

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large consolidated policy working group call taking place on Wednesday, 2nd of November, 2022, at 1300 UTC. We will not be doing the roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom room and on the call bridge, will be recorded after the call.

And just to go over our apologies. We have received the apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Christopher Wilkinson, and from Justine Chew. From staff side, we currently have Heidi Ulrich, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present on today's call. And Chantelle Doerksen will be joining us very shortly.

And as usual, we have Spanish and French interpretations provided on today's call and our interpreters are David and Veronica on the Spanish channel. And we have Aurélie and Isabelle on the French channel. And before we get started, one final reminder will be for the real time transcription service. I'm going to share the link with you here in Zoom chat. Please do check the service for real time transcription service. And another reminder will be to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes, please. And with all of these reminders, I would like to now leave the floor back. Over to you Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yeşim. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I would like to remind you that you are on this week's Consolidated

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.

Policy Working Group call which will have quite an interesting agenda. As if agendas of this call were ever not interesting. Now we have first the work group and small team updates with particular emphasis on the expedited policy development process on internationalized domain names.

And then we will have the policy comment update, the policy pipeline that we have that we revisit every week and that addresses the commenting system that ICANN has where everyone is able to comment on processes, on ICANN processes. You'll see it's quite an extensive section this week. And then we'll have any other business after that.

So at this point in time, if anybody wishes to add anything to the agenda or make amendments, now is the time to ask. If you need to leave within the next hour and you are presenting something, now is the time to ask as well so that we can reshuffle the agenda and put you first. If you have time, that's fine. We can just leave the agenda as it is. And I'm not seeing any hands up. So it looks as though the agenda is adopted as currently is on our screen.

And so that takes us to our action items from last week and they are all completed. The only one that we had in last week's call was to deal with the timing of today's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. You'll also notice that previous action items are also completed, especially when it comes down to Hadia and Alan having developed notes for consideration of registration data consensus policy for gTLD, a public comment proceeding that is currently starting up. You'll also

notice one additional thing. Well, we'll see that in a second, but that's our action items for this and previous week. No hands up.

Let's move swiftly on to our work group and small team updates. And there I will note that we've got an additional friend that has joined us and that's the closed generics. I'm saying a friend because it's not something that we've been working on since yesterday. It's something that's been around for quite some time, a discussion, another one of these longstanding discussions in the ICANN community.

And the facility dialogue on closed generics is starting up soon. So the workspace is not public at this time but it will become public once the work of the group is completed. And our At-Large representatives on this group are Greg Shatan and Alan Greenberg. So no doubt they will be providing us with the correct information, but let's rewind first and start at the very beginning. And the first is the transfer policy review policy development process.

This week, the group was on I believe it was on a recess, so there was no further movement forward. And so we can swiftly move to the Expedited PDP on Internationalized Domain Names. And here we have 30 minutes allocated to this topic with a presentation with Satish Babu and Abdulkarim Oloyede, and of course Justine Chew and Hadia also being part of this process. I believe that Satish will take us through the slide deck and the floor is yours.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Olivier. I hope you can hear me well. I might have Internet issue, in which case, I'll request Hadia to step in. So here is the overview

that we are providing today. The first is the revised project plan for the whole EPDP. So there were some decisions taken on the phasing of the report, as well as the timeline got revised. So I'll share those. And then we have two chartered questions B4 and D1B Part 2. We'll have most slides on this.

So next slide, please. So for the project phasing, the EPDP started off last July. And at the last ICANN meeting, we had a review of the old project plan and we had a more realistic approach to estimating the end of the EPDP. But for reasons that we will share now, there were two options provided to the EPDP team. The first option was to complete the report in one single take, but with two parts. So we'll run two public comment.

The first public comment would be in April 2023 and the second January 2025, and the whole final report would then take until August of 2025. This is the first option. I mean, of course, the year looks somewhat unusually long, but this is a very complex EPDP and even to wrap our heads around some of these topics is time consuming. We'll see the next option.

Next slide, please. The second option is to have a two-phased approach. And there's a reason for it. So in the first phase, in this case, have all the charter questions relating to the variants at the top level. And the second phase would have all the charter questions about variant at the second level. So the advantage of this approach is that once we complete Phase 1, we have all the material that is required by SubPro. So SubPro won't be held up. If you wait for the whole phase to

I mean, the whole report to come out as one piece, then SubPro will have to wait until that happens. And that will happen in 2025.

And as we'll see later, there'll be some consequences for waiting too long about it. So this way, when we can finish the first phase and run the public comment in next year April and make final submission to the Council by November next year, then the road for SubPro implementation become easier because all the SubPro related material is there in the Phase 1 report. And the Phase 2 report can go on and can take some more time. So this is the second Phase.

Next slide, please. So after a lot of discussion, the group decided that option 2 was the way to go ahead, and the EPDP leadership team has updated the Council on the revised plan. In the Council, there was some discussion on the additional time maybe even some concern. But there was agreement that the two-phased approach will be more efficient.

But it was pointed out that even in the two-phased approach, even if we complete the Phase 1 report and publish it, there will still be some amount of time required because it has to first go through the GNSO Council approval and then the Board approval, both of which take some time. So in this case, the Phase 1 report will be out by November next year. And hopefully, there'll be in time for the SubPro to take up all the recommendations and work with it for the future.

