

---

## ICANN Transcription

### IDNS EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group

**Tuesday, 16 February 2021 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/mgJACQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and welcome to the IDNS EPDP charter drafting team taking place on Tuesday the 16th of February 2021 at 18:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please identify yourselves now?

Hearing no one, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription recording purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speak to avoid any background noise. Please note that the raise hand option has been adjusted to bottom toolbar for those that have updated your Zoom profiles. So I just wanted to let you know where it could be located. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to our chair, Dennis Tan. Please begin.

---

*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.*

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Terri, and welcome, everyone, to this week working group session. We'll go right to our agenda today, so we are going to discuss subsection F and G, then review our post-meeting homework and final time, a few minutes, for AOB.

Anything to add to the agenda today? Just want to ask quickly, see if there are any hands or suggestions. Okay, seeing none, let's get right to it. Let's change our focus to our charter draft document, and we'll start at section F. So this pertains to changes to, impacts or implications to the registry agreement itself and the registry services. And we'll start with the, I think, overarching question of—F1 pertains to the overarching question whether a variant TLD has a dedicated registry agreement or is it part of a single agreement with any other—within appendices or amendment or whatnot.

So I believe this is a gap question, so the SubPro did not discuss the details or how should a variant TLD can be applied to or how it is registered, recorded from a legal standpoint, whether it's one single registry agreement or separate sets of registry agreement with certain language that binds the two TLDs or more in the set together, or whether there is a different way to memorialize the relationship.

Okay, so you're making me hungry, so let's put a pause on the recipe exchange on the chat. Okay, so going back to the charter question, this is the overarching question. So the staff paper recommends separate registry agreements, and not only separate registry agreements but also separate application processes, evaluation and all other steps in the application process per se, but there's a question here that it's been added by Edmon and whether it makes sense to perhaps not have different distinct registry agreements but find a different way to memorialize the variant TLDs in a different way. So I think that's the gist of it. So the question perhaps is, you will find it at the bottom of F1.

So you will see there is from the original document some explanation, context, information that we will remove here. So that's highlighted, so that'll go away so that we can streamline the context

---

---

information. So right at the end, the F1, that's the actual question that could be proposed in this charter. And I'm going to read it to you. the question goes like, does the working group agree with each future variant TLD being subject to a separate registry agreement, or should each TLD along with variant TLD be subject to one registry agreement as one TLD? And the rationale for such definition clearly stated, and all the other implications as well. So that's the question. I see Jeff's hand. Please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Dennis. I think you've answered part of the question, which is to remove all that other text. So I think that's good. I certainly agree with that. But the first part of that is, well, in this whole section is kind of an overall comment. We seem to, for every one of these, state what the answer should be, followed by a question of, do you agree? And I'm not sure that a charter should be that kind of direct as to stating what the answer should be, because we start out each of these saying the staff paper recommends this, and then could go into more detail, and then it's like, do you agree?

That's just kind of a question that especially some of the ones further down, they really get to, "Here's what the answer is," and then a small question at the end is, "Do you agree?" I don't know about that. But we can talk about that as a group.

And then the second thing is, we should definitely separate out of F1 the question on fees and application procedures, because really, the gist of the question is on the registry agreement, and if we do want to ask the others about the application process, that should be something completely separate, and so should the fees question be completely separate. That's all I'll say for now. Thanks.

---

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Yeah, so the first item, the actual language of the question, yes, this is a legacy from the original draft document, and since then, we have our framework and principles, yes, these questions may need to change. So we'll go revisit that.

and I just want to capture and rephrase what you just said, and please keep me honest here. So what you said is to decouple these issues. One is how you memorialize from a legal standpoint the contract between the TLD and ICANN, right? and that pertains to the registry agreement. Decouple that from how fees and the application procedures are structured. So two different set of issues. One is the legal binding document and the other is the processes and fees associated with those. Did I capture that correctly?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Absolutely. The fees there, I'm not sure also whether you refer to an application fee or whether you're referring to like the annual fees. So that also needs to be kind of distinguished too. So yes, there are three separate issues: what's the application process, what are—and maybe in the application process, that considers the application fee. But then question two is, what are the fees in the main registry agreement or agreements, or however it's structured? And then, yeah, those two. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you for that, Jeff. I see now Maxim and then Sarmad.

