EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 20 April 2023 at 13:00 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/twP5DQ

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, 20 April 2023 at 13:00 UTC.

We have no apologies today. But Edmon Chung will be joining late. All members and participants will be promoted to panelists for today's call. Members and participants, when using the chat, please select everyone in order for everyone to see the chat and so it is captured in the recording. Others will remain as an attendee and will have view only chat access.

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 e-mail 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 multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you and back over to our chair, Donna Austin. Please begin.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks very much, Devan. Welcome back, everybody. I hope you enjoyed your mini break. I know I did. That's not to say that things weren't happening in the background. I think I'm happy to report that we are on track to have the Initial Report published for Public Comment next Monday, I think. Is that correct, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, that's correct. I actually need to follow up with Public Comment team just to check on their progress.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks again for that big push we did towards the end there to meet the timeline so we can report to the Council that we've met our deadline.

So what we're going to go through today is just some administrative stuff initially. And then what we want to spend most of our time on today is a review of the Phase 2 charter questions.

And what we want to achieve from that is you might recall that when we started the Phase 1 work, we had an exercise in trying to do our best guesstimate of how long we think it would take us to work through the charter questions. We're going to do that again today for Phase 2 for a number of reasons. One is that we want to update the project plan. But the primary purpose for doing so is that the Board has requested from us a timeline and a project plan for how long it will take us to get through the charter questions that we believe will directly impact the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. So what they're trying to identify as a bigger piece is they're trying to put together the timeline for the release of the Applicant Guidebook. As most of you probably know, we are a dependency. So getting the Phase 1 stuff is really important, getting that done and finalized to the Final Report. Getting that to Council is going to be an important piece of work. But secondary to that will be getting through those charter questions that we think will be required for the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement.

So what we want to do is identify how long we think it's going to take us to get through the charter questions. So we will do that today. And to help us get through all of that we're going to put a timer on. So we're going to set four minutes to consider various pieces of the charter question to ensure that we can get through that exercise today. Once we've got a sense of how long we think it will take, then we need to do that secondary exercise of identifying which charter questions we think are going to be impacting that Applicant Guidebook. From that we can develop our project plan. So for the next couple of weeks, that's going to be the focus because we have to provide that timeline to the

EN

Board by the end of ICANN77. It might be a little bit tedious to get through the next couple of calls but we need to do that groundwork so that we can prepare a decent kind of a project plan and timeline for the Council so that they can provide that to the Board.

Okay. So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Ariel to go through some of the admin stuff, and then we'll get into the review of the Phase 2 charter questions. Thanks, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna. So today's date is the 20th and we're at meeting 79. We're already mentioning the Public Comment we're going to publish on Monday. We will confirm with the Public Comment team, make sure there's no surprises. And then we'll have another meeting scheduled next Thursday at meeting 80th.

In the agenda, you probably saw we have some outreach-related efforts planned. I just want to quickly mention what are these. One is the leadership team would like to hold a community-wide webinar to promote the Initial Report and provide more flavor to the key recommendations. In that way, it can help the public participating our Public Comment proceeding.

So the webinar is planned for the week of May 14, two options for them, among the leadership team, to either Tuesday, the 16th of May or Wednesday, 17th of May. Time is now down to 11:00 UTC to 12:30 UTC. So we'll keep the group posted. We'll also widely advertise that in some ICANN communications channels. So you'll

probably see it in newsletters and social media. So that's one of the outreach events right now.

Then the other one is were planning to meet with the SSAC SMEs for IDN subject to kind of discuss with them some recommendations they may have a keen interest in. The method we're thinking about doing is to invite them to one of our meetings in the month of May. So either 18th of May or 25th of May. So we're already reached out to the SSAC administration and they're going to come back to us which date would potentially work better for them. So we'll keep the group posted.

And lastly, we do have another outreach targeting the GAC. We followed up with the GAC and tried to understand whether they have an interest for a follow-up webinar, just to focus on the Initial Report. But we also let them know there's this general community webinar being planned. So they said they will definitely be interested in the general webinar, but they will get back to us on whether there's special interest for a more targeted webinar for the GAC.

So that's the three outreach-related efforts. Also for the month of May, we have meetings, but most likely we're going to cancel the meeting for May 4. That's due to a conflict with the Special GNSO Council meeting that's focusing on SubPro implementation. Also, Donna actually wouldn't be available that day anyway. So it's possible we have to cancel the May 4 meeting, but May 11 we'll probably still have that meeting on calendar. So a quick heads up on that.

EN

Lastly, for the month of June, as you see, we have meetings scheduled for June 1. The meeting for June 8 is mostly going to be canceled because that's right before ICANN77. And for June 5, that's our scheduled day to close the Public Comment period. That's 42 calendar days. But subject to community request, we may be able to extend the Public Comment to June 26. So that will be three weeks extension. If anybody from the community requests that, that's something we can consider.

Another important heads up for ICANN77 is that Donna requested to have four sessions in ICANN77, and we were able to secure those slots. So basically, during 77 we will have EPDP meeting every day. These are the local time for the sessions. We just want to give folks a heads up on that. We understand there may be conflicts with some other community sessions, but we hope everybody will be able to make it as much as you can. So we do have a lot of work planned for 77. Of course, we will circulate the details via e-mail.

Donna, I saw you're unmuted. Yeah?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. I can't find where to put my hand up. What would be really helpful to know from folks is how many of the sessions you can attend at ICANN77. I don't want to assume that everyone's attending in person either, so if you can let us know whether you'll be there in person or remotely. Because we're a little bit under the pump from the Board to, well, not just the Board, but we're very conscious that we are a dependency for getting SubPro rolled out. We really want to make the most of the four days that we have or

the four meetings that we have. So we will be focused on the Phase 2 work. Even if our Public Comment period finishes on the 5th of June, while we can maybe do a cursory review of the comments, I don't think we'll have enough time during the meeting to spend on that. So the focus for ICANN77 will be Phase 2 charter questions. We really want to get the most out of that time. So if folks can let us know their availability, that would be really helpful. But regardless, we are going to push on anyway regardless of how many we've got in the room and in what conflicts people have.

Full schedule not available yet, Michael. I'm not sure what the timing on that is. Yeah, I understand. It's hard to know whether you've got conflicts on that yet. But we just wanted to give you a heads up. So we have had that confirmed from the GNSO secretariat. So that's pretty good news because it doesn't happen all that often.