So this is the first topic that we wanted to share. Are there any questions on the project? Because the other two charter questions and more technical, but this is more related to the project management and phasing. So is there any questions we can take them at this point? If

not, we can also of course take it towards the end. I don't see any hands. So let's proceed then if there are questions, we will take up after the next two charter questions and requests. Gopal, I see your hand. Can you please go ahead?

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

Thank you, Satish, for this nice choice of two options. The option 1 report has no bearing on the option 2 in terms of timeline. Is it already planned for what will happen on option 2? Option 1 up to sometime 2023. It has no bearing on option 2 in terms of the timeframe.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks for the question, Gopal. So fundamentally, the points discussed are completely independent. So there is no dependencies on the Phase 2 part in Phase 1. So Phase 1 is independent and stand alone. So we can pick it up with priority and finish it all. The second level can take some more time because there is no immediate pressure, because the point about finishing Phase 1 is because the next round is dependent in some way on this, whereas the second level is independent on this. So we have more leeway and more time for doing that. I hope that answers the question. Yes. Thanks for that. So we will move on.

Next slide, please. Right. So now we have two closely related charter questions. B4 it's about some of the aspects of how the mechanics or how the application can be made. Now so far we've been applying for a particular string, and that is it. There's only one string that we are discussing. But when you have variants, IDN variants, you are actually

applying for one string, which is called the primary string or the full string, and then one or more variant of the full string.

And these are the ones, these two parts, the full string and the variants are the ones by something called the same entity constraint, which means the whole set has to move together at every stage. And it can only be allocated to one applicant. And even in the future, it cannot be divided even if there's a transfer of the registry operator. Everything has to move lockstep.

So now that being the added complication for IDN variants, some of the questions, should all the following be permitted? A new applicant applies for a primary IDN gTLD only. This is currently what we had in the last round. So this is obviously accessible and permissible. The second is a new applicant applies for the primary IDN gTLD, and one or more of its allocatable variants label. This is for a new application.

And the next third point is about an existing registry operator. Now in particular, there are two languages where this is true as of now. This is Chinese and Arabic. So in both these languages, there are people who have activated, applicants who have activated IDN gTLD.

Some of those IDN gTLD also have variants. But the last round, they were asked to lift the variant, but there was no guarantee or rather it was pointed out that this will not be allocated. But this is just for us to know whether there are variants that that apply. So there are therefore cases where existing registry operators have possibilities of variants. And how should we handle that particular use case? So in general, the group felt that all these could be permitted? Then there's another

interesting question. The first thing and the variant or variants, are they interchangeable?

So suppose I applied for a particular full string, and I also at the same time, applied for a variant, and I'm allowed to activate it, can I activate the variant first and not the full string? So the group generally felt that once the applicant identifies the source and variant strings, they have to be activated in that specific order.

The point that is raised was that, in general, there is a reason to the logic or rationale why somebody is saying this is my first string, and these are my variants. So once that position has been taken, there's no question of reversing it. But there are some technical implications of deciding which is source and which is variant.

Now this has to do with the rule root zone label generation rule. There's a little bit of ultimately when you apply a root zone LGR depending on what is your original primary string and what is your variant. It is not a very big deal, but it can actually give rise to issues down the line. Therefore the order does matter. And therefore, you cannot change the order once you have applied for the particular thing. So this is B4.

Next slide, please. Now this is a chartered question D1B. This is about the process for existing registry operative who-- now the background to this is that in the case of at least Chinese, there is a lot of pressure from end user community saying that we've been waiting for the last 10 years for variants to be activated. And there are some real issues in Chinese referring to the standardized and the traditional script which makes the

end user community very anxious to get the variants activated. But it has taken us 10 years and we're still not closed this the whole issue. And the end user community is getting kind of, what's up about this? It's a real problem. It is not a hypothetical problem.

So there is a reason why existing registry operators who have already listed their variants in the 2012 round. Although there's nothing, no guarantee saying that they will be provided the opportunity to activate those variants. They were just listed for academic reasons, not for any practical reasons. And they've never used the whole processing also. But now we are confronted with the situation that people want variants to be activated for at least Chinese. So the question was is there a compelling reason to create a stand-alone process for the existing Chinese and Arabic TLD operators, the registry operators, sorry, to apply for variants detailed leads.

Now there was a discussion about a separate round, but that didn't get any traction from the group. So this is not about a separate round, but it's something like IDN ccTLD fast track process. This is not a separate round-based test, but it is a special case. And if you have to take a stand-alone process, then we can maybe start much earlier before the round itself start. Round starting is a heavy weight process. But is this a stand-alone process for, I think, Chinese and Arabic industry operators for activating their variants, then it will be quite useful, and it will be received well with the end user community.

However, during discussion, there was not much support for a stand-alone process. So the general point was that, okay, it is too difficult to fit this into a stand-alone process and then later the next round. It is

generally speaking much more effective and also it costs less if you wait for the actual round to start.

So the general feeling was that we should still wait for the next round, even though it has taken us 10 years and it may take us another two to three years maybe. It is still worth waiting for the next round to start. So the Chinese representative, they spoke up and said that they have been waiting for years and they can't ask their community to wait for indefinite period of time.

