

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. For the recording, this is Devan Reed. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP call taking place on Wednesday, 1 July 2026. We have no apologies today, but Satish will be joining late. 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 assistance is needed 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. 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. Thank you, and back over to our chair, Michael Bauland. Please begin.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Devan, and welcome everybody to our maybe final meeting. Let's see how it goes. So for the agenda, we will recap last meeting, continue to review the public comments, and if we manage to go through that, we'll take a look at the proposed table of contents for the final report and give a consensus call process reminder, and then look at the work plan and next steps. Next slide, please. Next.

For the outcome and action items, we looked at PR 18, 19 and agreed to discard them and leave the fee considerations to ICANN. For the HRIA, we also agreed on a path forward, and for PR 14, we also had

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.

agreement. We looked at PR 39 and IG 40 last meeting, and while we agreed on how and what we want to do, namely to include the diacritic characters into the same entity set at the second level, there were still some issues of how to write the recommendations clearly so that all the cases are covered. We had quite some discussions and, yeah, discussions in the background with the leadership team and also ICANN staff and Sarmad, and thanks all for contributing here. And we think that we've found a way forward how to rewrite these recommendations so that the intended meaning of the working group is covered and there are no loopholes or missing things in the recommendations. We'll take a look at that right after this slide. And then we also have the action item to update the recommendation X, which will become Recommendation 6, to add an exemption provision, and we'll come to that after that.

So let's start with the fun part. Recommendation 39. I just read the new wording and then say a few things why we think this is the best approach here. Recommendation 39, building on an ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set as defined in Final Recommendation 1. An ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set is defined to include, one, a second-level string and all its variants within a given TLD as determined by the second-level LGRs for that given TLD. Two, all second-level strings from one under all other TLDs, if they are valid and determined by the second-level LGRs for those TLDs. Three, all variants of all second-level strings from two as determined by the respective second-level LGRs for those TLDs. The criteria and requirements applicable to the second-level LGRs for the gTLD registry operators that manage the ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD sets are outlined in Recommendation 40.

So the thing is, as we've seen previously, there are no variants crossing the TLD levels because the TLDs itself are not variants of each other. For that reason, the same entity needs to be defined in a bit more complex manner. This first point says just like we start with a label or string that has been registered and we, of course, add all variants of that string within the TLD. This is already defined by the IDN EPDP. And then we need to move all those strings from this TLD to all other TLDs in the set, but only if the strings are available, because the LGRs might be different in those other TLDs, even though they are harmonized. There may be cases, as we have seen in examples in the previous sessions, that some of the characters are not allowed in one of the TLDs, so some labels might not be valid. But all valid labels must be carried over to all other TLDs, and then we have again to apply all the variants. So apply the LGR rules for variants for all the other TLDs, because there might be variants again within those other TLDs, which are not valid labels in the first TLD. But if we do this, we catch the full set of all strings which belong to the same entity set and which we call the ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set.

This is 39, and then this 40, which used to be an implementation guidance, had to be changed into a recommendation too, because we require this for the definition of this Recommendation 39. So the new Recommendation 40, next slide please, would read as follows: ICANN org should create a set of second-level LGRs that serve as a template and minimum requirement for gTLD registry operators managing an ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set. These LGRs should include the diacritized versions of the ASCII letters from the list of eligible characters determined in Final Recommendation 1.2 as blocked variants of the corresponding ASCII letters, and additionally include the impact of this

change on other variant sets. These LGRs should be developed using the reference LGRs as starting points. As with any second-level reference LGR, gTLD registry operators may adapt this to their needs by adjusting the repertoire, adding more variant relationships, or changing the disposition of variant relationships to support their targeted user community. These optional changes will still need to be reviewed based on the applicable processes already in place, or as updated by ICANN org.

