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, 13 May 2026. We do have apologies from Tapani Tarvainen, Christian Dawson, and Alan Barrett.

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 statement 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 over to our chair, Michael Bauland. Please begin.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Devan. For administration topics, I also received an excuse from Prudence Malinki. She said that she unfortunately cannot join today because she has two or three other things at the same time. She is a busy person. Welcome, everybody, to our meeting. The agenda is the same as in the last weeks. We are looking at the public comments. Next slide, please. Next slide. As a key outcome, we reviewed and considered

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.

the PR23 public comment submissions and agreed to remain with the policy intent and language. Next slide, please.

Coming to the action items. Before I start with those, I have one administrative question for the group. We used to start at the top of the hour, or for the Indian people at half past. We moved that 15 minutes later because ICANN staff had a meeting directly until the top of the hour and there was no time to switch this. For the next two meetings in May, this is not the case, so we could start at the top of the hour at 13:00 UTC. Would that be possible for all, or is somebody saying that it is not possible? Please, if you are uncomfortable with that or it is not working for you, raise your hand or write something in the chat.

I see a few greeners. That would give us twice 15 minutes more, which hopefully helps us get through the public comments a bit faster. Bill is not too happy with the time. Sorry for that. But if it is only you and you are just preferring and not vetoing it, then maybe we can get this additional 30 minutes for the project. Please think about this. You can also mention it at the end of the meeting if there is a problem. If I do not hear any objections, we will start the next two meetings, which are the remaining ones before the ICANN meeting, at 13:00 UTC.

For the action items, we asked Alan Barrett to seek the board's input and provide guidance on the existing policy language. Alan is unfortunately not able to join this call, but he sent an email to the list just a short while ago, and we will look at the results in the following slides. Then there was a question to provide some more examples and some more information about the high-risk scenarios so that the group has better input and background information to take a decision here.

We will take a look at those in the slides after the board input results. Of course, everybody is asked to continue reviewing the public comments to prepare for the meetings. Next slide, please.

With this, we are back at PR18 and PR19, which are the fees for the operation of the TLDs. PR18 says that the fixed fee for gTLD registry operator that operates a delegated gTLD labels that are part of an ASCII and Latin gTLD set must be the same as a fixed fee for a single gTLD. REC19 says that the registry-level transaction fee must be based on the cumulative number of domain name registrations of the combined TLDs. With that, we checked back with Alan and he provided some input on what the board thinks about this. They have a divided opinion. There are a few who said that the recommendations are well enough aligned with the IDN EPDP recommendations, and therefore it should not be a problem.

However, there were also some objections saying that they are unsure of the financial impact of doing this. One even explicitly said that this would not be possible because the IDN EPDP recommendation was an exception which should not set a precedent. If we are using this and taking the same road, we are choosing this as a precedent. For us, this now means basically what do we do? Options are to retain the recommendations as they are, discard the PRs to say we do not make any pricing recommendations here, or any other idea you might have. Our objection is just to make this exception process possible, but we should not define the pricing for these recommendations. That would be more conservative. I already see Bill's hand. Please, Bill.

BILL JOURIS: I sent out an email reply, but just to repeat, I do not think we are treating this as a precedent. I think we are merely noting what was done and saying that we think this is a good idea rather than trying to reinvent the wheel. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. While I understand that this might be an okay way forward, I am hesitant to call this not a precedent. If there is one decision and the decision was that we just do it this one time but this should not be a rule, it is just like with children when they have to go to bed and you say they may stay up 15 minutes longer just once. The next day they come up with, "Yeah, but we can do it again," and then this somehow does make a precedent. I do not say that this is the wrong decision, just that I personally tend to disagree with the precedent comment. Anil, please.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Thank you, Michael. Anil for the record. I also personally feel that we must retain PR18 and PR19. As Bill has said, I support it. I also do not like the word precedent which has been used by input from the board which we have received. This will help to promote adoption of the TLDs to be used much more in the future also. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. While I agree that this would help the adoption of this exception, it is not our mandate to make this easier or help with the adoption. We just should make this possible in the first place. I see your opinion to keep that, and Bill is with you there. Any other opinions? So