Then there was the discussion saying that there was some kind of consensus that if a standalone separate process is not possible, then the next round should prioritize in some way variants of existing TLD. So this only applies to the variance of existing gTLD is already delegated. This does not apply to new variants. That there should be a priority given so that the end user community can access this particular feature.

Then there was another concern that if our report is going to get delayed. Now 2025 is, of course, quite a bit and the EPDP then would have worked for nearly four years. If the report gets delayed to a point where the next round may kick off, and it will be without variants. That would be much work, meaning in the language community have to wait even longer. So an interim mechanism or the standard mechanism was again predicted as a solution to avoid this problem, but finally, there was no consensus about this.

So these are the two chartered questions, next slide please, that we wanted to update. So any questions welcome. And then Hadia will take us through two poll questions about the topic that we had discussed. I

see some questions in the chat. Let me see if I can. Okay. So I see one from Amrita saying what is the full string and the variant label. So In English, the problem is working in EPDP for IDN. In general, is that we are talking about languages that none of us can read. And very few of us can actually read. So many of these things have to be converted into form to begin to understand.

So a simple way would be, if you take English word color, it is spelled in two ways depending on whether using American spelling or British spelling, color and colour. Now for the end user communities, both are the same. There is no difference really within the tool. So suppose I want to use that as a TLD, then I can say, okay, color, this is my primary and colour is my secondary.

In some cases, in the actual Chinese, Japanese or Arabic cases, there is one primary and sometime several. And in the case of Arabic, that big number becomes even higher. Sometimes running into tens or hundreds of variants possibly. So the whole root zone approach is to minimize the numbers so that it doesn't lead to instability. But this is the concept of a full string and a variants string.

Now down the line, if I'm allowed to delegate to both these things, color and colour, then the constraint, the same entity constraint says that whoever gets one should get both. And in future, if one registry operator transfers it to another, both should go together. That's the same entity constraint. Then okay, Hadia has [00:21:28 -inaudible].

So, Sarah has a question, which is an important question. Are there financial implications when applying to a variant? What impact would

this have on applications? There is a financial impact because there is a fee. And now we have still not completely resolved this problem, whether they will be a single fee for the whole set of variants, irrespective of the number of variants or will there be a per variants fee. But it's very clear that there will be a fee. But it's also clear that this will not be like the fee for the primary label itself, which is like last time is, I think \$180,000.

So the variants are not going to be priced at that level. They will be priced at the cost sharing, which means what are the actual costs and then divided among all the applicants in turn. I mean, differently level. So it won't be the same as the full primary label fee, but whether it should be per level per variant fee, or commit people to hold a bunch of variants per source. This has not been yet discussed. So it will probably take some time. Shiva, I see your hand up, please go ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Satish, earlier you mentioned that when a registrant registers a source TLD and a variant TLD, and then he want to activate the variant TLD first, a variant domain name first, you said there was a debate that concluded that the source domain name must be activated first. And so I wonder why that should be such a confusion at all. If I have color.com and colour.com, and if I activate them both and use color.com as my primary domain space, wherein I have my website email, everything, and then use colour.com as a pointer to color.com where does the question of activating one of the two arises?

SATISH BABU:

Right. Thanks, Shiva, for the question. So first of all, what we are discussing is not about second level. The second level policy can actually be much more flexibly. We are talking about the gTLD sale. We're talking about dot color, dot color and dot colour. Now the question that you raised is fair, actually, because from an obvious point of view, there should not be any difference. But it turns out that in the world of root zone LGR, there is a difference.

Now the process what goes on behind the scenes is that whenever there is IDN, we're not talking about English words here now, we're talking about other scripts, non-Roman scripts, non-Latin scripts. When you push it through the root zone LGR, root zone LGR states this is allocatable string, this is a blocked string, etc.

Now it turns out that when you have two labels, and we had discussed in the last presentation about the string review process. And we talked about the hybrid model and all that. Now in that process, it turns out that if you choose one of these as a primary and the other as secondary and the reverse, the results of this whole process becomes different.

So there's a bit [00:24:50 –inaudible] in between that and it only applies to the root zone LGR when you bring in the whole concept of the root zone LGR. So it is not a simple thing to explain, but the fact is that there is a difference depending on which you assign as primary and which is secondly.

So down the line it will create problems, because the last time's presentation, we've talked about the complexities of [00:25:10 - inaudible]. And there we are also considering the blocked, all the

different dispositions, label dispositions, we are considering. So the short answer is that down the line in the case of some of the script, it creates problems because we are using the tools on LGR approach.

So the other part the other the discussion that came up here was that some of the people felt very strongly that why should it change. If you are assigning a particular string as the primary, then I mean, presumably there is a logic as to why you have done that. So then in that case, why should we then change? That question also, that's a point of view of some of these people. Even if you set aside this whole technical aspect of it. Yeah.

Yes, Steiner is asking a question about, will all the variants have to complete technical test? So we have done a very actually, Ariel has done a very extensive analysis of every step of the application process. And whether variant have a specific or either it is a very specific treatment only for variant in that step or is it the generic treatment that every label, those label get? So that is being now worked out, but the variance have to go through every step of the process.

