
ICANN82 | CF – GNSO: Latin Script Diacritics PDP Working Group
Saturday, March 08, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 PST

TERRI AGNEW

Hello and welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP Working Group. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor back over to Michael Bauland. Please begin.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Hello. Welcome to the Latin script Diacritics PDP. Next slide, please. This is the first meeting of the PDP and we have a quite packed agenda to go through. So we need to be short on certain topics and we will mostly do the discussions of our topics in later sessions. This is mainly the introductory session to see that everybody's on the same page. Next slide, please. And next slide, please. And let's kick off with the introduction. Everybody could briefly talk about themselves, who they are, then what is the background? We should keep this as short as possible. So not more than a minute. And I will start and then can we go through the room. For the remote

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.

participants, maybe you can raise your hand and then we can call you once the room has finished. So let me start with myself. My name is Michael. I'm from Germany. I work for a software company in Germany. We have several software products like a registry back-end. And I've been involved in ICANN with the IDN topics for several years now. I've been a member of the Latin Generation panel and also been part of the ID EPDP. So continue with Mark, please.

MARK DATYSGELD

Thank you very much for the introduction. I'm Mark Datysgeld. I have been working in the Universal Acceptance Community for the past eight years or so. I come from Brazil. I have been an Ambassador for the Americas for Universal Acceptance and went to different countries in Latin America to map these issues. I have been developing research for universal acceptance and IDNs, and some publications from the USG are altered by my consultancy. And I represent the Business Constituency in spirit. But in this group I'm representing solely myself and the Universal Acceptance Community.

PRUDENCE MALINKI

Thank you. Hi, this is Prudence Malinke. I represent the GNSO Council. I'm the Council liaison for the group today. I work for a corporate registrar called Mark Monitor, but I'll be primarily here as GNSO Council Liaison. Thanks.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

Sarmad Hussain. I'm with the IDN UA program at ICANN. Thank you.

DAVID BEDARD

Hi everybody, I'm David Bedard. I'm the GAC rep for Canada. So I'm at ISED Canada or our long name which is Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada. It's great to be here. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Hi, my name is Sebastien Ducos. I usually say it with a more Anglo accent but I'm French. I have not participated in the earlier IDN work but I've been following it. I speak seven languages, six of which are written in Latin, five of which have got diacritics. And even though my name I spell without the accent, I misspell my name without the accent because I gave up on English keyboards long ago. I think we should restore them.

LOUIS HOULE

But I keep adding the accent when I send you an email. My name is Louis Houle. I'm on the Board of dot-Quebec. I've been on Board for quite a while now. Very interested in that topic. Listen, I'm an ICANN old-timer since 2009, and these are the topics I've been always involved in and interested in. And diacritics is to me really central for the IDN success.

SATISH BABU

Hi, my name is Satish Babu. I'm a member of ALAC and based out of India. I've been working with the IDNs and UA from its inception and I've been a member of the EPDP on IDNs, and with Louis and the Canadian communities, we've been pushing this agenda on diacritics for quite some time now. Thank you.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

Hello all, I'm Tapani Tarvainen from Finland, actually working for Electronic Frontier Finland now, not the foundation mind you, but

I've had a long career at university and I've been ... Well, I've not been involved with the IDN work in ICANN before but I have been involved in various conflicts in IDN domain names on the second level in Finland. So I have some idea what's going on and I'm a techie deep down. I run my own nameserver and so on just for fun. So I have an idea of what these technical problems are that are involved. Thank you.

EMMANUEL VITUS

So hi, my name is Emmanuel Vitus. I was in the IDN EPDP representing the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and I'll be representing the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group in this working group. So same as Tapani, I'm a French speaker as my native language and I think I will have some fun as well bringing the French perspective to the conversation. Thanks.

BILL JOURIS

Hello, my name is Bill Jouris. I'm a resident of the United States, about 2,000 kilometers south of here, which for those of us in the western part of this continent is a day's drive, which is what I'm going to do going home. I have been a member of At-Large for the past several years. And before that, along with Michael, I spent seven years on the Latin Generation panel, generating the problem that we're addressing here today. Thank you.

JOHN EMERY

Hello everyone. I'm John Emery. I'm part of ICANN Org and I'll be supporting Saewon Lee in this PDP and I look forward to working with all of you.

