ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 08 February 2024 at 12:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/d4D6EQ

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

DEVAN REED:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Thursday, February 8, 2024 at 12:00 UTC. We do have apologies from Alan Barrett, Zuan Zhang, Jennifer Chung, and Jerry Sen. All members and participants will be promoted to panelist. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDN's EPDP wiki space. Please remember to state your name for the recording and transcript. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you. And over to our chair, Donna Austin, please begin.

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

DONNA AUSTIN: Hi, thanks, Devan, and welcome, everybody, to today's call. I'm a little bit worried that we are very light on—I don't know that we formally have a quorum requirement, and I do note that we do have reasonable representation, I suppose, from our respective member groups, but I'd just like to hear from everybody about whether—I see Maxim's coming—whether they have any concerns about going ahead with today's call, given the light attendance. So, as Devan noted, we do have apologies from Alan Barrett, who's one of our board liaisons, Zuan, who I think is not a formal, he's not a representative of any group, Jennifer, who is with the Registry Stakeholder Group, and Jerry, actually, I might have Zuan and Jerry mixed up about their, okay, Zuan is registrar, and I think Jerry is a [representative.] So before we kick off, I just want to go ahead, see if folks are okay to go ahead, given the light attendance that we have. Okay. Dennis is okay. Michael's okay. Satish, okay with you? I'm seeing thumbs up, but I don't know who's giving the thumbs up, so it's a little bit hard. Satish, okay, Anil's joined. All right, and I do apologize to our colleagues that are celebrating Chinese New Year. I know this isn't a good time for them, so my apologies for that.

Okay. Alrighty, so, with that, I don't think I have any updates, do I, Ariel, from last time?

ARIEL LIANG: Nope, I think we're good to get going.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Alrighty. Anil, go ahead.

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, Donna. I just want to update regarding my SOI. I submitted the revised SOI to UASG around 40-45 days back, and Sarmad promised me that he will update to all other SOs and ACs, so I have not really updated this. So, I just want to update that I am no longer associated with the registry .in, and I have moved to an ISP as well as a domain registrar, and that is Common Service Centres in India. So, I just want to update this. So, I request you that on the mailing list in front of my name, .in is written, so that may be corrected. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks very much for that update, Anil. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thanks. Sorry, just to let you know that we've actually updated the information at UASG, but I would request, Anil, if you want to, I guess, share it more broadly, then please share the updated version and also with whom you'd like to share, and I can certainly forward. Thank you.

ANIL JAIN: All right. Thank you. No, Sarmad, thank you very much for this. There is no further update than what SOI, latest SOI, which I have shared with UASG. So, thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Anil. Alrighty. So, let's get going. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. Thanks, Anil, again. So, today's goal is to basically conduct the second reading of our draft recommendations and make sure the group is okay with the proposed updates, and we can start firming our language and getting ready for incorporation in the initial report. And I just want to note that we basically have closed off all the difficult, challenging issues. The only one remaining is the IDN table harmonization topic. We really have to close it off as soon as possible because that's the last thing we're waiting for. But everything else is pretty much in good shape. Of course, we have to go through the text and make sure everybody's okay with the update, and then we can start accepting the red lines and, you know, put that in the initial report that staff is preparing.

DONNA AUSTIN: My understanding of the harmonization issue is that we are waiting on feedback from the Registry Stakeholder Group. Is that correct?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. I also understand the small group in registries, they want to have a follow-up conversation with Sarmad's team. I don't know whether they have reached out yet or not, and if not, I'm happy to, you know, facilitate this. But, okay. Dennis, please go ahead.

DENNIS TAN:
Thank you. This is Dennis, registry. I just want to provide a little bit of context and update on that conversation. Yes. So, we have had a few conversations internally, the registry IDN small group, in terms of how to move forward. I believe we are going to meet again next Tuesday, and from there, we'll hopefully finalize our internal position, and then we'll follow up with Sarmad and the team.

DONNA AUSTIN:
Okay. Thanks, Dennis. Thanks, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:
Thanks, Dennis. Okay. So, let's get going. And I think the flow I'd like to do is to start with page 24, if you're also on this Google Doc. So, from this portion on, there are the new texts developed following our workshop, and based on the input received, I think it's limited, per se. I think I only saw Michael, Satish, and also a comment from Sarmad, and also, I just want to quickly mention that ICANN Org SMEs provided some responses to specific questions the group raised. It's not a formal input, but it's more like consultation with SMEs, so we're probably just going to review these, and hopefully, we can move the process quickly.

The first part, this is actually a draft response to a chart of questions with regard to the TMCH, and basically, the group decided not to develop recommendations, not to change the matching rules in the TMCH by, you know, also requiring TMCH to calculate variant sets [inaudible] the group agreed on, so we draft this response to the charter questions in that effect. And there's

one question that was raised for this portion. We did note that in the link to the registry agreement, there's TMCH-related requirement, and in that requirement, it talks about the registries, if they have established variant registration policies, they do have the option to extend protections to the variant labels of verified marks. And if you recall in the workshop, we looked at, I think, section 4.1.2, and 4.1.3, these three different clauses in that TMCH requirement. So those requirements, they provide flexibility for such registries to extend protections, and there was a question raised, I believe it was from Sarmad, asking the registries that have established variant registration policies, do they only include registries that allow activation of variant domains, or they also include the registries that block variants, so we consulted with the SMEs in ICANN Org. The understanding is this includes both, so not only the ones activate, but also the ones that block, because it's possible that there could be allocation without activation. So that's what we found out, and hopefully this satisfies the, I guess, questions or address the questions that Sarmad raised, and there's nothing else to do here, but we can also just include a footnote to say such registries include both cases. So yes, Maxim, both are yes. So anyway, this is what we found out, and I'll just pause for a moment, see whether there's any question from the group, and Maxim also said allocation [inaudible] reserving, yes, so it basically kind of addresses that it's not just registries that activate variants. I'm not seeing hands raised, no questions, so I think—

DONNA AUSTIN: So Ariel, I guess, sorry, I guess what we're suggesting here is that we don't need to do anything.

ARIEL LIANG: Correct.

DONNA AUSTIN: You could keep the text as it is.

ARIEL LIANG: Right, or at most, we can include a footnote just to kind of clarify what this means. It means the registries that not only activate, but also block or reserve variants or something, like we can include that if the group prefers.

