
ICANN79 | CF – GNSO: IDN EPDP Working Session
Saturday, March 2, 2024 – 09:00 to 10:00 SJU

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome to the IDNs working session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants and in-room participants will be given permission. In-room participants, please use the microphone. Remote participants, please use the Zoom microphone. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

I'll now hand the floor over to Donna Austin. Please begin.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks very much, Terri. And welcome, everyone, to today's call. Sorry I'm not there in person, but I don't know, a 36-hour flight for a 60-minute meeting didn't seem to make a whole lot of sense to me.

So normally we'd go around the room and introduce ourselves, but I think in the interest of time because we've only got 60 minutes we're going to get pretty much straight into it if that's okay with everybody.

Steve, I don't know if you have slides for me.

STEVE CHAN: Hi, Donna. No, you're good. We're using the documents directly.

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.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, great. Thanks, Steve.

So what I hope to get through today is to finalize our discussion on the harmonization of IDN tables. In our last call, the Registries Stakeholder Group members introduced a set of principles that they had put together. We had some discussion about that and at the end of the call we said that from a leadership perspective we would see whether we could make those principles a recommendation or implementation guidance just so that it gives a little bit more weight to the principles themselves.

So we had a long discussion about what the best approach was and how to actually try to put these into recommendations. So what we've done is we've taken the Registries Stakeholder Group Principles 2 and 3 and we've made those into recommendations.

And then we've got an implementation guidance which goes to some of the conversation we had around Sarmad's concern just to reflect that one of the things for consideration could be using a baseline dataset of variant code points that's based on the work being done by the script community. So that's Implementation Guidance 22.

What I'd like to do is.... First of all, obviously it's a bit hard for me to see who's in the room, but I think I did see Jen was there. But [while we were] going through this from a leadership perspective there were a couple of things that we were unsure about which are highlighted in yellow. And I would just for clarity like to get a better understanding of what that means, particularly what's meant by an operational process.

I'm just wondering if there's another way that we can say that, that makes it pretty much crystal clear what we're trying to get to here.

So, Jen, I don't know if you're in the room and can speak to that, or somebody from the stakeholder group. Go ahead, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Donna. I guess my first thing I wanted to do is to thank leadership for coming up with the two new recommendations, the preliminary draft of that, and also the implementation guidance.

In the current highlighted one where it says that registry operators must undertake their respective mechanisms and operational process, I think what we were trying to capture there when we were coming up with the high-level principles is that when we have that back and forth with Compliance, when we have that back and forth with Org on how we can get our IDN tables in there including other processes when we have that, that's what we mean there.

But if we list that out, it's not going to be an exhaustive list. So I do understand that keeping it at a high level describing those processes but not actually having to list out a list is a probably the best way for us to capture that.

I think probably Dennis can speak a little bit more to that as well. If there are any other operational items or a way to describe that, I think that would be helpful if you think that makes it clearer in the actual Recommendation 20. I'm going to stop here to see if he wants to add a little bit more on that before I go to 21.

DONNA AUSTIN: Jen, before we move from you, there's something else I'd like to clarify here in the principle. Are you talking about this from an individual registry operator's perspective? Which is what I think you're getting at, but I just want to be 100% sure.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Yes, and also collectively as well because there are things that affect the entire Registries Stakeholder Group. We would also want to make sure that is captured. But what I described earlier is the individual process that each RO does go through with Org and staff. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Jen. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. I think in general the second part captures what we...speaks to the principles that we've shared with the group.

The first part, what I see here is we keep insisting harmonization as a--I don't know how to describe it—but harmonization is the outcome, right? Make things consistent. And I think there is an argument here that we're trying to get around it is that make it consistent with something, and we're discussing what's that something?

But at the same time, there is why are we doing this. We don't just want to say harmonize all IDN tables to this thing. What's the because? My concern is that we don't have all the answers in terms of how languages

work. So I'm just thinking along just to bring the example of Quebec. I mean, how the French treat or not treat variants in their language, and would that impose other rules in other languages? And so we were going to create rules that....

I'm just trying to get my head around what are we going to do there. It's not harmonization, per se, what we want. I think we're talking about a more basic thing here. It's what are the minimum standard requirements to deploy at the second level.

