
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is Devan Reed for the recording. Welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP call taking place on Wednesday, 22 April 2026. We do have apologies from Alan Barrett and Anil Jain. 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, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the Latin Script Diacritics Wikispace. 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:

Thank you and welcome, everybody, to our meeting number #32. Today on the agenda, more or less the same what we've been talking about the recent weeks, recap of last meeting and review of the public comments we received, but we'll do a small change here, which I will be talking later. And then Next Steps and AOB. Next slide, please. So, for the previous meeting, we had consensus on the new language for the PR6 and the newly introduced IG7.

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.

Next slide, please. And as action items, the usual ones, everybody to look through the public comments, be familiar with what has been asked. And there was a suggestion by Tapani in the IG8 that might be a bit easy to misunderstand. So, we introduced the word negative there to make the wording more clear. We'll show the update on the next slide. And then we ask you all to think through the meaning of conservatism and brainstorm potential ways on how to deal with that.

Next slide, please. So, for the IG8, basically, we've been discussing this quite a lot now, and we added a new item there, 8.6, and within there we added the sentence negative. So, the new wording reads like, "the negative evaluation outcome of an applied for ASCII gTLD string impacts the evaluation of any other Latin diacritic gTLD springs in the application by causing the dissolution of the set.

For the avoidance of doubt, if only multiple Latin diacritic gTLD springs remain in the application process, the applicant must select one Latin diacritic gTLD spring to proceed under the standard application process." So, this was about the fact that if the ASCII TLD fails evaluation, it's not possible to keep the set intact. And before that, we just said that the outcome of the evaluation, irrespective of whether it was accepted or not, would cause a dissolution of the set.

And that's of course not the case only in case the ASCII gTLD is not evaluated positively. And with that, I see Tapani is happy with the change. So, unless there's any other comment regarding IG8, I think we also have a wording now that the working group can work with. Waiting a few more seconds if there's any comment. Okay, seems like

we're good with IG8. See some thumbs up and confirmation on the chat. Thanks for that.

Next slide, please. So, with that, we come to the review of the public comments. And after we have had some discussions about what is a diacritic and what should be included in the scope, there's been quite a few discussions about that, but no real solution because there was some contradiction about what is conservative enough or not.

We decided to postpone the decision for that question and first go through the other preliminary recommendations we have and go through all the public comments related to them, and all the time, also try to have the conservatism principle at the back of our minds to look at the PRs, whether they are conservative enough or not.

And hopefully, once we are done with all of that, then the decision about the scope of the characters falls into place and we can finalize the discussion afterwards. So, with that, the leadership team, have prepared a very broad overview of how we think our recommendations compared to the IDN EPDP recommendations, whether they are similar, whether they are less conservative or more conservative.

Next slide, please. So, here's the overview regarding the different topics we have. As a caveat, this is not set in stone. This is just that we as a leadership looked at the RECs that exist in the IDN EPDP and the ones we have and tried to find the decision whether we are more conservative or less conservative than the IDN EPDP.

And in this table, you can see that on topic one Requirements for the Set at the Top-level, we are less conservative than the IDN EPDP, but I

think there's not really much we can do about this because even if we introduce just a single diacritic letter, it's already less conservative in the sense that we are extending the variant, not the variants, but we're extending the code points that are handled in a similar way to a variant. So, we are less conservative, but there's not much we can do about that, I think.

For the topic two, the Same Entity Principle, we are basically the same conservatism scale because we are requiring also same entity principles on all levels in the same way.

For topic three, Application Submission, Administrative Check, Initial Evaluation, we are even a bit more concerned, conservative because we do not offer any free TLDs. So, we say that even if you just want to add a single Latin diacritic TLD to your ASCII TLD, you have to pay for that. Whereas in the variant context, you can get up to four variants for free, making it much easier for applicants to get variants where our case, the financial restrictions make it more difficult and likely will cause not so many people to apply for that.

