YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to APRALO Policy Forum call taking place on second of March 2023 at 06:00 UTC. Our call today we have Shreedeep Rayamajhi, Justine Chew, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Satish Babu, Nabeel Yasin, Ali AlMeshal, Amrita Choudhury, Udeep Baral, Bibek Silwal, Gunela Astbrink, K Mohan Raidu, Maureen Hilyard, Samik Kharel.

We have received apologies from Suhaidi Hassan, and from staff side, we have Gisella Gruber, Athena Foo, and myself Yeşim Sağlam, and I will also be doing call management on today's call. Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes, please. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to Shreedeep. Thank you very much.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Yeşim Sağlam. And firstly, I'd like to welcome you all to the March first meeting. And it's quite interesting with all the buzz happening at the ICANN76 Policy Forum, everybody's getting busy. I hope everybody's settled on with your traveling activities, and [00:01:36 - inaudible], hope to see you joining online as well. Now getting back to the agenda. Today we have Justin, who's representing us all about EPDP on IDN. So Justin, the floor is yours.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Shreedeep. Hi. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Justin Chew, if you don't already know who I am. Firstly, I probably

need to apologize, there's some construction going on above me, so I'm hoping that the noise doesn't filter down into my microphone. So I will try to speak as loudly and clearly as possible.

So when Shreedeep asked me to talk about the EPDP on IDNs, I had suggested back to him that rather than going into the specifics of the policy discussions that we're having, because it's actually very hard to summarize and condense everything into 15 minutes really, and even with the CPWG, we will normally take at least half an hour to get through a few questions, let alone the entire charter.

So what I suggested to Shreedeep was that if I could just give folks here a little bit of background about why we have this EPDP and what is the EPDP actually tasked to do. And then that might give you a better understanding of why we're doing certain things and how we're going about doing those things, which could be subject of future conversations that I'm prepared to have with folks here on maybe in May or so forth. So, I am going to use a deck that the leadership team of the EPDP on IDNs use for an outreach with the GAC.

So pardon the fact that this is addressed to GAC. And it was just so that to save me time from having to come up with my own deck for this purpose on a short notice. So this is what roughly I'm going to go through, and I'm going to try and pause at certain points in time so that if there's anyone who doesn't understand what I've said, or has a supplementary theory, they can stop me and ask the questions and I'll try my best to answer. So the thing is, I think a lot of people miss understand what it is that the this particular EPDP is doing, right?

Because they see IDNs, and then they just think IDNs, right? The fact is IDNs has already exists, existed for some time now. So this particular EPDP is actually focusing on variants, IDN variants, so not specifically on IDNs because there's already existing body of policies that deal with IDNs. There may be some gaps that we're also looking into, but our predominant focus is on variance. So just keep that in mind. I'm going to try and explain to you what we mean by variance. But first, so in context of IDN, the history of IDNs.

So the IDNs first came about at the second level back in 2000, year 2000. Sp imagine there's already a 20 year history of IDNs. And then, of course, there were different times when dealt with the gTLD side of things, and then the ccTLD side of things. So in terms of the introduction, at the second level gTLD, that happened in 2000, at the ccTLD, which is the top level, we're on the second level, top level by country code, that happened in around 2019, and to date, we have about 61 ccTLDs.

And then, because there was no rules pertaining to variants, so the board said, look, we can't allow the introduction of variants until we have proper rules to govern the management of variants. And you will probably appreciate that a bit more when I get into further down the deck as to why that is important. So, at this point in time, just note that there was no, in 2010, there was no rules, there are still no rules, by the way, for variant management.

So the board took a reposition to say that we're not going to allow the introduction of variants until such point in time where we have rules for the management of those. But that was in 2012, and that resolution

still stands and is still valid. And then, IDN gTLDs, in gTLDs, not variants, just gTLDs, more were introduced in the 2012 round, so we wanted specifics. And then while that was happening, it started about 2013, the board sort of said, we need to start doing some work about how are we going to manage this IDN gTLD problem.