Say that we want to, for example, address the homoglyph for Unicode, the Unicode homoglyph issue. Okay, so let's focus on that problem regardless of what is the script, regardless of what is the language. What are the minimum rules to address that problem?

Harmonization is going to be just a way to get there, but it's not the end goal.

That's what I have been advocating for. Let's remove this conversation from harmonization to what's the problem that we want to solve for. And we can get, we the operators, can solve for the problems in different ways. It's not just make these IDN tables consistent, right? There are ways to address those problems in a technical manner that is efficient, we can apply to our legacy systems and move forward. And that's why I've been advocating let's decouple the conversation from harmonization to what are the rules that we want as a community in those tables.

And we have a baseline for the ICANN IDN guidance for the second-level domain names. We can augment those as far as [reading]. There's a first

step. I think there is language in Version 4.1 to encourage addressing those issues. We can take the following a step into really looking at the issues and collecting the dataset and defining what are the rules that we want in there.

So I hope that makes sense. Again, I think harmonization is just skipping a step. It's focusing too much on the outcome and not really the problem. So that's my two cents. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. So I guess a bit of a challenge that I have, I can understand what you're saying, but the charter question is really about harmonization. So that's the question we're trying to answer or the problem we're trying to solve. Okay, I see you're hand is up. So if you can add to that, that would be helpful.

DENNIS TAN:

Yeah, thank you. So if that was the question, I think we answer it. The recommendation right now as it states—or I see there is a new version—so the older version said registries must have consistent rules in their gTLDs. So they make it consistent.

The question was then later added on, okay, but make it consistent with something else. And that's where we were going in circles as to what is that something else. And we say, okay, let's figure out what the problems are in a future, for example, ICANN IDN Guidance Version 5 something, right? That we be the next evolutionary step.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Steve, would you mind just scrolling back to the charter question, please. And, Steve, if you had something in response, could you add that now? And then I'll come to you, Michael.

STEVE CHAN: Yeah, thanks, Donna. I guess I just wanted to clarify one thing. (It seems really loud. Let me back up a little bit.) Dennis mentioned another recommendation about the consistency of the tables. I just want to clarify and make sure that that recommendation very much still exists. It's our Preliminary Recommendation 1. So this additional layer I think you're talking about of the requirements of what harmonization means, that's what this is right here. So the consistency aspect is definitely still there.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Steve. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Michael, for the record. Yeah, also wanted to respond to Dennis. He said consistency and asking consistent compared to what. I think the consistency is meant to be within the TLD. That all IDN tables within a single TLD plus optionally all variant TLDs must be consistent with each other. That's one part of the harmonization. That's, I think, the easiest part because that can technically be checked and that's clearly defined.

The other more complex part of the harmonization is the problem with cross-script variants or characters which look the same in different scripts and that those must not be allowed to coexist next to each other

in registrations. This is not easily definable because this always depends...it's subjective so to say not objectively clear.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Donna. From an end user perspective, the issue of consistency is somewhat clear as both Dennis and Michael mentioned. It is that the TLD behaves in a predictable manner from an end user perspective. If that's the case, then we have...that is the objective that I would look at.

I would also support the present formulation because it doesn't really reduce the flexibility for the registries. They are allowed to implement it in a way that they see fit, and I think that is where we should leave it. Not tighten it any further, but not loosen it either. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Satish. So when you say stay with what we already had, are you talking about the team response that's in the box here?

SATISH BABU: No, I'm talking about the preliminary recommendation below that we looked at earlier.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Okay, so can we go back to the preliminary recommendation? Okay, thanks.

So I'd like to hear from others. Dennis, I think we are getting at it seems to be.... I mean, I understand what you're saying about what's the problem we're trying to solve. But I think you've kind of taken it up what seems to me to be at another level.

Obviously, we've got a question here that's specifically related to harmonization, and that's why we're focused on that. But I went back to the conversations that we had last week as well, and I get the sense that what you're suggesting is that there may be future work for the IDN implementation guideline working group whatever future version of that there is to look at the implementation of IDNs and variants at the second level and perhaps the top level once that there's been some period of time where variants have been implemented at the top and second level.

