EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP F2F Workshop AM Session

Friday, 08 December 2023 at 01:00 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: All right. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP face-to-face meeting taking place on today, Friday, December 8th, day three of three. Good job, everyone. No apologies today, and all members and participants will be promoted to panelists. The observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Statement of interest must be kept up to date, and if anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. All right. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDNs EPDP wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript. I see Terri already posted the link to the wiki page. Thank you so much. During this session, it's requested that questions are asked verbally. To signal you have a question or would like to speak, if

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.

you're here in the room or online, please use the hand raise function in the Zoom toolbar. If you're in the room, please join this meeting without audio, or if you do join with audio, please mute your microphone and speakers as audio is taken care of through our meeting AV support staff in the room. When called upon, you'll be given permission to unmute your microphone. Kindly unmute your microphone at this time to speak. Please state your name for the transcript. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN's multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you and over to our chair, Donna Austin.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you, Dan. Welcome back, everybody. As Dan said, day three and we, with any luck, we'll be out of here by 3:30, maybe sooner, depending on how we go. I think what we'll start off with, I think Steve's going to give us a bit of a recap. No, he doesn't want to do that. For what we did yesterday, maybe someone else would like to give us a recap of what happened yesterday. No? Okay. I'll just filibuster for a minute. I think for today, I think we have to get through the glossary and what else? In my mind, we're finished. But anyway, what do we have to do?

ARIEL LIANG: The terminology and also the deletion of the source domain name.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right. So, we have to have a discussion around terminology, which I guess is related to the glossary. And then

EN

deletion of the source or primary domain name. Is that the? Another one of Edmon's topics. And yeah, I think that's pretty much it.

STEVE CHAN: This might sound a little off the cuff here because it is. So, I'll try to do a recap of the—I mean, this is going to be very high level for the entire day. And so, we talked about quite a bit. I think we started—it's kind of a blur. I think we started the day with the WHOIS RDAP discussion. I can't remember if that was actually concluded the day before. And I'm actually struggling to remember where we landed on that one. But we did add the nuance about the IANA WHOIS. And then so I think where we settled is not prescribing how it looks, but rather just that the primary and then all variant TLDs must be captured in some manner and displayed and understood to be part of the root zone. I think then we moved over to the IDN implementation guidelines. First, we started talking about the process. And where we landed there, I think, is that the process at a high level remains fit for purpose, but there's still some improvements that need to be made in around made around the edges. There were improvements identified in the room, but we'll also take this one back to make sure we at least look at the PDP process overall for inspiration to look for additional maybe checkpoints that can be added into the process to ensure that the outcomes don't surprise anybody.

I think then we moved on to reviewing V4.0, the deferred elements from the 4.0 guidelines. And I guess at a high level, at least most of the things were touched on by this group, but there are a couple of remaining items that I think were the action items again, end up

being, we take those back and make sure that there are no gaps. And we also understand the process by which we're going to inform the board of the outcomes from this group to make sure that nothing is dropped.

And the last thing I think we talked about was the IDN tables. And where I believe we end up there is we're trending towards, well, this has not really changed, but tables must be harmonized. But for the reference LGR, those must be considered. Not something that has to be integrated into the table, but when you're developing your table, especially looking forward, it needs to be a consideration. I don't know if we fully landed there, but it seemed like that was where things were trending towards.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. The only hesitation I have is that it's a soft requirement. It's not a must requirement. I appreciate the sensitivities around the word must, but we'll find some language. So I think that's it. Yeah. If there's anything you want to add.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. So I guess before we move on to the glossary and terminology, I just wonder whether the group is comfortable where we landed with the IDN table harmonization. Do you believe we need to talk more today where this is good and then we just move on? Because if you don't say anything now, I don't think we're going to come back to this for a long while.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: There is one suggestion I was going to make, and this is really for Jennifer and Maxim and whether this is feasible or not, but whether it's possible to get some sense from the registries about how the, to what extent tables are harmonized now, what process is used. We don't have a data point on this. And I think that makes the conversation a little bit difficult. And we also, because we don't know to what extent harmonization is being done, whether there's actually a problem that we're trying to solve for here. So if there's any way to get some more information for the registries that might be helpful, that'd be great. But I appreciate that it's unlikely as well.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Just quickly to your request, Donna, yes, we'll do that. I'll send a query over to the stakeholder group. I mean, we have our Tuesday call, so I'll bring it up there and we have a drop in call next week as well. Anecdotally, yesterday when I informally asked them and our sense is that there really isn't that many registries out there at all who have harmonized tables, but we'll find out and then we'll share with the group.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Good morning. My biggest problem with the status quo is that I still don't really see how registries can check or know whether their tables are harmonized enough, so to say, that they would pass ICANN's validation. Since we just say they must be harmonized, but not really state what it actually means. Apart from the consistency, that part is clear. You can check that. But the other part of having variants between scripts and maybe

sometimes even in scripts that need to be there, even if you do not support variants at all, this is still a bit underdefined, so to say. I would like to have some explanation, some description, some way that you can check and say, "Okay, my IDN tables are harmonized. It's enough of what I've been doing or there's still something to do for me."

DONNA AUSTIN: I guess the policy recommendation for us is that the tables must be harmonized, which isn't done at the moment. I could have this wrong, but I suspect that through implementation, that conversation will happen about, "Well, what does that mean and what is going to satisfy?" Because I assume that it will become a requirement on the registry operator. If they're not harmonized, then it's a compliance component. I'm not 100% sure whether that's accurate or not, but that's the way that I've been thinking about it. Maybe during implementation, that will be sorted out. I guess the other option that is available to us is that we could provide some implementation guidance, but I don't know what form that would take, so that's something we could think about.

MICHAEL BAULAND: So you mean that this will be verified within an IRT, if that's correct? I'm not very familiar with all these processes. This is my first EPDB, so to say, so I'm not 100% sure of what happens when and what is done in which group, so to say.

DONNA AUSTIN: So the how is generally worked out by the IRT.

MICHAEL BAULAND: But it still could make sense for this group to maybe say that at least the variants defined in the root zone LGR, they must be within, if it's not too strong, I don't know.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I guess my thinking on that as a soft requirement is that it could be a consideration in developing, in harmonizing your table. So I think there was language in the implementation guidelines that we had up on the screen yesterday that we could use this as a soft requirement, whether that said must or shall or something. I think Ariel's trying to pull that up. So registry may use relevant work for the root zone LGR and other sources to determine the IDN variant code point sets. So I think that's associated with the harmonization. So Nigel and then Maxim.

NIGEL HICKSON: Good morning all. Yeah, I mean, I thought we had a really good discussion yesterday afternoon on this. And I just wondered whether we'd finished going through the slides, because I was looking at number 86, where there were a couple of options. And I just wondered whether we discussed those and apologies if we did and I sort of missed it. But I do think we probably need some further discussion, although perhaps we need to, as you say, Donna, we need to wait until we have some more factual evidence, because I think the problem we have is that we have a fairly strong recommendation that this information should be displayed, but there's some doubt about how it's going to be taken

forward. So although we want to, as you say, have a flexibility in how it's taken forward, but I'm just conscious that we don't want to be in a situation where after this is all adopted in the implementation there's a pushback to the possibility of doing this at all. You know, the recommendation has to be revisited. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Nigel. Maxim and then Steve.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we, until we have some clear definition—It's not a good idea to leave it to implementation because since implementation is in ICANN hands and leaving it as is puts us in a situation where we will have to do something to approve it without understanding and to say all those registries who do not do it, whatever it is, those are bad and have to be punished by compliance. I do not think it's a good idea because without a clear definition, what is harmonization and some objective method like you have a script made by ICANN, who knows, maybe some optical recognition of the strings where the strings are generated and then recognized for the visual similarity, I'd say, why this method or something else where registries can check the tables. We will face a situation where someday, compliance, they actually will not care a lot about what we talked about. They will have some text, yes, and they will enforce it. And they actually do not care what ideas the group had, if the group has not expressed it in clear wording. What is harmonization? How do you check the table versus this requirement and which tables are not to be, I mean, where these principles shouldn't be applied. For example, the 100% ASCII TLD

shouldn't be checked for harmonization, yes? Or maybe some scripts, if they don't have similarity in symbols, they shouldn't be checked for the harmonization because without it, we are not going to be safe. Like one day compliance comes to us and says, oh, by the way, in Cyrillic script, letter O somehow similar to zero. You have to do something with it. And without it, you have issues. You're in violation of the harmonization principle. And we are going to be all alone. So this thing should be resolved before the implementation. Or we will face consequences like basically many registries will have a situation where their hands are twisted by ICANN, so they have to do something with the IDN table. Because in reality, these days, if ICANN is not happy with your IDN table, despite all the words that, oh, yes, we will allow you to use your old IDN forms, they just do not let you pass back-end testing or the procedures for the migration of registry until you do whatever they want. So in reality, it's already not this good. So I suggest we do not add things, unresolved things on top of the current situation. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. So the preliminary recommendation that we had on harmonization is on the screen. So all of the existing and future IDN tables for a given gTLD and its variant gTLDs must be harmonized. This means that all of the IDN tables for a gTLD and its variant gTLDs must produce a consistent variant domain set for a given second-level label registered under that gTLD or its variant gTLDs. What we were talking about yesterday, I think, is part of the how. And I think we still have a little bit of disagreement on this, is whether the how must be a must or a may, as Hadia

has put in the chat. So I think at the moment, I think it's a may. I'd like to see what Jennifer comes, Jennifer and Maxim can come back from the registries, what information they have available for us. Maxim, to your point about compliance, I mean, how compliance interprets whatever happens to be in the registry agreement is not for us to worry about. We'll just try to be as clear as we can in the recommendations. We can't decide how compliance is going to interpret whatever ends up in the registry agreement. So with that, I've got Nigel, are you back in the queue? Okay. Steve, Hadia, Maxim, and Michael.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Donna. This is Steve. And I guess I'll throw out a caveat. I'm clearly not an expert on IDN tables and I've implemented zero and developed zero. But I'm just wondering if we might be blending two things. And so I think it's helpful that we're returning to this recommendation, which I think is really about the consistency of IDN tables. And then I think what we talked about yesterday is more along the lines of how you compose the table itself. Like what are the contents and composition of your table? And then it seems like this recommendation is to ensure that once you've actually developed your table, that as you apply it across your TLD, it produces consistent results. And so I'm just curious if we might be conflating two different things.