So they endorsed a procedure to create what is called the root zone label generation root. And we're talking about the procedure, so the way to formulate the RZLGL, the Root Zone LGR. And that involves communities, and it is language communities that is involved with developing RZLGR indirectly. And I'll come to that a little bit as well. And then, of course, GNSO and ccNSO, we're doing some site work to take into account the work that was being done through the RZLGR.

And then that brings us to 2021, where we had the Subsequent Procedures PDP which actually started in 2016, but it ended in 2021. And the Sub-Pro, Subsequent Procedures, the short term name is SubPro, abbreviation is SubPro. The SubPro itself has got a topic area that uses IDN, but again, it's just IDN as a primary TLD, not variance. And the variance part of it is where it got sort of moved-- it wasn't dealt with under SubPro, and that's why we need this EPDP to deal with that aspect of IDN, the variance side of it.

And in the meantime, the work on the RZLGL is still proceeding because that's parallel process, nothing to do with EPDP. And now we have-- the board recently approved version five of that RZLGR. So what do we mean by variance? There are a lot of nuances in it, but I'm going to try and tell you just the basics so you get an idea of what we're trying to

grapple with. So when we talk about variance, it comes down to the language and the script.

Now there are certain languages, for example, Chinese and you see on the screen far left, where you have, and this is just Chinese alone, you have the simplified Chinese and you have the traditional Chinese script. Script meaning what you write, the text as opposed to speaking the language. So because there is a simplified Chinese script and a traditional Chinese script, that means there are two versions of the same word. As you see the one in white and the one in blue, but they're essentially the same word, which is why they are considered as variants.

So that's one aspect of variants that we're talking about. And that's only within a single language. Then the second part of it is when you have cross languages. So Arabic script is an example. Arabic script doesn't only serve the Arabic community, it also serves other communities, and the example given here is urdu. So urdu-speaking people also use the Arabic script. And when we're dealing with rules, we're always talking about the script, not the language, because at the end, domain names is written, it's not spoken, it's written. So that's why script is important.

And in some cases, the script actually cuts across many languages. So Latin script is another example, where it covers normally the ASCII based languages like English, French, Spanish, lots and lots and lots. And so those two examples that I've given is regarding the usability aspect of it, of variants. And then we have the complication of the security aspect of variants, where you see in the green cells on the right-

hand side of the screen, the green portion, where certain Latin strings, I call it strings, look very similar to the Cyrillic script.

So if you were to introduce both of them into the root, for example, there is very high risk of configurability on the end user, because they see it, they may not see the term being different, but they actually different, they see them as the same thing. So that is the security aspect of it.

And understanding the impact of variants. So as I said, variants, we try to serve as many languages as possible across the globe, because in some cases, when the user of the language, they see something, or they see two things, they kind of end up thinking that it's the same thing.

So for example, before with the Chinese script, there's traditional and simplified. So we know for a fact that whatever is written in traditional Chinese is the same thing as what's written in the simplified Chinese. But different parts of the world use different scripts. So for example, with a simplified Chinese is used in mainland China, but the traditional Chinese script is used in Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan, Singapore, and some other Chinese speaking regions.

So we need to cater for global use and we need to make sure that whatever the Chinese mainland people are reading as a string, is the same as what the other people, the Chinese speaking community in Hong Kong, Macau, is seeing as the same thing. Although it's written differently, but it's exactly the same word. And then we have other cross script things like Latin, Cyrillic, Armenian, Greek, Canada, and

Telugu. So they have similar issues in terms of similarity and language using the common script.

Now, from a usability point of view, that is the sort of the complications that we have to grapple with. But from a technical point of view, from the DNS point of view, each string is separate, because the computer doesn't know one string from another. They just know that it is different strings by virtue of the code point. So what is the code point? This is the code point. So the computer actually reads this, the computer doesn't read the character, it reads the code points. So if it's a different code point, then the computer will know it's different strings.

