EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 12 October 2023 at 12:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/1YyZDg

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

DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Thursday, 12 October 2023 at 12:00 UTC. We do have apologies from Emmanuel Vitus, Satish Babu, Jennifer Chung, Amina Ramalan, Edmon Chung, and Michael Bauland. All members and participants will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have view access to chat only. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDNs EPDP wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the call. Please remember to state your name for the transcript. And 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 over to our Chair, Donna Austin, please begin.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Devan. Welcome everybody to today's call. So this is a momentous call because it's call 100. So that can be taken as either good or bad, I suppose. But we're certainly almost at the finish line with phase one, so that's good news. And hopefully when we get to the face-to-face meeting, we can get really close to wrapping up our conversations around the phase two charter questions. So that's my hope anyway. So congratulations on sticking the course for 100 meetings for all of those that have been with us from the beginning. And thanks to those that have joined part way.

So just by way of Chair update. So we have, I just mentioned the face-to-face workshop. So that's from the 6th to the 8th of December in Kuala Lumpur, and you should have all received an email from ICANN Travel to set up your flight booking. So if you haven't received that email, if you could just let us know and we can sort out what the problem is. It may be that we did have a criteria for travel support, so that may be the issue. But if not, we'll sort out that on your behalf. So the email was sent around on the 9th of October, and the booking deadline is the 16th of October. So that's only in four days' time. And I appreciate that it's pretty close to folks traveling to Hamburg, if that's what you're doing. But if you could kind of prioritize that, that would be great. So we can get that finalized for everybody. So I think that's the only update I have. We'll get back to 3.5, 3.6, and 4.4, and hopefully we can close those out on this call. And then we'll have Ariel take us through the consensus call process, just so that everybody's clear on that. And then we'll continue our second reading of the Phase 2

draft text. So that's the Phase 2 charter questions that we got through in DC. So with that, Ariel, can I hand it over to you to drive?

ARIEL LIANG: Yep, sounds good. So basically, after last week's meeting, we have only 4.4 left. We haven't got the explicit confirmation from the group whether they agree, whether everybody agrees with the red line language. And another point I want to raise is last Friday, staff sent an email highlighting additional edits suggested by the leadership team. And that's what you see on the screen, this highlighted portion under 4.4.3.1. So that's the consideration about if both the gTLD application and the ccTLD request are in process, and both haven't been finished, how to prioritize, I guess, in a simple way. And the proposal from the leadership team is that if one of the primary string has completed evaluation and is successful, then that primary string's application, as well as applied for variant labels in the same application, would not be disqualified by the other newly filed application. So that applies so 4.4.3.1.1 is about primary gTLD string that passed the evaluation, then that application would not be disqualified by the newly filed IDN ccTLD request. And the next element that's about the reverse situation. So that's the kind of a suggested edits from the leadership team, but we haven't seen any questions or comments on list regarding these edits. And another thing I want to note is that Dennis has included a couple of comments in the Google Doc, and I'm not sure whether everybody has seen it, but I would just quickly note it here for discussion. So one comment is 4.4.3.2.1, that's regarding in the situation where a gTLD

application actually requires approval from relevant government public authority, but did not get it, then the IDN ccTLD request that's basically in conflict with that gTLD application will prevail in that situation. So I think Dennis had a comment about this should be more specific because not all gTLD applications require approval, which is completely true. So we're trying to make it a little bit more explicit and thanks, Maxim, for the comment in the chat. So he's saying it's only for gTLDs. Dennis had the comment, it probably is the case, but we cannot be super certain about that yet. You know, it could be gTLDs for sure, but could also be others. And okay, I saw a couple of hands up, so I will stop here and Maxim first and Sarmad next.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Usually, ccTLD has approval from the highest ranking authority in the field of Internet for the particular country. And for geos, it's usually lower tier authorities like authorities of city or region or could be of the country. So it's logical that in this situation where a potential geo applicant doesn't have a letter of non-objection or approval, I think we need to change approval to approval or non-objection because it's how geos applications work. It can be approval or letter of non-objection and it's important. Thanks. But the overall idea, in my opinion, is correct that if a ccTLD has approval from the government, local government or authority and gTLD, for example, doesn't have, then it's logical that in this particular case, ccTLD prevails. Thanks. And about letter of support or non-objection, it's important. Thanks.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. I think for completeness, I don't see any harm in adding, being more specific than this letter of support or non-objection. Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Donna. This is Sarmad. So just wanted to point out that I think we're obviously talking about this in the context of string similarity. So these are not strings which represent a formal name, which is relevant for a geographical territory. It could be purely accidental resemblance. And so I think limiting it to a particular kind of application may not help because it could be, as I said, a purely accidental kind of similarity. And it may actually not be a geo TLD or any other kind of TLD, but just an arbitrary string. The letter of support, of course, is more, I guess, at least the way I was reading it was more of a proactive thing where the applicants realize that even though they're submitting a string, which is quite ad hoc in a way, but it has, for some reason, some similarity with some geo name. And so they proactively go and seek a non-objection from that government saying that it's similar enough, but they don't have any objection because it's a different string and they can move forward. At least that's how I was reading it. So I guess the question then is that if we limit it to, for example, geo strings, then what would happen in the case of those strings which are more accidentally similar? Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. I'm not sure that I'm 100% following what you're saying because the...

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I can try to clarify maybe.

DONNA AUSTIN: So maybe if we can just clarify. So Dennis's comment about the geos are the only one that require the approval. I think that's right. So I'm not sure how a string similarity would change that at all because there would be no requirement from the gTLD application process for any other string to have approval or non-objection from the government. So I'm just not following that piece.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Okay. So this is Sarmad again. Sorry. So I guess what I was saying was that this is not a same string case. Only non-objection is for same string case, right? That if you're applying for a string which represents a geo name, then you get a non-objection like, I don't know, Amazon or some other string. But this is a string similarity case, which means that you're not really applying for that particular geographic name. It just happens that the string you're applying for is visually similar to a geographic name. And that's why it is going to end up in this string similarity review. So I think that's sort of what I was thinking, that it's not really a country name, right? If it's a clashing with a ccTLD, then it's not really a country name which is being applied for. It's being some other string, but maybe it is somehow similar to a country name string. And that's why somebody got non-objection. But if I'm not reading this right, then maybe that's something we can discuss. Thank you.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I don't know whether it's because of the hour of the day here for me, but this is about what happens in the circumstances where the gTLD process and the ccTLD process are incomplete and who has priority. So I don't see it necessarily as a string similarity issue. And that's the point I need to make clarity on. Is this about string similarity or is this about where two processes are incomplete? Maxim, is that a new hand or an old hand?

