EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 05 October 2023 at 12:00 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/04yZDg

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

DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Thursday, 5 October 2023 at 12:00 UTC. We do have apologies from Michael Bauland. All members and participants will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDNs EPDP wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN monthly stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you. And back over to Donna Austin, 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.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks very much, Devan, and welcome everybody to today's call. I'm feeling a little bit underprepared for this call because I just realized that I didn't look at the deck. So not that it's any different to any other call, but I will be perhaps relying a little bit more on Ariel than normal. So I don't think I have any real chair updates to do. Will we have a call next week?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, it's on schedule unless people change mind and don't want to do it. And I just learned a fun fact. If we do have the call, it will be the 100th call of this group.

DONNA AUSTIN: Oh, my. Well, there you go. That's a milestone for us. Okay, so we do plan to have a call next week and then we'll have the quiet week before we go into ICANN 78 and the 25 years celebration, I suppose, of ICANN. So with that, I think we'll just kick in and see where we get to. I will note that attendance is a little bit lower than usual. I think we usually have around 23. But today it looks like we've only got 14, 15 so far. So we will continue. But just to note, attendance is a little bit light today.

So our plan for today is to resolve the outstanding comments from the phase one recommendations. So we had quite a bit of discussion around 3.5 and 3.6 last week. I think we reached a reasonable understanding and I don't believe I've seen anything on the list regarding any concerns. But I do understand there's been some comments in the Google Docs, so we'll go through

EN

those and also with four point four. Then we'll have a look at a refresher on the phase two deliberation. So hopefully we're getting really close to resolving all of the phase one recommendations and being in a position to finalize that report so that we can provide that to council soon after the ICANN 78, I think is our plan. So we'll do a refresher on phase two and start review of the draft text, which is text that was developed as a result of conversations that we had at ICANN 77 so it's been quite a bit of time since we've had the opportunity to get back to phase two conversation so there's a few things we want to pick up and I appreciate that people's memories might be not so not so fresh at the moment on phase two, so we'll do a bit of a refresher, and then start our review of the phase two draft text. And my hope is that by next week, we can sign off on that phase two draft text. And then we can make plans for what we will talk about in Hamburg. And then also what our plan is for the face to face meeting in December. So I think that's where we'll get to today. So, with that, Ariel, I think if you can take us through comments that we've received on 3.5 and 3.6.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, sounds good. And also I have Sarmad on the call and I believe, Nigel did send an email to the group, supporting the new text, but I think folks didn't get a chance to see Sarmad's common on the Google Docs. So Sarmad, if you'd like to speak to them directly, please raise your hand. Okay, please go ahead.

EN

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Ariel. And hello everyone. So, I think I just want to raise three comments more from an implementation, I guess point of view, than anything else. But one is around 3.5.4. And the text actually says that the applicant will take to minimize the operational and management complexities. I guess the question was, is there a difference between operational and management complexities? Are they supposed to be synonymous here? And if they are, then can we just reduce it to for example management complexities. The reason I'm saying just management is because I think some of this is motivated by the SSAC recommendation and SSAC actually talks about management complexity. But if there is of course something which is separate from management which is operational, it may be useful for the applicants to understand what the difference may be and maybe that can be highlighted in the rationale part. So that's the first comment.

The second comment was on 3.6.1. And there's apparently a requirement here that the evaluators must include somebody from that language. I guess normally when we have panels, we actually have a core panel. And we normally allow, ask them that they can incorporate more experts as they require. And so it is really up to them to decide if they need external expertise, they can bring in more people. But in this particular case, there's some sort of very significant restrictions that each language which the TLD belongs to. Which means that if you're applying for a variant, one application and four variants, and those four variants is one each in four different languages, or three different languages, then you would want to bring in four different panel evaluators to evaluate that one application. Seems that it may be a bit too much from an implementation point of view. You know, the same can be

achieved if we allow the panel to consider additional expertise if they need. Sometimes somebody who's familiar with the script, and also they can understand the explanation which has been provided by the applicant and evaluate them effectively, even if they don't speak that language. So that's my second, I guess, comment that is this really a must or we can let the panel decide. And so let me stop here. There's a third comment around 4.4 but we can take that up later. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks so much. So I think, let's address this in sequence. So, operational and management complexities, I think operational could be considered the technical side, the management could be considered the policy side. So I think there's, or you know, whatever variation you want to put on that. So, I don't know that it's intended to be one and the same. So, I think it's okay to have operational and management complexities there but I'm interested to hear from other folks whether there's a preference here or if you disagree with or agree with Sarmad's comments. So Maxim and then Hadia.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think operational is enough because operational it's technical and also bureaucracy and what's between and actions which have to be made by people in the team, etc. So, it should be enough. But if we leave as operational and management, it will not hurt. So, operational just shorter. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Maxim. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. So I do agree with you, Donna, that I think we need to keep them both. However, if we do want to omit one, that I agree with Maxim, that's definitely not the operational part, because the operational complexity, generally speaking, they arise from day to day activities and processes of an organization. It relates to the execution and management of tasks, operations and workflows, which we as a group think could be affected by having a primary and a variants. However, again, I think we could keep them both because also managerial complexity will also touch on decision making and leadership. So, I guess we need to keep them both. But if one, it's not the management, but it's the operational. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Hadia. Any other thoughts from other folks on this? Satish is saying that he agrees with me. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, so I think that is fine. The only then request is if we can maybe add a sentence or so to clarify what may be anticipated in operational and management. So, for example, as is being suggested, operational deals with more technical side of things and management more, I guess, the management side of things. If that makes it a bit clearer, I think that will be useful for the applicants. Thank you.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So we'll take a look at the rationale and see if we can just pick up on that, those points that you've identified and put something in the rationale that will hopefully address your concern. Okay, so on the second issue that Sarmad has made in relation to the suggestion that rather than language, we change that to script. I don't have any objection to that. I think Sarmad's made a valid point. And if there's no objection from anyone, could we live with changing language to script? Satish is okay with script. Dennis is okay. Hadia is okay. All right, so I think we'll swap language out for script. Jennifer's okay with script. Okay. All right. I'm not sure who's driving. I assume it's Ariel. So thank you for that change, Ariel. And Hadia, thanks for the note in chat about operational management, and we can reflect that in the rationale. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna. And I just remembered I should report back to the group about the reseller question that we asked our colleagues about. So long story short, they don't see any concerns, which is good. And I'll just provide you some information is that reseller is actually a defined term in the registrar accreditation agreement. And also mentioning Article 2 of the base registry agreement. So it is already included in the contract, although it's not specifically asking them to do anything. It's just recognizing their existence. So that's why they believe that including the stakeholder in this clause is not a problem, because the recommendation isn't imposing any requirement to the reseller, but basically