So that's kind of what I was reading from or getting the sense from when I read back through last week's call. And I kind of think that's similar to what I'm hearing from you today. So it's not specifically about harmonization. It's broader than that.

But I guess that the little bit of a challenge I'm having here is that we're specifically talking about harmonization. So Preliminary Recommendation 20 is pretty much what happens now in that registry operators with their tables they do work with ICANN Org and the baseline is follow IDNA2008 and then the implementation guidelines. And then Preliminary Recommendation 21 is a little bit beyond that and I think could go further than harmonization.

Dennis?

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Donna. The other point that I wanted to stress, and Jennifer shared that in writing, is the principle. Continuing the path of talking about harmonization with the root zone LGR, it just creates...it's a step too far. That's where we are coming from.

We understand the nature of the DNS. It's a delegation system. ICANN manages the root. TLD registries manage the second-level and the top-level domain names. And there is an implied dotted line between the root and the TLDs. But when we're going down the path of harmonization we believe it is a step too far because it's saying now that root zone adopts certain rules, then you second-level TLDs need to adopt those as well. Without any consideration as far as the implication operational, all the things that need to be taken into account before we can deploy registration rules, restrictions, or what have you at the second level.

And that's why I'm saying it's wrong to talk about harmonization because harmonization, again, is an outcome. What are the problems that we want to solve for at second level? I think if we focus on that, on the problem that we want to solve for, and based on my understanding of what Sarmad and Pitinan have shared with us is the concern about the Unicode homoglyphs that have been found in the root zone among other things.

So that's a problem. That's an issue. We can solve for that. But it's not by way saying you need to harmonize. There are different ways we can solve for those issues, and there are products out there that certain

registries offer their customers as a way to solve for those issues. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Any other input or thoughts from folks? So I get the sense that Preliminary Recommendation 20 is okay. We could move forward with that. We probably need to spell out a little bit what we mean by operation process. But I'm not sure that we're good on Recommendation 21. Satish and then Edmon.

SATISH BABU: Actually, my hand is for Edmon, so pass it on to him.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry. Oh, okay. Thank you. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Sorry, I'm having a lot of trouble getting into two Zoom rooms and they keep kicking me out. So probably a new Zoom feature here that I'm struggling with. Sorry about it.

DONNA AUSTIN: [Oversubscribed.]

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. I guess in response to Dennis, I guess the idea at least from the discussion about harmonization is to use that word so that it's not complete conformity. It's not equivalent to whatever other TLDs and so

on. So the idea, at least for me, the requirement or the concept of harmonization is much more in the sense of the second-level registrations than it is within that TLD different language tables should be harmonized between each other.

So I think you're trying to say some harmonization across TLDs, which is good to have but not necessarily the requirement that at least I think we're trying to think about. It is within a particular TLD or the variant set. The second-level registrations, if it is using different language tables and if there is either overlap of code points or if there are code points that are homoglyphs of each other between different language tables, if you will, then there needs to be a process within the registry to harmonize those code points.

I think that is what we're talking about. And then your concern about it having to follow what the root zone LGR does and second levels need to follow should not be the case. If it is, then I want to hear about that. Because I think what, at least the original intention, is that within the TLD it has to be consistent and that's what harmonization is about.

Across TLDs or even to the root level, that's not an issue. It should not be an issue in itself. Of course, the root zone LGR, there's a lot of effort put in place to do harmonization and we can learn from that and maybe we can "reference" it, not necessarily have it as a standard to go for. But at least the thinking behind it and how it was done is something that registries can learn from.

And then at the second level the harmonization happens maybe with similar methodologies, similar thinking but not necessarily exactly the

same code points mapping together. Because each registry may be serving different communities that see things slightly differently.

So I just want to throw that out and to make sure that, at least in my mind, harmonization means that. And if we try to choose another word, we'll have to define that other word again. Let's stick with this and use it because the idea of harmonization is that. It's not complete uniformity. There is some harmonization but not necessarily completely conforming. That's the idea.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Edmon. So Saewon put the Preliminary Recommendation 1 in the chat a little while ago. So just to be clear that the recommendation that IDN variants tables, if any, must be harmonized. We do have that as a recommendation. The how is something that we agreed is at the discretion of registry operators. And Sarmad and Pitinan raised some concern about the how, so we asked that they go off and have a conversation with registries about how that might be done and whether there should be a baseline.

