
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO: Latin Script Diacritics PDP WG (2 of 2)
Saturday, March 7, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

TERRI AGNEW

The recording has started and this is Terri Agnew. Hello and welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP Working Group Session 2 of 2. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning Statements of Interest.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. Only questions posted in the Zoom chat identified as a question will be read aloud during the session as time permits and when directed by the chair of the session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I'll now hand the floor back over to your chair, Michael Bauland, and please begin.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thank you very much and welcome everybody back after the lunch break. And with that, I'll directly hand back to Saewon for our Public Comments.

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.

SAEWON LEE

Thank you, Michael. I'm trying to go back to the page. So, during our working session 1, we concluded with Implementation Guidance 11, the two points, one on the draft language, to be updated where we show the alignment with the intent. And then secondly, just noting for the record that the Working Group confirms the assumption that ICANN Org made of the recommendation that any additional criteria or tests resulting from the research would not be required to undergo a policy development process for confirmation, but implemented directly.

So with that, as you can see from this slide, the next recommendation we'll go to is preliminary recommendation 29. And I'm going to redirect you to the sheet.

So preliminary recommendation 29, again, with the consistency notion, just asking that the consistent with part of the language is not used if the language departs largely from the PDP IDNs and where ICANN Org mentions is from final recommendation 8.1, our current language has not only added the last sentence in addition related to our requirements, but also we have eliminated the requirement as existing measures in the Root Zone LGR to reduce the number of allocatable top-level variant labels, which was originally in the EPDP IDNs language.

So, for this, they're asking that consistent with is not utilized. And I would like to hand it back over to Michael to see what the Working

Group thinks of this. I will also share in the chat, the EPDP IDNs language for your reference.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon. Any thoughts about this item? So, it's basically, we added this. In addition, there will be no restrictions on the number of critical marks applied to a single character, nor the type of TLDs, e.g. real words identified in dictionaries, geographic names, brands, and the part missing about the variant labels in the EPDP IDNs. I mean, the intention of our REC is essentially the same as was with the IDN EPDP, but we changed some wording.

So I'm fine with either way. Any other thoughts? No thoughts, no objections. So, I guess we can just adjust the wording in the background and then see where we go from there. And, Saewon, you can continue with the next one, please.

SAEWON LEE

And I think we have one support in the chat, Michael. Yes, so we will draft a new language for the Working Group's consideration by the next meeting. So this time, it's Implementation Guidance 41, again, related to the consistency notion where we have eliminated the EPDP IDNs language related to limiting automatic activation. And this is where the ICANN Org sees the discrepancy. We'll get back to you, Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks. Any thoughts about this one? Satish, please.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Michael. Satish, for the record. So, in the previous one, the comment basically said that in some cases there are even material differences, not just wording. So, if there are material differences, then that really cannot be fixed by changing the wording. It might require discussions back in the Working Group in the PDP team to resolve those. I don't know whether there are really material differences, but if there are, then I think there should be a more formal process to resolve those than just the wording change. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks. Should we go back to that one quickly, Saewon?

SAEWON LEE

I'm sorry, go back to?

MICHAEL BAULAND

I think Satish was referring to the previous one, right?

SATISH BABU

The previous one.

JOHN EMERY

That would be PR 29.

SAEWON LEE

Yeah.

SATISH BABU

Yeah, REC 29.

SAEWON LEE

It's on the screen for you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, I'm just switching between screen and the Zoom screen and the Excel sheet directly since I've just a small screen here.

SATISH BABU

Yeah, I'm looking at PR 29. I'm looking at line 17, the text that has the title same as PR 7 and PR 11. Down the text, you see that last but forward line from the bottom. In some instances, material differences. That's what I meant to.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, I'm just reading it some. Okay, but I think in this instance, we have no material differences or do you see material differences here?

-
- SATISH BABU
- I was referring to the comment that outputs contain minor contextual or in some instances, material differences. I haven't really correlated this to the actual text.
- MICHAEL BAULAND
- Okay, I think it's just a general comment not specific to this one. Saewon, correct me if I read this incorrectly.
- SAEWON LEE
- Right, so basically the comment that Satish is referring to from ICANN Org is referring to all the linked outputs that I mentioned through the slide. So, preliminary recommendation 7, 11, and this and moving forward. It doesn't really only refer to this one only.
- As I mentioned, there's an additional sentence that LD PDP has added for this recommendation and obviously taken out the Root Zone LGR which doesn't relate to us. And again, that's what ICANN Org is referring to where they see inconsistency in the language but it is how it applies to our PDP. And it's up to the Working Group to see how they want to reword this if necessary related to the consistency notion.
- MICHAEL BAULAND
- Yeah, thanks. So, I don't think there's material differences here and we will check the wording with leadership and then suggest a new wording but I don't think we need to discuss substantial items here.

