
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 1st of February 2023 at 21:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call today. However, all attendees on Zoom and the audio bridge will be noted. I would, however, like to note the apologies that we have for today are Annett Bonuke, Priyatosh Jana, Satish Babu, Sarah Kiden, Anne-Marie Joly-Bachollet, Gopal Tadepalli, Mouloud Khelif, and Raymond Mamattah. From staff, we have Chantelle Doerksen and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. Our Spanish interpreters are Claudia and Paola, and our French interpreters are Jacques and Camila.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking so that our interpreters can identify you on the other language channels, and to state your name every time you take the floor. Thank you all very much. And with this, I turn the call over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Claudia. Welcome to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call that's going to be very, very full. Why? Because we have a number of presentations today. First, we'll have our workgroup and small team updates with one presentation from the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Internationalized Domain Names, the IDN. It's a long-awaited presentation. So we've got that happening today. Then the second one that we have under the small

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.

team updates is the one on closed generics, where Greg Shatan will take us through some of the recent developments since there was a face-to-face meeting that took place last week. We'll also have an update on the Applicant Support GNSO Guidance Process. It's a shorter update but it's also significant. So altogether, we will spend about 75 minutes on the workgroup and small team updates.

Afterwards, we'll whiz through the policy comment update pipeline that has two items under consideration at the moment, and then a little bit of Jonathan's Zuck at ICANN76 planning, just to provide us with an update on this. And then Any Other Business will be a kind reminder on one of the Operational Finance and Budget Working Group consultation.

Let's open the floor if there any questions, comments, changes to the agenda. I am not seeing any hands up at the moment. So the agenda is adopted as it is listed on your screen. We can go to our action items.

Our action items are all done. They're all related to this week's work apart from one. Just to mention Christopher Wilkinson to send details, a concern on Google's recent actions. So that's reached us and we're currently discussing this and seeing what next course of action will take place. On Jonathan Zuck to lead the small At-Large team on developing advice on SubPro, I know that's ongoing. That's also work happening behind the scenes at the moment. So nothing else we need to add to these.

Are there any comments or questions? I am not seeing anyone. So I can see someone is in the car. Okay, good. Usually I'm the guy in the car. I'm

glad somebody else is in a car from time to time. Okay, let's move on then. Our action items are complete and we can go now to the agenda item that deals with the workgroup and small team updates.

The first one is the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, the TPR PDP, and Steinar Grøtterød has a small update for us. Welcome Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Thank you very much. Good evening, good morning, everybody. We had a meeting yesterday and they finalized the deliberation on all the incoming stuff for Phase 1A and the ICANN Org staff kind of promises to have a finalized red version for all questions and recommendations for the Phase 1A within a short time. When that has been given to me, I will distribute that and also give some recommendations or comments to what we have achieved for this process.

We took a little review about the charter questions for the Phase 1B that is connected to the change of registrant. We will discuss that in one or two meetings before we will go into the Phase 2 that goes into the defining the dispute policies of when a transfer has been disputed.

There is also a change of process going on. So we will merge these things together, as I previously mentioned, and this will cut down the time. So by 2025 ... by the end of February 25, there will be a finalized version of the Transfer Policy going into a public comment period, I think.

That's my short update from yesterday's meeting. If there are any comments or my fellow colleagues at the working group can have some additional stuff, let us know or we go on. I don't see any hands. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar. For a moment, you got me worried when you mentioned 2025. I thought another couple of years of work to find an answer to this topic. Goodness. Thank goodness, it's February, not the actual year. Let's go then to our next update. Sorry, Steinar, is it 2025?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, I can confirm that later on. I'll find it and put it into the chat. It's going to take some time this thing. Anyway, go on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Maybe I'm just being too hopeful. All right. Thanks so much. I'm not seeing any hands up in the queue so we can move to our next item and that's now the Expedited Policy Development Process on Internationalized Domain Names. Now, we don't often hear from that group because what they like to do is to do some significant chunk of work and then they come with a full set of slides. Today is not unusual. We have a slide deck and I believe Satish Babu will take us through this deck. Satish, welcome.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry, Olivier. Satish is actually an apology.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is he? Oh, sorry. Okay. Well, it took me wrong. Then it's so over to you, Justine. Welcome, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, no worries. I don't see [AK] on the call. I think it's going to be left to Hadia and myself to take us through this presentation. Maybe I'll just start off with the introduction or the opening remarks, and then Hadia can jump in if she likes. Can you go to the next slide, please?

In terms of where we are, I just like to highlight the process that we take within the EPDP as the work progresses. So we have the charter with the sub charter questions, right? And then we're supposed to deliberate on each charter question. So that's what we mean by deliberation taking place. Then the first output that comes from there is a set of draft recommendation and/or implementation guidance texts. And that goes to what we call the first reading, which is the first opportunity for review which we call first reading. Then from there, if there is no issue then we come to some stable text. And then what happens with the stable text is—this part of it is an improvement to the PDP process. That is part of the GNSO effort to continuously improve PDP is that we set this stable text off to ICANN Org for input. And their role there is then to look at the draft recommendations and/or implementation guidance and highlight any implementation issues or any need for clarity. So that's something that has been introduced into this particular EPDP. I'm

not sure whether it happens with the other PDPs. But it happens now with this particular EPDP.

