconcile with the one on the right. I just think that might make it tighter. Although, I mean, overall, I understand, generally, all the topics are relevant, but if we are providing rationale for particular, maybe they should match each other. Right. I have to admit though, I'm reading as you were reporting on it, I should have read this before this meeting, but I haven't, but I'm reading it, and that might have further questions. But so far, I think it's great, just that nit-picking point.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Edmon. And obviously, as our previous board member, and I know you are very much involved in this, I'm very greatly appreciative by your comment. Definitely, I did just take note that we will try to

---

---

cover all the topics possible. I think we tried to, but obviously, we'll go back to it and see if we can.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, the first one contains all of them, not all the rows contain all of them, as far as I could be skimmed through it.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, thank you so much. So yes, we'll definitely go back to this and try to cover everything possible. Any more questions? Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, no question. Just to comment that I think this is a good approach, and that indeed, as our main purpose was to allow something which is sensible, but not allowed under the current rules. This is basically all we do has a positive impact, and there's no negative because we are making things available that otherwise wouldn't be available. And it's just giving people—using the script more freedom to use it in the way they intend to use it. Thank you.

SAEWON LEE: As we wait for more questions, any suggestions at this moment will be very helpful because, as I mentioned in the beginning, this is our first time actually proactively not only utilizing this checklist, but also doing this work as a working group. So, thank you for all your input, and definitely we'll ask for more. Tapani?

---

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Hi, all. Tapani is speaking. I'm not sure if this is actually more appropriate to the human rights impact assessment part, but one potential, even though rather unlikely, negative impact is that it might not treat—as we excluded certain non-diacritic special characters from Latin [inaudible] scripts. It means we are treating some languages, some minority languages differently, and they might be preempted by this process.

For example, like by preparing Norwegian versus Swedish, because the O slash is not technically diacritic. So, I think it should be noted as a potential negative impact somewhere, even though I don't see a very low impact because it's very unlikely that any such TLD would be applied at this round. But having it noted so that I expect another GPDP will take care of it sometime in the future before the next round after this. Thank you.

SAEWON LEE: Michael, please.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, it's a good point, Tapani. We indeed excluded those characters, but I don't think that our policy is creating a negative impact here because the negative impact already exists now. Our policy is just avoiding some of the already now existing negative impact of the rules which currently exist. We removed those rules to avoid this negative impact. So, we're not creating this negative impact. We're just not

---

addressing it in our policy. So that's why I think it's an important point, but it's not that our policy is creating it. It's just that we are not addressing the existing negative impact.

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Well, you are potentially creating a negative impact. If, say, the registrars built SJO with the diacritics, that will have a negative impact on, say, Norwegian one trying to do it later. So, that will be a new negative impact because otherwise, they would just wait and fight it in equal terms at a later time. So, even though I agree, it's very unlikely, but still, I'd like this one [inaudible] noted for your future work. Thank you.

AMADEU ABRIL: Hello, this is Amadeu. Can you put me in the queue, please?

SAEWON LEE: Yes, please. Please, go ahead.

AMADEU ABRIL: May I go ahead? Okay, two questions. First, trying to answer Tapani. You're correct on the final assessment, but not in the work of this group, I think. The question is, when you say, oh, now everybody is discriminated because they could not apply for diacritics. After the work of this group, still some people would be left out even if someone would be included. As Michael says, it's not a new discrimination. The problem

---

is that, we cannot fix something that comes from Unicode and the LGR working group.

We probably should note that we are using the existing notion of diacritics that leaves some symbols out, but it's something that this group cannot fix in any way. And I guess, I'm sure that your suggestion is because we cannot include those, we should include known. So, I guess that you support the fact that, at least for those that—with the current external circumstances [inaudible] diacritic in the definition, we should allow them even if this leaves out some others.

Regarding this question of discrimination, there is something I would like submitting. I think, and that's traditionally a problem with ICANN. ICANN will always understand discrimination as treating the same thing in a different way. But we don't understand that discrimination is also treating equally things that are very different. And in this sense, I think that we should know that the fact that the sets of ASCII plus Latin diacritic being forced to pay more than the fee for one TLD for evaluation and later more than one annual fee for, sorry, for the ICANN annual fee for each registry is potentially discriminating, because this is not for technical needs.