MAXIM ALZOBA: As I understand, the suggested application guidebook, most probably, it will call the same as the last time, will have the answers about the application procedures and fees. And since it was subject to SubPro, whatever is decided there should stay there. And I don't think that this policy should interfere with the results of SubPro. And thus, the text in yellow doesn't seem to belong here, because it questions effectively what is going to be in the guidebook. And following this logic, we will see that if we do nothing, this policy will amend somehow the

---

guidebook, and it doesn't look good, because I'm not sure that the charter of this ... Yeah, anyway, I think it's the answers which should be in the end of the implementation of SubPro, not of this PDP. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. I have Sarmad and Edmon.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. So I think there is one more thing in this text the way it is, I guess, written, and that is whether the variant TLDs are going to be considered as one TLD. So that's, I think, a separate issue altogether from the registry agreement itself, whether two or three strings are considered a single TLD. So that may need to be fleshed out as a separate item as well. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Sarmad. Just for clarification, are you saying this is new that you found in this charter, or that's something discussed in the staff paper?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: No, in this text. The staff paper, I think, talks about each variant TLD as being a separate TLD, but here in the blue, green text here, it says—

DENNIS TAN: Okay, got you. Yeah, I see it. Thank you, Sarmad. Okay, I have Edmon, and then I think Maxim again. Edmon, please go ahead.

---

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. I think I agree with Jeff that we should separate out a few issues, and also Sarmad on the particular issue of one TLD. I'm not so sure about what Maxim says, because what Maxim says seems to say that—because Jeff said that—well, in some ways, Dennis, you said that there is a gap here with the SubPro, but Maxim says that there is no gap. I think there is a gap, and the future EPDP should address the issue. And also, what Sarmad said seems to agree with that there is a gap that we need to talk about as well.

In terms of Sarmad's further response, I'm a little worried that—I want to make sure that if we treat everything as separate TLD, then many of the previous discussions in A, B, D up to now might need to change as well. There are a number of things that talks about a variant TLD, and variant by definition means variant of a particular TLD. So if they're not a TLD, then we have a problem with the descriptions from the very beginning of this particular document. So I think we need to hear probably Sarmad further a little bit in terms of what he might have an issue with. If the issue is thinking about it as one TLD is a novelty at all, then we might have to go back to the beginning of this document and say, what are we talking about in terms of variant TLD? And it goes all the way back to think about what variant TLDs are anyway, because variant TLDs, by definition, imply that it is a variant of a particular TLD. So I think we need to be very careful here. And I very much agree with Jeff that we need to be very clear here and not predetermine what the answers might be.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. I have Maxim again.

MAXIM ALZOBA: This item was discussed in SubPro, and I don't think there should be a second bite on the apple if someone didn't like the outcome, because nothing changed since then. I'd say there were no huge changes leading to necessity of questioning the outcome of that work. And effectively, if for some reason variants are deemed to be one registry, then we will see the difference between the past registries who had to pay for many years different fees, and it's going

---

---

to be a huge material discrepancy. And I don't think that it will be voted for in the GNSO council for this reason. And also, it's such huge difference. If it's regarded to be the same entity, same TLD, we face a situation where we're talking about multiple separated from technical point of view, they're separated, and attempt to, I'd say, make the cost of each second and third and fourth variant zero, we also mean that if we're talking about same TLD, then they will have to die together. You cannot [inaudible] it as separated in one situation and as united in another situation. So it's quite a complex thing, and since it was already discussed, I'm not sure why it's here. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. I'm a little bit confused. You seem to be saying that SubPro discussed this issue, and we certainly don't want a second bite to the apple, as you said, but Jeff is, on the chat, I think, saying that the extent of the discussion within SubPro was about the same entity question, and the conclusion or the recommendation was that, yes, registry variant TLDs need to be allocated to the same entity, and that entity—the same entity as the registry operator, period.

He confirms on chat that there was no discussion as to how you or how ICANN would memorialize that relationship in paper, meaning, is it going to be two different, distinct registry agreements, or is it going to be one registry agreement with annexes or exhibits or what have you, or a different vehicle? And he also says that there was no conversation or discussion about application fees and other processes that might need to be built in terms of how you deal with these variant TLDs. So I'm a little bit confused. And I know Jeff is on the queue, so I will let him do the explanation himself as well. But before Jeff, I have Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Dennis. So just to clarify further from the staff report's perspective, the way, I guess, it was being looked at in the staff report was that each string, whether it's qualified as a variant of a TLD or otherwise, is entered into the root zone, dedicated