In some cases, there is an additional complexity that happens because of variant. And variant are not excused from any part of the whole process because they're also first class GTLDs. And from the point of view of the technical community, they don't even differentiate between the two. They are saying there are two independent variant and the two gTLD. So the fact that they are tied together is more of a language community concern. Gopal. Shiva I see a hand. Is it an old or a new hand?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: It's just an observation. Two minutes. It's a new hand. It was a nice discussion, thanks for utmost clarity. Typical end user says you send me the URL instead of characters I just go ahead and use it. All the more reason why the owner sees on us to make sure that the URL happens as predicted. The nice stuff, but in particularly vernacular languages. It's a great idea. Looking forward to more simulating interactive. Thanks.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Gopal. Since I don't see any other hands up, I will request Hadia to run the two poll questions. Over to you Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Satish. This is Hadia for the record. If we could have the poll questions, please. So the first one says, how should an existing registry operator apply for an IDN variances for its existing gTLD. And here actually also refers to when. So first, we are saying through a one-off standalone process.

And the idea presented here was to have a standalone process sort of or like the IDN ccTLD track. However, the argument here was that based on the flowchart presented, if an existing gTLD operator wants to apply for a variant, it will need to go through almost all of this text that a regular applicant for a TLD would go through. So actually a standalone process does not make much sense. Also, a standalone process could have higher associated costs. The argument here again is that if a

registry operator wants actually to endure those costs, then it should be its choice.

Another thing to note here is that SubPro recommends prioritization of IDNs in processing order. So a possible way forward in order to get the best of both worlds is to also recommend prioritization of variants in processing order. The other option is through the next round, like an existing gTLD cannot apply for its variants except through the next round. Okay. The part here was, why can't the applicants of an existing gTLD apply before the next round for its variances? Especially that many of the existing gTLDs have been waiting so long to apply for their variance and waiting until the next round might seem a very long time.

However, the counterargument here is that if we look at the time frame and when will we actually conclude the EPDP on IDN variants, we are talking about the top-level domains, that won't happened before 2024. And by the time it's going to be implemented, we are talking about 2025 and Satish show us in the beginning of this call the proposed timeline. So even if we say today, okay, existing gTLDs can apply before the next round, it is not foreseen that they would be able to do that because we won't have a variant IDN policy in place soon enough in order to benefit from that.

The third option says, through the next round, but with priority process for IDN variants of existing gTLDs, and I discussed this while presenting option number one. So if you want to discuss the options before you actually go through the poll or you need more clarification, please raise your hand. If no clarification is required, then we can go ahead with the poll. So, Bill, yeah, go ahead.

BILL JOURIS:

Sorry to be slow. I keep moving the poll around so I can see the little things at the bottom. On option 1 versus option 2, yes, it might seem if we go with option 1 versus option 2, it wouldn't make that much difference, but it seems to me just knowing that the option is coming along would be enough to deal with most of the concerns about, see, it's going to be an incredibly long time.

Yes, it will be a long time, but just knowing that the solution is going to happen will mitigate most of the concern, I think, over, how much longer will we have to wait? Well, it is coming. It's not that we're going to have to wait forever, it's just we'll have to wait for a bit. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Bill. So If I understand you correctly, you're asking for actually one, two, and three altogether. So we could have one. And then it's actually time does not permit, and this never happens, then we could have -- oh, you're asking for one and three. So we could say, look, we should have a one off standalone process. If it happens, then let's go with it, if it does not, then we go with option number three.

I must also mention that one of the concerns also in relation to this one-off standalone process is that registries or concerned people who actually might object will need to follow-up and know what's happening in order not to miss any necessary objections on any of the applied for variance. But again, I think also what you present is doable as well.

BILL JOURIS: Other concern would be, is it going to have any kind of a process? The panel that does a manual review of TLD is also going to need to meet regularly for option 1 versus going through a whole bunch for option 3 to get all of them done at once.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Exactly. And the associated costs also will be much higher.

SATISH BABU: Hadia this is Satish. If I may make a brief the comment. The reason why this standalone process is being proposed is that in the case of an existing gTLD, this source or the primary label has already been processed in the last round. So the work involved is not the source plus other variant, which will be the case for a new one. But in the case of an existing gTLD, all the processing, the complete hundred percent processing of the source label has been completed already.

So some part of the work is already done in this case when an existing gTLD wants to activate its new variant. So it doesn't require a full round because that has been already processed in the last round. That is why this ask has come up. Why don't you do something? Only the incremental thing that requires to be done for the variant needs to be done. Thanks.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I don't see any other hands up. So let's proceed with the poll.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Hadia. I'm going to end the poll and share the results right now.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So 62% through the next round, but with priority process for IDN variants of existing gTLDs. And so far, actually, the group has reached consensus on. If we can get the next question, please, the next poll. So this one says, when applicants apply for variants along with a primary string, should they be required to activate all applied for variants within the prescribed time, allowed to activate the primary initially and the rest at a later date.

One issue here to consider and I'm not sure that we reach consensus on that or whether the applicant actually will pay the fee for the whole set or for each label that is going to be activated. And activated here is used as delegated as well, like put in the root zone. And I think this could actually impact our decision as well, whether it's a one off, whether you pay a single fee for the whole set or you pay as you go, as you activate your labels. Satish, do you want to add something here?

SATISH BABU: Actually, you've clarified it. So here the primary thing is that you're not looking at the cost per se, but the process of activation. Some of the registries wanted flexibility to activate whenever they had to on whatever market conditions we could have. Whereas others tell that even if you want to activate it in that passion, you might still have to pay for the entire thing in the upfront.