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's a new hand. I think in this case, we need to add when required after the public authority. So we refer only to the cases where such letter of approval or non-objection is required. And approval non-objection is just a formal requirement for the geos at this moment. And in some countries, authorities cannot issue a letter of support for legal reasons. So they issue letter of non-objection. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, everybody, for the comment. And I guess I have two input. One is the original language of the 4.4.3.2.1 is from the 2012 AGB. And it was in the string similarity review section. So I don't think we have to keep expanding from what's already covered. And we should just focus on the problem at hand, which is the term that's pointed out by Dennis about the required

approval part that if we can figure out a solution to address it, then it will be a win. I guess that's my first comment. And the second comment is just a kind of a suggestion in terms of how to resolve this term. I wonder whether we could just replace required approval with support or non-objection when required from the relevant government or public authority. And then in the rationale, we could kind of explicitly state that this is most likely concerning geographic TLD applications. But we don't know whether that's going to be the only case, but that's the case we know. But maybe in the rationale, we can specify that. So I'm wondering whether that would be acceptable to the group.

DONNA AUSTIN: Any thoughts on Ariel's proposal? Support or non-objection? Okay, so Justine's okay. Maxim's okay. [inaudible] okay. Dennis is okay and just change it to when required. Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: So I will update the rationale to just to state that this is most likely applied to geographic TLD applications to the knowledge of the group. But it doesn't preclude other types if that's also required in the future. So I will add that if that's okay with the group. I'm not going to do that on the fly here.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. And thanks, everybody for the comments in the chat. And I would just note the second comment from Dennis. And my apologies, I resolved some of the conversations with regard to the red line here. And if I left it here, Dennis probably wouldn't have this question. So he had a question about why we changed contention to conflict. And in fact, that's some kind of observation from Sarmad. And I think the group actually agreed with that is because the word contention has specific connotation, especially in the context of a string contention resolution. And in this situation, that's regarding a conflict between gTLD and ccTLD applications, there's no contention resolution for that. So it's better use a different word to differentiate. That's why conflict was suggested as a replacement. And so that's a comment to Dennis's question here. So I guess we probably just need Dennis to give us a response whether this is acceptable.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Ariel. So I think we agreed to changing it from contention to conflict, just so that it's clearer. And it's not about a contention resolution. It's about a conflict of process of the two processes. So Dennis, are you okay with that? With that? I see your question. You okay with that? Okay. All righty. So Dennis is good. What's next, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, so basically, that's it regarding the language of 4.4 that was not resolved from last weekend, but seems to be resolved now. And I probably just want to pause for a moment and see whether there's any other comments. If not, then we can settle on the

language of 4.4. And not seeing comments or hands. So my presumption is everybody's okay. So basically, we're done with the language for the recommendations. But I do want to note a couple of items here. So I'm going to actually go to 3.5. Oh, yeah. I saw it earlier and skipped. So we have resolved the recommendation language for 3.5 and 3.6. But I just want to make sure everybody has seen the update for the rationale for 3.5. This is Donna's suggested language. And another part that was added is regarding the explanation of management and operation, like what's the difference. So thanks to Hadia's input, we developed this new sentence here. So I just want to make sure folks had a chance to see it. And if you have any comment or concerns, please raise it as well. So that's a note here. And also another. Okay, and thanks, Nigel and Maxim. So that's the rationale language.

And another, just for full transparency, I want to show folks what was suggested in terms of change. So there's a couple of words. We tried to make it consistent. And you will see the word retrospective replaced by retroactive. And that's actually stemmed from Dennis comment in the phase two draft language. And we will go there today as well. So basically, maybe Dennis can explain this better. And there's definitely a reason why it's changed to retroactive from retrospective. This is a more accurate or precise term. And yeah, Dennis, if you have any input here, please feel free to raise.

DENNIS TAN: No, just like you said, the more accurate description as to what we intend to the policy recommendation to say, that's all.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. Thanks, Dennis. And Maxim said retroactive acts in the past, retrospective since some moments in the past as he understands. So yeah, thanks, Maxim, as well. So that's a in a couple of places, we replace that to retroactive to be consistent. So that's the kind of a full extent how that change really. Obviously, there's a grammatical thing I accepted here.

And lastly, just let folks know that for the recommendations under the general number three, like the 3.x, those recommendations, the numbers may change when you see all of the clean text. Because if you recall, we did create a new recommendation along the way. And now we have it assigned as 3.xx But we will give it a number. So it may affect the other recommendation numbers in that section. Just give folks a heads up and then staff and leadership team will talk about the exact placement of this and the number we're going to give it and in our email to the group regarding the clean text, we will highlight this and so you know, how the number got changed. But this is a kind of a warning. So that's all for this Google Doc. And if there's no other questions or comments, staff will accept all these red lines. And then you will see the clean version shortly. I mean, after today's call. So I'll just hold on for a moment and see if there's any final comments or hands. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: I was just going to note, in the absence of any additional comments on the text, that this is pretty much what is going to go into the consensus call. So if any of the members do have any

concerns about what they're saying, please let it be known. Otherwise, these recommendations are all going into the consensus call. And that's the text that we'll be seeing if we have consensus from the group on. So this is kind of the last chance that you have this to provide any comments on these recommendations. I think we're okay. Ariel, I'm not seeing anything.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. And thanks, everybody for the hard work along the way. And this is a major achievement. So things to celebrate. And I guess in the next part is a quick refresher on the consensus call process and also our timeline reminder. And basically, today's date is the 12th of October. And it's not me, Nigel. It's everybody. I'm just merely capturing the screen. So thanks, everybody. So hopefully, today, we can start the consensus call process. And I will provide more detail in the following slides. And the period is 10 days. So based on that calculation, our closing day for consensus call is 21st of October, which is the first day of ICANN 78. So hopefully, it's not an issue. But at least we will meet on that day. If there's any final concerns from the group, we can address that.