The other thing—and I don't know whether you've got this next, Ariel—is the membership refresh. Yeah? Okay. All right. So, because we're moving into Phase 2, what we thought it might be useful to do is just a membership refresh. So what we'll be doing is sending a communication to each of the SGs and Cs just to reconfirm membership and participants. So if you want to give your respective chairs a heads up that there will be communication coming, that we're just going to reconfirm the membership because we think it's an opportune time to do so because we're moving into Phase 2. So we will get that done, I don't know, probably in the next week or two. What else have we got, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Donna, do you want to mention the face-to-face?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. So the other thing that we've been talking about at the leadership level is the possibility of having a face-to-face meeting of this team because we think that there would be value in doing so, and we feel that we almost will need to do so. If folks remember when we chunked our work into two phases, the project plan that we submitted to Council has us completing our work at the end of 2025, I think it is. And leadership is very keen to push that up by at least 12 months. We appreciate that we've already been working on this for—are we close to two years? I think July might bring it up to two years. So that's a significant commitment already and I think it's unreasonable to expect that people will have the time to maintain this for another two years. So we will be seeking or requesting from Council the opportunity to have a face-to-face meeting.

So the exercise we're doing today in breaking down how many meetings do we think we're going to need to get through the charter questions, it's going to be important to when to best schedule a face-to-face meeting. One of the things that we've been informed is that there is a six-month lead time for ICANN. So if we're going to put a request in, we'll need to do it relatively soon. But we don't expect that we will have a face to face in the next six months. It's going to happen sometime soon after that. So we just wanted to give you a heads up on that as well, that we are thinking about that, and we will pursue it because we think we'll

EN

need it. Any questions on any of those issues that we've just run through? Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. So I think we're done for the admin part.

Okay. So, Ariel, are you okay to lead us through this? Just to remind folks, we're going to put a four-minute timer on this. So for each question, once we understand what it is we're doing here, where we get to considering each of the charter questions, we're going to put a four-minute timer on to hopefully enable us to get through all of the charter questions today. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Quick question. Do I time myself too? What time? After I finish introducing question?

DONNA AUSTIN: That's a good question. When we decided on four-minutes, have you factored in your intro?

ARIEL LIANG: I can try to do it in 30 seconds, as quickly as possible. Maybe the exercise will be a little slower at the beginning because we're going through, but it may get faster later. We'll see how it goes.

Okay. So this is the Board resolution passed on March 16. Donna already mentioned it and I just want to repeat that we need to get a timeline to the Council regarding the recommendations related to questions that may have an impact on the next Applicant Guidebook. So that's the task at hand. Then today we're focusing

on the timeline part because we need to have on the setting how many meetings potentially will take to finish deliberating the Phase 2 charter questions. So that's the purpose of this exercise. To assist our exercise, leadership team and staff have kind of agreed on some aspects that the group needs to consider in order to conduct this exercise and get this guesstimate how many meetings potentially it will take to deliberate the question.

So one is for each charter question, what data is potentially needed. So data here is more general term. It doesn't mean it has to be hard data. It can be an anecdotal evidence where some other forms of data that's not based on survey, that kind of method. And then also for each question, what the potential outcomes may look like. So that means what potential answer to the charter question may look like and what kind of recommendations this group may develop. We're definitely not talking about the substance of each charter question and getting to the deliberation mode, but merely just talking about what the potential outcome may look like. So, now we will have an understanding how difficult or extensive the discussion may become. So that's the second aspect. Then based on our discussion for item one or two, we will perhaps have a more accurate guesstimate how long it may take to deliberate each charter question. So that's the basic framework for the exercise.

Item three is the focus today. So to help us kick off the discussion, staff already did some kind of suggested answer to each of these three questions. We also provided an interpretation for each charter question because we realized a lot of charter questions are kind of long and a little bit hard to understand. So we tried to

EN

simplify the message and honing on the actual ask of the charter question. So hopefully that can help the group grasp the key message a little bit better.

Then in terms of the guesstimate how long it may take to deliver the question, staff provided a guesstimate for your consideration, and it's based on our understanding how difficult the question is. Based on the background and context, the group has to understand first also potential data that's needed to get to an answer. Then also based on our experience in Phase 1, because in Phase 1, we have encountered some really difficult charter questions such as the String Similarity Review, that took 11 meetings to get to agreement on approach. And then also our recent discussion about application fees, that took five meetings. But for the String Similarity Review, the 11 meetings is one hour, so roughly the same, like five meetings, four difficult questions. So that's our benchmark. Then when we did the guesstimate, we used that benchmark to provide our guess how many meetings it may take for each question.

This is a summary view of what we think in terms of the meetings it may take for tackling each question. And just to give a quick overview, we have 19 questions in Phase 2. The first three, C1, C2, C3, we think those are probably the most difficult ones, also including C4, because they're at the beginning of topic C and they're basically laying the groundwork for the kind of deliberation for the following questions in that topic. So it may take longer to tackle those first. Then four meetings is for the difficult questions. Then also another set of difficult questions are in Topic G. That's

about IDN Implementation Guidelines. So we put four meetings for G1 as well.

Then we also discussed about contingency. So in case we cannot wrap up deliberation based on the kind of allocation of meetings we provided us, we can have a buffer of 12 meetings just to wrap up anything that's kind of left over. So if you do this calculation, the total number of meetings based on our guesstimate is 60 meetings to finish Phase 2. That's a kind of a summary view. So please keep in mind while we go through them.

So this is the first question, C1. Then I will introduce this question and provide you the staff's analysis, and then I will stop and see whether there's a hand up or comment. C1 is basically a question asking about the same entity requirement. This is applied to second level. So we already tackled the top-level same entity requirement. For the second-level same entity requirement means that a second-level primary label that arises from a registration based on IDN table, all of its allocatable labels must only be allocated to the same entity that registers the primary label were withheld for that entity. So same entity means register to the same registrant, in this case, basically. And then all the allocatable variant labels for the second-level label must be registered to that registrant or withheld for that registrant. So that's what it means. The key ask of C1 is basically whether the same entity requirement should be extended to existing variant domains. Because for SubPro they already had a recommendation saying same entity requirement must be applied to future second-level registration that's variant domains. So we're trying to fill the gap in terms of whether that recommendation should be extended to

existing variant domains. So that's the kind of key ask for this question.

Then in terms of data, we thought we may need to have some understanding how the variant domains are managed today by registrars. It doesn't need to be hard data. It can be just anecdotal data from registrars and just get an understanding how the current situation looks like.