From what I'm hearing, I don't think there's any agreement that that should be the case. And even what you're saying, Edmon, I'm thinking that you're pretty much saying things consistent with what the registries are. So there doesn't have to be a baseline consistency adopted by registry operators in the implementation or in the harmonization of their tables with the second level. I think that's what I'm hearing. How it happens is still at the discretion of the registry operators.

I've got Satish, Dennis, and then Sarmad.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Donna. I support what you've just posed. There is value in using a consistent terminology, and for us right now it is the word harmonization. Now if there is something that the registries do not want to be brought under this broad label, that we can definitely look at. That means there's a more precise way to define what is harmonization but more importantly what it is not. So that should be considered, in my opinion. But otherwise, I support what is said. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, thanks, Satish. I don't think we're suggesting that we move away from what we understand by harmonization. I think we're still pretty sound in that regard. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you, Donna. Just to clarify, you earlier said that in KL, we had discussed that harmonization is agreed on. And I just wanted to say that what we were raising was not the process. I think that part each registry can decide how to do the harmonization.

I guess we are more focused on the result, and what we were raising in KL was that to actually get to that result the software process is not really important. That's a registry specific implementation. But the data which is being used to get to that is what we were at that time suggesting that there are examples where one would need to refer to some more, I guess, baseline sources to determine what that data is.

Just to give you an example, if there are two IDN tables within a registry which do not define, for example, a variant between Latin and Cyrillic, then data which do identify that those two code points are, for example, homoglyphs may be outside those IDN tables from within a registry, maybe somewhere in root zone LGR, a reference LGR, or some baseline data which can be developed in collaboration with RySG or other stakeholders.

So that's.... But I think what we were saying is that there needs to be some reference data to do it, not necessarily the process. It would be registry specific. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Sarmad. So this is what I'm having a little bit of a challenge with, right? The process is at the discretion of the registry operators, but what you're suggesting is that there should be a consistent approach to the outcome. And to me, that takes away the discretionary element of the registry operator to decide how to harmonize the tables. So it's the introduction of a baseline dataset that registry operators would have to follow.

So maybe there's a bit of a nuance here but it sounds like in requiring that, that would actually affect the process by which the registry operators had to do the harmonization because you would be looking for a specific outcome. And I think in doing that, you're taking away that discretionary aspect for registries and how they harmonize their tables. So I think that's the rub that we have. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Donna. I guess I just wanted to clarify one thing, or maybe I got it wrong, but IG22 talks about that minimum dataset but I don't see a reference to the RZ-LGR. So it says in collaboration with Org that that minimum dataset be developed, but it doesn't specify that it needs to be the RZ-LGR. So it doesn't make a reference to what that dataset is, just that it should be worked on collaboratively. So I don't know if that helps, so I was just looking at the comments from Dennis and Jennifer in the chat. So I hope that helps. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Steve. So I just want to ask Dennis and maybe Jen, when you talk about the baseline dataset that we refer to in the implementation guidance, is that essentially adopting the root zone LGR and we're just saying it a different way? Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Thank you, Steve, for pointing that out. Yes, this is the language that was delivered I think a few days ago so not fully reviewed and think about this. I think it's a reaction to the registries' input in terms of the principles and how we see the problem to move ahead and progress.

So I've been thinking about, and that's going back to my remarks earlier, let's focus on what problem do we want to solve. We can create a dataset, minimum requirements, rules, what have you. That's why we're saying let's not solve this by policy saying you have to do this instead of we recognize there are issues that we want to address and

have an established process such as the IDN implementation guidelines to look at the issues.

I don't know if we want to go into maybe scoping what the issues are, but that's what this dataset I think is referring to. Creating the minimum—we don't have to call it dataset. That's kind of old. So looking for a specific way, template, or what have you. I think what we want to do is to work on what are the rules that we...what is the problem that we want to solve for and what are the specific items that we want to address. And then registries can solve for those issues.