And we also have another session scheduled on the 23rd of October on Monday. So if there's any issue with the consensus designation, then we can resolve that, too, in that last session of our group. But that's really a hard deadline we need to meet. Otherwise, our timeline will slip. The goal is for the leadership to report to the GNSO Council during its public session on Wednesday, 25th of October, letting them know that we basically

have completed the phase one final report. So let's all hope we can get this delivered as good news to the Council.

And then next thing, we have three sessions scheduled at 78, two 21st of October. And they're back to back. And then the third one is on Monday, 23rd of October. And if we did receive any disagreement with the consensus designation, if any of the recommendation did not receive full consensus, then the members who have disagreed with the recommendation have opportunity to submit minority statement. And we have put this 30th of October as the deadline for receiving minority statement. Hopefully, this is not a necessary step for our group. In our project timeline, we said we're going to deliver the final report by November 9th. So that's the final date. But if we can do that earlier, it would be even better. So this is the final, final day to deliver our report.

So that's a quick timeline refresher. And regarding the consensus call process, you have seen this before, but this is just another refresher before we actually start the process. Basically, what you can expect is that the leadership team is going to propose the consensus designation for each and every final recommendation that the group has discussed. And there are different consensus levels that can be assigned. So full consensus basically means nobody disagreed, that everybody supported that recommendation. And consensus means there may be disagreement from very, very, very small number of people. That's why it didn't receive a full consensus here. And strong support by significant opposition means it's a level up in terms of a disagreement from certain members. And divergence definitely

means it's just people have very scattered views regarding the recommendation. And minority views is basically the other end of the extreme. It's a basic recommendation is very unsupported. So that's what the leadership team is going to do next, is to propose the consensus designation. And you will probably see it as a PDF document and look at the designation that's assigned for each recommendation. And then you will see a notification from the mailing list that we notify the start of the consensus process. And basically, we will include the whole all the designation in the email, and then you can review them and also the clean text of all of the recommendations with their rationale. So they're going to be two documents attached to that consensus call email, and with the dates that we will highlight. And then next is for members of this EPDP team to indicate via the mailing list, whether you accept or do not accept the proposed consensus designation by the deadline of the 21st of October. So one thing to highlight here is only members are expected to participate in the consensus call process. And that's explicitly stated in the EPDP team charter. And for participants and observers, they cannot participate in the process. So that's how the group is set up in terms of a members' responsibility. Yeah, I'm not sure I understand Nigel's question either. But anyway, so if there's no objection raised for any of the proposed consensus designation, then it will be considered accepted by the EPDP team. And if there's any objection for any final recommendations' designation, then the leadership team has to reevaluate and publish an updated one. And no response will be taken as non objection. And I saw Nigel's hand up and Nigel, please go ahead.

EN

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. And good afternoon. And yeah, really great progress. No, I suppose in in the way we define or the way we use the term consensus in the GAC is so there would be no difference between full consensus and consensus. I mean, consensus is where everyone is either in favor and explicitly says they're in favor or they don't object. So you know, so you have consensus. I mean, full consensus is not really any different, I suppose. I'm not disagreeing. I mean, everyone has different position, but certainly the definition of consensus in the GAC, if a small minority disagrees, then it's not consensus.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Nigel. Yeah, I mean, it's separate processes. The GAC has reasons for why they define consensus one way and the GNSO has reasons why they have a different set of designations for consensus. So it's just differences in process. But as Maxim said, the GNSO has their own designation. So it's just maybe ALAC has different designations again for consensus. I don't know, but it's just a difference of, within the different structures. So, and for clarity, we will be using the GNSO designations of consensus. So that's what we have in front of us. Thanks, Nigel. Yeah, it's actually an interesting observation when you think about it. This multi-stakeholder model is consensus based, but within the different structures, there's different understandings of what consensus means. Okay. So anything else on this?

ARIEL LIANG: Let me just go back to the slide. So basically we talked about members need to state acceptance or non-acceptance to the

proposed designation by 21st of October, but no response is also okay. That would mean no objection. And finally, in the minority statement, we mentioned that previously—Hopefully this is not the case for our group. So maybe I won't need to expand on this. And in terms of what you will see in the final report, we will have an annex included in the final report that explicitly state the consensus designation for each final recommendation. That's how it's going to be incorporated. But for this consensus or full consensus designation, we don't include members' names associated with that, unless there is any designation that's lower than consensus, then the members' name will be associated with any of that recommendation, and especially in the case if they submit minority statement. So that's the expectation in terms of how it's going to be incorporated in the final report. And also, I think Justine had a question, is each group has one or more members? For ALAC team, for example, it has three members. So in terms of the consensus call, it should be a group determination, not an individual one. So the group has one voice, regardless how many members it has. So hopefully that clarifies. And also Steve had some notes in the working group guideline, has a footnote about consensus, which notes that the term may be akin to the term of art, like rough consensus or near consensus. And in the slide here, I did copy paste how it's explained in the working group guideline. It's a small minority disagrees, but most agree, that's consensus. So with that, any questions? Yes.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, before we move off this, Ariel, so I guess, Nigel, this is a question for you as our main GAC representative. Do you