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Ariel. Yes, so I'll only raise my hand to agree with your assessment with the registries. We also, I'm sorry, two days ago met and also look at the reseller language in the RAA, the registrar accreditation agreement, and also the reference in the base agreement. So, yeah, well, good. It's now less of a concern, the inclusion of resellers. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, that's great. Thanks, Dennis. And thanks, Ariel, for that update as well. Just before we move on, we have an administrative issue, I suppose. So, Siva, who is listening, but not one of our members, has his hand raised and unfortunately, Siva, I don't know that we are able to allow you to speak. Okay, so the hand's gone away. So I think that solves that problem. But perhaps, Devan, you can follow up with Siva and see if there was a contribution he wanted to make.

Okay. All right. So that's 3.5, 3.6 done. So now we'll go to 4. Oh, just a note on the rationale here. So I've done a rewrite. Unfortunately, the time that Ariel put it out, leadership hadn't had a chance to take a look at the rationale. So I've done some rework of the rationale and all of this is to tighten up the language. I haven't changed anything that's too substantive. So we'll get that redlined into the document so that folks have a chance to see it. And hopefully, we'll be okay with it. So that's just a note and we'll

put that [inaudible] sends out his notes, we'll just put a reminder that folks, please have a look at the rationale for 3.5 and 3.6 because it will change a little bit. Okay, and we need to change that operational management and just explain that a little bit. Okay, I think we can go to 4.4.

ARIEL LIANG: So I know that Sarmad wants to speak to one point he wants to raise, but maybe I can go through the other points that Sarmad put in the Google Doc because based on staff assessment, these are not controversial. So I can probably help just drive this and Sarmad please feel free to chime in if I miss anything. He did make quite a few comments. And first one is on 4.4.3. So if you recall this item is regarding if a confusing similarity is found between apply for gTLD string and its variants with a requested ccTLD string and its variant, what to do. So what Sarmad suggested is we include IDN specifically here in front of IDN—the ccTLD. And the reason is that if you recall in 4.4.1, it's already kind of clarified that if applied for gTLD string is found confusingly similar to a two character ASCII string, then that gTLD string is ineligible to proceed. So the two character ASCII string here will encompass the basically ASCII ccTLD strings. So that's what 4.4.1 includes. So 4.4.3 is something not about conflict with an ASCII ccTLD string, is conflict with IDN ccTLD string and then the following sub recommendations apply to that scenario. So that's why his suggestion is to add IDN here. And similarly, add IDN in the sub recommendations under 4.4.3, right in front of CTLD. So that's the first suggestion from Sarmad, which I believe it's correct. And the second one, I'm not going to talk about it because this is

EN

something probably requires some discussion from the group. But I'll talk about the third one here. So he had a comment about validated this terminology, and he was wondering whether we can explain this. So the reason we use this term is because this is a specific term using ccTLD world. And they have the whole kind of validation process and requirements. And this is also using the 2012 round AGB regarding how to resolve conflict with requested ccTLD strings. So we borrowed this term here, but the enhancement is to kind of provide a bit more information on what this means. So it essentially means it's successfully evaluated. And then we provided the reference document to provide more information if a reader wants to read more. And hopefully this addressed the last concern.

And the next one is 4.4.3.2. So this is regarding what happens if a newly applied for gTLD string is found confusingly similar to another applied for gTLD string in a previous round, but still hasn't been delegated. So what Sarmad suggests is that we probably want to clarify that if such conflict is found, then the new application has to be put on hold until the previous application somehow reached a determination. So we added this paragraph here. And another suggestion he made is that -- oh, sorry. My apologies. This is still under the conflict with the IDN ccTLD request. So basically, he just said, so if neither application has completed its respective process, what happens? So basically, this new paragraph says the gTLD application will have to be put on hold while the ccTLD request is still undergoing evaluation. So this is the newly suggested detail that Sarmad kind of provided in this paragraph. And then we kind of also clarified there are two scenarios here. The first scenario is if the gTLD application does

EN

not get the required approval from the relevant government public authorities, then it will not be eligible to proceed in the application process. And the ccTLD one will prevail. So that's the first scenario. And then the second scenario is if the ccTLD request is withdrawn or fails the evaluation, then the gTLD application is eligible to proceed. So basically, just to spell out the two possible paths under this 4.4.3.2 and to clarify this recommendation. And also, from staff assessment, we believe that's reasonable. And it's basically just to clarify what happens under this scenario.

And finally, there is a 4.4.3.3. We used the word contingent here. It really means confusingly similar. So Sarmad's observation is this is a word that has a special meaning and probably we shouldn't use this one. To use a different one would be preferable. So from my suggestion, I think conflict should suffice because we did use conflict in this recommendation somewhere else. And it means confusingly similar. And I think Justine has some additional suggestions, which I won't belabor. If Justine wants to speak up, please feel free. So that's basically what we did here, is to swap contingent with conflict if there's no alternative suggestions. And I saw Hadia supported it. So basically, that's the extent of the change. And also, I just observed that we used can here in 4.4.2. And we clearly recall one of the public comment requests is the input is to make sure when we use terminology, we are consistent and that the word can was concerning in another context. And basically, I just swapped can with "is eligible to" just to be consistent with how we word these sentences in this recommendation. And I saw Justine had a comment or suggestion about the conflict, but to clarification. Yeah, thanks, Justine. So that's, I guess, noncontroversial comments in our view. And then I