But starting with the root zone LGR and taking wholesale is a no-go. The root zone LGR is meant, it was not designed, and the procedure that governed how the root zone LGR was developed is not for the second level. It was not designed for second level. You have to start adding hyphens and digits and then, okay, so what do the hyphens and digits do to the rest of the repertoire. There were code points that were removed from the repertoire of the root zone because they were not conservative enough. But they are okay for the second level. So what does that do to this whole repertoire? So you start doing that, adding and removing, and then the new thing is not the root zone LGR anymore.

So let's focus on what do we want to solve for, what do we want to see at the second level and address those issues without harmonizing. Because at that point harmonizing is, again, it's just harmonization means make things consistent. And you can say all IDN tables are consistent in a way that they have to refer to one script. That's

consistency, harmonized. I don't know. I'm just going in circles right now, I think.

I think there's opportunity to improve upon this language. I think we are progressing. But, yeah, it's just those principles that we want to not break, management of the root for ICANN, management of the second-level domain names to the TLD registries.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, thanks, Dennis. Michael and then Jennifer.

MICHAEL BAULAND:

Yes, as Steve said in the chat, I think the problem is quite clear in the sense that we want to make sure that the IDN tables that are used by the registries or the way they use the IDN tables must ensure that it's not possible to register two domain names which look exactly that same or almost the same if they are not also belonging to the same entity, so if they are not variants. And this requirement I think is one part of the harmonization.

The other part, the more clear one, is the consistency in the sense that independently of which IDN table was in a TLD you use, you should not get two different variant sets and that's a consistency question.

But this first part that I mentioned about the harmonization, that is a more unspecified, more vague problem because it's not objectively clear which code points are too similar to disallow them to coexist in different domains. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: So I think Michael did articulate one of the main concerns that Sarmad and team and also we talked about in our internal calls about the cross code points, the variant code points.

But I just want to take a little step back here. I think this preliminary language, I don't think the registries have had enough time to actually really dive into it. I think it's a very good starting point, and we might have to massage the language a little bit more here.

I think Dennis has also articulated a lot of concerns that were raised during our internal discussions as well. There was a discussion that it might have been a little bit of concern for some registries when we're just calling out work done by the script communities. Specifically because there isn't a huge amount of participation within the Registries Stakeholder Group in these communities, and there was a little bit of concern of just like, hey, we're going to take this work and wholesale put it in.

I think there might be a little more comfort if we specify the higher level requirements and principles instead of just calling out the specific piece of work. So my recommendation here is maybe if we can take out the words--I don't really want to wordsmith right now—but if we take out implementation guidance baseline dataset. If we're looking at within cross script variant code points and we take out script communities, we are articulating that is what we're looking at.

The work done by the script communities, that is one source of it. If we're looking at Preliminary Rec 21, if we're going to look at it in a wider scope, that could be one of the things that this group could consider. But just calling it out in a singular manner in Implementation Guidance 22 is probably a little uncomfortable for some in the registries.

I hope I didn't make it more difficult for our discussion right now. I'm going to stop before I go back to 21 again.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jen. So I don't know that you've made it any more complicated than it already is. I'm wondering how folks would feel about...I think in the recommendations that we had in Phase 1 we had a recommendation in there that after a certain period of time there—and I can't recall what number recommendation this was—that after a certain period of time there would be a review by ICANN Org, relevant stakeholders and whatever to put together a set of best practice guidelines for IDNs and their variants at the top level.

And I wonder whether we could possibly think about doing something similar for the second level. But given this is kind of I guess it's more technically focused in that we know that harmonization happens now with IDN tables. Not by all registry operators but by probably a good many of them. They may do it differently. We don't know because there's never been any thorough analysis of that.

We have for the first time we're introducing a policy recommendation that says harmonization of IDN tables at the second level does have to happen. So I'm wondering in considering Preliminary

Recommendation 21 whether we could take that as a kind of overarching recommendation for the...you know, maybe it's future work for the implementation guideline working group to look at issues for the second level introduction of variants and whether that's how we deal with this.