envisage any problem with GAC being able to support the recommendation? So what I'm trying to understand is if there's any challenges within the members, SO or AC, that might be a challenge for responding to the consensus call. I don't envisage there is, but it just occurred to me that I should ask. Go ahead, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, thank you very much. And Donna, you read my mind to an extent. I was going to put something in the chat because I assume—and I might be quite wrong on this, that the idea is that as members, we are, I mean, we're individuals, but we are to an extent representing our community, so to speak. So, I mean, I would obviously refer this to the GAC leadership and discuss with the GAC leadership whether it should go to the GAC. I wouldn't envisage any pushback, really. Well, I don't think so. But I suspect I won't get much response at all because of the, A, because some people aren't focused on this, but also because of the timing is obviously, I'm not saying it's bad, but I'm just saying the timing is a challenge given there's a lot going on.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, Nigel, if you get to the point where you think it's going to be challenging for the GAC to respond to the call for consensus, then if you could let us know as soon as possible.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, sure. Of course. Yeah.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you. Okay. Where to now, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: So, I think we're good to go. And you will expect to see our notification email to start the process ASAP, hopefully today. So, then I think we can go to item four of the agenda. And if everybody's ready for phase two, we can get that started, I mean, resumed. So, I will put the link in the chat. So basically, we're picking up from where we left off. We finished C6. The first section is about the IDN table harmonization related recommendation and response to charter question. And now we're going to the next cluster of recommendations that's regarding same entity principle at the second level and in the context of question C1. So these bullet points capture the group's response to the charter questions, but they're not part of the recommendation language. However, there is a comment here, any existing variant domain names that do not conform to the same entity principle and predate this requirement must be grandfathered. So, if you recall previously, I think Dennis had the comment about whether variant is necessary. And that was in the context of the IDN table related to charter question. But I think the agreement is to actually keep it because we also don't want to just say broadly all existing variant domains because what if they are noncompliant with some other requirement and we can't just say they all can be, must be grandfathered. We only talk about in the context of variants for now and they must be grandfathered. So, I think we still keep variant here based on the discussion last week. And I will pause

for a moment and see whether there's any questions or comments from the group. And seeing none, I guess we keep it.

The next one is preliminary recommendation two. The same entity principle applies to the activation of future variant domain names. This means that all allocatable variant domain names from a variant domain set must be activated or withheld for possible allocation only to the same registrant at the same sponsoring registrar. So, Dennis proposed to change register to activate it. And if you have noticed, he sent an email to the mailing list regarding why he's proposing the word activated. And Dennis, if you want to expand on this on the call, please feel free to do so, so that folks understand the rationale behind it. And Dennis, please go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. Yeah, so, and more information, more detail is in the email of 18 August. But briefly, we want to draw a distinction between registration and activation when it relates to variants. Because there is a well-understood concept and it's a defined term in the registry and registrars contracts. Registration is tied to a creation, a transaction, which is billable transaction, whereas a variant may not be always the case that you register that domain name, may be activated or enabled for the registrant to use because of the different business models that exist today in terms of how variants are enabled. Just briefly, and I think in ICANN 78, we'll speak more in detail about these, the different models is high level, there are two models today, where variants are independent, unique objects as a domain name. So each one is in its own domain name on its own right. So a distinct registered

EN

domain name. There's another business model in which a variant domain name is an attribute of a parent domain name. So the primary or source domain name that we have established is the first domain name that is registered, that becomes the primary or the source for the variant labels. And then variant labels are attributes attached to these parents. And so they behave as a unit, but they are not registered domain names on its own right. They have to be, they transfer along with the primary updates to domain name information. They inherit all those attributes from the parent domain name. And so because of an update, an update transaction is not a billable transaction. So it's important to draw those distinctions in order to not [conflate] one to another. And unintentionally, our policy recommendations direct one way to deal with variants, whereas that's not the case in reality. I hope that makes sense. But again, there is a distinction that basically what we're drawing and activation is actually used in today's legal framework in terms of when a registry wants to activate a variant, using it again, but that's the standard language in the approved services language in the RSEP process. But again, I think we'll have time during ICANN 78 sessions to talk about more of these models. I hope that makes sense and it was helpful. Thank you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Dennis. And if I may, I do have a follow up question. Is allocation here still okay? Or it should also be changed to possible activation? I'm just wondering.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, good question. I don't have a strong feeling about that. Because that post activation or registration allocation. To me, I think to the industry at large, it means you're allocating that to a registered name holder. So I think it works fine for variants as well.

ARIEL LIANG: All right. Sounds good. So we'll keep it for now. And I just want to know that Sarmad had a couple of questions in the in this comment section. He's asking, how would the activation status be communicated to the registrar from the registry? So, Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thanks. First of all, thank you, Dennis, for that explanation. And I do understand the distinction and I'm good with that. So I really don't actually have a follow up question. Just I guess raising hand to say that I understand. I'd actually raised a question on how it's defined. As far as the communication is concerned, I don't know, is that relevant for this? Then I guess we could discuss it. If it's not relevant, then we can just skip it. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Sarmad. And Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, sure. And again, briefly, I think we're going to get into those discussions during ICANN 78, so I don't want to steal myself the thunder. But briefly, this communication, right, business models at

large, be IDNs or other type of transaction, there is always a handshake between registry and registrar and registry needs to go explain to registrar how transactions are going to be managed and on business transaction at large, how they're going to be processed. So this is a understanding before any registration happens, registration activation happens within the registry and the registrar. So those processes, connections, transactions are well understood before any registration happens. But again, we'll get more into the shortly in ICANN 78.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis and Sarmad.. Okay, so I think we're good with recommendation two. Recommendations three, it's a similar change. Basically replace registration with activation. And also, as noted before, retrospective is not a precise term, retroactive is. So that was the suggestion from Dennis and then it's also get carried over to phase one final recommendation. So I guess that's the extent of change for recommendations three. And keep going. So in the rationale portion, the wording change of activation—and that that's already discussed, I think there's a comment here from Dennis and that's in this sentence, for consistency purposes as well as to minimize user confusion or security risks, the EPDP team agreed to extend the SubPro PDP recommendations to existing registration. So that's separate also from the same entity principle and the second level. So that's what this intent to say here. And Dennis was asking whether that's actually mean to be gTLD these because we're recommending to grandfather existing registration means the new rules won't affect them, which means this group is not recommending that variant domain names must

EN

be unified somehow under one registrant if it is not the case, or am I misreading it? So the grandfathering item is recommendations three. And I think for recommendation two, that means, for example, if there is a domain that's already existing and none of its allocatable variant domain has been activated yet, then extending SubPro PDP recommendation means in the case they need to be activated, they still have they need to be activated for the same registrant. I think that's what this is covering. But then for recommendations three is talking about like, if they already variant domain have been activated, but for different registrant, then they can stay the way it is, there's no need to retroactively apply the same entity requirement to them. So that that's covered under recommendation three. So yeah, so that's the distinction, I guess. And would that be okay explanation, Dennis? Or do you think we should kind of enhance the rationale a bit to clarify?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. Yeah, I put this a while back and I think I agree with Donna. Maybe just [inaudible] Okay, let it go.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. And I mean, I'll take a look at the rationale and see whether there's any way we can clarify this a bit better. So that doesn't conflict with recommendations three. Yeah. And I know that a few folks have to leave. And thanks for joining so far. Yes. So the next set of edits is basically the wording change to activation and retroactively. And we have quite a few folks leaving. I guess maybe I will ask just Donna, we keep going or do we ...?