---

---

into the root zone. And technically, each of these strings are, of course, distinct. So each of the strings is a top-level domain from that perspective, and they're administratively tied together. So the same entity applying for those two different strings, even though they're separate from a technical perspective. So that was where the staff paper was coming from. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you for that clarification, Sarmad. Jeff, please go ahead, and I think we need to find a way forward on this one. I think there are issues to be asked here. Let's not delve into the details so that we can move forward. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Just to correct—we did discuss these, but we consciously decided not to come to conclusions on these because they involve the complex questions that you and Sarmad and everyone else have been talking about. So I think if at the end of the day, it is concluded that it's one, it would be one application, then yeah, a lot of things from SubPro apply. But that initial decision needs to be made first, and then we'll know whether SubPro covers it or not.

So yeah, I think everything else is pretty much said.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you for that clarification, Jeff. So I think with that clarification, this charter needs to ask a question how do you—I think it was suggested that there are at least two items that need to be discussed, how you memorialize the relationship—and when I say that, that means what's the legal document in which you establish that relationship, whether that's distinct registry agreements for each variant in the TLD set or one with many appendices, and second is the issues or topics about the application process and the fees associated with those, and not only the application fees but the variable fees and [cost fee structure,] I think that's perhaps bundled into the second category of issues.



---

Do we agree that we need to ask at least those two groups of questions? One is the legal document and the other how to treat the application process. Okay, so I have quite a queue here. Sarmad, and then Maxim.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Dennis. So I think what I was suggesting earlier was that the way a registry agreement is organized, whether it's single registry agreement with multiple appendices for each variant TLD or different registry agreements, I think that sort of discussion is different from the discussion on whether the TLD strings are going to be considered same or different. So one could of course consider these different TLD strings and still bind them together into a single registry agreement.

So I think that's a fundamentally different question than how to organize a registry agreement. I just wanted to point that out. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Sarmad. That's a helpful way to say it. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I will explain in short. First of all, it's going to be a huge change compared to what we see now in registries, potentially in IANA, and also, it will have consequences in right protection mechanisms, because if you consider that all those strings which are variants are just subsets of one TLD with one agreement, also, SubPro explained what is going to be, I'd say, in the next round, and the rules for the next round and standards, etc. And in situation where some TLD is delegated right now and somehow—and if the rule of the same entity is honored, then the entity which owns that registry contract will be the only entity eligible for application for all variants of that string, and in situation where it's going to be one agreement, effectively, they will have no application phase because they already have an agreement.

---

So we need to add that situations for if this is deemed to be a good idea, all technical, operational and legal consequences should be reviewed in advance of taking decision in the PDP phase, like situations where the TLD is an old TLD, or maybe worse, it's a really old TLD with separate contract, and yeah, situations where there is a new application or situations where there are two separate different TLDs in the past, etc.

So we need to add that all those combinations of outcomes should be reviewed. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Yeah, I think you just confirmed with this explanation of issues that a question or a set of questions need to be asked for the future working group to really [distill into the business] and look at all the use cases and implications to this fundamental question as to how you treat and memorialize the relationship between—or how you operationalize this entity rule, if that makes sense.

So Jeff, if you could quickly make your point so that we can move forward. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: I was just going to say, Maxim, definitely, if there are certain choices that are made during the actual PDP to treat these as the same application or whatever, that is going to have a lot of the questions Maxim is asking. And by application process, I just want to be clear that we're not necessarily talking about the same application process as in SubPro. In theory, a PDP could say that there's like a fast track IDN, a fast track variant application. There's lots of ways a PDP working group could go.

So I do agree that once that decision is made, the working group should then be aware that it's going to have to solve for a number of other variables. So yeah.

---

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you, Jeff. So we don't have to wordsmith the question here, but I think we captured the gist of the fundamental questions in how to—there are two groups that we need to focus right now, and then we could come back to the actual wording of those, but those are the two groups that we are going to capture for the policy question as far as how to—the legal vehicle to register this same entity, relationship between registry TLDs and the other one is the application fees and structures and the process itself.

Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just a short note that RPMs is not a policy, so they need to be mentioned separately.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Just going through the chat to see if there's anything here. So let's keep moving. So that was a long F1 discussion, but it's meaningful because that's the overarching question and how that question has snowball effects into the other parts of the ICANN policies as far as registry TLDs and how do you implement the same entity rule in every single aspect of the consensus policies and procedures.