-
- STEVE CHAN I'm Steve Chan, ICANN Org GNSO support staff, also supporting our fearless leadership team, not just Saewon, but the leadership team.
- SAEWON LEE Hi, my name is Saewon Lee. I'm also with ICANN Org from staff. Again stressing what Steve said, we are here to support you, the team, the leadership, in making sure that this PDP working group goes to the finish line. Thank you.
- STEVE CHAN Now just to address the queue we did have in the chat from Claude Menard, who isn't able to address the working group, but president of PointQuebec. Thank you for being here. I have Bridget next in the queue.
- BRIDGET CHASE Hi, my name is Bridget Chase. I am calling in from Canada. I work with Typotheque and I have been working with indigenous language technology for the last 10 years, specifically with indigenous communities in the Pacific Northwest. Thank you very much.
- STEVE CHAN Thank you. Next is Isabelle.
- ISABEL COLAS-ADESHINA Hi everyone. I'm Isabel Colas-Adeshina. I'm also with ICANN Org as the GDS liaison and I look forward to working with you all. Thank you.
- STEVE CHAN Thank you, Ariel, next.

ARIEL LIANG

Hello everybody, this is Ariel and this feels like a reunion of a lot of folks that works on the IDN EPDP working group. And I was a policy support staff back in the day with the IDNs, but now I'm joining Isabelle from the GDS side. I don't know exactly what my role is, but I think right now it's as the observer. But in any case, I will be very happy to provide input and contextual history and knowledge about IDN related policy work. And hopefully I can be a good contributor to the group as well.

STEVE CHAN

Thank you so much, Ariel. Amadeu next.

AMADEU ABRIL I ABRIL

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, good night. I am Amadeu Abril I Abril in Barcelona. I was unable to make it to Seattle this time when I had the reservation. I work for CORE, which is a registry service provider and a registry operator as policy advisor. And my two reasons for being here are one on the problem side, the other one on the solution side. On the solution side, I was the CEO of .cat, which in 2004 submitted an application for a new gTLD. From the very beginning I wanted to diacritics at the second level as variants. Even if they're not variants, it is applying what now is called the same entity principle that could be part of the solution. Here is one of the topics that we have to study. So we've been implementing that since 2006, once .cat was launched, certainly the first gTLD and probably only by now, and probably also the first TLD at all to do that. On the problem side, a score. We've been working as a registry service provider and application helper, etc.,

for dot-Quebec since the very beginning. And since 2011 we've been trying to figure out a way to get along with dot-Quebec without an accent, the pure ascii, [to] the dot-Quebec with an accent (so in the correct French form) to work as some sort of single TLD, even if in fact they would be now two TLD indeed. So this is the problem that somehow made this question visible. Now, my point here is not to make [dot]-Quebec happy or say that the registers have the right to this or another. My main goal here is that we focus on preventing user confusion in the solution.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Amadeu. Okay, thanks.

AMADEU ABRIL I ABRIL

Yes?

MICHAEL BAULAND

No, no, I just wanted to check that we should keep the introduction short. Thanks.

STEVE CHAN

Next we have Asteway and then the additional individual who just walked in at the end. So Asteway, the floor is yours.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Hi everyone, this is Asteway Negash. I'm from Ethiopia. I'm very happy to join this group and work with everyone and I'm very interested in IDNs and I'm very eager to learn. I have tried to follow up with the works of the Ethiopic Generation panel and in all phase one and phase two IDN EPDPs. So I'm happy to join this working group and I'm happy to contribute my list. Thank you very much.

STEVE CHAN	Thank you so much and sorry to call you out. Floor is yours.
ASTEWAY NEGASH	No worries.
EDMON CHUNG	Edmon Chung here from dot-Asia, not an official observer yet. I'll probably observe. I have been following IDN work a little bit. Thank you.
MICHAEL BAULAND	Okay, thanks for the introduction. Next slide please. Next slide please. Okay, so yeah, this slide shows leadership. So I'm the chair, Mark sitting next to me is a vice-chair, and Prudence sitting next to Mark is our GNSO liaison. Next slide, please. I would quickly talk about the meeting frequency. Initially we decided to meet weekly once for 90 minutes. This can of course be changed if this is required. If we find ourselves moving too fast, we could change to a bi-weekly schedule, or if we are too slow, we could even increase it to 120 minutes. But for the time being, we start with the weekly meeting, and according to the poll we did, the best time turned out to be Wednesday at 13:00 UTC. If there's no reason right now to change that, we'll keep with that. And the next meeting will then be in two weeks. So it's not the week during ICANN, and the week after ICANN, also not. So the first date is then the 26th, I think. Next slide, please. And now I will hand over to Saewon for the overview of the charter. Thanks.
SAEWON LEE	Thank you, Michael. Again, we're very happy to support this group. So we will go through the charter first. And as you can see, we'd like

