EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP F2F Workshop PM Session

Friday, 08 December 2023 at 06:00 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/o4AJEQ

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

DAN GLUCK:

Hey, everyone. Welcome back. Session three of three of day three for the IDNs face to face, our last session here. Should be going for about 90 minutes or hopefully less. As a reminder, let's keep our chats out of the chat box and verbally spoken. If you have something to say, please raise your hand using the Zoom toolbar. And with that, I'll hand it off to Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dan. Welcome back, everybody for our last session before everyone can go home. So we've just got a few more of the terminology things to go through and try to tie off a few of the loose ends and then we'll talk a little bit what our plans are to, you know, for when we come back together after the holiday season and kind of map out a little bit what our timeline looks like. So we're going to hand back to Ariel just to go through some of the

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.

trickier terms and see if we can reach some resolution on those. So back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Hello, everybody. Last session of the day for the whole workshop. So before I go to the next new tricky term, I just want to confirm our understanding of the variant domain set because that was the one that probably had the most discussion last session and then we concluded towards the end. I just want to make sure we recap it accurately. And in the glossary, we will capture this in a general way. So variant domain set basically consists of variant label set at both the top and the second levels. So it's in general how it's going to be. And the top level is based on the RZLGR calculation. And then at the second level is based on the IDN table of a given gTLD. Well, I guess there's one potential issue I see here is, so the IDN table, are we just saying a given gTLD's IDN table and we're not considering its variant gTLD IDN table? I mean, we don't have to go into that detail. But Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, so this is Sarmad. I think we have we're talking about two terms. I'm just, I guess, asking whether we're going to define both of them. One was a variant label set. And one was the variant domain set. At least that's what we were discussing. So just, I guess, asking whether we'll include both or just one. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: And Sarmad, we will have an entry of variant label set. So we have that entry for phase one report. That's only on the top level.

EN

And then we can, I guess, reuse whatever we explain for the top level. And then we'll also have a separate explanation for the second level, variant label set at the second level. What that means is based on, you know, the source domain, I guess, especially the second level label and then the IDN table calculation that calculates the set for that source label. That's what it is for the second level. And then we will re-explain the variant domain set, which is a separate entry. Hopefully that clarifies. But yeah, we can, you know, work on the draft after the workshop. But in general, this is our understanding. And if we identify any other problem issues, we will bring these to the group. And also another thing Edmon mentioned is that when we use the term variant domain set in our recommendation and also rationale language, sometimes we may need to qualify that if we specifically refer to the gTLD and its variant gTLD that are delegated, then the variant domain set in that context is the variant domain set under those delegated gTLDs. So we will qualify that when we have to in the actual, you know, rationale or recommendation language. So that's, I think, the agreement from the group.

DONNA AUSTIN: Just a dumb question from me. So this also applies to ASCII gTLDs because they will have variant at the second level, potentially. Yeah. Okay.

EDMON CHUNG: And potentially at the top level as well with the Latin added in. Right. There's none? I mean, it could be a variant TLD. But it couldn't be an allocated one, but it could be a blocked one.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Just as an example, strasse in German with a sharp S will have a variant, strasse, which is an ASCII label with a double S.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Yeah. Anyway, I think the variant domain set in the glossary is more like a theoretical concept because in practicality, it's not all top level can be delegated. Not all second level can become domains either. So anyway. Okay. So we're going to go back to the active or activate term. So I would just read what is in the column here. Activate refers to the activation, allocation or enablement of a domain name after activation or domain name is fully functional, e.g. its associated website and or email services are active. And then the second part is the part that had some discussion earlier, but I'll just read it. Nevertheless, when a domain enters the expiration, redemption or pending deletion stage of the domain name lifecycle, it is still regarded as an activated domain name as long as it is not deactivated from the domain name system. So that's what we wrote. And then I know, Michael, you had thoughts and comments about the whole redemption pending deletion and whether activated or whether it's still applied to that stage. So I will let you expand on that.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah. So it says that it's still considered to be activated in redemption or pending deletion as long as it's not deactivated from the DNS. But in redemption and pending deletion, it's always deactivated from the DNS. It's never in the DNS. So this statement

could be reduced to just removing redemption and pending deletion if we don't want them to be considered to be activated in those stages, or we would have to remove the condition as long as they are not deactivated from the DNS because both contradict each other.