DONNA AUSTIN: Any thoughts from the group? I'm happy just to keep this as it is and move on. Okay, as is is fine, says Satish. So I think we'll go with that. Thanks, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. Thanks, everybody. So moving on. Right, we don't have that many comments, which is good news for us. But okay, so now we've got one. So this is some charter question [D8,] which is the catch all question. And under this question, we did have a couple of recommendations pertaining to the RDAP domain name query. And so the recommendation text itself, we're not going to look at this for now. But we do have a comment from

Michael here. So this is the response to the charter question. What the group agreed on is that the RDAP response must include the domain name, all the other allocated variant domain names and the source domain name that calculates its variant domain set, if applicable. So Michael has the question, do we want to make any rules regarding querying a domain that is not registered or allocated, but has allocated variants? So basically, it's someone may think such a domain could have been registered or something, but it's actually not. But the domain belongs in a variant domain set and has other allocated variant domain. So do we want to have the RDAP query to also produce that result? And I just want to quickly mention that we will look at the ICANN Org response separately, but ICANN Org SME also raised the same question. So I think that's something for the group to consider whether you like to also request doing that. I will stop and Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: If we're speaking about non-standard RDAP behavior, there is a document called RDAP profile and it has to be reflected in that document too. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Maxim. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: To answer my own question, my suggestion would be, yes. There should also be a response if you query for a domain that doesn't exist, but has existing variants. But I'm not sure if we really want to

force registries to do that, or if we just recommend to do that, but not force them to. I think it makes life for users much easier because we already say that if you query a domain, you also get the results of existing variants. So why not also include those results if you are querying for a non-existing domain within that existing variant set? Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. I have one question and that goes to implementation. Obviously, we're making recommendations about the queries as they're made through RDAP. I don't really see this as more difficult to implement than what we've already recommended, but I'm just wondering if there would be some challenges with implementing. Go ahead, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, it might depend on the way the registry system works and how they implement variants. I can only talk about our own registry system, and there it's not a big problem. I think I even showed you in Kuala Lumpur for .cat, I think that when you query a non-existing domain, you already get the results for the existing variants. But just because we do it, I don't want to force it upon everybody else. So that's why I'm bringing this up here.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. Edmon speaking personally here. The way I read the current language, it already includes response to unregistered or allocated domains, because this is focused on the domain name and it could be registered or not registered. And it returns the domain name and all the other things that... And then also the source domain that calculated those variant sets. So the domain name that is being queried may not be the source domain itself. And I think it is important that when a domain that is actually allocated is included or somehow included in a set that some other domain is already registered, that some information be provided. So I think that is what we discussed previously and I don't... I mean, yes, it might be a little bit of a burden, but I think it's a sensible burden for registry systems to support this.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, I agree with Edmon that this might already include what I'm querying here because we just talked about domain name and not a registered domain name. But still, if we really want to include non-registered domain names, we should probably at least add some comment or explanation to make this really clear. Because up to now, when talking about RDAP, you always implicitly talk about existing objects that you query and you never query or you never get results if you query non-existing objects. So if we want to include that, we should at some location explain this a bit more explicitly. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. So we're kind of assuming that it's included, but it would be useful to be specific or explicit about what we mean. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Donna. This is Sarmad. So a couple of things. First of all, clarification that when we're saying allocated variant domain names, it means all the variants under all the variant TLDs, or just under the particular TLD. I'm assuming this means everything. The second comment actually is that, not really suggesting one way or the other, but the two ways of looking at it. One is a minimalist kind of approach and one is a maximalist kind of approach. This seems more of a maximalist kind of approach that you ask for one thing and you get everything related to it. The minimalist would be that you ask for something and you just get that information and perhaps the primary, which is sort of the anchor point for any variant. So those would be, for example, two extremes. I'm just sort of sharing my thought. I'm not really suggesting anything. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. So I guess in my thinking of this, I assumed that the query was related to a TLD and not a set, not a TLD that would be in a variant set. So it would be good if we could if we could be clear about what we're talking about here. Michael?

EN

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I think since we are talking about the variant set, this then includes also all variants under variant TLDs because a variant set is a whole set including all TLDs. And for that reason, those existing variants under variant TLDs should also be included. Whether we also include the source domain name under each variant TLD, I don't know. At least the source domain name under the TLD that has been queried should be included as a minimum. I don't think it would harm to also include the other source domain names, though it might make the answer a bit more complex. So I'm still unsure about that. But I'm sure about including all the variants that exist, even if they exist under variant TLD. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. And I guess to Maxim's point, RDAP is per TLD. And I guess that's why I was thinking it would be just related to the TLD. And just to add to that, I'm a little bit concerned that if that is the case, then what kind of complexity are we adding to RDAP? And are we going beyond the expectations of RDAP with what we're recommending here? So I just want to be, I don't know, a little bit cautious, I suppose. Dennis, go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. I think you said it for me. RDAP has a specific purpose, and because of that, also has specific and very strict SLA. I'm afraid that if we want to expose everything under the sun of a domain name, it would really affect and create operational headaches to registries to implement that. And I think registries also have to own, they run their own RDAP server. So how that relationship will work out, I don't know yet. But we'll take a very

EN

hard look at this and come back with our position. But I'm looking at this, and I'm concerned. I'll just leave it there. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Dennis. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, just a quick comment regarding Dennis's comment. Yes, registrars also have to have to run an RDAP server. And since our RDAP is not restricted to a certain TLD, you just query the registrar, at least for registrars, it makes sense to include the variants of variant TLDs, because it's anyway, you query a certain domain name, and want to know all existing variants and variants under a variant TLD is also an existing variant. And in that context, it might seem strange that if you query the registrar, you get the variants of variant TLDs. But if you query the registry, the authoritative data, you just retrieve a subset of the variants. That would seem strange to me. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. Just trying to think about the best way to handle this. So, I mean, I take on board what you're saying, Michael, and I don't disagree that it would be a good to have. But I am concerned about whether we're kind of going beyond what is the purpose of RDAP, and are we expanding on that? So that does concern me a little bit. So perhaps we'll leave this as it is for now. And Dennis, I'd be interested to hear back from the registries on this. One way that we could kind of deal with this is we need to say what our understanding of RDAP is. So for me, it was that if

you do a query, it's per TLD. I guess, if it's per TLD, then the other TLDs in the variant set somehow have to be captured in RDAP. But I'm concerned that that's not really fit for purpose for RDAP, so that provides a complexity. So we could have kind of a minimal recommendation with something that says optimally what we think would be worth doing over time or developing or considering over time is something that would encapsulate the variant domain set. But perhaps that could be something that could be done once there's kind of, I don't know, a body of understanding about the nature of how the variants are working and all the rest of it. So we'll give some thought to how we can do that. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: I agree that this might cause some effort at the registries, but either we remove point two at all, so do not include other allocated variants and just return the source domain name. But if we say that variants should be included, then I think the whole set should be included and not just a partial set. Because to—it's one set, and to end users, for example, it makes no difference whether a variant is because it's a variant of the second level or whether it's a variant because of a top level variant. A variant is a variant. And so if we want to include all allocated variant domain names, we should include them all and not just a subset of that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. And I don't disagree with that. I think if we're going down this path, the reason that we're doing that is because we want anyone that queries the RDAP to have the full picture related to whatever it is they're querying and for whatever reason