Because I'm not hearing that we're going to get agreement on this in order to get recommendation language in the initial report if we want full consensus from it. And I've got my eye on getting that initial report out. So my sense is that we have maybe Recommendation 20, but we look at doing something a little bit more strategic for Recommendation 21 in that it's a full review of the implementation of variants at the second level after a period of time that variants have been introduced to the top level.

So I just wanted to throw that out for consideration. So I don't think, sadly, I don't know that we'll be in a position to finalize this today. And I don't know that there's opportunity during the week to get this group back together and see whether there's any progress. But I know Jen has suggested that perhaps there's a way to finesse Implementation Guidance 22 that takes out the baseline dataset and also the cross group or the work being done by the script communities.

Because it's not really inclusive of registry operators. So the operational perspective of a registry operator isn't being taken into consideration I'm assuming by the script communities. So maybe there's a way to change the wording or finesse the wording in Implementation Guidance 22.

So can I...I guess what I'd like to know is whether there is at a minimum agreement that we can move forward with Preliminary Recommendation 20. And that would replace the existing text we have for C(5). Any initial thoughts from the registries or registrars, ALAC? I don't know if the GAC is in the room. Okay, it looks like everyone is.... Sorry, Michal. Go ahead.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yeah, just a question. Suggest replacing the previous text by Preliminary Recommendation 20 and this 21 should be removed? I didn't quite understand.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Michael. I'm just trying to do this in a pragmatic way. So I understand there are still problems with Recommendation 21, but I want to see if folks at a minimum are okay with Recommendation 20 and that that would replace the current text we have in C(5). Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks. Did you mean that if we...? Sorry, can you scroll back up so I know what we're talking about. Did you mean to replace this text that's currently in this box?

DONNA AUSTIN: Correct.

JENNIFER CHUNG: I think that in all of our internal discussions in the registries that we were actually quite happy with this text. I don't really see that there is a big conflict between keeping this text and also having actual recommendations. Unless this is not something that's usually done in the report. I just want to get some clarity on this because I'm not...

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Jen. So if the recommendation was to replace this text, we would still maintain this text. It would come into the rationale, so we wouldn't lose the text. But the conversation we had last week is in order to give meaning, I suppose, to the principles that the registries had agreed to a policy recommendation would be the way forward. But the other option is we keep what's in the box here and we just reference that they registries had come up with a set of principles and that will just get lost in the rationale. So there would be no action, I suppose, on the principles that the registries had developed.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Donna, for clarifying. Yes, if we actually move this text to rationale, we're okay with that. I'm not going to answer the first part of your question regarding the Recommendation 20 because I still think there is need for registries to really just kind of huddle and talk about this because it has been not very long since we started looking at this new text.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay.

JENNIFER CHUNG: I think the registries do have a will to actually get together, have a huddle here in San Juan to be able to forward this work. So, I mean, I can at least try to get that together with the registries and people who are interested to talk about this.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Jen. All right, so I think we're going to have to draw a line under this. And Satish has said he's okay with this. He's a plus-one to Recommendation 20 and happy to receive inputs from the registries.

So I'm getting probably a sense I'm getting a little bit antsy to get this done so that we can get the initial report finalized and out for public comment. I think I had a conversation with the GNSO Council last week and said that our publishing date is set for 25 June. Now, look, if that slips, it slips. I'll just have to go back to the Council and let them know. So we'll hopefully be in a position to finalize this and find language that's acceptable to all to move forward and not lose the meaning or intent of the conversations that we've had.

Steve, we've only got 10 minutes left. So I think we've got the revised language from two other recommendations, one being the registration data.

STEVE CHAN: Correct. It's on screen. Did you want me to run through that, or did you want to do it yourself?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, if you wouldn't mind running through it, I'd appreciate it.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Donna. I will try to do my best Ariel impression. She drafted this text, so I'll try to speak to it in a faithful manner. And I think people are laughing because I'll probably fail that, but anyway.

I think this part will hopefully be a little bit simpler because I think what we're trying to do is just clarify language. And the purpose of raising it here is just, I think, to get validation that what we've changed is proper. And I don't think it's going to have quite the long discussion as we just had.