So the challenge is when you introduce something to the root zone, it's considered separate TLDs. But we as the user, the humans, we are trying to force the DNS and the computers to make sure that these two are the same, but although they exist independently in the root zone. So we are imposing certain rules on the usage of to string, and that is a challenge. And then it leads to confusability and then something.

So I said before that variant doesn't exist at the moment or is not allowed to exist at the moment because there has not been rules, community endorsed rules to allow for variants. And because SubPro doesn't deal with variants, and all this ongoing work that's done to the Root Zone LGR as well as GNOS and ccNSO, it doesn't answer the two main questions, which is, what is the definition of variants? And the second question is, how are we going to manage the variants given all the other background as I've just gone through? Now, I mentioned the Root Zone LGR before, so the Root Zone Label Generation Rules that has

been building up in terms of the body of knowledge, that offers a way for us to adopt as the way forward to define variants.

What am I talking about? I'll come to that in a minute. But what I was trying to point out here is the RZLGR exists, yes, but it's not been adopted as community consensus policy, and that's what we're trying to get to with this EPDP. And, of course, once we have a way to define what is a variant and what's not a variant, then we have also to create rules to determine things like who gets the variants? What happens if there is like, for example, a set of three variants which is supposed to be the same string or the same words? Are they meant to go together?

Are they meant to be managed by one registry operator? If that's the case, then how? So those are the kinds of questions that this EPDP is charged with answering. So what is the Root Zone Label Generation Rules? In simplified terms, I mentioned about language communities. So there are language communities that have been working for good 15 years coming up with certain rules that are language and script directed. So for example, the Latin script is a combination of English speaking community, French speaking community, Spanish, all those languages which use ASCII script mainly.

So you imagine there's one Latin LGR, that could be Arabic LGR, it could be a Chinese LGR, Han LGR. So there are various LGRs that cater to various languages that's using the same script. So you have lots and lots of LGRs that pertain to script. And what happens if each script LGR goes to integration panel to basically consolidate all those LGRs into one single big body of rule, which is called the RZLGR, the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. And this is what it is.

So, for now, we have 25 LGRs, script LGRs that have been incorporated into version five of this RZLGR. And you can see here now is the tool is what is used to tell you what is a variant of a string and what is not a variable string. But even though there could be variants, then we come to the complication of whether it should be blocked or allocated. What am I talking about now? Okay, so hopefully the next-- sorry, this is the interface for the tool. The tool is actually available online, I think, but you have to log into to get access to it. But yes, this is the URL for it.

So you can go and play with if you want, it's available. But basically, this is the tool that incorporates all the rules behind all the scripts that cater to multiple languages as one body, one authoritative body that will tell you if you fit in a string, what are the variants, what is an allocatable variant and what is a block variant? And what are those? So for example, if you feed this new label, what we call the origin of the primary label, into the tool, it will spit out this list.

This is a truncated list, it actually goes on to maybe 1000, over 1000, but I'm just showing you by way of an example. So, you feed a label, an original label or primary label into the RZLGR two, and it will spit out this list that shows you what are the variants. So each of these are all very labeled variants, there are variants of this primary label will be called the original primary label. And then this will tell you what is blocked and what is allocatable.

So what does that mean? Allocatable means that it's available for application and delegation. Blocked means that it is not available for application, and therefore it's not available for delegation. So these are not determined by the EPDP. This is determined by the RZLGR, and the

rules that are integrated into the tool. And the rules actually come from each language community. There are particular label generation rules. So I said before that it's the community, cross-language communities that share one script will come up with their rules.

So for example, there's a French community that uses French rules, and their rules get incorporated into the Latin LGR because French is written in Latin. Same with Spanish, same with all the other scripts that have ASCII as a basis. Then the Latin LGR gets incorporated into the RZLGR. So in a similar way, that's what the Chinese LGR, which is Han script, gets incorporated into the RZLGR, but the Arabic LGR gets incorporated into the RZLGR.