EN

they're querying. So I don't disagree with you on that. It's just how we come up with a recommendation that can be implemented and isn't going to ... Well, I guess this is going out for public comment. So we'll see whether we ruffle feathers or not. Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna. Thanks everybody for the discussion. And I know we're not changing the recommendation dramatically, but I just want to confirm one thing is if you look at the text 12.1, the domain name, does the group have a preliminary agreement that such a domain name includes an existing one and also non-existing one? If that's the agreement, we should update the language at least here to make it explicit. But then for the other parts, we can keep it as is for now or we can discuss with leadership and see whether we should put something like at a minimum, the returned response should include this and that. And I just want to clarify what the agreement is.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, Ariel, can you restate your question?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. So the question is mainly about the first point that Michael raised. The response should also have that response for a non-existing domain name, but it does have allocated variant domain names. Because the way we word this recommendation is rather vague about it. Even Edmon believe it does cover that point, but it wasn't explicit. So I just want to make sure that the group does

agree that the domain name should include both existing and non-existing. So I just want to understand that point.

DONNA AUSTIN: Must be late. Any thoughts from folks here? I mean, obviously with recommendations, if we're uncertain about the meaning, then we should do the work to make the recommendation crystal clear to us so that it's reasonably clear to anybody who reads it without the benefit of the conversations we've had. So Satish is for making the assumptions explicit. So maybe Ariel, I think what you're asking is whether we need to expand on what we mean by the domain name. And it seems like we probably do. Does that answer your question or am I answering the wrong question?

ARIEL LIANG: No, no, that's my question. I'm just looking at Maxim's comment. It should not make SLA worse. So I'm not sure whether the whole group agree with that. So that's why I'm asking the question.

DONNA AUSTIN: So I take Maxim's point about SLAs, but we don't know what the SLA is going to be on this. And to be honest, I know some development of SLAs was recently done for RDAP as a separate process to another process. So to be honest, I'm really not sure from a PDP process how the SLAs are actually developed, whether that will be part of the implementation of this or whether it will be done as a separate effort. So I really don't know. So, yeah, so I don't know, Maxim. So Dennis has flagged that the registries will have a look at this and come back to it. And then I guess as a

EN

secondary issue, if we go forward with the initial report with this recommendation as it is, we'll see what public comment we get. And maybe we need a little bit more input from those that are—I know there's an RDAP profile working group or something or other that could be helpful here. But all right, so let's not belabor this too much. Let's keep moving here. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: I keep my hand up because I want to bring up the ICANN Org comment on this because we're at this recommendation. I just thought it's better to talk about it while we're at it. So this is the PDF that I shared on list before the call. And we did consult with IANA SMEs from ICANN Org's side. And I just want to quickly read the comments here. It's basically three points. The first point is first paragraph would presume this feedback or the query is primarily targeted to RDAP servers operated by TLD registries. IANA is not involved in the lookup.icann.org tool. So if you look at the recommendation text, we have a second paragraph about the same return response needs to be consistently reflected in the lookup tool on ICANN.org. So IANA SMEs said they're not responsible for that, but does manage the RDAP bootstrap registry described ion RFC 9224. There are also plans to implement an RDAP server for IANA level allocations, which would include TLDs. There are potential implementation questions relating to how this requirement would manifest at the level in terms of variants at the root zone level and ensuring that at the second level, the RDAP servers are cognizant to respond to all allocated variants at the top level. So basically, they said there's some plans to implement RDAP server for IANA level, including

EN

variant TLDs, but there will be implementation questions about that. But they didn't say whether they have concern about the recommendation. They just want to raise it. But I think the part about the lookup.icann.org tool in the recommendation text is probably not accurate, but I don't know technically how to capture this. So I just want to bring up the IANA SMEs' comments on this. I will stop here quickly. There are two other points, but we can address that separately. So any thoughts after seeing the IANA comment? And Nigel said we [inaudible] feedback and public comment from those involved in the work.

DONNA AUSTIN: Any thoughts here, folks? Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think the issue is we are developing new requirements for RDAP and potentially EPP and representation of TLDs to show them that some particular TLDs are linked in two sets, which are variants. And asking about the implementation now, I think we will have answers like most probably yes, but we need to look at the final representation of the design. Because before that, it's hard from the technical perspective to say what is feasible, what is not, and what is contradictory to ideas of the current system. So yeah, things like that. So I'm afraid we will have to invent things and step by step talk to registries, registrars, IANA, language communities. And I'm not sure that it's possible for us to develop technical standards, which are in the hands of IETF, etc. So I'm not sure how we should proceed with that, but we most probably will have

quite different opinions in the process from different parts of community. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Maxim. So I guess from a leadership perspective, when we had a look at this, we didn't really think there was anything we needed to do. We would probably benefit from making the recommendation clearer related to its intent. The fact that allocated variant is not definition specified in the RDAP variant specification, I don't know that that's really our problem. But we could have something in the rationale that could address that. So I don't think from a leadership perspective, we thought that there was anything too drastic that we needed to do here on the recommendation. All right, Ariel, I think we will move on.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, I just want to finish the IANA feedback, two other points, but we actually mentioned earlier, and Donna, you actually mentioned the second point, it just said the word allocated is not a defined term in the RDAP variant specification. They provided a link to that. So we could try to address it in the rationale. And basically, that definition includes assigned and registered or something. So allocated will encompass both, but not a problem for the group to solve, but we could try to address it in a rationale. That's the second point they raised. And the third point is actually the exact point that Michael raised at the beginning, is whether the query or response to a query should also include the one for an unallocated variant domain. So they're also asking the same question. And I guess the answer is, yes, we will make this explicit

in the recommendation text. They just want to raise the point that consider specifying this. But also, this depends on registry implementation, malicious actors could potentially register domain with many variants and rapidly activate and deactivate variant and frustrating investigation efforts. They just want to raise that there could be like a double sided sword situation, I guess. But they had the same question as Michael. So that's the idea of feedback on this recommendation. Now pause and see whether there's any further comments and questions on this.

DONNA AUSTIN: And so Ariel, I have a question for the team. So if somebody was to query a domain through RDAP, and it turns out it was an unallocated variant, but you didn't get that response through RDAP, could the person still register that name if they tried to? Maxim and Michael.