can stop for a moment and see whether there's any questions or comment from the group. And it seems pretty peaceful. Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. There's a lot to process here. So this is a very early reaction to the new text, and I confess I have not reviewed these prior to this meeting. So I'm reacting as I'm reading through these. I think a few weeks back when we introduced this section, my reaction was we are duplicating the language, which is already in the AGB, the 2012 version of it. And my reservation was, are we creating a fork here, a parallel process or procedure to define how to deal with these cases with when variants are involved? And we are deviating from what is already established and maybe the future [inaudible]. And at the time we talk about what we don't know what the future holds in terms of how the next applicant guidebook will process this. But as I'm seeing more of edits and how we anticipate or we recommend to process these, I fear that we are creating these more deviations. So I wonder if we can go back to, in my mind, I'm just thinking of the basics, because we already established a basis for comparison, right, for a string similarity review process and to those very busy, complex sets, how you compare a primary allocatable labels, blocked labels against the rest, right? The rest being the applied for gTLD banners, applied for ID and ccTLDs, reserve names, already delegated gTLDs and ccTLDs all that, those relationships. And the only thing that we need to deal with is how do you resolve the contention? And I see some of it here. But my question is, and maybe Ariel, you can answer it again, right? This is me just reacting first time reading this. Are we creating a different process

to resolve contention that deviates from our conversation around the string similarity resolution processes or outcomes? And that's one question. And the second question is, or not question, but observation or concern on 44321. And when the gTLD application does not have the required approval for the relevant government authority, it might be that they don't have it because the label that they are applying for has nothing to do with a country, territory or regional name, right? It just happens to be similar, but not necessarily mean the same. So just wanted to raise that observation. But anyway, so I'll pause there. But again, I'll continue within this and processing. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So before we go to Hadia, I think, and Ariel, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think all of the black text was lifted from the 2012 AGB. And this was the language that was intended to deal with the situation where there's an IDN ccTLD in process through the ccTLD process and the IDN gTLD that's in process through an application round. So I think the intention with this, it's not so much about string similarity review, or contention set resolution. This is about the process by which you would deal with what happens if you've got a ccTLD that's going through the process and a gTLD that's going through a different process. So what takes preference over the other, I suppose. So this isn't, at least this is my understanding, it's not about string contention resolution. This is about what gets preference. So I think that's what this is about. It's not about string similarity. So the black text, as I understand it, was taken from the 2012, pretty much taken from the 2012 guidebook. And the new language that's in green is

stuff that's been added for clarity from Sarmad, who is also part of the GDS team that's looking forward to implementation details. So I think the intent with the new green language is to provide clarity around some of that. So that's just the context for what we're looking at here. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Donna. This is Hadia for the record. So I raised my hand to pretty much say what you have already said. So as I read it, this is not about the resolving the contention, but it is about like which string goes first. So it's sort of like a giving priority, but it's not about the resolving the contention itself.

DONNA AUSTIN: Exactly. So Dennis, I don't know if that gives you—Go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. And maybe you can help me understand. When you're saying this is not about the contention, but who goes first, why do we just rely on the first come, first serve principle? I mean, whoever put their request first has the priority, because otherwise we are creating a contention procedure here and putting some criteria other than first come, first serve to see who prevails in the application process. So I'm not sure how we are removing contention here from the equation.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: So I guess we're removing contention from the equation because there will never be a situation where the gTLD applicant and the ccTLD applicant have to basically fight it out, I suppose is the way that I think about it. But this is recognizing that for a gTLD applicant, there is one process and for an IDN ccTLD there is another process. So this is how to give preference to wherever an applicant is in the process. So what we have in front of us isn't necessarily giving any preference to the IDN ccTLD applicant, particularly if the gTLD applicant is almost at the end of the process within the gTLD process. So it's, what if, right, so what happens when, and it's about the two different processes, so recognizing that they're not going to—an IDN ccTLD request is very much an ad hoc basis. So it can happen at any time. And the processing is quite different from gTLDs, whereas gTLDs at this point in time are in rounds. So there's a defined application period. So, so it really is just dealing about how do you deal with a situation when one process is already underway and then an application comes in for a string, what happens. So it's not that they would never be in contention of sorting it out, it would be preference based on the process and where and the status within the process. So to me there's a very clear distinction between resolving who goes first within, because of where they are in a process rather than it's a contention set and they have to resolve among the applicants or whatever other processes there might be. So Dennis, go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. I understand what you're saying. And I also understand that we're using leveraging language from the old

EN

applicant guidebook. Just are we using it in the right context? And I think I'm reusing one of the examples that you just gave us. A gTLD is going through the application process, probably passed through different evaluation processes right at the end. And then a ccTLD request is submitted. Each one, separate processes, they understand why we're not talking about contention, because there's no contentions in two different processes. But nevertheless, they may be found equivalent in some sort and therefore pause is required. But basically, what we're saying is that gTLD that has gone through the different application evaluation processes right to the end, and a ccTLD is submitted, then that gTLD evaluation process is off, put on hold.

DONNA AUSTIN: No, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: How are you reading 4432 then?

DONNA AUSTIN: So I think what I want to request here is to give you the opportunity to go back and read through the full set of recommendations here. Because it depends on the situation. So in some circumstances, it may be that, depending on the timing within the process, there may be a different outcome. So it's not always going to be the case that the ccTLD is going to get preferential treatment. It depends on the circumstance and the timing. So, rather than kind of get into a back and forth on it now, perhaps it might be best if we leave this open for another week so

EN

that you've got time to think about it, have a have a read of it, and have a think about it, and then we can come back and see where we are next week on this one. I would like to resolve the, well, it's actually we can't resolve the new green text, I don't think, until the registries have had a chance to review and come back to this next one. Anil, go ahead.