If we look at the input that ICANN Org gives, that's the second review. And then hopefully, we come to more stable text. Then the idea is that the second lot of stable text goes into a draft initial report that goes out for public comment. Then the process completes by ending up with a final report.

In this particular situation, we are at a review process. The ALAC team has been asked to consider a set of draft recommendations and implementation guidance text. So this is what we're seeking input on from you guys today. The challenge with it is that some of the charter questions have got multiple parts. We may have considered one part earlier, and then got stuck because we need information or some data to be collected before we can consider the rest of the charter questions. And which is why you see at the bottom section of the bottom half of this slide, you'll see some reference to partly new and entirely new. But in essence, these are the charter questions that we will try to present today.

Hadia, I see your hand up. Do you want to say something?

HADIA EL MINIAWI:

No. I raised my hand when Olivier was asking for Satish in order to go with a presentation. So yeah, after you finish your part, if you want me to go through the topics, I would gladly do so. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, okay. It's fine. You did indicate to me which parts you want to present on. So please feel free to take on any parts if you want. Okay. So I'm not hearing anything from you. So I'll just carry on then since we have limited time.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Only maybe the charter topics, the charter question. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm not quite sure what you mean. So do you want to take on charter question a7?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay, yeah. I could. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Go ahead then.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: So, you finished the introduction?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Let's move on. Can we go to the next slide, please?

HADIA EL MINIAWI:

Okay, great. Thank you. So, charter question a7, this belongs to topic A, which is consistent definition and technical utilization of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. As background information, the SubPro PDP recommended that single character gTLDs may be allowed for limited script/language combinations. And where characters and ideograph or an ideogram and does not cause any confusion or introduce confusion risks. This is consistent with SSAC recommendation, SAC052, and the recommendation of the ccNSO and GNSO IDN Working Group. So the charter question said, “What mechanism or criteria should be used to identify the script/languages appropriate for single character TLDs?”

So currently, the Han script is the only ideographic script included in the Root Zone Label Generation Rule. Chinese, Japanese, and Korean are the only languages incorporating Han script. So the Chinese language, the Kanji portion of the Japanese language and the Hanja portion of the Korean language which all use the Han script can use the single character gTLDs.

Accordingly, the EPDP requested the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Generation Panel, CJK GPs, to develop guidelines for a prohibitive list of Han characters that should not be allowed to be used as single character labels. So, originally the team, the EPDP, had requested the panel to identify allowable characters. However, the Generation Panel indicated that it only agreed to develop a prohibitive list of Han characters based on a narrow technical criteria such as characters that are not ideograph and characters that are symbols that may cause security and stability or may be confusing risks.

So, the recommendation, the output of the Generation Panel will be subject to a public comment, and applications for single character IDN TLD labels will not be accepted until relevant guidelines are provided from the Generation Panels. So that's basically Recommendation a7. So I'll stop here and ask you if you have any questions.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. We can pause here for any comments or questions.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Of course, Justine, chime in.

JUSTINE CHEW: Hadia has already gone through basically the bullets for the rationale in the EPDP coming up with the draft recommendation. So the ALAC team looked at it—and I'm going to channel Satish here since he's absent—he highlighted the fact that basically delegating part of the work to the CJK, the Chinese, Japanese, Korean Generation Panels, I'll call them CJK GPs, to do this work on developing guidelines for prohibiting single character Han script characters. That is something that they need to work on but we do not have a timeline established for that. Satish was concerned that that might be a dependency for the next round, whether that happens in time for the next round. And if it doesn't happen in time for the next round, then the ICANN Board will have to make a call as to whether to allow single character ideographic TLDs or not. So he suggested that we may want to include in our input a consideration of

getting a time commitment as to when the CJK GPs would finish their work on the guideline. So we'll open that up for comments or questions.

HADIA EL MINIAWI:

Justine, also, if I may, I would say based on this recommendation, you cannot actually go ahead with the next round until the GPs develop those guidelines. My personal view, you cannot develop policies and recommendations, and then start removing or making exceptions to some of the recommendations in order to proceed with the next round. My personal view, if you start doing this with one recommendation, you could do it with others as well. The purpose and then the recommendations itself become useless if we start adopting this idea that maybe if this is not done in time, we can make an exception and go ahead without it. That's my personal view. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I don't think that would happen. I mean, the Board has already indicated by a prior resolution that they will not allow single character TLDs until policy and technical considerations have been addressed. This would be reinforced by the EPDP's recommendation that also this should not happen until the guidelines are developed and implemented in the program. I'm just saying that it's not our decision per se. It's the Board's decision as to whether they want to accept the recommendation, obviously, if the GNSO accepts the recommendation.