So if you go visit the first choice, it automatically means that you have to pay everything upfront because you are asking for all the variants. But in the second case, the idea is that we can pay one after the other for each variant separately. There was not much traction for that idea in the group. So here, we just want to get the temperature of the room here on what is proposed from our side. So thanks and back to you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. Steiner, you do want to take the floor?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes. Hi. This is Steiner up for the record. I'm just curious because when the applicant, if there is a process that you have for a completely new IDN TLD and the variance, is my understanding correct that you applied for a primary TLD and then all the variants that you want to, at some point, activate or enable for that audience. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: So Hadia, do you want me to?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. Yeah. Go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Yeah. So thanks, Steiner, for the question. So the current decision is that there will be only one application. We are talking about new

applications now. We are not talking about what we discussed in the last question about investing gTLDs variants that we activated. For any new application, you will not get another chance to go through this process. So in the first opportunity you have to give us tools and all your variants that you're require. And the whole application is one application. So earlier the proposal from staff was that each variant should get to pay the application.

But the EPDP team started down and said that the entire thing has been managed with one application, but you have to state what is your source label and then what are the variants that you're looking for. But all in one application. But the fee question has not been decided yet whether when you lift all the variance you have to pay upfront for all of them, even if you're not planning to activate them or there's a new option.

The group is favoring the fact that you're applying for one source label plus the five, let's say, five variants. So no matter when you're going to activate it, the fee for the five variants has to be paid up front. So that's the current situation. We don't know if that can change.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Satish. And we need to remember that once delegated, or activated, ICANN start charging fees. Before delegation that does not happen. So if there are no other comments, we can--

SATISH BABU: The is question from Bill, he is asking if we are going to do a poll on whether we prefer, the group prefers that the applicant should pay for all new variants upfront or-- actually, we're not running that poll right now. This is because the EPDP still has not started the discussion. Once the discussion starts off, then we can come back to CPWG and take inputs from here so that we can pass it on, we can reflect it there in the other group. So currently, we have not discussed this. Thanks, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Thank you, Satish. Shiva, do you have-- I don't see your hand up.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yeah. Okay. An applicant applies for a TLD an IDN TLD and because there are issues related to variants, he also applies for the variant TLDs, one variant, two variants, or five variants as Satish said. And why does ICANN expect the applicant to pay for five applications. It is one application, one TLD to be activated. And to make the confusion, possible confusion obvious, the applicant specifies that these are the variants of this TLD. Don't delegate this to anybody else.

So here, what is right in my opinion, I don't know, I've not considered all facts I've not considered all complications, ICANN should still create it as one application for one TLD. And why does it want five registry fees. And then if when activated it wants annual fees and taxes and all that for all activated source TLDs or variant TLDs, why is there such a process? It should be one fees. It should be singular. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Satish. So thanks Shiva. So first off, ICANN doesn't want anything. We are still working on this policy. So again, in the end, we could say it's of one set and you pay fees for the whole set. We need to remember though, even if we treat it as a whole set fees wise, delegation has, if you have one primary and five TLDs, that means you have six labels. You need to delegate all six labels. Technically speaking, they are six different labels. So from a technical point of view, you actually don't delegate it. As I said, is delegated as six different labels. Fees wise, this is a different issue, and we have not yet discussed or reached any conclusions in that regard. Satish, do you want to add?

SATISH BABU: Yes. You had mentioned the—

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Hadia, sorry, my hand has been up for some time. Can I please?

SATISH BABU: Sorry. Yeah, AK, please go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I wanted to raise something else, actually but I think Satish has addressed it. On the issue of fees which were addressed, I think, yes, for me, I believe also that it doesn't really make sense to pay for each of the variants because each of the variants everything comes as a package. And because they have variants, it cannot be allocated to somebody else, and that's why they are called variants. So it doesn't

make sense. Even if there are six, and it's not, even if there are seven or eight or ten is dependent on the character, it's not dependent on who wants what or, that you want the variant. It's something that has to be.

So for me, I think probably just to address that, and I think the group to also understand that, that everything should come as a package. Because you are not the one to determine the number of variants you are going to have. So it's not for the applicant to say I have ten variants. I have to pay for ten applications. If after I am ten variants does not make any difference, that's the way I see it. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Hadia, if I may. So there are two aspects. One is the first aspect, other is the technical aspect that Hadia had mentioned. The SSAC stated very strong view that variants may be one set of equal and labels for the end users. But technically, they are completely independent gTLDs. So all the costs of each independent gTLD applies when you have variants. So the more the variants the high the cost.

The second is in the processing of the application. Every step cost money. So even one variant, then there's a certain cost involved. But if you have one plus five, you have a very different cost. And therefore, the cost has to be met. And we have agreed in EPTP that we have to go by costing mechanism that is different on the actual expenses involved. So there is a cost implication and I think the Amazon also has raised this question.

So there is cost difference between delegating just gTLD versus gTLD plus say five variants. And that cost somebody has to meet, ICANN is

not going to meet it. That is the reason why the discussion is yet to happen really on the cost, but this are the considerations. Thanks, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Satish.