So that is what determine, so it is the RZLGR that determines what is a variable, and whether that variable is allocatable or blocked. Any questions so far? I'm not seeing the chat screen. I need someone to tell me if there's a question in the chat or if someone has their hand up. Okay. So if there's none, then I'll just move on. It's important to note that not --

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: There is a question.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, what's the question?

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Okay, there's a question by Samik Kharel. Is LGR a system which allocates strings for various scripts? Also confused about strings and label? Can you please simplify these.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. LGR, Label Generation Rules is basically a set of rules that determine how you treat certain-- how would I explain this? The LGR, the Label Generation Rules is a set of rules that is determined by the language community. So for example, if you use French language community as an example, they have diacritics, they have the accent, the grave or something. So they have to have a way to transpose those letters into code points in order for the computer to know that it is a different word or different character. So those are the LGRs are determined by the language community themselves.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Justine, Cheryl here. I wonder if the Arabic is a good example, because the Arabic was one of the first LGRs to come out of this community process very much early in a very successful one. That's not a single diaspora, this is a whole lot of different as you said, different language uses, entirely different countries, which use the Arabic script, and they gathered together into a language community and agreed what would or would not end up in a single set of code points.

And then once they agreed what would end up with a single set of code points, that meant that they were some of the earliest ccTLD strings to be delegated. So that's a good example where it's just French one diaspora, but a number of diasporas working together. Hope that helps.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, that helps. You caught me there. Samik, I hope that kind of helps answer your question. I'm probably not doing a very good job with answering that particular aspect of the question, but to your second question, label is the technical term for a string. So all these are labels, they're considered labels. And we talked about again just think of a label as a string. And then a string has got-- so this is a string, this could also be strings, but they are also called labels from a technical perspective.

ICANN have got all these weird things that they use. So if I can just move on. I'm happy to maybe talk to Samik offline so that we don't hold up the presentation. So not all scripts have got variants. I said before that we've got 25 introduced into the Root Zone LGR already. There's two more that's still being worked on, which is the Tana and the Tibetan. But when you talk about variants, it's only 22 scripts that have got variants, but even within that 22, it's only seven scripts that have got allocatable variants. So the rest of them are blocked automatically.

And this shows you what are the seven scripts that we have to deal with in terms of allocatable variants. So now, there's a little bit about work. I've mentioned before that there're certain [00:27:16 - inaudible], basically, when SubPro, Subsequent Procedure had the PDP, they had a very high-level policy recommendations regarding IDNs, which is mainly to do with, we will continue allowing IDNs at the top level, but they didn't touch specifically on variants. So again, that's what is the role of the EPDP on IDNs. Okay, so this is something that I've kind of talked about in high level, but yes, it's here.

Okay, so who we are is quite clear our role. Our work, I've talked about this a bit already. So the challenges, if I can just touch on the challenges that we face so far as the EPDP is that we're always faced with the need to be conservative. So like some people asked, why don't we just allow all these variants to be entered into the root? Why do we have certain block variants and certain allocatable variants? And even within the allocatable variants, do we allow all the allocatable variances to be delegated? Now, in terms of what is blocked and what is allocatable, I already explained, it's language driven.

And what is allocatable and can be delegated? There is a question of, do we really want to introduce so many TLDs into the root? Is it absolutely necessary? Because the more TLDs you introduce into the root, the higher the risk, and the higher the chances of something going wrong, especially when we know concept of variance, people tend to think that something is similar to something else. So the logic and the guidance is that we should always be conservative and stick to if we really, really, really only need the variance to be delegated, the allocatable variants to be delegated, then we'll look at that.