The reality is that IDNs without an ASCII, they don't even work in email, and this is our collective fault, or they don't work well. But at the same time, if we apply the same registrant principle, they are always selling one product across the two TLDs, but they're paying as if they have two products. And this is treating equally, you have the TLDs in the root, something that's fundamentally different. They work in a very different

---

way in the market. So, I think that still in our results, there's a potential for negative discrimination for the Latin diacritic sets. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Amadeu. I think Tapani also mentioned in the beginning, I think this aspect is dealt with through the Human Rights Impact Assessment, so maybe could have saved this for that part of the discussion, but they're all valid points. I do agree with Michael, where obviously, when we were conducting this analysis through the GPI checklist, though we were not intentionally trying to only get positive as our conclusion, or negative as our conclusion, we were trying to figure out, is our work, as in are our recommendations or is any production of our work creating any negative impact?

And I think that part, when we were focusing on that, obviously, we were thinking of the limited scope of our work and how, because of the focus of our work, we were eliminating a lot of—not eliminating, but saving a lot of topics for future work. And we did consider those as well, but when we were going through the checklist, it didn't really strike us as a negative impact from our work. It did more seem as though that is for the future work to deal with then. Related to the fee discrimination as well, it's kind of dealt with in the Human Rights Impact Assessment, so maybe we could continue this discussion there. Does that sound okay? I don't see any objection, so I will just continue to the Human Rights Impact Assessment.

So, if you see this sheet again—thank you for sharing this again, John. So, Human Rights Impact Assessment, this sheet actually—so, before



---

actually going on about the sheet and the template, just kind of as a background, I want to share that ICANN bylaws actually included a commitment to human rights, and it was calling for respecting internationally recognized human rights, and a cross-community working party on human rights published the Human Rights Impact Assessment for PDPs.

And similar to the GPI checklist, there wasn't a real prescriptive way to conduct this assessment. And through brainstorming on how to go about this work, this sample template was shared with us from our relevant org function. And based on their suggestions, staff modified this template to better suit our work, as in our PDP, and help identify and priorities our policy impacts on human rights.

And as I mentioned again in the beginning, obviously, this is still a work in progress and can be and will be improved and updated over time even during our work until final reports. At this moment, we tried to stay true to the template, but also, there was a recent work within the GNSO where they retroactively looked into the Human Rights Impact Assessment, and this was through the Transverse Policy Review PDP, and we also kind of looked into that, the template that they used, and through assessments of our relevant org function, this is what we concluded with.

So, if you actually see in the tabs below, the third tab was the sample that was provided to us, and then the second was like a guidance on how this template should be used, and this first tab is basically what staff and leadership derived from that given template. So again, I just want to note, and I've actually noted it here in the top, in the notes, this

---

---

assessment as well mainly deals with our topics rather than any procedural aspects. So, when developing the sheets from the standard template, the categories that we used or chose related to was more related to our recommendations and topics rather than procedures. And I've noted that here in the top of the notes, and you can see this in the first two bullet points.

The third bullet point in the notes, it actually mentions how some categorization and listing of the issues, this is basically what I mentioned, that it referenced the Human Rights Impact Assessment conducted through the Transverse Policy Review PDP. So, you can read the background there. And then if you see how the columns have been categorized, you'll see that in the categories section—sorry, you'll see in the columns there's an issue area, and we dealt with diversity, participation, due process, accountability, and transparency. And I'm kind of trying to slowly scroll it down for you.

And then in the description, you'll be able to read what this issue is about and what human rights categories they relate to. In column D, that's where the staff have listed the topics that are relevant, and again you'll kind of see that it's mostly all, again. And then here we have actually put the severity of impact. So, we've categorized them into high, medium, low, or non-existent, again, whether they're positive or negative impacts.

Again, in column G, you'll see our rationale, and then if the impact is positive, the columns K to M, I'm trying to also show you in the screen, regarding necessity, proportionate, and legitimacy was left as non-available, non-existent. And then if the impact is negative, you'll also

---

see our rationale behind it in the columns K to M. So, I do want to note, before I go into or point out some sections, I'm trying to manage this screen so that you can see it well, and please do ask me to show us a certain point if you need, but I'll try to put it to the beginning again.

So, in the beginning, when we went through this analysis, again, we were not trying to focus on positive or negative, we were trying to go through our recommendations and see where they landed. And as I continue to mention on a general note, it all landed as positive or at least low to non-negative impact. Whereas the staff and leadership, we assess that all our results were positive, with our recommendations having positive impact on human rights.

So, for example, and I mentioned this through the GPI as well, we allow for our recommendations, strive to allow for multilingual diverse internet environment while ensuring fairness, transparency, and security and stability throughout the process, and this was basically what I think our PDP intends to do or achieve. When going through this checklist with our relevant org function that deals with this human rights impact assessment, we were advised from the experts that obviously for a more balanced assessment, it may help us to note some potential negative impacts even if they're really minor.