Any questions? Actually, there is no really harm in adding that comment from Satish. It's still up to the EPDP to discuss it in the future. Yes, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess Hadia raises a more general issue which is where do we want to hold the line on a new round? I think that's the issue that she's trying to raise is what are our priorities? We dealt with this a little bit in our ODA correspondence and our upcoming advice. But it was generalized, right? So where do we want to hold the line on the availability of different types of domain names before we're going to be supportive of a new round launching? I think that was Hadia's point.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yes, Jonathan, exactly. I think I also stated my view on this. If we develop a policy with a set of recommendations, then our line should be all of those recommendations need to be implemented before we proceed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. There's so much pressure on Org to get the new round going, and that's why there's this Option 2 business and everything else. I don't know if we're going to get all the way through variants and things like that before a new round or not. So, we may need to prioritize. I guess is what I'm saying is where we're willing to draw the line. I don't know if it's on single character domain names or not. It might be variants, for example. I think that's a more general question and maybe one that we don't need to answer right here with all this presentation. But it's something to keep in the back of our mind is where we're trying to draw that line in the sand.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Jonathan, I agree with you. Again, we need to remember that this only concerns the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean communities. If they think that single character labels are important for them, then they need to defend them. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: What Hadia says is correct, that this particular recommendation, it deals only with the smaller group of single character TLDs which affects only the Han script. So I suppose the question is can we live with the next round, not having the ability to apply for single characters gTLDs if the GPs don't finish their work on time? It doesn't necessarily have to delay the entire round. You just carry on with the round just without this particular element being available. That's the other possibility, which is what happened in 2012 anyway.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: But we need to remember one thing that most of the variants are actually belonging to this community, to the CJK community. So we have—

JUSTINE CHEW: But we're not talking about variants here per se, Hadia. We're just talking about single character TLDs.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yes, single character in general. Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: I think we need to move on per se. But does anyone have any objections to what our proposal says?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: I could proceed with B if we don't have any questions.

JUSTINE CHEW: Because of time, please go ahead.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Justine, please chime in whenever you feel you need to. Could we have the next slide, please? Yeah, it's b4. We finished that. We finished a7. Yeah, we are b4. You want to go with D first? That's fine as well.

So Recommendation number D. This one is in relation to existing registry operators. I thought maybe we would do B first, I think. Would you want to go with B first? Yeah. Because B will relate to D. Okay, so let's go with B first.

So the policy recommendation advises that variant TLD labels be allocated to the same entity, but a process to apply for a variant TLD does not actually exist. So the charter question says, "What should an application process look like in terms of timing and sequence for an existing and future registry operator in relation to applying or activating their allocatable variant TLD labels?"

The recommendation says the registry operator cannot apply for an allocatable variant unless it has applied for the variant primary label IDN gTLD. So, the registry operator could apply for the primary and the variant in the same time or for the variant after applying for the primary. But it cannot apply for the variant before applying for the primary. The rationale for this is that variants, whether allocatable or delegated, are actually calculated by the Root Zone Label Generation Rules based on the primary labels.

Just to note, if you decide to make one of the variants your primary, based on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules, you will end up with this same set of labels. However, you might end with a different disposition. That is, you might end up with different allocatable unblocked, like allocatable becomes blocked or blocked becomes allocatable. So, that's the first recommendation. That's 2.11.

2.14, we said here that you cannot apply for the variant prior to the primary. However, after applying for a variant and primary in the sequence where the primary comes first or with the sequence for delegation actually does not matter. So, the registry operator could decide to delegate the variant before the primary doesn't really matter. However, they will need to follow the timing indicated originally by SubPro, which is 12 months for testing, and then they could apply for another 12 months as an extension. During this period, it doesn't matter who's delegated first.

Okay. So I go back to 2.12. A registry operator who wishes to apply for an allocatable variant label of its delegated IDN gTLD must submit an application during an application round. So that recommendation

speaks specifically to new gTLDs, they need to go through an application round.

Recommendation number D, which we will take after this one, will speak to existing registry operators who actually would like to apply for variants. We end up with a recommendation which is more or less similar to that one, with one more exception, giving some advantage to an existing IDN TLD applying for one of its variants.

We go to Recommendation 2.13. It says, "Applicants for a primary IDN gTLD and requested allocatable variant labels that pass evaluation will be subject to the terms and conditions of the 2012 round in respect of the timeframe for delegation." This is what we already also covered.

So I'll stop here. Justine, if you want to chime in, and if anyone has a question, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Questions, anyone? Okay. So I'm just going to chime in and say that if we go to the next slide, please, Claudia. Essentially, what we're seeing is the sequence and timing of the application does matter. Because as Heidi has pointed out, we are using the RZ-LGR, the Root Zone Label Generation Rule, to determine the set of variants that go with a particular primary IDN. So, which one you delegate or designate as the primary will determine whether the variant in the set that is associated with a primary is whether it's allocatable or blocked. So, you change the primary, the set may remain the same, it may turn out that the blocked variants could be allocated and the allocatable variants could be blocked. So what can be applied for is determined by what you use as

the primary. So therefore, it matters that you have to apply for the primary first or the primary in association with the variant. You can't apply for the variant before the primary. Okay. So that is Recommendation 2.11.

But having said that the order of the delegation matters less, because once you have obtained the set that you have sought for, then essentially each of the variants in that set, including the primary, individual TLDs. So, from a technical perspective, it doesn't matter which you delegate first. And in some instances, there could be a justification for delegating the variant first ahead of the primary, and the example given is on the slide.