So what we are stating here is that all the diacritics which we defined in Recommendation 1, so all the characters which are allowed at the top level to create an ASCII/Latin gTLD set, exactly those diacritics should also be included in the set at the second level, so that we have consistency between second level and top level. To start with, those variant relationships are blocked by default. This already ensures the same entity requirements which we have imposed on this set. But of course, the registries are free, as with other LGRs too, to change this disposition value. So if the user base for that TLD usually uses those diacritics interchangeably, then the registry is allowed to change these blocked variants into allocatable variants. And of course, they are allowed to add additional variant relationships. So we have excluded some of those characters at the top level because they are not clearly diacritics, but people might still use them in a similar way, like the ligature of A and E or O and E. Those have been excluded, but we don't prescribe this exclusion also at the second level. So if registries want to make a variant of æ and A and E, even though it's not part of this LGR created by ICANN, registries are free to do that. And of course, they may drop some characters if they say, "Well, for the language we target,

some of the diacritic letters are not used at all, and we don't want them at the second level." They are also free to drop those from the repertoire, and that's totally fine, too. Yeah. This is a suggestion. Any questions, comments? Amadeu, please.

AMADEU ABRIL: It's me.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes.

AMADEU ABRIL: Can you hear me? Okay. First of all, apologies because when I was trying to raise my hand, I kicked myself off the call. So I joined it, and I missed part of the information. So one thing you solved for me, one of the questions is, well, by default it's blocked, but indeed, the text says the registry has the right to change the disposition, which means make them allocatable. Correct? As well among other things.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes.

AMADEU ABRIL: Okay. I have another question regarding this one, the number 40, which in general I understand, but I think you reference somehow the reference to the characters to the top-level LGR. But indeed, there are some characters at the second-level Latin script LGR that are not at the

top level. I guess that the registry can also include those characters that are present in the second level for use at the second level of the TLD, correct?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, that's correct. It's not stating which characters to be included in the LGR. It's just stating which characters should be variants of each other, and those are the diacritics from the top level.

AMADEU ABRIL: Okay. Then for 40, I'm perfectly okay, and I think that it's clear now to understand what we're trying to do. Back to 39, I still have a problem of personal confusion. Even if I understand what you're saying and why you are saying it, I think that the use of variant as a term is a bit confusing, probably, to anybody who's not a full-time specialist in IDNs and ICANN, because probably people will tend to understand variant as they are defined in each script LGR. But here in number three, I think that we mean variants as variant relationships defined by the registry. But if I read that without taking that into account, I don't understand that. You understand what I mean?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah.

AMADEU ABRIL: The use of variant here is as a registry has defined that for this concrete purpose. It's not the general definition that is. It's not just referring to

the double S and the SZ in the Latin script. It's referring to, for instance, A and A acute, if the registry has defined it as variant. But if I read that from, let's say, a less specialist position and say, "Oh, variants? Let me check what ICANN says is a variant," then 39 becomes a little bit difficult to understand.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah. I understand your concern. The thing is we write that they are variants as determined by the respective second-level LGRs for those TLDs, and then we write the requirements for those LGRs are given in Recommendation 40. So this should hopefully make it clear that Recommendation 40 defines those variant relationships, and those include the diacritics, and this 39.3 references those variants defined by Recommendation 40. Does that help?

AMADEU ABRIL: Well, it helps, yes. Recommendation 40 helps. If I only read 39, I still would say, because second-level LGR, I would say be more precise, that registry-defined it, because it's not the ICANN-published second-level LGR which exists and has a limited number of what's defined as variant, which is double S and Z. And some others are blocked, yeah?

MICHAEL BAULAND: I understand your concern, but part of Recommendation 39 explicitly states that the LGRs are defined in Recommendation 40. So it's not just me saying it. Recommendation 39 states explicitly, look at

Recommendation 40 for the definition of the LGRs which are to be used here.

AMADEU ABRIL: Once both are read, I understand it, and I think that people will be able to understand. So if it's just me, let's forget it.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks. Any other comments, thoughts? I see Tapani has an example where two ccTLD registrations have same A and MX records. That's okay, and is also possible in our case if the registry wants to do this. We don't prescribe this, but it's not excluded by our recommendation. And I see Mark's comment that he understands Amadeu's point, but thinks the text is okay. Not perfect, but good enough, and I see two thumbs up. So if you have suggestions how the text can be better or more perfect, please say so. Always happy to get input, but we have been spending quite a few hours in the background trying to find a text that will work. Doesn't mean it's perfect, and as I said, if you have suggestions for improvement, we are happy to listen to those. I see a few more thumbs up, and Anil says text is okay, so I guess okay. Great. Thanks for the feedback and the agreement.