So F2, for example, the actual question here is one of the registry transition process, how it works in order to implement the same entity rule or to enforce the same entity rule for that matter. And yeah, Jeff, so this text needs to be changed or streamlined a bit. But actually, the question is to go into the details once the operational model is defined, how do you make sure that the entity rule is enforced across all the policies and procedures? And what the staff paper did was to call out some of the—I think if not all of the processes that will need to be looked at. For example, the registry transition process, F3 deals with EBERO, the emergency backend registry operator, basically, so in the case where you need to move registry TLD to—emergency situation, you need

---

to take into account there are variants and therefore they need to move together. So those are the things that will need taken into account. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, so I think we can drastically shorten this section and almost do this all as bullet points. So you say that the main question is how we treat the variants operationally and legally. And once that decision is made, I think everything else can either fall into place or be just a logical next step, and you can list this out by basically saying once you decide the operational model, then you also need to think about the impact on registry transition process, the transfer process I think is later on, and whatever else. I don't think we need an F2, F3, F4, F5. I think it all kind of relates to once you've selected that model, the legal and operational model, the other things just need kind of bullet points in this scope document rather than these long, drawn-out questions.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you very much, Jeff. Yeah, you just stole my thunder. Yes. I was leading to that point, that all of these questions can be streamlined and just bullet points list of the policies and procedures that the staff paper has identified and potentially the ones that we will identify in our conversation as well. So we'll take note of that and make the appropriate changes there. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think this item is a part of the previous question, because all you need is to add including registry transition process or change of control in the registry agreement. And it will just complete the set of items which need to be reviewed or investigated. Thanks.

---

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Yeah. [We need to do this.] So not sure the next week, but Jeff, in the future, before we finalize section two, we'll see a close to final draft of all the changes that we are suggesting here, so section F especially, we'll see a drastic change in terms of what's the overarching questions and the list of policies and procedures that need to be looked at without all the context in each of the processes and procedures.

Okay, so F4 deals with—I think F4 and F5 need to be looked at together, and this pertains to the—this is we're talking about domain names, so now into the second level realm, if you will, as far as the staff paper is basically suggesting how to send information to registrars. F4 pertains to the [check EPP] command, F5 pertains to synchronized metadata across variant domain names. So Edmon suggested this is out of scope. I tend to agree, because this pertains to operational implementation at the second level, which falls under registries. So not sure—but I do open the question where there is a higher-level question that needs to be asked here, because there are ICANN implementation guidance at the second level, so, is there a question that can be pushed over these IDN guidelines that the working group might consider? But what is actually what we are solving for here in terms of availabilities and [inaudible]?

So I don't see any hands here. Thank you, Maxim, for volunteering. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking about EPP, it's heavily regulated in the registry agreement, and so the answer of this is part of operational part of the question about we should investigate all consequences, all cases, and this is a part of technical, and partially operational question. So you just add including EPP, and that's it. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: So Maxim, are you saying that we need to add the question whether there are any EPP enhancement needed?

---

MAXIM ALZOBA: I mean that this—if we say somehow in the top of the text that in case of different TLDs are regarded to be the same—or I understand now. It's different, because if on the top of the text it's decide that they're not the same, this will be an actual question. So there might be needed a reference there at the top, so we include EPP there, and see it separately here. Because if a single entity has, for example, two contracts, maybe a regulation that is going to be the same backend, it's too much because nobody prevents an entity from synchronizing backends. Who knows? But this might need to be checked. But I'm not sure, because it's implementation here. But we need to add it on the top in that big question.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. So I think what you're saying is that this is one of the [inaudible] that is one of the bullet points that we mentioned early that need to be discussed, along with EBERO and registry transition process, any EPP enhancement that might be needed for a list. But I fail to see what the problem that this is trying to solve. Today, registry operators have the ability to, for example, reserve names and not necessarily put those available for registrations, and they'd simply say, yeah, not available, but they don't have to issue a reason for that. It just says not available. So the same would be for, I think, variant domain names. So I'm not sure what ...

Anyway, I'd like to see any more reactions. Do we agree there are questions to ask here? And what is the right question here? Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. I think, as I wrote in the comment, this section should be struck out. And if there are high level questions about whether or not a standardized EPP extension should be developed, even if the answer might be yes, that would be the following discussion would be out of scope from the EPDP. I think we can add some higher level questions. I don't, off the top of my head, know which part, but when we go to a second pass for the document, we can park that idea, and as we go through the second pass, we could add back a part where we consider some high-level question about how we might implement.