ARIEL LIANG: That makes sense. So does that mean basically we have the adjective activated and we have the adjective deactivated? So when a domain name enters the redemption pending deletion stage, they're deactivated, but they still exist?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah. It depends on for what we want to use the activated domains. If it's used, for example, the same entity principle, it also must apply for domains in redemption and pending deletion. So if we say as long as the domain is active, it must belong to the same entity, then we would have to include redemption and pending deletion in this term.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. I see Edmon has his hand up, but I just want to quickly note that the reason the way I wrote it is because I want to just say any the activated domains from the same variant domain set must follow the same entity principle so that encompass the other two stages. So I was trying to find a word that can just group all these together, but it doesn't seem to be possible, but maybe we can find another word. Yeah. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Edmon speaking personally here. So maybe a way is not to list out the statuses, but talk about it and the other way around and saying that a domain name is considered activated regardless of the status as long as it is not deactivated from the DNS, then it will be correct. I mean, then basically you cover all the different statuses as long as it's not deactivated. But because if it's activated, it has to be in the DNS. That's really what this is saying.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Right. Yeah. But then we are losing the redemption and pending deletion states because in those states, it's not in the DNS and we probably need one term that covers the domain throughout its whole life cycle, even in redemption and pending deletion where it's not in the DNS anymore.

EDMON CHUNG: That goes to allocated. No allocatable, right? That would mean.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, maybe we indeed want to use allocated instead of activated because allocated does not imply it's in the DNS. I agree with you that activated has some connotation that it must be active, i.e. visible to the outside world, i.e. being in the DNS. But if we use allocated, it does not need to be active in the DNS. And then we could encompass those redemption and pending deletion states.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, that's exactly why I asked the question whether we should have allocated the term. Yeah. And Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I strongly suggest we draw some kind of picture with the life cycle, preferably of the domain set of variants, because without it, we have some part of confusion due to different opinions on the same term where it belongs. So as I see, part of the group thinks that something is in DNS when in reality it's only in SRS system of registry and visible via RDS. So we will spend less time discussing it if we understand the same way the states, their methods to switch states. Like in this point, we need to, for example, activate it. So it switches to the next stage, etc., etc. Because without it, we spend a lot of time discussing things which we seem to understand differently. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Maxim. And I think that's an action item, but I don't know who's going to be the owner. We hope our registry registrar friends can help us find an infographic somewhere to explain the life cycle. Although we did have a life cycle graphic when we talked about it in 77, I believe, but it's a very simplified version. But again, I'm not sure whether we have to go into detail, but if you or others have some existing resources, we can take a look, then we'll be very helpful. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think the issue is we have a different life cycle than the current life cycle of a domain. That's the issue. We need to draw some

areas like DNS, where the domain is in the DNS system. Some overlapping area called SRS, where it's in a registry system. And things like allocatable are in SRS. So the registry system allows that very special party, which is one entity, to have rights to register or activate domains. And we may use it as a starting point, the old life cycle picture of many years ago. But the current life cycle is going to be different. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Maxim, you said that the life cycle will be different for different registries. Is that what I understood you to say? Or do you mean because of variants in the work that we're doing, that the life cycle is going to evolve?

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's both. First of all, what I was describing here is going to differ from what's usually in the registries at this time. And potentially, it might differ a bit for the different registries. For example, in the current TLDs, some registries have an add grace period, some not. So it may differ.

ARIEL LIANG: Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: I just put a link to a picture of a life cycle in the chat, which is the .ua registry. But I think it's not a perfect fit. But I think we could work with this. If you could bring it up, then I could. Oh, you

already have it there. So you see the green background is when the domain is still in the zone file, i.e. it's active, it's visible, it's usable. And the yellow and red one, it's not anymore in the zone file. And the usual life cycle starts with a create. And then you see the first upward arrow is a renew. This is a manual renew, which can be done any time. And then it's again one year active again. Then if it's not manually renewed, it expires. But at some point in the expiration period, this yellow arrow, I think all gTLDs have auto renew. I'm not 100% sure, but I think that's mandatory. So it always goes the yellow arrow up again and is automatically renewed. This never goes to the orange arrow. In ccTLDs, it might go from the expiration directly to the delete if no one sends a renew command. But in our gTLDs, you have to follow the red small arrow from the green circle to the deletion point. And then it is in the redemption grace period, in which this is no longer available. It's not active. But it can be restored with a restore command. And then it becomes active again. And if it's not restored, then it is five days in pending delete, in which it is still allocated from our point of view. So all these circles and the background green, yellow, and red is still allocated. And the same entity principle is active. And only after the five days pending delete, it goes into the release and is available again. And then it's not allocated anymore. I think this is a good enough picture.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, thanks, Michael. This is definitely very helpful. And also, I also think we don't have to be super scientific in our glossary as long as whatever term we use is consistently applied and is understood, and then we explain the meaning, then I think might

