

Thanks Steve.

It seems clear at this point we should recommend for the matters to proceed in a separate PDP and not added to existing PDPs.

One of the important decisions the group needs to make though, is whether to recommend to the GNSO Council:

- A) A regular PDP, for which an Issues Report needs to be developed
- B) An EPDP, for which the only difference from a PDP is a further Issues Report is not required

Given the volume of background information already produced for the topic, as well as the rough draft which staff has drawn up, which includes the issues (1) as well as the listing of the background documents (2):

1. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/13tO5IP64EAnFebdefRahK3vuhIBzUEd1oeGFBnQVc0/edit?usp=sharing> [docs.google.com]
2. [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1vhbllpua9\\_3s\\_0G-LMNQ3hdWo8SkIxObUSpfJPk-LAQ/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1vhbllpua9_3s_0G-LMNQ3hdWo8SkIxObUSpfJPk-LAQ/edit?usp=sharing) [docs.google.com]

It appears that an EPDP is the appropriate approach because there is ample background information on the subject and there does not seem to be any clear gaps requiring an Issues report.

I understand that Maxim has raised concerns about EPDP, but that seems to stem from the emotional aftermath of how the EPDP in response to GDPR was created more than the actual requirement (i.e. of the Issues Report). If there are any other concerns or objections to proceeding with EPDP please raise them.

If we do move forward to recommend an EPDP approach, the chartering team can determine the structure and membership of the EPDP working group and complete the IDN Variant Issues Scoping (1. Above) which would form essentially an issues report for the working group consideration.

Please take a look and we hope to come to conclusion on the matter so we can make the recommendation to the council before its meeting in January.

Edmon

**From:** gnso-council-IDN-scoping [<mailto:gnso-council-idn-scoping-bounces@icann.org>] **On Behalf Of** Steve Chan via gnso-council-IDN-scoping  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 7, 2019 4:02 AM  
**To:** [gnso-council-idn-scoping@icann.org](mailto:gnso-council-idn-scoping@icann.org)  
**Subject:** [GNSO-Council-IDN-Scoping] Actions & Notes: GNSO IDN Scoping Team Meeting on 5 December at 3:00 UTC

Dear Team,

With apologies for the late delivery, please find below the action items and notes captured during the IDN Scoping Team call on Thursday, 5 December at 3:00 UTC.

Staff has posted to the wiki space the action items and notes. ***Please note that these are high-level notes and are not meant as a substitute for the recording and chat room records***, which are posted on the wiki at: <https://community.icann.org/x/z5czBw>

Best,  
Steve

==

#### **Action Item**

- Staff to add SAC060 and SAC052 to the list of documents
- Edmon to determine if he feels like he can make an assessment as to which Option the scoping team supports to recommend to the GNSO Council. If he is able, he will provide his assessment to the email list for input.

#### **NOTES**

1. Welcome and roll call

- Edmon may need to leave meeting early
- Update on coordination with the SubPro PDP – SubPro leadership does not believe that the IDN work must take place in SubPro. If an IDN variants PDP is launched, it can further the related work done in SubPro and build upon it.
- Edmon has review the SubPro draft recs and they indeed seem like they can be built upon rather than needing to be overturned.

- SubPro may want to consider the technical utilization paper for the RZ-LGR, currently under Board consideration, but they should be aware that it's a fluid situation of they indeed review the document now.
- GNSO policies can be replaced by policy development taking place at a later date, so a new PDP on IDN variants could in theory develop recommendations that go against the SubPro recommendations on IDN variants.

## 2. Review of new Issue Scoping Document

here: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/13tO5IP64EAnFebdefRahK3vuhIBzUEdl1oeGFBnQVc0/edit?usp=sharing> [docs.google.com]

- Purpose of this document is to explore whether or not there is sufficient background documentation and analysis to serve as a proxy for an Issue Report, which could make an EPDP make some sense
- There is also the existing work on IDN variants taking place in SubPro
- Document is structured similarly to the substantive part of an Issue Report and make sure that all of the required elements are present.
- First part is about identifying the problems that need to be solved, which in this case come from the Board resolution (e.g., RZ-LGR must be the only source and that policies should be developed to manage IDN variant TLDs for current and future gTLDs).
- Also notes that coordination with ccNSO is needed and GNSO concerns about the process by which the IDN Guidelines are updated from version to version.
- Second section identifies the list of relevant documentation. There is also, by reference, a comprehensive list of documents related to IDN variants.

### **ACTION – Add SAC060 and SAC052 to the list of documents**

- The list is not intended to limit what a PDP may consider, in the event something relevant arises later.
- Third part of the document is about the issues and questions a PDP should consider and address. Firstly, broken down into the two challenges. Lists out the recommendations from the staff report.
- Also lists out questions from the staff report where there may be policy implications. This list is captured verbatim from the staff paper.
- The Council did not specifically request a charter from the IDN Scoping team
- There was not a specific time frame dictated by the Council, but there is an expectation that the scoping team will provide its recommendations prior to the end of the year. Concerns expressed from Maxim about the time constraint.

## 3. After discussing agenda item 2, revisiting the options

paper: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1o\\_9bfnkKufrSxiJGxpNcOcfTK2VLWp5XYQvwe5qxJlc/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1o_9bfnkKufrSxiJGxpNcOcfTK2VLWp5XYQvwe5qxJlc/edit?usp=sharing)

- In light of the previous discussion about what could be in an issue report, based on existing materials and analysis, what option makes the most sense?
- Option A is to leverage existing PDPs (i.e., SubPro and RPMs), Option B is to separate new gTLDs versus existing gTLDs, Option C is a PDP or EPDP, Option D is an expert working group.
- Maxim indicates that there is not support from the entire group to for an EPDP, suggestion that he should indicate why he oppose, what he prefers, and why. Also indicates that GNSO should not feel obligated to follow pace of ccNSO.

**ACTION – Edmon to determine if he feels like he can make an assessment as to which Option the scoping team supports to recommend to the GNSO Council. If he is able, he will provide his assessment to the email list for input.**

- Maxim notes that some believe that the set of documents is not holistic and that further analysis is needed.

4. Possible next steps

- None, discussed above

5. AOB

- None

**Steven Chan**

Policy Director, GNSO Support

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)  
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300  
Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536

Email: [steve.chan@icann.org](mailto:steve.chan@icann.org)

Skype: steve.chan55

Mobile: +1.310.339.4410

Find out more about the GNSO by visiting: <https://learn.icann.org/>

Follow @GNSO on Twitter: [https://twitter.com/ICANN\\_GNSO](https://twitter.com/ICANN_GNSO)

Transcripts and recordings of GNSO Working Group and Council events are located on the [GNSO Master Calendar](#)