MAXIM ALZOBA: My understanding is that there is a need that this person has to be the same person for whom the set is reserved. And it could be done on the registrar level, because registry, they don't like talk to registrants. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Michael.

EN

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, basically what Maxim said. Due to the same entity principle, if there is already an existing domain in the variant set, then somebody querying a not existing one could only register it if they are the same entity to whom the existing one belongs.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. So I guess that kind of brings me back to a little bit about what's the problem we're trying to solve here? And are we complicating things a little bit too much by adding things onto RDAP that really don't create value? So I guess that's the balance we need to strike. So, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I think that's a good question. And I think it does add value if you are able to query a non-existing domain name, because just like [inaudible] could have recently deactivated a previously active variant and suddenly you are not able to query it anymore, even though the whole set still exists and it's still doing some malicious things, for example. So for users, it's certainly a good thing if they don't have to or only if they have the possibility to query any variant from the set and get the information of all existing objects. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Michael. Maxim?

EN

MAXIM ALZOBA: Users can make any queries, including those containing mistakes or errors. It's up to the registry or register how to answer. And in the current situation, for example, some TLDs, they answer that some particular string cannot be registered. For example, if it's in ICANN prescribed lists like the word example. Some do not because they don't have to. And so it depends on the registry or a registrar. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Maxim. Okay, Ariel, I'm having more questions than answers here, but I think we can keep moving.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay I just want to note Edmon has a comment. How does the [inaudible] concern differ between rapid activation and deactivation of main servers or child hosts? I don't know the answer to this. Others may. But I just wonder whether this is for the draft recommendation text or it's just a curiosity. I don't know. But I just want to make sure this is on the record. And if anybody knows, please feel free to respond. Maxim.

DONNA AUSTIN: I don't know what the difference is between a rapid activation and deactivation.

MAXIM ALZOBA: IANA has some processes when you change your records as a TLD. And all they care is DNS servers. And I believe what is

named there is WHOIS server is just a text output. So for IANA, they have procedures for everything, basically. So we could ask them by ICANN staff. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. Thanks, Maxim.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. Okay, let's draw a line under this and we can move on. And I think, Donna, if you're okay with that, I would just bring up the ICANN Org comment when we go through the recommendation. It seems logical to me. Instead of jumping back and forth, we just do it as we go. It's really limited, which is good news for us. So the next one is recommendation 13. Oh, actually, sorry. I think I skipped a comment from Satish here. So this is a response to the charter question. The source domain name that calculates its variant domain set is applicable. That's still concerning the RDAP response. And Satish suggests to change the wording to the source domain name used to calculate the variant sets that the queried domain name is a part of, if applicable. So I think he's trying to make this clearer, language clearer. And Satish just wrote that he will leave this to the leadership team for consideration. So thank you for that, Satish. And he had a similar comment in the draft recommendation text to consider making 12.3 clearer, too. So we'll take this offline.

DONNA AUSTIN: Can we just go back to Satish's comment? So I guess sure, leadership can have a look at this, but it would be really good to

understand whether any of the rest of the team supports Satish's idea or don't think it's necessary. So Michael's good with that, with adjusting the language to Satish's comment. Okay, so we'll go ahead and yeah, do that, I think, accept Satish's comment or suggestion.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. Thank you all. And I just note Alan has joined us. Thanks, Alan, for joining us. So I think we can move on from recommendation 12, finally. And we have recommendation 13 here. It's about the recommended update to the root zone database on ICANN.org. So basically, the variant relationship between TLDs has to be reflected. And then also, WHOIS, which one is the primary gTLD needs to be indicated. That's our recommendation. So just quickly scroll down. There's no comment from the team. But we did ask the IANA SMEs to provide some preliminary feedback on this. And they did bring some feedback. I just want to quickly summarize what they said here. So the point one, they know there's sometimes source, sometimes primary, they just wonder whether there's a distinction here. So yeah, indeed, there is a distinction for second level and primaries for top level. And we have defined this in the glossary. So they can just read the glossary for details.

The second point, generally speaking, they didn't have concerns about the recommendation, which is great. But they note that how the variant relationships are expected to be managed on a day-to-day basis, likely contain a lot of implementation choices. So they just said there will be implementation choices, but no concerns. So that's good news.

And then the third point, they do have a bit of a concern about a comment in the rationale portion of this recommendation. We know something like the root zone database does not seem to contain the most up-to-date information. And I believe that was something the group discussed during the workshop. The HTML version seems to contain some outdated info or not accurate info, but the TXT one has the most up-to-date ones. And I think this is something Sarmad brought up, and that's why we captured this in the rationale. So it's actually the last sentence here. But I think this is not something super critical per se, because it doesn't change the recommendation itself. And then the IANA SME objects to that characterization about the current version is not up-to-date. So I just wonder from the group point of view, whether we should just take this sentence out, because it doesn't change the recommendation. And so that's the comments from the IANA SMEs.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. And for the record, I would be in favor of just taking this out. As Ariel said, it's not going to change the recommendation or the meaning of the rationale. So I'd be in favor of just deleting this. I don't think it's our intent with any of this to get into a discussion with any part of ICANN about whether parts of the organization are keeping stuff up-to-date. So any objection to just deleting this from the team? Michael says it's okay. Yeah, as Michael says, it was an observation. [Nitin's] okay. Satish is okay. Okay, we're going to take this out, Ariel.

EN

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you all for the feedback. We will do that. Okay, so we can move on to the next. And so this is recommendation 14 about the IDN implementation guidelines, the mechanism for updating future ones. We have some comments here. And I think part of it has been addressed. So the first one is from Satish. Wasn't there a suggestion to just leave this as ICANN board? So there's some sections of this recommendation talk about ICANN board will be responsible for developing the charter, like part of the ICANN board, basically. So there is a general comment, I think, from Alan last call to just leave it generally as ICANN board. But I think there's also a suggestion to say, ICANN board IDN UA working group or its relevant successor working group. So to kind of specify it's like part of ICANN board, but we understand that IDN UA working group may not be a permanent structure could be replaced by something else down the road. So there are basically two thoughts here. So I just want to pause for a moment, see whether the group has any preference, whether just generally or—and I see Alan has a comment, "I'm happy with the proposed new text about or its relevant successor." So yes, so I think Alan is okay with that approach as well.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Ariel. So Satish, to your point about was this a suggestion [inaudible] this is the ICANN Board, I guess my concern was that the ICANN board is the ICANN board. So we wanted to make sure that this was the those with the, I don't know, nominated expertise within the board that were responsible for this, not the board as a whole. You know, hopefully without—Alan's on board with the change that we've made. And so this will be relatively okay with

EN

the rest of the board. But I guess my concern was that the full board has responsibility for that. And I don't think that was our intent. Okay. So I think we're good on that. So thank you. Ariel, I noticed in the agenda, we had an update from ccPDP4. Is that about this recommendation in particular?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I do plan to just mention it now, since we're at it. So I was grateful that ccPDP4 actually allowed me to provide introduction to this recommendation during their last call on Tuesday. I did provide the background to the group and why we're seeking their input on this. So what's the next step is they will talk about this recommendation text again, in their next call, I think it's next Tuesday. And then they will provide a recommendation to the ccNSO council, whether they see any concerns or whether they don't see any concerns and supportive of the text. And I think the council is meeting next Thursday, I believe. And they said they will aim to provide us a response by end of next week on this recommendation. So that's the plan. But during the call, they didn't say they support it or have concern right away, they just need an introduction. And I did send the whole text and the rationale language to the group. So they will get back to us next Friday, the latest.