DONNA AUSTIN: I don't know that we're conflating. I think this is it must be harmonized. The other part was a little bit of the how. So there are ways that you can harmonize your tables. And I think the

EN

recommendation is that one option is that you could use the LGR to assist in that process. That's at least my understanding. Am I wrong? Okay. Yeah.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks Donna. When I was looking at the presentation from Sarmad and Pitinan yesterday, it seemed like that is the contents of the table. Like you could now set up these code points as variants in the table. Wasn't that sort of what we were looking at yesterday? That's not so much about the harmonization. That's like what is in your table. I don't know if I'm making a nuance correctly. I guess not. Sorry.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Hadia, Maxim and Michael. And I Sarmad if you wanted to. Okay. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia. So to me actually those two recommendations, recommendation 1c4 which says that tables must be harmonized is in contradiction with the IDN implementation guidelines number 13 which says registries may use relevant work developed by script user community in order to determine the variant code points. So actually if we had only this and we didn't have the other at all, that would have been fine. But actually having both of them, you're saying in one of them you may use the—so actually Donna, your argument was this could be left to implementation phase. And I totally actually agree. If we

didn't have the other recommendation that says may. But since we have—

DONNA AUSTIN: So can we just try to get clear on what this is? And maybe I'm misunderstanding. The requirement is that the tables must be harmonized. And then the how is up to the registry, right? So it's the registry that decides how they're going to harmonize their tables. I think what that may is suggesting is that one way that you could harmonize your tables is to use the root zone LGR and those code points, right? So that's the may and that's the how. So there's nothing inconsistent here. It's just this is the must be harmonized. So the tables have to be harmonized. How you do that, we're saying is up to the registries. But what we're suggesting because of what Sarmad and Pitinan presented yesterday is that one way you could do that is using the LGR.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: But how would you ensure the must if actually each registry design decides on its own?

DONNA AUSTIN: Because the tables will still be harmonized. It's just the way that you do it will be different. So there's a process to do the harmonization and each registry may do that differently, which is probably the back end providers will do it differently. This is just a way that you could do that.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: But we are not really talking about a process that each one will do in its own way because we had already agreed that the process could vary. We don't care. We don't care about the process. It's actually the data based on which you make you make this must possible. And that's been developed by a user script community. It's something that takes a lot of time to do. It takes lots of experts. It involves lots of experts actually to come up with this. So it's not the process. We agree that each registry will have its own process. But it's the data based on which the process lays on. And there we have a may.

DONNA AUSTIN: I'm not sure I'm following your logic, Hadia, if anyone else is, can you help me out? So we'll get Maxim and Michael and then Abdulkarim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Few things about the reaction of registries. Realistically, we can have the feedback in two weeks because in one week we will only have feedback of those who are really active in IDNs. The biweekly call passed just a few days ago. We need a clear wording that this definition is applicable to the IDN variant set declared by the applicant. So ICANN compliance doesn't come to registries who has only one IDN table for the TLD and forbids all variants and declare hereby, we think that your IDN table is looks somehow similar to some other IDN table and we declare it to be variants. These should be avoided because it might create a lot of situations we do not need.

Speaking about the community efforts, we shouldn't forget that one of the ICANN's missions is to ensure security and stability of Internet. Registries and registrars' platforms are part of the Internet infrastructure. If we create something endangering the technological part of Internet, we're putting the stability and security at risk. It should be avoided.

Speaking about the must for everything community produces as an output for registries, I'd say since there is this thing called implementation after the work on data structures is finished and if something is implementable, it can go into the production. If not, despite all the efforts of community, if technological aspects were not taken into account, it might create some situations where following the whatever we invent in IDNs, variants, EPDP is going to be so hard that nobody will use it. I remind us all, if we create the rules are so strict, so hard to follow, so hard to implement, registries will not say that their IDN tables are variants of each other and couple these. They will just apply to these TLDs separately without all this hassle about variants and their clients will couple the strings on themselves via marketing. The harder we make rules to follow, the more chance that nobody uses it at all. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, Michael for the record. I think this recommendation one is wrong in the way it's spelled out here. There are two parts in this

EN

recommendation. First part is it says the IDN tables must be harmonized. That so far is okay. But then the second part explains what harmonization means. The only thing it requires is that the variants that get produced by the IDN tables must be consistent. But that is not enough for harmonization. Because if I have a Latin IDN table with no variants, especially no cross script variants, and a Cyrillic IDN table with no cross script variants, then I have under this definition of harmonization, I have two harmonized IDN tables because the variants produced by these IDN tables, i.e. no variants at all, are consistent. Because if no variants are produced, naturally they are consistent. But this is not harmonization, what was described by Pitinan and Sarmad, namely that we also take care that the letters, the code points which look exactly the same in Latin and in Cyrillic, they have to be variants. So this is also part of the harmonization. And you don't cover this by just requiring that the produced variants are consistent.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. So there's a note in chat from Satish that the recommendation is actually the first sentence only. And the second part logically becomes part of a glossary. So there's a way that we could say that the recommendation is that they must be harmonized. And then we talk about what harmonization means in the glossary. But I think there's a bit more work to be done here with registries and perhaps the registrars. I'm almost at the point where I want the contracted parties and maybe Sarmad to go off and have a conversation and see what they can come up with in relation to this topic and see if you can find a way forward for us.

Because I think it's technical and it's operational. And I think a number of us are talking out of our hat without really understanding what we're saying here. So if I can make that request that the registries, registrars and Sarmad and Pitinan have a conversation around this and see where you get to. This recommendation will stay as it is for now with the soft addition of the May use a reference LGR. And then we'll come back to this at a later date. Is that fair? Yeah.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Okay. So the recommendation is the IDN tables must be harmonized. I'm fine with that. But then we really need to explain what harmonization means. And it's not just the sentence which was put here.

DONNA AUSTIN: Right. Yeah. So I'm asking that basically we're putting a small group together to try to sort this out. Abdulkarim and then Ariel.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I just wanted to elaborate more on what Hadia was saying. And I think the point is if you're talking about harmonization and you have two ways of doing things, then you're only talking about harmonization if only method A and method B would generate the same result. If method A and method B, which is what you were mentioning, do not generate the same result, then that is not harmonization. And the most here is about it must be harmonized. So the method is actually important because if the two methods you are using or three methods or whatever method

you are using is not generating the same results, then there is this cannot be implemented. And also, Maxim was mentioning the fact that we are trying to make the rules too difficult. I don't think that's the case. I probably think it's just a matter of trying to ensure that things work the right way. And one thing, again, I've been saying since we started this discussion is the fact that the registrars, the registries, and they're saying it's going to be difficult to implement. But how, why is it going to be difficult to implement? That is something we need to understand. If we do not understand why it is difficult to implement or how is it going to create, because Maxim was also talking about security of the internet, but you're just saying security of the internet, you need to tell us how it's going to affect the security of the internet. Then I think that way, everybody will be able to make an informed decision. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Abdulkarim. So I guess one of the things for us to recognize and appreciate is that TLDs provide IDNs at the second level now. They have done for some time. Some allow variants, some do not. The IDN tables are produced by the registry operators. They have been done that way for a long time. They do that according to their own purposes, own rules, own community. So to Maxim's point, from an operational perspective, it is challenging and there are costs involved, but I take your point. It's fine to say that that is the case, but can you provide evidence? So that to some extent is back to my request to Jennifer earlier, is it possible to get some kind of information from the registries about what happens now and how are these things developed? What tables have been harmonized? What ones haven't?

So we are lacking data on this. We have a lot of anecdotal data, but we don't have actual data. We don't know the size of the problem that we, well, we don't really know if we've got a really a problem we're trying to solve. If we do have a problem we're trying to solve, what's the size of it? So whatever the solution is must be suitable to the size of the problem.

So I think with this one, we have some different opinions and that are pushing for different reasons. But one of the things that's problematic for us is we don't have data and information that can help inform our discussions and decision on this. So we'll wait to hear back from the small group that we've just put together and then they can come back to the group and report to us on this and then we can move forward. Okay. All right. Ariel and then Maxim.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. I don't want to kind of further belabor the point, but the reason I raised my hand is perhaps just make certain points clear for the small group to discuss if that hopefully that'll help. And I think what Sarmad and Pitinan's point is not to ask registry operators to redo their IDN tables. What they have is fine, but what they're asking is to include additional variant code points that were identified in the RZ-LGR or reference LGR that may not be previously identified by the registry operators in their IDN tables. So I think that's the ask, is to add those code points that were identified by the community. So that can perhaps drive the harmonization end result and perhaps make it easier for compliance down the road. So it's really not redoing the work, but adding more code points, but Michael's shaking his hand. So, but okay. So now, yeah, now I mischaracterized, but, but anyway,

that's the point I've got. And I just want to help make it explicit and hopefully that's helpful for discussion.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think it sounds pretty simple on paper, but I don't think that's the reality, and that's the challenge. Maxim, and then we're going to draw a line under this.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking about security of the current situation, we shouldn't create new rules which endanger existing registrations in IDN TLDs, because it's more relevant to stability and predictability of what we do. And also speaking about costs, someone has to pay for the cost of development. It's not that registries and registrars have lots of cash and at any moment they hire new and new coders and they implement whatever we produce. It means that if the costs are too high, either nobody uses this method or end users have to pay the registrants, the public at large, because the prices will go up. It has to be compensated. That simple. And the speaking about the different opinions, the difference in opinions must be resolved before the implementation phase, because if we do not resolve it, it will come to situation where difference of opinions at compliance phase means compliance disputes. And it's not something we foresee, but it may happen. Also, the wording that current IDN tables for the TLDs, which are operated in a single manner, in single TLD manner, they should be somewhere in what we produce, not in something we suppose, because compliance will check only the final text of what we produce.