Then we can continue to the next slide, which is Recommendation X. And we added new language at the end of this recommendation. I first read the start, which is still the same as it used to be. The string similarity evaluation panel should not permit any ASCII and its corresponding Latin diacritic gTLDs to proceed independently through separate applications. Such gTLDs may only proceed and be delegated

as an ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set by a single entity. Potential applications where an ASCII or Latin diacritic gTLDs correspond to their existing gTLD can still be applied for by the same entity as an ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set per Final Recommendation 3. Now is the new part which has been mentioned last week. This is the exemption process for existing. The new part reads, "For the avoidance of doubt, the pre-existing independent gTLDs that are managed by different gTLD registry operators are excluded from this requirement. No new application shall be permitted for those existing gTLDs that continue to be operated under different entities."

So this is very similar to the way variants at the second level are handled by the IDN EPDP if they already existed before the IDN EPDP became effective, that those registrations can continue to coexist as long as their owner wants them to be. There's no force to remove one of them or to combine them under a single entity. And we suggest the following here. If such TLDs were to exist, it's unlikely, but it could happen, then these can continue to exist, but none of the TLDs can add a Latin diacritic TLD set to theirs because it would be impossible to decide which of the existing TLDs is entitled to get the set and which doesn't. Yeah. Saewon found a typo. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Right. So, this is Sarmad. Thank you. Though it is implied, I'm just wondering whether it's clear enough that in that last sentence, I think what is suggested there is that once that conflict is resolved, then an applicant can proceed and apply for additional LD TLDs. As I said, that's how it was also in the IDN EPDP for the second level. Just if this

language is fine, I think we may want to explain that in the rationale more clearly. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah, definitely. Good point. This should be part of the rationale. The exemption process exists as long as the requirements for the exemption is given, which means at least two TLDs exist which are managed by different registry operators, and the exemption stops if only one TLD exists or if all of the TLDs belong to the same registry operator, then that registry operator is allowed to combine them into an ASCII/LD TLD set and is then also able to add more TLDs to that set. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Interesting case which you just pointed out. I think you said that, for example, if there's a gTLD and then there's a diacritic gTLD which preexists with different operators, and then one of that gTLD is transferred to an existing operator. So now we have a case where the two TLDs exist with the same operator, but they exist as two different TLDs. And you said that then would they continue to exist as two different TLDs or will such a, I guess, fusion of the two gTLDs into a diacritic set be required? And then there's this third bit that if somebody wants to do it, convert, for example, two independent gTLDs into an LD TLD, that cannot automatically happen, right? There needs to be some recommendation which allows to do that.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, exactly. I don't think there should be a force because the exemption process is still okay and the users are possibly used to using them separately, but if they want to do that, then they are allowed to do, but I don't know if we have to define this, whether this needs to be in an application round or whether it's possible to do that via a change request to ICANN. I don't know if it's up to us to decide or whether that's a technicality. Maybe someone from ICANN staff can answer that. But yeah, we can see how this works. We can discuss this in the leadership team. But generally, the rule is that we have this exemption process and those TLDs are not forced into a set. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. Thank you. So not talking about that case where they have to be forced into a set. I think that's perfectly, of course, they exist independently. They can continue to exist independently. But in the case where if the registry operator wants to combine them, I think if there is an explicit, I guess, recommendation or guidance, that makes it easier. But, of course, there can be other processes which already exist, which can be used to combine, irrespective of, I guess, recommendation or implementation guidance. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. We will discuss this with the team and decide whether it makes sense to have an implementation guidance for the case, how this exemption is dissolved into a set, so to say. Okay. Anil says, "I think this case is technically possible. We just have to refer this use case in our recommendation." Thanks, Anil. So apart from the question how this

exemption ends, we will follow up with that. Any other comments, thoughts, questions? Agreement, disagreement with this recommendation? I see agreement from Amadeu. Thanks. And Louis. Great. And a heart. I take that as an agreement, too. Thanks. Okay, then I guess we are fine with this to be Recommendation 6.