Then in terms of potential outcome of this charter question, it will try to develop an answer, there may be two possible options. One is yes, we will recommend same entity requirement to be applied retrospectively to all of the existing variant domains. Or no, we will say we'll grandfather existing registrations and not to enforce the same entity requirement. So that's the potential outcome of our discussion. And because this is kind of a principal question we need to address, we are estimating it may take four meetings. So maybe the first meeting, we would just do this context review, and then review some of the data from registrars we could collect, and then we will have three meetings to conclude and develop a recommendation. So that's my opening. I will stop and see whether there's any questions.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So obviously one of the things that Justine has raised in chat is that based on what Ariel presented and the guesstimates done by staff, we're potentially looking at 60 meetings to finish the deliberation to the charter questions, which it's not really acceptable. So we need to find a means to get things done quicker. So I'd be interested in thoughts from folks about

EN

what they think it will take us to get through this. So if you've got any comments on what data you think we'll need, any other insight that you might have on this question without actually deliberating the substance of the question, and then thoughts on how many meetings you think we'll need for this. So, there it is, guys. The floor is open. So if you have any thoughts, please let us know. Just any random thoughts that you might be having on this at the moment, we'd be happy to hear them. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks. You said random thoughts. You might know that Dennis just started a CPH subgroup where we will be discussing some of these topics, and hopefully maybe the results that come out of this will help the discussion of this group and make our discussions here faster because we already have prepared some thoughts, some possible solutions. And maybe Dennis wants to say more to this. I don't know. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: Thank you, Donna, and thank you, Michael, for that. So yeah, we've started a conversation. And just maybe a little clarification, I like to clarify as we zoom in, because about a month ago we started a paper on collecting operational information on how some registries and registrars are deploying variant domain name today. And from that exercise, we learned there are at least two operational models, the attribute and the object models. So that,

of course, is important as far as how the same entities enforce in different ways. So today we will resume that conversation, hopefully, with more focus.

Ariel shared with me the collection of the questions related in the charter that are potentially pertaining to what CPH tackles can discuss and provide input. So, we are working off that list of charter questions and trying to keep our conversation focused on that list. We started today and we intend to meet biweekly so that we can keep a regular cadence on our discussions. Like Michael said, hopefully we can provide useful information to this group to discuss. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis, and thanks, Michael. One of the things that we spoke about at the leadership level is that we think one of the ways to speed things up potentially, and Michael kind of hit on this, before we actually get into the meat or the substance of the charter questions, if we could do an overview of how IDNs operate at the second level at the moment. Because I think all of us really do need to understand how it works now so that we can really understand or have a better sense of how to respond to these questions. So any work that the CPH is doing, thank you very much for that. But I think before we actually get into this work, to the extent that we can provide an overview of how IDNs work at the second level already and some of the potential touch points in the charter questions, I think that will be really helpful.

So I am aware that Sarmad did a presentation at the last ICANN meeting on how second-level domains operate. We'll review that

EN

to see if it's fit for purpose here. But if it's okay, I really want to lean on our Registry and Registrar colleagues in this group if I can because you are the folks that understand how this works operationally. So to some extent, I'd like you to be our subject matter experts as we go into these conversations.

Okay. So we've hit the four-minute mark. So I think what we'll have to do on C1 is just accept that. Four meetings is the way to go. Ariel said we'll get better as we go through these.

Now, I just want to address something that Satish suggested in chat, which is about breaking into smaller groups to do some of this, consider some of this work. I'm willing to think about that a little bit further, but my initial reaction is I don't think that will work because we're a relatively small group anyway. I don't know how it would work to have people working on different things simultaneously and how we bring that back to the group. I'm not sure that would save us any time. So I'm not 100% confident that that would work, Satish, but we will talk about that at the leadership level.

Maxim, I apologize, your hand's been up. So over to you.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, we might need information like how many IDN domains were registered in the IDNs which might have variants or just in IDNs compared to ASCII. Because from DNS perspective, it doesn't matter if your domain is IDN or ASCII. It's just resolved or not. The second thing, formally—yeah, okay. We will speak about later. But thanks. I also agree that splitting the small group further

will require additional synchronization and we will have station of diminishing returns that the more we split, the more time we spend. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Okay. So now we'll get into C2 and we'll see if we can stay on target here. Once Ariel's done the setup, maybe it only takes less than a minute for folks to give their thoughts on the length of time it will take us. But the other thing I'm really interested in hearing from folks is what data or information do you think we'll need to address some of these questions. So back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna. Thanks, everybody. So for C2, I'm not going to read the actual wording of the charter question but the interpretation of that. It actually has two parts. One part is asking whether the same entity means the same registrant. And also should same registrant requirement be extended to existing variant domains. But to be honest, I think part one belongs better in C1 instead of C2. But I just want to clarify this is the first part of C2. And then the second part of C2 is asking about whether the cover rule for activating variant domains should be updated. And in the context of this charter question, there's a link to a [inaudible] to the Registry Agreement, I believe, talking about how the variant domains are activated now, and I think it's based on request from the registrar, if I'm not mistaken. So basically, they're asking two questions in C2.

Then we believe the data that may be needed is the some data from registrars regarding whether registrant is used as the entity for variant domains. So just to get some understanding how variant domains are managed currently, and then it's kind of related to the data for C1 as well. Then the other data we think may be helpful is from registries regarding their current practice of activating variant domains. So we need to review the section in the Registry Agreement, and then also just to hear from registries what their current practice look like.

So in terms of potential outcome of a C2 discussion, for part one, we envisioned that the group may kind of go to two types of answers. One is that yes, same registrants must be required for existing variant domain registrations retrospectively, or no, this group may recommend grandfathering existing registrations. For part two, one outcome is there's no change for the current rules for activating variant domains. And then the second potential outcome is that this group may develop some new rules or policy for activating variant domains. This is also a kind of principal question this group has to address and we allocated four meetings due to the difficulty of this question. I will stop now.

DONNA AUSTIN: Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I'm not sure that we will be able to find current practice for TLDs for variants because they were not allowed. And using only ccTLD practice, it won't be right because we might face some

EN

unapplicable results. Because ccTLDs effectively can do whatever they find in feed, unlike TLDs will have many policies to follow and the contract to follow. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. I think what we want to understand is what registries and registrars currently do in registration of IDNs at the second level now, understanding that there are no IDN variants at the top level at the moment, but we'd still like to understand how registries/registrars actually register IDNs at the second level at the moment, and also variants. So I think that's the intent.

Okay. All right. So folks have any thoughts on whether we think this will take four meetings? Or maybe you only think it's going to take a meeting? Any thoughts on what you see in front of you? And I understand you're seeing this for the same time. Well, probably not the first time we're reading the charter questions, but the exercise itself is probably unexpected. Is that an old hand, Maxim? Okay. All right, let's move on, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. So C3, this charter question is ask about the mechanism to identify the same registrant. In the staff paper, it was recommended to use the ROID as a mechanism for identifying the same registrant. We need to deliberate whether that's appropriate mechanism for identifying the same registrant for not only in future variant domains but also existing variant domains. And if this group decides that's not the right mechanism, we need to also consider what other mechanism may be

appropriate. Then it's more like what other mechanisms already exist, and now we're saying that it's more appropriate to identify the same registrant.