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, Donna. So, you have explained about no preference on any other process to Dennis, but the language which is written here, it makes a intention that if gTLD process is, although advanced, and IDN ccTLD has just started, then the gTLD process will be kept on hold. In case the intention is that no preference should be given to anybody, then whichever process gets completed and at the stage of delegation should get the preference and the decision regarding the other process may be taken accordingly to the string similarity decision which we have indicated in our policy. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Anil. Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I'm just echoing just things commenting the chats regarding to what point the gTLD application is regarded as completed and won't be disrupted by IDN ccTLD requests. So, that's 4.4.3.1.1. So, this address that scenario that a newly filed ccTLD request won't disqualify a gTLD application. And if that gTLD application is already completed evaluation and it's eligible for entry into an RA,

then at that stage, it won't be disqualified, and it won't be needed to be put on hold. So, so that's where it's at. This is also the same language. I mean, disregarding the circling stuff, the black stuff is consistent with the 2012 on AGB. That's exactly the language in the 2012 AGB. So, I'm happy to pull this up on the screen just to show folks and so that you know where to find it if you want to do a cross reference or cross checking.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So, Dennis, to your point, what if one evaluation process remains? So if you're talking about 4.4.3.1.1. So I guess if there's still one evaluation process that remains then perhaps the application is put on hold. So the problem here is that these events are probably low likelihood of happening. And as Steve mentioned in the leadership chat, applying for an IDN ccTLD is very strict I suppose in what you can actually apply for, particularly in that it has to be a meaningful representation of the ccTLD that's already been delegated to the country code sponsoring organization. So I think that has to be a factor in this as well. I think most of us understand that there are differences in the processes, but I think we also understand that there has to be rules. And this is our opportunity to put rules or recommendations in place for what happens if, understanding that the likelihood of if is probably pretty low. So, Dennis, to your point, I guess if you have a problem with where the line is drawn with 4.3.1.1, then perhaps we need to have a look at that. So I guess another way to deal with it is that—I'm not going to go there. So I'm going to go back to what I suggested Dennis and that is, we'll give a week for the registries to have a think about this and come back to this next

EN

week and see where we end up. What I would appreciate is a heads up before we get to the call next Thursday about where the RySG is ahead of the call. And just to reiterate this, this was in the AGB from 2012. So this isn't new. This is something that we had overlooked when we were developing recommendations and I think it was a late addition to some of our work because of—not sure whether it was public comments or what, whether it was a gap that someone had identified, and that's why we've come up with this language. Ariel, did we just want to touch on the suggestion from Sarmad in 4.3.1.1? I don't know, Sarmad, if you want to introduce this.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes. Thank you Donna. This is Sarmad. So, I think again, as you were saying earlier, many of these comments are just to make sure that from an implementation point of view, things are clear. Not suggesting any substantive changes in the original text otherwise. So, in this particular case, I guess a question was that when we are evaluating an application, there is a possibility that somebody applies for let's say one primary string and two variants. And they're going through the evaluation process and assuming for some reason, the variant is successfully evaluated but primary is not, I think it's quite clear that the whole application will not be able to proceed until the variant is primary is actually successfully evaluated. However, I think this one is, I guess in this case I want to talk about the other scenario where we still have the same application, but the primary has been successfully evaluated. But maybe there was an objection or something against a variant string. And so the variants, not all the variants

are successfully evaluated and some one variant, for example, may be in the process.

So now there are two possible options there. And I guess we're only asking for clarification. One possible option is that the primary gTLD string is clear and can move forward with on with delegation. And therefore, if a ccTLD string comes along, it will not be able to proceed because the primary gTLD is already evaluated. However, if we are talking about variants together, as it was written in the black text, it wasn't clear that in case the primary is clear, but one of the variants is held back because of some issues and is under process, and then a ccTLD comes, does it also hold back the primary or can primary go forward and just the variant is held back and therefore the ccTLD cannot proceed. So I guess the question is that whether we wait for the entire gTLD application to complete when we are looking at it from a timing point of view of the ccTLD application or is that driven solely by the primary gTLD. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Dennis, just before I go to you, I am concerned that what Sarmad is suggesting is getting way too complicated. I had always assumed that the application would go through pretty close together so that you wouldn't have a situation where the variants are being held up at the primary has been approved. I kind of always felt that they would be pretty much in sync and go through the processes together. And also the fact that we have a recommendation for one registry agreement, it wouldn't be possible to delegate a primary if some of the variants are still going through the evaluation process, because they wouldn't have

entered into the registry agreement. So, I think with 4.3.1.1 that the focus should be on the application, and not on the primary gTLD string. So I would really like to hear from others on this. Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you Donna. Just raised my hand to agree with what Sarmad and you just said, I mean, we need to, these are important questions, important use cases, scenarios that the program is going to run into and so we need to really have a good understanding of all this, going back to the conversation about operational and management issues, complexities that variants introduced. This is one of where we need to get our heads around and have a good solution, including, taking into account all these operational aspects. Donna mentioned one registry agreement and that's important, right, and that's valid observation as we do we break up the set as in terms of the evaluation processes and then we allow the application to be an asynchronous, right, in terms of where they are in the evaluation process and how that will translate into a, imagine a dashboard where the applicants need to see in what state their evaluation is and then you all of the sudden now it's not just one string but several of the strings in one application and you will need to report each one in what state they are. So that will be very complex to do. So I'm leaning towards looking at this as an application. I think we need to come back to this, and I'd just encourage everybody to look through the lenses of how these would be implemented and taking into account all that we have considered thus far in terms of the set and how do we want to manage the set, one registry agreement and having a

EN

predictable, consistent and not so complex process to go through. So just wanted to make those statements. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. It would be nice if we could come up with a not so complex process. We'll leave this one open as well. And we'll come back to 4.4 next week so if everybody could please take the time to review the language and the comments that have been made by Sarmad and additions that have been provided by staff to respond to those. It would be appreciated because I really want to try to get these things resolved. So we'll come back to this next week. And I think we'll park the conversation for now. Okay. Ariel, just one question and actually Dennis, you may know the answer to this. But the CC PDP, did they have anything in their recommendations about what happens in these situations?

DENNIS TAN: I want to say no, I don't think there was any consideration in terms of contentions or not conflicts of some sort.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Dennis.