So where you have the strasse as the primary, the German word for, I believe, street, if I'm not mistaken, and which allows the variant strasse in ASCII string to be obtained as allocatable variant. So the applicant applies of both and both passes evaluation. But the applicant, which then a RO, decides to delegate the ASCII label first because that is already more identifiable with international market, rather than going ahead with delegating the primary which is the German version of it as the IDN string. So there is a case for allowing the variant to be delegated ahead of the primary. And in this case, if you were to swap the position of the primary and the variant, if you put ASCII as the primary, you may not get the German as allocatable variant, which is what the last point says. So if you put strauss as the primary string, then the German version of strauss is blocked. You can't get that as a variant.

Questions? If there's no question, then our response from the team is that we would agree to all these recommendations. Okay. I'm seeing no

hands, no comments. Let's move on. Okay. Do you want to go back to D?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yeah. Let's go back to D.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. Okay.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you. Recommendation number D, again, speaks about the process for applying for variants, but this one speaks to existing registry operators who would like to apply for their variants. So among the 1265 existing TLDs, only 35 Chinese gTLDs and 9 Arabic gTLDs have allocatable variant labels. This is according to the Root Zone Label Generation Rule calculations. So in order to look for a deliberate on a timing and mechanism by which those registry operators could apply for variant labels, the EPDP team sent a survey to registry operators of those gTLDs. So 22 out of the 34 operators responded. The majority expressed an interest in applying for a variant. The majority also asked for a simplified stand-alone process. But when looking for examining the process through which IDN variants will need to go through in order to apply and have them allocated, it turns out it's the same process through which other new gTLDs will need to go through. It didn't make sense to have a special stand-alone process for existing TLDs.

However, the SubPro already had a recommendation that says that IDN TLDs will need to be prioritized in the next round in terms of processing.

The EPDP team confirmed this but went one step further in saying that existing gTLDs applying for their variants would also be prioritized in terms of processing. That is, they go ahead as well. They go before even IDN TLDs, and that's a one-time exception. The reason for that one-time exception is that those IDN gTLDs were not allowed in the round of 2012 to apply for their variants. So they were already disadvantaged for more than a decade. So it does make sense to give them a priority this round.

So I'll stop here. Justine, if you want to chime in, and if anyone has a question, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I think that we only have five minutes left. I'll go for questions. Does anyone have any questions?

John, your question is subject to a different charter question so let's not get into that here.

Seeing no other hands, Hadia, did you want to carry on? If we try and cover e5, we can drop e6, I think.

HADIA EL MINIAWI:

Yeah. We don't have e6 today. I think it's just e5. So, e5, this speaks to reserved names. Two points here. There are two recommendations here. The reserved name list should not be expanded to include variants. That is, we are not going to have variants in the reserved list. The second is that no application for a variant of a reserved name is

allowed. That is if someone applies for a variant of a reserved name, this will not be allowed.

So, an applied-for gTLD string—let me tell you the rationale also behind that. Any applied-for gTLD string will be compared against the reserved names in the string similarity review process, and that includes also blocked ones. Doing so will actually complicate the implementation because an applied-for label will be compared against thousands of labels, many of which are actually are actually blocked and will never be allocated or delegated.

So the EPDP team reviewed the variant of reserved names as calculated by the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. It found that all reserved strings are ASCII strings and only have blocked variants. So basically, again, the comparison will be against thousands of blocked variants, which complicates implementation for no good reason.

So I guess I covered the recommendation, yeah. So I'll stop here. Justine, if you want to chime in.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Can I just clarify? The charter question actually attempts to make us deal with two lots of strings. First lot is reserved names. So there's a reserved names list. And the second lot is the strings ineligible for delegation list. That's another group of strings. The charter question itself, I think we concluded that it was a typographical error in the charter question itself. So that's why we say that the charter question is actually intended to address two groups of strings. We interpreted it that way.

So the reserved names list was subject to prior deliberation, which is not the subject here now. What Hadia has elaborated on is the reserved names list. But we wanted to just recap on what was deliberation on the reserved names list, just to compare it with the strings ineligible for delegation. So if people are totally confused, let me try and clarify again or further clarify.

Reserved names list includes the terms such as IANA, ICANN, and ALAC. So you can imagine it's more internal list of what ICANN uses and IANA uses. So the reserved names is a list of strings that cannot be applied for altogether. And because they cannot be applied for altogether, it makes sense that the variants are also not allowed to be applied for. But you get the same effect even if you don't include variants into the reserved names list because of the principle of the set. If one primary creates a set, then the set is controlled by the primary. So if no one can apply for the primary, then no one can get the variant set. So the effect of it, as I said, is that if the primary string is already in the reserved names list, then all the variants will be protected as with the primary. We don't need to include all the variants into the reserved names list.

Now, the strings ineligible for delegation, we wanted to try and keep the recommendations similar so as not to create too many complications and too many exceptions. But what differs is the strings ineligible for delegation is mostly to do with the names of protected organizations. So if we go to the next slide, please.

The examples of such organizations would be the Red Cross and the International Olympic Committee. So they are external to ICANN, so to speak. That's kind of a simpler way of defining what's the difference

between reserved names and the strings ineligible for delegation. So we agreed that these particular organizations, their names and the strings that reflect the name should be protected because they should receive special protection. They are created by way of things like treaties, international agreements, that sort of thing, so we should respect that, in effect. But it's also a finite list and it's very specific. It's determined by the organizations in which GAC is also involved out of it. There is a process that's outside of this EPDP, what names actually gets put on to the strings ineligible for delegation.