SATISH BABU: There is a hand up. Amrita's hand is raised.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. Amrita, go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Hadia and Satish. Amrita for the record. Just to go further in this question, I understand there is a cost for each variant to be uploaded. However, variants are not something which is created. It is happening in the languages by default. So for example, if I am taking, for example, one gTLD, which has two variants, would ICANN think of giving the other variant to someone else? Because that may create confusion.

And what I understand is people want to keep the variant so that they can protect their IP and have the same kind of, so that no one else misuse, tries to have it in a different way or confused people. So while there is a cost, I'm sure that if the first one while taking one that also

could be borne. Or is there a huge cost difference if you're having each variant to be uploaded?

Is there a cost structure, etc., which is shared, Satish, because I agree with Shiva [00:50:42 - inaudible] that if there, as you said, in Arabic, hundred variants, would it be justifiable for an organization, say, for example, even a nonprofit to try to get all those variants and have to pay for it.

SATISH BABU:

Hadia, if I may. So would Sarah's question and I'm just [00:51:04 - inaudible] and connect it. So step first point is that the variance cannot be broken into multiple, cannot be given to multiple applicants. The entire set has to travel together. And this is called the same entity constraint. What it means is that if one of these labels and the variants that goes to is formally allocated to a particular applicant, then the entire set has to be given to the same applicant.

They cannot be ever separated because as has been pointed out, will create a lot of confusion. So the same entity constraint actually ensures that these sets, the primary plus all the variance together as one single set, they travel every step like for delegation and, for example, transferred later. At all those points, the set has to move together. Back to Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. And Shiva, also has his hand up. So, variants are mainly generated through the label generation rules. So you have a tool in

which you put the primary as source and then the variants are generated. And you have the allocatable ones and then you have the blocked ones.

And as Satish just said, we have the one entity or set entity principle and that has already been discussed and agreed on. So no other entity can actually take it. We have to remember here that this call is talking about applied for variance and not any variance. So it's not talking about the variance that the entities is not applying for. Shiva, please go ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Satish, let's say that the new gTLD application fee for the next round is \$300,000 and Google applies in a hypothetical situation for dot Google. And that would be a pretty much open and shut case. ICANN does not even have to read through the application. So it can look at the title page of the application packet on Google from dot google dot Google by Google, and it'll delegate that. It costs zero for ICANN to delegate that application. Would ICANN return 300,000 to Google and say it did not cost us to evaluate your application. So we give you the fee back.

By the same logic, for TLD costs external applications, external consultation and that cost 10 million dollars, is ICANN going to go back to the applicant or the group of applicants and say, okay, in your case, we are going to charge you another nine million dollars as application fee. I think by this you're applying the second logic to this variance

situation. You're saying that, technically, it's going to cost us a lot of money to process and determine the variance.

So an applicant has to apply for each variant that was associated with that TLD. As Amrita pointed out, it's an inherent issue. It arises from the language, it arises from the script. So the fee, as a suggestion, needs to be uniform irrespective of what cost ICANN to process a certain group of applications and what cost to process another set of applications. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Shiva. So we're running a lot of time now. So this question is actually way beyond my pay grade to answer. But ICANN raise a counter example. You cannot generalize with one Google. There are thousands of other applications coming that cannot be approved like that. There is a cost, and the cost is finite. And I'm not sure what ICANN uses, what formula ICANN uses to arrive at the total cost, whether it's an average of all the different-- I mean, the point basically is that in some other meeting I can share the entire the flow diagram for every step.

Now even if Google is obvious, it has to go through every step. There is no excuse. I mean, there's no way to bypass any step. Because this is an open transfer in process. And therefore, we had to ensure that we create a process, we had to follow the process, no matter which companies are paying for it. So the costs are real. It is not artificial.

But we can, of course, pass on this point of view to the EPDP when we start taking this up for discussions. We can definitely pass on this point

of view that some of us feel definitely that there should be a single package pricing rather than by the number of variants and so on. Thank you. Hadia over to you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, Satish. And also one point here is that we need to differentiate between applied for variance and variance that are not applied for. And it does actually matter whether you are apply for the variant or you don't apply for because applied for variants could actually block future TLDs. Going through confusing similarity processes, it could actually lead to blocking other variants in the future. Shiva, is this an old hand or a new head?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Hadia, it is Olivier. I'm really sorry, but we are so much out of time here. It's supposed to be a half an hour section, and we're on 45 minutes or more, actually. So I'm really sorry. I'm going to have to cut this one short. And maybe we can continue the discussion next week, or continue it on the mailing list, but we have a lot of other things to address today. So apologies for this. And I know sometimes discussions get a little bit out of hand, and it but it's good. It's good to discuss things. And I'm going to have to move swiftly on for the other things. And so the next agenda item is the RDA scoping team.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Olivier, if I may.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please. Just a quick closure on this.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sorry. This is this this is Yeşim speaking. Would you like me to share the results of this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that would be helpful. Sorry about that. It's just I'm concerned about the time at the moment, so please have a look.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you so much. So we get a 57% required to activate all of Slide four variants within the first correct time. Thank you. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thanks very much. And apologies to everyone on that. It's interesting, but unfortunately, we can't. Well, we have other things to discuss today. So the next topic is the RDA registration data accuracy scoping team. I think there's a very short update perhaps from Alan Greenberg on this and, of course, also the SSAD ODA.