For the topic four, Contractual Requirements, we are basically on the same level again because we have more or less the same contractual requirements which are defined in our preliminary recommendations 15.2.28 in detail, but we try to follow all the decisions done by the IDN EPDP.

For topic five, Delegation and Removal, again, we are somewhat more conservative because we have a rule there that if a set gets dissolved, the original members of that set become blocked for 10 years. So,

those will not be able to be applied for to avoid user confusion with sets that used to be run in the same entity principle, that they now can't be run separately. So, in that sense, such a rule does not exist for the variants. We introduced that, and therefore a bit more conservative in that context.

For the topic six, Requirements for the Set at the Second-level, we are basically the same because we don't change any rules for the second-level.

For the Same entity at the second-level and the IDN table, this needs a bit more discussion, I guess. While we also require same entity and also require this IDN Table harmonization, there's this thing about diacritics at the second-level, where we have no policy, no recommendation that could possibly be considered to be a bit less conservative. We'll get back to that once we are covering those PRs.

And then finally, topic eight, Adjustments in the Registration Process Pertinent to the Domain Name Lifecycle, again, we don't have any changes here, therefore, we are on the same conservatism level. That's just a very rough overview. We are a bit less conservative, a bit more conservative depending on the recommendations you look at. But all in all, I think it looks quite okay. But we'll look at all the details when we go to the Regs and look at those.

Any questions or comments regarding this overview so far? Satish, please go ahead.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Michael. Satish for the record. Of course, this table is very interesting because we get to see how it compares in terms of how conservative we are. But my comment here would be what is the objective of this exercise? Because we are not able to come out with a single composite number or rank for overall conservativeness of our entire recommendations.

We can't say that topic one is more important than topic two. No such ranking exists. So, are we able to condense this table into a single number or grade so that then we can say, okay, we are more conservative than the PDP and IDNs? Or is that at all the objective? We're just looking at this point very innocently at this table, just so that we get an overall high-level picture of where we are. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. Good question. Of course, there is no absolute objective number we can put there to say, oh, we are 5% more conservative or we are 0.1 points more conservative. This is just a rough overview, and as you said in your second part, it's just so the group and everybody can see more like the general overview where we think we are. There's no hard requirement of how conservative we have to be.

This is all subjective and some people might think that this level of conservatism is enough, others might think that no, it's not enough, we might have to improve at some point. It's just so that everybody can see how we are generally doing. It's also very bird's eye view because we combine many recommendations into one section, and it might be

that in one of the recommendations, we are slightly less conservative and in others, we are a bit more.

So, this is not an exact science at all. It's just meant as an overview to get us kicked off in the discussion for the specific preliminary recommendations. And there we can at each level, look, is this okay, or is there maybe something we should change to be a bit more conservative because it makes sense and it's a good thing to do. I hope this answers. Yeah, thanks. Yeah, exactly like Saewon says, we have been looking quite closely at some of the recommendations, but we have never seen the whole picture a bit more broadly. We've done this to help the group to get an overview, and it's definitely not necessarily exact.

Okay, no more questions here. I think then we can go to the first recommendations we will look at today. Next slide, please. So, we have the preliminary recommendation seven, which will be moved to Rec. 8 because we introduced the IG7 recently. And that one reads, "Consistent with Final Recommendation 3.5 of the IDN EPDP Phase 1 Final Report, in addition to explaining the mission and purpose of the applied for ASCII gTLD string or existing gTLD, the applicant seeking one or more Latin diacritic gTLD labels will describe the justification of such need.

The justification given by the applicant shall at minimum provide the following information. 7.1, The meaning or intended meaning for non-dictionary words of each of the applied for ASCII gTLD string and or Latin diacritic gTLD labels including sources." I guess we will also change this to be a more consistent regarding strings and labels.

Then 7.2, Explanation of how the ASCII gTLD and Latin diacritic gTLD labels are considered the same.