In terms of data, we thought again any data from registrar regarding their mechanism of identifying the same registrant will be helpful, and also we need to gain a better understanding what ROID entail, how that works. So we need to get some basics of ROID as well.

For potential outcome of this question, this is asking two aspects, both future and existing. So for future registrants, maybe the group will recommend using ROID to identify same registrant or we recommend a different mechanism that already exists to identify same registrant where we don't develop any specific recommendation and just ask the registrars to determine their own mechanism. So that's for future and for existing. Possibly the answer could be yes, we recommend to use the ROID retrospectively for all existing variant domains registration, or we say just grandfather the existing practice and not to change anything. So this is also a tricky question and foundational question, and we allocated four meetings for this one. I'll stop.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Maxim had his hand up. I think it's a new hand.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN:	Oh, I thought it was an old one. Sorry. Maxim?
MAXIM ALZOBA:	I think we might ask ICANN Compliance to provide us with information on cases opened where ICANN wasn't happy with the use of ROIDs, and without particular information but with the uniqueness of ROIDs. Because our practice say that registries/registrars and ICANN have own vision on how to use and how to apply that. Also, I need to underline that using the same ROID for different registration might not be good because of tracking issues. Thanks.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Maxim. Justine?
JUSTINE CHEW:	Thanks. I think Maxim made a good point, getting information from Compliance. My other thought that sprang to me is I think ROID is also mentioned in the Transfer Policy PDP. So insofar as something that's come out from that PDP that we may need to know, then that will be useful as well. Thanks.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Justine. Hadia?
HADIA EL MINIAWI:	Thank you. My understanding is that ROID is a part of the Registry Agreement. Also, the Registry Agreement requires the

EN

use of ROID at least in some objects like the RDDS output, the data escrow, ERP, trademark database, and others. So I think the decision also on whether to continue using it or not will extend to other already existing processes where it is used as an object. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: Thank you, Donna. Maybe I'm repeating this but I just wanted to observe again from early data gathering from some registrars and some backend service providers, the ROID, the registrant object is not reused, meaning registrars opt to create a new object for every single domain name, whether or not it's an existing account. So that's a reality. Some registrars reuse the object for the same "registrant," others create new objects. So it is not a guarantee that they are reusing those. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So I guess from that perspective, it's important for us to understand how ROID is being used by registrars at the moment and if there's differences in the way it's being applied. So that could be a data or information gathering part. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Since same entity, it is meant in legal terms, as I hope the only method to establish that it's the same entity is provision of some

kind of papers like for businesses it's business certificates or signature of the director, etc. For persons, it's ID or passport or whatever you call it. But it's done by a registrar because registry has no way to contact. I mean, it doesn't contact the registrant. It's done on registrar level and identification could be done only on that level. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Okay. So we haven't had comments on the number of meetings. So I'm just going to assume four meetings it is. Moving on, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, everybody. C3a is related to C3. And it asks about whether additional requirements should be developed if ROID is recommended as the mechanism to identify same registrant. So again, for data, we need some data from registrars regarding their mechanism currently for identifying the same registrant.

In terms of potential outcome, this is dependent on the group's answer to C3 because the kind of opening for this question is if the group recommends ROID, then what? Then maybe the group will develop some additional requirements or there's no additional requirements recommended. What the group can just say, like registrars determine their additional requirements. This is very much kind of getting to the implementation side of things. So it may not be needed for the policy group to develop recommendation on this. So we estimated two meetings for C3a.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. So I note in chat that Satish is saying that he thinks all foundational charter questions may take four meetings. If folks could just put their thinking caps on, is there some way that we could consider the foundational questions as single group? Because I'm pretty sure they're kind of interconnected. So is there a way that we can consider them together rather than doing them as discrete questions? I don't know whether it was possible. But one of the exercises that we're trying to do here is how do we find efficiencies in the way that we conduct our meetings? So I'm open to any of those suggestions as well that folks might have. So if we decide these are the foundational questions, is there some way that we can do them as a job lot, and then we'll find some efficiencies in that way. So if folks have thoughts on that, I'd be very happy to hear. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: Thank you, Donna. Yeah, I think I agree with that approach. As we are doing this exercise, let's look at the commonalities of the question. For example, C3a is an extension of C3. So let's think holistically. I just want to observe perhaps something for consideration that's useful. So we're looking at the questions. But I think it would be also useful to understand what's the end goal. What are we trying to achieve? And this is something that extended from our earlier conversation within the TechOps group. What do we want to achieve to get a registrant equivalence? Is it to manage the same entity through the life cycle? Again, this is very early conversations but I think I found it useful as far as how to frame the angle so that it's helpful for us to answer these questions. Why do we want to do this? So maybe that will also

EN

help and channel our discussions, questions, and whatnot, right? Again, we're in contrast with what's possible today or not. Just an observation for consideration. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So to your point about what is it we're trying to achieve here. So maybe we can draw that information from the SubPro recommendations because that's kind of guiding the way here where we have a SubPro recommendations about same entity at the second level, so maybe we need to go back to the rationale for that and those recommendations, and see if we can pull that information out to your point about what is it that we're trying to achieve. So I think that could be instructional for us to actually get to the crux of why these questions have been developed and what we're hoping to get out of it. So, I think that's a good point. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks. I'm putting myself in the queue. I think in the top-level deliberation, we have touched on four principles. One is using RZ-LGR as a sole source, but this probably not applicable for second level. But then the second, third, and fourth may be applicable, one is same entity, and one is the integrity of the stat, and then the third one is conservatism. So these three may be still applicable for second-level discussion, and if we follow the same underlying principles, it may help us get to a recommendation quicker. Just a quick note on that.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. It's a good point. Because I'm not convinced that those principles we had for the top level are actually going to flow to the second level because we're really getting into operational stuff at the second level. But it is good to keep those principles in mind and see whether they actually do flow through to the second-level stuff and whether they are equally important to our discussions here.

Okay. So I don't see any comments on the two meetings here. So we'll agree that that's what we have. We'll move on to the next one. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, everybody. So the next one is C4. It's about whether IDN tables under a gTLD should be mutually coherent. This question asks for both future gTLD as well as existing gTLD. So we're not going to go into the detail of this question. But in terms of data, we definitely need to have better understanding what mutually coherent means.

Also, another quick heads up is there's another word called harmonization. A lot of us already heard about that repeatedly. They're kind of equivalent. So basically, to understand what harmonization and mutually coherent mean is key to deliberate this question.

Then second is in terms of current practices from registries because some of them already tried to make their IDN tables mutually coherent. We've heard that before. So we probably want to review those examples again.

Another potential data is ICANN Org has been doing the IDN table update project for a while. And then if they have any information that would be helpful to share, then it could potentially help us understand this question better.