ALAN GREENBERG: No updates on either at this point. Nothing changed from last week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. In which case, we can go to our new friends, the close generics.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I don't think Greg is on the call. But in any case, there is an introductory meeting two versions of it based on two different time zones next Monday. Other than that nothing happening.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So it's just a starting point, basically.

ALAN GREENBERG: I presume so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. Let's then go on to agenda item number 4, policy comment updates with Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia Elminiawi.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Olivier. I just want to quickly note that there are no new open public comments at this time. However, two statements have been recently ratified by the ALAC and that is the ALAC statement on the Universal Acceptance Road Map for domain name registry and registrar systems, and the second one was the ALAC statement on the draft IANA and PTI FY24 operating plan and budget. There are a couple of comments of course that you mentioned last week that are coming such as the EPDP on specific curative rights IDOs that we'll want to start thinking about.

In terms of draft in progress, the OSB WG is working on two, which is updates, the GNSO operating procedures and then the initial report on the second CSC effectiveness review. So if you have interest in those, please make sure to stay tuned for that. Hadia, I'll turn it over to you for any updates that you might have on the public comments.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, Chantelle. So in relation to the upcoming proceedings. So we have one in relation to the ICANN developed additional script based reference label generation rule sets for the second level in consultation, of course, with the relevant script communities. And the aim of course is to improve consistency of the IDN table review process and this is still an upcoming comment. It's more of a technical one. And the second upcoming comment, which is a policy one, is in relation to the final report on specific curative rights protections for international governmental organization.

The report sets out the final recommendations policy issues arising in cases where following an initial decision in favor of an IDO in proceeding under the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, or the Uniform Rapid Suspension Procedure, the losing registrants seeks to review of the merits of the case in court and the court declines to proceed based on IDO immunities or privileges. Anyway, those are still upcoming comments and we have time to discuss and see how we are going to proceed with them.

So currently, ratified as Chantelle said, the Universal Acceptance Roadmap, no comment in relation to the proposed amendments to the

base gTLD RA and RAA. This is in relation to the RDAP protocol. And then we have also no comments in relation to the SLA for the AINA numbering services. And we can start discussing today the registration data consensus policy for gTLD. So this one has been extended to the 18th of November. So we still have 20 days until this public comment closes. So we started drafting some comments. If we can actually get the Wiki page.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Sorry, Hadia. Which one? Could you please repeat for the Wiki page?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

The Wiki page for the registration data consensus policy for gTLDs. Yes. So as the public comment seeks community input on two matters, first, the implementation of the recommendations of Phase 1 of the EPDP on gTLD registration data and second updates to the policies and procedures that were impacted by the new registration data policy.

So comments are going to be provided through a guided submission form. Part 1 walks commenters to 12 sections to identify if they accurately reflected the intent of the gTLD EPDP on registration data. So, Alan, yes, if we can scroll down because I did put some comments on the Wiki page that you can see if you actually scroll down. Yeah. Alan, if you want to, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, thank you very much. Yes, I would suggest at this point, we actually moved them into the comments below, not as a draft statement.

Because when someone reads it as a draft statement, they view it as a fait accompli. And I think at this point, we're just looking for input. In terms of the content, I think I agree with you on what you were saying there, but I need to go back and look at the documents and verify. I will be doing this later on this week and I'll do a full review.

I would suggest we put a deadline perhaps beginning of next week for anyone to make comments and that will give us time to discuss them in the upcoming CPWG and formulate a document that can go to the ALAC. So we still have a couple of weeks before it's due, but I don't think we want to wait much longer. So I would suggest something like next Monday or Tuesday as a deadline for adding any comments to the Wiki.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Alan, for that. And yes, I will move this to the comments part. I encourage all of you also to start adding your comments. Maybe we can put together some slides for next week's call. So back to how we actually submit the form, what the form looks like. So applicants or commenters are going to provide feedback through by choosing one of four options. First accurately reflects the policy recommendations with no issues, accurately reflects the policy recommendations with added clarification, does not accurately reflect the policy recommendations, and four the write additional concerns or issues.

As I said, we are talking about 12 sections. The 12 sections, the first is just an introduction. The second is about the scope. Third, definitions and interpretation. Four is about policy effective date. Five data

protection agreement. Six collection of registration data. Seven transfer of registration data from registrar to registry operator. Eight transfer of registration data to data as co-providers. Nine publication of domain name registration data. Ten disclosure requests. Eleven log files. And twelve retention of registration data.

So what we have provided comments are in relation to section number 10, which is about disclosure request. And it's about urgent disclosure request. So again, in the scope we have definitions and the definition of an urgent request according to Section 3.8, is that those are requests related to circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation. And if we look at the time frame actually provided in the implementation report, we see two business days. So if a request is done on a weekend, that means the response could be received after four days, which actually does not satisfy the purpose of the request.

Again, if we go back to recommendation number 18, which actually spoke about this part, it did say that the details will be finalized during the implementation stage, which means that we did not have those like two business days are set in stone anywhere in the recommendations.

