
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 27 March 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/yAP5DQ>

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 Monday, 27 March 2023 at 13:00 UTC. We do have tentative apologies from Satish Babu, Anil Kumar Jain and Edmon Chung.

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. Observers 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 email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDNs EPDP Wiki space.

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.

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 multi-stakeholder 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, and welcome everybody to today's not so normal call in the sense that it's on a Monday not a Thursday. We are a little bit light on in attendance but I think that's okay. We're not really discussing anything of substance today in terms of reviewing language for the final report or recommendations. It's more administrative things that we're going to work through today, and in particular, two items that have come up from the Board related to the items of divergence with the ccPDP4 and also, there was a letter from the Board to the GNSO Council and I think I mentioned this last week and essentially our work has been identified as a dependency for SubPro and specifically the Board would like to understand what our project plan is or timeline for reviewing what we're now going to refer to as 2a questions and they are the phase two questions but the a of it is going to be charter questions that have a dependency on getting the applicant guidebook out. So we've done some initial analysis and we just want to walk through that with the group to understand, just to make sure that we think we've got the right questions identified so that we can start to think about what that project plan will be and what our timeline is so that we can get back to the Board.

We do have quite a bit of time to do this because the Board is requesting the information by ICANN 77 so it's not super urgent, but I think it is something that we'd like to discuss with the group today. So with that, I think Ariel, are we are we good to go here?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes. And I guess we can first talk about the divergence point. And just to kind of expand on what Donna said, the Board is in the process of identifying the divergence between GNSO's EPDP recommendation and ccPDP4's recommendation and the request is they would like us to include a section in the initial report to explain the divergence and then from our perspective why we recommend certain items in certain way. And we don't need to explain why ccPDP4 they under the same topic they have a different recommendation. That's for ccPDP4 to explain. So we only need to explain our rationale behind our recommendation that is different from ccPDP4's recommendation and then also explain the impact or whether the difference matters. So that's the Board request, to include that section in the initial report.

And then to facilitate our discussion today, I already kind of drafted this section but of course nobody has really seen it. I did that really quickly Friday but definitely, everybody will have a chance to read this in detail. So maybe I can just kind of go over this section to give you a quick overview about the background part and then we can discuss more in detail about the specific items identified as having divergence.

So the background for this section just mainly talks about the Board request for both GNSO and ccNSO to coordinate on their

policy development efforts in IDNs and that's a Board resolution that was passed on March 14, 2019. So that's basically the request and then following that is some basic information about the GNSO, ccNSO's PDP on IDNs when that was launched and both working groups are ongoing and then we also have appointed liaisons to each other and also as everybody knows, the two groups met periodically to compare their recommendations and discuss alignments. So that's a well-known fact. So basically just to state the fact and then at the end this introduction paragraph talks about we understand the group's recommendations are in draft form, they're not finalized yet and it's subject to public comment and then also ccPDP4, I think their target date for publishing the initial report is later than our group. So whatever we extract or copy paste from their report, it's still a kind of draft language. It may be changed when their initial report is published. So we just want to provide that caveat in the introduction. So that's the first background section for this little paper we're presenting.

And then the detail of this paper is to provide analysis of the topics with divergence. So in fact, the ICANN Board were going to review this in their process and their working group IDN UA topic, but they haven't got a chance to review the details. But there are seven topics that were identified in preparation for the Board's review of the divergence and that's basically staff's work on that, mainly by Sarmad, and he's going to join us shortly today. So there are seven topics that were identified and I will just give you a quick overview of what the seven topics are.

The first one is the variant label disposition values. So for the IDN EPDP, we didn't create any new disposition value. We basically followed the RZLGR. So there are two. One is allocatable, the other is blocked, and then for the ccPDP4, they created a new disposition value which is called delegatable, and that's a subset of allocatable variant labels. And the reason is that for ccTLDs, they must be a meaningful representation of the names of the territories, so they already have that restriction or limitation in place. So not all allocatable variant labels can be delegated as ccTLDs, only the ones that are meaningful representation of the territory names that can be delegated. So that's why they have a new disposition value on top of what is specified in the RZLGR. So that's the first point of divergence.

And the second point of divergence is about some the ceiling value for the number of delegated variant labels. And I think most of our members remember this because we discussed this specifically with the ccNSO I think last summer. So for our group, we have the recommendation 1.4 which is we do not limit the number of variant labels that can be delegated because RZLGR already has existing measures to reduce the number of allocatable variant labels and then also there are other factors applicants must consider when they apply for top level variant labels. So for our group, ceiling value is not necessary and we do not have one to limit that.

On the other hand, for the ccPDP4, they have some kind of limitation put in place. It's only the delegatable variant labels that can be delegated. So that's in line with the disposition value they put forward, only a subset of allocatable variant labels can be

delegated at ccTLDs. So it's consistent with the first topic I just covered. So they do have a ceiling value, but that's based on the meaningful representation of territory names.

That's the second divergence. And then for the third divergence that was that identified regarding a potential RZLGR update if it's not backward compatible, what to do with the existing TLDs. So for our recommendation 1.7, we basically said the delegated gTLDs must be grandfathered even if the RZLGR update renders the delegated label invalid, they still must be grandfathered. So that's our recommendation. But for ccPDP4, in principle, they recommend grandfathering already delegated ccTLDs but it's not an absolute situation and if the removal of a ccTLD is the only way to address the security stability issue of the DNS, then those delegated ccTLDs have to be removed from the root zone. So grandfathering is not absolute for ccTLDs. So that's a major difference and I think both groups discussed that last summer as well.

For the fourth difference, it's about string similarity review, and I believe both groups have discussed that last December. I think we had one dedicated meeting just to talk about the string similarity review related recommendations.

For GNSO, of course, our recommendation is the hybrid model. So basically, the entire variant label set, every label within that needs to be kind of compared and have to be conducted—the visual check has to be conducted for every label in the set with the exclusion of comparing a blocked variant label against another blocked variant label. However, the string similarity review panel may decide not to include blocked variant labels in the comparison

based on certain criteria or guidelines such as the script of that label is not confusingly similar with the script of another label. So there's no need to compare the blocked variant labels of those strings. So that's the hybrid model we put forward.