And the last thing, we need clear examples from ICANN, which current IDN tables are harmonized, which are not. So we can check if it's applicable, if it's possible to predict it, etc. Without it, it's just saying that we invented new term harmonization and it could be used to punish any registrar, any registry because the IDN table is not harmonized, but we don't know. We cannot say how to distinguish, but we will punish for sure. It's not predictable, this method. So either we create simple, understandable method of checking if the current IDN table is harmonized or not. Or we... Without it, our task is not going to be complete. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Sarmad and then we're going to draw a line under this.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. This is Sarmad. So just to clarify, I think as per the variants which are defined by the community, the harmonized version of Root Zone LGR, for example, is currently published. So there is actually very clear data which is available in the context of Root Zone LGR. There is actually a version which integrates all the variants across all the tables and that is actually available on ICANN website.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, Sarmad, across all the IDN tables?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sure. So it actually integrates the 26 scripts which are currently defined. And there's actually already ongoing discussion with RySG on how would we deal with the scripts for which community, for example, has not identified reference LGRs. And current discussions with what RySG is suggesting is that in those cases, the reference LGRs should first be developed in collaboration with the relevant registry and the community. And then that work should move forward. RySG still has to confirm that decision, but our current feedback from RySG is that that's the direction it's going. So we have a separate discussion on the thread for scripts which are not integrated, but scripts which are integrated, there is a very clear definition. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Sarmad. So we'll leave it to you guys to find the time and then report back to the group. All right. Thanks, everybody. So where do we go to now, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Maybe we can go to easier item, which is the item that Edmon kind of keep mentioning, but maybe he will drop it. So maybe just go there and see what he thinks. So it's basically the source domain name question. And we did talk about the deletion of source domain name in the context of recommendation five. So just refresh everybody's minds. The recommendation five says the registrant and its sponsoring registrar must jointly determine the source domain name for calculating the variant domain set under a given gTLD. The registrants and sponsoring registrars of the grandfathered variant domain names pursuant to

EN

recommendations three are exempt from this requirement. So this recommendation mainly talks about a source domain name must be identified. And then in the rationale portion, we captured the discussion about the deletion of source domain name. So I'll just so quickly read through this paragraph. It basically says that the group had extensive discussion whether source domain name can be changed or deleted. A member proposed that it should be possible to delete or change a source domain name as long as its activated variant domain names remain allocatable. The ultimate agreement among the team was not to prescribe any policy recommendation pertaining to this matter. The EPDP team understood the specific details in the domain name lifecycle management are discretionary on part of registry operators and registrars in accordance with their policies and practices. In addition, registry operators would not allow a situation where an activated variant domain name becomes blocked due to the change or deletion of the source domain name, as this would likely become a non-compliance issue with IDN table implementation.

So that's where the group discussed previously. And it seems there's still wide agreement on this, except Edmon mentioned a couple of times about this. So I just want to make sure we address the question where concern maybe Edmon has and close this off.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Ariel. Edmon here speaking personally. So there on this, there are just two outstanding things that I want to highlight. One is the use of the terminology delete is problematic in my mind. But if everyone thinks delete is fine, it's fine. But because

delete and activation is, it doesn't balance, they're not in the same order. Delete and create are in the same order. Activation and deactivation would be in the same. So I think the word delete in this, the words delete, reference to delete in this whole paragraph should be deactivate, then I have no problem with that concept.

The other thing that is important is that at no time can a set of names be without a primary. That's not included in the sentence right now. Because without a primary, you cannot form a set because you can't even calculate what is in that set. And whether the ones that are activate now are still valid.

So I guess those two things. One is I think the terminology should be deactivate, not delete in this context. And we need to add a sentence that makes sure that there is still a primary identified, even if it's deactivated. It can be identified as primary. But if none of them are identified as a primary, then the set doesn't make logical sense.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes. So as set, I guess you mean the set of allocatable variants. Because a set of variants is always defined and independent of the primary. Okay. What is a deactivated domain? Is it one that is registered, but for example, put on hold or without name server? Or is it something that is yet still to be defined, what a deactivated but existing primary is?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. So if we go back to the terminology that I think we agreed quite a while back, then it will change the status to allocatable. So

that in essence would be deactivated. It becomes allocatable and not in the zone file. Does that make sense?

MICHAEL BAULAND: But then it's the same as deleted, right? Because what's the difference between deletion and deactivation technically in the registry system?

EDMON CHUNG: I would say deleted means it goes into pending delete and gets eventually deleted and back into available. Right? Because the terminology of delete in a registry context is that it's deleted and it's back into being available.

MICHAEL BAULAND: And deactivated is in what state?

EDMON CHUNG: Deactivated would be a new state that is specific to the—It's an action, not a state. So deactivation means an active domain becomes an allocatable domain.

MICHAEL BAULAND: But after deletion, it's also an allocatable domain.

EDMON CHUNG: So it depends on how you see it, right? But in the overall context, when you delete a domain, the entire thing goes away and it goes

back into available pool. Right? You can register it. You can create. So in my mind, delete is against create. You create and then you delete. But here is in the case the registration remains. Right? As you said, the registration remains. So one part of the set is now moved from being active to being allocatable. We should distinguish between that terminology is what I said. But if everyone feels it's fine and people will understand it, I don't have a problem with it.

But my second issue I think is more important, is in order to calculate what is allocatable, as you said, we must have a primary name.

MICHAEL BAULAND: So registration remains means that the registrant and all registrars still have to pay for that primary because it's just deactivated but not deleted. So in that sense, deactivation means like put an EPP hold or something like that. Okay.

DONNA AUSTIN: So we got Maxim and then Abdulkarim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think that depending on the method we use in understanding if the transaction is billable and if the fee should be paid for each domain in the variant set, we have to avoid situation when the particular domain which was a billable transaction removed at all into allocatable state and all other domains are still active. So either you charge for each domain and it's billable transaction,

EN

then you can allow the primary domain to go into allocatable state after its removal from DNS and from registered domains until some of its variants are still active, stop being active, or you remove the whole set when the primary domain is deleted because it was the single billable transaction. And we should not create situation where domains should be effectively used in DNS and not paid for. Thanks. If I'm not clear, I can try to explain it better.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Abdulkarim?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you. This is Abdulkarim for the record. I think one thing we really need to understand is the issue of deletion because I think the reasons for the deleting, because Edmon was talking about it being allocatable because in my head, if it was as a result of a dispute, then it doesn't go back to being allocatable for that registry. Probably it has been transferred or something. So the issue of the primary is still going to be there. And also what is going to be the variant, especially when that registry do not have the primary. So from my own understanding, it's not going back to be allocatable depending on the reason. It might be probably as a result of probably judgment or something, then you can't say it's going back to being allocatable. That's my understanding.

SATISH BABU: So I think the last sentence here is a bit of over-prescription, according to me. Edmon's suggestion regarding adding something

like, at no time shall the set not have a primary or something like that. Because what happens here is that we are specifically saying about blocked due to change or deletion. To me, it sounds a little bit redundant if we can substitute it with something simpler and leave it maximally to the registries to implement in whatever way they want. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Satish. Maybe my brain just died after the first conversation. So I think the focus of this discussion is about what's in the rationale and whether a source domain can be deleted or not. I think there's concern around the word "delete." If it's deactivated, that is probably the preference, because deactivated means that the remainder of the set can stay. But if the source is deleted, then the whole set is deleted. So is that accurate? So the problem lies in the rationale and the preference is to change deleted to deactivated? Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we need to ensure that the variant set doesn't fall apart. It does it without the primary. But the set existed only after the registration of the primary. And if the primary goes into allocatable state, it means leaving the set intact. But also, we need to ensure that we avoid situation where all the domains in the state are only allocatable, because it means it's not used at all by the registrant and the set should be destroyed at this phase. Thanks. We need to avoid situation where the databases of registries are full of not used variant sets. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia. I just raised my hand to say that I do actually understand Edmon's point. And there is a difference between deletion and deactivation. And to his point, deletion would mean that the whole thing goes away. While deactivated means it's still there, but it's not active, so the rest of the set remains. And I think this is what you mean, Edmon. And if this is actually what Edmon means, then yes, it does make sense.

DONNA AUSTIN: To change the language in the rationale. Right. Right. Okay. So, any objection to changing delete to deactivated? Does that address your concern, Edmon? Okay. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. So, I guess this begs the question, do we want to make an explicit recommendation or something to say the actual deletion of the source domain name leads to the deletion of the entire -- no? So, we don't want to say that. Okay.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, we don't want to say that because of the earlier conversation about using EPP create and delete for certain IDN variant management, although you can use update. The reason why I suggest not to use delete in this case is the same, because

it then kind of boxes into one particular direction. So, I don't think we need to add an additional recommendation. I think it's okay in the rationale. The other thing that I'm not sure if we have already agreed is the second point that I made, which is at no point in time can there be no primary identified at all. So, you can change it, you can deactivate it, but at least one of the strings need to be identified as the primary.

DONNA AUSTIN: I guess my question is, at what point in time would the -- well, why would the primary be changed? So, just because you deactivate the primary, you may be using another label in the set. I'm just trying to understand what—Even if the primary is deactivated, it's still the primary for the purposes of the set. You can use any other label in the set. So, why would we -- yeah.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, the possibility then when I talked about the UDRP case is one, right? So, if an abuser used a variant to try to hold the ransom on another domain, they would have used that domain as a primary. So, when the transfer happens to the winning brand owner, the brand owner might want to change the primary to the one that they're actually using. Does that make sense?

DONNA AUSTIN: Nope.

EDMON CHUNG: There are multiple names, right? The trademark is one of them, but I purposefully register something else and put that as primary, thinking that I can get away with it, saying that I didn't infringe on your mark. It just happens to be one of our variants. But if the panel find that, no, you're actually infringing, then what happens is that registration is that besides being transferred to the rightful owner, the rightful owner might want to switch the primary back to what they actually want it, what the brand actually was. So, changing the primary may be necessary in those cases. Still no? Seems like Ariel -- Ariel might be able to explain it better than I do.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think I understand what you're saying, but I still don't understand the change in the source domain. And what I don't understand in that scenario is the UDRP is against the activated domain. But if -- because the variant set includes the brand, but how -- but does that have to be activated to be kind of relevant of the process? So, that's something I'm not understanding. Yeah, go for it.