Then up to the next open public comment cases. Next slide, please. Here we have Recommendation 48, which we have already slightly updated with the wording, changing in accordance to consistent with. It currently reads, "Consistent with Final Recommendation 11 of the EPDP IDNs Phase 2 Final Report, in the event a domain name is ordered to be transferred as a result of a Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, UDRP, administrative proceeding, the transfer process must include all of the domain names that constitute the ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set, if any, together." The exempted domain names pursuant to Preliminary Recommendation 42 are excluded from this requirement. We already agreed to this. Next slide. We have some more comments here. The first one is from ICANN org. It reads that, "Request for the phrase 'all of the domain names that constitute the ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set' in the output language to be revised." Problem is the current language needs further clarify that only the allocated domain names are to be included in the transfer process. So suggestion is here to change it to, "All allocated domain names from the ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set." Going back to the previous slide. So we stated here that all of the domain names of the set, and ICANN org suggests to only the allocated domain names, because the set in principle could be larger and there could be TLDs in the set which are not allocated, and

those of course do not need to be transferred. Any thoughts about this?
Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: I'm sorry. I was a little slow when I read this initially. I don't think we need "together" on that first sentence. I think it's sufficient to say the ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set, if any, and just stop there.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah. Thanks.

BILL JOURIS: Picky little comment from the native speaker of English.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. But since we try to keep the wording of the IDN EPDP, if possible, we decided to also keep this "together," even if it sounds a bit strange to a native speaker. If we remove this, people might think that there's a difference between our recommendation and the IDN EPDP recommendation, and they might wonder what this difference is. So for that reason, we have discussed this previously, that we will stay with the wording from the IDN EPDP even if it's not optimal, unless there's a real error in there or a real problem, then we change it. But if it's just nice to have, so to say, we stay with that wording.

BILL JOURIS:

I would be willing to bet a substantial sum of money that the number of people who will read this and read the other one and notice the difference is probably in single digits and possibly closer to zero than to 10.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Might be, but we had this discussion and the working group decided in majority that we want to stay with the wording, and that's why we will keep the wording here from the IDN EPDP. And we're not revisiting all those recommendations which we have already agreed to. We are just looking at the public comments and see whether they are reasonable and we want to implement them, or whether we say it's unreasonable and for what reason we don't want to do this. So we don't open up all the arguments we had before. So this should stay "together," even if it's not perfect wording here.

So back to the question from ICANN org. They say instead of writing here all of the domains that constitute the diacritic domain set, they said just the allocated domain names from that set. Any thoughts? Should we change this? Do you disagree to change it? Okay. No opinion so far, so I can then voice my opinion. I think we should change it because when TLDs are transferred, of course, only allocated ones, the ones that exist. Non-allocated domains are reserved labels, not really domains. I don't see the point, but not against it either. Mark seems okay, too. So yeah, if it avoids confusion, we change it to allocated and, okay, great.

Then the other comment regarding this PR 48 is from IPC. They state, "Request for additional outputs that speak to calculating UDRP and URS filing fees as it relates to disputed domain names within the ASCII gTLD set." Problem is cases where UDRP or URS covers more than one domain name in the set could potentially significantly increase the cost burden on brand owners. They should be considered as a single domain for purpose of calculating the UDRP and URS filing fees. Working group action is the consideration of this comment. However, we think that such fee policy is subject to ICANN org's discretion and not part of this PDP's output. We don't define any UDRP filing fees here, and I personally don't think this is something we should go into. I see agreement from Anil. He says fee is not part of this PDP, and some thumbs up. So yeah, we will not change this and just respond that it's out of scope to define fees for independent processes, even if they are somehow related to our policies here. Thanks.