But then for ccPDP4, what they recommend for comparisons is basically just delegatable variant labels that are requested as ccTLD strings. So there's no hard requirement that the comparison must include other non-requested variant labels, but the panel may have the discretion to determine whether additional variant labels need to be compared as well. So the panel can expand the comparison by including other non-requested allocatable variant labels or even blocked variant labels and then they need to make that decision based on certain criteria such as the likelihood of misconnection, the scalability and other unwanted side effects. So that's a major difference, for-string similarity review, what labels must be compared in the review.

So that's the four major topics and then there are some additional topics that were also identified by us staff, not specifically me or Steve or others but the staff supporting the effort for the Board to consider in terms of differences. But we want to see whether the group agree with these, because we think maybe we don't need to include this in our section.

So the fifth one, in terms of applying for a string which script has not been supported by RZLGR, what to do with that? So applied for string which the script is not in RZLGR, what to do with that situation.

So we actually didn't talk about this topic in the IDN EPDP because SubPro has addressed this topic. SubPro basically said those applications must be accepted and such applied for strings should be processed up to but not including contracting. So that's what SubPro discussed and we didn't relitigate or change the SubPro recommendation, we basically just acknowledged that's what SubPro has already put forward, is to process such application up to the point of contracting.

And then for ccNSO, they recommend such applications cannot proceed for evaluation until its script is integrated into RZLGR. So that is difference from what SubPro recommended. But again, this is not what EPDP recommended, so I wonder whether we have to explain this in this section. But I just want to make sure to include this for everybody to consider.

The sixth difference that was identified for the Board is about single character TLDs. As all of you remember, we do have some recommendation related to that. So basically, the single character TLD in the Han script that is used in Chinese, Japanese and Korean languages, they can be applied for in the future rounds. However, since we did ask the Chinese, Japanese and Korean generation panels to develop guidelines and other criteria regarding the single-character TLD application, such application cannot be accepted until the guidelines from the generation panels have been implemented in the subsequent rounds. So that's our recommendation for single character TLDs, but for ccNSO, they didn't discuss this topic. So it's really not a topic of divergence, it's more like we discussed something they didn't. So I wonder whether it's for this group to talk about our rationale,

because it's mainly for ccNSO to explain why they didn't feel the need to address that topic.

And then finally, the seventh topic is regarding the delegation of a successfully evaluated TLD. And for our group, we did have a recommendation regarding the time frame when the application that passed evaluation when the TLDs must be delegated into the root zone. So we recommend to follow the time frame requirement in the 2012 round's applicant guidebook it's within the 12 month period, both the primary string and delegated variant labels must be delegated. And then with the possibility of extension up to 12 month period. So that's our recommendation, but for ccNSO, it's unclear how the ccTLD variant will be delegated if the primary label has not been delegated. So I guess in general, they didn't really have a specific time frames in mind recommended, and again, it's something the GNSO has addressed but ccNSO didn't. So it's really for ccNSO to explain why they didn't make a recommendation on that topic. So just for completeness, I want to include these as three additional points that was identified by staff or Board, but I wonder whether we have to explain these three points other than the four points above. So that's an overview of this section. I think I will stop here for a second and see whether there's any input from this group about these topics that we identified.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Ariel. I appreciate that's a lot to go through and folks haven't had a chance to consider it ahead of time. These are things that we've spoken about before, but I guess the question for us—and Dennis perhaps as the liaison to the other group—

whether these areas of divergence that have been identified seem to ring true, and also if anyone has any thoughts on the last three. Ariel, just a question on the last three. I think Edmon said at the end of the meeting that we had with the GAC that he was going to provide something to us on the areas of divergence, and I'm just wondering, do we have any insight into when that is going to happen or if that's still the expectation?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Donna. So all these seven topics are the areas of divergence we expect that the Board is going to provide to the EPDP. It's exactly what they have identified, it's just they haven't gone through their official discussion of these topics because they're waiting on this Board working group on IDN UA topic to discuss these. But that's exactly the seven topics they have identified so far and we expect to receive the same information, because they did give us the green light to share ahead of time, so that's why we're sharing now. So I don't think they're going to give us anything different other than the ones we already included in this document.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, thanks, Ariel. Do you want to scroll back up to the first one? Dennis, go ahead, please.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Donna. Well, I guess I'm speaking with my liaison hat here now. So one another point of divergence, that's the way we're calling it, it might be also second level consideration

because I think that's not—or maybe is understood but it might be also good to highlight that the this EPDP will produce recommendations that will be relevant to the second level labels as opposed—and ccPDP4 just doesn't do that because of the remit of policymaking in the ccNSO. So I think that's another point that the we can highlight as difference between the two groups.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, thanks, Dennis. So that seems to be a little bit similar to calling out that in number six, so the single character TLD, so the ccPDP4 hasn't discussed it. So I think the second level probably fits into that kind of category as well, so it's something that we've discussed and they haven't. so we could just call that out for completeness. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN:

Sorry, one clarification. So in the ccPDP4, we discussed some IDN second level, but I think the way that it's going to come out is as not policy recommendation but consideration—I'm not sure the ccPDP4 has arrived to a how to label it. We did have considerations about as we in this group, we are talking about the implications of variant domain names, not just at the top level but that as implications to second-level domain names, how you manage the variant domain names holistically. We had conversations within ccPDP4 but because of the remit of ccNSO those conversations did not yield to a policy recommendation but in some way that conversation is going to be captured in the final report and I'm not sure whether it's going to be issued as guidance or considerations or what have you. But clearly, there's going to

be a distinction what is going to be a policy recommendation and what is not going to be a policy recommendation. But I just wanted to clarify that there was some conversation around second-level domain names and their implications when variants are introduced and how the expectations of keep the same entity principles persistent throughout the life cycle of the domain names but because of the limitation of the ccNSO policy making that clearly required a different treatment as to the conversations and conclusions.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. I guess the other challenge for us—so this discussion is going to be contained in our initial report. We won't have got to the second level conversation by the time we put this initial report out, so we won't have our recommendations either. But we could still flag this as something that might be of interest to the Board. And I'll put a caveat on the fact that it won't be in the initial report and that depends on how we treat the charter questions which will be 2a. But we'll put that aside for now.