7.3, The benefits and the user communities who will benefit from the introduction of the applied for ASCII gTLD string and or Latin diacritic gTLD labels. And 7.4, A description of the steps that the applicant will take to minimize the operational and management complexities of the corresponding ASCII gTLD and its Latin diacritic gTLD labels that impact registrars, resellers, and or registrants.

And just note that compared to the initial recommendations which we have published, we have introduced this 7.2, explanation of how the ASCII gTLD string and the Legend Diacritic gTLD labels are considered the same, because for some reason we have been missing that in our original recommendation 7, but it should have been there. That was a major change here. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

Yeah, Bill Jouris for the record. One thing strikes me is, do we want to give any kind of guidance, I guess is the word, for how much explanation is adequate? If somebody says, why are they the same on 7.2? And the answer is, because it's Tuesday. Something that's totally irrelevant would be probably too ridiculous to accept.

At some point, we're going to get to edge cases, I suppose is the phrase. And I'm wondering if we want to say something about how persuasive do those explanations and benefits and justifications and et cetera have to be, or are we just going to leave that wide open? Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks for the question. I think that's out of scope for us to make the exact definition, this will be part of the application process and there will be a panel that is going to decide that. And this is not part of our rules to define what is acceptable or not. And also, similar to the IDN, EPDP, they have the exact same questions, and I don't think there's any additional explanation, but I see Sarmad's hand, maybe he can also respond to that. Thanks.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. Just to add a bit more on this. This is Sarmad. So, in the IDN EPDP Phase I requirements, there is some text which talks about that these are evaluated at a general level of reasonableness. I think that was the text which was proposed and that sets a criteria, I guess, for this working group in this context this is obviously a slightly different context.

So, that's something to discuss, whether the same level of criteria is sufficient, which was there for an allocatable variant or for, in this case, maybe the group wants to set something more conservative. But there is some language in the IDN EPDP recommendation. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks for that. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS: Yeah, you mentioned a panel to evaluate that. Are we contemplating a new panel or one of the existing panels or a group from the Org? Just curious as to where we're going with this. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I think that's out of scope how ICANN wants to evaluate applications and how they are technically doing this, this is not our concern here. There are so many questions in the application process, and those questions have to be answered by the applicants and ICANN somehow has to evaluate those answers. They can do that in-house, they can give that to other parties, contract them. And this could be panels. This could be individual things.

I think personally, it's not our decision how this is done. So, this is basically what's also there in the IDN EPDP. We wanted to be consistent. We copied the requirements, and we thought or Sarmad asked the question whether we want to have the same level of reasonableness for the answers or whether we want to require something different. Any thoughts there? I have just seen Ariel's comment that the next IG exactly talks about the panel.

So, I take my comment back that indeed in the IG8, we say that with respect to the evaluation of the information submitted per preliminary recommendation 7, in accordance with implementation guidance 3.6 from the IDN EPDP 8.1, the evaluation panel must include evaluators with the Latin script expertise. The evaluation panel should apply criteria based on a general standard of reasonableness, and the criteria must be established during implementation.

So, that's basically what Sarmad said about the reasonableness, and we also say that it's not our job to define the standard of reasonableness, but that should be done during the implementation. The only thing that we basically changed here is that we require the evaluators to have Latin script expertise because, of course, all our cases are only related to Latin script and no other scripts. Satish, do you think this is sufficient? Let's see a thumbs up. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yeah. So, I think just 8.1, though it's an implementation guidance, it may still be useful to make it slightly more broad, because sometimes it's useful, for example, to also look at related scripts when looking at latent script, especially in the context of diacritics. So I'm just thinking, I guess it's on the spot, but whether it's useful to also say something like Latin and related scripts or we want to just limit it to Latin here. I'm thinking about Greek and some of these other scripts which have diacritics and reasonable similarity across the script.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. Any thoughts about that? No thoughts. So it's an interesting point from my view, but I think the main requirement is really that they are familiar with the Latin script, and since this is asking for the Latin labels and how they are considered and their meaning, so certainly some other script knowledge won't hurt but I guess Latin script is the ultimate requirement. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, and I would also maybe reiterate my earlier comment which is related to 8.2, that this sets it at the same level as the allocatable variance, whether the standard of reasonableness is at the right level or is it something which could be made more conservative. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Any thoughts, comments about that request for 8.2, where we say the evaluation panel should apply criteria based on a general standard of reasonableness, then the criteria must be established during implementation? Are you okay with that, or do you think we should require a different standard of reasonableness or need to change anything there, or it's okay?