Otherwise, do we really need it. But having said that, a lot of the scripts that have got variants themselves, have themselves also said that we shouldn't-- in some cases, they said that we shouldn't introduce more than two variants. In some cases, they said that we shouldn't introduce more than three variants of the same string. Arabic is the only one that hasn't got a limit in terms of the number of variants to be introduced. What I'm trying to get Is part of the reason why we're harping on conservatism is this thing about DNS security and stability, we don't want all this confusion to break the DNS in some way or another.

So that's why we always say, do we really need it? If we need it, then can you justify why we need it, then we'll look at it. And because, as you see, like only one string, as I showed before, one Arabic string and come up with so many variants, and as I said, it's a truncated list and it could go to 1000s and 1000s and 1000s. So, therefore, it introduces possible permutations, and that increases configurability risk and security risk at the same time. So, some of the high level principles that we have kind of moved towards would be same entity principle and sanctity of the set.

So, I will briefly just explain what we mean by same entity principle. So, once the RZLGR tells us what is allocatable, what are the variants for a particular string, and mind you, if you put a particular string, say string A into the root zone tool, the RZLRG toll, it will give you a list of variances, and with the other dispositions, and it will tell you which ones are allocatable and which ones are blocked. But if you then try to reverse it, and use one of the variants within that set as the original, as the primary level, you put that into the tool, you may come up with a different list, and it may be the same population of variant labels, but the dispositions could change.

So, if you use A as a primary label, something that could be allocatable variant may turn out to be blocked if you use B as a primary label. So, it is important to remember that what you feed into the tool, the primary label is the one that determines the variance set. So when we have an idea of what the set entails, so for simplification sake, so I use A as a string, the primary string, I put it in the tool, it spits out all the variant set. So say for argument's sake, it spits out only two allocatable variants, which is B and C, and one block variant, D.

So arguably, B and C can be applied for and can be delegated because they're allocatable. Then the question becomes, who can apply for those? We already said that, A, B and C, let's forget about D because it's blocked, A, B, and C are essentially the same word. So it makes sense that only one person gets to control those three labels. Hence, the same entity principle. So one single same entity should be allowed to get those three labels. You can't have three different registry operators operating those three labels, they have to go to the same registry operator or the same applicants in order to maintain this connectivity that they are three labels that represent the same word.

And in terms of sanctity of the set, what we mean by that is for example, if something happens to one of the labels, say something happens to label C, then the question is does that impact label A and label B? And there are obviously permutations around that. The other question is, say for example, the registry operator breaches their registry agreement and they have control of A, B, and C. So A being the primary, B and C being the delegated variances. So if they breach the registry agreement, consequently, A gets removed from the control.

And it could be that somebody else put it on the train like two years later. But the point is, if you lose A, then you also lose B and C together, they have to go together. And that is what you mean by the sanctity of the set. So I think I've taken up too much time already. At this point in time, I hope I haven't confused everyone. I'm happy to take questions.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: So there is a question by Naveed saying, "Does it all to include detection of coalition of labels between different language and detecting unauthorized label?"

JUSTINE CHEW: I don't follow the question. Can you repeat the question, please?

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Does it also include detection of collision of labels between different languages and detecting unauthorized labels?

JUSTINE CHEW: Unauthorized labels, the word for it is invalid. So the tool will tell you whether that particular string is valid or invalid. If it's valid, then it will spit out their answers. If it's invalid, then it stops there because we cannot have that string, we cannot have that label. And because the RZLGR incorporates all the 25 language scripts, yes, it would detect no cross root so to speak. Okay, any other questions?

NABEEL YASIN: This is Nabeel Yasin for the record. Thank you, Justine, for your very interesting subject and it's our history timeline for 20 years of IDN so on. Just regarding of the Arabic scripts, the Arabic script, it's used by many, like urdu, sindhi, persian, pashtu, so many language communities. And, like, for the example over here, it was written Shabaka, it means network. So this word could be in Arabic.

If it's allowed to be registered, then in some languages, it's not the same word, but in Urdu and other languages, it's a dictionary, the same word. So it will be difficult not to enable other communities to register their own script, although it will be the same, it will be the same script, but how we can manage that, it's quite difficult I see.