Then to the next section. This is for IG 52, PR 53, and IG 54. I quickly read the language we have agreed to so far. Implementation Guidance 52. Consistent with Implementation Guidance 15 of the EPDP IDNs Phase 2 Final Report, in order to allow a requestor to discover the allocated domain names of an ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set, corresponding sponsoring registrars should accept requests for disclosure of this information, and unless there are data privacy concerns, the information should be granted. In considering whether to disclose the information, the corresponding sponsoring registrars should balance the interest of the requestor with those of the data subject where such balancing is required by applicable law.

And next slide, please. For the 53 and 54, we have the current wording. 53, consistent with Final Recommendation 16 of the EPDP IDNs Phase 2 Final Report, if two or more delegated gTLDs belong to an ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set, the root zone database on IANA.org must denote in a transparent manner their relationship. And 54, consistent with Implementation Guidance 17 from EPDP IDNs Phase 2 Final Report, gTLD registry operators should publish policies in a transparent manner that reflect their implementation of the LD PDP recommendations at the second level. In particular, such policies should reflect the implementation of Final Recommendations 39, 40, 42 through 44, 51, and Implementation Guidance 41. Next slide, please.

So what comments are still open regarding these recommendations and IGs? There's a recommendation from, or a comment from, ALAC. It requests for faithful implementation and long-term review. They state ALAC emphasizes the importance of faithful implementation aligned with the LD PDP's stated intent and the outcomes of the EPDP IDNs, and also encourages openness to future reassessment should evidence emerge that consumer trust, confidence, or meaningful choice are adversely affected. LD PDP's actions, acknowledgement, and awareness of the comment received. So, Anil, please go ahead.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you, Michael. Here, I think the request is quite good and has good intention. But here we need a definition of long-term review. Long-term review means what? How much? Five years, 10 years, 15 years, or it is based on certain events which happened also. I think that is required. Otherwise, we should acknowledge the good intent of ALAC. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Anil. I agree that it's a sensible request, but I think the recommendations we have and the implementation guidance are sufficient in the way we state this, and just that in the implementation, ICANN or whoever does this has to take care that this is done faithfully. Any questions, comments regarding this? Seeing none, then we can continue to the next public comment.

This is from IPC. They have a non-substantive comment, support with wording change. They request IG 52 to be discarded. That's kind of a strong wording change. The problem is this implementation guidance may be redundant or moot. The allocation recommendations already suggest that all allocated domains in a particular set should have the same underlying registrant data. So if we could go back to 52, please. There we are. Thanks. So their concern is that they say we don't need this because we already require that the registrant data is the same for all domains. But I think there's a misunderstanding here because this implementation guidance is not requiring same registrant data. It's requiring that the set of domains is made available, so that if a registrar, for example, or some registrant asks the registrar, "I have this domain name. Could you please tell me which other domains are in this set?" In that case, the registrar should accept this request for disclosure of this information, and unless there are data privacy concerns, they should inform this person about the other domains. So this is basically just asking to make available which domains are existing, are allocated in a set. It's not requesting that those share the same registrant data. And for that reason, I think that this is a misunderstanding on the IPC's part, and we should keep this Implementation Guidance 52. Any thoughts

about this or questions? I see Anil agrees to no change. Right. And one thumb up. So I think we agreed that this IG 52 is needed because the public has a possibility to determine which domains are in the set. This is also similar to the IDN EPDP, where it's also possible to obtain the allocated domains in a variant set.

Okay, then we can continue to the next comment, which is also some wording change from Nitin Walia and Alan Barrett. And the request here is, request for ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set, ASCII/Latin diacritic domain set, source domain name, corresponding domain name. We should cross-reference those and explain the distinction more clearly and possible with examples. So I think it's a good suggestion, and we will, in the background, check whether there are any inconsistencies in the usages and if they are explained enough or whether we might add them to a glossary, if not yet there, and make it easier to understand what those mean. Thanks, Sarmad, for joining, and sorry to lose you already now. Okay. So any comments here regarding this recommendation? Or not recommendation, public comment? I think it makes sense that we check this and be sure that it's easy to understand and it's not contradictorily used. Louis agrees, and I see some thumbs up. Thanks.