So, it seems that the general standard of reasonableness is still a good approach here and set the exact criteria that will be established during implementation. And it's always possible to adjust that slightly should that be necessary. Okay, I think we can go back to the PR7 slide. And then the next slide is the public comment, and I'll hand over to Saewon for that.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Michael. Actually, you kind of covered everything. This is Saewon Lee from Staff for the record. You actually kind of covered everything for PR7, just in the sense that there are no new comments to actually review for the team. It's all related to what we discussed with Preliminary Recommendation 1. One thing I do want to highlight, obviously, is if you see in the bottom during ICANN85, we had a bit of a discussion related to, again, other points related to the, I think, forgot

the number now, but here 7.2, explaining how the labels are considered the same or the strings are considered the same.

And when discussing this point on whether we should be adding this or not, to be consistent with the PDP IDNs, there was a comment that we were to generally minimize the number of variants to be delegated, and that the objective or the justification should be clearly explained. And so, again, because we do have the four requirements, and now we have the agreement on keeping certain language within those requirements, I think, unless we want a bit more conservative approach here, it was pretty much covered with you, Michael.

I do want to highlight in the next page, though, if you see in 7.4, again, this was kind of where we wanted to make sure that the working group was okay with this language, or if this was tight enough, conservative enough, or if there was any other way that we could maybe improve the language to, let's say, not incorporate but respond to ICANN Org's comments on conservatism. But Michael, unless you want to take it back again, I think, are we good to move on?

MICHAEL BAULAND:

I think unless there are any remaining comments. But as you show here, the 7.4 has highlighted the request that the applicant has to describe the steps they will take to minimize the operational management complexity. This also while not explicitly setting a maximum number of elements in the set, it still restricts this quite well because if they were to activate 100 ASCII TLDs, then they most likely

would have problems arguing how this would minimize the operational and management complexity.

So, this is basically similar to the variance where it's also in theory possible to have an unlimited amount of variance, but the requirements here to argue by keeping them the same, we also have the same restrictions there. So, seeing no more comments, I think we can continue to the next slide. That looks at two recommendations. You could move on.

Next slide. Thanks. This is about Preliminary Recommendation 12 and 13. What we have so far is as follows Preliminary Recommendation 12 says, "Consistent with Final Recommendation 3.10 of the IDN EPDP Phase 1 Final Report, the fee structure associated with future applications that include the ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD label set and ASCII gTLDs and or Latin Diacritic gTLD labeled applications from gTLD registry operators of existing gTLDs, must be consistent with the principle of cost recovery reflected in the 2026 Round AGB and affirmed by the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures."

So here, we are saying that unlike the variant where you can get up to four variants for free, we are more conservative and say that every TLD you apply for you have to pay, but since the general principle of the application process is that it should be on a cost recovery base, we also require to check whether there is a possibility to give some discount if some checks don't need to be done due to the fact that those TLDs are similar.

Before I go to Bill, I'm just reading the Preliminary Recommendation 13, which says, "Consistent with Final Recommendation 3.13 of the EPDP-IDN Phase 1 Final Report and Preliminary Recommendation 12, a future gTLD register operator applying only for the corresponding ASCII gTLD or Latin Diacritic gTLDs of their existing gTLD must incur an application fee consistent with the principle of cost recovery reflected in the AGB. ICANN Org will decide the discount based on what it considers to be proportionate to any costs associated with evaluating the application and consistent with the cost recovery principle."