far we just heard two in favor of solution one, keeping this. To Bill's question, we originally took this decision to be as much aligned with the LD PDP as possible to not take a different route here. The reason why we are revisiting this is because ICANN has asked us to be a bit more conservative and also the ICANN board might have a problem with this. But seeing that the ICANN board is also not clear on this decision, it is hard to say whether they actually have a problem or not. That was just background information on why we are rediscussing this. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish, for the record. I think while the board is not sure about what they want regarding the use of the term precedent, I agree with Bill and Anil that that is a kind of stretch. We can call it something else, maybe for consistency with the IDN PDP. The word precedent has baggage, meaning there is a perception from different sources about what precedent really means. There is a negative kind of a thing, so maybe we can simplify that.

My question is actually about the financial impact. Nobody seems to know the financial impact, and at least the feedback that we get from the board is that we have to examine the financial impact. What are the possibilities that by not charging we are going to have a lot of money flowing out? Is it possible for us to estimate what is going to be the financial impact? If it is trivial, then I do not think we should change anything at all. But if it is substantial, although I do not know whether we have a proper estimation tool for that, it is worth finding out so that we can take an informed decision on this. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. Interesting thought. I do not know about the financial impact or if someone from the ICANN Org team is able to say anything about that. If so, please raise your hand. I will go to Amadeu first.

AMADEU ABRIL: Okay, just a couple of things. The first one is that indeed we should avoid the term precedent or giving the idea that it is simply because it is a precedent. I think the basis for all these fees is cost, and this is something we should remark. Probably many people here are of the opinion that, for instance, for the ICANN evaluation fee, it probably could and therefore should be lower, and probably the annual registry fee should be the same. Having said that, I think that no matter what we say, it is only a vague recommendation because as far as I understand it, pricing is not policy in that sense. We are not supposed to set pricing for these kinds of services.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. I think this is what ICANN meant when they said this IDN PDP should not be a precedent in the way that they are defining the pricing, because that is usually ICANN's role and not the PDP's role. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Michael. This is Steve from staff. I am just providing some input on the pricing aspect, and I think Ariel might follow up with it too. I just wanted to note the ambiguity of the impact. Essentially it is still

unknown. That was part of the rationale for the boards only adopting the IDN recommendations with a caveat about the unknown impact of pricing. As Amadeu just said, this is typically not something that policy development establishes recommendations about. The unknown aspect is precisely why the recommendations were only adopted with a caveat. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks for the background information. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: I would point out we are not writing a recommendation to the board about what to do. We are writing something for the GNSO Council, which can then write whatever recommendation to the board they wish. I am not sure I am quite as twitchy about this as some of the people from the Org seem to be. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks, Bill. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, everybody. I wholeheartedly agree with what Steve mentioned. The ambiguity of the effect of this implementation is the precise reason why the board had the caveat for adopting the IDN PDP recommendation. Hopefully, we will have a better idea about this since the round has already opened. By the end of August, we will have some

general idea how many variant strings are being applied for, so maybe that will give us a little better picture.

But then again, for this set of recommendations from the LD PDP, there are some differences as well. Regarding the financial analysis portion, I also agree with what others mentioned. This is more for ICANN Org to do later on when the set of recommendations are adopted by the GNSO Council and move on for board deliberation. Then ICANN Org will come into place to provide analysis on financial impact and implementation effort impacts to assist the board deliberation. I think, in general, this is not a task for the working group to conduct. Hopefully, that helps a little.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. As far as I can see, the working group's majority is in favor of retaining PR18 and PR19. We will go with this and see what the board will say about that. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Michael. It is obviously the working group's prerogative to recommend whatever it wishes, but I will just stress that at the Council level, there is a push for board-ready recommendations. When the working group is aware that there may be concerns at the board level, they should be concerns that are taken into due account. I just want to remind you of the implications. If there is board resistance to adopting the recommendations, it sets up a rather lengthy process and it stops everything.