---

But for sure, how each particular registry implement their registry system is out of scope from the policy point of view, in what I think.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Maxim next.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think that at least EPP extension could be required for this, and it's definitely out of scope of this EPDP, but I will try to be short. If nobody manages to change RFCs for EPP, it might not be implemented here, because it's for IETF to implement standards, not for ICANN. So we might ask a question. If the current EPP is enough for identification of the reason of the failure to register, because currently, it's not possible to understand, not use in something like WHOIS, if the domain cannot be registered for some reason. Currently, registries can mark some domains as not being able to register.

So I believe we need to add—if it's possible, by using the current set of standards to identify such domains for the third party to understand that it's possible to register or something. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. I think you brought up good points there about how EPP functions. And yeah, the reason for EPP response is it's a freeform text, so it doesn't have any formal standardization, and an extension might be a better solution, but in terms of standardization, but that requires, of course, a different level of effort and complexity. So I'm not sure that's what the intent is here. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: I think Maxim raises a good point. I don't know whether the document covers this already, but we should, as we go through, touch on the WHOIS or registration data

---

issue related to variants as well. so if it already covers, because I don't remember the entire document. If it already covers, that's good. If it's not, then we should put a mark and add that in.

DENNIS TAN: Noted. Thank you, Edmon. RDDS, I think, will go along with EBERO and transition process. Looks like there is a question for the next working group to ask. We'll need to think how we're removing the context here, see how we can craft the question that goes into this operational, which is implementation of the same entity as far as top-level and second level [inaudible].

So, F5 goes along that vein of operational implementation, technical, into the details, and how to sync metadata information, I think the registrant contact information, syncing that information, also, we'll need to bundle it with F4. So I think that's the best way we can actually put them together in the same technical operation and implementation as far as, one, EPP and enhancement or synchronization of registration data. So we'll see how that goes, unless there's any other ... Okay.

Moving on, F6, data escrow. So F6, FX and F7. I was reviewing these questions, the three, and I kind of came to the conclusion that they need to be together and looked at in a way that the overarching question or the requirement is [inaudible] registrant or variant domain names. Now you're talking about data escrow, then whether they need to be considered as separate or single registration, and then the question about the life cycle.

So the overarching requirement we established above in the charter that there's going to be a same entity for second-level domain names. So that's the same registrant. And now the questions are about the lifecycle. We already service some entity who—but then there are two questions that remain about the lifecycle, how do you update, transfer or delete any of these domains in the set, and about the behavior, whether they can be allocated or [blocked] depending on the variant TLD in which they are registered to .



---

And to some extent, we already answered that question in the harmonization discussion, right? Harmonization of variant table. You'll remember that the requirement or the question is whether it makes sense, it's advisable to harmonize variant tables, and the implication of that or the caveat is that domain name variants [need not to] behave identically. So that's the behavior part of it. But there is no question about the life cycle, which F7 basically talks about.

So the way I think we can frame the discussion is we have the same entity, same registrant as the overarching requirement, but the next questions are, do they need to follow the same lifecycle, meaning they need to be created at the same time, deleted at the same time, transferred, updated at the same time, or, they could be independent as far as for example deletion, right? You can delete a variant label but not others, but if you transfer one, you need to transfer all. So there are going to be different behaviors. And then the other behavior is about the allocation, whether [in which the variant TLD does.]

So I think we can simplify F6, FX and F7 in that way. Hopefully, that makes sense. Okay, so I see no hands, whether you all agree with me or I confuse you all to this. Edmon says consolidating fine. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG. Thanks, Dennis, for the explanation. So just for staff's understanding, are you suggesting move these questions to the previous section related to the same entity requirement for the second level? Because you mentioned that the harmonization of IDN tables and the overarching requirements, that's in the previous section. So I'm just wondering, logically, what would be the best placement for these questions.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. Yeah, I think that would make sense, because it would make the conversation more natural in the flow once you establish the overarching requirement, and then you ask the follow-up question, okay, so what about the lifecycle and the behavior? And kind of