Again, I think also in accordance again also with the original recommendation, which is the recommendation number 18, we also would like to emphasize the importance of having a disclosure system, that is like implementing section 10 does not mean that we stopped there and we stopped actually seeking a unified disclosure system. So I stop here. Gopal, do you want to speak to your note?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: I suppose it's out of time as well. So by the time I got this typing, I can take it next week or it's a simple point. It's not merely a domain name and the variant. It's a bunch of domain names and it's variant. That's the cost factor, which we need to look into is what I think. And they have a way of timing it. It's a nice question earlier on the timing.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hey, Gopal, could we have this, it's about the IDN. So could we have it next time?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: That's what I said. We'll pick it next time.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Thank you so much. Any comments in relation to this EPDP? The registration data, Alan, is this a new hand? Okay. Thank you so much. So seeing no more hand up back to you Olivier. And as Alan mentioned, I moved the draft into the comments. I invite you all to put on your comments on the Wiki page. And we'll try to put some slides together for next week. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And actually because you've been so efficient, we have gained some time. So if you want, because it's only quarter past the hour, we have another

15 minutes. So let's say 10 minutes until we have to close the call and finish with the any other business, the next meeting. If you want, you could continue the discussion on the IDNs for another 10 minute. If that could bring further discussion. I see there's demand on the call for that. It's fine by me, Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Yes. Thanks, Hadia. So I see Gopal's question or a note rather. I'm not sure whether there is any IDN angle to this. I can see the logic of what is being said. It makes bundle of related -- so I have a second level domain name and I can at one stroke get the whole bundle together to give building blocks for business for example.

But I also see John's comment below that. So there are various considerations that may prohibit such a bundling arrangement. So I don't have any comments further on this particular thing. But if there are any questions on anything that we have presented today, we'll be happy to discuss that, Hadia and I. AK is also there, Abdulkarim.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I think that Abdulkarim may have dropped, Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Right. So the only other comment that I have is on the inputs that we received right now on the pricing strategy for the variant. I mean, the general feeling that I got from other questions earlier is that we prefer not to have a per variant a variable pricing. But there are actually considerations that we have to understand. First is that if someone

applies for two variants and somebody else applies five variants, there is a cost difference. And so far, what we have as a consensus is that the cost, the fee will be actually based on the cost. And, of course, it is quite it's not very easy to sit down and add up all because a priority, meaning beforehand.

So we are not very sure as to how that's going to work, but that is a detail for implementation, not for the EPD sale. But the principle of it is going to be that the cost is going to be different depending on the number of variants that an applicant is actually applying for. And earlier, the Hadia made the distinction between the total number of allocatable variants with the number of applied for variant. So an applicant may not apply for all the available allocatable variants. So now on which should the pricing standard be dependent on? So these are things that we have to see how these discussions emerge. But we will certainly take back to the EPDP, the [01:15:06 - inaudible].

Now we're feeling that finally, this is a natural a set. It's not been created by somebody. It is a natural technical, it's a language artifact. Therefore, we should not try to fragment it by putting up a label cost on it. It is one unified whole. So that logic we will take it to EPDP. But EPDP, so far discussions have been based on the actual cost, which may be a factor when we decide on the final a policy on this. Thanks, and Hadia, if you want to add on anything back to you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Satish. Nothing to add from my side. Thank you. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Hadia. And thank you, Satish. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And wow, what a lot of work on this and indeed very, very interesting issues. And I hope that the discussion here will be helping you in the working group at the moment. It's a case where there's no silver bullet as in many topics at ICANN. And it certainly makes you think a lot. So anyway, I gather this is not the last time we have a discussion on these topics. And so for anyone, I would say there's a lot of material that was discussed today. I would say have a listen to this material again and perhaps come in the future call and continue following up on the mailing list on this and other topics.

With this, that pretty much concludes this week's call. We have to go into any other business. I am not seeing any hands up at the moment. So then that means we need to look at next week's call, and I'm well aware that next week is the EURALO Hybrid days in Brussels. Now I'm actually not going to be physically in Brussels, so that means I can chair or co-chair the call with Hadia provided it's an evening UTC time. But I'm also aware that a lot of our EURALO colleagues are unfortunately not going to be able to make it on this occasion. But obviously, we have recordings. What's the proposed time? Is it 1900?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM

Hi, Olivier. This is Yeşim speaking. Yes, the proposed date and time for next week is Wednesday 9th of November at 1900 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Yeşim. It's Olivier speaking, so I can make it. And I'm sorry for those who will be not able to join. But of course, you're going to have a great day at EURALO. And I'm looking forward to that and following this remotely as well. Of course, it's a general assembly and we've had the NARALO general assembly recently and other RALOs have been going through these. So it's all part of the At-Large course of events.

And that's pretty much it for today. So thanks to everyone for having participated. It's been again a very interesting call. Thanks to our interpreters and the real time text transcription. I, as per usual, got cut off in 59 minutes, 59 seconds for some reason. And so I managed to bridge the time that I was dropped using the real time text, and that's been really, really helpful. So thanks for this. When you close to your Zoom, there's going to be a questionnaire about the real time text. That's why I keep mentioning it because it's still a pilot project. So if it's helpful, please tell us about it.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It is not a pilot project anymore.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is no longer a pilot?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, it's in the budget, but English only. But they still have the survey.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Judith. That's really helpful. So they still have the survey. Okay. Great to hear it's not no longer pilot project. We get the transcriptions there and then. So that's cool. That's all. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night wherever you are, and thank you all. Thank you

YEŞİM SAĞLAM Thank you. Bye-bye. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]