EN

be sufficient. Because the main challenge we're trying to address is to make sure even the domain they enter the redemption and pending deletion stage, the same entity principles still have to be adhered to. And then we just want to use the proper adjective to call, you know, what are these domains? Are they allocated domains? Then yes, if they're allocated variant domains, then they still the same entity principle applies. And I think that's the problem we're trying to address. And if no comments from others, trying to find the list. Okay, so I think the active, meaning we just need to delete the redemption and pending deletion stage. And maybe we can move that to a second paragraph to say like, once the domain name enters the pending deletion or redemption stage, it will become deactivated, but still remain allocated, something like that. And then we will have a separate entry for allocated, and then try to explain the meaning of that. And okay, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Ariel. I'm just curious about so when you look at the additional notes on usage on the right hand side, to me, it sort of talks about the differentiation, differentiation between activate versus registration. And so I'm just curious about the purpose of the definition. Is it to try to draw that distinction? Or is it to try to talk about when a domain name or variant domain name is active? Does that make sense? It's like, what is the purpose of this definition? So we can tailor it to that purpose. Because if it's just about how you if it's activate versus registration, we might want to formulate this differently. And I think Donna had a question in the chat about this activated equal registration. So I think he might be sort of asking the same thing.

ARIEL LIANG: I have a separate entry for registration. So do you want to look at that first? Yeah, so because we want to use a consistent term, I think several of our recommendation refer to either registered variant domain or activated variant domain. And then there was a debate about that. And that was Dennis' comments, that we should use activated variant domain because that was the word used in the registry agreement. So then we have this additional note about, you know, why we make the distinction here and why we're trying to use activated throughout. But now we have a new term, allocated. So we also need to figure out where to use that. And we'll have to be very purposeful about that. So yeah, but I will stop him. I think Michael and Nigel.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes. I think the thing we have to also distinguish between activate and activated. The difference between register and activate is that register always requires an EPP create command. You register a domain, i.e. you create it. But with variants, we didn't want to impose that you have to send an EPP create command in order to create a variant, to activate a variant. But that, Dennis, I think said we should rather always say variants are activated independent of the fact whether they are registered and thereby activated or whether they are activated by updating an existing domain. So the difference between register and activate is the way, the process which does this. Register is always EPP create and activate does not talk about how this is done. And then the adjective activated, that's the description of a domain being in the DNS. I guess that's the best description for activated. It's active, i.e. it's in the DNS, it's

EN

visible. And allocated would go above that activated state in that it also includes the redemption and pending delete states. Allocated is whenever the domain or variant exists in the SRS, in the shared registry system. So whenever it's also visible in the WHOIS, for example, it's allocated.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Michael. Nigel and Edmon.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much. Good afternoon. Yeah, I thought I had understood it until Michael explained it again. In seriousness, I found the diagram really useful. And so that pointed out to me anyway that there is a difference between registration and activation, because I assume that you register and then it can go into this redemption period where it's not, it's, you know, to all intents and purposes, it's no longer there as far as the user's concerned. And then it's reactivated again. So I suppose there does seem to be a difference there. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here, I put something in the chat and I, you know, I'm hoping it helps clarify, because the way the best way to think about it is that an IDN really has two aspects of statuses on its own. One is whether it is the source label, whether it's allocatable, and whether it's blocked. And out of these three states, there are also two other states where it's activated or not activated, right? So when you put them together, it could be a source plus activated, it could be a source plus deactivated. It could also be an

allocatable and activated, allocatable and not activated or deactivated, and then finally blocked. So there are five possibilities. And in the different lifecycle of a domain, they could be in one of these, right? And when it goes to redemption, it actually is in state four, which is allocatable but deactivated, right? So these five will always fit into any one of those parts in the lifecycle, I think.

ARIEL LIANG: I think we need a graphic, like a Venn diagram. That's what I was thinking. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I like that idea of Edmon to say we have the disposition values, and for the allocatable, we also can distinguish between activated or deactivated. The question is just, should we rather say allocated and not allocated? Because then we would also include the redemption statuses, which might be useful if we want to talk about the same entity, because also in the redemption and pending delete, where it's not activated anymore, but still allocated, the same entity principle must be upheld.

EDMON CHUNG: And respond quickly. I think I don't mind the final terminology, but it's really these two things that we're talking about, the disposition and whether it's activated or not activated. And as long as we logically think about it that way, then, you know, however we name the particular status, it doesn't really matter so much.

DONNA AUSTIN: So I think the purpose of trying to get this terminology right is that we need to go back to our recommendations and ensure that we have consistency. So the context of how we use the word becomes important. So I'm wondering whether it makes sense to go back and have a look at where we've used these terms and see if we can, without really nailing down the definition, if we can at least try to assess whether it is the right word, and then we can come back to the... We were going to do it the other way around, but I'm starting to think it might be better to just go through the recommendations and see where we've used these terms and see if we think that's appropriate. Does that work with you?