I take note of Bill's comment that this is not going to be able to be integrated into the next round, but it is not only time; it also creates work and effort throughout the process. So, I guess just a reminder. I think you might be parsing words with precedent versus some other description, to be quite honest. As I said, this is obviously the community's decision, but I am really stressing that the impact of non-adopted recommendations at the board level is pretty substantial. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Thanks for the caveat and the background information on that. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish, for the record. I think Steve's point is a fair point. It is something that we need to consider because we do not want our recommendations to cause a lot of additional processes while it gets implemented. I was wondering if there is anything we can do to state that this is not a kind of uncontained risk. The kind of numbers we are talking about or the financial impact is, in my own thoughts, less than the case of the EPDP because the actual number of domains which are impacted by our policy is likely to be lower, maybe even much lower. We do not know what is going to happen in the future, so it is actually bounded by the size of the possible number of domains. It is not an unbounded, uncontained kind of open-ended situation. I understand we are dealing with uncertainty and the board does not like uncertainty here, so if you can define or propose some logic to mitigate that

concern, I think we are better off. But I would still say we should continue with these two recommendations. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. I am not sure how we could do what you propose. It is interesting, but I do not know if there are such procedures or how this could be done. But I see a clear vote of the group to retain PR18 and PR19. We will continue with these and let us get to the next topic. Next slide, please.

This is about PR29, where we state that we do not want a ceiling value for the number of Latin diacritic gTLD labels. We think it is not necessary as economic, operational, and other factors will keep the number of delegated top-level Latin diacritic labels conservative. For the EPDP, there will be no restriction on the number of diacritical marks applied to a single character nor the type of TLDs. Next slide, please.

For this, Edmon suggested to possibly introduce a high-risk scenario with wording similar to this one: each Latin diacritic gTLD string included in an ASCII Latin diacritic gTLD set shall be assessed on whether a high-risk scenario may arise. Where the set exceeds a threshold of some number of Latin diacritic gTLD strings, a high-risk scenario evaluation shall be automatically triggered during the application process. This evaluation will initiate a structured step-by-step review process to account for unforeseen or unknown conditions and to implement heightened risk mitigation measures. We talked about this last week, and you asked for a bit more background information, so we will present some further information about this. Next slide, please.

The big question here is: do the current set of recommendations address all high-risk concerns while adhering to the conservatism principle? If so, the additional language may not even be necessary. Next slide, please.

Let's take a quick look at this overview of our conservatism scale, which we already looked at a few weeks ago. Just very briefly, you can see that there are some recommendations where we are on the same conservatism scale as the IDN PDP because we essentially do the exact same thing. There is the requirements for the set at the top level, which is less conservative, but that is basically unavoidable because we are creating an exception process here which allows some domains to coexist which, under standard LGR variant rules, would not be possible. By definition of our PDP, we need to be less conservative here, otherwise we would not do anything.

Then there are a few topics where we are more conservative. Regarding application submission, we have no free applied for TLDs there, whereas the variants have up to four free TLDs. We are also more conservative with regards to delegation and removal, where we have special safeguards in place that will prohibit standalone domains which have been part of a set to be allocated within 10 years. Then there are some recommendations in topic seven where it is on a per-case basis. We might be a bit more conservative in one case and a bit less conservative in others. Next slide, please.

Regarding high-risk scenarios, general cases are operational challenges in managing multiple gTLDs as a set, possible registrar confusion, registrant confusion, and possible end-user confusion. All of these cases

will occur regardless of how many LD gTLDs are delegated, although some might be more prominent, like operational challenges. Those will likely increase with the number of TLDs. The proliferation increases risk and requires close monitoring since they are not easy to manage. This underscores the importance of the conservatism principle. Next slide, please.

For the scenarios that may lead to high risk, we have the registry operator challenges. Technical failure or cyber attack could bring down all those TLDs simultaneously. However, our PR7 requires the applicant to answer questions about how they will operate this set and implement safeguards. This should address such potential risks. Regarding registrar challenges, inconsistent rules provided by the same registry operator may be confusing, and registrars may face a lack of technical support for IDNs. Again, the same entity management as well as the PR7 requirements should address such potential risks. Finally, for registrant challenges, registrants may assume that if they own an ASCII domain, they automatically own a diacritic domain, which is not a given at the second level. Similar characters make it easy for users to fall victim to phishing attacks. Again, the same entity requirements together with PR7 should address such potential risks that may impact registrants.