So are there any other comments on this document? And it's not problematic that we have inconsistent recommendations so long as we can provide a reasonable explanation of why that's the case. And in many instances, like Dennis has just explained, CCs operate differently the Gs and they have different frameworks. So the Gs operate under a contract with ICANN and the CCs don't, and the scope or application of policy developed within the ccNSO is very different to the way it's developed in the GNSO. That is a major difference and will be helpful when we explain the differences in rationale.

I think it will be helpful if the ccPDP and our PDP have consistent explanations, but other than that, I don't think—for the issues that have been identified here,. I don't think it's the big ticket or things to worry about because they are inconsistent.

So I don't see any more hands. What we might do is with the notes we'll put this out to the group and just get feedback, particularly on five, six and seven. To be honest, with my chair hat on, I don't see any problem with including those. If it happens—my expectation was that we would receive some kind of communication from Edmon identifying the areas of divergence that have been identified by the Board working group and we can just respond to that. So I don't think five, six and seven are generally problematic. Alan go ahead please.

ALAN BARRETT:

Let me try to cover for Edmon here. I think the items of divergence that have been discussed in the Board's IDN working group are identical to the items that we see in the list in this document, or if not identical, then at least very close. And I think I agree with your explanation a little earlier that you don't need to reconcile all the inconsistencies. Or at least the Board is expecting something consistent, but it's possible for two different recommendations from two different groups to nevertheless be consistent if the groups can explain why they're not problematic.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Alan. So I think we can move off this topic. As Ariel said, this is draft language that is currently intended to go into the initial

report and we'll put this out to the list and get some feedback on it. But I think we're probably in good shape. Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Donna. so I think maybe I just want to add a bit more about this document to help the group review it and please keep those points in mind, because we do have a job to explain why the divergence is not a problem. So that's why in each of the topics, we have this section called rationale impact that's I guess from staff side our attempt to explain why it's not a problem and I just wanted to give a quick summary of at least the first four topics that we kind of expand on the analysis for.

So the first one, the disposition value, I already kind of explained the divergence really shouldn't be a problem because ccTLDs have a restriction of they must be meaningful representation of territory names. So that's why it makes sense for them to have this delegatable disposition value. But for gTLDs, we're generic top-level domains, we don't have that restriction. So it's okay not to have the delegatable disposition value. So that's why it shouldn't be a problem.

And then for the second topic about not limiting the number of delegated variant labels, so for ccTLD, they have that limitation because of the meaningful representation of territory names, but then for gTLDs, we already explained that for RZLGR, only seven scripts that have allocatable variant labels and six out of the seven already put a ceiling value for how many labels can be allocated, so it's two to four labels that can be allocated. Only Arabic may potentially be an issue for permutation but we also have other

recommendations to help mitigate that potential risk of permutation. For example last week, we just discussed for application fees if the applicant exceeds certain threshold level of variant labels being applied for, then the applicant needs to pay more for that. So we'll have that draft language for the group to discuss on Thursday.

And then also we have other recommendations, for example, developing a framework for best practice in the management of variant TLDs by registries and registrars. That's also to help mitigate the issue if a lot of variant labels are delegated, what to do with them. So we have some additional recommendations to counterbalance that lack of a ceiling value.

So that's a second topic. And then for the third topic, grandfathering the delegated gTLDs, the way we explain why it shouldn't be a problem is because we talk about if we don't grandfather, it could be a problem for registries, registrars, registrars and end users because there will be second-level or third-level domain names registered under those TLDs. So to grandfather is to provide safeguards and provide predictability for all these stakeholders involved, but then also, we have recommendations asking the generation panel and integration panel to make best effort to retain full backward compatibility for their RZLGR updates. And then if in an update, the backward compatibility requirement cannot be retained, we ask the GPs to explain in public comment why there is such an exception and then we also ask the GP to work with ICANN Org and affected registries to analyze the security stability impact for grandfathering the TLD and then discuss mitigation measures. So yes, we require

grandfathering but we also have recommendation asking to conduct the security stability analysis and then also require GPs to make best effort for retaining full backward compatibility for RZLGR update. So we have additional recommendation to help mitigate potential issues.

And then fourth topic on the string similarity review, in summary, the main difference is the GNSO side, we are more conservative than the ccNSO side so that's why we include non applied for allocatable variant label and blocked variant label in the comparisons as well, but we also leave flexibility to the string similarity review panel to consider whether blocked variant labels have to be included in the comparison. So basically, we're more conservative than ccTLD, but then at the same time we give flexibility to the panel to make judgment call based on criteria guidelines whether blocked variants have to be taken into account. So that's another way to help mitigate the potential issue with the increased complexity for string similarity review. So that's in general how we try to explain why these differences are not a problem, and then again, for completeness, item five, six, seven, we didn't expand on why we're recommending those recommendation, but ccPDP4 didn't. I think it's for ccPDP4 to address, but I think we can convert item five, six, seven into a paragraph just to say the EPDP also discussed topics such as item five, six, seven, but those topics haven't been addressed by ccNSO and we can also include a quick mention of our second level topics that will be addressed in phase two but then for ccNSO they have a different approach for that, but we're not going to delve that into detail because for this topic, for this report, we're focusing on top-level recommendations. So we will include

another paragraph to talk about these. So when the group see the document, you will see these updates.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. Let's keep moving.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. And I think next topic we have is about the dependency issue that Board has asked our group to address regarding the second-level topics, and we need to discuss which ones that may have impact on the applicant guidebook and figure out potential ways to speed up our deliberation so we do not become a problem for the next round. So I'm going to paste this spreadsheet in the chat. I hope everybody has some view access. I just want to make sure. Actually, I'm going to change it to comment.

DONNA AUSTIN: Do you have the Board's letter to the Council?

ARIEL LIANG: I think it's a resolution that was passed in ICANN 76.

JUSTINE CHEW: There's a link on the agenda page. Steve posted the link. Ariel, can you search for Steve's email on the agenda for today?

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay, and I think Alan just post that resolution.

