

# 2021-09-02 IDNs EPDP - Meeting #04

The call for the IDNs EPDP team will take place on **Thursday, 02 September 2021 at 13:00 UTC for 60 minutes.**

For other places see: <https://tinyurl.com/4ex5bsh5>

## PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Roll Call & SOI Updates
2. Welcome & Chair Updates
  - EOI process for new Chair
  - Data & metrics
3. Initial review of charter questions (continued) – Topics C-G
4. Early outreach to SO/AC/SG/Cs
5. Begin deliberations on Topic A: Consistent definition and technical utilization of RZ-LGR
6. AOB
  - Next call: 9 September at 13:00 UTC

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

## RECORDINGS

[Audio Recording](#)

[Zoom Recording](#)

[Chat Transcript](#)

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

## PARTICIPATION

[Attendance-CRM](#)

**Apologies:** Tomslin Samme-Nlar

## Notes/ Action Items

IDNs EPDP – Notes and Action Items

Meeting #4 on 2 September 2021

Action Items:

**ACTION ITEM 1:** Members to read background documents included in Edmon's welcome email and confirm when they have done so [here](#). The welcome email is available at: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-epdp-idn-team/2021-July/000002.html>

**ACTION ITEM 2:** Members and participants to review the data and metrics part of the charter on page 19 and think about whether other data and metrics would be useful for the group to consider in deliberating on charter questions.

Notes:

1. Roll Call & SOI Updates
2. Welcome & Chair Updates

- EOI reminder – Edmon will begin serving on the ICANN Board at the AGM. The EOI process is now open to identify a replacement EPDP Chair: <https://www.icann.org/en/announcements/details/call-for-expressions-of-interest-chair-of-epdp-internationalized-domain-names-1-9-2021-en>.
- Edmon will be talking with the ICANN executive team and legal counsel about his transition and will keep the group updated on these discussions. For now, the goal is to keep the work going without interruption.
- Data & metrics – Everyone is encouraged to review the data and metrics part of the charter on page 19 and think about whether other data and metrics would be useful for the group to consider in deliberating on charter questions. This will be discussed further as the group gets into the substantive deliberations on the specific topics