to go through the key highlights within the charter that's already been shared with this group, especially to keep the group well informed, but also aligned of the working group's requirements as staying true to the charter is very important in this work. So as you can see through this slide, you'll see that the key parts of the charter refer to mission and scope, the membership model and structure, and the decision making methodology. We'll be actually going through the scope in the later slides. So if we go straight into highlighting a few things about the membership model, as you are already all aware, this working group will function as an open model. So basically this means that this group is open to all parties that are interested. And the rationale behind it was that there'll be a limited number of people that have these expertise and knowledge. And so the Council wanted to limit any barriers to participation and also to allow easy administration in the process. As for the consensus designation process or the decision-making methodology, we're following how it is outlined in the GNSO Working Group guidelines. And also we'll go through more details in the later slides. Next slide, please. Again, just to kind of go a bit more deeper into the membership model, again, anyone can join and the views of each member will represent an appointing organization only as necessary or where applicable, which is the difference between this and the representative model. But it also means that those groups that are not joining should not be disadvantaged in the process. All the members will participate in the consensus calls. And this means when the leadership makes the consensus designation on the working group recommendations,

all the members will participate. And as you also heard in the beginning, if you see in the bottom part of the slide, we have three groups of liaisons, including the GNSO Liaison, Board Liaison and ICANN Org liaisons. We're still working on the Board liaisons currently, and we have confirmation on the GNSO Liaison, as we heard, and the ICANN Org Liaisons. And they will basically be acting as the channel between us and these respective groups where they'll give timely updates or hopefully they'll act as the active channel between the two so that we are sharing information in a timely manner. Next slide, please. So this slide, as I mentioned before, introduces the decision-making methodology. So this consensus designation is within the working group guidelines. Again, this is within the charter, which has already been shared with the group also, and this is a standard practice as in any other PDPs. So I'm not going to go into each one, but we would recommend that all working group members familiarize themselves with the designation levels that's mentioned here, and this will be again introduced to the working group down the road before we actually go through that process. Before we move on, I do actually want to emphasize this consensus playbook that I've kind of presented at the bottom, just because it was actually very helpful for me as well. And I'm hoping that this will give you a bit more insight into how to work together in a very congenial manner. Next slide, please. So this is one of the main parts of today's kickoff, which is going through the project plan. So the proposed project plan includes the main tasks as well as some estimated timelines, or let's say, realistic timeline. And once the working group agrees,

this project plan will be submitted to the GNSO Council for its confirmation. If you see on the left, this is the usual or the normal Z PDP that is within the GNSO. And on the right I've extracted those milestones that are relevant to this group. Next slide, please. And so from that milestone, the expected deliverables of this group is to, first, as I just mentioned, submit the project plan to the GNSO Council and then, throughout the process, complete an initial report and then the final report at the end which concludes this group's work. Next slide please. So this is the proposed timeline. I know it seems very long when you see it from this slide, but as I understand it, this is quite a short process for this group, especially seeing the limited schedule scope of this work and compared to any other PDPs within GNSO, but here is the proposed timeline. So at the end of March we are planning to send out the early input to each community group which has already been shared with the group for input for some feedback. And then hopefully by February of next year, we would like to publish the initial report that will go out for public comment and then finalize the final report and submit it to the Council by October of next year. Again, I know it does seem long, but according to a wise colleague of mine who's like a project management specialist named to remain anonymous, it's better to under promise and over deliver, and I would like to rephrase it as make realistic promises and overdeliver. So I think this kind of makes sense for us. Next slide, please. So this is the draft work plan in a tactical manner that is kind of, again, an extract from the project plan. So this will be updated within the leadership and staff every two to three months

just to kind of see what lies ahead for the next two to three months each time. Currently it's only mapped out for the next month because we're only kicking it off now and we still have some moving parts. And especially as you can see in the top box, the assumptions or the factors that serve as a foundation for the progress, which is mapped out in the below table, like the project plan confirmation, hopefully by the end of the month, and weekly meetings, which hopefully will resume at the end of this month as well. Once these are all smoothly confirmed, we don't see any risks and it will go as planned. But again, I've only mapped out the next month or so just based on the assumptions shared above. Before we go through the next slide and the scope and the nitty gritty of things, I would like to stop here to see if we have any comments or questions just because again, this will need to be confirmed within the team and submitted to the Council for its confirmation by the end of March.