And obviously, as you all know, even the best-intentioned policies could have some risks, and that's what we tried to squeeze out in our analysis here. So, though we still consider them as low, if you see here in the negative impact scenarios, and this is in column H, you will see that our potential concerns or the potential concerns from our recommendations were on fee-related topics, the complex and

---

---

expensive processes, as well as awareness aspects where undeserved communities and smaller registries with limited awareness and/or any limited legal and technical support may have many challenges. And they're all written in this negative scenario column.

However, again, from a policy formulation point of view, I do want to again emphasize that the leadership team and staff believe that our recommendations covered these concerns as we formulated our recommendations, and we tried our best to mitigate these risks. And again, that's why generally we saw it as a positive impact. I think, again, related to topics, rationale and details, I'm sure you all did your homework, so I'm not going to go into all of them again because other than those negative scenarios that I've mentioned, most of them were positive in general. So, I think I'm going to stop here to see if there's any questions or discussions from this.

Time-wise, we do have a bit of time to discuss further on this before we conclude, so please do. If it's your first time seeing this checklist, please do examine it carefully and see if you have any questions or concerns. Before the meeting started today, there were some input or feedback that they were in agreement with this impact assessment. Obviously, please do write in the chat or raise your hand if you disagree or have any concerns. I see in the chat that Tapani is raising the point that was being discussed before. I'm going to give the floor over to Michael if he wants to address this.

---

MICHAEL BAULAND:

I think I addressed most parts, and just the last one, where I think Tapani is right that this case is not covered here, or this is possibly an edge case where we introduce some disadvantages for people having similar cases like diacritics, but that are not diacritics. So, he brings up the example that if there are two parties, one wants to have .sjo and sjo with two dots at the same time, which they would be able to get with our PDP, and there's a different party who wants to have .sjo, the same ASCII TLD, but also, .sjo, I don't know how to pronounce it, the Norwegian one. The O with a strikethrough.

And while this second party can preempt this first set by registering any of the two at the moment, he said that in case they have a business model where it only makes sense to go live with both of the TLDs, but not just one, and the other first party also has a business model where it just makes sense to go online with both of the TLDs, then this would lead the second party to either not do anything and lose the TLDs or to just apply for one of the TLDs and thereby paying for a TLD with no business model.

But yeah, in theory this could be the case, but I really think it's highly unlikely that there are two parties that have a business model which only works if both of their TLDs are in the root zone at the same time, which does not work if only one of the TLDs is in the root zone. So yeah, I don't know if we want to write that down somewhere. It's a highly theoretical example, but I admit to Tapani it's not impossible.

SAEWON LEE:

Oh, sorry. Yes, Tapani.

---

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Yeah. I agree that this is a very theoretical possibility. Perhaps a more practical issue is that this is a symbolic significance of discriminating against certain languages that some might lead to say that feeling somewhere that people might not like, but I'm not sure if that is relevant to what I mentioned here.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, that might be more for the actual work description which is kind of discriminating against languages with Latin characters which are no diacritics. It's not the result of our policies because the work description has this discrimination and we just have to live with it. We can't or shouldn't extend our work in that sense, but we addressed this problem. We mentioned this that there are cases which are not diacritics but have a similar behavior and we call them out and thereby raise awareness that there might be use cases which are out of scope and which might be considered in a follow-up PDP or in some other way that ICANN sees fit.

Okay. Tapani says we decided to use Unicode definitions of diacritics, which is different from what linguists use. I don't exactly know too many linguists, I have to admit. I talked to one of them and he agreed that the Unicode is the most commonly agreed understanding of what diacritics are, but if you have a different definition for diacritics, please bring it up, although this possibly should have been talked about when we agreed on what diacritics are.

---

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Okay, that's not really the problem with the linguistic definition that it's different in different languages, so it's not really viable for our use, so I did not place that too far, but we could have, for example, the O slash is actually existing Unicode in two forms. It's a mathematical symbol where it is built like a diacritic and just a separate [inaudible]. But still, yeah, the linguistic definition [inaudible] A and two dots is a diacritic in German which is not diacritic in Finnish, which would be kind of difficult to deal with in this context. So your Unicode definition is the only one that we can really live on if we insist on the word diacritic.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I think it's a worldwide, commonly accepted definition. Okay.

SAEWON LEE: While we wait for more questions, I think we have four or five minutes more that we can spend on this. I do want to say, and I mentioned it in the chat, if necessary, we can try to mold it in the issue areas under accountability, where it talks about discrimination or participation. Again, when we were conducting this analysis, while not trying to focus on the procedural aspects, but just how our recommendations stand and what impact they might have on human rights, while concluding, obviously, that they were generally positive and not trying to have any negative impacts on human rights, we tried to—not going into specific details or examples, we did try to mold in whatever discrimination that this work may have on future work.

