

2019-12-05 IDN Scoping Team Call

The IDN Scoping Team teleconference will take place on **Thursday, 05 December 2019 at 03:00 UTC for 60 minutes.**

For other places see: <https://tinyurl.com/qrn7el>



PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Welcome and roll call
2. Review of new Issue Scoping Document here: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/13tO5IP64EAnFebdefRahK3vuHlBzUEd1oeGFBnQVc0/edit?usp=sharing>
3. After discussing agenda item 2, revisiting the options paper: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1o_9bfmkKufrSxiJGxpNcOcfTK2VLWp5XYQvwe5qxJlc/edit?usp=sharing
4. Possible next steps
5. AOB

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

For item 2, this new issue scoping document was drafted to respond to this action item identified from a previous meeting: "Staff to identify the part of the staff papers for IDN variant TLD management that can fit in an Issue Report." This new document is in [Horizontal rule](#) tended to help determine if there is sufficient existing background documentation and resources that might make a formal Issue Report unnecessary.



RECORDINGS

[Audio Recording](#)

[Zoom Recording](#)

[Chat Transcript](#)

GNSO transcripts are located on the [GNSO Calendar](#)



PARTICIPATION

[Attendance](#)

Apologies: Aleksandar Ichokjaev, Michele Neylon, Pam Little, Ariel Liang (staff)



Notes/ Action Items

Action Item

- Staff to add SAC060 and SAC052 to the list of documents

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

NOTES

1. Welcome and roll call

- Edmon may need to leave meeting early

- Update on coordination with the SubPro PDP – SubPro leadership does not believe that the IDN work must take place in SubPro. If an IDN variants PDP is launched, it can further the related work done in SubPro and build upon it.

- Edmon has review the SubPro draft recs and they indeed seem like they can be built upon rather than needing to be overturned.

- SubPro may want to consider the technical utilization paper for the RZ-LGR, currently under Board consideration, but they should be aware that it's a fluid situation of they indeed review the document now.

- GNSO policies can be replaced by policy development taking place at a later date, so a new PDP on IDN variants could in theory develop recommendations that go against the SubPro recommendations on IDN variants.

1. Review of new Issue Scoping Document here: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/13tO5IP64EAnFebdefRahK3vuhIBzUEd1oeGFBnQVc0/edit?usp=sharing>

- Purpose of this document is to explore whether or not there is sufficient background documentation and analysis to serve as a proxy for an Issue Report, which could make an EPDP make some sense

- There is also the existing work on IDN variants taking place in SubPro

- Document is structured similarly to the substantive part of an Issue Report and make sure that all of the required elements are present.

- First part is about identifying the problems that need to be solved, which in this case come from the Board resolution (e.g., RZ-LGR must be the only source and that policies should be developed to manage IDN variant TLDs for current and future gTLDs).

- Also notes that coordination with ccNSO is needed and GNSO concerns about the process by which the IDN Guidelines are updated from version to version.

- Second section identifies the list of relevant documentation. There is also, by reference, a comprehensive list of documents related to IDN variants.

ACTION – Add SAC060 and SAC052 to the list of documents

- The list is not intended to limit what a PDP may consider, in the event something relevant arises later.

- Third part of the document is about the issues and questions a PDP should consider and address. Firstly, broken down into the two challenges. Lists out the recommendations from the staff report.

- Also lists out questions from the staff report where there may be policy implications. This list is captured verbatim from the staff paper.

- The Council did not specifically request a charter from the IDN Scoping team

- There was not a specific time frame dictated by the Council, but there is an expectation that the scoping team will provide its recommendations prior to the end of the year. Concerns expressed from Maxim about the time constraint.

1. After discussing agenda item 2, revisiting the options paper: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1o_9bfmkKufrSxiJGxpNcOcfTK2VLWp5XYQvwe5qxJlc/edit?usp=sharing

- In light of the previous discussion about what could be in an issue report, based on existing materials and analysis, what option makes the most sense?

- Option A is to leverage existing PDPs (i.e., SubPro and RPMs), Option B is to separate new gTLDs versus existing gTLDs, Option C is a PDP or EPDP, Option D is an expert working group.

- Maxim indicates that there is not support from the entire group to for an EPDP, suggestion that he should indicate why he oppose, what he prefers, and why. Also indicates that GNSO should not feel obligated to follow pace of ccNSO.

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

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

1. Possible next steps

- None, discussed above

1. AOB

- None