So, this again is similar in the variant case, even if you have an existing TLD and want to add variants, you can get them for free. In our case, we say that in all of those cases, every single TLD has to be paid for, but there may or may not be some reduction if ICANN Org finds out that some steps aren't necessary and could be left out, and that's it. Then we will take a look at the public comments regarding this, but first, I'm going to Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS:

Yeah, this is Bill Jouris. On recommendation 12, I'm not entirely clear why if variants you can get up to four for free, the same language should not apply here.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah, good question. The thing is, the variants are special case. They are manifested in the LGR and ICANN wants to encourage the communities to use more IDNs and use variants, and that's why the IDN

EPDP decided to help the community in establishing those variants and using their local languages and therefore making this free.

The goal of our PDP is not to encourage people to get more Latin diacritic TLDs or to make it easier for them. Our PDP has a sole goal of creating an exception process that TLDs which the applicant wants to have and would be willing to pay separately that they at the moment with current rules most likely cannot be applied for because the policies prohibit this. So, the only thing we want to change here is to make it possible for those applicants to have their TLD. Not to make it easier for them or to give them any preference. This is not the goal of the PDP. So, that's why we have a different decision here to make different words from the IDN EPDP.

BILL JOURIS:

It seems to me that the goal of encouraging native languages, et cetera, et cetera, is met exactly by this. Why we're doing it is so that people who have a ASCII gTLD, because that's all that was available, can also get one with the diacritics which fits their native language. It seems to me that's an exact match, and I just don't see the other argument. Sorry.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah, we had this discussion a year ago when we made those recommendations, and our PDP's goal is not to create any incentives here. This is not what we try to make a policy here. That would be a different policy or whatever. Our sole policy is that create an exception process for applicants who want to run both TLDs, and they would be

willing to pay to run those two TLDs or more separately as independent TLDs.

They would be willing to pay the full application cost, that they would be willing to pay the full running cost. It's just with the current rules, it's not possible for them to run them, to get them. They would be rejected because they are confusingly similar. So, we are asked, and that's the only thing we have been asked for, to make an exception process to allow these TLDs to coexist to and not to make it easier here.

There are many different things that could make life easier for local languages, but for this, ICANN even have some support program, ASP, the Applicant Support Program where applicants, if they think they're doing something for a community and are not well funded, they can use that. This is not what we are discussing here.

BILL JOURIS:

Okay, I understand that. But at that point, why have this recommendation in there at all?

MICHAEL BAULAND:

This recommendation just says that possibly they don't have to pay the full cost because the AGB says the cost for applications should be on a cost recovery basis. And if you apply for a string together with another string, there might be some checks that are not necessary. And therefore, there might be the possibility to lower the cost based on the current rules for the AGP to be on a cost recovery basis. That's why we have the recommendations here.

But we can also get rid of them, of course, if you have any new information that changes these. But otherwise, we have discussed those in detail, and I expect that not everybody was happy with this, but the majority decided that this was the way to go forward, and we're not reopening the whole basic discussion here.

The reason we are listing those here is not for the group to start discussing this again, but to look at the public comments that we have received and see how we respond to that. With that, I hand over to Saewon to inform us about the public comments.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Michael. Once again, actually, there are no new comments to actually highlight again, for Preliminary Recommendations 12 and 13, which was again in relation to PR 1 that we are reviewing this first. The comments are the same, so I'm not going to go into them all again. It's just again to make sure that these recommendations are sufficiently conservative, and if there is anything that we could add or revise, that's why we are seeing this again.

But obviously for this one, I do want to note, and this is just for the record, Kyionna Blaylock also submitted a comment under a different category which was just supporting the recommendation intent with a wording change but as in previous recommendations because there's no suggestions or rationale, there's nothing to really go over, I'm just mentioning it for the record. But nothing more to add.