DONNA AUSTIN: That's great. Thanks, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: No problem. So we could move on. But I do want to note there's one more comment here is actually from Michael. But I think Michael posed a hard one to us. I don't know. So he is wondering, because we're basically recommending just continuing the existing mechanism, not making drastic changes, but he is wondering, there are also PDPs within the CC world, like the ccPDP4, is a PDP always strictly either in GNSO or in ccNSO? Would a joint PDP make sense here? But to clarify, it's not suggesting to change our recommendation, but just thinking out loud, he's also totally fine with keeping the current mechanism, with the reasoning that has worked for two decades. But he is asking a joint PDP, whether that's something actually a feasible vehicle.

DONNA AUSTIN: Steve could probably talk to this given that's his job. Dennis, go ahead.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. So I'm just reacting on these highlighted sentences here about whether it would be inappropriate to have future [inaudible] GNSO PDP. Just thinking through, the guidelines are obligations, contract obligations for gTLDs, whereas for ccTLD managers is not. And I would not think it would be inappropriate to drive the guidelines or whatever you want to call it afterwards, contract obligations on gTLDs and PDP being the vehicle of it that will end up to in consensus policy contract obligations. And ccTLD managers always can look at contract obligations of gTLDs or best practices of gTLDs and adopt them voluntarily, which is the case for the current guidance, right? They

are not obligated to adopt them, but only voluntarily. So I'm just saying, I don't think it's totally inappropriate to think about these through the lenses of GNSO PDP, because gTLD registries and registrars aren't going to be the most impacted in the outcomes of these guidelines, whether it's PDP or not PDP, but because the work that is going to come out from this process is going to be required for gTLDs registries and registrars and not for the ccTLD part of the ecosystem.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Dennis. So, Michael, are you okay?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, I'm fine.

DONNA AUSTIN: It's a bit of a tricky situation because it does impact CCs and gTLDs. And I think in terms of a joint PDP, I think what we're doing here is probably the closest that we've had to that in that the board has asked that we have consistency within any charter questions that are similar in our recommendations, so that they've asked for consistency with those recommendations. And I think that's probably the closest we would get to a joint ... But they are different processes with different rules and procedures and consequences as well. Maxim?

EN

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it's a bit incorrect there because ccTLDs are not impacted at all. Whatever policy we invent here in GNSO, they just can apply it if they wish so, or just not, because they don't like it. So they're not the impacted party. They're the party who is interested in the process, in the outcome, but definitely not the impacted party. So we should correct that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Next.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Thanks, everybody, for the comments and discussions here. Moving on, I think this is the last comment from this new portion of recommendation text. So implementation guidance 15. It's implementation guidance, so not a recommendation, but the group did suggest registries taking into account this particular SAC 060 and consider setting a maximum number of allocatable variant domain names that can be allocated, as well as developing a mechanism to limit automatic activation of variant domain names to a minimum. So this is to align with a deferred guideline from the IDN implementation guideline version 4.0. So I think Sarmad has a comment. Should automatic activation be allowed generally or be only considered for where generally the community agrees with the need for this? Okay. So Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes. To give my opinion to Sarmad's question, I wouldn't restrict this to only where the community agrees to this. I think the registry operator should have the freedom to decide whether they think

automatic activation makes sense or not, and they may have different reasons for doing this. And I don't think we should really make a decision for them here. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Michael. And Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yes, thank you. The reason I raised this was because automatic activation creates a challenge for the registrant, meaning that if I'm registering for one domain name and I, I guess, get three domain names instead, that can have impact on what I can manage or what I cannot manage. So the SAC 060, obviously, there is the challenge that it can create management challenges, both at registrar and registrant levels. So there's obviously some case to be made for certain script communities. That's why we had considered this, well, the IDN Guidelines Working Group had considered this recommendation as part of IDN Guidelines 4.0. But in the guidelines, they explicitly noted that this was currently only for the Chinese community. So it was not a broader recommendation, just because it creates a certain amount of burden for the registrant. And since that is documented, I just wanted to raise it here to make sure that, I guess, whether this is the best way to go forward. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Michael?

EN

MICHAEL BAULAND: I agree with Sarmad that it makes some burden for the registrant, and it's essentially also a burden for the registrar, because they also have to somehow get the information from the registry, which other variants suddenly also are in their portfolio without them activating them. So from a [inaudible] point of view, I would even say automatic activation should be not allowed at all, because it makes life far too complicated. But yeah, I see the reasoning that some activation makes sense. So maybe I take back my comment from earlier, because it was more from a registry perspective, and I'm a registrar representative. So I should say, as a registrar representative, I agree with Sarmad that we should restrict this.

DONNA AUSTIN: What do we mean by restrict here? Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So when we actually had this discussion as part of the IDN Guidelines Working Group, there was basically, this is not really a request from any of the communities, except the request had come in from some, I guess, some community from Chinese community, because I think what they want is that if somebody registers a simplified Chinese, the traditional Chinese should also be activated and vice versa, or something to that effect. And that's just the way the writing system works. It doesn't really work like that for other writing systems, for example, in Arabic or other scripts. So making it a general rule across all the script communities may not be relevant. This has only been raised as a concern by a particular community. So that's why in the IDN Guidelines Working Group, when this was noted, because it's sort

of going against the conservative mechanism, which SSAC has raised about management overhead for registries, registrars and registrants in addition to registries. And so in IDN Guidelines, it was explicitly noted that this is based on community agreement and for now, only applicable to Chinese. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: So Sarmad, you would be comfortable if we had limit automatic activation for Chinese only at this time?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. So I think the way it was captured was that each script community should capture this and if there is a need from the script community, it could be extended. But currently, the request has only come from the Chinese script community. So there's no reason—If it was generally okay, there was not an issue in making it broader. But because there's an explicit SSAC, I guess, advice on keeping this as limited as possible, I guess, the suggestion is that we consider this on need basis rather than give a general approval. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: So I just want to note that this implementation guidance is strapped to align exactly as the guideline 12 from version 4.0. And it did mention that registry operators should consider SSAC 060 and should develop a mechanism to limit automatic activation. So in my view, the language is consistent with what the guideline 12 says. It just didn't specify as what Sarmad is saying, automatic activation can only be limited to Chinese script, because that was