ARIEL LIANG: Just to supplement what Dennis said, I did check the text, the previous version without this green stuff with Bart, and he didn't have any concerns, how it was written and doesn't conflict with

EN

how ccTLD look at the conflict. So they were fine. But of course, it's the new information. He hasn't got a chance to see it.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Ariel. Alrighty, so we'll park this and come back to it next week. Please, if you've got any comments, put them in the Google Doc or separate email to the list so that we can try to get this done before we all head off to ICANN 78. So just a reminder that our goal is to try to get this completed by the end of the call next week, so that we can pull the final report together for phase one. Okay, let's do our refresher on phase two, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Before we go there, just a question. So the original plan is to start consensus call today, but obviously that's not going to happen. And if we could get agreement from the team on the text by next week, that's October 12, then is the plan to start Consensus Call October 12? And I just want to understand what the deadline would be and because it does require 10 days to do that. And we probably won't be able to finish Consensus Call before the start of ICANN 78 if we start on October 12.

DONNA AUSTIN: Can we do a Consensus Call on the recommendations that we've agreed that aren't outstanding? Do we have to do one consensus call or can we break it up?

ARIEL LIANG: That's an interesting question because I haven't encountered that kind of situation like do a segment of recommendations for consensus Call. I will have to get back to you on that.

DONNA AUSTIN: So it doesn't mean we can't do it. All right. Let us know, Ariel. So my preference would be if we still have 4.4 discussions that are holding us back that we actually do the consensus call and all those recommendations that have been signed off on so far and we'll do 4.4 separately if we have to. Unless you tell me that the GNSO operating procedures say that we can't do it that way.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, this is Ariel. So just looking at the working group guidelines, it's silent on exactly how you do it. It's just that you have to do it for all the recommendations. Didn't say like you have to do it all together or you can do part of it first. Yeah. So I think that that's our understanding. And if the preference is to start consensus call for everything but 4.4, I think that's fine. We just need to put that additional clarification in our email to the group, I guess.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. All right. So I'd really like to have just one consensus call. So if we can wrap 4.4 up on our call next week, then that means that we can do one consensus call. If we can't, then we'll split it. So that will be our path forward. All right. Now can we go to phase two, Ariel?

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Although I'm still kind of very kind of, my brain is still in phase one, but we can switch. So this is just a quick refresher of our progress so far because that was a long time ago. The last time we talked about it was in June, I believe. And hopefully this will help folks remember where we left off. And I think folks remember we had 19 questions carved out for phase two, and the initial deliberation was completed for nine out of the 19, and I would just quickly summarize which are these.

So C1, C2, they're basically talking about same entity requirement at the second level, what that means, whether it should be applied to existing variant domains. And then C4, C4A, these are talking about, I guess, C4, C4A, and sorry, my apologies, C4, C5, and C6. These are the three questions that related to harmonization of IDN tables. So C4 is the principal question about that. And C6 is about the format of IDN tables, so the mechanism. And C5 is also the mechanism of IDN table harmonization. So we concluded the discussion about these three. C4A that talks about the behavior of variant domains. So basically, it's really related to the usage of the domain names, and that's something SubPro already covered and the group confirmed what SubPro said is the same, how this question should be answered. And then D4 is about the variant domain name, the lifecycle of variant domain names, and that's what we focused on in ICANN 77. So it went through the whole domain name lifecycle, and then the group reached a couple of principal recommendations that the same entity upheld, the principle upheld, and as long as that's upheld, then they can have a separate lifecycle. There's no other restrictions. But one key component of that is about transfer, is in the event of one variant domain is transferred, the other domains from that variant domain

set needs to be transferred to the same entity as well. So that's what's kind of under D6 as well. It's a transfer policy, and that's related to D4.

And then D7 is also a component of D4 because this talks about suspension, and the principle recommendation also covers this aspect. So that's what we discussed, and then when we go through the draft text, we will look at all the recommendations in detail and then we'll enhance our memory, what was agreed on. And this slide basically talks about what is remaining, and there are 10 out of 19 questions that are remaining.

So C3 and C3A, we actually did have quite a bit of initial discussion, but it hasn't been concluded because this is a key question regarding the mechanism to identify the same registrant. And staff paper had a suggestion in terms of using the ROID as the mechanism, and we understand there's a problem with that, and the contracted parties house tech ops team, they are working on a proposed solution or mechanism to identify the same registrant. And we will hear from Dennis and Michael and others about this, hopefully soon. So we will go back to C3, C3A very soon.

And D5, that's a question about the fees related to variant domain names and whether they should be one variant domain name be charged for individual fee, or whether the variant domains will be charged for a fee. That's something we need to go back to, but also just recall we had similar discussion in phase one. We can reference and make sure whatever recommendation we make needs to be consistent with what's agreed on in phase one.

So D6A, D7A, these are actually something we can discuss under F1, because F1, F2, they are related to the rights protection mechanisms and dispute resolution mechanism related to domain names. And that's something, it's kind of a new topic for many people in this group. And we do need to provide some background and context and understanding. So F1, the key part of this is about the trademark clearinghouse. That's something we should talk about in terms of the background, and then that will enhance our understanding of the related questions.

So D6A and D7A, they're also related to the rights protection mechanism. So D6A is the remedy of UDRP. That's one of the rights protection mechanisms. And then D7A is about the remedy of URS. So these four questions are all related to that. So that will probably take a chunk of time from the group to deliberate.

And then after that, there's a D8. So the actual question of D8 is a catch-all question related to variant domain names. Are there anything else that wasn't covered in the charter that should be addressed? And I think in this question, Edmon did brought a suggestion. What we should look at is how to reflect the variant domain names registration data in the IANA WHOIS and registry WHOIS. And again, about the WHOIS topic, it's another new topic we should kind of brief the group on, and then we can deliberate this question more effectively. So that's what D8 is about for now. But maybe in our deliberation, we may identify additional questions to be covered under this catch-all. So we can look at that as well.

And finally, G1 and G1A, these two questions are about the ID and implementation guidelines. So it's mainly about whether it is

still a proper mechanism. Because it is something even it's called the guideline, but it actually does have contractual impact and obligations for the contracted parties and how it is updated. It's something the group needs to discuss because the recent version 4 had some controversies that we will talk about that with the group. And that basically serves as the origin of this question.