MICHAEL BAULAND: So, imagine the case that there's a brand name and a variant of the brand name. And the variant has been registered. And the brand name is a blocked variant of this registered variant. Now, some law, URS, UDRP, whatever, comes and says, like, no, even the variant is too close to the brand name that has to go to the brand owner. Now, if they can't change the primary somehow, they have no chance to activate their brand name because it's a blocked variant. So, the only possibility for them would be to delete the whole domain name, wait 30 days, and hope that in the

EN

meantime nobody else comes and registers their variant again, so they have to go again to the courts to get it. So, that's a bad situation. In that context, they have their variant of their brand name but can't use their brand name because it's a blocked variant. In that sense, they would want to change the primary to their brand name to be able to activate that. Does that make sense, maybe?

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So, the answer is yes. I think I see where you're going. I just don't know whether it's an edge case, but we probably need to account for it. So, I'm happy to create a recommendation around this too if that would allow for a change in the primary, which I think is what you're getting to.

EDMON CHUNG: I think in the rationale, we'll be fine, because you already say that one member proposed—Well, we need to edit it such that it's more general that deactivation or changing of a primary is acceptable, basically.

ARIEL LIANG: I just have two remaining questions. So, if we do change delete to deactivate in the rationale portion, I just wonder whether the last sentence can be struck. So, it says in addition, registry operators would not allow the situation where an activated variant domain name becomes blocked due to change or deletion of source domain name, blah-blah. I just wonder whether this is still useful, but we just changed deletion to deactivation. Okay. And I have a

second question. When we talked about this, we also talked about rationale in another recommendation. It's in general the lifecycle management. And I'm putting the text on the screen. I hope you can see it. We have a bullet point about pending deletion because when we review the lifecycle, pending deletion is the last stage. So, we do have a bullet point address that in the rationale. And the first sentence doesn't really change if it's a deletion of a non-source variant domain name, then it doesn't impact the set or the source. But the question is regarding the source domain name. So, I wonder how we're going to expand on that, or do you think we should just not touch this? Or will we change the highlighted part? But maybe I should read it just for the benefit of the room. So, it says the EPDP team agreed not to prescribe any policy recommendation pertaining to the deletion of source domain names, but leave it to the discretion of the registry operators and registrars in accordance with their policies and practices. So, we're still kind of saying the same thing we said in the previous rationale language we reviewed. But here we're indeed addressing the pending deletion stage. So, I just wonder from the group what would be the right approach with this? Or should we just say something like the source domain name can't really be deleted? Or there must be a source domain name? So, yeah. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So, this is Sarmad. I think we are probably looking at two different scenarios on how registration of source and variants is being done and trying to maybe find one solution for the two methods. And maybe that's probably what's causing some confusion or

inconsistency. The one method is that you actually register all the primary and all its variant labels separately, which means there's a separate entry for each one in the zone file. And in that case, of course, a variant can be added, removed from the zone file, and that would be sort of creation and deletion, which we've been talking about. In that case as well, of course, the primary needs to be identified. And there needs to be a mechanism to record whether it is registered or not registered. So, there must be a record of what the primary is because that determines what are the possible allocatable variants to check what can be registered and what cannot be registered. So, in any case, that's one method.

I think another method which is being proposed is what is normally that for each variant set, only one representative domain name will actually be registered in the zone file. That's a sort of a second method. And Edmon, please confirm if—I think that's also something which we are discussing. That's a totally different scenario. And I think that's really where the confusion is coming from. So, my understanding is with that method, actual registered domain name could actually be an internal system-generated domain name. It's not any of the primary or the source. And we normally call it an index variant or something which represents the variant set.

So, now consider an internal registration which is one against the whole variant set, which may or may not be any of those variants but could be something else, an index variant, an internal system generated thing. And now we have to manage the whole variant set. We still need to identify the source variant, which may not be

the registered variant anymore. And that variant is going to then determine which other variant—that source, sorry, domain name will determine which other variants can then be registered or quote unquote registered, they're not really registered, but activated. That's the term we're using. So, registered and activated. That's probably one of the differences.

And that list is kept internal to the registry. It's not an entry in the zone file anymore. Entry on the zone file is only one, which is index variant, which represents the whole variant set including the source. And that will remain in the zone file as registered, as long as one of the labels in the variant sets is actually activated. What is the source, what are allocatable variants is then just managed internally by the registry itself. And has nothing to do with the zone file. And therefore, there is no delete and create and activation deactivation is going on on the recessive side, not in the zone file.

In that case, as long as so, it's up to the registry then to say that, okay, this one's activated, this was deactivated, and therefore becomes allocatable. But all this is not really causing any changes in the zone file at all. Some of this, I think, it may be useful to capture that there are two ways of doing this. And then for each way, trying to explain what is the expectation or what is the minimum expectation, for example, source always needs to be identified. But I think we're trying to find language, which is trying to maybe use terminology of the one to explain the other way of registration and so on. And that's potentially causing the confusion. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. Edmon and Michael.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Edmon speaking personally. So, I agree with Sarmad that we're probably conflating terminologies here, pending delete, it's already probably taking the approach of the domain create and delete in terms of dealing with variants versus the domain update kind of thing. So, my suggestion for here is to delete the first sentence and cross out the pending deletion and just keep the grade portion, except to change the first deletion word to deactivation and the second deletion word to change. So, that would read, that would essentially encapsulate what we're saying, basically, that registries can implement it the way that they look to. But if the primary is changed, we cannot have a situation where when it's changed, the disposition of active variants are actually blocked.

So, the grayed out sentence is valid, except I would change the first deletion into deactivation and the second deletion in that grade thing into change. The change of the source domain.

ARIEL LIANG: I'm sorry, a quick follow up, Edmon, do you mind apply the red line you were suggesting? Yeah, thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I generally agree with Edmon's suggestion, but I don't think it fits to the definition of pending deletion anymore, because pending deletion is a specific EPP or RGP state and this is not connected

to deactivation of variants, because that's a totally different concept, the deactivation and the pending deletion. So, if we still want to say something about pending deletion, this should be different from this deactivation thing. There's one point.

And the second thing I wanted to say regarding Sarmad's comment, it seems that two things you describe relate to what we previously called variants as objects and variants as attributes maybe, but I'm not sure we should look at the DNS or the zone file, because when you say that only one domain is in the DNS and all the other variants are not, then I wonder why we have variants at all, because variants just existing in the registry and not in the DNS are, for all means, for the whole world, not existing, because no one can see them.

DONNA AUSTIN: Is the distinction between whether, how many, and my terminology isn't going to be right, but how many domain names within the variant set are actually being used or activated? I mean, my understanding for what Sarmad was saying is that if it's in the zone file, then that equates to it's being used and it's registered. So, if there's more than, and if there are variants of that name, then they're also being used and they would be in the zone file, but if they're just sitting, waiting for it to be allocated or whatever, then they're not visible.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah. Every variant that is activated and used is in the zone file and any variant not activated, it's not in the zone file. And the

registered status is maybe something even different. You could technically register a domain or variant without putting it in the zone file by using EPP hold, for example, but that's a rather unlikely state, especially for variants. You use it for normal domains quite often if you want to register the domain and block it for anybody else to register it, but don't have a use for it yourself. But in the sense of variants, it makes no sense because they are automatically blocked for yourself. So, there's no need to register or have a variant in an EPP hold state, in a blocked state, because it's anyway blocked for you.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, Edmon, Hadia, Sarmad, and Maxim. And maybe we can just recalibrate here. What are we actually talking about now?

EDMON CHUNG: I think we're talking about Ariel's question about what to do with the pending delete portion of the, is this part of the rationale? Yeah.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia. So, I actually raised my hand to talk about this point, the pending deletion. So, my understanding now that we have actually addressed the deactivation status and based on what Sarmad was saying, and again, I don't know what registry operators do, but if registry operator is using EPP create, where you have a separate entry for the primary, as well as a separate entry for each of the variants, so, what if an actual deletion happens? Did we address this anywhere? And again, I

don't know actually for registry operators, how they do it. So, maybe if they're not doing it as separate entries, then what I'm saying doesn't exist. But what if actually this is what they're doing?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So, hearing Michael, I actually have a question and see if Michael and Edmon can answer that, if that's okay. And that is that, is it required that all activated variants are registered? I guess, hearing Michael, it seemed like it's a yes, but I just wanted to reconfirm that.

MICHAEL BAULAND: In the variant attribute model, you have one registered domain and the variants are just properties of those domains. So, in that sense, yeah, you have activated variants that are properties of one registered domain. So, my first answer was probably wrong. It's no, yes, no. The other thing.

DONNA AUSTIN: We're getting very close. So, Sarmad, do you have a follow-up?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: No, no follow-up. So, now I'm not confused anymore. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: That's one person in the room. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think if the situation is that in the whole variant set, all domains are only allocatable, it's an equivalent of the domain set being reserved for the particular registrant without the use. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So, in this particular document, then I saw the redline and seems like the registration is deleted and replaced by activation. I think both are needed. There has to be something registered, even if it's not the primary or something. So, there needs to be some thing registered, and then activation is certainly something on top of it. But we do need to talk about activation and registration separately, not sort of replacing one or the other. Those are two different kinds of operations. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So, Ariel tells me that we are going to talk about terminology soon. So, maybe we can just put a pin in that and we'll sort it out once we've sorted out the terminology. Okay. We're going to take a break, folks.

DAN GLUCK: Yeah. See you back in 32 minutes. Hey, everyone. Welcome back to session two, day three of the IDNs face-to-face meeting. And with that, I'll hand it over to Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:	Okay, what have we got next, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG:	I just wonder whether we have closed off the discussion about the pending deletion bullet point rationale or maybe we table that for now and look at the glossary and terminology and then come back to this. I wonder what the group—So I saw some nodding from Donna. So maybe we just change gear for now and look at the terminology and then we can come back to this to close it off. So I'm going to paste this document in the chat. One moment.
	So just a quick poll in the room. How many of you have read through the document before coming here? Oh, thank you, Hadia. Thanks, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND:	So just a part, not full.