MARK DATYSGELD

I have a small comment. One thing that will be important with this early input is that we bring back to our respective stakeholder groups some of the technical content of this group, because as we know, it is pretty dense. So it will not be just a matter of sending out this this quiz and "Hey, fill the quiz for us." It's more about how we need to help them through the issue. We need to work together with them. So this is a little more involved than just sending this query out. So just to want to flag that this will be an important part of this initial work: helping the stakeholder groups actually provide the inputs in the way that they perceive it. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN

Thanks. And I guess maybe just sort of a counterpoint to that is that if groups have members participating in this group ... I'll take it one step back. Don't necessarily feel obligated to provide early input. If you have members on this group, it's not necessarily a requirement. It's sort of an artifact from many years ago when the PDPs weren't quite so open for folks in different groups and you needed to collect that early input. But with groups actively participating and broadly represented in this group, you might not need to provide the early input. So that's not me discouraging you, but if you have active members in this group, you might not need to. Thanks.

SATISH BABU

So I was under the impression that the deadline for early written confirmation was 28th of April. Is it right?

SAEWON LEE

So currently, as how it is ... And we actually do have an agenda item that we will go through the early input, the draft message, with. Again, the date there will have to be changed according to when we send it out. Usually the guideline is that we put it out for input for 35 days, and so the date there is calculated according to when we plan to send it out. And again, does that answer your question?

SATISH BABU

Yeah, my actual question was there are some dependencies here. When you're making the plan, shouldn't you consider also the inputs if you're going to receive anything?

SAEWON LEE

Within this plan?

SATISH BABU

Yeah. So, in At-Large, for example, we have a formal thing called CPWG where we get things cleared. So if they feel the need for early input on some of these things, shouldn't you be getting that and then making the plan rather than making the plan first and then waiting for the inputs because you don't know then what you can get?

STEVE CHAN

It's a fair point, but I think in the interest of trying to make progress, what you could do is actually move along the deliberations as they're laid out in the project plan and then, to the extent that it's new information, you can come back and revisit it, or if it's inconsistent with the preliminary findings of the group, you can go back and revisit it. But I think I would hesitate to have this group pause its work until it receives all that information.

SATISH BABU

Fair enough. That's fine.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

I have a question which may actually come up later about the scope. It was shown here that we are only considering base Latin and the diacritic version. Are we excluding cases where multiple different diacritical versions of the same letter might be considered or possibly cases where the base Latin version does not exist or should not exist, but only some rare diacritic versions?

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, these are good points. I think we should discuss them in the first working session and not now. But we definitely have to discuss exactly what the scope is and what is not within the scope, but we'll postpone that to the first working session. Now we just want to give an overview without starting the discussion right now. But important points. Thanks for that, Tapani.

JAMES KUNLE OLORUNDARE

Thank you very much. So my name is James Kunle Olorundare. My apologies. Probably I came a bit late while the introduction was going on. So my concern has to do with a little bit on the scope. I know that basically we'll be looking at the Latin scripts and all of that. But there is something I really want us to open up in Africa. I believe there are so many diacritics that needs to be looked at as well, which I believe strongly that some of them have not been captured or well-captured in the Latin script. So I think we should look at the charter questions. And beyond that, we need to add something like challenges or concerns even within the community because if we limit ourselves to the charter questions, that may not give us the overview to be able to elicit other concerns that are out of the Latin script. Thank you very much.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks. Also important points, but I'm afraid the repertoire, so to say (which characters are included or are allowed) is out of scope of this PDP. This has been part of the Latin generation panel work or other script generation panel works. They did the work to decide which characters, including diacritics, are available for the certain script. And this is definitely out of scope here. If you have certain

characters which you think are missing from the root zone LGR or the Latin script, then you should go to ICANN and start a different process of revisiting the root zone LGR and including new code points for that. But this is definitely out of scope for this PDP. Thanks.

STEVE CHAN

Just highlighting we do have a comment from Bill Jouris in the chat.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Verbalize it.