DONNA AUSTIN:

That'll do. So just so folks are clear what it is we're being asked to do , it's item four. So it's a project plan from the GNSO IDN EPDP working group identifying all charter questions that will impact the next application, the next applicant guidebook along with considerations to ensure a consistent resolution of IDN variant TLDs with the ccPDP4 on IDN TLDs in accordance with the prior Board resolution and a timeline by when the IDNs EPDP working group will deliver relevant recommendations to the GNSO Council. So that's why we're having a look at this now, because there is a request from the Board to the GNSO Council. but I think if you scroll down, so the this is to be delivered by the Council to the Board by the 15th of June 2023. So we have a little bit of time to pull this together, but one of the things that we've been discussing among the leadership team—and we haven't agreed on this yet—is what we would like to do is with our phase one initial report, we would like to also include the recommendations for 2a in that, and that could mean a heavy lift for us to be able to do that. But I just want folks to keep that in the back of your mind, that as we go through these charter questions and identify what we think are 2a, give some thought to how long you think it will how long you think it will take us to get through those charter questions. And so I just wanted to give folks the kind of complete picture. This is why we're doing it. And this is the leadership thinking about how we can get through the phase 2a questions, but we need you guys onboard to do that.

So sorry to interrupt you, Ariel, but if you can take us back to that phase two questions and we'll see if we can pull out those that are 2a, which are the ones that will impact the next applicant guidebook. And I don't know, I don't have a crystal ball, we don't know when the next applicant guidebook is going to be developed or when it will be available, but I think it's a shorter period of time than what we might have thought before ICANN 76. Okay, back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Donna, for that background. So I'm trying to make this spreadsheet a little bit bigger so it's more legible. And in fact the consideration of phase two questions and the dependency with the new gTLD program has been discussed for a while now, at least between leadership team staff and also the ICANN Org GDS function because they're very close to the implementation of SubPro. So we have been in contact with all these groups and kind of discussing in the background what topics that do have a dependency with the SubPro, and also, the Board was going to discuss these topics as well but unfortunately they haven't got a chance to discuss in their working group on IDNs, and I just want to make sure everybody knows that the topics we identified as may have dependency or definitely have dependency, it's consistent with what the Board is going to discuss. So it's based off the same analysis. They're not gonna start analysis from a different kind of direction. It's the same material, it's just presented in a different way. And then this is what we have done for our analysis, so it's going to be the same starting point for the Board to consider as well. And that's why we're kind of looking at this

spreadsheet together and then we want to get the group's input on these two and see whether we our analysis is okay. Dennis, you have your hand up.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank You, Ariel. I appreciate the Board's request to do this, but I think you and I have a quick chat during the ICANN 76, what is it that the applicant guidebook requires from this group. And this is a clarifying question, Ariel, for you. On column B cell 3, B3, I think here we're making or you are making the assessment whether any of these items are within the scope. So AGB, applicant guidebook, application question, contract for future ROs or operational impact, if any of these boxes are checked, then it is a dependency question for I think what we are referring now phase 2a. Is that the way we should look at it?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Dennis, for the question. I would say yes, but then at the same time, we may need to do a second screening because in the Board resolution, what was asked as dependency is that the item that have an impact on the AGB but then when we're doing analysis we also look at items that may have impact on contracts for future ROs, the operational impacts. So we're not just looking at the AGB but the other factors we believe may impact the new gTLD program. So when we go through the list, we may want to do another confirmation whether the items we identified basically only have impact on AGB or have impact on other aspects of the new gTLD program. But I think in general, it's probably better to include items that—also not just on AGB but also other aspects of

the new gTLD program, to include that in the phase 2a so that we don't miss some serious gaps. But I just want to note in the Board resolution, the language is kind of specific it's about AGB.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you for that. Yes, it's a broad question what is needed for the applicant guidebook. And I think Donna said it, we don't have a crystal ball how the new applicant guidebook might turn out to be. But I think we're doing our best effort to make an interpretation as to what is required for the applicant guidebook. But understanding that certain things not perhaps will be referenced in the applicant guidebook, but they will live outside it. For example, the contract, TMCH requirements, and a number of things that don't live within the applicant guidebook, but are referred to in that document. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Yeah, thanks, Dennis, for the question.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, Dennis, it's a good point. We don't know what's going to be in the AGB. The best that we can come up with is what was in 2012. And I don't know what the plans are for developing the applicant guidebook. I suspect—I don't know whether the IRT is going to develop the applicant guidebook or what the process is. So, we're just kind of making a best guess here and we'll see whether that's good enough. But either way, there are going to be some two-way questions and we are going to have to come up

with a plan for how we're going to work through those in a kind of expedited fashion, I guess. Okay, back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Donna. Thanks, Dennis. So let's go down the list. As many of you recall, topic C in our charter is about second level domain name and variant management mechanism. So mainly phase two is about topic C and then there's also some topic D and E questions sprinkled in there. But we can take a look at those when we go down the list. So C1 is about the same entity principle at the second level. So I'm just going to—when we go through the question, I'm just going to summarize the question. I'm not going to read word by word.

SubPro actually already addressed that topic for future second-level domains, the same entity principles need to be followed. And C1 is basically asking whether the same recommendation should be extended to existing second-level domains that are variants for each other.

So we analyze this question as no impact on the AGB or SubPro because it's talking about existing second level labels. So that's why I would put it as a no. And then after I talk about each question, I'm going to pause for a moment and see what the endurance reaction is. So Dennis has his hand up.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Ariel. Thank you for indulging me in my curiosity here. So I think I was following what you were saying, and then the last sentence kind of triggered me. Here, one of the buckets that you

have here in B3 is contract with future ROs. So if something will touch on contract future ROs, the answer would be yes, it is an impact. And so when I see second level registration, that is a contractual requirement, right? Today, there is a requirement, contractual requirement on IDNs in Exhibit A whenever the registry operator applies for IDN activation or offering IDN services at the second level. And that Exhibit A services will determine how variants are treated, whether blocked or allocatable and what have you.

So there is contract requirements on second level registration. I think the first part you said, because this is already considered a SubPro, then we don't need to worry about that, which I think I agree, right? Because SubPro already took care of that for the next applicant guidebook. And here in this EPDP, we discuss it for existing gTLDs. But basically, they're going to be rolled over to whatever treatment that's going to be in the future.