---

---

[they move together.] So yeah, I tend to agree that maybe moving up this section to up when the same entity rule is discussed probably makes sense. But Edmon is right, it depends on the answer of the harmonization question. So we'll need to see how it all fits so that it's a natural combination of questions and see how the flow is. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just for clarity, it's about the different domains to be deemed the same domain, effectively, only with subsets, including fees and things like that. So, as with TLDs, a lot of technical operation and legal questions need to be answered, because you cannot read the item as single in one situation and multiple in other situations, because it will cause lots of issues due to different logic, ideas applied to same entity in similar situations, and we will have like operational disaster, I'd say. So we need to add question about the feasibility from technical operation and legal perspective, because for ICANN for example, it's going to be—if it's answered yes, then all the registrations in all variants are single domain and single fee. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Yeah, I think the answer to that question [inaudible] several implication as far as fees and whatnot. So that's why I think [inaudible] framing the issue and the questions so that the next working group can discuss in detail. Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Thanks, Dennis. As I put in the chat, I think this section probably belongs here a little bit better, because we have to resolve—as actually Maxim pointed out—the legal part, which is how we administratively deal with these variant TLDs before we can answer this question. So I think it makes more sense to put here, but even if we put it up to the harmonization part, at that point of discussion we might have to touch on the F1 or 2 parts as well. So I think keeping it here might make more sense.

---

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you, Edmon. Yeah, we'll see how everything fits together. I agree. The more we go into the details, we know what's that relationship to the overarching higher policy questions that we need to answer first before we go into this level of detail. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we have a huge operational issue in the work of our group, because when the IDN issue was discussed at the previous stage, it was separated into policy stream and technical operation stream with registries. And now I see that we are going to have discussions about technical and operational items in this stream, and it's quite wrong, as I understand, because it's a bit different from what was expected when we started this. The separate process with the Contracted Party House about technical and operational implications.

So I don't know now how we resolve this. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. I think you're referring to the exercise of the scoping team in which they separated the two Work Tracks, policy and operational, [if] my recollection is correct, and please, those participating in that scoping team can keep me honest.

The operational track was limited to the implications of the IDN guidelines version four and the IDN table review process, and that's the extent of the operational [inaudible]. So it doesn't introduce new things, it just remains within those constraints. The implications of the version four of the guidelines is still in draft and not yet adopted, and the IDN table review process, two of the issues that the Registries Stakeholder Group raised. So that goes as far as the operational track. So not to discuss anything new or new best practices or operational models. It was limited to those items. Maxim, go ahead.

---

MAXIM ALZOBA: As I remember, one of the items which his hugely discussed here, the same entity was also discussed as a potential operational issue. So I think we're in a situation where it's going to be separately discussed in two Work Streams, because I don't understand how it's going to be synchronized, etc.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I think ICANN has reached out to our—the CPH leadership in order to start talks on the operational track. So we can raise that in the Registries Stakeholder Group-and see how that can be dealt with.

Okay, so in the interest of time, let me go back to the document. So we are in F8, and F8 is basically a catchall of the other processes and procedures that need to be dealt with in order to enforce as an entity rule, and there are a few items that already were captured there, but as you can read, they were already identified in upper sections of our charter document, so just confirming we already identified those. If anything, this is a catchall for the next working group to think about anything new, or we already captured RDDS to some extent and maybe other items.

So, with that, I think we went over all section F. Unfortunately, we couldn't go into section G as we had expected, but that was kind of our stretch goal, to reach G if we had the time. So we'll start next meeting with section G here, and probably, we'll go faster than today, and we'll try to look at G and H together. I think that's doable. And potentially I if we go quick.

JEFF NEUMAN: Dennis, on G, I'll give my kind of—I think the whole section should just be eliminated. So just think about that when rue going through it. I think the only real relevant question there is on transfers, and that could be moved up to section F because it's part of the legal agreement. So yeah, that's my overall comment on G. So if you think that and agree, then it might be real easy to go through G.

---

DENNIS TAN: All right. Thank you for that, Jeff. Yeah, I'll take that into account when I'm reviewing the section. All right, so just really quickly, we are one minute after the top of the hour, so for next week, G, H, and our stretch goal is going to be to reach out to I. So we'll see how that goes. So yeah, Ariel, I think it's already there. Yeah.

So, Any Other Business before we go and adjourn?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just one second, please.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, sure, go.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do we know when the Work Stream is going to start? The registry/registrar Work Stream for IDNs.

DENNIS TAN: The operational track, you mean?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes.

DENNIS TAN: My understanding is that the GNSO council sent a note to the CPH leadership to start. I know there has been some back-and-forth, but other than that, I don't know anything. So I think we can raise the question this Wednesday, the [leadership] has as meeting. Will do, Maxim.

**EN**

---

Okay, so with that, thank you very much for this fruitful conversation, and we'll talk again next week. Thank you and have a good rest of the day.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. I'll stop the recordings, and disconnect all remaining lines. Stay well.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**