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Let's keep going. We'll have a recording available.

ARIEL LIANG: Sounds good. Yeah. And I just noted that Dennis picked up a typo. So thank you. Conform to, not confirm to. Yes, that's correct. So that's for the rationale portion of the recommendation two and three. I'll pause for a quick second and see whether there's any more comments or questions, and if not, I'll keep going.

So the next is charter question C2 and then the related recommendation four. So this is talking about in what situation where any of those grandfathered domains—there's a one limitation for the grandfathered domains, if you recall, is that there's no more activation of their variant domain names, unless only one registrant and one sponsoring registrar left for that set, then there will be a further activation for variant domain in that set. So that's what recommendation four is about. And I didn't see any comments for the language itself. So I guess it's okay. So there are some edits in the rational portion. So this paragraph basically talks about an example, I guess, to explain it. Because if you look at the wording, it's pretty convoluted. It's hard to understand. And so far, the edits are mostly editorial, I think, from Dennis. So I'm not going to try to read everything here. I think they're all very reasonable. And unregistered. So he said ineligible for activation. Yes, that's a much better way of saying it. And there is comment from Michael, but unfortunately he's not with us today. So he said we could also include a second scenario to explain this recommendation, is that one of the two domains is deleted. So I

think he is talking about, in the set, there are two variant domains, and then they are already activated for two different registrants. And then in the situation where one registrant decide sto basically delete the domain it holds, then in that situation, in that set, only one registrant left and one sponsoring registrant left. So further activation will be allowed in that scenario. So he's just basically suggesting we can further expand on the examples to explain how this recommendation works. And if there's no questions or comments, staff can develop some language around that and include this as a red line in this rationale portion. So I will pause for a second and see whether there's any comment or question from the group. If not, then we will do what Michael suggested. OK. So there's no more comments for this rationale, so we're just going to keep going for D4.

And so D4 is about the domain name lifecycle that we discussed extensively in ICANN 77. And there are a couple of agreements that we captured here. And the second one, Dennis had a suggestion to change allocatable to allocated. So he said each allocated variant domain is allowed to have an independent domain name lifecycle. It's not that the same entity principle is adhered to in all stages. So just from my personal view, I thought allocatable is the right word because the domain name lifecycle includes several stages, like the initial activation and to the end, like deletion. So if you say allocated, it seems to imply only the activated variant domain. They're allowed to have their independent lifecycle and doesn't include the non-activated one that could be activated down the road. So that's why I thought allocatable should be the right word.

DONNA AUSTIN: Dennis has stepped away for a minute. But Maxim, are you agreeing that allocatable is the better word here? I'm not sure by your comment.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Allocatable is a domain which has potential to be allocated and allocated is a domain which is already allocated. And the lifecycle is applicable to something existing, not to something potentially existing. When you register or allocate something, then it's start of the lifecycle. Before, it's a rule which has to be applied when it's allocated. So I agree with the edit of them.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, so you think it allocated is the appropriate term.

MAXIM ALZOBA: The usual meaning for this technical idea is that, for example, you have three variants in a set and you have allocated one. And then in five days you decided to allocate the second and third and the cycles for those are to be separated. But the set is not destroyed. They're together. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Donna. So, yes, I was going to say the same thing, which Maxim said, so do agree that allocated is the right word here because only the allocatable variants would go through those stages. Allocatable is not quite allocated. It's just a withheld allocatable one, so it doesn't really come into a lifecycle. So I agree with what is suggested. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So I think it's allocated.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good and well understood. So I will check the other part of these draft text, including the rationale and make sure it's a consistent wording there. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. I do agree with what has just been said. However, I would like to refer to the recommendation 9.3, where we actually put a visualization of the label state transitions. And there we have blocked withheld same entity, rejected, delegated, and we say allocated. Should we here say allocatable or no, whereas here allocated is different than allocatable? There, I mean, in the final in 9.3, where we put the label states in phase one. I know it's about the top level domains and not the second level domains, but I mean, if we carry the same logic. I'm not sure. I'm just raising it.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, so I'm not understanding, because allocated is what's used in 9.3. Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes, in this diagram I think allocatable you could equate with withheld same entity. And that's a different state than allocated. So, the blue one is what would be potentially allocatable and the light green one is allocated, of course.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So maybe we could like, try to elaborate on those different terminologies, the usage of the different terminologies, because in the end phase one of phase two are two reports related to the. IDN gTLD EPDP and having same phrase meaning different things throughout is a little bit confusing. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you. I think the allocated phrase is the same. Allocatable is the problem, which Sarmad said withheld same entity would be allocatable. Ariel, is your head working better than mine?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. So, we did explain the difference in the glossary in the phase one final report, and it's pretty intentional whenever we use allocatable and whenever we use allocated. So, allocated is label state, allocatable is a disposition value. So when we use it, it's very clear and consistent, and we explain that in the glossary, and similar glossary is being developed for phase two draft text.