ARIEL LIANG:	Yeah, it's okay. So I wonder what level of detail I should go. I think maybe I can provide a quick overview and then we can review some kind of key terminology that I think will benefit from the group discussion. But I think what I'm going to do is I just go through the list one by one and quickly summarize it and why it's there and we can focus on the key ones I think I have questions with.
	So this is not unfamiliar because we have this glossary for phase one report. We're using the same structure for phase two and the

terms that made it on the list are the key terms frequently used or have a special implication and we need to explain the meaning.

And the first one is activate. That's definitely one of the key terms. So I'll just say it. And we will go back to the exact wording regarding the meaning. And then the next one is allocatable. It's kind of similar as a disposition model at the top level. So we're using that at the second level. We did mention this word a few times. Although I have an immediate question to the group, is since we have allocatable here, do you believe we should add a term allocated in this list? And Michael seems to be ready to talk. Yes.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I think allocated isn't that the same as activated? Or what would be the difference? Allocatable means it's a variant that you can activate, that you can use. For me allocated and activated is the same. It's a domain of variant that is actually usable because it's in the DNS.

ARIEL LIANG: I have a queue. Is that Edmon next?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. So I agree with Michael. In the case of a TLD, maybe it makes sense to have allocated because there's a time difference between allocated and activated. But in the second level there's no difference.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Edmon. I think it's Sarmad and Nigel, I think.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So question, what is the difference between registered and allocated and activated?

MICHAEL BAULAND: I can try to answer that. For me, registered is a term related to the registry. It's an object that has been created via an EPP create command, i.e. that has been registered. It means you have to pay for it. It has its own life cycle. It's got an expiration date. And that's registered. Activated, I think we use the term for variants in the sense that a variant is now usable. And this activated could come from the variant being registered. So registering a variant would also activate it. But you can also activate a variant by doing an EPP update command to another already registered domain. And then the variant is still activated, but it's not registered, if that helps.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Michael. And Nigel, I think?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. Not Nigel, for the record. But this is, the term we've got here is allocatable, isn't it? So allocatable is much different from allocated. So allocatable is a subjective term. So that it's potentially able to be allocated. Otherwise, we should,

well, if there's no difference, then we should use the word allocate. Allocatable is, it might not have been allocated at all. It just might be able to be allocated. It's quite a different meaning.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. Yeah, sorry, Nigel, I probably confused everybody. Maybe I did it this wrong. So I was just kind of randomly asking a question whether we should add allocated into the list. We currently don't have that. And then sounds like from Michael and Edmon's input, we don't need to have that term. But yeah, but anyway, if you think it's helpful, maybe we can do this. I can just go through the whole list. And then we can go back to the key ones to focus on. Because I do want to get folks input on the way we wrote activate, because that's very important. I have a term of registration, or registered later. So then maybe we can focus on that after I go through the whole table if that's okay with the group. And Michael, yeah.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Maybe just a quick response to Nigel. This allocatable is a technical term. It's not the thing that the general understanding of allocatable means. It's a property of a variant. A variant can either be allocatable or blocked. A variant always has one of these two properties, allocatable or blocked. And that's what we mean with the term here.

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

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. And this is Hadia. I have a comment with regard to activated. Do we want to explicitly like say that activated means that it is registered in the domain name—That it is in the domain name system? So, the last sentence says, it is regarded as an activated domain name as long as it is not deleted from the domain name system. So, this implies it's in the domain name system. But do we want to explicitly also mention this? Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Hadia. Based on my understanding, activated variant domain doesn't have to be registered because the EPP update.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It has to be in the domain name system, though. If it's active, it has to be in the domain name system. If it's activated, it's a must that it is in the domain name system. So, do we want to explicitly say that? I'm okay if we don't.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, I see Edmon put some red line there. As long as it's not deactivated, I guess. It makes sense. It's activated. Activated so it's not deactivated. But we'll have Satish and Michael.

SATISH BABU: Yeah, thinking about this from a registrant's perspective, I'm just trying to visualize how this process is going to happen. So, I enter my primary label and the system gives me a list of allocatable

variants. And I choose from them the ones that I want to activate. So, for me as an end user, these are different things. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I see a problem with definition here in the sense that we say activate if a domain is in redemption or pending deletion, it's still activated. But we also say that it's activated as long as it is in the DNS. And domains in redemption and pending deletion are not in the DNS anymore. So, either we say we take out redemption and pending deletion as being activated or we remove the DNS part, because we can't say it's activated as long as it's in the DNS and also say it's activated if it's in the redemption state. That's a contradiction.

ARIEL LIANG: And this is Ariel. My understanding is if it's not deleted, it's still activated.

MICHAEL BAULAND: If we say if it's not deleted, it's still activated. But the question is what is deleted? If you delete a domain, it goes into redemption. So, it is deleted, but it is in redemption. And it's not in the DNS anymore. And the question is, is it then still considered to be activated? If yes, we have to remove the part with the DNS system. I'm causing confusion here, right?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I am confused because I believe the stage is like expiration, redemption, pending deletion, and then deleted. I thought deleted is the last end result.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah. That's the... That's a bit problematic in the registry system because you send an EPP delete command, then the domain is in pending deletion. But it's already removed from the DNS. So, at the moment you send the delete, it's in pending deletion or in redemption pending deletion. Those are two different concepts. But still, when you send an EPP delete command, the domain goes into the redemption and/or pending deletion state, and it's directly removed from the DNS.

EDMON CHUNG: I'm going to add quickly, but when it expires, it stays in the zone file for a while. So, that's the reason why there's a difference.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Expiration, yeah. Usually registries have an auto-renew, so it doesn't really expire. But CCs may do this differently and don't have an auto-renew. I'm just saying that when we... The question is, do we consider domains that are in redemption and/or pending deletion are still to be active? If yes, we have to remove the part with DNS.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, thanks, Michael and Edmon. I know this is not going to be easy, so I was thinking we can go through the whole list first and come back to these tricky ones. But we have Hadi, Satish, and Maxim. No, it's okay. Maxim, do you have any additional comment?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim, for the record, I think for the clarity of discussion, we might need some kind of picture like a life cycle of these entities. So, we can see what states are available, where the object is, like is it in DNS or is it in SRS only, and actions. So, it changes the states. Because without it, it's quite an abstract thing. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, thanks, Maxim. Good suggestion. Maybe our registry registrar friends can help us if you know any infographics out there. But perhaps we can just keep going through the list and look at the other ones that we covered. Then if you have any immediate comment for the easier ones, maybe we can address that along the way. So, I see Edmon has a few comments here for allocatable. So, he said maybe should add reference to LGR RFC. So, I thought for allocatable in the second level, it's based on IDN tables. That's what IDN tables determine, like what is allocatable, what is not. So, I wasn't sure the comment you made. Yeah.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, but the definition is still from the LGR RFC. And the LGR RFC doesn't care about whichever level. It could be top, second, third, fifth.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thanks, Edmon. I think I may know what you're referring to. I think I saw the LGR RFC, but I will check. So, the next one is blocked. And I guess that's the second type of property of a domain name and then make the same reference to the LGR.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, Edmon, when you say suggest we reference the LGR RFC, so where and why would we do that?

EDMON CHUNG: Because that's where the terminology came from. Unless we change the definition there, I think we should reference the source.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Okay. Got it. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. Thanks, Edmon. I think that was mentioning the implementation guideline 4.1. There is a glossary also and allocatable they mentioned the RFC so I can find a reference. The next term, canonical, so that was a term that we discussed in terms of the activation of varying domains. That's in the existing registry agreement. I think it's annex or something. I forgot. That's the first time I saw this word. And then when we talked about the harmonization, this word was used. And so, that was also in the same RFC, Edmon, just quickly. Okay. So, I will check how that

was defined. But in any sense, I would just quickly read how I wrote this. It's for a code point in a second level label registered under a given gTLD. Its canonical code point is typically the variant code point of the lowest code, Unicode number as described in all of the active IDN tables for that gTLD. And there is example here. And I think that example was actually provided by Michael when we explained this term. The canonical name is the combination of canonical code points of a given second level label. So, I just want to quickly check with the room whether this is okay explanation. And then we'll find a reference of the RFC. Not seeing hands or comments. Seems okay.

And the next term here is the disposition value. So, because we have allocatable and blocked, so I put disposition value here just to cover it. Nothing to it, really. And then, of course, domain name. That's a term. Because that's the focus of second level topics. I got this explanation from ICANN website. ICANN actually has a glossary and acronym list. So, hopefully not controversial. But I am not going to read through. Imagine ICANN doesn't get domain name right. Right. So, yeah.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Ariel. I was just curious, does this text match what's in the definition exactly or has it been adjusted for our purposes at all? And the reason I ask is if it's exactly verbatim, maybe we don't reproduce it. We just reference it and rely on it. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: I think the first paragraph. Oh, yeah. Actually, the whole thing match. So, is this suggestion from a group just simply linked to the—Okay. So, I can replace this just with a link. Yeah. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, I mean, perhaps the link is useful. But for someone reading this, I mean, they want to read all the—I mean, I think it looks a bit odd to have some definitions all written out and then just a link for domain name. I mean, you could put a note saying this is from this link, but I think it's helpful. You know, anyone who prints out the paper and then reads it. I mean, I think we always have to think about that. I mean when someone might have a long—Might want to read this report and print it out.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. Yeah, good point, Nigel. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Yeah, I agree with that. We should have a short description here and then a link for more details for people that want to dig deeper. You can use a link.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. And thanks, Satish. So, I guess my action is to probably condense this and then say learn more and then point the link to the ICANN website. So, okay. If no more comments about domain name, we can move on. We do have domain name lifecycle here. So, I would just read what I wrote here. From a

technical standpoint, the domain name lifecycle concept is reflected in the EPP status codes, which indicate the specific status of a domain name. The domain name lifecycle is generally summarized in five main stages, which are available, active, expiration, redemption, and pending deletion. So, oh, I have a footnote here. Yeah, actually, we did talk about this in depth during ICANN 77, and the footnote points to the recording and the presentation on this topic. Just want to check with the group, do you think this is generally accurate, or there's issues? But again, this is how we explain the meaning, not the definition per se. So, yeah. Seems okay, and we'll move on.