And D1A is about I guess the legal separate legal mechanism. So that's probably talk about the part that's mandatory in the implementation guideline, whether it should still be lying that guideline or it should be a separate mechanism. And then also, I think this related to ccTLDs, if they want to adopt some of the requirements in the implementation guideline, is there a way for them to do that too? So I think that's what's covered in G1A. So these are the remaining questions in our phase two charter that we haven't really discussed. So I think we still have a lot of interesting work to do.

And this slide is to remind folks about some unresolved issues that are covered in the part of phase two charter that we already had initial deliberation. So one unresolved issue is about the definition of source domain. Even we sort of understand what this means, but there's some, I guess, unresolved discussion around it because I think towards the end of the discussion, there was a comment whether each gTLD should have a source domain or whether the set at the top level will share one source domain. And I think the person who asked the question is leaning towards under each gTLD, there is one individual source domain. So that's something we probably want to clarify with the group.

And then another unresolved definition is related to the variant domain set. And that's, I guess, related to how we define a source domain. So the set itself is kind of evolved around the source domain. And then another unresolved issue, which we need Michael to help us out, is a question he brought up regarding whether the source domain can be changed or deleted. And if you recall, he had a proposal of that, but I don't think the group has reached agreement on his proposal and there are still discussions that need to take place to resolve this. And then the second thing you see on the slide is something I mentioned about C3 and C3A that TechOps team will get back to us about their proposed mechanism for identifying the same registrant. And this is some key dates for us to keep in mind, because we don't really have a luxury of time to resolve all these remaining questions. We will have our face-to-face workshop, which is great. We will focus on tackling all these questions in December, from 6 to 8 December. And our goal to publish the initial report for Phase 2 is April 2024 and go to deliver the final report of Phase 2 is October 2024. So that's the timeline we're working against. And Donna has a question. How the TechOps team is progressing? And Dennis, if you have any additional information, please feel free to speak up.

DENNIS TAN: Sure, thank you. So yeah, we have had a number of conversations with the members of TechOps groups and talking about these shared responsibilities between registries and registrars to enforcing or determining the same entity, same registrant. And so there is no, I mean, coming together to a single standard solution, that is not what we were discussing, but we

EN

were recognizing the different aspects of how do we achieve these. There are a number of ideas that have been put in the table, and that's what we are, Michael and I will bring some of that information next week, I think, right on our next meeting. So, yeah, so that's happening. I mean, and in parallel, I know some of us are, some of us in the registries are still thinking about progressing on those ideas. So I think we're going to have a conversation as well on some of the other ideas. And if the timing works, I mean, we can talk about those during our meetings as well. Welcome.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks for the refresher on phase two, Ariel. I must admit it's a little bit hard to change gears right now. So let's look at the text. I don't remember when we first put this text out to the list, but it's been out there for quite some time. But I'm sure it's been quite some time since anyone had the opportunity to have a look at it as well. So we might need to do a bit of a refresher on the language as well. So I think what we'll do is go through and pull out some of the comments and see if we can reach agreement on them and then see how far we get. So, Ariel, can I hand back to you to drive?

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. I put the link in the chat so folks can read on your own screen if you want. I'll just go through these comments sequentially. So C4, this is about the IDN table harmonization question. And as how we drafted for phase one text, we did a brief response from the EPDP team to the charter question and then followed that with the preliminary recommendation and then the

EN

rationale. So that's the same structure. So the first comment is from Dennis about this bullet point, all the existing variant domain names that predate the IDN table harmonization requirements must be grandfathered. So his question, our comment is that the intention is to grandfather all of the existing registered domain names, not just the ones that are deemed variant domain names by the registry. So Donna, agree with Dennis. So this is just my personal view of this and happy to be corrected. And the reason when it's drafted, we didn't or I didn't put existing domain names is because I wasn't sure whether this will be too broad because we don't know what other existing domain names may have problem with. Maybe they have problem with other requirements and I'm not sure whether we say just grandfather them all is going to be too broad and can potentially grandfather problematic existing domain names that have other issues rather than IDN table harmonization requirements. So that's why in the text, I included variants here because that's the specific topic we're talking about here. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Ariel. Just to give an example, perhaps of one of such cases, there may, for example, be a registration which is not IDNA 2003 or 2008 compliant. And if that is the case, for example, I am not sure whether that should, for example, be grandfathered. So I guess I'm giving example in support of what Ariel was saying that what is being grandfathered could also be impacted by some other conditions in the contract. Thank you.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. Yeah, I mean, I appreciate the observations and maybe we can use a different terminology than grandfathering. The intent here is that I mean, there are domain names today. And some change might happen in the future whereby the main names that were independent are going to be now variants of each other and won't be compliant with the same entity requirement, right? Future state, not today, but future state. So those domain names need not to be bring to the same entity requirements because we know we talk about there are existing registrants with existing rights and we do not want to take away those rights from these registrants. So that's the intention of these lines that we can translate that into other words. I'm good with that. But the intention is that those domain names today are not affected by any IDN table harmonization that's happening in the future related to the same entity requirement. I hope that makes sense.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So Dennis, are you suggesting that we need to kind of enhance what's here to be a bit more specific?

DENNIS TAN: I would say no, because I don't see grandfathering as a wild card to permit non-compliant domain names, right, with the rules that we have today. So that's why if we need to change that to be more

EN

specific, I'm good with that. But the way I read it is not meant to be a pre non-compliance card. That's not the intention.

DONNA AUSTIN: All right. So this text is only about what we agreed. And it's only intended to capture the discussion that we had and what we agreed. The recommendations themselves are probably, the language within those is probably more important. So if we can just keep this as it is, that all of the existing variant domains, domain names are predate. If that was the context of the conversation we had and that's what we agreed. Would that be acceptable to keep that as it is, Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, I think so.

DONNA AUSTIN: All right. So let's keep variant in, but let's have a look at the recommendation because if there's an issue with that, then that's where we have to make adjustments.