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, again, we talked about the script, so it's not so much the language per se, it cuts across a lot of language communities, but it's still the script. And we're dealing with scripts, rather than languages. So when you talk about, say, a particular, the string that you mentioned, anyone can apply for the string, we're not we're not saying that only Arabic community participant can apply.

NABEEL YASIN: Yes, okay. [00:38:49 - inaudible] use this label in their own [00:38:54 - inaudible], anyone can register from any committee. So it says the script, rather than the language. Yes. It's understood. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW: Correct, the script. And we're talking about the top level, so it's only really registry applicants that can apply for the TLDs. So we're not talking about the [CROSSTALK], that kind of thing. You were thinking of second level?

NABEEL YASIN: The top level, yes, like the .com, .net, and so on, yes. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW: No worries. And then, just to digress a little bit. So, for example, you're talking about Arabic community, and Arabic community wanting a particular string, and then maybe the Urdu speaking community wants to have the same string because it means different things to them. So perhaps both communities through some corporate entity, apply for the same string. And then that's what happens when you get into contention sets. Then there has to be a mechanism to determine who gets that particular stream because two people are fighting for it.

And that's part of the SubPros mandate. So it's all through the application process. Any other questions? So I'll just finish off to say that the EPDP has been going on for over a year since August last year, and we have a quite large responsibility in terms of charter. And we've in fact had to go through a charter adjustment to break down what we consider as the top level, questions regarding the top level versus questions regarding the second level, because we are also under pressure to not stop the next round from happening.

So that's why we've had to rearrange our work to deal with all the top level questions first, because the application round is to deal with apply for top level labels. But it's also been pointed out that some of the second level questions, so the second level domain questions may have also some impact in the application process. So now we're going through the motions of seeing what we need to prioritize in terms of

the second level question so as not to delay the next round from happening or the work for the next round to proceed.

And for the top level, we are in the process of, in fact, producing the first cut of the draft initial report. So we've gone through the motions of coming up with draft recommendations for all most, if not all of the charter questions to do with the top level. And we are expecting the initial report to come out sometime late April. So at ICANN76, the EPDP itself is going to go through second reading of a lot of the draft recommendations that have been worked on. So if you're interested, you can come along to the sessions.

And it's on the first day on a Saturday, it's the first two sessions of the day. Hopefully, you can follow what's going on because as I said, it's quite complicated. But it'd be interesting to watch what happens if you want a stronger appreciation of IDN variant management in order to participate more actively in the public comment, because once the initial report goes out, there's a 40-day public comment period, that's typical of ICANN. And then I'm pretty sure that ALAC will we'll be putting a comment so you can participate in that process. And presumably, it would be the ALAC team that's on this particular EPDP that will be guiding that process. That should happen late April or early May. Okay, so yes. Sorry for taking so much time.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Justine. That was really, really, really comfortable and you really made us understand such a complex topic in such a easy way. Thank you for that, and thank you for being there. We really appreciate

you, and the work that you do and represent in different policy forums and the work that you have been doing. Thank you for that. Now, let's have Satish Babu for CPWG update and UA update. Satish, the mic is yours.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Shreedeep. This is Satish for the record. So before I get to the reporting of CPWG, it's actually very little work because of the ICANN meeting next week, I'd like to share one thought about Justine's presentation. As you can see that it's a very complex EPDP even for the participants who are participating every week, because sometimes it's hard to wrap our heads around the complexity of it. It was very long, two full years for any EPDP is really long. So just to understand, the word HSBC is the name of a well-known bank, can be written in Chinese in two ways.