And then EPP, we had this term in our phase one report. So, this is just a repeat. I don't think we need to expand on this. And then the next one is the EPP domain name, a domain status code, because that was relevant in our discussion of a domain name lifecycle. So, Satish, please go ahead.

SATISH BABU: The EPP should be okay.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, yeah, thank you. So, the EPP domain status code, I do, oh, yeah, sorry. Yeah, Manju, thanks. So, that was kind of abbreviated explanation I got from the ICANN website that actually explained the details. So, Abdulkarim, please go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: The domain name lifecycle, I think it's my own understanding of lifecycle is every domain must go through that stage. Because if you say lifecycle, that means it has to go through those five stages.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, has the potential or has ability to go through all these stages. But yeah, but some may exist forever, maybe. That's hope, that's the case. Anyway, okay. So, going back to the EPP domain status code, it's short, I'll just quickly read it is the EPP domain status code also called domain name status code indicates the status of a domain name. I think it's not a great sentence. But anyway, every domain has at least one status code, but it can also have more than one. There are 17 standard EPP domain status codes plus the registry grace period status code. So, there is a website, web page on igann.org for more information. So, that's how we try to explain it. So, if no questions or comment, I will move on to the next one. So, here is the term grandfathered, because we do have a couple of recommendations are specifically about the grandfather domains and what they could benefit from, I guess. So, we do think this term should be explained. This is what is written, a provision in which an old rule continues to apply to some existing situations while a new rule will apply to all future cases. In the context of variant domain name management, grandfathering means that there will be no change to the contractual and activation status of existing variant domain names that do not conform to the same entity principle as recommended by the EPDP team. The grandfathered variant domain names are also

exempt from the additional requirements relating to the same entity principle. So, Nigel, please go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, yes, thank you. Usually, grandfathered relates to a previous rule, I mean, rather than old rule. I mean, I don't think there's a great difference, but old has a slightly different context. But yeah, thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Good point, Nigel. Anything else? If okay, we can keep moving.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, I think the second part is more, I think, going beyond the definition of what grandfathered, the word itself means, and more explanation of a particular part of the policy recommendation, I think. I'm not sure whether that's sort of relevant to include in the definition of grandfathered because grandfathered can be, of course, used in other contexts as well. It's a more generic term. So I'm just wondering whether the second part of it should just be where the policy recommendation is being discussed rather than in the definition of grandfathered. Thank you.

DAN GLUCK: Yeah, thanks so much. So when this section is drafted, we try to draft it in the context of our actual deliberation. So some of the explanations may be expanded. But maybe the way to address is, is we can move like this highlighted portion over to the second

column, because that's additional note about how that's used in our actual deliberation, so that we don't distract reader from reading the actual explanation of the meaning of the word, if that works for you. Yeah, okay. Thank you.

And we'll keep moving. And harmonization. This is the tricky one. And I think maybe we table this and we'll go come back to this. Next one, IDN. Well, again, this is something from the ICANN website. But the actual explanation on the website is pretty short. So I just copied the verbatim here. But I will check again, maybe there's some additional information. If so, then I will put the link for like learn more to the ICANN web page. So I don't think it's much to this one.

No objection, I guess I will move to the IDN table. So I don't I do think I should read this part. Just make sure we get this right. And I believe I got this from ICANN website too, but I'm not completely sure. So I will read it. A specification that defines the permitted characters and rules for combining characters to form labels in the languages and scripts applicable to the second level under a gTLD. IDN tables represent a registry operator's second level rules for its represented a respective gTLDs regarding IDN second level domain names. Registry operators develop their IDN tables and submit them to ICANN Org for review of any security, stability and competition issue considerations. Yeah, actually, I don't think I've got this from the website, is more like my summary version of the IDN table when we discussed this and grabbed some key points here. So any comments from the group? And I actually recall the review for security, stability and competition issue. I think there is a word significant before security and stability. I think

that was Dennis's suggestion. So I can add this word here. So yeah, Satish and Sarmad.

SATISH BABU: Yeah, I was wondering if that second level should refer to labels, right? Not domain names.

ARIEL LIANG: Oh, also Satish, if you see something, you can feel free to red line directly because I may get lost in the discussion. Sarmad please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I think similar comment. Maybe second part of it can be moved to additional notes because it's not really talking about IDN tables, but a related process for IDN tables. So maybe that's an additional note and not really part of the definition.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, thanks. Good point. And I will just move this on the spot. Okay. If no more other comments, we can move on to the next one. It's label, and also, we have the same term in the phase one report. The explanation comes from the ICANN website, so I don't think we need to talk about this one. And the same applies to PDP. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, I'm just wondering, in the AGB, I think we are using a string instead of a label. So whether it's useful to also add a string and explicitly say that label and string are equivalent.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, thanks Sarmad. And so if I recall this discussion at the top level, string is what we used, especially for applied for string. That's what we used instead of label. And then in the context of second level, I don't think we use the word string, but Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes. So there's a whole, for example, chapter on string similarity, which talks about second level labels. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. I'm okay to put string in with a question mark against it because string is not something that we use in this. The fact that it's being used in SubPro implementation, I'm not sure that's an issue for us. So I'm willing to put it in, but just with some kind of caveat on it.

ARIEL LIANG: Perhaps what I can do is just in the second column note, it may be interchangeable with string in some context or something like just note that sometimes string is referred to, but in our report, we haven't really used string for phase two draft text. Okay, thanks Sarmad. And I guess we can move on.

EN

Registrant, that's definitely an important concept for a second level. And again, the explanation comes from the ICANN website. So I don't intend to read the whole thing. And I will check whether there's any additional detail that I can link to, but I think this is short enough.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, just on that. So I think consistent with Sarmad's comments, I think registrant is the first sentence and then perhaps the second stuff about the process, maybe that's in the other column.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, yeah, sounds good. No issues for me. So the next one, registrar, that's also from the ICANN website. And I guess in a similar vein, anything after first sentence can be moved to the second column. So I'll just do that on the spot. But I will double check how we wrote the second column because the additional notes here is usually regarding how we use the word in our report. But it doesn't really matter. It's additional notes on usage. So to expand on the context where the term is also appropriate to be included there. And Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thanks. So I was wondering if—Our work has been on IDN invariants, and that creates a new relation between the registrant and the registrar, which is in terms of identifying the variants, the primary, etc. So should that be mentioned somewhere? Because this definition refers to the old pre-variant position. Now that we have variants and there is a special relation between the registrant

and the registrar in terms of variants, and I'm just wondering if it should be somewhere.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, thanks, Satish. I think I know where you're getting at. So maybe in the registrant section in the second column, we can note there's some recommendation regarding registrant and registrar's joint responsibility of identifying the source domain name, because that's additional obligation that this group recommended. So we can just reference that and point to the recommendation number for more detail, if that works. And the same can apply to registrar, that section. But I think there may be more to it. I think, just to note that the first paragraph in the registrar section, second column, basically we did mention this term refers to, okay, so it was basically key part for fulfilling the same entity principle at the second level. So we just didn't note the specific recommendation related to that, but we can link to the recommendation if that helps. If no more comments about these two terms, I will move on.

Okay, so this is the term. I think probably needs some fine-tuning, registration. And I know that when we use this term, it's not always registration in the draft text. A lot of time we say register or registered. So that's one that we probably want to look at together with activation. Maybe we'll come back to this. So we have tabled activation, harmonization, and registration. So we will remember to come back to this. And next one is the registry operator. Yes, I don't remember why I have this note, but it's same situation. I got the explanation from ICANN website. So I don't think we need to expand on this.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think for me, Ariel, this is a definition of what the registry is, but the registry operator is the contracted party. So I'm not sure that this is—

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, yes, yes. I think that's why I have the note.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, yeah. So I think it's about the registry database, but not necessarily the registry operator.

ARIEL LIANG: So I wonder from the group, do you believe we should have a separate entry for registry operator? Or we can put registry operators in the second column as expanding on the registry, but either way probably is okay. But I wonder from the group, what do you think?

DONNA AUSTIN: Maybe we can have this as registry, in brackets, database, and have a separate entry for registry operator.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. So, yeah, I can follow up on that and create a second term, a second—

DONNA AUSTIN: Or it could be the registry operator maintains the authoritative master database.

ARIEL LIANG: Organization or something for—Oh, Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: So I'm trying to understand, are we splitting the definition? Well, that's not the right definition for a registry operator already, but are we going to put a definition in for that and then another one for database and then link the two or we're trying to combine it? That's what we're trying to work out. So any suggestions?

EDMON CHUNG: Why are we distinguishing between the two?

DONNA AUSTIN: Because this definition isn't the definition for a registry operator.

EDMON CHUNG: Oh, okay. As it is defined in the registry agreement, there is a definition for a registry operator and this is not it. Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: Hadia.

EN

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia. So maybe we could just put it in the additional notes, put the definition of the registry operator that exists.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think we can have registry operators as a separate definition.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I agree to have this separate. In fact, I think we use registry operator much more frequently than just registry by itself. So yeah, thanks for the point pointer to the registry agreement. We can look at the language there.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we can take just the definition of registry operator from the registry agreement. That's it. Because registry operator is an owner of the registry agreement contract for the particular TLD.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Got it. Thanks, Maxim. Okay. If no more comments on this, then we'll go to the next one, which is ROID. So we did have a lot of discussion about this, but the agreement from the group is not to recommend ROID as the mechanism for same entity principle at the second level or requirement at the second level finding the same registrant. So I do have a longish explanation of this, because that's the material we used when we provided the background and context of this. So I just used the language from the slides.