Anyway, it's the same effect if you have the string or the name that is already on the list of strings ineligible for delegation. So they are protected, but they're protected in such a way that only the international organization that is associated with the name can apply for the primary, and there is a process for it that's outside the scope of this EPDP. But as I said, as with the reserved names, the effect is the same. If you have the primary in a list that's already protected and the effect of that is that only the relevant international organization can apply for the primary, then because of the set principle that if only one person is allowed to get the primary, that same person is allowed the variant. So if you protect the primary, therefore, the set of variants is protected. And you don't need to include all the variants into the list that is being protected. So that's why we say that the list can remain the same, you don't need to add the variants to it. We added also that because the strings ineligible for delegation is protected and it's only protected for the specific organization, then no general application for the string or the variant should be allowed.

I hope that clarifies things. So, our proposal from the ALAC team is that we agree with the recommendations.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Justine, I could quickly also go through e6. By this, we would have actually covered all the proposed draft. So in two minutes, I could go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: I think Greg has agreed to give us some of his time so please got ahead.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. So, e6 basically asks, "Is there any reason to permit the registration of gTLDs consisting of decorated two-character Latin labels which are not variant labels of any two-letter ASCII labels?" So, the EPDP here has agreed not to develop any additional recommendations on this topic but to rely on the existing process, the string similarity review. So, the EPDP team noted that standards used in string similarity review from the 2012 round will continue in the future round as well. So, if an applied-for two-character string, regardless of script or language, it will need to be reviewed for visual similarity to any two-character ASCII combination, and this is to protect actually future ccTLD delegations. As such, there is no need really for any recommendations in that regard. And applied-for string consisting of decorated two-character Latin labels will be evaluated for visual similarity to any two-character ASCII combination. If it does not pass the evaluation, it will not proceed. If it passes the evaluation, then it goes

ahead and proceeds. So really, there is no place here for recommendations, and we agree with that.

I'll stop here, Justine, if you want to chime in.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks. So if people wondering what decorated labels are, decorated simply means things like the German [inaudible] with a French accent and other diacritics. But the focus here is not so much on the decorated portion but more of the two-character portion. So we know that ccTLDs are two characters. So that's our predominant concern here that there isn't a conflict with the ccTLD. We're saying that the existing process already allows for that protection to be maintained by way of the string similarity review. So therefore, there isn't a need for a special or separate recommendation to deal with it. Bill, I saw your hand up but now it's gone down. So I don't know if you still want to—

BILL JOURIS:

I was only going to ask what decorated meant because I was on the Latin GP and never encountered the term, but you just explained it so I'm good.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you so much. Okay. We'll keep that in mind. So any questions? Yes, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Justine. I have a question, actually. It relates to one of the concerns of one of our ALSes that has members that are running .quebec. They have a concern with regards to the E with an accent and E without the accent. How does this decorated two-character Latin label recommendation relates to this, or does it not?

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, Quebec is not two characters.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

JUSTINE CHEW: That kind of answers your question. The other issue that is the main state of the Quebec argument, and the answer is what they're arguing are not variants. There are actually two different TLDs.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think what they're arguing is that it should be a variant because it should be the thing.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, they are arguing that they should be variants, the two versions of Quebec that they are highlighting. It's not up to them, though. It's up to the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. We are saying that that is the authoritative source for determining what is a variant or not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So what you're saying basically, because here we're looking at decorated two-character Latin labels, that might be a different rule to actual to the wider Label Generation Rules themselves.

JUSTINE CHEW: You brought up the issue of Quebec, and I'm saying that in this particular situation, charter question e6 use only with two characters. So it's out of scope for Quebec per se. Then I went on to explain that. So I'm saying that in terms of what Quebec is asking for the groups that are proposing to get the two versions of Quebec, the answer to the question is that they are not variants. They are two different TLDs. They're not variants at all according to the Root Zone Label Generation Rule.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. So now taking Quebec out of the way, my question is, is the CQ e6 decorated two-character Latin labels likely to come up with a different answer than the current Label Generation Rules?

JUSTINE CHEW: No. I don't quite understand your question.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yeah. How would it?

JUSTINE CHEW: Exactly. I don't see the connection.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: If I may. Basically, Olivier, the variants are calculated by the Root Zone Label Generation Rules based on the primary. So, now we have a clear rule that we did not have in 2012 which says that the Root Zone Label Generation Rule is the one and only authoritative source for evaluating any future TLDs.

So if you speak about Quebec, if the Root Zone Label Generation Rule does not say that they are variants then they are not. However, you have the Confusing Similarity Panel. So, once they pass the Root Zone Label Generation Rules and they're not variants, then when someone is applying for a label, it goes through similarity reviews. And if they are confusingly similar, then they're not allowed. What's your question in relation to the two-character?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Hadia. That makes sense. My concern or my comment here was that the rules that we're going to end up with, the two-character Latin labels would be different. But it looks like it is not.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. I'm being prompted to wrap up. So can we just get through the list of hands? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Quebec raises an interesting problem that E and E accented are not variants. They're two distinct characters. But in the real world, they are often used interchangeably. You can't do a Google search with an accented character. But if you search for an E, it will find accented Es. So the real world treats them as variants, but technically, they are not variants.