not something captured in the guideline version 4.0. So we don't mention this. But in my view, this is consistent. So I'm not sure what the concern is. That's my general question.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. Sarmad, did you want to respond? And then I'll go to Nigel.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sure. So I'm actually going back to the guideline document because some of these extra details we actually had in the additional notes to these guidelines, and not in the guideline language, because the guideline was more general. And then the specific kind of, I guess, tweaking to those guidelines were done in the additional notes. And maybe, I guess that's captured the detail which, so there's an additional note five, which says, so there's some additional notes, which lists some of the scripts. So maybe something to look for as well. You may not find all these details in the guideline. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, yes. Good afternoon. And yeah, it's good to speak to everyone. On this, it didn't seem to me too problematic, because it's prefaced by the note that people should take note of this, the registry operators should take note. So presumably, in taking note,

people assess whether it's relevant to them, whether they're dealing with particular names that have been mentioned are relevant here. So I don't think we need to be overly prescriptive, especially if we give the reference to the particular recommendation. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Nigel. It's a good point. It is implementation guidance that we're talking about. And the language is registries should consider. So if we want to do something about 15.2, by saying developing a mechanism to limit automatic activation of variant domain names to a minimum on a, I don't know, a script basis, or as needed basis, I guess my concern with 15.2 is that it seems to suggest that it's automatic activation for all variant domain names, and it doesn't say anything about particular languages. So the leadership team will think about this and see where we can get to and come back to the group. Okay, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks. Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, just a quick question. I recently had a conversation in the chat. And I'm wondering if that's still something we should talk about. I wasn't able to follow this, but if it's still something that should be discussed, maybe we should move it to the voice part. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, so I think the discussion that you're talking about, Michael, is whether CCs are bound in the same way that gTLDs are bound by policy development processes. And I think, and I wasn't paying a great deal of attention to the chat, but I think that it's people are using different terms. CCs, my understanding is, are not bound to follow policy development output, or recommendations that come via the ccNSO, it is discretionary. Whereas gTLDs is very different in that you sign contracts that say you will abide by consensus policies. So I think that's the point that people are trying to make. But if I've missed something, then by all means, we can talk about it. But I think that's the crux of the issue. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I'd like to add to that, that consensus policies are created by GNSO. So writing somewhere that it should not be created only in GNSO [inaudible] makes whatever produced is not a consensus policy. And registries will not have to follow it. So I wouldn't recommend to install these bits of text, saying that due to ccTLDs' interest in the process, GNSO is not a good place for development of policy. Thanks. Because it will create something which is not going to be followed, because of legal reasons. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Okay, so I think we're good to keep moving, Ariel. So we'll have a look at implementation guidance 15 and see if we can thread the needle on it.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, sounds good. Yeah, I just want to respond to Sarmad's comment about the Chinese TLDs. They do automatic activation. It's an acceptable practice. That was captured in the rationale. So we can discuss with leadership whether any recommendation text needs to be adapted to reflect that or it's okay just to put in the rationale. So we'll take that into consideration. And then also regarding the ccTLD discussion in the chat, we can look at the rationale portion of this recommendation and see whether we need to fine tune any way we word ccTLDs impact and accurately reflect the reality. So we will take that into account as well.

I just want to quickly go back, because there is an ICANN Org comment about UDRP-related recommendation. So I just want to make sure everybody has seen it. So that's recommendation 8 and implementation guidance 9. So if you recall the discussion, recommendation 8 is about the transfer remedy of UDRP. Basically requiring the transfer of a domain name requires the transfer of all of its allocated variant domain names together. So that's the main recommendation. And then implementation guidance 9 talks about the GNSO council should request any subsequent GNSO PDP that's tasked to review UDRP to include a review of this recommendation 8 and consider adjusting the UDRP policy and rules by taking into account variant domain names. So that's implementation guidance 9.

So we did consult with ICANN SMEs on these two. What they note is they don't have a concern, which is again great news for recommendation 8. They think this is something achievable. But they do have a bit of concern about implementation guidance 9, because as it's currently worded, it sounds like ICANN Org is not

in position to implement recommendation 8 until and unless such a time when a subsequent GNSO PDP has considered recommendation 8 and has concluded its work and the board has approved its recommendation, if any, pertaining to this UDRP-related output from IDN EPDP. And until such time ICANN Org is in position to implement it.

So they do have a bit of concern about this. And then what they said is this could potentially delay policy implementation. And then the same kind of work can be done via an IRT that's set up to implement IDN EPDP Phase 2 recommendations. And the IRT can involve the relevant folks from the community that's expert in UDRP to consider how to implement this recommendation, what adjustment needs to be made to the UDRP rules and policy to make this transfer remedy doable. So they just said implementation guidance 9 could potentially delay the implementation of recommendation 8. So I think the question for the group to consider is, do you believe implementation guidance 9 is absolutely necessary? If not, maybe we should just take it out. And basically, ICANN Org has this recommendation to work on in implementation and they can involve the relevant experts in considering adjustment to UDRP policies and rules. So that's the question for the group, I guess.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. We did discuss this with the leadership team, I think last week, maybe we had the conversation. I don't think there's any harm in removing the implementation guidance 9. Because I do agree with what the ICANN Org has highlighted. I don't think we want our recommendations to be delayed and waiting for the

next UDRP policy rules. So variant domains might actually come around before that happens. So I think it might be safe to delete implementation guidance 9. We're not going to lose anything by it. And the IRT will sort out the what happens next bit. And I see that Satish is okay with removing it. It is a should clause and therefore already weak. Michael, go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, thanks. I also have no real problem with removing it. I just don't understand why this could be causing delays. I mean, we're just saying that any future process should just remember to also take into account variants. So it's just a suggestion, a reminder kind of thing to say, like, hey, if you do, when you do your work, think about the fact that variants exist. But maybe I'm not so much into this policy and more technical guy and don't understand the intricacies about this, the consequences. Sorry.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think the problem is that the recommendation plus the implementation guidance provides some ambiguity. Because on the one hand, we're saying that with UDRP and variants, the transfer process must include the domain name and also allocated variant domains. And then we're saying that any PDP that's tasked to review the UDRP should include a review of our recommendation 8. So there's some ambiguity there. And the ICANN Org concern is, well, are we saying with the implementation guidance that our recommendation 8 shouldn't be implemented until a review of the UDRP is done? And I don't think that's our intent. I think our intent is that the UDRP be adjusted