They both are not so different. So these are actually variants, and it is very easy to figure out why HSBC would want both variants, to own both variants, they cannot just say that we'll take one because for the Chinese people, both of them read HSBC. So that's the very idea of a variant and that is also what happens when the same entity [00:44:50 - inaudible]. The reason is that they are equivalent and therefore the entity that owns one should own all the others also, and they should move in lockstep, meaning they are transferred when the registry operators, then all of them have to be transfer it for the same reason, and this is what really drives the basic principle of the whole EPDP and IDN.

Yes, so the CPWG, we didn't have too much of discussion for the transfer to the policy we talked about, and decided the topic was about transfer emergency contact. And this is something that happens between the registry operator and the registrar. It is nothing for end users. So that is currently being discussed, there was a continued discussion on closed generics. There was also some discussions on the global public interest.

Now the global public interest [00:45:40 - inaudible] multiple contexts, and in yesterday's discussion, Alan basically pointed out that we still do not have a single definition, there are multiple definitions, and perhaps, as Alan -- his own opinion was that perhaps it is not bad to have multiple definitions, we can have for any particular context, maybe we can live with a particular definition.

So we are looking forward to the ICANN meeting next week, number of topics to be discussed, and you have seen the the policy report for the ICANN meeting next week. There are no public comments except the one on additional scripts, and we had a presentation, I think the last policy forummeeting, where we talked about .quebec, with an accented é and without an accented é.

So a couple of elements. The first is that Justine pointed out the difference between IDNs at the top level and IDNs at the second level. Now, it turns out that the policies that can be very different for these two, although it's the same IDN and same language scripts and so on, but because ICANN centralize this, and has centralized policy for the top level, the EPDP exists to work on that policy.

But at the second level, it is a matter of each registry, they have a lot of freedom deciding. So in the last meeting, we discussed that .quebec with an accented é and without an accented é, they cannot coexist, that will be one is valid as it is blocked. But the French communities want both, because they are saying they are the same. So currently, we have a problem, and we decided to kind of put out a statement. But later on, we contacted Sarman, and Sarman is saying that this particular statement was actually for the second level.

Now the second level, it turns out that .quebec with .ca already exists, and it [00:47:40 - inaudible], so let me just put it in chat. So what you see in chat is Quebec.ca, and this is of course ran by the Quebec.ca registry, and they have the freedom to create policy. We don't really have a fixed policy, because it's under the control of the registry operator, and there could be variations. Although the top level gTLD .quebec with an accent is not available, and the second level it is available. So originally, we were actually arguing for the top level, but this particular policy is not for the top level.

So, we will be putting out a statement as discussed in yesterday's CPWG. But it won't be using the top-level example, we will use the second level example. And second level, it turns out that [00:48:38 - inaudible] already have the freedom to kind of innovate. And if you try this link, it will result to quebec.ca, the ASCII quebec.ca, [00:48:48 - inaudible] registry. So that particular public comment is the only live public comment right now. It has got a deadline tomorrow, and a small team is kind of working on that, and it will be posted tomorrow before the deadline. So that is it from the policy side of things.

UA Day. So we had reported that 50 proposals were finalized, the formula being applied on one per country. However, this one per country policy had some issues. Basically, the problem was that in large countries, there's a lot of linguistic diversity, even the proposals submitted by the UA ambassadors did not get through because there's one official maybe supported by the government and that didn't get funded, and all other initiatives or proposals were rejected. So there was a bit of a problem with that people started asking why, we are UA ambassadors and our own proposals haven't kind of been approved.

So after discussions, the [00:49:53 - inaudible] yesterday decided to reconsider if there is a budget available, the proposal that was kind of promoted by UA ambassadors. So that second part is happening now. So hopefully, if ICANN is able to find some funding, there will be a few more proposals submitted by the UA leaders, that will be [00:50:18 - inaudible]. So that [00:50:20 - inaudible], but otherwise, the new planning is going on, it's quite hectic and [00:50:24 - inaudible] completely kind of drowned in planning work. There is a call out for speakers, because there are no speakers for some languages, some timezone, some countries, etc. If you're interested, please join the mailing list, you can see the activity there. And that is the end of my report. Back to you, Shreedeep.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Satish. That was the information and the examples that you gave [00:50:55 - inaudible], and I think it is these kinds of interactions that help us to dig into more topics and get more interested in this, and thank you. Now, I think let's get to the next topic in the agenda, that is

the APRALO policy forum activities, that is by me. So, certainly, we have our working document and we will try to follow that. I have tried to contact [00:51:23 - inaudible] as well, and then apart from that now, Nabeel is also there. So we will do an activity after the ICANN76 meeting, and before the other meeting.