So I agree in that sense that we don't need to worry about that, because that's already been taken care of by SubPro. But the last part you say, this is because of second level domain names, and we don't worry about those. I think that's what triggered me. You clarify the no is because SubPro is taking care of this, but it's not just because second level domain names. There are things that are second level domain names that are going to be part of the contracts. And I'm guessing the question, the intention to have clarity, what is going to be included in the applicant guidebook or not, is that the applicants have predictability as to how they are going to be entering into this new round, right? Whether fees,

contract requirements, evaluation processes, or what have you. So that clarification then. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

So, Dennis, I think the point that Ariel was making about this particular charter question is that the charter question is actually, should this recommendation be extended to existing second level labels? So there's the retrospective aspect. So I think from that perspective, it doesn't touch on the applicant guidebook or really the contract, because it would almost have to amend the existing 2012 contract for that specific registry operator. I don't think it's going to be—a new registry operator isn't going to have the same problem. So I think the reason this falls outside of what we're doing here is because the question is specifically about extension to existing second level labels.

The other thing that I think we are going to have to get some clarification on is the request from the Board is specific in that it's questions that will impact the next applicant guidebook. And we don't we don't have any criteria for that. So maybe as Justine said in the chat, maybe we should just think about these charter questions from that very narrow perspective of what's the impact on the next applicant guidebook and don't worry about the contract at this point. Let's just worry about the applicant guidebook. And I don't know whether it's a question for Sarmad or whether it's a question for Michael, or whether it's something that we go back to Council and say we want a little bit more detail about what the next applicant guidebook means. Will that include the registry agreement? Because I think the registry agreement

might have been available with the 2012 guidebook when it went out, but I'm not 100% sure. Okay. So Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

First of all, as I understand, there are no current variant TLDs. Because variant TLDs were prohibited in the last round. And the second thought is ICANN includes in the contract whatever they think the most up to date info. And to say more, even in the previous round in 2012, the final contract was a bit different from what we saw in AGB. Like specification for .brands, etc. So I think the question about contract is a bit irrelevant because it's up to ICANN and they don't have to listen to us. And speaking about the current variant TLDs, I think it's not relevant because there are no current relevant variant TLDs. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Maxim. I think the relevance here is that we're talking about second level IDNs and the same entity principle, whether that should be applied retrospectively to existing second level domains. So it's not really about variants at the top level, or at least that's my reading. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you. So just to, I guess, clarify further on what Maxim was saying, I think Maxim may have been pointing to the second level variants and that they're currently not activated, but blocked. But there is also another scenario where there may actually be two different strings or labels which are registered at the second level, which were not identified as variants in the, I guess, current

scenarios. But eventually they have been identified as variants by the work done by the communities and then therefore incorporated in the reference second LGRs as well. So there's that possibility that there are two strings which are already registered as separate strings, but they can potentially be variants. And then there's also that scenario that there are variants, as Maxim was saying, but are not currently allocated but blocked. So there are two kinds of possibilities. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it's extremely dangerous scenario where a panel of persons have no contracts with the registries and thus they are not affiliated and they don't have contracts with ICANN and not affiliated this way. I came to conclusion that some contracts with ICANN are bad. I think it's going to play extremely badly in courts because those parties are going to be at least outraged because you deprive them from the contracts and the money they invested in the process. And I think it's going to be a legal disaster. Thanks. So I recommend to avoid this scenario at all costs where the panelists decide something without having any obligations, any responsibilities and it comes to a situation where some contracts are going to be terminated between parties where no policies existed before that. Also, we need someone with a legal background to explore this. And I think it's not a simple thing. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. So just the intent here of this exercise wasn't really to debate the substance. We're just trying to do an exercise to identify which of the charter questions to will fit into that 2a category. And that is that the recommendations will be required for the applicant guidebook. So I think what we're saying here, I know, Dennis, you might have been not 100% sure, but I think the answer here is that C1 will not be required for the guidebook. And I think we should skinny this down just to the applicant guidebook because that's what the Board's request is. So let's not worry about contracting or anything other than unless of course somebody can tell me that the contract is going to be attached to the global.

Okay, so for the purpose of C1, I think the answer here is no. Everybody okay with that? Or no objection to that? Okay. Alrighty. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna. Thanks, everyone. So for C2, this question is about—let me just make sure. Okay, so it's about what does the same entity requirement mean for the second level registrations. So, this is also only about existing second-level domains. And SubPro already has a recommendation regarding future second level variant domains, the same entity means the same registrant. So we're asking in C2 whether the SubPro recommendation should be extended to already activated second level domains that are variants. Should the same entity be defined as registrant for the existing second level variants.

So if you interpret this in this way and we're asking whether it has an impact on the AGB, for us, it's no, there's no impact because this is asking about existing second level domains. So not about future. That's why we put no here for C2. Any comments or input from the group on this one?

Maxim, I think there's an issue with the understanding here. So second level, there are variants. It's the top level that we don't have variants, but at the second level, there are variants and they're already existing, kind of a provision in the registry agreement, like how to activate second level variants. So the second level already have IDN table, those things already exist. So it's relevant. We have to discuss C2. So I think there's a fundamental understanding here we should have.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Let's not get too hung up on whether this applies or not. I mean, I take Maxim's point that there's currently no variant TLDs, IDN TLDs, there's no variant TLDs in existence so therefore under the second level there is not—there's no existing second level domains. But Maxim, can we just leave that here? The idea here is that we're just trying to understand which of these questions we need to put in 2A. We can worry about the substance of this later. So I think on C2, this is a no. It's not going to impact the applicant guidebook or the development of the applicant guidebook.