ARIEL LIANG: I agree with Donna because we're looking at this in the vacuum. It's probably better to look at this with context of the recommendation. I just probably want to do one more thing, is just take a look at quickly the registration and so that everybody knows... Just have this in the back of your mind, and hopefully this still makes sense. And I'll just read this quickly. Domain name registration is the process of creating a domain name and acquiring it for a certain period of time. Domain names can be registered through many different registrars that compete with one another. And this text down here is from ICANN website. So hopefully this is accurate. But I guess basically the first sentence is touching on the creation of a domain name and acquiring it for a certain period of time. So hopefully this is still an accurate way of capturing registration. But Satish, please go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thanks. While this should be accurate, I would like to know if this is specific to IDN variants or it is a general kind of text about registration. In other words, is there anything specific to IDN that's not included here?

DONNA AUSTIN: And I also wonder whether this should be registration or registered. So I think we talk about registered. Do we talk about registration?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, because all these words are the same word, but I guess I don't even know how to describe it. But you know what it is. It's just like, okay, registered, registration, yeah, it's like we're trying to say the same thing. I just can't have separate definition for each. But if folks believe registered is better, we can use that instead of registration. Yeah. But anyway, Satish and Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: To respond to Satish's question, I think it's okay the way it is. And registration can also refer to variants, but does not necessarily need to. So variants may be registered, depending on the policy of the registry. But variants may also become active via other means than registration. But registration is always a process of creating a domain name using EPP create and acquiring it for a certain period of time, which implies that the registered domain name always has an expiration date. And this is also an important

property of the registration or registering in contrast to just an activation of a variant, which does not necessarily need to be a registration, which can also be via an EPP update command, in which case this thus activated variant does not have its own life cycle, its own expiration date, it doesn't have the properties of a registered domain.

DONNA AUSTIN: So this would be applicable to the source domain? So the first one, there has to be a source domain to create the variants. So this would be applicable to the source domain?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, although we haven't really decided how the source domain is assigned or how it's determined. This is left up to the registry, registrar protocol to decide. But most likely it will be that the first registered domain will be the source domain, because that's the easiest way. You don't need any special EPP extensions to define the source domain. It's just automatic. But there may be other ways.

ARIEL LIANG: Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I guess we've been saying registration is the same as activation. I'm just thinking, suppose I want to do a defensive registration where I don't really want to point a domain name to a website, but

I don't want it to be available for registration by anyone else. So in some ways I'm registering, but I'm not activating. I'm just trying to understand, how is that possible? And then does that mean that registration is still slightly different from activation? Or just trying to understand the difference if somebody can explain that.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, so to answer this, registration, activation are not the same. As said, variants may be registered or activated by other means. So activating a variant just means the variant becomes active, i.e. is in the DNS. But it may be via registration or via different means. Registering a domain does not mean the domain afterwards is active. It just means it exists in the SRS, in the registry. It is visible in the WHOIS. But it not necessarily is added to the DNS. So you can register defensively, for example, a domain, then it is in the SRS and visible in the WHOIS, but it's not in the DNS.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So then should we have activation and registration separately in the glossary?

ARIEL LIANG: I think we're talking circles. So maybe we should just look at the recommendation text and see what is the right words for each of these terms. Okay. First, recommendation doesn't apply here, which is great. We don't have a recommendation here, which is great. And just, okay, this is the first time, I mean, for this word to have a role here. The same entity principle applies to the activation. We don't know whether that's the right word yet. It is.

So for future variant domain names, this means that all allocatable, I believe that's the right word, variant domain names from a variant domain set must be activated. Is this the right word? I don't know. Or withheld for possible activation only to the same registrar at the same sponsoring registrar. So we're basically using active, activation, activated in this recommendation. Is that correct? Or yeah.

MICHAEL BAULAND: It looks good to me, the recommendation.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Any other thoughts in the room? Or this seems correct for folks? I'm not seeing hands. So that seems okay. We don't have the same, oh, sorry, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: So I guess what we're trying to do here is understand whether we've got the right term, which we say we have. So is it possible to get some meaning to these terms and why it's appropriate? Or do we just—Because at some point, we're going to have to explain them. I don't know whether it's possible to do that now or not. I think our brains are a little bit fried. All right. Let's just keep working through it and then we'll try to reverse engineer the meanings from the text.

ARIEL LIANG: Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, I think this still works. I was just thinking the second sentence says this means that all—I was thinking whether it should be allocated variant domain names. But when it says allocatable variant domain names from a variant domain set, maybe it means the same thing. Thank you. So I'm okay with it. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, I thought allocatable is the right word because it's potential to be allocated and activated. So yeah.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Actually in this case, it sort of means that it's already allocated, right? If it has to be activated. That was sort of causing the confusion that the source label is registered and that creates the allocatable variants. But in that sense, it's actually allocated. But in any case, I think this still works perhaps. It's okay.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. So I was just thinking, why do we need the last sentence that says this means that all, why do we not just stop after the full stop? The same entity principle applies to the activation of future variant domain names and that's it. And the reason I'm saying that, because when I read

EN

the second sentence, well, it is correct. But then another question jumps into my mind. So what about registration? So this applies also to variant domain names that could possibly be registered but not activated. Or we don't care, maybe?