EN

now. And Ariel and Steve can probably talk to this better than me. But when a new policy process has recommendations that impacts on an existing policy, I'm not sure what the process is to update the existing policy, but I think there is one. And this would be one of those situations. So there'd be an update to the UDRP. And that would be worked out through the IRT. So that's my understanding, could be wrong. So Steve or Ariel can correct me if I'm wrong. But I think the concern from ICANN Org, and it's a valid one, is the ambiguity that we create by having that recommendation, and then the implementation guidance is saying, well, but hold off until you do the review of the UDRP before you implement recommendation 8. And I don't think that's our intent. Okay. So any objection to removing implementation guidance 9? Satish is on board. Michael's on board. Nitin's on board. Registry colleagues, any objection? Or Nigel? Okay. I think we can remove it, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Sounds good. And yeah, thanks, everybody, for the discuss. Just in the interest of time, I'd like to kind of move a little swiftly, because I want to make sure everybody has at least seen the red lines for the first portion of this draft recommendation text. I think in our email, we did note, we made some update, and they're all in red line format. I'm not going to look at the first recommendation as the IDN table harmonization topic we'll have to go back to hopefully soon. And I just want to quickly go through the subsequent ones. So you will note that in some part of the text, we put red lines here. It's to reflect how the group considered the deferred guidelines from IDN implementation guideline version

4.0, whether there's a preliminary assessment, whether it's consistent or inconsistent, something to that effect. So that's why we put the red line here. And then some other red line we put here is to do this kind of wording change from activation to allocation. And I believe that's our agreement in the workshop is allocation. This is a much better term to capture what we intend in terms of variant domain names. It doesn't necessarily need to be activated. So that's why you see the changes here. But in some cases, we did leave activation. And because for example, there is, I believe it's appendix or annex one of the registry agreement that talks about activating variant domain names. So that word is specifically used in that portion of the, sorry, it's called the standard amendment language. So in that document, the word activation was used. So that's why we're keeping activation in some cases. So that's why I put a highlight here with the comment. I just want to make sure folks have seen it. So yeah, here you see all the red lines is about like the wording change from activation to allocation. That would believe it's appropriate.

And then another part, this wording change, this is about the ROID discussion, which is kind of ages ago. But the good thing is the group didn't recommend anything but have a response to the charter question. So there was a comment from Alan. I don't know whether everybody has seen it. He was not comfortable with the phrase may not, but he suggested an alternative phrasing. So for example, different ROIDs may be assigned to the same registrant across gTLDs managed by the registry. So he just doesn't like the way it was said before, may not. So we did a different phrasing here. But Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: I just wanted to agree with that because may not could sound as must not. And must not is definitely not the case. So to avoid confusion, it's better to rephrase it. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Right. Thank you. Thank you for supporting this. And you probably will note that here as to put may not, ROID may not be required for inclusion in the minimum data set. Let me know if you think the may not here is also not great phrasing that we can change it to something else. But at least for the portion that was highlighted by Alan, we made that suggested change. So with no comments for now, I will move on. And in recommendation five, the red line you see here is relating to the source domain name discussion that we had several times. Oh, Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN BARRETT: Yeah, thanks. Sorry, it took me a while to read the text and come to a conclusion. I think that the use of may not about ROID may not be required for inclusion in the minimum data set, I think it also is confusing in the same way as the previous case. And I'd suggest rephrasing as ROID may be excluded from the minimum data set.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan.

EN

ALAN BARRETT: Yes, I think you've captured my comment. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. Appreciate it. And I saw agreement with Alan's suggestion from Michael. Okay, if no more other comments, I think we can move on from this one. And regarding the recommendation five, the red line is relating to the source domain name definition that we talked a lot about. So here we made it clear the variant domain set has to also include the delegated gTLD variant labels at the top level, if any. So that's what we tried to make explicit. And also the source domain name must be registered. That's the point we try to make it explicit.

So here in the rationale portion, there's quite a bit of red line here. It's because we had a lot of discussion about the whole explanation of variant domain sets, source domain name, variant domain name. So we tried to capture all these explanations in this rationale. Just letting folks know it's the position of these explanations TBD depends on which one is going to be the first recommendation in the initial report. And we believe those concepts are so important, we should mention them at the beginning. So if, for example, we put recommendation five as the first one, then this placement makes sense, but for now, we can [inaudible]. But I just want to highlight the portion that was the blue highlight, that's what we updated based on last call. So if you recall, last call, we talked a lot about the variant domain sets. And if you have a source domain name under a TLD, how do you calculate the whole variant domain set across the TLD and its variant TLD if delegated. So the understanding is, yes, you can calculate the composition of the whole set. But for disposition

value, you will know the disposition value of variant domain names under a given TLD. But then for the ones under the variant TLD, you wouldn't really know their disposition value unless another source domain name from the same set is also identified under that variant TLD. So we had this whole discussion, if you recall, last meeting, and the blue stuff is to reflect that discussion. And we did ask Michael to have a preview of this because he had a lot of thought about this. And he posed some initial questions at the beginning, too. So he did provide some further comment. And I think the back and forth, the result is he seems to be okay with how things are captured. Although he still has a bit of concern that in terms of the top level variant TLD, we only take into account the ones that are delegated. But he believes the ones that are not delegated or allocated probably should also be considered in the variant domain sets. And those will be out of repertoire variant domains from, I guess, the lens of academic and theoretical perspective, I guess.

But the concern, at least from my point of view, is we're going to confuse the registrants and also contracted parties when we try to implement this recommendation. Like how they're going to understand you also have to consider unallocated top level variant TLDs in the whole calculation of variant domain set. I think a lot of people are going to get confused. So that's why we only limit to the ones that are delegated at the top level in this explanation. So I will stop my monologue and see whether there's any comments or questions from the group. But if you haven't got a chance to read through this red line, especially the ones highlighted in blue, I will welcome you to take a look at this after the call and make sure

we captured things accurately. I'm not seeing comments for now. So I will move on.

And then there's some additional comments here. It's still in the rationale portion of this source domain name recommendation. We did talk about the grandfathered variant domain names. This source domain name requirement doesn't apply to them until and unless the grandfathering situation is rectified. So the last sentence is revised to make this explicit, is that the source domain name identification requirement must come into effect once the grandfathering situation is rectified. So earlier we said may come into effect at the discretion of the registry policy. So this is to change this into a mandatory requirement rather than optional. So I just want to make sure folks are okay with this adjustment. Thanks, Michael. And if no other comments, I will move on.