So, I think the main question here is which one is the correct term, and folks have explained that once a variant domain has been allocated, the life cycle starts. So, that's why allocated is used here, and my personal previous understanding was like if a variant domain can be activated, then it has a life cycle, but that's not true based on the feedback we heard. So, that's why allocated is used here.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. And I do for sure agree with you, Ariel. I think my only problem is in relation to the diagram where in this case withheld same entity is actually equitable to allocatable. So, I don't know if this is like sort of explained in the glossary. So, my main actually issue is the diagram and where we actually mean here withheld same entity, we mean allocatable.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So, let's take this on notice, and we'll talk about on the leadership call, and we'll see what we can sort out with this one. Maybe it's picked up in the rationale. I'm not really sure. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it's not equal to allocatable because a registry has right to have its own lists of domains which are not to be registered for some reasons. For example, it's swear language or something

which doesn't go well with the policy of registry or some other reasons, or maybe it's one of the domain names which is held from the allegation to by ICANN. For example, you cannot use word example or many others. So, withheld, it can be withheld for some entity, some domain, but not at the same moment, not allocatable for technical and policy reasons. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Maxim. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, this is Ariel. At this late stage, I have really cautioned us going back to these foundational terminology because we did have extensive discussion about that. And so, just to clarify, allocatable is really a very broad term, and it can encompass withheld same entity. It can encompass allocated and can include delegated. So, this is not labeled state, but disposition value calculated by RZLGR. So, anyway, I just want to caution how we don't go back to this at this late stage as we already clearly define them. So, yeah.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I agree, Ariel. I think, well, if anything, we can adjust the rationale, but in terms of changing recommendations at this stage, I'm not in favor of doing that, particularly if we're headed towards a consensus call. So, it seems that most people are okay with this, so I don't want to tinker with it at this late stage, but perhaps the rationale, we might be able to do something. Okay. Let's keep moving, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: All right. Sounds good. So, back to phase two. So, the recommendation language for five, just as a reminder for folks, what it's about, it's basically for the registrant and its sponsoring registrar to jointly determine the source domain name in order to calculate the variant domain set. But this recommendation doesn't apply to the grandfathered variant domains that was defining recommendations three. So, that's what recommendation five is about. And then recommendation six is the same entity principle recommendation. What the group agreed is that this principle must be adhered to in all stages of the domain name lifecycle. I guess we need to change allocatable to allocated, if folks agree with that. So, to say it must be adhered to all stages of the allocated variant domain names in the same variant domain set, but then for the grandfathered variant domains, this requirement is exempt. So, that's what recommendation six is about. And I didn't see further comments in the language itself, but some edits in the rationale portion. So, some of them are kind of editorial, some of them more substantive. I'll just kind of quickly read what Dennis suggested. So, he said, based on common understanding, a domain name must have at least two labels separated by a dot, a top-level and a second-level label. And then he provided an example.tld, where example is the second level and tld is the top-level label. So, I think that's reasonable edits here. And a domain name status as a variant is determined by the source domain name. And the source domain name serves the essential role as the input for calculating the variant domain set and determining the disposition values of the variant domain names allocatable or blocked. The So, this highlighted portion is basically trying to

EN

define what the variant domain set is about. And we actually need to come back to this most likely during ICANN 78 to clarify the determination, because if you recall, I think we ended the discussion talking about having one source domain name per gTLD, because each gTLD may have different IDN tables. So, you can't have one source domain name shared by the gTLD and its variant labels at the top. It's probably not doable. But we should confirm that that's soon, maybe in ICANN 78. So, that's why this set definition may need to be revised based on what the group agrees. And then I just want to note that Justine has provided the comment from ALAC team. So, the proposed edit is the set of variant labels at the second level as well as their disposition value are enumerated from the source label using the harmonized IDN tables of a given gTLD. And then she has a question here. Do the IDN tables have to be the same for the top and the second levels? If they could be different, then the last word above would need to be changed. So, I'm not too sure I understand this question, because the IDN table is just for the second level. The top is the RZLGR.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, Justine, is there anything you want to clarify?

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry, it was actually a question from Satish, not me. I was just putting it there on his behalf.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So, I think the answer to the question is what Ariel said, they don't have to be the same because they're two different tables. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna,. Yeah, talking about source labels, I think I remember conversation in the past about in the context of variant TLDs, not just one gTLD where consequently there's only one source label. What happens in the case where there are two gTLD variants of each other? What's the source label? Does the source label transcend one gTLD to the other one and how those disposition values and composition or the composition of the set is created? And this is one way that I have thought about the process. There might be other ways to solve for the problem, right? So, I think we all understand that each namespace, meaning a gTLD, has its own rules, right? They are independent. The variant relationship is created at a policy level and there's going to be some calculations, computational processes in order to create those relationships. But at the end of the day, these are independent, distinct gTLD spaces. So, each gTLD will have its own IDN tables in order to govern how domain names, or IDNs specifically, are registered or processed. So, one way that I have thought about is, okay, so you have a gTLD variant set and there's a domain name registration coming to the registry. How do you create the set? And for the sake of this conversation, let's talk about superset because we're talking about two gTLD variants of each other, so it's going to be a set for each gTLD, but a superset that encompasses, comprises all the variant labels in the gTLD variant set. I hope you are following me. So, let's put that aside for

EN

a moment and let's come back to the calculations that are done on the IDN tables to, one, calculate the composition of the variant set, and second calculation is the disposition values. So, let's talk for a second about composition. We know that to be able to calculate the composition, we need the source name or the primary domain name and that primary domain name will help us create the composition of the set. And because we have these harmonization requirements, that means that variant relationships that exist in one table must also be present and consistent across other tables and across main spaces, right, gTLD variants of each other. So, that makes very predictable to calculate the composition for the two sets. And so because one source label will help us calculate the superset of variant domain names, right? So, I answer the question number one with a source, one source domain name in any given gTLD of the set, I can calculate the variant set, the variant superset. What I know and the second calculation now is going to be the disposition values. So, what is the disposition value for each one of those variant domain names in each of the gTLDs, right? So, if I apply a domain name under gTLD one, I know the composition and I can know the disposition values as well. We know the disposition values aren't necessarily symmetric, meaning a variant relationship can go just one way, not the other one. I mean, one way could be allocatable and the other way could be blocked. So, it's important to know where to start and the source domain name give us the starting point. And so, for gTLD one, I will know the composition and disposition values. What I will not know for sure is the disposition values of the gTLD two because I know I use a source domain name to create the, and because of harmonization, I know what's the composition of the