Then for potential outcome, again we need to address both future and existing IDN tables. So for future IDN tables, maybe the group would recommend yes, they must be mutually coherent, or no, they do not need to be mutually coherent. That's the two possible outcomes we can think of. Then for existing, we can also think of one potential outcome as yes, all have the existing IDN tables must be mutually coherent, and this requirement needs to be applied retrospectively. Or we can say no, let's just grandfather the existing IDN tables and not to enforce the mutually coherent requirement. So this is again a foundational question, and we allocated four meetings for this one.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. Just on the data points, what we say data from registries, I think it might also be good to put backend registry providers in there as well. But understanding ICANN doesn't have a contract with the backend providers, but we do know a few backend registries that might be willing to provide some of that information if it's requested. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, responsibility for what's going on is on a registry contract owner, not only backend providers. So backend providers can say what happens but they're not the party to decide. They either do

EN

what's requested or they say, "No, it's not possible to do." As I understand, for many years, registries were promised by ICANN to have current IDN tables which are good for use to be grandfathered. But the reality is the process is like migration, etc., will have to pass via ICANN, and in the process, ICANN forces to use new formats of IDN tables. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. I understand your point about the backend registry providers, but it still might be helpful to ask them for information that they're willing to share. And also to Maxim's later point, just a note that the IDN tables are, you might say, a bit of a political object between GDS and registry operators. That's, I guess, just something to be cognizant of but not something that we need to do anything about. It's a fact.

Okay. I don't see any other hands so I think we can move on, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. C4a, the question is long but interpretation is short. I'm not sure why I would put it as a subset of D4 because it's asking about whether the variant domains under a single TLD should behave the same. And we believe this question actually doesn't need to be deliberated extensively, because SubPro PDP recommendation 25.8 already addresses this question. So for data, we need to look into detail what that 25.8 means and the rationale for that. And what we think is the potential outcome would basically just affirm SubPro PDP recommendation 25.8.

Also, this recommendation has already been approved by the Board so we shouldn't dispute that or challenge that or change it. That's why we're only allocated one meeting to this, but it's possible just a part of one meeting we can address it if we fully understand 25.8 and also this question.

DONNA AUSTIN: Dennis?

DENNIS TAN TANAKA: Thank you, Donna. Just putting my former drafting team member going through this question. I think we included this question because it pertains to or talks about single TLDs that have variant domain names at the second-level and the SubPro recommendation pertain only to variant TLDs. I think that might be a reason, but as you explained, Ariel, yeah, the conclusion might be just about the same. But for completeness, we included the question. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. I don't see any other hands so it looks like one meeting it is. Let's move on, Ariel. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much. Good afternoon. Yeah, this all looks fairly reasonable. I just didn't quite understand the reference to the Board has approved this. So this is part of the SubPro. So are we

EN

just topping and tailing it? So perhaps I misunderstood. Thank you very much.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, no problem, Nigel. So at the last ICANN meeting, the Board approved a number of SubPro recommendations. I think what Ariel is saying that 25.8 and I guess 25.6 and 25.7 were approved as part of that. Because this question is really related to that, there's probably not much for us to do here because those recommendations were adopted by the Board.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much. I understand. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Nigel. Okay, let's get moving, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: All right. Sounds good. C5 is actually tied more closely to C4. It's about the mechanism to harmonize the IDN tables to ensure they are mutually coherent. So that probably tied better to C4 than C4a.

Then in terms of data, again we saw some data from registries regarding their current practice of IDN table harmonization. And also, as Donna and Maxim mentioned, the backend registry service provider. I think Maxim mentioned another entity that can potentially provide us some anecdotal data regarding the current practice, how to manage their IDN tables.

For potential outcome for C5, we thought the group may recommend the method that was suggested by staff paper. There are two methods staff paper kind of suggested where there's IDN table harmonization. Or the group can recommend the staff paper didn't recommend. Or the group pages said we don't want to develop specific recommendation, just like registries to determine their method for harmonization.

So this, we thought three meetings may be enough. If we can get to a conclusion of C4, that's foundational regarding IDN harmonization, then this one may be slightly easier to discuss. I will stop here.

DONNA AUSTIN: Nigel, is that a new hand or an old hand? Okay. Thank you. Okay, so any thoughts on this one? Michael agrees. Okay. I don't see any hands. So three meetings it is, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. Thanks, Michael, too. C6, this question is about IDN tables again. It's asking whether IDN tables should use the LGR format, which is specified in RFC 7940. It asks about for both future and existing IDN tables, whether the LGR format should be recommended.

For data, we thought again get some data from registries and backend registry operator and other entity that can provide us regarding the IDN table format will be helpful. But then again, we think ICANN Org may already have some data regarding the

EN

current IDN table format. So just to have that general understanding will be helpful.

For potential outcome for this question discussion, we need to address both future and existing. So for future, the group could just recommend all the IDN tables must use the LGR format, or the group can recommend a different format, or we can have no specific recommendation and just let registries to determine their format. Then for existing, one possible outcome is we require LGR format retroactively to all of the existing IDN tables or we just grandfather existing IDN table the way it is and no specific recommendations.

This, we allocated two meetings because we think this is getting to the nitty-gritty of IDN table and it's very technical and implementation-related. So we thought two meetings may be enough to address this question.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. Any thoughts on this one? Michael thinks we might be able to get through this in a single meeting, but it's okay to leave it at two. Satish is okay with two. Okay, all right. Let's move on, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thanks, everybody. D4 is about the behavior of variant domains. There are several aspects of the domain name life cycle that was mentioned in the charter question. So basically, we're asking whether the variant domains should behave the same throughout the domain name life cycle. This is a slightly more

difficult question. And first off, we need to understand the basics of domain name life cycle and the various stages, what that means. Then there's another recommendation from SubPro. It's SubPro Recommendation—I think I've got the number wrong—it's 25.8, not 25.7. That's regarding the variant domain stage do not need to behave the same. So SubPro already have that recommendation. So basically, it's already adopted by the Board and then we should review that because it's either addressed the exact same question as D4 or at least very similar or very much related. So that's the data point we need to review.

Then for potential outcomes, possibly there are three outcomes we can think of. One is the group will recommend the entire variant label set from the second level. They also must behave the same in all stages of the domain name life cycle. Or we can just say no, they do not need to behave the same. Or there's a third option is maybe some stage of the domain name life cycle, they require the same behavior, but some other stages they do not need to behave the same.

So to answer this we have to keep some underlying principle in mind. For example, C1 and C2, they're talking about the same entity principle. So if we affirm the same entity principle, then this may have an impact to our deliberation for D4.