If it's not described properly, we'll try to mold in what we can. And obviously, the working group can review the updates during the initial

---

report review period. And if that is not enough, then there is also a public comment period where we'll try to send out a guided submission form, where you can submit a public comment on this as well, and then we can definitely try to readjust it accordingly. Does that work for everyone? Okay.

But thank you for all the points. We'll definitely try to revise or update as necessary. So, all your points are very helpful to get this tool more refined and polished, not just only for us, but for future work as well. So, please do go back to this and submit any feedback. If you have any concerns, please do send it through list as well. But, as I mentioned, we will have an initial report review period where, if there's anything that falls short of your expectations, we could get that readjusted then.

I kind of went long so that I could wait for questions in the meantime, but I don't see any other questions other than having seen a few thumbs up about the next steps. So, Michael, if you're okay, I'll just go into the next steps.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yes, please.

SAEWON LEE:

Okay. I'll go back to the slides. Okay. So, today, we'll spend a bit of time on the next steps just because I think that does kind of conclude our GPI Human Rights Impact Assessment analysis. I'm hoping that with no real objections as of now, it's a big fat green check mark that's kind of



---

showing us that we've done our work. Again, obviously, we still have a lot of work to do, but at least as of deliberations, I think we're done.

So, if you see here, now we are at the end of the year. And this calendar is just a proposal at this point, and it is a proposal and work plan, which will continue for the next two to three months. It may change, who knows, but this is kind of what we are trying to stick to. And now that we have finished all the charter question deliberations, as you can see through this timeline, staff will be in the background drafting and completing the initial report to finalize by 15<sup>th</sup> of December.

And then the leadership team and working group will review in parallel for approximately 10 business days to two weeks. And obviously, this is excluding the holidays, which means that we will be going over to the new year. So, currently, we are aiming to publish for public comment on 12<sup>th</sup> of January. There are a few rules about when not to publish and when to publish, and that's why this date has been chosen. So, after the publication, the public comment will be out for 40 days, and it will end on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of February, as you can see in the slide.

Now, again, time-wise, the working group meetings are anticipated or expected to resume during ICANN85 in Mumbai. So, it just works out where our public comment will end. There will be a bit of review and report drafting period following the 23<sup>rd</sup> of February. And on the 7<sup>th</sup> of March is when our working group will resume to review the public comments. Before I go on to the next point, I just want to see if there's any questions. Okay.

---

So, it does look like a long break, but it's actually not a break because obviously, there's the review period of the report that we ask of. And during the public comment period, I know you'll all be consulting your own stakeholder groups and constituencies on this work as well. So, there's that homework for you. But on top of that, we will be asking you to conduct a short survey of 15 minutes on the working group. So, it's called an interim self-assessment. And this will be sent out after our report is published. So, if you could also attend to that, that will be greatly appreciated.

So, that kind of concludes our next steps. And obviously, the immediate next step would be for the working group to review the draft initial report once it's circulated on the 15<sup>th</sup> of December. Any questions? Okay. Michael, do you want to say anything or do you want to hand it over to John?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Hello and [goodbye]. No. Yeah, John can take over and then I can finish the call. Thanks.

JOHN EMERY: Perfect. Thanks so much, everyone. So, the big outcome today is we completed the Human Rights Impact Assessment and the GPI checklist. So, bravo, everyone. And big thanks to Saewon for her diligent work on this. I think she set a really strong precedent for future PDPs. And so, just huge praise to her on this. Action items. So, staff will review the GPI framework rationale to ensure that all topics are covered and be consistent to set this positive precedent for future PDPs.

---

All working group members are to review the initial report when staff has drafted it by 15<sup>th</sup> of December. And then when it is out for public comment, working group members complete the working group self-assessment really helps steer the future work on this working group and ensure that any issues are flagged early on, not after the fact. So, with that, I will hand it over to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, John. And, yeah, with that, we have actually finished all our preliminary recommendations. And let me try the special effects. Yay, they work. Great. And yeah, with that, this concludes our meetings for the time being. As John and Saewon said, it doesn't mean you don't have any work to do. There's still the preparation for the public comment. But meeting-wise, we will convene in-person hopefully, with many of you in Mumbai. And then, depending on how [inaudible] and how many comments there are, we might have follow-up meetings scheduled again after Mumbai.

And with that, we can stop nine minutes early. And I wish you all great seasonal holidays in case you have holidays. And if not, enjoy your work. Thanks, and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]