set, but I don't know the disposition value. So, I envision there's going to be a later conversation with the registrant and say, okay, so you have these domain names calculated and withheld for you because of the same entity requirement, but how would you like to activate them? So, you will need to choose the source domain name in gTLD two to calculate the second part of the [inaudible] right, which is to calculate the disposition values. So, I know it's a lot of detail. I'm happy to go over that in a graphical way in ICANN 78, but I think this goes back to the question, in the gTLD set, is it one source domain name, two source domain names? What is going to happen behind the scenes in order to do that? So, I know there was a lot, but I hope it was helpful. So, I want to pause there. Happy to take any questions.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. Dennis, I think I do understand what you're saying, and basically, I don't know actually how would you calculate the disposition of the variant under the other TLD, right? But I also raised my hand to ask you that maybe you could also, on email, send like definitions to what you just said, superset, set, and what this represents and what the other represents. But yes, I think you do identify a problem. I don't think we did discuss it. Thank you. Or did we?

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Oh, thanks, Hadia. I have to admit, my brain isn't helping me out here today. So, Dennis, the intervention you just made, is that about the source domain name and how to identify the source?

DENNIS TAN: Not so much about identifying this. Well, it's about identifying the second source, I guess, to define the disposition value of the second TLD where there is a variant TLD in the mix. The first one, I think, is straightforward, right? The first registered domain name, that's the source as a primary, there is no question about it. When you have a second gTLD in the set, then that's where things get more complicated and things might not be as straightforward as this.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right. I think I'm there now. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, just trying to perhaps clarify. So I think if I am understanding what Dennis is saying, is that the registrant needs to select a primary label under each variant gTLD. I think that's eventually what would be required. It's not that there's one primary label across all the variant gTLDs. So it's one primary label variant gTLD. Thank you.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks. Okay. So it seems we might have a bit of work to do in the explanation of this. Alrighty. So can we keep moving, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, definitely can. So I guess for this first paragraph, we could basically accept Dennis' edits here. And then regarding the ALAC comments, my reading is, it seems to be the same explanation about the source domains, but it's basically a different way of phrasing it. So I'm wondering whether accepting Dennis' edits here is sufficient in addressing what ALAC is recommending. But if folks can't figure this out on the fly, we can just park this and come back to it. So that's just my editorial comments.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. I think maybe if we could just ask ALAC to come back and see whether they want this additional language or whether the editing that Dennis has already done achieves the same purpose. Thanks, Justine.

ARIEL LIANG: So, okay. So we'll let ALAC team go back to us. And then the next paragraph. So Dennis suggested to remove for the same registrant. So without source domain name, it will be impossible to know which allocatable domain names, if any, can potentially be activated. So Dennis just crossed out for the same registrant. I think I understand why. It doesn't create conflicting message. So activation is the key here. So I think I understand this. And then the second comment, this requirement is essential to preserve the

same entity principle pursuant to preliminary recommendation two. And then Michael said he's not sure that the requirement for a defined source domain name is really essential to preserve the same entity principle. I think these two are not related. The variant set is already defined independent of the source domain name. And you just need the variant set for the same entity principle. The disposition value, which depends on the selected source domain name, are only required to decide whether a certain domain may be activated or not. Agree. And then we remove the sentence altogether. That's what Dennis responded. So I think it's the same logic why Dennis crossed out for the same registrant. Because knowing the source domain, we know what allocatable domain domains are for activation. So that's the key. And we don't have to conflate with same entity principle. I think that's why there is Michael's comment. Yeah. So basically, it's to remove this whole sentence if the group agrees with that approach. And I will stop here. And Dennis said that's right. Yeah. Okay. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I was just going to say maybe at this point, just put a line through it, Ariel. So it looks like it is going to be crossed out.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. So also, just note Donna also messaged us. We have few people, a lot of people dropped off. So maybe after we review this part of the rationale, we can stop at this, the end of page 12. Just cognizant that we don't have enough attendance right now. And the next paragraph. So this sentence, the EPDP team discussed the scenarios where a registrant may decide on the source

EN

domain name on behalf of the registrant based on the date of source domain name registration, whichever domain name from this variant domain set that is registered first becomes the source domain name. So this is basically one of the ways how source domain name can be identified. The first come first serve as the source domain name. And Dennis has a comment here. I found this confusing. Once the primary domain name has been registered, the registry is in control of what is the source and which variants can be activated. I don't follow the rationale of what the registrant decide upon the source domain name. So Donna's comment is the previous paragraph states that the source domain name must be identified between the registrant and the registrar. So basically, we're saying this could be one of the way it's identified, but it can also be another way, which is the registrar actually ask the registrant to identify which one is the source. We don't know how that's going to work out in reality precisely, but we just don't want to preclude that possible scenario. We don't want to say this is the only way how a source domain name can be identified. So Dennis, please go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. Yeah, trying to read it on the fly again. So let me just take some fundamentals here. I agree with the notion of the registrant decides what domain name they want to register, and in the case where there is no variant set and the domain name is available for registration, there is no conflict with another variant set, the registrant decides the label that they want to register and there's going to be a, the registrar will enable that process to the registrant. Once that domain name becomes registered, that is the

source domain name and the primary domain name, which the gTLD registry will use to calculate the variants that are going to be withhold for the same entity. So upon this moment, the registry is in control and the registry will set policy whether the primary can be replaced, changed, or moved, whatever they want, but it's up to the registry to decide. It's not that the registrant say, hey, registry, my registrant wants to change this domain name as a source and not the other one. And the registry will say, no, that's not possible. So I just want to make sure this is understood. At the outset, at the start when the domain name is being registered for the first time, yes, the registrant and the registrar are in control, but once that domain name exists, then a primary source is being established and now the registry is in control. What is allocatable? What is blocked? And what are going to be the policies as to whether that source of primary domain name can be replaced or swapped among the variant set? I hope that makes sense.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So we may have a little bit of work to do here in the text for the rationale, so we'll have a look at that.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. So if I may do a quick follow-up. Dennis, is the wording of recommendation five still okay? Or do we have to incorporate registry in this context? Because here we only talk about registrar and registrant. And Dennis, if you can't do this on the fly, please feel free to review this offline.