### 3. Begin initial review of charter questions (continued) – Topics C-G

- Question regarding the exercise: Both Topics A & B came back with a estimation of a “medium” level of effort. Is this accurate?
- This exercise is just to get an initial sense of the expected workload for the purposes of building an initial draft work plan for the group. The work plan will be delivered to the GNSO Council so that the Council can monitor the progress of the group, manage the process, and troubleshoot if there are issues that need to be resolved. The estimates do not need to be exact.
- Comment: The working group should aim to create a work plan that is as accurate as possible with the available information.
- If the working group needs to change more time than originally expected in the work plan, it will deliver a “project change request” to the GNSO Council.
- Topic C: “Same entity” and the second-level: estimated level of effort: High = 10+ call hours: (4/20): 20%; Medium = 5 to 10 call hours (12/20): 60%; Low = < 5 call hours: (4/20): 20%
- Comment: There may be cases where two different legal entities have rights to variants but suddenly only one survives, and two strings should belong to one of the entities. There may be legal implications that have not yet been investigated and will require some time from this group.
- Comment: There are two tracks: One where you are changing the definition of an existing IDN implementation in a TLD and the names already exist and you make changes to the variant mapping based on the sources you choose. That is problematic when you have to decide one or the other based on rights. The second is you introduce IDNs to an existing namespace and no names are registered in that IDN, so that is determined before all of that happens.
- We might want data points on what existing registrations look like – how many would have a conflict if RGZ-LGRs are applied over them.
- Topic D: Adjustments in registry agreement, registry service, registry transition process, and other processes/procedures related to the domain name lifecycle: estimated level of effort: High = 10+ call hours: (12/19): 63%; Medium = 5 to 10 call hours (4/19): 21%; Low = < 5 call hours: (3/19): 16%
- Topics D & E are the administrative processes that are required. For D there are 8 questions covering a wide range of issues. Looking at the mapping document, a lot of it has been covered to some extent.
- For this topic, we are not talking about writing the legal language in the Registry Agreement. This subject is just about the policies for what needs to change in these things.
- We are only focused on the elements that need to change with respect to specific subjects that this EPDP covers.
- Registry Transition Process is a potential for IDN conflicts if the RST phase does not accept the incumbent RSP's implementation of a language/script and requires the use of a new LGR (better defined but can contain conflicts such as new variant mapping, more or less code points and new or different context rules).
- We are going to change some basic elements and need to consider all the dependencies on a procedural level. This may take time.
- Clarification: The focus on this exercise is to estimate the time required for the Working Group to consider topics for policy recommendations, not necessarily timelines for each TLD process and specific Registry Agreements.
- Topic E: Adjustments to objection process, string similarity review, string contention resolution, reserved strings, and other policies and procedures: High = 10+ call hours: (5/17): 29%; Medium = 5 to 10 call hours (9/17): 53%; Low = < 5 call hours: (3/17): 18%
- Many of these topics were covered in SubPro. This group will be focused on considering what the SubPro WG has already looked into. We are not looking to second guess the results of that process.
- There will be an IRT for SubPro. This group should coordinate with the IRT and review what it comes up with to make sure there are no holes. It is primarily an oversight function, and therefore may require less effort than some of the other topics.
- On the other hand, this topic covers all procedures related to new gTLDs and will change the process for reviewing applications, so it may take a lot of time.
- Topic F: Adjustments in registration dispute resolution procedures and trademark protection mechanisms: High = 10+ call hours: (2 /17): 12%; Medium = 5 to 10 call hours (10/17): 59%; Low = < 5 call hours: (5/17): 29%
- Comment: This is a complicated issue. It is possible for an intellectual property owner to have rights in the registered name but not variants or vice versa. Finding out legal implications and whether transfers can be ordered is difficult. This might take time even though there are only two questions.
- This group might need to ask for help on this topic from other groups to inform final discussion. This is also a topic where additional data and metrics may be needed.
- Putting this task of developing the work plan in perspective, we have likely overestimated or underestimated on some of these topics. It will likely even out. In a worst-case scenario, we have the option to go to the Council and adjust the timeline.
- If we want to take a conservative approach, we can estimate on the high end of the ranges specified in the polls.
- Topic G: Process to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines: High = 10+ call hours: (6/20): 30%; Medium = 5 to 10 call hours (10 /20): 50%; Low = < 5 call hours: (4/20): 20%
- Some uncertainty on this topic.
- More might be brought our way under this topic. IDN Implementation Guidelines 4.0 have not been adopted. The Working Group may need to consider the path forward.
- Comment: It is surprising that this topic came back as medium and so did Topic F. The representation of different expertise is not balanced on the call. The leadership team should take this into account as it builds the work plan.

### 4. Early outreach to SO/AC/SG/Cs

- This is a standard step in the EPDP/PDP. The working group will ask SO/AC/SG/Cs for early input on the topics included in the charter.
- This step is somewhat of a duplication of effort, since the groups have an opportunity to provide input through their representatives in the EPDP.
- Based on conversations to date, it appears that the charter questions are fit for purpose for early outreach and staff can go ahead and draft a cover letter asking for early input on the charter questions (with charter questions appended). The WG will have an opportunity to review the draft document before it is sent.
- If anyone has concerns with this approach, they should reply on list.

4. Begin deliberations on Topic A: Consistent definition and technical utilization of RZ-LGR

- This item will be started on the next call.

5. AOB

ACTION ITEM 1: Members and participants to read background documents included in Edmon's welcome email and confirm when they have done so [here](#). The welcome email is available at: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-epdp-idn-team/2021-July/000002.html>

ACTION ITEM 2: Members and participants to review the data and metrics part of the charter on page 19 and think about whether other data and metrics would be useful for the group to consider in deliberating on charter questions.

- Next call: 9 September at 13:00 UTC