ARIEL LIANG: Michael, you can answer.

MICHAEL BAULAND: In the context of variants, activation is just a broader expression of making the variant available. This can be done via registration. That's one way of activating a variant. But it may be also possible via an update to the source domain name or some other domain name. So in that context, this activation includes the possibility of registration.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: But there is a difference between activation and registration because activation means it's in the DNS while registration doesn't necessarily mean that it is in the DNS. So there is a difference between how you do it and the implications of it.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, that's true. So if you register a domain name, you could also register it in such a way that it's not activated. Which yeah, that's true. That's a corner case, so to say. And that probably makes our definition and recommendations even more complex. But we probably—I don't know if we should, yeah.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I was just saying maybe we could stop. We could just have the first sentence. My question, real question, why do we need the second sentence?

ARIEL LIANG: The second sentence is to explain what same entity means. I mean, there's no other place, unless you want to push everything in the rationale. But then there's no better place to emphasize it. So that's why it's needed there. But actually, sorry, I don't know whether there's other hands, but I was thinking maybe we should use allocation in this recommendation. Like applies to the allocation of variant domain names and all allocatable variant domain names can be must be allocated or without for possible allocation, then that covers everything. You know, I wonder, but Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Can we just say withheld for the same registrant and remove all of that? So not talk about activation or allocation or whatever it is that it just withheld to for the same entity. It's like so then we don't have to kind of split hairs on exactly what it is that they need to do or what they can do because they can do all of it. It's the same entity. Withheld for or with, you know, for same registrant.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, I heard this suggestion. Thanks, Jennifer. But Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, I'm actually going back to the recommendations which we have in SubPro. And it seems like activation, registration are like almost implementation details. And if we can talk about one option is to talk about it logically, and not really go into how it's implemented, whether it's through activation or registration. And that's sort of how it's done in SubPro where it talks about the variants are allocated or withheld. And you know, the following process, whether they are activated or registered, that's sort of left for implementation, the same entity principle as long as they're allocated to the same entity, and whether they're registered or activated, it will mean they are allocated to the same entity. So that sort of addresses it at a logical level, without getting into this, I guess, possible confusion about what's the difference between activation and registration. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. Satish and Michael.

SATISH BABU: Thanks. I agree with Jennifer and Sarmad that you don't have to have unnecessary details in the recommendation itself, because we are hard coding things which we don't know how will work out later. So better to simplify it. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I was wondering if we really need the activation and activated words, or if we could replace those by allocation and

allocated, because then this definitely includes the registration without activation, as Hadia just mentioned, and it also includes the activation of a variant via an EPP update command of registered domain. And we just say it's allocated, which is similar to registered, that it is now in the SRS and belongs to a certain entity. And that also covers the cases where the domain is in this pending delete or redemption period, it's still allocated. So maybe we can get rid of the whole activation and activated stuff and always replace it by allocated and allocating.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. I think that's what I suggested, too. And I think Sarmad also liked the word. And Manju, I think she in the chat was saying similar things. But also Edmon may have a different opinion.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon speaking personally. We're kind of coming full circle to what Dennis mentioned. Activation is important because it's part of the contract and all those kind of things. And personally, I do not think allocatable can supersede activate, because activate is a superset of allocate, it cannot be the other way around. The particular reason, the simplest reason is if we only say allocate or allocated, then it says nothing about whether it's activated to the DNS. Then both in terms of fees, in terms of processes, in terms of whether registries are allowed to activate the name comes into question, right? Yes, you get to allocate, but then, okay, now you activate it, we're going to charge a fee. Then that defeats a big part of the discussion itself. The concept of activation that it's active in the DNS has to be here somewhere. So if we replace all

EN

of it as allocated, there still needs to be an additional definition that allocated or allocated, or automatically means that it can be activated. We need to at least add that definition. So we cannot avoid the concept of activation completely.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Edmon. And actually, we do have other recommendations where activated probably is more explicitly mentioned there, and also we have the fee related charter question we addressed it. And then so if those places may be more appropriate, then—

EDMON CHUNG: I actually think what is right now is completely fine.

ARIEL LIANG: So we have Michael, I think I saw Maxim, but maybe, yeah, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I'm not sure about what Edmon said, because the fact whether the variant is active or not, and whether it's in the DNS or not, is really not important for the same entity principle. It's just important whether it's allocated, i.e. whether it belongs to some registrar registrant, because what happens if you register a variant, as Hadia said, without activating it, then you don't activate the variant, but you still have to make sure that it's registered to the

same entity. So for that reason, I think allocated makes more sense here.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, so I wasn't trying to disagree with that. I'm okay with that. But what I'm saying is that even if we completely replace it with allocated, somewhere in the document still has to define activation and its relationship with that allocated.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, understood. It's definitely not the last place. It's more to come. But I think in the interest of time, and also we're all exhausted, I think we should just keep moving to tackle as many as possible before we adjourn.