Then we continue to the next slide, please. This is about some IDN EPDP outputs, which we, as a working group, determined to be not applicable for our case. And ICANN org is asking here whether they really are not applicable or whether we maybe overlooked something. And this starts with the IDN EPDP Recommendation 5.5, which we have not copied, so to say. It says, with respect to the Limited Public Interest Objection, Legal Rights Objection, and Community Objection, the possible

outcomes are as follows. If an objection against an applied-for primary gTLD string prevails, then the entire application is ineligible to proceed to the next stage of the application process. And there follow some more examples what objections could cause. And the problem here is no corresponding policy output in the LD PDP related to objections and the resulting outcome. Objection is not the same as evaluation, so it's important to clarify the effect of an objection outcome on applied-for ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD strings. The request here is a working group to consider to create a policy output that specifically talks about objection outcomes. Basically, if an objection for the ASCII string prevails, what happens? If the objection for an LD string prevails, what happens? We took a look at those, and our proposal is to adapt the PR 6, IG 7 language that deals with the evaluation outcome scenarios to more explicitly cover objections rather than creating a whole new recommendation. So we have already wording that clearly states if evaluation fails, what happens with the set? What can continue? How this can continue? And it seems to make sense to have the same behavior if there is an objection that takes place. So next slide, please.

So we suggest to add on the Implementation Guidance 7, which reads now, with respect to the withdrawal of an applied-for gTLD string per Preliminary Recommendation 6, it can be divided into one of the following scenarios. We have the one where a single ASCII gTLD string and multiple Latin diacritic gTLD strings, or if the application contains a single ASCII gTLD string and a single Latin diacritic gTLD string. And we suggest to add to these possibilities the following statement: with respect to the Limited Public Interest Objection, Legal Rights Objection, String Confusion Objection, and Community Objection, any possible

outcomes that prevent an applied-for gTLD string from continuing shall proceed in accordance with the withdrawal provisions that impact the set outlined in the points above. So this would cover all the objection processes and just state that the same behavior as in withdrawal or evaluation failures should occur. Any thoughts about this? Tapani says it looks good. And Anil also says the additional language makes sense. Some thumbs up. So, yeah. Okay. Thanks. Then we will continue with this change.

Next slide, please. And then we have the recommendations from the IDN EPDP 8.2 and 8.3, which read: in order to encourage a positive and predictable registrant experience, ICANN org must, during implementation, create a framework for developing non-binding guidelines for the management of gTLDs and their variant labels at the top level by registries and registrars. And three, the framework should outline the scope and the steps involved in developing future non-binding guidelines, which at a minimum should involve relevant stakeholders such as registries, registrars, and where feasible, registrants who have experience with IDNs and variant labels. The problem here again is that there is no corresponding policy output to provide guidance on working with relevant stakeholders with the experience in LD PDP, which may benefit the LD PDP. And the request is working group to consider developing policy outputs that address a joint effort process and/or developing guidelines involving relevant stakeholders with experience in ASCII/Latin diacritic sets. Our suggestion is to follow this comment by ICANN, and we propose the following new recommendation to cover that comment. Recommendation 30, generally consistent with Final Recommendation

8.2 and Implementation Guidance 8.3 of the IDN EPDP Phase 1 Final Report. ICANN org must, during implementation, create a framework for developing non-binding guidelines to encourage a positive and predictable registrant experience. This may require a joint effort with relevant stakeholders who have experience with ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD sets and variant gTLDs where practical. Any thoughts, comments? Agree with this new recommendation to cover ICANN's comment? Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

Yeah. I'm rather enthusiastic actually about requiring some non-binding guidelines or any kind of guidelines to help make clear what it is we're attempting to accomplish here. So yeah, go for it.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. I see a thumbs up from Claude and Louis. Anybody not agreeing, please raise your hand or say something or write something, but I see several more thumbs up, so it seems that we are good to go with this. Thanks. And with that, I think we have finished all public comments, and I can hand over to Saewon for the final part of this session. Saewon, please.

SAEWON LEE:

Michael. Yeah. Congratulations, everyone. Well done. All the public comments have been now reviewed. Just one thing to note related to other comments. There were many other comments, but they were not necessarily categorized under a certain section or a recommendation,

and that's why we didn't actually have to go through them all now because we actually went through them as we looked through each recommendation. And also, the only other comments that we looked at now are the ones that were outstanding. So I don't want you to think that we were disregarding any other comments. It was more that we went through all of those subjects and topics as we went through the recommendation itself.