So if you have any suggestions, any recommendations, please do forward us, and please, we have our working group document link, so you can also put it there as well as a suggestion or a comment. I'm putting down the link in here so that you can put it down. And now let's go to-- if anybody has any anything to say, please go ahead, unmute yourself.

NABEEL YASIN: Shreedeep there is a question in the in the chat from Samik. I will read it. "Is LGR a system which allocates strings for various scripts. Also confused about strings and label. Can you please simplify this?"

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Nabeel, we did answer this question. Justine did answer this question.

NABEEL YASIN: Yes, I think it's all said. Yes.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: So if anybody has any suggestions, please. Okay. Maureen, you have the floor. Please, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, Shreedeep. I wanted to actually sort of like say was that I just wanted to give people an update on what-- on the online course that I was actually doing. What I did was I-- first of all, the course was just sort of like a draft, and I so appreciated, everybody's contributions to it. I think it was really, really good. What I aim to do is when I can find somewhere to actually store it, because at the moment, it was like, for a week, I think it was 10 days, it was on the articulate sort of like site, and I'm trying to like find some way to store it.

Now, I did approach Betsy Andrews from ICANN Learn, they're not so interested in stuff that's actually sort of like geared towards RALOs. That's not an issue, that's fine, that's ICANN. But what I'm working on working on at the moment is to find some way to actually store it, and so that people can [00:54:17 - inaudible] the course and go through it. But before we even do that, I want to create a small team so that we can go over the course completely to make sure that it's sort of like the every bit, but with what we want to learn about DNS abuse and the DNS Abuse Institute.

So that's the purpose of it, and we'll move on with that later on, but I just wanted to update you so that she has like had an idea of where we're at with that anyway. Thanks, guys. And I did appreciate everybody's contribution, it was just fabulous. Thank you.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Maureen. So now let's go to the AOB section; Yeşim, can you please run the poll? So we have this poll, please do submit your answer, and we'll reveal the thing about how was today's meeting?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Okay, so this is Yeşim speaking, I'm going to end the poll as the vast majority have already voted. And here are the results?

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Yeşim. So we will be working more towards making it better. So please, forward us your suggestions, and anything? So now, the mic is to Nabeel. Nabeel, please summarize the session.

NABEEL YASIN: Thank you, Shreedeep. This is Nabeel Yasin for the record. Today, we had a great session with two main presentations. One from IDN by Justin Chew, which was great. The presentation gives us a whole idea about the history of IDN and the challenges. Also an update from Satish Babu, and we hope they have any comments or questions so that we can then share it together and learn more. I think that's all for today's session. If anyone has any comments or question, you can ask anytime. Thank you very much.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Nabeel. So I guess we are exactly on time, and I think next month, we will be having our meeting on the second week. I guess it is on 6th. Yeşim, can note that down and confirm?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Sure. Let me super quickly open up my calendar. I'm looking at [00:57:51 - inaudible] as we are doing our calls on the first Thursday of each month. Yes, it will be Thursday, 6th of April, same time, which is 06:00 UTC.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Yeşim for confirming that. Now, I'd like to say thank you to Justine, thank you to Maureen, thank you to Satish, for being there and sharing their part of the knowledge and experience that they have. And I think this is a great way of collaborating, and then we will move forward. So I'd like to officially end the call. Yeşim.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you very much, Shreedeep, and thank you all for joining today's meeting. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]