Now we will come to two examples which you were asking about last week. Next slide, please. Example one: let's say we have two TLDs, .cafe and .cafe with a diacritic, which are applied for as an LD set and are later run as an LD set requiring the same entity. Then TLD .cafe with the 'a' replaced by an umlaut is applied as a separate label. The 'a' and 'ä' are non-variants, and the SSE panel does not find the former LD set

confusing with the umlaut version as an assumption. All TLDs are therefore allocated and delegated. In this case, the registrants and end users may be confused and the inconsistency can be exploited. The question here is would this potentially lead to a high-risk scenario?

Oh, by the way, have you seen those nice rabbits on the top left corner who really like the story time? Thank you, Saewon, for lightening up this topic with them. They are German? Oh, I did not know. But why do they speak English then? Anyway, I see a hand up. Anil, I would like to go through the examples first and then we will take the question and comments at the end. But please, keep your hand up if you like.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Thank you, Michael. Anil for the record. I personally feel that the statements here are conflicting. In case-

MICHAEL BAULAND: Anil, sorry. I want to go through the examples first and take the comments at the end.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Sure, sure.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Next slide, please. We have a second example here. Let's say we have two TLDs, .coupe and .coupe with an 'e' diacritic which are part of an LD set and operated under the same entity principle. At the same

time, we have two different TLDs, .cafe and .cafe with a diacritic, which are run independently and separately by two registry operators, not as an LD set. Both TLDs use the same ASCII and diacritic letter in their label, one within an LD set and the other without. This would mean that domains like auto.coupe and auto.coupe with a diacritic are ensured to belong to the same registrant because of the same entity rule. But on the other hand, domains like auto.cafe and auto.cafe with a diacritic could belong to different entities because the TLDs are run completely independently. Users who are used to using auto coupe interchangeably might be confused that by going to auto cafe they are not seeing their usual auto cafe with a diacritic. This is another example where this could potentially lead to a high-risk scenario. Next slide, please.

Here we have PR7, which is taking care of several of the risks by requiring the applicant to answer some questions and describe how they will deal with these problems. We have four requirements which we copied from the IDN EPDP. I will quickly read them. One is the meaning for each of the applied-for ASCII gTLD strings or Latin diacritic gTLD strings. Two is an explanation of how the strings are considered the same. Three is the benefits and the user communities who will benefit. Four is a description of steps that the applicant will take to minimize operational management complexities.

Here is a suggestion now that we possibly could add a fifth requirement, which reads: a description of how each string promotes usability and how the applicant will account for and/or mitigate potential adverse impacts on end-user confusion arising from inconsistent use of relevant code points across different TLDs and LD TLDs. This is the background information and the suggested addition that could take away the

requirement of having a special high-risk scenario here. Any thoughts? I first go to Anil since he already had his hand up.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Thank you, Anil for the record. In the first high-risk scenario described, it is said that the string similarity evaluation passes the strings like .cafe and .cafe. But at the same time, it is written that the registrant and end user may be confused. I think if there is a likelihood of getting confused, the SSE panel may not approve it. I personally feel that if the SSE level has approved it, then this may not be high-risk. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. That is an interesting and good point that the SSE panel's job is to check whether there is a potential for confusion or high risk of confusion. If so, they should put those strings into a contention set and not allow all of them to go forward. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: I would point out that the case of cafe with the umlaut is no more at risk than it would be if the LD set was not there. I do not feel that this is any higher risk than already existed, so I do not see this particular scenario as any exceptional high risk. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. This is also a good point because if the cafe were not an LD set, but if one of the TLDs exists and the other did not, we would have a similar problem with potential confusability. Amadeu, please.