Okay, I don't see any hands or objections so we'll take that as a no. Back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay, sounds good. Moving on to C3. So this question is asking what would be appropriate mechanism to identify the same entity at the second level. And in the wording of this question, we're asking for both future and existing second level domains. So this question has an impact on the AGB, possibly. But at the same time, we'll put it as a maybe because this question we're asking whether ROID is a reasonable mechanism to identify the same registrant at the second level for both future and existing labels. And this seems like an implementation question when we read about this. And then also SubPro already put forward the recommendation using the registrant as the definition for same entity at the second level. So it's possible that SubPro IRT can address this question because it's asking about the mechanism. So we put this as a maybe. And then we're open for the group to give us feedback on this. And I see Maxim has his hand up.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Actually, ROIDs should be unique identifiers, and also to avoid issues with the personal data protection laws about tracking of actions of users, even two registrations done by the same registrant have to have different ROIDs to avoid issues with tracking. And thus, I think ROIDs are not a good idea. Also, if you as a person or me as a person, we register domains in two different registrars, and in one I use my name as Maxim with KS and in another Maxim with X, most probably it's going to be different entities because all the fields are different. Also, different registrars do not exchange information about registrants. So there is no way to understand if it's the same person. And even if it's the same registration—

DONNA AUSTIN: Maxim, sorry to interrupt, but what we're trying to do here is work out whether this question is going to be required—a recommendation for this question is going to be required for developing the applicant guidebook. So we're not talking about the substance of the question. We're just trying to do a little bit of an analysis here of whether this is something that will go in the applicant guidebook. So I appreciate your thoughts on the question, but that's not where we are at the moment. We're just trying to work out what happens next.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just a short version. For technical questions, potentially for IDN variants, it should be there. The reason is they need to have methods somehow to identify those and to ensure that there is a method to register only to the same entity and to withhold from registration if it's not the same entity. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. So, Maxim, you're suggesting that this is a charter question that should be included in the applicant guidebook.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Maxim. Any other thoughts on this one? So I think maybe we should lean towards yes on this for now. And just the

rationale that was here. So I'm a little bit confused and Michael Karakash, I don't know whether you can help us out here, but will the applicant guidebook be developed by the implementation review team or is that going to be done separately? If somebody has any insight into that, that would be helpful. Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. Donna, sorry, I was in my own thoughts. Can you repeat the question, please?

DONNA AUSTIN: It's okay. I want to know whether anybody knows how the applicant guidebook will be developed and whether that will be developed by the implementation review team. Because I noticed that in the rationale here it says it's an implementation detail. But if the applicant guidebook is developed through the IRT, then that would lead to a yes on this. So that's what I'm trying to understand.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Good question.

DONNA AUSTIN: Did you have another question, Dennis, or another thought?

DENNIS TAN: I guess I thought maybe just to voice it, I put it on Justine and following up her question about how I think related to the detail of

the AGB, something like the mechanism to ensure same entity at the second level is something that is discussed within the AGB itself or referred to in another implementation procedure process or what have you, as many parts of the AGB contains. And that's why—and I think I agree to a certain extent, C3, I think it will have a degree of influence in the AGB. But how much of the detail needs to be in the AGB, I don't think we have the answer for that right now. I think that's kind of your question about who develops it and to what detail. So those are my thoughts for now. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks Donna. And I'm not going to touch on the detail part of it, but what I did want to mention is maybe just clarify the roles and responsibilities. So, the IRT itself is constituted of community members. So I guess what I wanted to clarify is that the AGB will definitely be a part of implementation. And it will be a responsibility of our colleagues, or I guess my colleagues, in GDS to do the drafting of the AGB, and it's a responsibility of the IRT to help validate that the implementation, aka the AGB in this case, is true to intent of the SubPro recommendations. So I hope that helps clarify a little bit that the AGB will definitely be a part of implementation. But clarifying the roles and responsibilities, so drafting the AGB is a staff responsibility, with the assistance and guidance of the IRT, which is the community body. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks Steve. Okay. Ariel, C3A.

ARIEL LIANG: All right. Thanks, everybody. So C3A is related to C3. It's regarding whether additional requirements needs to be developed to ensure the same entity principle is followed. That's based on the group's understanding whether ROID should be used as a mechanism to identify the same registrant as the same entity. So we put this as a no because that's really going down to the detail of implementation. And in general, AGB just needs to include policy level requirements and then for the implementation, this seems too detailed. So we will put it as a no. And then we'd like to hear from the group whether you think this analysis is right.

DONNA AUSTIN: Dennis, go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: And maybe no is the answer because I think C3, it will touch on the same entity principle and how do you manage that, whether or not to a method to manage it. But that's the question. I think we need to be clear as to how we triage these questions. I see the point. I mean, one could argue that the mechanism by which you ensure same entity principle is followed is going to be a contract requirement in the future version of the TLD. And if that's the case, then by the assumptions in the document, this would be a yes. But I can also argue against a bit because you don't need that per se in the applicant guidebook. So that's why I'm having—there are certain things black and white, but these kind of fields fall into

these gray area as to how level of detail do we need to—trying to fine tune our triage thresholds so that we can clearly say, yes, this is a yes, this is a no. And perhaps this is a maybe, to come back later and decide and provide an answer rational to that.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, fair point, Dennis. I know I'm starting to think we don't have enough information to do this exercise justice. But with that said, we're going to push on and see where we get to. So maybe C3A is now maybe. Because of the connection to C3. You can keep going, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay. Sounds good. And then also I just want to say, C3A is kind of on the condition that the group agree ROID should be used as the mechanism. So if ROID shouldn't be used, then C3A is kind of moot. I just want to add that point. And then for C4, that's about harmonization of IDN tables. And it's basically, there's some detail we will discuss when we actually deliberate on C4. But I just want to provide analysis that we think this is an important policy question that will have an impact on the AGB because it impacts future registries when they apply for the labels. And then most likely in the application question, they need to answer how they're going to deal with the IDN tables. And I think just from my background knowledge, I know SUBPRO was going to talk about this, but they ran out of time to talk about it. So they didn't address this topic. So it's on our plate to address it. So this question is definitely a yes for phase 2A. And it does have an impact on the AGB.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. And Sarmad has said in chat that harmonization will impact the IDN tables submitted by applicants. So any objections to this going through is a yes. Okay, keep going, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. C4A. So this question is a little convoluted. This is about the behavior of second-level variant domains, whether they have to be identical or they can be different. And I think this question basically is honing on the second-level domains under a single TLD that doesn't have a variant label at the top level, whether they need to behave the same or they can behave differently. And so basically we actually need some help about this. And I think we put it as a no, because it's not really about top-level variant labels. It's about second-level domains under a single TLD, whether they need to behave the same or not. And then SubPro already has a recommendation saying they shouldn't behave the same. So we think SubPro already addressed this topic. We don't need to further discuss this. So that's why we put it as a no. But I think I saw Sarmad had his hand up earlier.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. I was going to say the same thing you already said, that SubPro already takes a viewpoint that they can actually be different, which is, I guess, the more liberal version versus the other option where somehow they are coupled and tied in behavior. And since SubPro already has, I guess, the broader perspective that they can just behave in any arbitrary way and

different from each other. If anything additional is done here, it will make it narrower than SubPro, I guess, in that sense. So it's a no because SubPro already clears that there's no such restriction on them. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Any objections this being a no? Okay, no objection from Dennis. And Justine. All righty. C5?