EN

DENNIS TAN: Right. Yeah, I'll think of something. Recommendation five, I think we need to explicitly say it's the first transaction, right? That's where the registrant is in control of what he, she can register. But after that, I mean, yeah, giving them the power to change source domain name, that's really complex and not really something that they should have that. Yeah, I'll think of something to clarify to what extent this recommendation five can be applied. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you, Dennis. And I think I understand about this much better now. And yeah, and Donna said include the words like consistent with the registry policy. I think that could work and we'll kind of discuss offline. And the next comment we just highlighted this is regarding educating the registry, registrar, registrant regarding the concept of source domain name, because it's not easy and has implications. And I think during the discussion we did raise who's going to be responsible to undertake that education outreach effort. And then the understanding is that most likely ICANN Org has to do this. It's down from the policy recommendation. So for implementation, it's probably going to be ICANN Org's responsibility for educating the relevant stakeholders about the source domain name concepts. And then ALAC team agrees with this. So didn't see other comments here. So maybe it can stay as is for now. And finally, the end of this paragraph, [inaudible] once the grandfathering situation is rectified and only one registrant and one sponsoring registrar remain for the variant domain set, the source domain name identification requirements should come into effect. And then so this is talking about the grandfathered variant domains

EN

when they actually need to identify the source domain name is at the moment only one registrant and one registrar left for the set. So Michael has the question whether it should is not correct by must use must. Do we want to enforce this as soon as the grandfathering is resolved, a source domain name needs to be defined through whatever means? And Dennis comments it might even be the case where there is no discovery needed. The registry might say that the registered domain name is the primary and registrar nor registrant would be able to change that unless they delete the domain name. So I guess that goes back to Dennis' previous comment about registries doing this. So yeah, but we don't know what is the right word here and whether the rationale needs some further work. And Dennis, see if you have any more reaction to Michael's question here. Like do you think should is still appropriate or we need to address that somehow. And Sarmad has his hand up.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Ariel. So I think what Michael is saying and then what Dennis is saying could both be true at the same time. So I think what is being suggested is that the source domain or primary domain must be identified. Who identifies it is really up to probably the implementation. So is it the registrant or some domain name which is registered earlier and done directly by the registry. But even if it's done by the registry or the registrant, it would need to be identified so that I guess one could determine what other allocatable variants are available to that registrant. Thank you.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Sarmad, and I just see Dennis has the comments in the chat. I think it may be a good way of refining the sentence. Dennis, please correct me if I misunderstood. So basically replace should with may and then at the end after coming to the fact put a discretion to registry policy so that it leaves flexibility to how this can be implemented. So if the registry policy requires that, yeah, it needs to be identified. But if registry already have a different policy how this is going to be done, maybe there is no involvement needed from registrar, registrant. It's just automatic. Yeah, so Dennis confirmed that could work. And then just for transparency and visibility, I'm going to put the red line here and make sure everybody has seen it. Okay. At the discretion of... I guess. Yeah. Okay. And thanks, Donna.

So basically what's remaining is we do need to come back to the rationale of recommendation five and address the first set related definition. That's something we'll talk about in ICANN 78 and then also the comment Dennis regarding registries' role in this. We probably need to expand on that in the rationale and also possibly recommendation five itself. We need to clarify it too. So we'll come back to it at a later date. So Donna, do you want to stop here now?

DONNA AUSTIN: I think so, Ariel. I think we've lost quite a number of people in the last half hour. So I think it might be best if we just draw a line under this one and we'll come back to it at some future time. Just to give people a sense of what we'll be talking about in Hamburg, do we ...? I should say do we as leadership team have a sense of

what that would be? Maybe you could share that with the team and then we'll...

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. So this is something we discussed last week was the presumption that we finish the second reading of the phase two draft text, but obviously we haven't finished that. So that could be part of the ICANN 78 work, is to continue reviewing the draft text and finish it up. But we will talk about that with leadership team and confirm. And then the second item is regarding the source domain name question. So we... I believe we have some unfinished discussion about that. So it's about the change and the deletion of source domain name and also whether source domain name must be registered and the definition of that as well, the definition of the variant domain set. So these are the things we probably want to reach a clear conclusion with some visual aids if possible so we can close this off. And then the third item is something kind of highly anticipated. And no pressure, Dennis, but it's regarding the mechanism of identifying the same registrants. And that's the following up on C3, which is ROID question. And we know TechOps team has been working hard to figure out a way that can be implemented down the road. So we hope to hear from Dennis and Michael and others involved in TechOps team discussion of whether they have a concrete proposal to share with the group. And yeah, so we'll see how that goes.

Yes. And then finally, if we do have luxury of time, we could tackle one more charter question from phase two, which is related to the variant domain name transaction fee, whether each variant domain is regarded as independent transaction or not. We hope

EN

this is one of the low hanging fruit and then we can tackle that quickly. So I think that's the plan for 78, if I'm not mistaken, but leadership team and staff, we can discuss whether we want to continue the second reading of draft tax there too or pick it up later. So yeah.

DONNA AUSTIN: Dennis, go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Just to understand my action item for 78, ROID. Yes, that's noted and also an explanation, more visual explanation of the source domain name across and gTLD variant set. I think that's what I have signed up for. Okay. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: That's what we've signed you up for, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Yep. And I will sign up Ariel to help me.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you. And thanks, Ariel. In the end, we're pretty close to time anyway. So thanks everybody. I know this is pretty hard and laborious work working through the text, but thanks for your attention. And we won't have a call next week. We'll see folks in Hamburg. Is that right, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, because next week is travel day. Yeah, it's not possible.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Okay. All right. So we will, actually, it would be really helpful if I could just put in the email thread, whether they'll be in Hamburg or not, be really helpful to know. But assuming we'll see most of you there, I look forward to that. So thanks everybody. We'll see you in Hamburg or see you online in Hamburg.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]