EN

MICHAEL BAULAND: I would replace in the third line contact object to registry object because a ROID is not only for context, but it's also for domains and hosts. I think in our context, we just need contact, but better write to registry object and then say, i.e., contact domain host. And ignore the admin tag registrant contact. I think that's a detail we don't need to mention here. So replace Admin tag or registrant with domain contact host. I suggest replacing admin tag or registrant with domain contact or host to explain what a registry object is.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. Please see whether I applied the red line in the right place. And Sarmad recommended that we move the last paragraph to the second column. I guess that belongs in the additional notes about usage. So I will do that. Just one moment. Any other comments about ROID or is this okay? Seems fine. We can move on to the next one.

So RZLGR. To be honest, this term wasn't frequently used, but we did mention that maybe a couple of times in the report. But that's very important term for variants in general. So we still keep this entry in the glossary. And that's exactly the same text from phase one report. So hopefully not a controversial thing. And if no comment, I will move on to the next one.

Same entity. So I do believe this, we have to explain it, because in the first, the phase one report, we do have a similar entry, but that was explained in the top level context. I would just read what is

written here. A principle agreed upon by EPDP team, where at the domain name level, all allocatable variant domain names from the same variant domain set must be activated or withheld for possible activation only to the same registrant at the same sponsoring registrar. In other words, all of the variant domain names from the same variant domain set must remain linked contractually to the same registrant and at the same sponsoring registrar. And this should be considered a persistent requirement. The goal is to minimize user confusion and security risks associated with variant domain names.

And also, I just want to note, we did have words like activation, activated. We will go back to this once we kind of hone in the terminology of this one. But I see Satish and Sarmad have hand up.

SATISH BABU: Yeah, so in the second column, cornerstone developed during phase two, or is it phase one? Because in the phase one only kind of identified the same entity as a principle.

DONNA AUSTIN: We could just say during the EDPP, during the deliberation of the IDN EPDP. So just keep the phase mute.

ARIEL LIANG: All right, sounds good. Thanks, Donna and Satish. And Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: In the root zone LGR, I'm just wondering whether we should say latest or current instead, because by the time this gets published, we may have a different version. So if we do need to refer to a particular version, maybe use current rather than latest.

ARIEL LIANG: And thanks, Sarmad. And I think maybe I can just add this sentence to something like, during the deliberation or at the publication of this report or something, that's the version.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: That may also change, because we're currently looking at updating the root zone LGR.

DONNA AUSTIN: So we can review this just before publication and make sure it's up to date.

ARIEL LIANG: Can you do this by January, like version six? It's a race.

DONNA AUSTIN: I don't think we're going to get this done.

ARIEL LIANG: Oh, yeah, yeah, sorry. Yeah, no, but I think Q1 2024.

STEVE CHAN: I would, I guess, just ask what is the value of referencing the version anyway? How does that add to the definition?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, it's not necessary. So, yeah, sure. And we can strike this or add to it, but either way is fine. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much. I just lost it now. Where in the definition in the first column it starts, the goal, which is the last sentence, I think, I just wonder whether this was part of the definition or it should be—Yeah, the last sentence, actually, the goal is to minimize user confusion. Is that something which is more of an explanation or—But I'll leave it to the experts. Thanks.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, thanks, Nigel. Yeah, no issues moving this to the next column if that make this a little clearer, and we can refine this a bit. Okay.

So, moving on to source domain name, this is definitely something we have to explain. I would just read it. In the context of this phase two initial report, a source domain name is a registered domain name that determines the variant domain set under a given gTLD. The variant domain set consists of a given gTLD along with a variant label set at the second level. The source domain name also determines the disposition values of variant domain names in the variant domain set. The EPDP team recommends that the

source domain name must be identified between the registrant and the sponsoring registrar as a joint responsibility.

So I do want to note that I struggle with the term variant domain set because I feel we have some unfinished business with that term. So this term probably will need to be updated, but Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: It was basically regarding the same topic because the variant domain set consists of a given gTLD along with its variant label set at the second level. It's not correct because a variant set also includes all domain names of the variant gTLDs. So, yeah, but if you're anyway going to revisit this, that's fine.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, thanks, Michael. That's exactly the unfinished business part that I understand. We probably want to make sure everybody's on the same page. And Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here. I agree with Michael, but I want to add that somewhere here, we should also identify that the use of the terminology primary domain is quite prevalent as well. It's also used in the IDN implementation guidelines and other documents, but maybe in the additional notes or something.

DONNA AUSTIN: Did we come up with source to differentiate between second level discussion and top level discussion?

ARIEL LIANG: [inaudible]

EDMON CHUNG: But they are related. So I think. Yeah. But without mentioning it all, then people might think it's completely different than that.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. That was really a question for my own.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. Thanks, Edmon for the additional notes. I will expand on this in the second column. Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I was just wondering whether we could have in the term column in brackets also sometimes called primary domain name, directly in the term column. In brackets, whether that makes it more obvious that these labels are actually ...

ARIEL LIANG: I'm not against the suggestion. I just want to note every term is more kind of kept in line with how we wrote it in the draft report. And if we never wrote primary domain name, I just don't know whether that's something we want to call it in the first column. But I

think second—sorry, the third column, definitely we can know it can be interchangeable with primary domain name. That was a term mentioned, used. Okay. I do have a quick question. Oh, sorry, Jennifer, please go ahead.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Ariel. Did we put primary in the glossary for our phase one report? Can we point to that?

ARIEL LIANG: So the primary is at the top level.

JENNIFER CHUNG: So I mean, like, obviously, in our context, we're using source to differentiate. We're talking about second level labels. So Edmon's suggestion is we need to put something about it primary in the second column. So if we do that, maybe we also need to put that in our context. We differentiated this. And this is our explanation of what primary means in our context in the phase one report.

ARIEL LIANG: Got it. That definitely helps clarify the context. Satish.

SATISH BABU: Just a clarification question. I know it's very late in the process, but when you have two variants of a gTLD and at the second level you have further variants, do these domain names have to have the same primary for both the gTLD variants?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, that that's exactly the question I actually want to ask, because when we have the source domain name recommendation, we explicitly say it has to be one source domain name per gTLD, not per gTLD variant label set.

SATISH BABU: And the variant set is a combination of both the sets.

ARIEL LIANG: Right. So I see a few hands up.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So this definition is saying that registered source domain name is the registered domain name. Do we actually have a recommendation which says that, or is that—Are we repeating a recommendation or we actually creating a definition here or additional context here?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, I actually believe we put that in the recommendation language. If not, it's definitely in the rationale because we did have discussion about this. It has to be registered. So if that helps make this point clearer, then we can look at the recommendation language and make sure the word registered is in there.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I think that's a significant thing, so it may be useful to verify that. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here, speaking personally. So in response to Satish's question, from how I read it, because I apologize I missed some of the meetings, from how I read it, it's that it's up to the registry operator policy whether it is just one or it could be multiple. And as Ariel mentioned, then a registry operator can implement it in a way that it identifies the same label as the primary or the source across all the variants. Or they could have a system that identifies multiple and different ones across the different variant TLDs. But it's not explicitly written. So I understand why Satish probably asked that question. I don't know whether it's explicitly written that way, because the recommendations only existed for—Ariel, how you described it as one for each one. But it doesn't say it's up to the registry whether all of them are the same or all of them could be different. I don't think we need to add it, just in response to Satish's question.

ARIEL LIANG: Before we move on, maybe I just want to quickly show the recommendation language with regard to the source domain name. Because the word "registered" is not in the recommendation language but in the rationale. So maybe we should find the right place for it. It's recommendation five,

registrant and its sponsor registrar must join and determine the source domain name for calculating the variant domain set under a given gTLD. The registrant and sponsor registrant also still— This second sentence we don't need to talk about. I guess the first sentence, where do you think will be the best place to slot in the word "registered" or "register," Satish?

SATISH BABU: Yeah, I was just wondering if under a given gTLD, under "a" gives the impression of a single gTLD. We're obviously talking about the variants also of the gTLD here. So should we mention under a given gTLD and its variants?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, this is Ariel. Still, I believe the agreement is to determine per gTLD for the source, the variant, sorry, the source domain name, not the variant gTLD set. And we had discussion about that with some examples that Sarmad provided, because the gTLD, even their variant, they could use different IDN tables. And a source that's valid for one IDN table doesn't mean it's valid for another one.

EDMON CHUNG: But I think that's what Satish is suggesting. It's not different. It's just to add a few words that says, and its IDN variants, but not necessarily one entire set. Adding those words just clarifies it, rather than, it doesn't change from what you explained.

DONNA AUSTIN:	Sorry, what's the proposed language or change here?

SATISH BABU:	And its IDN variants. Yeah, probably.

ARIEL LIANG:	Satish, if you feel comfortable, you can directly suggest red line. Yeah, Sarmad, you want to go ahead?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:	I think the working group is clear that the source domain should be registered. Maybe after the first sentence, we can just copy paste from the rationale or just say that the source domain must be registered. And for the variant gTLDs, I think that's significant enough for maybe the working group can consider a separate recommendation for it. Just to highlight it's significant. A text can be added to a current recommendation as well. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG:	Thanks, Sarmad. I'm not sure exactly what you're suggesting for the significant separate recommendation.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:	So talking about source domain name for variant gTLDs, I think, basically, what we're saying is that source actually could be different or one source per variant gTLD. So that's a significant additional information. It could be added to recommendation five,

EN

but it could just be a separate recommendation in itself, which is complementing recommendation five. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you. And what I'm going to do is I'm going to do some red line here. And I think what you're mentioning can be included in the rationale. Just to clarify, I don't believe a separate recommendation is needed. So I think it's what Satish was suggest suggesting, but yeah.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: In this case, then the source domain names, it should be plural in case we're allowing for multiple domain names in the previous line, or are we for, in a way, saying that there can only be a single source domain across all variant gTLDs? Because that may not be, I guess, true in case the IDN tables under the variant TLDs are different.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think the intent of this recommendation is really just to identify who's responsible for deciding the source domain name. So I guess it's more about responsibility.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. But in case we're talking about multiple variant gTLDs, then maybe use source domain names rather than a single name, singular in the previous line, just to sort of clarify that there could be more than one.