With that, if you see here, so the table of contents for the final report pretty much mirrors what was out for initial report. So nothing to highlight here other than the two red boxes, as you can see in the table of contents. So the first one where we have our recommendations is Section 4, and then if you go down to the next red box in Annex B, this is a new section that's added for the final report, which is the consensus designation, which will be the result of the consensus call that the working group members will be conducting soon. So, with that, again, no change in the topics. I think as of now we have 56 recommendations. I will have to go back to the sheet and map out everything again, but with the plus/minus recommendations, I think we are now concluding with 56. So this is going to be the final report proposal. Before I go onto the next steps, Michael, do you want to add anything or are there any questions?

MICHAEL BAULAND:

No, not from me. From group, any questions, comments?

SAEWON LEE:

Bill?

BILL JOURIS: On the previous slide, just total curiosity question. What is the meaning of the different colors surrounding the various numbers? I realize this is utterly trivial, but I looked at it and went, "I think there's a meaning there," but I have no clue what it might be.

SAEWON LEE: No meaning, just design. I will note it for next time to not confuse people with colors that don't mean anything. But no meaning.

BILL JOURIS: Okay. Thank you.

SAEWON LEE: Any more questions? Okay. Okay, so into consensus call process. We added this for the last part of our meeting because though this was introduced at the kickoff, if you all remember last March, it was introduced then, but I think I also noted that this will be presented to you as a reminder at the end, and so this is what it is.

So if you see in this slide, this is the consensus call process. So now that we have actually concluded all the deliberations, the leadership team and staff will go back, finalize the policy language, and then circulate that with the working group for review and finalization, and then the consensus designation for each recommendation will be shared by the leadership team, and this is what you see in the first column on the left. And the consensus designation level will actually be introduced in the

next slide, but it's also in the charter, if you remember. So please do go back to the charter if you would like to get more details on it. And then the leadership team will initiate the consensus call through, as I mentioned, which will be through the working group's mailing list. And then the members can indicate through the mailing list whether they accept this proposal or do not accept the proposed designation, and this will be out for a 10-day period. And then if no objections are raised, the consensus designation is considered accepted by the Latin Diacritics PDP working group.

And if any are raised, sorry, I was getting distracted because John shared the charter. Thank you, John. The objections or any recommendations that actually did not gain full consensus will need to submit the minority statements, which will be kept on record and documented in the final report. And you can also see this in the slide, though the minority statements will have the names linked, the full consensus or consensus designations will not have the members' names linked explicitly. And final point to make here in this slide is that if you see in the middle, the third column at the end, no response during the 10-day period will also be taken as non-objection.

And with that, I'll take all the questions after. If you see in this slide, this is the consensus designation level that was introduced in the beginning at kickoff, as well as in the charter that John has just put in the chat for you. And the standard practice and the levels are guided through the working group guidelines. With this, any questions? And obviously, Michael, if you have anything to add here, please do. Yes, please, Bill.

BILL JOURIS: Yeah. So are we going to include in the final report items that have strong support or divergence, or are we just going to leave those out of the final report? I'm just not clear on the process here.

SAEWON LEE: So first of all, again, just to go back, when the leadership team proposes a consensus level, hopefully with all the work and the deliberations that's been done until now, I'm guessing it will be that we have gone through a certain consensus level. And then when the leadership team proposes such a level, the working group members, again, can accept or reject. And let's say it's not a consensus because there's a significant opposition, then obviously we have to receive the minority statement. And obviously if we reach that, the leadership team will have to go back and assess whether the leadership team agrees or disagrees. And if they agree, obviously they will republish the consensus level, and we will have to see how to consider that and maybe come back to it. But until now, as I understand it, the levels that actually go through to Council are above consensus level, and I hope this answers the question that you're asking. Obviously, I can't say where we will be at before the leadership team proposes the consensus level, but basically, I think we will have to check in step by step and see where the level is at with the working group to maybe reassess or reconvene. But at this point, I don't think I can say much more than it's usually the consensus and the full consensus that gets through to the Council.