DONNA AUSTIN: So I just also want to guard against, you know, it's fine to look at these recommendations on their own, but they do correspond to a charter question. So we don't want to change the meaning of the recommendation, because it's based on conversations we had around a specific charter question. So we just need to be mindful of that as well.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Donna. And if you do look at the charter question corresponds to recommendation two, the word used there is allocation. So maybe that gives even more reason to use that word here. Okay, recommendation three, I don't believe this word

was invoked. So we're good. Let's keep going. Not for recommendation four. Oh, actually it does. Oh my gosh. Okay. Any allocatable variant domain names of grandfathered domain names cannot be activated unless and until only one registrant and one sponsoring registrar remain for the grandfathered domain names. So I think allocations still apply here if I'm not mistaken. Or no, Michael. Oh, I guess Sarmad is first and then Michael.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So again, in this case, it could be registered or not activated and or activated. But I think allocated covers both options, depending on whichever mechanism the registry is using, whether they're using create or update. So again, I think that's sort of a logical catch all for both terms, at least that's how I understand it. And we could go into how allocation eventually translates to activation as a separate discussion. But if you use allocation, it covers all different implementation details, I guess.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Sarmad. And Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, I think it should be changed to cannot be allocated, because activated is not as strong. You could allocate it without activating it. And we need to make sure it's not even allocated, independent of the fact whether we activate it or not.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Michael. And Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia. So I tend to agree with the so I do agree with what has been said, but what jumps into my mind now, so why are we grandfathering domain names that are not in the DNS? Grandfathering is something that we don't like, but we need to have. And why do we need to have it if it's not in the DNS? It's just maybe from a business point of view, it does make sense.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think it's recognition that there are domain names that are currently in the DNS that have allocatable variants. And we're saying that they are, you know, because of the grandfathering, nothing can happen with them. So I think that's what that's about.

ARIEL LIANG: And Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually being in DNS is not necessary for the registration. Currently can register a domain, but do not appoint NS record. So you do not use name server for it. And thus it's registered. For example, you want to do protective registration, or maybe you're thinking about a website, you found the name you like, and you need to register that to ensure someone else doesn't take it before you finish the process. But it is not in the DNS system, but still a valid registration. So we need to protect such registrations too,

because if you check quite many domains, which are registered, do not have NS records. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Maxim. And Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So again, the situation with grandfathering is that you have two registrants, one of them having some of the variants and the other having maybe the primary and another variant. And the ultimate goal actually is to get rid of this situation. So if you actually have one of the variants, not in the DNS, well, it is allocatable. Why would you grandfather it so that it can be in the future put in the DNS? That's not particularly related directly to this recommendation. It's just, you know, it's related to the whole concept and idea of grandfathering.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Hadia. I think the grandfathered ones have at least been allocated. But anyway, we have Maxim and Nigel and Michael.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think the idea of grandfathering is to protect interests of the current registrants. Because for example, two companies may have trademark rights for some word and its variant, but one company registered the word and the other company registered its variant. And it's okay now because they have rights for doing so. The thing is to avoid situations where protection of one entity

principle is going to undermine the principles of the registration because it's more important. You have millions of registered domains, while not many variants. So the new idea we introduced shouldn't undermine the old idea, like 20 or 30 years old idea of registration. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG:　　　　　Thanks, Maxim. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:　　　　Yes, thank you very much. I think, you know, I was going along with what Hadia was saying. So grandfathering to me is a sort of concept where, you know, people have abided by previous rules, they've acted in good faith, they've gone through a registration procedure. And then new rules come along. And so, you know, we say, well, you can be exempt from these new rules because you acted in good faith under the old rules. But there's a sub question here about if the registration has been done, but it's not live in the DNS, because it hasn't been activated, should it be grandfathered? But from what Maxim was saying, it probably should be because the registration has been done in good faith, even though it hasn't been activated, perhaps for some other reason. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG:　　　　　Thanks, Nigel. And Michael and Satish.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Just the reason we did this recommendation is that we don't want the set of grandfathered domains to increase. So we say that if there are grandfathered domain names, and they have allocatable variants, which are currently not allocated, we don't let them be allocated unless the grandfathering process for these domains is over. And so we don't start new domains to be included in the grandfathering process.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Michael. And I'm hoping after Maxim, we can draw a line because there are other recommendations we want to go through. So Satish and Maxim.