AMADEU ABRIL: Amadeu for the record. Going in the same direction but a bit farther, I do not see what this recommendation has to do with the problems described. Here we are asking the applicant for the Latin diacritic set to solve a problem with third-party registries unrelated to them. I do not know how this can happen. I believe that it is really very unlikely that this scenario should happen. Even more, I think we have a duty to consider a recommendation that if we allow the Latin diacritic set, we are opening a new situation. We do not currently have any pair treated as a single TLD or separate TLDs of IDN Latin IDNs with ASCII equivalents. In fact, there are only two IDN gTLDs which are basically unknown.

If we are opening this possibility, the risk of confusion will increase. We should state that the string evaluation should take into account that the real risk in the real user base would be higher. Therefore, as a principle, other diacritics of an existing TLD should not be allowed independently. Cafe with the dieresis should not exist as the use of another cafe, or the reverse. If we allow this, the risk of confusion here will be higher. Our basic rationale is to lower user confusion, not increase it.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. So your suggestion is that even though it is likely the SSE panel would mark those as confusingly similar, it should not be a choice of the panel, but it should be mandatory.

AMADEU ABRIL: As we are saying that this does not apply to the current round, I think that there should be a recommendation to take this into account in the next Applicant Guidebook.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. This scenario is certainly at least theoretically possible in the current scenario. If cafe and cafe were separate and everything was separate consistently, then there would not be a problem. The problem is that cafe and cafe with the accent are put together, but cafe with the umlaut is not. That starts creating arbitrary sets and pairings, which leads to inconsistency that can eventually cause end-user confusion. So yes, if everything was done the same way, then there is no issue. The issue is because of the inconsistency. At the end of the day, a lot of it depends on the SSE panel, but we cannot determine the outcome of the SSE panel. It is a manual outcome and eventually they could resolve it based on their own arguments. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Sarmad. But even though it is a manual decision, they are using data points. Those data points already suggest that this should not be possible. They say they are likely confusingly similar, so the panels would have to make a clear case to contradict those data points. Which they may do if they have reasons for that, but the standard procedure

would be to not allow this. If you want to respond to that, I could go to you again and then to Satish.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. There are certain guidelines and data used this time to make the system more predictable. But again, theoretically this is still possible. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. Understood and noted. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish, for the record. I tend to agree with the last two interventions. I feel that the conservatism should also extend to these sorts of cases. The real problem is that the end user is not a single monolithic group. End users in Europe may be used to diacritics, but end users in places like South Asia have never seen a diacritic before. If you are going to differentiate using an umlaut with an accented 'e', the chances are very limited that they will be able to do that fine distinction. We should avoid that possibility in the first place, and therefore I would call for being conservative here. This indeed is a high-risk case. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Great. Thanks. Any other comments, or are we just enjoying the story time? We now basically have two questions to resolve. The first one is whether we need to introduce a special high-risk scenario into our recommendations. Secondly, whether we want to have some additional

precaution, like on slide 18 where the applicants have to answer another evaluation question to avoid potential problems. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. I think 7.5 was an alternate suggestion to the high-risk recommendation. Basically, what it is suggesting is that while 7.4 is evaluating on manageability, 7.5 could have another check on the user confusion side of things. It is all put together in the same recommendation. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. While I understand that, I see a slight problem. This seems to be not just restricted to the TLDs the applicant applies for, but also refers to other TLDs that may already exist or may exist in the future. It might be difficult for applicants to have rules in place that would be across TLDs.

AMADEU ABRIL: Just to add on that, if I apply for cafe and cafe with the accent as the diacritic set and Sarmad applies for cafe with the umlaut, what can I say? There are two different applications and I have no control over what the other party will do. I can only answer how I will manage my two TLDs, but not the relation with a third-party independent TLD. I do not see the relationship between the risk and this concrete proposal. Sorry.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Amadeu. Then to Sarmad. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. When we are talking about user confusion for string similarity, we are always evaluating that in the context of existing TLDs. I am talking about the regular string similarity review where when somebody applies for a string, it has to be compared with other existing TLDs and block names. If there is visual similarity, the recommendation is that the string cannot proceed if it is with an existing TLD. If it is with another applied-for string in the same round, then they would get put into a contention set.