STEVE CHAN

Yeah, I'll verbalize it. Another point for the first working session, the scope contains a presumption that we only care about visual confusable similarity. But it seems like the issue is more around ASCII versus letters with diacritics, regardless of whether they are visually distinct. We have another question from Amadeu. Go ahead.

AMADEU ABRIL I ABRIL

Also regarding the scope, I know, [for the next session, as we are laying it now], I would like to somehow rephrase and make a differentiation in different concepts. We are using sometimes both in the staff report and in the charter itself, as you know, interchangeably. But they are not completely so. It's visual similarity, visual confusion and user confusion. There's certainly overlap, but there are different things that will lead to different solutions and have led to, sorry, different confusions in the past regarding precisely this point of the diacritics and base ASCII. So I

think we should spend some time trying to define exactly what we mean when we talk about visual similarity, visual confusion, visual similarity and user confusion.

MARK DATYSGELD

Thank you, Amadeu. So I'll bring back some of the context from the GNSO Council discussion when this PDP was being discussed. One of the key points that we are seeking to address is exactly that the Latin script is so wide and so prevalent in so many different languages that we end up in a situation where, whether there is visual similarity or not, we're still dealing with one non-variant blocking the other. So an ASCII and a diacritic acute accent are considered exclusive of each other under the current rule set. So this exploration has to do with solving that issue more than anything because you can argue that the A without the diacritic doesn't have visual similarity or has. So that is part of the scope. But we are trying to dig deeper into this matter of what is actually confusable, what is actually going on in these different intersections, because this is something that's not made clear by default, seeing as they are not variants. So while the scope is clear enough, we just need as a group to come together to an understanding of exactly what is that range. So this is not something that we are starting the group with already solved. That's the matter. It's not something that we can in this meeting lay out because it is our collective work to get there. So that will be part of the fun that we'll be having together for an hour and a half every week. So let's start from that presumption. We have a very

clear problem. We just need to help the community understand the problem better and we need to scope it out better. Thank you.

SAEWON LEE

Thank you for that, Mark. So again I would just like to rewind back to the project plan, especially related to early input draft. First of all, I would like to apologize, Satish, I'm so sorry. Just for the record, he's not Anil. Secondly, related to again the proposed project plan, this is a proposed project plan. We can adjust today or in the next week as necessary. Again, this is according to the PDP protocol. We need to have the proposed project plan confirmed by the council as we move along. And because the draft message will be sent out to each group for 35 days (and again the date can change according to when we send the draft out), like Steve said, if you could work with ALAC on how you can work this input into your working group. But also (and again I'm not discouraging any group from providing input) it is voluntary. It's not mandatory. So please also keep that in mind. Secondly, related to the scope, we will be going into that now. I know this group is very keen to discuss all the details today, but just as Mark said, the that is the focus of the next few weeks because it is very important for the scope to be well-defined for this working group to succeed. So again, thank you for that, Mark. Before we move on, what we'll do is again refine the project plan. And as long as everyone is okay with the high-level timeframe or the timeframe that was shared with the team, leadership and staff will discuss this and submit it to the council by the end of the month. Does that work for everyone? Okay, so next we will go into the scope as to how we have planned out the project plan.

Basically, not that we don't want to, but we would like to focus on the high-level overview of the scope. And especially for today, we would like to just go through the charter and see how it is defined within the working group charter currently and how the council has approved it. So first of all, if you see on the left (and again this is what is written in the charter) is how we have defined what is in scope for this group and on the right is how we have defined what is not within the scope. I don't think we need to read each line unless we have some comments or questions related to this. But this is how it has been shared with the group within the charter and basically what we are working on. We will be going into the details from next week, but basically this is what we are working off of. Next slide, please. Satish?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Sorry, just a quick one. For the [knot] variant, there happens to be two variations (three, maybe; I can't remember exactly) in Latin scripts that are recognized that would then fall under the existing IDN variant rules or would be themselves sort of blocked in a way because they're technically not. They are variants and thus not part of this PDP.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yes, everything that is already defined as a variant in the root zone LGR is out of scope for this PDP as there is a variant relationship and there's nothing we can change within this PDP with this variant relationship.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE	And they basically are covered by the previous PDP. They're not blocked in their action.
MICHAEL BAULAND	Well, we have variants that are blocked and we have the variants that are allocatable. The disposition value is part of the LGR and depends on the actual variant relationship.
BILL JOURIS	Although for the record, there are exactly two that are allocatable.
SATISH BABU	I wanted to know, is there a requirement that, of the two, one should be delegated already?
MICHAEL BAULAND	No, that's not a requirement. We make a policy that's also applicable for completely newly applied-for TLDs, and depending on what the policy will be, you could even apply in a single round for the base form and the diacritic form, even if none of them existed beforehand.
SAWEON LEE	Okay, could we go to the And again, we will be discussing this over the next few weeks. So these are the charter questions currently that are prescribed within the working group charter. Basically, again, this is what the Council has approved of and these are the topics that we'll be going through each week as we define the scope and develop the recommendations. Again, I'm not going to read each one because the charter has been shared and I'm sure all of you are aware of this. Before we move on, again, I would like to see if there's any questions related to this. But again, this is the