If you recall, in the workshop, we did talk about having another kind of a—Thanks everybody for the comments. So for the domain name life cycle, there was a suggestion to have a better graphic to reflect those different stages. So we had one at the beginning, but we added one. This is an official graphic from ICANN Org that talks about the typical life cycle with some additional details. We don't want to reinvent the wheel, because this has already been done. It's an old graphic. So we want to make sure everybody has seen this. And if you have concerns about this, let us know.

So definitely other comments, those suggested red lines still related to allocated, allocatable, that kind of stuff, the wording change. And then this part of the red line, so this is related to the domain name life cycle discussion. If you recall, the recommendation is to ensure that the same entity principle is here

EN

too in all stages, but the group didn't make any specific rules beyond this. So we just have a rationale sentence to capture that is to prevent the situation that people think we're having some kind of overreach by further prescribing rules. So there is a comment from Steve about this, and he said, it's better with just say some members believe that making further rules beyond this principle could create undue operational complexity and perception of overreach. And so you just want to make sure—This is a bit of a judgment call, and now we just need a qualifier. And this is still factual, because it's indeed some members believe that if not all, but you know, I don't think it's materially significant, but it's make our statement more accurate.

And for some other portion of this rationale language is also to make things a little clearer, so not like material change, we did leave activation for some part of it. It's because we believe activation is still accurate in those instances, rather than using the word allocation. So want to make sure everybody have seen it and agree with the key activation in those places. And then we have this bullet point about deactivation. That's what we discussed in the workshop. I think it's Edmon's suggestion, because previously we'll put deletion or something. We'll put deactivation, that's a much better or more accurate way of capturing this stage. Nigel thinks "some members" not good. So I think it's related to the previous comment. So Nigel, do you have a better suggestion?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, sorry, I don't at the moment. I can look at it. It's just in these sort of texts, just saying some members is not the right sort of language, because it invites the reaction. Well, and so some other

members thought what? Or usually in such texts, we put, there was a view or the one alternative or—but you don't usually just say some members, but I can have a look. Yeah.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Nigel. I actually like what you said, there's a view. We could tweak this language a bit to use that phrasing. But I think it's in terms of meaning, it's kind of conveying the same meaning. And just we try to make it sound better, I think, but I like what you're kind of alluding to. Yeah, there's a view. Yeah. we'll note that.

And I'm moving swiftly, all these changes are related to wording change to allocateed. And I think here, this response is also to make things clearer. It's not a material change. So, welcome you to check this offline. And we crossed out the word registered, because for variant domain, it's not always the case. And also, removing this word doesn't change the meaning, either. And then we replace registered with allocated. That's the agreement from the group. And for E5, the response we have included, we have kept activated here, because this is about the fee discussion we had. And I believe in this context, activated is the right word instead of allocated. So, I just highlighted these words here to make sure everybody's okay with not changing that to allocated. So, that's kind of first portion of this draft text. And hopefully, everybody had a chance to review that and were okay with these red lines. And but if not, please make sure to bring back comments to the group as soon as possible, so we can address that.

And we only have six minutes left. And then we do want to make sure everybody has seen the glossary. It was part of the draft text for review. I don't think we will have time to go through everything. But Donna, do you want to still try to make progress on this one? Or we leave this for the next call?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks. I think it's probably a good place to stop. The glossary can get very complicated and difficult to read. So, I'd really appreciate it if folks could pay some attention to that between now and our next call. And if you do have any concerns, please update the document accordingly. The text that Ariel has just been through, one of the things I'm a little bit concerned about, and this is nobody's fault, it's just the way things happen, is I feel like we're slipping in our timeline. I know that we said that we get this done by the end of the year, but I was hopeful that we get it done—And when I say done, the final report to council, I'd like to wrap this up sooner rather than later. So, I would ask that the text that Ariel has just been through, if that review could be done this week. So, between now and the next call. And if there's any concerns, we can please note them in the document. And a note to the list would be helpful so that people know what to look at as well. But I'd really like to wrap the text up by next week, if that's, well, not next week, I'm not sure when our next call is, but have the text pretty much wrapped up by next call, if we can. And then we'll get into the glossary on our next call as well.

So, I'm going to start to, I guess, accelerate things if I can, so that we can pick up a bit of time that I think we've lost. We do have a meeting on the agenda for Puerto Rico. It's only a 60-minute

meeting. I won't be in Puerto Rico. So, I'm questioning the value of 60 minutes to bring everybody together. I'm not sure what we can accomplish. So around Puerto Rico, we're probably going to lose three weeks as well. So, just to request the team we've got a little bit more of a heavy lift to do. And then if we can get this initial report out sometime soon after Puerto Rico, then we can all have another breather for the comment period. And then we'll come back and do that final push to get the report finalized and out to council. So, that would be my request. I really do need input. I know that we've been doing this for an extremely long time. It is getting tiresome and we are losing people. So, if we could just have a bit of a push as we get to the end of what's been a pretty long and hard road. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Donna. You said everything I want to say. But I just want to kind of highlight in the glossary section, you may wish to just focus on the yellow ones because these are the difficult terms. And thanks to Michael that provided comment. And the ones that are not highlighted, they're mostly non-controversial and has already incorporated comments that was suggested in the workshop. And you may also notice there's some blue highlight. These are the new ones that were added after the workshop. But they're mostly non-controversial because most of the wording were repurposed or reproduced from ICANN work definition. So, yellow ones are the ones for your focus.

And then lastly, we did send another document out just right before this call. It's about how we captured the deferred guidelines, how the group considered this and whether they're

consistent with our recommendation or not. So, we drafted a separate section for this per recommendation from Edmon and others. So, if you haven't got a chance to read it, please take a look. And hopefully, you're all okay with the content there. So, I think we can pick up on this next call and make sure we close these off.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Ariel. So, we are at time. So, when's our next call? Next week? Is that the plan? Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. I think before Puerto Rico, we can still squeeze in two meetings. So, 15th of February and 22nd of February, 1200 UTC as our usual time. So, if we can get everything down by 22nd, we don't need to have a meeting. Hopefully, that's the case in Puerto Rico. But maybe you want a meeting in Puerto Rico. So, we'll see. But yeah.

DONNA AUSTIN: Even if the group wants to get together and there's a room available, that might be a good use of time. Alrighty. Thanks, everybody. And thanks, Ariel. That was a lot to get through today. As I said, a little bit more to go and then we'll get some of that time back that we've lost between KL and now. Alrighty. Thanks, everybody. Have a good rest of your day.

ARIEL LIANG: And happy year of the dragon for those who celebrate.

DONNA AUSTIN: Happy year of the dragon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]