So we allocated three meetings to this question even it is a little hard question, but if we get the foundational questions right, then this may not be as difficult to address as C1 and C2. I'll stop here now.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Ariel. Any thoughts, folks? Okay. It looks like it's three. Michael is suggesting it may be even four. Nigel thinks it's going to be pretty complex. Okay. So, three, possibly four, I think is where this might be going. Maxim?
MAXIM ALZOBA:	Actually, these might even require to have been some kind of standard change in terms of EPP. So it's quite a complex argument. I would recommend to have some exchange of opinions with TechOps. I mean, the Registry/Registrar small team or technical persons. Thanks.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Thanks, Maxim. Okay. So it looks like this is leaning more towards four, I think, Ariel.
ARIEL LIANG:	Okay, sounds good. Should I move on?
DONNA AUSTIN:	Please.
ARIEL LIANG:	Okay. Thanks, everybody. D5, this is regarding the fees paid to ICANN by registry/registrar for each domain name registration. I think it's 18 cents paid by registry and 25 cents paid by registrar. So the question is asking whether each variant domain will incur

such a fee or the second-level variant label set will incur the fee. I think that's what the question is asking.

Of course, for data, we need to understand the basics of the fees, but it's really not much to it, it's just 18 cents and 25 cents.

For potential outcome, folks probably remember we already have a recommendation regarding the registry level fee. There are two aspects. One is the fixed fee, the other is the fee for transaction. We already have a recommendation that each domain will incur a transaction fee. It's not like the transaction fee is not calculated based on the set per se. So if we take that recommendation into consideration, then potentially the outcome for this question is that either we say each domain name will incur the fee. And they're all independent from each other so they will incur the fee paid to ICANN, or the group can say the set will incur a fee as a unit. But most likely, I think the first outcome is possible because it's consistent with our existing preliminary Recommendation 7.6. So we thought we could conclude discussion of this question within one meeting, but I'm happy to hear other people.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. I guess not withstanding that preliminary recommendation 7.6 is going out for Public Comment so we may get some feedback on that. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it's better to say in terms of transactions, because the mathematics behind fees for registries is more complex than just 18 cents. It's flat rate until 50k domains, and the next one costs a

EN

lot. Also the number of domains is used in calculations of fees for escrow. So it's registrar who pays to ICANN, registry who pays ICANN, also registry collects money from registrar, and also escrow. I believe it's four items where fees depend on the number of domains or registrations. So I think we made better use term of transaction, and if we see that the set of IDN variants is a single transaction or something like that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Part of this question is for reporting and the second part is for the fee accrual purposes. I assume the reporting is related to obligations under the Registry Agreement that may not be specifically about fees but maybe something else that needs to be reported on. Maybe there's a second part to this as well that we haven't correctly identified.

So this could potentially be two meetings, I think. I think we need to understand the distinction here. To Edmon's point that each registration it's not really each domain name, it's each billable transaction. So I think we're going to have to understand a little bit of the detail here so that the data, I think, is probably differences between billable transaction or domain name registration or other types. I think we need a little bit more data to understand properly the question. I think this is probably two meetings, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. Thanks, everybody, for the input. More difficult than I thought but all good points. I guess we move on to

the next one, it's D6. It's about whether and how should the Transfer Policy be updated for variant domains.

For data, we definitely need to get some basics of Transfer Policy. And there's a current Transfer Policy Review PDP going on. But we probably don't need to know every single detail, but at least the relevant part, then the variant domains we need to get a basic understanding of that.

In terms of potential outcome, I think the key point is regarding the same entity requirement at a certain level. Maybe if the group affirms that principle, that will have an impact on transfer because if you transfer one domain from a variant label set, you have to transfer the other associated domains in that set. That could be one of the recommendations the group may develop or the group can say the transfer of one domain does not affect the other domains from the variant label set. That depends on what our answer is to the foundational questions. Then also, it could be it depends on circumstances. If you transfer one domain in specific situation, it will affect the other domains and the other domain will need to be transferred together, but not necessarily all the time. That could be another outcome. Or the group can develop some additional recommendations to the Transfer Policy that staff haven't think of yet in order to preserve some of the underlying principles of variant domain management.

We allocated two meetings for now, but maybe we need more because we have to get up to speed with the Transfer Policy and what are the relevant parts. But so far, we'll just put two for now.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN:	Ariel, just a check. So the RPM PDP Phase 2 hasn't started its work yet?
ARIEL LIANG:	No. Actually, the Council has decided to pause that because the Phase 1 implementation is still ongoing.
JUSTINE CHEW:	It's been deferred for 18 months.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Okay. So we don't have to worry about that. Maxim? If you're speaking, we can't hear you, Maxim. Or have you put your hand down? Okay. All right. Thank you. So, two meetings for this one. Let's keep moving, Ariel.
ARIEL LIANG:	D6a, it is related to D6, because it's specifically talking about the remedy of Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy. It's one of the Rights Protection Mechanisms. It's one of the long-standing consensus policy of ICANN. The remedy is basically a transfer of a domain name to the prevailing party that utilizes UDRP for domain name dispute. Basically, we're asking whether the remedy of UDRP needs to be updated to ensure that the variant domains need to transfer altogether so the same entity requirement will not be broken. Of course, that depends on our answer to the foundational question.

EN

For data, we need to understand the basic stuff UDRP, in particular its remedy, and then depends on our answer to the foundational question, and also D6. Possibly, the group can recommend the remedy of UDRP requires the transfer of the entire variant label set. Or the group can say just transfer the domain name that's subject to the UDRP dispute, but not necessarily transfer the other domains from the set. That could be another possible outcome. And then the group may also see some other parts of the UDRP that needs specific changes in order to preserve those underlying principles. So there may be additional recommendation developed regarding the remedy of UDRP. We allocated two meetings for this one as well and open to input from this group.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. We have two differences of opinion in chat. Edmon is suggesting we may need to ask WIPO or other UDRP providers if they have precedents and current practice on this before we have our discussion. So two meeting might be good. Michael thinks that one meeting UDRP must follow the same rules as normal transfers so it's done. I think we'll leave it at two meetings and aim for one.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. Thanks, Edmon, for the suggestions as well. D7, that's about domain name suspension. Question that's asked in there, how should the suspension related procedure be updated for variant domains?