SATISH BABU: Thanks. So what I remember of the discussions earlier is that grandfathering is a special situation where the same entity principle has been broken due to whatever reason. And we want to handle this special case until the conflict is resolved some way. And we are saying here that the other domains available for allocation will be held as blocked kind of until the dispute is resolved and there's only one owner and the same entity comes back. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Satish. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it's a bit different. The same entity principle is not broken. It's just not applicable to a situation where we have two entities or more. So the first we need to select which one is the only one. And before that selection via extinction of one of those, we do not apply this principle. Before you apply it, you need to understand which one is the only one. That's why in the situation of grandfathering, until you resolved it somehow, you do not allocate anything because you don't know who is the prevailing one. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Maxim. And I think we should move on because we only have 23 minutes left and hopefully we can get through more as much as we can. So we're not going to look at the responses for now. They're not as critical as the recommendations. So let's go to the next one, which is recommendation five. And this one probably needs some work. A registrant and its sponsoring registrar. So that's the source domain name. So actually, this one is okay. We don't have that terminology challenge here. Recommendation six, the same entity principle must be adhered to in all stages of the domain name lifecycle of the, whether it's activated or allocated or allocatable. So we need to figure out the right word here. The variant domain name, seeing the same variant domain set. And then the grandfathered variant domains are exempt from this requirement. So Michael, please go.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I think it should be changed to allocated because that includes then also the lifecycle states of redemption and pending delete in which the same entity principle still has to be upheld.

ARIEL LIANG: Any thoughts or objections to the word allocated here? Seems make a lot of sense. So that's easy. Thank you, Michael. We can move on. And I don't want to touch on the rationale yet because we do need to just do a closer review and maybe too tired to do it on the spot. So we'll make sure to review the rationale language after the workshop. We're just going to focus on the recommendation language. So recommendation seven, that's about transfer. In the event and inter-registrar transfer process is initiated for a domain name, which is a member of a variant domain set, the process must encompass all of its, should we use allocated, variant domain names, if any, together. So Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, again, it should be allocated because variants that are currently, for example, EPP hold or don't have name servers, they are not activated, but still they must be included in the transfer. So all allocated is the correct word.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Michael. And I note Sarmad has some comment, but I will look at that after the call. But I just noted that allocated seems to be the right word here. And just quickly go through, I think the rest of the draft text are mainly response to charter question. And I think, Edmon, your point about where we should have activation

defined, and this is the charter question five, D5, that talks about the fee purpose. And then when you get a chance, please take a look at the response. And here that we did expand on activation and registration and the EPP related nuances. And if you think this is a good place to capture this, then I think it will be okay. But no worries, you can look at this after the workshop.

So I think we have a much better understanding of the terminology, even it's not super perfect yet, but I think we will have a line in the glossary for allocation and then define it and then capture it encompasses several different status. It can be activated or deactivated or registered. They're all within the allocated status. And then we will work on the activated, just make sure that definition is accurate. And then the registered, I think folks generally agree what is captured in the glossary, but we'll do a closer review. And maybe if we're really ambitious, we could create a diagram, like a Venn graphic to capture what the admin suggests. I actually really like the categorization. So maybe we can make visualize it. And are you sending me up on the PowerPoint as the visual thing? Oh, wonderful. Thank you. Let's take a look and then see maybe we can include that in the glossary. Okay. I'll check. Yeah, thank you.

So I think we're probably 99% done. Although I just want to make sure we don't forget we have this pending deletion piece that's not completely done. But I guess pending deletion is within the allocated stage. So I wonder whether there's any special things we need to say about it. Like if the primary is still allocated, then the set is okay. But Michael, you have suggestions?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I think we don't really need to have any special things, comments for pending delete. We can mention that pending delete, the domain is still allocated. Therefore, everything else that is valid for allocated variants also holds for variants and pending delete. Something like that. So I don't think there's any case where a pending delete has anything special that's not the case for allocated in general.

DONNA AUSTIN: I was just wondering if the registries or registrars have any tutorial programs or something that takes somebody through the registration of a domain name and all that. Well, I'm just wondering whether you, I don't know why you would have such information available when you have new people come in to the business or something like that. But something that could provide something that's a little bit more tangible for us to look at and understand some of these processes and how it would potentially apply once variants come into the mix. I find some of this is really hard for me to comprehend because I can't see it in practice. So I'm just wondering if that is something that's available. And if anyone was interested, we could all, I don't know, get on a call one day and see how it works. Just if it's not available, it's not available. Just sometimes we're dealing in the theoretical without really understanding the practice. So it becomes a little bit hard.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, I think effectively, we have covered everything we have planned for the workshop. So congratulations, everybody. Yes, well, we will use maybe quickly few minutes to talk about next