BILL JOURIS: Okay, thank you for the clarification.

SAEWON LEE: Any more? Michael, would you like to add anything?

MICHAEL BAULAND: No. Not at the moment. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE: Okay. I think also John added in the chat, but it would be greatly appreciated, though the consensus designation proposed by the leadership team will be done per recommendation, that the recommendations will be reviewed as a full package per topic and assessed through the needs per topic.

With that, I will go into the next steps. So if you see in this slide, again, congratulations to everyone. But obviously the deliberations are done, but the work is not done. We still have a lot of homework to do. And you can see in the July calendar on the left, the leadership team and staff will finalize the policy language from today for the next week, and this I mentioned before. And then the updated policy language will be circulated after for two weeks with the working group, and then the consensus call process will begin, hopefully on 27 July for 10 days. And then the report will be built in the background, and once the consensus call process is finalized and all the relevant materials are documented, we will hopefully finish the work by mid-August to once again circulate the report for the working group's review before submitting it to the Council for their review. So it pretty much is similar to the initial report process, except for the submission to the Council part. And then in

September here, Michael will be presenting to the Council our policy recommendations, and if any changes are necessary, these will be concluded by 9 October for Council's consideration on 21 October during their Council meeting, which will probably be in ICANN 87 Bali, I now realize, and that will be the end of the PDP working group's process. Any questions? Michael, it's a good thing that we are here. And obviously, again, we still have work to do, so we're not done, done. Any questions? Anything to add, Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: No. Thank you. Amadeu says beach barbecue on 21 October possibly.

SAEWON LEE: And Mark says, "At your home." Maybe Amadeu said...

MICHAEL BAULAND: No, in Bali. We're in Bali. Tapani wants to do the next PDP.

SAEWON LEE: Already. Well, I do want to say let's finish this first, and once this is done, and hopefully the working group is in full consensus and the Council adopts the recommendations, then hopefully we can start cooking up some new things for the future. Oh, wow. I didn't know. Thank you. Bali sounds wonderful, Juliana. Okay. Well, if there are no questions on the work plan or the consensus call process or anything else for the working group, maybe we can finish six minutes earlier today.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, everyone. Yeah. So this means this is the last meeting we have. Quite sad. I really enjoyed it.

SAEWON LEE: So maybe the six minutes can be used for anyone to say any last remarks or concluding remarks, but it seems like deliberation-wise, unless there's a very strong, significant opposition or divergence, for now, I think we are good.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Anil, please.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Thank you, Michael. Anil, for the record. On this occasion, when we are closing the PDP, I must say that the experience which we had interacting with all very knowledgeable, thoughtful members of this PDP was wonderful. A lot of learning personally to me by interacting with all the members. I hope that in future working group or maybe PDP, we may meet again to serve ICANN again. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Anil, for the kind word. And I can just, to be honest, it's the first time for me being chair of such a process, but it's been really a blast. I enjoyed it a lot working with you all, with ICANN staff, and it was always fun, even if there have been some discussions with some contradictory

opinions. I really love that because that's what keeps the process running, and if everybody just agrees, we don't really need the PDP. And, yeah, it was fun. But as Saewon said, it's not over yet. We will continue discussions and communications via the mailing list. It's just that you don't have to get up on Wednesdays so early anymore, and we can do that not in synchronous times.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Michael. I actually do want to add, as your support staff, and for the whole working group, I do want to especially thank Michael, Mark, and also Christian, and also Prudence here for the whole leadership team and their full guidance. We really could not have come this far without all your support and knowledge. So thank you all, and especially Michael, because I see your face. I do really thank you. I know it was very tough getting here, but, Michael, you really pulled us through the whole journey, so thank you so much. And it was my pleasure working with you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Saewon. Same here. Okay, before I start crying, I think we can give you back three minutes and enjoy the weather or whatever. Yeah, it's nice. And talk to you all on the mailing list and hope to see some of you in Bali in October. Thanks, and Devan, you can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]