Again, obviously, just based on the public comment review principle, we are not trying to reopen everything that we discussed before. But I just

hope that if there is anything that we could add to, let's say, adhere to the conservative principle, we want to open this up for discussion. But for that, I am going to hand it back over to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Saewon. And I just read Tapani's comment that Bill's point is why we don't want to encourage. I mean, personally, I may want to encourage gTLDs, but the scope of this PDP is very, very narrow. It's not about encouraging or making it easier, but creating one single exception to make it possible.

And regarding the conservatism question with the two recommendations, unless anybody wants to change anything in those Regs to make them more conservative, because this is what has been asked here by ICANN. I think we can live with them as they are. So, any suggestions, comments, whether you want to make them more conservative, and if so, how? I see two hands. Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG:

Yeah, I've been thinking about this issue of conservatism a bit, not specifically on these recommendations. I don't know what else is going to be coming up, but it's a completely separate idea and suggestion. So, I see a couple of hands already, so I'll get back to the end of the queue or before I bring it up. But just to talk about that.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay, thanks. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, I just wanted to not add anything to this, but I just wanted to reiterate what the leadership team actually summarized, that this is, in a way, an argument towards that the solution being proposed is more conservative than the variants. So, this is one of the arguments which would be used to present this as a more conservative solution. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks for that. Saewon, you had your hand up. Do you want to?

SAEWON LEE: No, it wasn't for this, and I put it down because if the discussions are going to be active here, I don't want to intrude in anything, but I realized maybe I want to introduce another recommendation so that we can kind of discuss it all together. But if there are going to be active discussions on this, obviously I want to not cut that off.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. Edmon, is this now the right time to get back here?

EDMON CHUNG: It could be. So, I'll just lay it out anyway. It's almost not directly related to any of the current recommendations. But thinking of the conservatives principle and the very robust comment from staff team, it brings me to the concept of conservatism in the IETF context and in the

sense that you try to be liberal of what you receive and more conservative from when you send out. In that sense, that brings me to the idea of the name collision side of things.

My guess, again maybe Sarmad can enlighten us some more, my guess is that there is a fundamental concern that there are uncertainties with things here because we're creating an exception and there could be uncertainties that a certain dangerous or risky situation might occur. If we have a recommendation whereby a similar mechanism of the high-risk domains that the NCAP stuff and the names collision stuff envisioned, a similar mechanism to add to what we do, that might solve part of the issue.

Because if the uncertainty is at the crux of this concern, then we can create a mechanism whereby, once it's applied, we accept those applications, and if there is a high-risk situation that's identified, then the applicant might need to provide additional information and additional mitigation and so on. I don't know, I'm just thinking that this might be a way to increase the conservativeness in the entire process.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Okay. I don't know if Sarmad would like to respond to that.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yeah, sure. So, certainly I think I would agree with Edmund that I guess there is a little bit of unknown here that we are developing a process which will allow potentially two strings to go into the root zone, which are otherwise through regular process not allowed to go to weather

into the root zone because they would create user confusion, and it's actually agreed by policy that that shouldn't happen and this is creating an exception to that.

And therefore, the suggestion and request to consider conservatism so that we do it in a way that it is a smaller step in the beginning. We learn from that process, and then once we know that it is okay to go in that direction, then obviously one can become slightly more liberal because I guess the general rule which we follow is that it is better to have... in the root zone, if you're delegating something and then you have to take it out, obviously, that's not the right solution. It's better to do it one step at a time.

So, I think that's sort of where we are what we are suggesting the working group to consider. So, yes, there is this consideration of I guess we're going into unfamiliar territory here. So, I guess I just wanted to agree with what Edmon was saying. Of course, it's not a name collision, it's a technically a slightly different issue. In this case, it's user confusion. But the overall, I think, thinking is the same. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks, Sarmad. I see Mark. Please, go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you. So, yeah, I have been considering these points these past few weeks, and I understand and agree with the need to avoid user confusion. My question is whether by enforcing that the strings resolve together since the TLDs will resolve together. Don't we by the nature of

this project already solve that problem of confusion at its core? Because even if the user is confused, there's no way for that confusion to be enacted or taken to any consequence.