So in that case, there's nothing to stop .quebec from applying for the accented domain, accented TLD. And if it is granted, and of course the confusingly similar is a problem, they could map the two TLDs together so they act as equivalents, they are interchangeable. That of course means for every registration, they'll have to pay two registration fees to ICANN and that kind of thing. But it could be done assuming the Confusingly Similar Panel does not kill it first. So it's an interesting issue where they're not variants but the real world treats them like variants, and we just haven't covered that. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Alan. Hadia had her hand up and down. I guess if there's no more questions, we would like to hand the floor back to Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Justine, and thank you, Hadia, for this presentation as well. So we are a little late but we can catch up on timing. There is no RDS Scoping Team update. There's no SSAD update. There is an update on the closed generics. Greg has said he could actually focus on a longer presentation next week. But perhaps if he's

able to provide us with a summary of what happened at last week's meeting on this facilitated dialogue, it would be interesting to know. So over to you, Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. Alan and I were both at the two-day face to face on Thursday and Friday in Washington. As I said, as I noticed there should be a post meeting summary report coming up from staff, which I can use or we can use next week as the basis for a longer report. But just to briefly go over what happened, we spent two days discussing a number of topics. Particularly, we looked at trying to define and react and figure out how to deal with the concept of a public interest versus the global public interest and what tests there might be. We finished looking at the draft global public interest framework that the Board has been using, and we concluded that it was not particularly useful in this exercise for closed generics, in part because the framework is essentially a summary and breakdown of only the first part of the Bylaws, which is kind of the mission statement. I can't even remember what the sort of high level stuff is, but it doesn't go into kind of the nuts and bolts of the Bylaws, which in many cases provide important context for trying to determine whether the public interest or a public interest is being served.

This was a unique session in the sense that it's the so-called facilitated dialogue. Melissa Allgood, who's a full-time ICANN staffer and recovering lawyer and moderator and facilitator, really kept us going through the process, had some unique tools to try to use to keep us from getting stuck and to try to get the temperature of the room.

Among other things, each of us had three strips of paper—red, yellow, and blue—so we would take instant votes in the room. That red was disagree, yellow support, and blue was just not happy but not the hill I'm going to die on either, in other words, you can live with. And we used quite a number of time, including iteratively, to try to refine some of the points we were doing. If there wasn't enough consensus, we tried to reshape and see how the retake of the temperature's working. It was a good use of visual.

We did one breakout session each day. But by and large, we stuck to kind of committee as a whole. We did a variety of different aspects. We were looking at both the application process. Potentially, what would the application look like itself? What would the process of review of the application look like? What would post delegation compliance look like? We tried to come up with as much of a life cycle analysis as possible. I think we made a lot of progress, actually. I think that there was relatively little, maybe almost no gamesmanship of the process, and pretty much did avoid going down any rabbit hole or getting stuck on small details that kept us from moving toward bigger questions.

So I think overall, I would say that the facilitated dialogue, if you will, maybe just a little bit more kind of professional facilitation in this case was quite useful. We've had many good facilitators from within the community over the years, of course, and we've had some mixed bag with independent facilitators, sometimes just not getting the community or the multistakeholder model well enough. For better or worse, I think it depends somewhat on the unique skillset of Melissa Allgood. But it's all learnable.

In any case, I don't want to take too much time because, as I said, we don't really have the end report. One thing I do want to mention is that we did take a couple of different examples, in this case, .donation and .flowershop, and tried to use them to test our various potential application questions. Taking a step back, we did breakout sessions where we had three groups and each group came up with what they thought the potential application questions should be. Then we tested those application questions and topics against those questions. Each of the breakout groups did that separately and came up with somewhat different results as to whether we thought these were good candidates for closed generic or not. But I think that in itself was helpful, the fact that they were different, because I think it exposed some of the remaining questions around what makes it a viable closed generic.

So I'm going to stop here and see if Alan has anything to add or see if there are any questions. Again, don't want to take too much time this week because I'd like to take a little more time next time. Alan?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Alan. Your microphone is muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry, my screen chose to freeze for a minute just when I was called upon. Can you hear me now?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, we can. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, good. I just wanted to make sure it's really live. Just a couple of brief points. On the Board's global public interest framework, what we came up with, and it surprised me, but no one had really realized until then that this was a framework for determining whether something ICANN does is in the public interest. We're looking at whether something a registry does in the public interest. And I think that's the main reason the framework failed, because it really had a different aim than what we were looking for. So that was point number one. I found that interesting that it was obvious when you think about it, but it was never really expressed that way.