Such evaluations are always in the context of what other TLDs exist and what other applications are coming in. Also, in case there are two strings competing against each other, we obviously always follow the first-come, first-served principle. In that sense, there will obviously be impact of what the other strings are and what other existing TLDs are in a particular round. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I understand that. That is the SSE panel's work. I just do not see how a registry operator of an LD set could do anything to avoid user confusion because some other TLD might be confusing to their own, and the SSE panel did not think it is confusing so they allowed it. I am not sure what rules they could implement to avoid this when the rules only apply to themselves but not to the third TLD. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. I do not have a solution here to give. I think what is being suggested here is that we know there is a potential challenge because of the examples shared. We just need to make sure that there is an assessment done to make sure that all potential scenarios are considered and there is no additional risk associated. If there is a possibility that there is some risk and it can be mitigated, obviously that could be proposed.

That may not be the case in some cases, but maybe there could be other cases where that could be the case because we have brand gTLDs and community gTLDs and so on. It is hard to predict what a possible solution or mitigation could be. But I think what this is suggesting is that if an LD TLD is applied for, let's at least look at it and make sure that no such risk exists before moving forward. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. Understood. So your suggestion is to not specifically require any criteria to be applied here but leave that open to the implementation team to create criteria that would take care of any end-user confusion. Is that a correct understanding?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sorry to keep coming back online, but yes, that is a correct understanding. I think what this is suggesting is that anybody could apply for these strings and they would be able to go forward unless there is some issue identified which the panel considers significant enough that they would block an application. If they are going to do

that, they will have to come up with a reasonable explanation for doing it.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. So back to the group. What do you think about this addition? Is this a possibility to address the higher risks without the need to add another recommendation? On slide 11, there was the suggestion by Edmon that we have some new language which we either put into PR29 or IG8 to talk abstractly about high risk. Should we have both? Should we have none? Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. Just one comment here. I think that the way this language is suggested, this is more dependent on the number of strings rather than the string itself. The way the other one is structured, it is actually looking at each string, so the content of the string itself rather than the overall number. The two are different. Of course, that is up to the working group to see if this or that other one or neither of them work. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I agree. Those are two different approaches, but both have the goal to reduce risks and to be more conservative. This one is talking about the number of TLDs, which possibly may not be necessary because there are other measures that restrict this, like the application fee and/or the 7.4 which requires the applicant to describe how they can manage this operationally. The other is more about the specific

strings and whether they might be creating risks. Back to the group. This one, the other one, both, or none? Amadeu, please.

AMADEU ABRIL: I should repeat, frankly, I do not think this is the way to address that. This is not for the current round; it is already too late. For the next round, I think we should simply say we do not want that risk. There should not be independent TLDs that could be part of a Latin diacritic set under these rules, at least not until we have some experience with that. This is what happens today with singulars and plurals. We do not have a clear view, so we say for the time being, no thank you. I prefer this than having these sort of abstract high-risk scenarios where you know that there may be a problem but we have no idea what the solution is.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Understood. So your suggestion is to neither have this one nor the other one, but have a recommendation requiring the SSE panel to not allow any ASCII and diacritic TLDs to move independently, only allowing that as a Latin diacritic set. My other problem with the one on the number of TLDs is that this is like making a legal analogy saying, "Well, we allow divorce, but only 1,000 per year. If you are 1,001, bad luck. Come back in 10 years." I do not think this makes any sense. The problem is not the number of TLDs; the problem is the confusion that it may create for the user, regardless of whether it is the first or the fiftieth that is created.

Okay. Understood. Any other thoughts, agreements, or solutions? The story time is over, by the way. Now it's your turn. Or was the story taking you to sleep? We just have one opinion here which says do not do this high-risk scenario based on the numbers and do not do the 7.5 introduction, but have the requirement that diacritic TLDs and ASCII TLDs should not coexist independently and the string similarity check has to prohibit this.