Even if they experience some confusion, that does not meaningfully affect their experience or that doesn't change what type of user behavior or what type of security behavior they would carry out. So, my question is more in the sense of at what level are we trying to address user confusion? Under what scope? Because if we understand that, it's much easier to avoid than it is to assume a general user confusion. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Yeah, so again, I think I'll add a little more detail as an example, but just to sort of reiterate that we are going into sort of slightly uncertain territory, because this is, of course, something happening at gTLD level and not really done before. Similar to what obviously, variants are also at the top level, of course, being introduced at the same level, and there was a similar argument there as well. But just to share maybe an example on how this uncertainty can come about.

Sure, I think as Mark's saying we are in some ways I guess using the rules or policy which was developed for the variants by administratively tying these strings, technically, of course, they're still distinct, but administratively because you have to have the same applicant at the

top level and at second level variants, at least you have to have the same registrant. So, administratively, these are tied up.

But these strings introduce something which is another variable, for example, which variants actually don't do, and that is that variant definition is consistent across all gTLDs. So, if there are two characters which are variant, they will be variant for all strings whoever applies for it. But in this particular case, in some ways, the equivalence is user-defined or applicant-defined.

And that creates a level of inconsistency because one applicant can say a character with a particular diacritic should be equivalent in their string, should be equivalent to the other string. Whereas, the same character in another gTLD maybe independently delegated from its ASCII version and so on, and there can be other configurations of this inconsistency as well.

So, we know that some of these strings will create user confusion. On top of it, these strings across different TLDs will be defining in equivalence based on applicant requests and not generally across the board like variants. So, that is an example of how we're going into an unknown space. On how this will then play out on end user confusion, we don't know yet. And that's why I guess we are saying let's take a look at it conservatively. Thank you.

SAEWON LEE:

Michael, you're muted.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yeah, I'm muted. Thanks. Good point. Thanks for that, Sarmad. It gives a bit more about the background of why ICANN is asking for these conservative principles to be as strict as possible, while still allowing the PDP to go forward and not block it completely. Some of these problems are a bit theoretical, some maybe a bit more practical, but yeah, definitely good to know a bit about background why. Coming back to these two recommendations, which are all about the pricing in the application process.

So, question is here, do you think we need to change something in here on the pricing to make the whole policies more conservative or do you think the rules we have in place now already take care of that? I see some of the case here. And I think even Sarmad said a while ago that he thinks that these Recommendations 12 and 13 are already quite conservative, especially compared to the IDN EPDP where variants to some extent are handed off for free.

We did not copy those policies, even though we try to be in line with the variants as much as possible. We said that here we want to be more conservative and say, no, this is an exception process of making this possible and not encouraging this. So, unless there are any further comments, I think we can take a look at the next recommendation. We have 10 more minutes, maybe quickly start with that.

It's PR 29, which at the moment reads, "Generally consistent with Final Recommendation 8.1 from the IDN EPDP Phase 1 Final Report, no ceiling value for the number of latent diacritic gTLD labels that constitute an ASCII/Latin diacritic gTLD set is necessary as economic, operational, and other factors that may impact the decision to apply for

multiple Latin diacritic TLD labels will keep the number of delegated top-level Latin diacritic labels conservative. For LD PDP, there will be no restrictions on the number of diacritical marks applied to a single character nor the type of TLD, e.g. real words identified in dictionary, geographic names, and brands.”

So, any comments here? Do you think with the background we had recently, anybody thinks we should change this? Maybe indeed put a ceiling value to the number of TLDs here? Or are you fine with the way we have this now? Tapani says, “This look good to me, no ceiling necessary.” Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you. So, this is obviously a recommendation where some conservatism, again, can be brought into play. Of course, up to the working group to discuss and decide it, but I guess this could be looked also in tandem with other recommendation which talks about reasonableness for each variant and see whether that combination creates sufficient conservatism or if there is more which can be done.