The second thing is I think we made progress. I say "I think" because until we see the output of the report, what was captured and ended up in the results is not 100% clear. So as an example, and a very important example, someone suggested that maybe every TLD does not need to meet the global public interest but it must meet a public interest and not hurt the global public interest. I thought that was rather inspired. But I don't know whether it made it into the final documents or not. So until we see the documents, we may end up with different conclusions as to whether this meeting was really successful or not. But it did have the potential. We did come up with some good ideas. I agree with Greg that, to a large extent, no one was playing games. They were all earnestly working towards the outcome, which each of us believe and those outcomes may be different, of course. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

I would just say briefly that Alan is spot on that we did realize that this global public interest framework is really ICANN-censored. And really, ICANN Org or ICANN Inc., it's really a board governance set of questions, more than anything else, secondarily maybe to the actions of the community, but really not a good test of what a third party would be doing. Even with regard to its intended use, the fact that it ends after the mission and core values session makes it a little bit of limited utility. Probably should pick out other aspects of the Bylaws that go to the question of the public interest. And there are a number of them when you start thinking about it.

With that, I don't see that anybody else has any hands up. I'm on my phone. I'm not a good cue runner. I will turn it back to the chair unless there are any questions for Alan or myself. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Well, thank you very much, Greg. I am not seeing any other hand at the moment. Thank you for your update. We look forward to further update once that awaited report gets published hopefully before our next call next week. That closes off on our workgroup and small team updates. We can now move to our policy comment to update. The policy pipeline—

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

I think we have an update from Maureen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We do? Okay. Sorry. Applicant Support GGP. Goodness, I'm too eager to flick through. Apologies for this, Maureen. Maureen Hilyard, of course, has got an Applicant Support GNSO Guidance Process update with some slides as well. Let's hear from Maureen. And sorry again.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can indeed. Go ahead, Maureen. Welcome. Well, we could hear, Maureen. Maybe now we cannot.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry. Can you hear me now? Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you now. Go ahead. Please proceed.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. All right. I'm just saying I had a thunder and lightning storm and my Internet went down. My satellite dish doesn't like the water. This is going to be brief. I can't see Zoom. I'm on my phone. I know Sarah is not available today, which is why I have to go through the presentations. She had a conflict. She's not available. I'm being very sparing with my resources. I'm assuming that Chantelle is going to be invisibly, for me, thinking with me in my presentation.

I'm doing a presentation tonight to the APRALO Policy Forum. I prepared this presentation, which is really a recap on the last CPWG meeting, plus an additional couple of slides about this meeting, which is what I'll be going over. I'm just supporting the work that they're doing in the policy forum, and also the fact that they reestablished the policy forum at the same time as I came onto the GGP. This will be my second report to them.

The PowerPoint is actually in the agenda for anyone who wants to get a recap. Chantelle, if she could just tell me when she just go straight through to slide six which is really just a look at the status of where we were at the end of the last GGP meeting. We were working on that framework that had all those queries at the top and a list of orders, which were actually in the SubPro where it came from, the list of metrics that we were going to be working on. Apart from myself and two others on the GGP, we were the only ones who put any comments. And we weren't allowed to write on that particular document anyway so it's really difficult to look in each of different things to find out who had actually responded.

What they did after the meeting and after our report to the CPWG, they actually created another document, which is slide seven, the final slide in this deck, which is suggested by Tom Barrett. I thought it was a great idea. Because what he's done is actually looking at the life cycle elements of the Applicant Support program, the process of it. Starting from outreach and awareness, looking at what applicants need to understand about the application process and the business case. Third thing was looking at what ICANN Org needs to do in order to support the program, especially as we're looking at the case indicators.

Application submission and evaluation guidelines, contracting and delegation. Then finally, ongoing operations of the gTLD for those who are [inaudible] delegation of domain that they're actually applying for. We were given these as this is the new framework. Chantelle, can you just tell me when you get the details?

What I did was we were actually able to write on to this particular document. So I was able to transfer the comments that were made in our past discussion and transfer them on to this document. Most of it was to do with outreach and awareness that we've discussed, that we hadn't had an opportunity to discuss these. I don't have any much else to say, apart from the fact that I've actually populated the new framework with our comments, and that our meeting next Monday will be the one that we will actually be discussing. Hopefully, we'll have some feedback from that.

Chantelle also has a user-friendly copy of that on the GGP workspace. If anyone wants to add anything relating to any of those topics that you think—I mean, it's relevant. For example, the thing that everyone's been talking about today is way over my head. Those will be all important for us to provide guidelines for those who are going to be making applications, especially in the area of IDNs. I think that that's going to be a particularly special case and I think we've mentioned that before.

I don't have much to offer. I know we're running out of time anyway. So that's the end of this. If there's anyone with their hand up, which I can't see, let me know. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen, for this update. I realized how hard it is to be able to do this when you're effectively blind or at least from an Internet perspective, blind from Internet perspective. Now, I am not seeing any hands on this. All I can do I guess is thank you for your update. It's good to note that there is progress in this. Some have said this is a near impossible task to progress in, but it's good that there's progress coming along. Thank you so much for the update.