So the purpose in the amendments we made here was to try to clean up language and references and to make it accurate in respect of RDDS and RDAP. And I think what the group concluded is that the references to RDAP were not accurate. And we want to pay attention and focus more on the query aspect of it, and so that's what we did. We changed references to RDDS and removed all references to RDAP.

So that's essentially what we did. We checked in with one of our resident experts Caitlin Tubergen who supported all of the reg data PDPs and still supports that now. And she helped make sure that we have this language as accurate as possible. So we think we got it right. Actually, I didn't share the link in chat. Thanks, Saewon. So any thoughts? Has anyone taken a look at the text, made sure that they think what we changed is accurate or inaccurate?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Steve. And one note on the recommendation is that we took out the reference to RDAP. We also took out the reference to, I think, end user. Because we understand that if we say end user, then we can have long arguments about what we mean by end user. So we just focused on the query and then the implementation guidance, that's when we bring in the RDDS and provide the minimum of what we're looking at or what we're trying to get to. Rick?

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Donna. Rick Wilhelm, PIR. I'm not on the EPDP, but I have been working with Dennis and Jennifer and others in the small team. I'm also leading the RDAP working group with the contracted parties. I made a rather extensive comment on this internally and since no one else is saying anything I just wanted to come up here.

I wanted to make sure that everybody knew that one of the reasons why this drew some extensive comments from the registries was that the RDDS responses are part of the contracts in the way that things are structured. And thus, they are not...the PDPs can't directly change those things because they're subject to contractual...they're part of the contract.

So the way that they work right now is that the responses are governed by the RDAP profile, and so what the PDPs can do is say this policy is going to cause a change to the RDDS responses and we need ICANN Org and the contracted parties to make some changes to the RDAP profile to come in sync with the policy recommendations. Take a look at that and make some changes and then come back to us and we'll make sure

that implementation is in line with the policy recommendations as opposed to the PDP going and specifying the RDAP output.

It's a little bit of an esoteric point, but that's one of the things that's going on here. Which is why the PDP doesn't just line item out what the changes are.

There's also something in here about the...I think this is the one. Is this the one, Dennis, where all of the other...? Yeah, in 17.2 coming out with all of the variants themselves, right? Querying which is not really a function of the RDDS. So if that's going to be needed, I think that's probably some other service but the RDDS doesn't do that. That's something that the RDDS...it only gives back information on names that are essentially allocated, but it doesn't do that kind of variant translation. So it's not that it's not a valid mechanism, but that's not part of the RDS. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Rick. Michael?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes, to respond to Rick's comment, the 17.2 is just stating to return the existing, the allocated variants. So it's not returning the whole set that the IDN table creates. And in that context, I think it's okay for the RDDS because it's supposed to return information about a certain domain and also the properties of that domain. It returns the name servers, the contacts, and also the existing variants makes sense to me in that context. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, I'd agree with that, the allocated ones. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Michael. Okay, thanks, Rick. I think the point with this recommendation is that with the introduction of variants how do we ensure that anyone looking for information about a domain name understands that, will get the complete picture that the domain name they're querying is part of a variant set and there are certain requirements with that?

And so while I appreciate RDDS may not currently be the service that could provide that information, I think what we're looking for here is something that will fill that gap. So we're kind of trying to give whoever the end user is or whoever is looking for information the complete information that it's part of a variant set and these are the other labels. So I take it that RDDS may not be able to do that, but we're trying to, the intent of the recommendation is to try to fill a gap. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Donna. I just wanted to validate an assumption we made in drafting 17.2. You'll see that it doesn't reference reg data here. And so that's intentional on our part, and I see Dennis nodding at least. So the allocated variant domain names, it's just the domain names and not the reg data of all those allocated variant domain names. So I think we got the captured accurately, but we just wanted to validate that point with you all. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Steve. So I suppose this language is out on the list. So if anyone has any objections, could you please note them on the email list? Otherwise, we'll put this in...this will get into the initial report. And there's still going to be time. We still have to read through the initial report, so you'll have time to do that.

But we are out of time, so we're going to have to close it out. Thanks, everybody. Have a good meeting, and I don't know. We'll work out what the next steps are in the next, when everybody's back home. Thanks, Steve. Thanks, team.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]