DONNA AUSTIN: We could have name/s. So it's not intended that it would always be plural. Yeah. Okay. Or multiples.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. Okay. I struggle a little, but maybe we'll have to go back to this to fine tune it. Okay.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sorry. Going back to my previous comment, which is not related to this, was we were discussing whether to add registered here or not. So that still needs to be addressed, I think. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. Changing this on the fly is not easy. So we'll have to go back and look at the notes. And we're going to go back to the glossary. It's almost lunchtime. I mean, I can push forward. Sorry. I think we still may need the third session of the day. But hopefully we can end earlier. And I just want to confirm with the group, the source domain name should still identify per gTLD or per variant gTLD. And that's not a changed fact, correct? And it's not source domain name identified across gTLD and its variant gTLD. It's not the case. So how we wrote in the glossary is still accurate. Okay. We can probably move on.

Staff paper, that was still kind of referred to quite a bit in the second, the phase two. And this is exactly the same entry we had in the phase one report. So I think we can just skip this. And same

with the SubPro. We talked about some SubPro recommendations. So it's just the explanation of what this is. And it's exactly the same text from phase one report.

And then finally, we have the variant domain name. So I will just read this quickly, because this is a key concept. A domain name that can be registered in different ways at the top end or second levels due to variations in the spelling of words in a given language. And then there's some examples here. So I think this is what I got from text. But Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: To me, that sounds strange, that one domain name can be registered in different ways. Wouldn't that then be several different domain names?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, good point, Michael. Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, the second part also perhaps doesn't really look right. Because variants are not really spellings and not related to languages. They're just labels, which are generated through variant code points in an IDN table.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Yeah, I think I'll try to explain this in layman's terms, but it's not accurate. So Sarmad, if you could suggest alternative wording, I will appreciate that. And I think the example still stands. So

maybe just the first sentence that needs some update. And I saw Satish.

SATISH BABU: Yeah, I completely understand the position that the glossary is meant for relatively newcomers who are not experts in this, which should be as simple as possible. But for the longer explanation, you can point to some link. But as it is, it should be simple enough for people to understand. You should not put off people from reading it.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Satish. I also understand Michael's point is a domain name, registered in different ways. It's kind of weird. It's not that. It's several domain names, they mean the same thing at the second level or something. But we can work on that with some help from expert. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here. I think an accurate definition here is quite important. And the key aspect is that it's generated out of either LGR or IDN table with the IDN policies. So I think there should have been a definition in the IDN implementation guidelines. So maybe might have to be adjusted, but might want to take a look at that. But the key issue is that it's not just any variation, right? Especially in this context, we are definitely talking about it is a generated out of some kind of table, whether it's LGR as defined or whatever is relevant. But it's not just some other string that someone feels that it's a variant. So yeah.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, got it. Sorry, I'm not able to keep up with the chat. But if you feel like commenting, please raise your hand and Okay, so I think we're at the last term, finally, variant domain set. So that's a key one. And it sounds like from the group that everybody believes the variant domain set consists of variants at the second level, as well as variants at the top level. And also at the top level, I just want to confirm, it has to be delegated variant gTLD, not just because RZLGR say, this gTLD may have allocatable or blocked. So you include those there as well. So it has to be something that can actually exist in the domain name. But no, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I would say the variant domain set, if you just write it without saying like, allocatable variants, then it includes all variants, even of top level domains that are not delegated. But then of course, the problem is what—Okay. Yeah, generally, I think it would include top level domains that don't exist. But the problem is that non-existent top-level domains don't have an IDN table for the second level domain. So no code point is valid in the second level for non-existing top-level domains. And therefore, the variant set in practical terms will not contain domains of non-delegated top level domains.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So I copied the definition of variant domain name from the IDN guidelines document in the chat as well as in the comment. So you could take a look at that. But separately, for variant domain

set, do we need to have a different term for variant domain set within TLD, gTLD, and then a variant domain set up across variant TLDs and different terms? Because we actually need to refer to both of them separately, especially when we're talking about source and so on. So having two different terms may actually be useful in the longer run. And that way, we can actually talk about things more precisely in the in the main text as well.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Sarmad. I think I got lost.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So let me try to repeat again. So there are two kinds of variant domain sets. And what I'm saying is that maybe we need to have different names for those two kinds. The simplest one is that with for gTLD, and it has some IDN tables with it. For a label, any label within that gTLD will have a variant domain set in which the variants are—It consists of variants which are calculated using the IDN tables of that gTLD. I think that's the more standard definition which we all understand.

The added complication, which is the second layer or second definition or second term, is more global variant domain set, which is not just related to that gTLD, but also the variants of that gTLD. So it will be, in essence, a union set of all the variant sets created under each of the variant gTLD. So it's sort of a super set of variant domain sets under each gTLD variant.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Okay, I think I understand. And Satish put variant superset. And I just have one question, is, does that mean, to create that superset, the IDN table has to be used for both the gTLD and its delegated variant gTLD? If they don't use the same IDN table, then the set is still under a given gTLD or a given variant gTLD, it cannot be used in the combined fashion. So I just wonder whether that's the condition to create that superset. And I have Nigel and then Sarmad.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, and I don't want to interfere in the language. But again, we don't use superset in the recommendations, do we? We do. I thought we just, yeah, sorry.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: There is actually a recommendation of same entity in SubPro which says that all variants at second level and under all the variant TLDs must be registered by the same entity. So there's a same entity principle, which refers to the superset.

STEVE CHAN: All right, my brain's tired too, but let me try and say that maybe it makes sense to differentiate between the top-level variant set and then the second level variant set and not necessarily invent a new term of superset. And so that collectively, all of those different sets equal, I don't want to use superset, but collectively all of these are, I don't know, that didn't help at all. I'm sorry.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Edmon speaking personally here. I agree with not inventing the terms and just spelling it out, which is to me, the variant domain set. If it's a domain, then it's the entire domain. So include a second level and the top level, and that would be the so-called superset. And if you want to specifically talk about under a specific variant TLD, then you can say the variant label set under a particular gTLD or under a particular gTLD variant and use it consistently that way. So maybe what needs to be done is the variant domain set, which includes the top level and second level and the variant label set, which then we can use for whether top level, whether we're talking about the top level or the second level or how we do it. I don't know if that makes sense for Sarmad.

SATISH BABU: Yeah. So, I mean, the reason for the bundling is that the same entity principle applies to the entire hierarchy. So it's useful to kind of connect that. But I have a question. Ariel, you just mentioned that the possibility of two top-level variants using different IDN tables for the second level. Is that possible at all? I was under the impression that it is not possible.

ARIEL LIANG: I definitely believe it's possible. I think based on some examples Sarmad provided, like Arabic, it can be Arabic language gTLD, but it has a variant with this Urdu language variant gTLD and then they use separate IDN tables. So a second level label can exist under one IDN table doesn't mean it can exist in the other IDN tables. So in that way, the variant domain set only under one given gTLD or one given variant gTLD, unless they share IDN

table between the gTLD and its variant gTLD. Then the variant domain set will consist of this combined variant domain set. That's my understanding. So my question for the group is, do we have to clarify that's the condition? The IDN table has to be shared. Otherwise, the variant label set, I guess, is only possible. But to have variant domain set, you have to have shared IDN table.

SATISH BABU: Potentially, there could be a breach of same entity if you use different IDN tables under the same variant global ... No? So are we harmonizing across scripts, across languages?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. So I believe, yes, you can have two different IDN tables. And the whole point here is that those two tables need to be harmonized. And so if you have two variants under one of the tables, then those two variants cannot be non-variants under the other table. But yes, you can have two IDN tables. And we go back to the harmonization and the importance actually of doing it right.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, just to say that we cannot force IDN tables across variant gTLDs to be the same. Because that's also a sub recommendation. Of course, they're harmonized, but they don't have to be the same.

DONNA AUSTIN: So it looks like there's support for having a variant domain set, and then a variant label set. So two different definitions for both of those. And does that overcome the problem that we're trying to address here?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: This is Hadia. Thank you. So yes, I do get the point. And I agree with it. However, we are still creating a new definition that we haven't used before. It's not that I'm saying that we shouldn't use it.

DONNA AUSTIN: But yeah, so I guess one of the reasons we're going through the glossary and trying to identify the terminology is so that when we go back and do a review of the report, we ensure that we are applying them consistently.

ARIEL LIANG: So the action for staff is to create this new entry of variant label set. And actually, we do have that in phase one report, but it's at the top level. So we can see how that could be reused or adapted for the second level. And then for variant domain set, we'll clarify it's combined at the both variant labels at the second level and variant labels at the top level. But the point I want to make sure we really understood is the top level shouldn't include blocked variants. And maybe allocatable is okay. But at the same time, if it's not delegated, it doesn't even have an IDN table. So my question is the top level, should that just be limited to a given gTLD and it's delegated variant gTLD rather than a gTLD and it's

EN

all of this variant gTLD according to RZLGR? Because if it came to exist, then the domain can exist. So I just want to make sure we get that right. And Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: I don't think that is correct. I think you will have to spell it out fully. If you just use a generic term that says variant domain set, my immediate understanding would be that it's the entire set. If there are parts where you need to specifically point to the applied for and activated or whatever, TLD, then you have to spell it out. I think creating a terminal, like terminology for that might be problematic. You probably in the text, you will have to spell it out. Yeah. Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. That's exactly what I was getting at. I'm just saying at the top level, we clarify, it includes a given gTLD and its delegated variant gTLD. Like that's the top level set we're talking about.

EDMON CHUNG: Right. But don't ever call it just a variant domain set and say that it's actually limited. Whenever you have to write it in a paragraph, then say the set that includes the applied for and the allocated or whatever, because once you introduce a generic term like this, even if you put it in a glossary, as you read it, I think people would interpret it as the more general understanding. I'm not sure whether that makes sense.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: I think we're agreeing the same thing, but [I think it's better] I just write this and then we can look at it again.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Good. Sarmad, last word.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: I'll make it quick. So just agreeing with the Edmon, that when we are talking about a genetic, then it actually spans the entire options. And then when we want to, for example, just talk about the delegated subset of it, then I think when you're using when we're using the term, we just qualify it that that is the portion or subset we are talking about of this larger term.

DONNA AUSTIN: All right. We're going to break for lunch and we'll come back at 2:00. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]