EN

For data point, we definitely need to understand the basic stuff for domain name suspension in those voluntary and involuntary situations. Also if we answer the foundational question regarding the behavior of variant domains, this may have an impact on how we answer D7 as well. The potential outcome from this group is we can recommend suspend one domain will affect the other domains from that set. So, all of the domains from the variant label set, that need to be suspended. That could be one outcome. Or one outcome is it does not affect the other domains from that variant label set. That could be another outcome. The third one is it may affect other domains from the variant label set depends on specific circumstances. For example, if the primary label is suspended, does that mean the other activated variant domains from that set that derived from the primary level need to be suspended too? So that could be one of the situations the third option alludes to. That's something for the group to discuss. We thought maybe two meetings may be enough for this one, but open to input.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. And I note that Alan is dropping off the call now. Thanks for joining, Alan. Michael is saying that two meetings is okay here due to the differences between primary and non-primary labels. Any other thoughts on this one? Okay, let's go with it. Thanks, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thanks, everybody. D7a, that's related to D7 because suspension is a remedy of URS. We're asking whether the

remedy of URS needs to be updated for variant domains. The deliberation of this question depends on some understanding of URS and its remedy. It may not just be limited to the remedy of URS but also other parts. I just noticed a domain lock lock. Once the proceeding is filed and then there's lock up, the domain that's under dispute too. So there may be other aspects of the URS the group also needs to review, and then that will help our deliberation.

In terms of potential outcome, of course, it depends on the answer to the foundational question before, it's the behavior of variant domains and also D7, in general, how suspension of domain is managed for variant label set. So possible outcome is, as the remedy of URS, the suspension of one domain will require the suspension of being higher variant label set that domain is associated. Or another outcome is the suspension of the domain that's under dispute for URS does not necessarily impact the other domains. But it could also depend on circumstance, whether that domain is primary or not. That's some outcome this group may develop. And then with that, also two meetings seem enough for the discussion. I'm happy to hear others' comments.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think the only comment we have here is the suggestion from Justine to lump the URS question with the UDRP one, which I think makes sense. But, Justine, go ahead.

EN

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, I was thinking more to lump all the URS questions together and the UDRP questions together. They could be separate lumps or whatever, groups, don't necessarily have to be together. But I don't think we need two meetings to discuss one question on URS, another two meetings to discuss another question URS. So once we've done with the foundational question, we can probably answer all those questions in one go. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Justine. Okay. It looks like everyone's in agreement with Justine so I think we can move on, Ariel. The two meetings, maybe. Maybe if we consolidate some of the questions, then that will get us some efficiencies in the number of meetings.

ARIEL LIANG: That sounds good. I just want to quickly note that there is a general question about RPMs. Maybe lumping the RPM questions together with URS UDRP may help, but we'll see whether that makes sense.

D8, it's actually catch-all question, but Edmon has suggested a question for the group to consider and we thought this seems logical to place it under D8. I think the original wording is what should be included or the behavior of WHOIS, RDAP for IDN variants both in the IANA WHOIS and the Registry WHOIS. Maybe we didn't capture the question precisely. But I thought what the question is asking is what data should be recorded in the IANA WHOIS and Registry WHOIS with regard to variant domains from a variant label set.

I know Edmon is here. I'm not sure whether ... Yes, he's still here. Feel free to help make the wording more accurate as what you asked before. We thought, in terms of data, we definitely need to get the basic stuff, WHOIS, RDAP and then also, there's a lot of GDPR-related work. Then there's changes to that, we probably need to get to understand the basics of that and the impact. Then in terms of potential outcome is that this group may develop specific recommendations or changes to the IANA WHOIS and Registry WHOIS by taking into account the variant domains. Then we thought this might be difficult because there's a lot of [inaudible] that needs to get up to speed. We thought three meetings probably is the minimum. Potentially more, but we'll see. But that's what we allocated. Edmon has his hand up.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. Sorry. Am I coming through?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, we can hear you, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Thank you, Ariel. I think you covered it pretty well. I guess, just to give us a sense, this is to talk about when someone searches a name over WHOIS, whether the response should also indicate which variants are activated and which variants are blocked and the dispositions and so on. This was touched on actually at the previous internationalization of the Registration Data group. Maybe when we talk about this, a little bit of the background from there should be pulled in as well. As Michael

EN

mentioned on the chat, it's really not the Registry but also Registrar WHOIS and those types of issue.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, IANA has the current practice of having some kind of bootstrap XML file, for example, to know which registry or which registrar uses which RDAP server. You can just check on IANA, there is a special file. And nothing prevents them from having a special file where variants are listed. It's simple. It will not require change of the standards, which is a bad idea because you will have to rework lots of software. And it's better to choose the method which doesn't change the current ecosystem. Because spending a lot of time and money for something which could be done really simple. I believe it could be done in three sessions. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Is that a new or an old hand, Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Old hand. Sorry.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thank you. All right, looks like three meeting at these, Ariel.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you. And thanks, Edmon, for another pointer for data. We'll look into that.

F1, it's about the TMCH, the Trademark Clearing House, and the services provided by TMCH. Basically, the question is asking should variant labels of a registered mark also be recorded in the TMCH? That's part one. Then part two is whether the variant labels of a registered mark are eligible to receive the sunrise and trademark claims services provided by TMCH. I think that's what the question is essentially asking. For data point, definitely we need to get the group up to speed with TMCH, what it does, the sunrise and trademark claim services, so we will have that background. In fact, ICANN Org has a research function in the GDS. They already helped us collect quite a lot of data on the TMCH in terms of the register marking languages, not just in English but in other languages, and whether they have any existing practice or mechanism regarding the variant levels of those marks recorded in the TMCH. So they already have written a research paper on that and we will definitely circulate that. I think we already sent to the group. But of course, nobody have a chance to review that yet. But when we deliberate this question, we definitely need to do that homework and review that research paper. That's for review. Then certainly, SSAC has 060. That advice has touched on TMCH. SSAC has some recommendations regarding how to handle the variant levels of registered mark in the TMCH. That's something we should consider as well.

In terms of potential outcome, we thought, potentially, the group may recommend no change to the TMCH and its services due to

EN

the exact match rule based on Trademark Law. So only in the registered mark that are exact match they can benefit from TMCH. Just because they have a variant label doesn't automatically give them rights to be recording TMCH and benefit from the services too. That could be one potential outcome. And then the other potential outcome is perhaps the group will take into account what SAC060 is recommending and then recommend changes to the TMCH and its services. That could be something the group to consider.