ARIEL LIANG: Yep. Thanks, Sarmad, for that comment. So moving on to C5. This is about the mechanism for harmonizing IDN tables. So basically, we put this as a no because this is the implementation question. Because from the EPDP perspective, we need to develop policy recommendations. So if we say, yes, the IDN tables must be harmonized, then that's probably it. How they need to be harmonized, that's for implementation to figure out. So that's why we put it as a no here. But we'd like to hear from the group what you think. Do you think we have to specify how they need to be harmonized in the AGB? Or is this something that can be left for implementation to figure out? And I see Sarmad has his hand up.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. And there may actually not even be an implementation issue. It may be something which registries just need to figure out themselves on how, if harmonization is required, how they want to harmonize, whether they want to go take it through a process,

manual process or automated process. But it may not even be an implementation level issue. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So any objection here to a no? Okay. So Dennis and Michael are okay. Maxim. All right. C6.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. C6 is about the IDN table format. So we're asking whether we should use the LGR format as specified in the RFC 7940 for second level IDN tables. And we believe this has an impact on the AGB because when the applicant applies for variant TLDs, they have to include their IDN tables. And then if we require them to use the specific format, their submission of the IDN table need to follow that format. So we believe that does have an impact on the AGB. So that's why we put that as a yes.

DONNA AUSTIN: So Justine saying in chat that C4 and C6—or asking the question. Not sure. C4 and C6 are closely related. It's a question.

ARIEL LIANG: So C4 is about harmonization of IDN tables. And then C6 is about the format of IDN tables. So they are both about IDN tables. And then we know when applicant apply, if they have IDN TLD, they have to submit IDN tables. So I guess they are related and they do have impact on the AGB.

DONNA AUSTIN: Do you have a question answered there, Justine? I mean, I think Sarmad's saying C6 is an independent requirement for IDN tables, whether they're harmonized or not, doesn't matter. Okay. So Dennis has got a yes for C6. Any objection to going with yes on C6? Okay. Looks like we're good. C4?

ARIEL LIANG: C4 is about whether second level IDN domains should behave as a one unit in terms of their lifecycle. So we do have something covered before is that they can behave differently. But the one point that we're specifically honing on is about the transfer of second level domains that are variant labels. So that's something this group needs to discuss. And if we uphold the same entity requirement, then it does impact the transfer phase of the lifecycle. So we think this does have an impact on the AGB because there potentially be a requirement that requiring second level domains, they need to transfer together if it happens. And, yeah, so that's why we put it as a yes here. And Sarmad, please chime in.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Ariel. Just to add to what Ariel said, I think transfer is already covered, that it has to be synchronized to maintain the same entity requirement. But I guess this question goes beyond transfer and is asking whether other steps or, I guess, statuses in domain name registration cycle need to be synchronized as well or not in addition to transfer. Because if there are variants which are, for example, registered by the same registrant, then there is two options. One, that they are renewed at the same time versus

they can be renewed independently to each other. I guess currently SubPro is saying that they're reasonably independent, but I guess if we put any additional requirements there, the suggestion is that those requirements obviously need to be put as part of, I guess, AGB or the application review process, because one would need to make sure that the applicants actually adhere to them. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it has to be in AGB, at least in technical part. And, yeah, simple version, yes.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Okay, so no objection to D4 being a yes? Okay. D5?

ARIEL LIANG: So D5 is about the fee for second-level registration. So that fee is about what is paid to ICANN. So every registration at the second level is 18 cents from registrar and 15 cents from registry. So we're asking for second-level domain, is that each domain still pay that fee separately to ICANN, or is that a set that pays that fee to ICANN? So that's kind of a policy question we need to discuss, and then we put it as a maybe, but it's probably leaning towards a yes here. So, yeah, that's our analysis for D5.

DONNA AUSTIN: I have a question for our registry and registrar colleagues. So we discussed transaction—not transaction fees, but within the RA, we discussed the fees, so the set fee, and then if the transactions go above \$50,000. So we've made a recommendation on that. So the fee that Ariel has talked about, I'm wondering how this relates back to the recommendation that we made about fees recently, because we were talking about it's a single transaction, but if the second level—it has to be the same entity. So I think there should be a link between D5 and the fee question that we answered last week on the RA. Anyway, Maxim, I'm not making any sense. I'm very sorry.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do you remember if SubPro recommendations contain the recommendation to leave financial model requirements in the AGB?

DONNA AUSTIN: So from an application perspective, I think the cost to submit an application, I think SubPro probably covered that, but I don't know whether SubPro covered fees at the second level.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I meant that in the last round, there was a requirement to provide ICANN with the financial model of how registry is going to work. And it's important because if you have, for example, triple fee or single fee, it creates different models. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Maybe Steve can answer that in chat. I can't remember off hand. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. I have a slightly different topic, my comment, but I was looking at the 2012 applicant guidebook. And in that guidebook, there is a copy of, well, I guess, at that moment, the draft registry agreement in which you find what's going to be the registry operator base agreement that the applicants will need to comply with. And it goes, those are familiar with agreement, with the basic functions and also all the specifications, including the fees, variable, fixed fees that registry operator will need to pay. So, and that's why I'm saying that D5—because it talks on or touches on how the registrations are going to be treated to whether atomic, not atomic, or policy defines principle and registry operators go and implement the best way they want to support their business models. Then D5 should be also—it's part of the application guidebook, I think.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So any objection to moving this to a yes? Okay. And just to be clear, this wouldn't be about setting the fee. It would just be about how the thing would be applied. Okay. D6.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. So D6 is about transfer policy. Again, it's kind of related to D4, I believe, whether second level domains, they need to be

transferred together to the same entity. That piece is critical. And we believe it does have an impact on the AGB. That's why we put it as yes. But maybe there are other part of transfer policy we also need to look at. So far, what we know is the part about transferring second level, they need to go together. So that's a part we have to confirm from the group.