AMADEU ABRIL: How do we solve these issues? Are we voting on all the pending issues one day, Michael? Because I think we have a long list now.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, we have to come to a decision here. That is why I am not forwarding to the next topic right now, but asking the group members to voice their opinion. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: There is one opinion, option one. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Option one. So you would like to have this suggestion by Edmon to be included under PR29?

BILL JOURIS: No, that is option two.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Sorry, what is option one then?

BILL JOURIS: It is the one you have listed as option one: no ceiling values.

MICHAEL BAULAND: On this slide, option one says to include this new language within or to follow PR29.

BILL JOURIS: Okay. Then I am just confused. Never mind.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Saewon Lee just put in the chat that option one is to use this high-risk scenario language. If we use that, we still have to decide where to put it, but that is a technicality. Option two is to use this 7.5. Option three is to have an additional recommendation suggested by Amadeu that the string similarity evaluation panel must make any ASCII and diacritic TLDs be confusingly similar so they may not coexist independently. Either three of those options are combinable. Option four is to use none of those and just continue with no changes here.

Bill says he does not see why we need an additional recommendation which puts a numeric limitation on the size of the LD set. This is also not what we are suggesting here. This option one is just saying that if the

number is higher than something, then there is an additional review taking place, but it is not prohibiting this. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Michael. Satish, for the record. I am not sure if I am helping at all in this, but I would prefer no coexisting, as Amadeu points out, of these two different categories. But except in the situation where there is some specification, either historic use or some other constraint because of which there is a real need. Of course, that has got to be established by whatever process we set. For me, the difficulty is that I am not able to visualize how this thing will work. This sentence says where the set exceeds a threshold of XX Latin diacritic strings. How does this really work for an arbitrary case? I would prefer that we do not easily allow the situation to happen that these coexist, and we should prevent it wherever possible. But I am just examining if there is any possibility of legitimate established use cases which get blocked because of our insistence that nothing should coexist. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Understood. Any other thoughts? Bill asks if we are not setting a value for XX here. If we were to go with option one to use this high-risk language by Edmon, then we are setting a value for the number of TLDs after which automatically a high-risk scenario evaluation should take place. It is not saying that the TLDs cannot continue or that there is an upper limit. It just says that if we have a certain number of TLDs within a set, this could potentially cause a high risk and there needs to be an additional evaluation. That is what option one is. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: Forgive me if I am being exceptionally mentally slow today. Are we talking about the threshold as, say, five members, or are we talking about 50 members? I think that matters for deciding where we go with this. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I think that would be the next question. If we want to have this high-risk scenario evaluation to take place, then the next question would be at what threshold this should automatically be triggered. But first of all, we need to know whether we want to have such a high-risk scenario recommendation or not. The same applies to 7.5 or the one suggested by Amadeu to make it in the future not possible for ASCII and diacritics to coexist because they have to be found in the string similarity and put in some contention set.

Either of these three are possible in their own right, in any combination, or we can say none of these are necessary and we just continue with the recommendations we had before. Just like Amadeu said, not all options are mutually exclusive. Since we just have a few more minutes left, I think we will summarize those three options without going into the details next week on a slide. Then we take a decision next week on that. You already know the samples and the background information. I hand it back to Saewon. Since I have not heard a full veto about the starting time, I think we will move the next two meetings 15 minutes earlier. Hopefully these 15 additional minutes will help us process and catch up a bit with our timetable. To Saewon, please.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Michael. That is actually all I had to say. If the working group agrees that next week and the week after, just for the two weeks in May, the time will be changed to 13:00 UTC sharp. Other than that, it is all the usual. Because we are not moving as fast as anticipated, this work plan will definitely be readjusted. Hopefully next week we will try to move faster with the other recommendations once these sticky topics have resolved. Back to you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Saewon. I am sorry again to Bill for making you wake up early, but hopefully that is possible. We really need you on the call, so if it is not possible, then say so. Otherwise, we will start at 13:00 UTC sharp. With that, I thank everybody for their contribution. Devan, you may stop the recording. See you all next week.

DEVAN REED: Thank you all for joining. Have a great rest of your week. Bye, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]