Also, I guess I want to bring our just discussion we were having just now on that since this is an area we're going in without prior experience. Is there a mechanism which could be looked at where we could do a limited exception, and then based on that experience, open it up further maybe in a staged way, rather than, I guess, allowing more delegations from the start. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Sarmad. I see in the chat that several people are saying it looks good and no ceiling is the right way forward. The question is whether we could maybe have a ceiling that in practice has almost no influence like something like five or even ten TLDs because it's very high highly unlikely that someone would want to pay for and activate so many TLDs that in practice it wouldn't make any difference but in the policy, it would bring a bit more conservative in there, and thereby maybe make ICANN Org cater to them a bit more. Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Edmon here. So, I'm not entirely against some arbitrary number, but we know it's kind of arbitrary. But expanding on my suggestion earlier, if we do have a mechanism whereby high-risk situations can be flagged and additional costs and mitigation can be done, what we can add here could be, let's say, after the first three, anything that goes beyond will automatically trigger the high-risk requirement and special mitigation. Then that would also introduce further conservativeness into this area.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay, thanks. And seeing that we have a bit more than five minutes left, I think we can take those comments, think about them and continue the discussion next week since we also have some administrative info to provide to you. And with that, I hand it over to Saewon. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Michael. Yes, I didn't want to stop the discussion, but I think we have some language to propose after the comments to take back, and obviously we will present it the next time we meet. So, the reason that we asked for these five minutes is just to, as you can see in this slide, next week, we don't have a meeting. Next week, there's a CPH summit. So, we will not be meeting next Wednesday. It's already been cancelled and removed from your calendars, but I just wanted to make sure that everyone was aware of that.

And then, I know I don't have it in this slide, but another update I wanted to make because there were some questions last week is that the LD PDP working session at ICANN86 in Sevilla will actually be on Tuesday, 9th of June at 14:45 local time. So, in case those members that need to get their flights booked and prepared, please do have this in your calendars as well.

One thing just related to the working group session at ICANN86. So, typically, we or working groups are usually given a U-shaped table room. I see Michael smiling, which is making me smile because he's aware of this, obviously. We have been actually given a classroom setting, and I know for some of you, this will be very unusual. It is for us as well, but this is what we have been given. And apparently, though it will kind of be weird with the head table and then the rest classroom setting, you'll all be given nice and comfy chairs with desks and you'll all be able to see one another to have an active discussion. So, I hope this won't upset anyone.

Next, just to highlight or briefly touch upon the work plan that's already been shared before, we just wanted to kind of share that I know our

discussions are taking longer with the public comment review, but we're not really falling behind, though we're supposed to finish the public comment review by the end of May. If you can see in this slide, you can see that we can continue our deliberations until ICANN86 as well as July, just because the public comment review period can extend until or can kind of in parallel work with the building of the final report and deliberating any contentious topics. So, I just wanted to reassure everyone that that may be thinking that we are running behind that we are still on schedule.

And then, just to kind of share the public comment review work plan. Again, I know today we were hoping to finish until the review of, well, as you can see, we wanted to kind of go until Preliminary Recommendation 50, and I know this isn't in order, but these were the recommendations that we wanted to review.

I know we haven't gone there yet, but the ones that we didn't see today, it will fall into 6th of May and then those topics that may get pushed back, it will continue beyond 27th of May which is still within our timeline, so I hope everyone's reassured, and hopefully the review of public comments will go quicker as we resolve some of these conservative issues that we need to resolve. Any questions, because I'm seeing that we have one minute left. If not, I'm going to hand it back over to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Thanks for the update. And anybody who is travelling to Manchester next week, please come and see me. I'll be there and would love to

speak to you in person. With that, we can end the recording Devan and meet in this context in two weeks' time. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]