work that the group will be doing each week as we determine the scope and develop the recommendations. Okay, the next slide, please. Oh, yes?

JAMES KUNLE OLORUNDARE

I can see the questions, and what I want to just add is that when you are carrying out this kind of assignment, especially for those of us that do a lot of research, you know that, along the way, other things come up and you need to put some something like comments that will allow you to be able to take care of issues like that. So I would like to suggest if it is okay to add any and any other issue that may be relevant to the chartered questions, maybe. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN

We also have a hand from Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

So a question is that, whatever outcome comes from this PDP, is that applicable to ASCII and any Latin script diacritic version or only that diacritic version which is found similar to the ASCII?

MICHAEL BAULAND

The direction is independent whether you start with a diacritic or whether you start with the letter.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

But sorry, I have a different question. So an ASCII version can be found similar to a diacritic version, but there is a possibility, because it's done through a panel, that ASCII version is not found similar to a diacritized version, in which case the diacritized version can actually proceed through the regular processes. This particular

question doesn't make that distinction that the diacritized version is found similar or not, which means that I guess the question is that, on the outcome of these constraints, whichever will build on this pair, will this be applicable to both scenarios, where one scenario is that ASCII and diacritized version are found similar to each other by a similarity evaluation panel and the other situation is where ASCII and the diacritized version are not found similar, so they are actually allowed to proceed even without this PDP? So will these outcomes be applicable to both cases or just the similar cases?

MICHAEL BAULAND

That's a good question. And I think this will be part of the discussions we will be having in the course of the PDP to decide to what situation the developed policies will be applicable. Thanks.

MARK DATYSGELD

Thank you. Sarmad. I don't think we had discussed this yet, and you make a very good point. If we could take this down for meeting notes as it's an important point to address because I don't think we have discussed it yet. And we have, in the queue, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Sorry I didn't give my name the previous time. Bad habit I need to correct. I think that one of the aspects also for this PDP was to solve a technical problem, but also solve a problem of predictability and no longer be dependent on the results of that panel to then have a TLT to go forward or not. So it may be that the policy in the end looks at the two questions differently and creates two different

paths. But predictability is really what is sought in this process, as far as I'm concerned.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yes, thanks.

SAEWON LEE

Thank you for the questions. And definitely these questions have been risen in the mailing list. But also it's been a discussion in the leadership staff channel as well, so we'll definitely keep that in mind as we move through the process. Thank you. Next slide, please. I am kind of conscious of the time now, but we'll move along. Again, just continuing with the scope of work, this is basically what was shared through the final issue report, and it was things to consider when managing the scope. And so the contents that you see in the box are some potential considerations to limit the instances of ASCII and diacritic versions. And again, it was what was mentioned in the final issue report and ,again, some things to consider as this working group works through the deliberations. Again, we won't deep-dive into it unless we have some comments or questions. I don't see any. So we'll move on to the next slide. Again, these are some examples that were presented in the final issue report. And again, these are probably some of the examples that we'll be going through. And the next slide, please. And these are the examples of potential impact on existing gTLDs. And again, as you can see in the note on the right, we only presented or showing examples for French here. And this is extracted from the list that was also introduced or briefed to the GNSO Council during ICANN 78. And again, these are the examples that we'll be looking

into in the next few weeks. Next slide, please. So, based on the topic or the charter questions, as well as what we will need to refer to, these are the existing body of work. Also, they are not only introduced through the charter, but we have also uploaded this on the Teams wiki for you to consider and refer to whenever you'd like. But basically we will need to be diving deep into these documents as we work through the questions to see what solutions we can get out of them or what kind of impact we might have on things like the existing consensus policies. Before we move on, I would like to again check if we have any questions or comments.