DONNA AUSTIN: Any objection to this being a yes?

ARIEL LIANG: Justine has her hand up.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, sorry. Just a quick comment. D6 talks about RPM PDP phase two, coordination with that. And we know that that isn't happening anytime soon.

ARIEL LIANG: Understood. Same as SubPro, we have a bunch of questions for coordination with IRT of SubPro, but we just went forward with it because it's not happening yet. It's just starting to happen. Maxim has his hand up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think this question cannot be answered before the RPM PDP two phase. Why? Because there could be a situation where two parties have rights for—one registered rights for one string,

another registered right for the variant. And it's legal rights effectively. We cannot decide before the finish of RPM PDP phase two about it. That's it, I think. Thanks Maxim. We'll just have to put caveats on. On stuff. RPM says inside of their work. There's not much we can do about it. D6A.

ARIEL LIANG:

D6A is similar. It's related to D6. It's about transfer. But that's specifically in the situation that a transfer is ordered by the UDRP. Which is a rights protection mechanism, as a remedy of UDRP. So if UDRP orders a transfer and then it relates to variant domains at the second level, how that should be done. So we put it as a yes as well, because it's still related to transfer. And then also in the—I believe in the application question, there are some provisions related to RPMs and UDRP. So that's why we believe this does have an impact on the AGB as well. That's why we would put it as a yes.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Any objection to this being yes? Okay. Let's keep moving.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Donna. Just note Maxim put a comment in there. We understand UDRP is a separate policy, but this is specifically about the remedy of UDRP relates to variant domains. Okay. So the next one is about suspension of second-level variant domains. We put it as no because if one domain is suspended, the other still exists. Then it doesn't really have an impact on the same entity requirement. It won't break the set. So [inaudible] the

answer to D4, I believe, it's like regarding life cycle of domains. If they don't need to behave the same, then yes, one second-level can be suspended. The other can still continue to exist. So [inaudible] the same entity requirement is not broken, then it's okay. So that's why we put it as a no for D7 as it relates to suspension. And we don't think it will have an impact on the AGB, regarding answer to D7.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. So I think the question for the team to answer here would be that if one particular variant is suspended, will it impact or have any impact on suspension of other variants in a set or not? So there may be some policy consideration relevant to AGB. The reason, as Ariel shared, we put no, at least for inclusion in phase 2a, is because in either case, the variant set is not broken, because suspension doesn't change the registrant. So that's a reason behind the no. But there may still need to be some language in case suspension of one variant has impact on potential suspension of other variants. If that's the case, then there may actually be need to put that in AGB as well. So maybe it's not a no. And maybe. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So move this to a maybe. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Registries and registrars have to follow all consensus policies. And if we're going to end up with some kind of consensus policy on IDNs, it shouldn't be the part of registry agreement because it's going to be included by reference on full [inaudible]. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. D7A.

ARIEL LIANG: D7A is also about the suspension, but it's as a remedy of the Uniform Rapid Suspension System. That's another RPM. It's very much related. I think the answer to D7 should be kind of the same for D7A. So that's why. We have the same analysis here. So if we say D7 is a maybe, D7A is probably a maybe as well. I'm not seeing any other comments about D7A. Maybe the group is on the same page here. Okay. Thanks, Michael. We're just moving on.

D8 is about a catch-all question regarding updates to the registry agreement. Edmon raised a question. So the question is, what should be included in the WHOIS RDAP for IDM variants? Both the IANA WHOIS and the registry WHOIS. So I think what he is asking is, should the variant relations be also reflected in the IANA or WHOIS in general? And we put it as a parking lot, and we think this question is more related to second level. So that's why we'll put it under D8. And it's possibly a maybe, but we are open to the group's input. And I see Maxim has his hand up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Registries and registrars, they follow the text of the registry agreement or standards referenced directly in the registry or registrar agreements. So far, there are no RFCs on this. And we haven't decided yet if it's going to be shown. So I don't know how we can demand to show something, when we haven't decided if it should be done at all. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Everyone okay with this thing a maybe? Okay. We're going to leave it with a maybe. F1.

ARIEL LIANG: Yep. Okay. F1 and F2 are about RPMs, but F1 specifically is about the trademark clearing house, TMCH, and whether any adjustments need to be made here. So we put it as a yes, because there is a specific SSAC advice related to the treatment of variants in the TMCH. And it's advice to the Board and important consensus policy. It does have impact for future and existing second-level domains as well. So that's why we put it as a yes. And then there's also ICANN org research about the language and variant treatment in the TMCH. We can look at that research when we deliberate on this question. So we'll put it as a yes for both F1 and F2.

DONNA AUSTIN: Any objection to yes, the F1 and F2? Okay. I think we're good.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Lastly for G1, G1A. Thanks, Maxim and Dennis. So it's about the IDN implementation guidelines. We put it as no, because that's separate from the AGB. And it's a very important question for the group to address, but it's not AGB related. So that's why we'll put it as a no.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Any objection to no? Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: And we're done. It's a lot to digest.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Ariel, for taking us through that and thanks, everybody, for your patience in going through it. Unfortunately, there's not going to be many questions left for phase two. It'll just all be phase 2a. So the challenge for us now is trying to understand how long it's going to take us to get through those questions and how we're going to manage it. My initial thinking was that we could potentially dovetail these recommendations into our phase one initial report somehow, but I'm starting to think that's not going to be possible because it's going to take us longer to get through these questions because there's more of them than I thought there would be.

So I think from a leadership perspective, what we'll try to do is just go through the phase 2a questions and see how long we think it will take to get through them, what data we need to collect. And then at some point we'll come back to the group with our best estimate. We don't need to get anything to the board until ICANN 77, but that'll be here before we know it.

Alrighty. We're not going to get into the comments form for this call. We'll do that on Thursday. And it should be just pretty quick to get through it, but I would like your feedback on that. And maybe what we can do is just post the template to the list. And folks can have a look between now and Thursday and then we can have a quick chat about it on Thursday.

Alrighty. Thanks, everybody, for attending. I know it's pretty hard to do two of these a week. But this is just the first one. So we'll see you all again on Thursday. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]