Now, we can go to our policy comment updates with Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia El Miniawi.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Olivier. Hadia and I are going to just fly through this week really quickly. The only update that we want to flag to you is that the OFBWG is asking for final comments on the public comment statement related to the draft FY24-28 Operating and Financial Plan and draft FY24 Operating Plan and Budget. Those links are in the agenda. We'll post them in the chat shortly. Comments are due on the 2nd, which is tomorrow. After that, it will go to ratification and then we will submit it. Everything else is the same as last week. And with that, we should probably move forward to ICANN76 planning, and then Any Other Business. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this quick update. Indeed, the At-Large workspace for the proposed procedure for selecting the top-level domain stream

for private use closes on the 28th of February. So we still have plenty of time until we make a decision on this and we can do that next week. Let's move swiftly on to the next agenda item. That's welcoming Jonathan Zuck to take us a little bit closer to ICANN76.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. I don't know how much closer it's going to feel because the movements are very incremental. We did get together and design a little bit of a session for our policy session so that Gisella could get the submission and get the invitations out. I think really, the next step for this group is going to be to gather up the issue shepherds and go through the calendar, figure out what the hot topics are going to be, and make sure that the talking points are current on the topics that are going to be discussed. So expect to hear from me and Chantelle on those issues if you're an issue shepherd. Hopefully, it's not something where we have to reinvent the wheel every time. But the real exercise is really just figuring out what subset of our issues and our talking points are relevant to the next meeting. That's what's next. Other than that, there's not a whole lot of new to report on ICANN76.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this update, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you for having me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was hoping that we would be five minutes closer to the next ICANN meeting. We're only three minutes closer to the next ICANN meeting.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Technically a success. I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment so we'll just have to watch this space and get even a little closer next week, I guess. That's it for agenda number five. Number six is just a repeat of what we're going to talk about earlier.

I see Sébastien Bachollet has put his hand up. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to say that ICANN, myself were on a call for the session about the multistakeholder and the WSIS+20, the call happened today. I don't know if you want me to give an update on that specific group or somewhere else, but I am sure that next week I'll tie myself quickly [inaudible] if you wish. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Your line was a little bit muddled. But as far as I understand, today was the call on the multistakeholder discussion. Is that correct?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's about session, the only one with—a public session during the ICANN76 and was about WSIS+20 and the multistakeholder model. We started discussion today and we will have a call next week. And if you wish, we can give you a report on that. I tie myself, if you want. I hope it's not as [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No, it certainly is a lot better. Thank you for this. Your line was just a bit muddled the first time around. This time, we actually managed to get what you were talking about. Thank you. What we'll do is to have probably a bigger update next week then because we're short of time today and of course you'll probably have more information for us at that time. But let's mark it in the agenda that we should have a few minutes for an update on this topic, the preparation for the WSIS+20 and multistakeholder model.

Any other comments? We are now in our agenda item six, which is Any Other Business. Hadia El Miniawi?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. I don't have any other businesses. There's a question in the chat, Bill Jouris is saying regarding the proposed procedures. I really don't understand Bill's questions. And if he can elaborate a little bit more, if we have time. We still have three minutes. Could we?

BILL JOURIS: I can try. The proposed procedure talks about how potential TLDs for private use will be evaluated. But all of the work it says is delegated to

the IANA staff. Maybe I'm just ignorant but I thought IANA was about numbers, not names.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yes. Basically, your question is why is IANA doing that? I don't know if this helps, but basically, the criteria for selecting a TLD for private use was done by SSAC. Based on SSAC recommendation, a criteria was developed by which a domain for private use will be selected and assigned for that. It will never be delegated, actually, in the root zone, because it will be used for private use. In your mind, who should look at the criteria and select the TLD, bearing in mind that the selection will go through a public comment period.

BILL JOURIS: Okay. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, thank you for this answer. Just to add to this, actually, bearing in mind that this top-level domain would be reserved, and therefore, I guess, allocated to IANA in the same way as the .int, .intezonemanagement is currently run by IANA. Also the .arpa is run by IANA. I guess it had to have a label as to who would be in charge of it. IANA looks like the normal, by default, name for this. I'm not saying this is the truth. I'm just saying I can deduce that this probably is the case.

Alan Greenberg adds, "IANA creates the root zone so IANA is not only the numbers."

Thank you so much. We are at the top of the hour. Well, the half-time mark, not the top, the bottom of the dial. I am not seeing any further hands up so that means we can just check when or next time is going to be. There's a slight change of plan. Just like today, there was a slight change of plan and a later call than usual. Next week, some staff are having fun, apparently, or maybe not.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hi, Oliver. Correct. Next week, staff will be busy at a meeting so we are not available for 13:00 UTC. However, we can start at 14:00 UTC if you'd like.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That certainly works for me. I hope it works for everyone else. I know that for some people, especially on the West Coast of the United States, they'll be more than happy because they can wake up a little later. I'm not seeing any objection. So let's make it 14:00 UTC next week. One hour later than usual.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Sounds good. Thank you, Olivier. Thank you all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Well, thanks to our interpreters, to the real-time transcriber, and of course, to everyone who has participated in this call, including those that have created some slide decks. It's really great to see community working on these things and community working for the community. I learn new things at every call. I hope that you also learned new things and that this was useful for all of you. Is there anything else you'd like to add, Hadia?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Nothing from my side. Thank you so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I just have one thing to add, is to apologize for the last call when I had to leave quickly so I dropped Hadia in the crucible at no notice whatsoever, and you did very well. Thank you, Hadia, yet again, for all the work that you're doing. Really, really great. Thanks, everyone. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]