STEVE CHAN

There's one in the chat from Edmon. Is “café” also included for existing gTLDs?

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yes, good point. The list we showed is not a complete list. It was just a set of examples. But something like “café” is certainly also part of the scope, yes.

STEVE CHAN

Thank you. No other questions.

SAEWON LEE

Okay, next slide, please. So together with the work plan, we would like to also conclude the early input message. First of all, I would like to say thank you to all those that have provided your input or feedback, and we won't be going through the grammatical suggestions or any kind of typos. But we did extract two main or substantive, or, let's say, even if not substantive, things that we needed agreement on. And the first is related to the acronym or the

abbreviation for this team. We received several suggestions about the negative connotation of LSD. So sorry for that. So basically we did receive these suggestions you see in the screen and I am going to hand it over to Michael to make some suggestions to the team.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, if LSD is not the acronym we want to use, I would suggest to keep it simple and use LDPDP because first LAPSD sounds a bit too long to me and there are already quite a lot of acronyms and ICANN to remember. And secondly, Latin Diacritics is a good name for it because Latin is already a script so we can leave out the S if it causes problems. So unless anybody has any objections, I think we should go with LDPDP as an alternative name.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

[inaudible]

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah. Okay, then LDPDP it is going forward then. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE

Agreed. LD. Okay, so we're going with LD. And then the second one was I've actually just shared the early input message so that you could also change check the actual comment through the draft message. But basically it was related to the wording of the presumption that we just discussed that we kind of briefly touched upon. And again, it's not that it's not significant to discuss. We do need to discuss this, but just for this early input message, the draft to be sent out [(purposes)], because it is how it is prescribed in the charter, we would like to suggest to send out the early input message with the presumption wording as is, but discuss in the

background as we, let's say, discuss or refine the scope. Is that agreeable? Okay. Yes, Bill?

BILL JOURIS

I think it might be easier if we just dropped the word “visually” out of there and say “confusingly similar” and define how confusingly later just to avoid confusion for the people reading the message we're sending out.

MICHAEL BAULAND

I think these are important points to discuss, but I'm afraid the discussion and the solution-finding process might take a long time, and we want to get out the early input as soon as possible. And if we first do the discussion of whether we want “visually” or “not visually,” it can take potentially several weeks. And for that reason we just keep the early input as it was written in the charter and then come back and discuss this in the team while the early input is being processed.

BILL JOURIS

Yeah, that was precisely the point I was trying to make. If we take the word “visually” out, we're not foreclosing that. We're just not making a decision ahead of time.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, but we're changing the scope and it's not clear whether we actually want to change it in that context. So for that reason, we should stick with the official wording for the time being and then discuss how to continue once we start the deliberation.

BILL JOURIS

Okay.

STEVE CHAN

Thanks. And just another quick maybe clarifying point. Why we reference visual similarity is because that's the standard that's used for the new gTLD next round and the 2012 round. That's the standard that's used. And if two strings are found to be visually similar, they would not be allowed to proceed and both be delegated. And so this is a callback and a reference to that mechanism in the New gTLD Program, which is why it's specifically referencing that standard. So essentially this PDP is sort of a workaround to that mechanism because that mechanism would stop two applications from proceeding. So I hope that helps a little bit. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE

Thank you for that, Steve. Again, the early input message will be sent out, but these are the discussions we can continue having from next week. Then I think we have agreement that the message can be sent out after incorporating or reflecting all the suggestions as necessary, and then we will share with the group as to by which date we have to receive the input by. I think we can move on. Okay, so this section is related to the potential impact considerations of the GPI Framework and HR Framework. It's not necessarily related to the Latin script diacritics. It's actually more of a suggestion, a recommendation given by the ICANN Board to make sure that we consider these issues as we develop the PDP, the policy recommendations. And next slide, please. So the need for the consideration of these issues is also currently determined within the working group charter. And the language of how it is written