ARIEL LIANG: All right. Sounds good. And thanks Dennis and Donna and Sarmad for chiming in here. Okay, so next, this is, I guess Sarmad's observation that's more, not specifically relating to the recommendation, but I don't know whether we want to talk about it here, but maybe we can. And maybe Sarmad, you can speak up to this directly. So please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Ariel. So I think what I'm saying here is that when we are harmonizing two IDN tables, that there may actually be like a third source, which may be used to contribute into that harmonization process. So just think about in Latin table through which we can produce this string epic. I can't type Cyrillic, but it is also possible to use a Cyrillic table to also have the exactly the same string. So assume the second one Cyrillic. So we would obviously the harmonization, the purpose of harmonization is to prevent such cases where you can produce strings, which are potentially variants of each other from two independent tables. So each table should also know the context of other tables which are present and so on. And also registrations which are available. So if one of the epics is registered, the other one should be blocked. Even if the other one is going to be registered through a different IDN table. So if the Latin is registered, the Cyrillic one should be blocked and vice versa. So when suppose if you're looking at IDN Latin table, normally the Latin table will not be defining variants with Cyrillic. And if you're looking at the Cyrillic table, they will not be defining variants with Latin. So if you're harmonizing those two tables, they will be harmonized without actually identifying these specific letters as variants of each other. If we use a third source, which is maybe an external source, for example we have root zone LGR. We also have reference LGRs, which could be used. Then that source actually can be used to in some ways discover that the E in Latin is similar to some one character in Cyrillic. P in Latin is another is also a variant of, not similar, sorry, to another character in Cyrillic and so on. And if that third source is used, considering the two Latin and Cyrillic source, do not identify those

EN

variants. That allows us to discover those missing variants and allow for better harmonization. That, I think, is what I am trying to say. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So we have a couple of comments in chat. Dennis or Maxim, I don't know if you wanted to speak to them.

DENNIS TAN: Sure. Thank you, Donna. So harmonization and specific variant rules are different. Harmonization is the way we are talking about it here and all the information that we have used in order to come to the recommendations that we are putting together is harmonization is the process by which [inaudible] consistent rules across IDN tables in a namespace or namespaces when we consider gTLD variants, as I said. Talking about specific rules, that's a different conversation. And we've established registries own those IDN tables and create those IDN tables for harmonization, is that those tables, as created, have consistent rules across these tables. And when a variant rule is set in one, that rule is consistent with the other tables which use those same code points, repertoire, what have you. So don't agree with conflating harmonization with specific rules or variants that exist in these reference LGRs.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Maxim, did you want to speak to the comments you have in chat?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I'm a bit puzzled with the variance between ASCII Latin scripts and Cyrillic. So far, I'm not sure we have any, because even in Kazakhstan, where they introduced Latin script replacement for Cyrillic, it's not strictly Latin script, it has a lot of special characters. And as far as I know, there is no country so far which uses Cyrillic language in both, yeah, any language in both Cyrillic and Latin. So I'm not sure it's a proper example.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right, so I guess through the root zone label generation rules process, when we worked with the different communities, script communities, they did identify cross script variants and those are, I guess, quite well documented in the root zone level generation rules. I think in any case, one of the purposes of, I guess, harmonization is that if there are two labels which are variants of each other, one should not be able to produce those variants separately and assign them to separate registrants by just using different IDN tables under a registry. And I guess the example I was giving was also trying to show the same. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So I don't know that we have support to make this more explicit, Sarmad. My sense is that the recommendation stays as it is, unless this is something you feel strongly about.

Then we could come back to it. But the sense I get is that the recommendation doesn't need changing at this point. So Ariel, can we move to the next one? Okay, we can come back to it. So I appreciate that it's been a while since people have had a look at these. Maybe you hadn't seen Sarmad's comments when you read through the documents. So if you could go back and have a look at Sarmad's comments and give your thoughts, then that would be appreciated. All right. Let's keep moving, Ariel. So we've got 20 minutes really left for this call, so we'll see where we can get to.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. Thanks all. The next comment is from Dennis. It's in the rationale of the recommendation one, so let me just quickly remind folks what recommendation one is. There is a requirement for harmonization for both existing and future IDN tables, and harmonization means the IDN tables for a gTLD and its variant gTLD must produce a consistent variant domain set of a given second level label registered under that gTLD or variant gTLD. So the harmonization requirement, that's recommendation one here. And the rationale part. So basically, Dennis added significant before security, stability and competition issue. So that's basically to explain the context why ICANN Org is reviewing these IDN tables, is for any significant issues. And he also included the reference of where significant is used. And I think that's a good addition here. I don't know whether anybody else has comment on that. And I saw Maxim has the comment, suggest replacement of registerable to available for registration. So Maxim, are you talking about the recommendation text,

replacing registered? Okay. I understand. So I'm just going to copy paste your comment here and we can come back to this. Thanks, Justine. Yeah, I'm just gonna park it here and see whether this is a good replacement. I mean, thanks Maxim for the suggestion. We'll go back to this. But just quickly, see whether any questions were coming from the group about significant as suggested by Dennis. And not seeing chat or raise hand, I guess it's okay.

And the next comment. So that's from Sarmad. It's about harmonization is to ensure that all of the IDN table for a given gTLD must produce the same variant domain set. And he is asking whether we should use the word consistent. So, yeah, just wondering whether there's a difference. Please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. So I guess there can be cases where, for example, you have a Hindi domain name versus a Nepali domain name, both using a Devanagari script. Since they are targeting different countries or different communities. They may not have all the different characters and therefore not exactly the same variant sets. But as long as those various sets are consistent with each other, meaning if two letters are two characters are variant in one, they should also be variant in the other one and or vice versa, then I think that's the target. Enforcing same would mean that it will require registries to add more characters in the Nepali IDN table just because it's needed in Hindi, even though it's not needed in Nepali. So that's why I was suggesting consistent rather than the same. Thank you.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. I note Dennis's plus one to use of consistent rather than same. So I think based on your explanation, I think consistent makes more sense so we can change that.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, thanks. And I'm realizing the recommendation I used consistent but in the rationale used same. So we should make it consistent. Double consistent. Yes. The next comment. So no matter which IDN table or whatever language script is used for gTLD, the variant domain set produced for the requested label must be the same. Okay, so I guess this is in the same vein as the same consistent discussion. So basically, are you suggesting just swap the same with consistent here? Would that be sufficient or is there anything else we need to change in this sentence? And Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, it's the same change. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Sarmad. Just quickly note this here so we don't forget. Okay. And the next comment, that's from Dennis. So this is the paragraph, harmonization requirement is expected to avert the situation of the domain names which are regarded as variants of each other under the same gTLD from becoming registrable or available for registration as what Maxim was suggested by different registrants as distinct domain names, which may