steps. So after the workshop, there are a lot of homework, at least for staff to develop draft text. We will review the notes, we have several recommendations we need to work on. And also, there's this draw man proposal about the implementation guidelines, how to improve the mechanism. That's something staff and leadership will work on together. And then also the glossary, we will do another review of what we discussed and update that and update the rationale based on what we have talked about. For example, I'm just looking at the rationale for this lifecycle bullet points, like activation, maybe we need to replace that with something else, or have like activation, registration, allocation, I don't know whether it's all needed. So there are definitely more work that to be done. And then maybe kind of just thinking right now, when do we want to resume our calls? The presumption is sometime in January. And talking with Donna, sounds like mid January seems like a good starting point, like a lot of folks are still on holiday, first week or even second week of January. So then that can buy staff some more time to work with leadership on all these draft text. But I will stop. Yeah, thanks, Ariel. So I guess our first call back is going to be influenced by whether we have draft text to look at because we've, or, you know, perhaps if there's some progress on the harmonization piece, as a result of the conversations that contracted parties will have with Sarmad and Pitinan, maybe there's an update there. But timing of the next call is going to be based on, you know, what text we have to share with folks. And given we finished our first deliberation of the charter questions, but how we move forward with the second iteration of that. But I think what we're aiming for is kind of mid-January would be our first call back.

At this stage, we don't anticipate meeting in San Juan, although we will request meeting space, but I'm not sure that there'll be a need to meet face to face. So I guess what we're working towards now that we've done the substantive review of the charter questions is what's our timing for getting the phase two initial report out for public comment. So that'll be the next substantive piece of work for us. So if we could do that, maybe by the end of February, that would be great, but I'm not sure whether that's achievable just yet. Anything else?

ARIEL LIANG: I have a Satish, but I just want to know that in our project plan, we did have a projection as we publish the initial report in April. That's what we said, because just based on project management, we want to build some slack but our goal is to get this out in February. Hopefully we meet that goal. And we did request one session for EPDP face to face in San Juan, and maybe we don't need it, but we just request for good measure. So but Satish, please go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thanks. So I'd like to know when we are supposed to take these recommendations back to our constituencies and get any feedback. Is it during the public comment process itself or is there a slot before that?

DONNA AUSTIN: So I think the way that it usually works is once we have texts to consider, I think that's when you guys generally take stuff back to

your groups. And then, you know, what would be optimal is that when we do the put the draft phase to report out for public comment, that this working group is actually on board with what's in there. So if there's any disagreements among the working group, we'll try to resolve those before it goes out to public comment. I think that's what we use for the phase one. So that's what we'd like to do for phase two. And then obviously, you know, depending on what comes back in the public comment that we need to have further discussions if there's other parts of the community that aren't at the table have concerns about what we've put together. So yeah, so initially, let's try to resolve any issues before we get the draft report out for public comment. But it doesn't mean that there's not an opportunity for, you know, your groups to change their mind and submit public comments accordingly.

ARIEL LIANG: Maybe just one last administrative question is, when we resume meetings, do we feel comfortable using the same time and date or should we try to find a different slot? I mean, it's pretty terrible for LA, but I don't know. But at the same time, if most folks are okay, we could just use the same time.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I think at this stage in the process, I'm not changing it. Sorry, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: There's a reason why we're meeting in APAC and not in LA. So I understand.

ARIEL LIANG: That's all I got.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, sincere thanks for everyone to take the time. I know it's the end of the year. So it's probably the last thing you wanted to do. But we've made some good progress and I'm hoping that this buys us time. So I think we're working towards the end of the year to get to the final report to Council. I sincerely hope we can do that much, much sooner than that. So thank you. Nigel, did you have something to say?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, no, just well, first of all, to thank everyone. And thank you in particular, for making this meeting so productive. I think it really does help, you know, having this sort of face-to-face environment to go through some of these really tricky issues. And hopefully now we've had this face-to-face, some of the emerging issues will be more important to deal with, sorry, more easy to deal with.

On the timing of the calls, it's great for us in Europe, because it's in the middle of the day, although that sometimes conflicts with other ICANN calls, of course. But you know, we would be, from a European perspective, very happy to have them at other times if it helps other people. So just wanted to make that clear. But I know, well, whatever is best for everyone. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Nigel. But basically, the spread of the group that we have, if we move one way, it's going to impact someone else. So we'll just stay where we are. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Donna. I guess I just want to call it the fact that these face-to-face meetings, we don't do this for every PDP. I think I know the answer, but I would just ask, is there anyone that would disagree that this was enormously beneficial to the group? Just because, you know, this requires time planning and money, obviously. So I guess I just want to take a very informal poll. This is time well spent. I think we made great progress. Correct. Okay, thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: All right. Thanks, everybody. So I guess we'll talk to you sometime in the new year 2024. You can end the recording now, Dan.

DAN GLUCK: Thanks. Recordings will be up on the wiki probably, you know, tomorrow, Easter time zone. So a couple hours from now. But yeah, it's a certain folder on the wiki space, not just like the regular meetings, it'll say face to face. Go in there. And the recordings will be there. Resources as well. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]