within the charter is as you can see in this slide. So the left is related to the impact on global public interest, and the right is related to the impact on human rights. And again, I'm not going to go read each section, but basically we will need to adhere to these or we will need to consider this as we develop the policy. And if we go to the next slide, please. So GPI Framework, (Global Public Interest Framework). It's something that has been suggested and developed by the ICANN Board and suggested for the community to utilize as we develop the policy recommendations. And it's not that we didn't consider the global public interest or human rights issues as the previous PDPs developed their policy recommendations, but it's more of a guidance and a framework so that it facilitates discussions as we go through these topics and make sure that we consider these issues when we finalize the recommendations. So you will see in this slide the background and the key features of how this GPI framework developed. And if you see in the last blue square (I don't know what you call it), we have a checklist which will be shown in the next slide, which offers these categories and languages to aid the discussion as we develop the recommendations. Next slide, please. If you see here, this is a portion of the checklist that I've shared through the slide, but basically it gives these categories that we can go through as we develop the policy recommendations to see if we have considered the global public interest. But we must emphasize that there isn't a prescriptive way in how to use this framework. And it's not mandatory, but it just is something that we can utilize to make sure that we go through the checklist. And also, I would like to note that

this PDP is actually, as I understand it, the first PDP working group to be utilizing this framework proactively. So I hope we make a good case study out of this and make sure that we do provide outputs going through each of the categories that are mentioned here. Next slide. Again, same with the human rights framework. The human rights category is also mentioned in the Global Public Interest framework. And this refers to the ICANN bylaws, as you can see in the screen. And for this human rights as well, there is a human rights impact assessment tool which you can see in the next slide. Again, I've only just extracted a portion of it. And in this working group, again, when we make sure that we have checked the list of the human rights impact, it's something that we can use for analysis and develop the policy recommendations accordingly. But basically, if you see in the charter the questions that is prescribed in the charter, you will see that it's kind of a summary of this checklist. It actually asks the questions in a high-level overview of what you can see in the human rights impact assessment tool as well. And if you would like to see these directly, as you can see in the top, I've shared the link through the slide which is also in the Wiki, and we'll be sharing this as we develop the recommendations and we'll be discussing as a team as to how we want to conduct this analysis. Any questions on this so far? Okay, so now we've come to the next steps. And next slide, please. So the next steps is as in, what is our immediate next steps for the team? First of all, as we went through, the support staff will send the early input request to the SO/ACs and SG/Cs. And then as we prepare to start our weekly meetings, we would like to request the working group to review the

charter again and all the background documents that have been shared throughout the meeting today. Lastly (this is relevant to the first step that I just mentioned), we would like to request the working group members to consult your groups and hopefully provide timely feedback on the early input request to make sure this PDP sets off in the right direction. Next slide, please. So this is for the participants in this room that are not members yet or not observers yet. If you're interested in serving as a member, as this is an open membership, please sign up through the email shared in the screen. Or if you don't want to be a member but are interested in following the work, please also sign up as an observer. If none of them suits your taste, there's also an opportunity for you to share any input or provide any feedback during the public comment periods after the initial report. I think we have a hand.

STEVE CHAN

Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD

Thank you. Even though he's a NextGen and a newcomer, I'd like directly to ask Edmon if you could to join our group. Your expertise would add a lot, even as an observer, given your small background with IDNs.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah, I just sent a new email to the [GNSO secretariat].

MARK DATYSGELD

Thank you.

-
- SAEWON LEE Thank you, Edmon. Okay, before we go on to the next one, any questions so far? I don't think we have any. And I think we come to the final step. We come to Any Other Business, and I'll hand over the floor to Michael.
- MICHAEL BAULAND Thanks. So I just [copied] Saewon's questions. Are there any questions in general you would like to ask now? Okay. Yes, please?
- JAMES KUNLE OLORUNDARE On the email, I observed that the email is actually the same email for if you want to be an observer or if you want to be a member. So probably maybe there is a need for something like maybe in your subject you put "observer," and if you want to be a member, you put "member" so that at least that will differentiate between who wants to be a member and who wants to be an observer.
- STEVE CHAN Thank you. Terri has an answer.
- TERRI AGNEW Hi. Actually, when you send an email to the GNSO-[inaudible]@ICANN-org, we'll actually send you a Google Form to complete. And within that Google Form, you get to pick the option that you want with additional instructions to complete as well. Thank you.
- MICHAEL BAULAND Okay, thanks. Any further questions? Okay, I see none. So I think we can give you back a few minutes and stop the recording, please.

STEVE CHAN

And if we have a couple minutes, if we could get a photo together. It's always good to get a group photo for kickoff. So if you are a member, even a new member or observer, please gather in front for a group photo. Terri is going to take it for us.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]