EN

potentially cause user confusion and security risks. So Dennis has suggested a new paragraph to replace this one. So what he said is that the harmonization requirement is expected to avoid a situation where two or more domain names that are calculated as variant domain names using certain IDN table rules can be non-variants using another IDN table rules. So he's saying not to conflate harmonization with same entity and also don't forget that domain names can be distinct domain names even if registered by the same registrants. So basically he wants to stay within what harmonization really means here rather than kind of alluding to the user confusion perspective. But I will stop here and see whether Dennis has any additional comments for this. And please go ahead, Dennis.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thank you. Sure, yeah, just to emphasize not complete harmonization with the same entity requirement. Harmonization is looking at one goal. Create consistent variant rules across tables within a namespace. Without additional policy, those domain names, variants of each other, okay, but they could be made available to different registrants. The same entity requirement will require those domain names, variants of each other, are allocated to the same entity. So its different levels of how we are going to the same entity. Harmonization will help enforce and operationalize the same entity requirement, but they're not one and the same. That's what I wanted to explain, right? So keep things separate, but they are going to work together in order to make this entity work better, if you will. I hope that makes sense.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Any objection to adopting Dennis's proposed language? So basically replacing what we have here with what Dennis has in the comments. Maxim is a plus one to Dennis. And I think based on Dennis's explanation, it probably makes sense to replace it. I don't see any objection, Ariel, so let's replace it, unless you have an objection, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: No objections, but maybe just a refinement suggestion is the end from the same gTLD registry. I was wondering whether I should say for a given gTLD, because I understand the registry can have multiple gTLDs and those gTLDs have different IDN tables, so it's just to be a little bit more precise, if that helps. And I can propose that on the Google Doc. And thanks, Dennis. I think Dennis is okay with that. And Maxim said the registry is always for a particular. Okay, I guess I may be overthinking this. Okay. I think you're in the right track area, so it's okay.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. And thanks, Maxim and Jennifer. Sarmad has a hand up.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, thank you. This is Sarmad. So, I think generally good with what Dennis is suggesting. Those are obviously two different things. But just, I think, raising the hand to indicate that, I guess in the previous recommendation, or we were actually discussing what should be the scope of harmonization. And I think that discussion may also be on this text once we come back to it. I just wanted to raise that. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. We have 10 minutes left. So I think that's the extent of edits for the first recommendation and its the rationale and we talked Sarmad's comment to go back to later. And the next one, C5, that's about harmonization mechanism and the team's agreement is left to the registries to decide their mechanism and not to prescribe any specific recommendation. And basically just have a response to the charter question capturing this agreement from the team. And Justine proposed this additional sentence. The consideration included a discussion on how the transfer of TLDs from one registry to another would work if the registry operators have different mechanisms for harmonizing IDN tables. That's proposed by ALAC team. And I realized I didn't report back on this because I think that's something staff is tasked to find out from our colleagues. You know, if, for example, a TLD is transferred from one registrar to another, will there be an impact on its IDN table? So what we find out is that there will be no impact because there's already mechanism within ICANN to ensure the consistency that will continue. And there is also something I think I learned. It's called the MSA, but maybe the registry colleagues can kind of supplement or provide more input on that. It's basically ICANN has to work with the new registry to ensure there will be no glitch or a problem arising from this transfer. So the IDN tables will still continue to be used and won't cause problems to existing registrations. So I think that's what we find out. But I don't know

EN

whether there's a request from the team to include that additional info here or this is enough. So I'll stop here.

DONNA AUSTIN: I don't think we need to include the additional information, Ariel. And I think this is just a statement to say that it's one of the considerations that we talked about when we were talking about this question. So I'm okay with including this. So Justine is saying that this is Satish's input and if nobody objects to it, yeah, it's just a fact. It's just something we discussed when we discussed this charter question. So unless there's objections, I think we're okay to keep moving.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Moving on. So again, C6, this is about the IDN table harmonization mechanism regarding the format of IDN table and the group's agreement is to basically not to prescribe any specific format. And that's for the registries to decide what is appropriate for their use. And the response is drafted to capture that agreement. And there are some, I guess, editorial comments here that basically agree to not rather than agree not to. And then I think Justine had a comment here via an automated process and just delete more here. And then again, it's just Dennis said, agree to not rather than agree not to, I guess, grammatical. And if there's no concerns or objections from the team, we could adopt these. Alan, please go.

ALAN BARRETT: So I understand that you may not want to require the XML format, but wouldn't it still make sense to recommend the XML format? Is the distinction I'm trying to draw there between recommend and require?

DONNA AUSTIN: Because what we're basically doing here is providing recommendations that become policy. It's best that we don't recommend or require because otherwise it would become policy. So I think that's the difference here, Alan.

ALAN BARRETT: Yeah, okay. Thank you. And let me try to respond to Justine in the chat. Yes, I suppose I overlooked the fact that anything recommended here can become policy. I was thinking it might make sense to say XML format is a good idea, but is not necessary if we've got a reason not to do it. That was the intent I was trying to convey. But yeah, I understand your statement too, Donna. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Alan. And I think it is the case that some registry operators do use the XML format, but it varies across from registry to registry. So what we're trying to not do is recommend that there be a single format. That would be left up to the registry operator to decide.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan, for that question. So I guess with no other comments about these edits on the screen, we'll adopt them. Donna, we have one minute left. Do you want to keep going or we stop here?

DONNA AUSTIN: Let's call it for today. I think we'll pick up here when we come back, noting that next week we need to come back to 4.4. And we may be starting consensus call next week. Anyway, we'll put out an agenda once we've had the leadership call tomorrow and we'll talk to you all next week. So thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]