We thought two meetings might be sufficient, one meeting to cover the basics up for TMCH and also the ICANN Org data, and then another meeting to conclude the discussion. That's what we analyzed. I saw Maxim has his hand up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I believe presence of someone from Deloitte and someone from office of Karen Lentz will be beneficial. Because for almost everybody beyond Deloitte and IBM and ICANN, TMCH is kind of black box so we really don't know what's possible there and what is not. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Maxim. That's why ICANN Org's research team, they have done a research paper on the TMCH on what is possible, what is not there in terms of variant label. That's some homework

they already did for us. And I believe they already reached out to Deloitte and relevant parties to gather those information. So maybe start from there would be at least helpful, if not enough. That's just my quick reminder on that. We will circulate that paper again to the group.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, sounds good. Next one, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Next one, F2. That's a catch-all question for all of the Rights Protection Mechanisms. Basically, it's to consider any additional recommendations may be needed to accommodate variant domains. That depends on the group's discussion of other relevant questions such as the UDRP URS and also the TMCH question. So if the group believes we already exhausted our discussion under those questions and there's no need for additional recommendation, then F2 is okay. We don't need to develop anything. But if you spot any gaps, then F2 could be the place to develop additional recommendations and recommend specific changes to all types of RPMs. Also, just a quick reminder, we already have a recommendation pertaining to TM-PDDRP, that's one of the RPMs, and that's covered on the top-level deliberation. So we probably should just look at them altogether and see whether any gaps need to be filled. That's why we thought one meeting may be enough to address F2. Donna, are you talking or just—

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Not at all. No, I didn't. I've been here. It's really Hadia's comment that after our deliberations, we will be able to decide on this. That shouldn't take more than one meeting to decide. So I think one meeting covers it.

ARIEL LIANG: Sounds good. Thanks, Hadia. I guess we move on to G1. That's another difficult question. I can say it's foundational but also it couldn't be very separate from other questions we dealt with because this is specifically about IDN Implementation Guidelines. That's a different topic, basically. We were trying to figure out whether there should be a better or more appropriate mechanism for updating the IDN Implementation Guidelines in the future because they do have contractual implications for registries and registrars. Usually, for those kind of changes, PDP is the appropriate mechanism to do that, because once it become a policy, then there's no question in terms of contractual implication. But the IDN Implementation Guidelines seems to be a different mechanism. So there are some controversy per se related to the recent update, it's the version 4.0 that contracted parties had a problem with. Then there's a lot of back and forth with regard to that version. Then finally, that version got updated to 4.1 and that was approved recently by the Board.

For data, we definitely have to gain some understanding of the IDN Implementation Guidelines, what it is, and how it has evolved over the years, and then the current process for updating that. So we need to learn that and also the background about the recent updates and why it was a challenge.

Then for potential outcome, this group may develop some specific changes to how the update process may look like in the future. We allocated four meetings because we think this is a tricky subject and require a lot of catch up on the background and develop some kind of mechanism may take time. That's our thinking, that four meetings may be needed.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. I think given the background and some of the contentious nature of the implementation of the guidelines, I think, four meetings is probably adequate. Satish has agreed and so is Dennis. Edmon is saying that we may need coordination with ccPDP on this as well as IDN guidelines apply to IDN ccTLDs. Edmon, just one question on that. While it applies to the IDN ccTLDs, are they required to implement it or is it simply guidelines?

EDMON CHUNG: Well, it depends on your perspective, I guess. It is required in the sense that in the application of the IDN ccTLD process, they are required to make a commitment to abide by them. And as to enforcement, that's a different issue.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right. I think four meetings is good for this one. Thanks, Ariel. Thanks for joining us, Nigel.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Nigel. Thanks, Edmon and folks who commented. Actually, I guess, Edmon, maybe allude to G1a which is sub-question of G1. It's asking whether a separate legal mechanism other than IDN Implementation Guidelines should be created to enforce the IDN-related contractual obligations. Actually, the original wording of G1a includes the ccTLD registries that also wish to implement IDNs. I think G1a may be the place to talk about invocations or some kind of coordination with ccPDP4. But I think within the remit or scope of this group, if we develop recommendation, it still has to be focusing on gTLDs and we can't develop things for ccTLDs. That's for ccPDP4 to consider. But G1 could be a place to coordinate, I guess.

Of course, for the data points, it's the same as G1, the history and background of IDN Implementation Guidelines and also the recent challenge with version 4.0, 4.1.

Then potential outcome is maybe the answer to this question is no, we don't need a separate legal mechanism developed because the Implementation Guidelines already suffice if we want to keep that for the future. Or we'll say yes, we do need a separate legal mechanism. So this group may need to consider what that mechanism is. Then also for ccTLD-related consideration, our current assessment is that it's maybe out of scope but we probably do want to coordinate with ccPDP4 because the current Implementation Guidelines also apply to ccTLDs, it's just they don't have contractual obligation like registries and registrars to implement those requirements. So we allocated two meetings for this one.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Any thoughts on this one? I think to some extent, that maybe we will pick up some of this when we're discussing G1 anyway. I think combined is these six meetings. I think that should cover it. Okay, all right. Is that it, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, indeed. That's it. I think we just have maybe two questions we need to allocate, one each for that. Then also we have the general buffer allocated. Maybe I should just go back to the summary slide at the beginning. Here it is. I don't think it changed our calculation dramatically. We probably should still allocate 60 meetings for the deliberation part. But I think Justine has reminded the group that we also have other time allocation we need to consider. One is once there are some stable recommendations developed, we're going to pass to ICANN Org and then they're going to get back to us their early input, and then we may need to allocate some time for processing those comments and incorporating our recommendations. Then also we do first reading, second reading along the way, would review draft text. That's also time that we need to factor in. And then thirdly, to develop the Initial Report for Phase 2, those times that we also need to factor in. This is just for the deliberation part but I think 60 meetings seem reasonable based on our current analysis.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. One way to chop that in half is from a timing perspective, I suppose, is we could move to two meetings a week. But I think that's a big ask for everybody. I am conscious that when we went through the Phase 1 charter questions, we spent a

lot of time on the setup to understand what the question was before we could get into deliberations. There is a part of me that wonders whether it's worthwhile having an hour early in the week for that setup conversation and then an hour or so later in the week for deliberations to try to push through things. Because I think it's very hard when we're taking on board the important information and then we have to get into deliberations. Sometimes it's just too hard to do. If any of you have any thoughts on that, whether you think that is something that's possible to do, it would be really good to understand. But I know that time is precious for everybody so two meetings a week may be a stretch. I'd have to say, even for me, that could be challenging.

The other thing that we will have to come back to is the timing of these meetings. We may need to think about maybe alternating the meeting. So we'll do it this time this week and then maybe switch to another time the following week just to give those of us that are doing it late a bit of a break and those that are doing it early, likewise, a bit of a break. We might need to think about that as we move through this.

Thanks for your patience today in working through this. We have a leadership call in about eight hours' time. So we'll review what we've discussed here today and then we'll work out what our next steps will be for the group in the next couple of meetings. Also, if we can get some feedback on folks' availability for the meetings at ICANN77, notwithstanding that the full agenda schedule hasn't gone out yet so it's hard to understand whether the folks have conflicts or not.

EN

All right. Thanks, everybody, for today. We'll see you back here next week. Thanks, everyone.

DEVAN REED: Thank you all so much for joining. Once again, this meeting is adjourned. I will end the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a wonderful rest of your week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]