So, if you're fine, okay, thanks. Then we can go back to IG41, I think it was.

SAEWON LEE

So, for Implementation Guidance 41, I left in the chat for you how it differed from EPDP IDNs relating to the limiting automatic activation portion that has been taken out for our PDPs use.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, so since automatic activation is something specific to LGRs and variants, it makes no sense for us to mention it here and therefore we left it out. And I think it still means we are consistent with it unless ICANN or anybody else thinks leaving this out makes our IG inconsistent with the IDN EPDP.

Seeing no objections and Bill agrees that we are consistent. And so, I suggest we leave it with consistent and just write a comment to ICANN that even though it's not the same, the intention and the behavior is still consistent. Seeing no objection. I think we can then continue with the next one. Saewon, please.

SAEWON LEE

Yes, and I do also want to note when ICANN Org did submit this comment, it was all under non-substantive. So, I do want to mention that they didn't consider it as substantive for your reference.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, that's also what Sarmad said in the previous session that it's more like a nice to have for them to easier see where there are changes, but I think here, there is no real change. So, we should be able to leave it.

SAEWON LEE

So what we're seeing now is all related to this consistency notion and this is recommendation 45. The slight difference that ICANN Org found was related to and or all, just to check if we were intentionally replacing and to all.

So, just to read the recommendation out to you and I know the screen is very, very small or the writing is very, very small, but consistent with final recommendation eight from the PDP IDNs Phase 2 Final Report, a registrant and its sponsoring registrar must jointly determine the source domain name, which must be registered for calculating the variant domain set under a given ASCII gTLD or its delegated Latin Diacritic gTLDs, if any. So, basically, they had a problem with this or instead of and, and just wanted to make sure that this was intentional.

MICHAEL BAULAND

I'm just thinking, did we have a reason to change it to, or, I can't remember one at the moment, but anybody else remembers?

LOUIS HOULE Might in some cases, you don't have a variant. You only have the Diacritic.

MICHAEL BAULAND Well, in the second level, you have variants. I think we could also change it back to and any opinions, comments? Louis, your microphone is still on. Okay, I think we'll change it to end and leave the consistent word there.

SAEWON LEE Okay, should we move on to 50?

MICHAEL BAULAND Yes, please.

SAEWON LEE Okay, so the next recommendation is related to 50. So, while we are looking at this, while we are looking at the consistency notion portions altogether, like the preliminary recommendation 7 and 11, we're trying to also look at other comments that kind of related to determining the consistency.

And it's the same for preliminary recommendation 50 where ICANN Org raised the consistency notion here under non-substantive, but also related to this, they left a substantive comment on the necessary information part. So, first of all, related to the consistency notion, they pointed out that if you see in the language here, ICANN Org must provide necessary information to dispute

resolution providers, et cetera, enhancing their understanding of the sets.

Basically, EPDP IDN's language was ICANN Org must conduct outreach. And we did have an extensive discussion about this to change it into ICANN Org must provide necessary information. So, this is the part that has changed for us. And this is the part that ICANN Org is pointing out related to the consistency notion.

And related to this on the substantive comment part, what we can also discuss today is with respect to this necessary information, what this entails. So, they put this under substantive comment, where again, this kind of divides into two parts where they are asking exactly what we mean by necessary information.

And at the time, we had explained that it includes the requirements of providing information on the requirements of the sets, and then the policy position determined by the Working Group. So, they would like us to clarify the necessary information that we are requesting, but also what this interpretation again encompasses.

So, basically, how heavy is this information that needs to be provided? And related to that, they are asking for clarification on the expected level of detail at which this requirement or policy position should be communicated to the relevant parties. And that's where they see this as a bit more substantive than just a clarification.

So, these are the points that need to be discussed together with the consistency notion.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon. Any comments from the group regarding this? I think the reason we changed it was that there was a request by the group to be a bit more clear about this outreach and that ICANN should do. But yeah, how much clearer do we need to be? And isn't this in the IDN EPDP where we just -- the previous group just said ICANN needs to do outreach that also not very specific.

So, we could either go back to the original language from the IDN EPDP and just say that we also request ICANN to conduct outreach because they seem to be okay with this language or else provide more details about what we want to do. No opinions. Satish, yes.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Michael. So personally, I'm not able to fully wrap my head around some of these issues. I fail to understand why these were not raised during the discussion that we had because I have lost context of some of these things. While the Latin Diacritic PDP is working, we were all in the kind of, the scope was in our heads and we knew what we're talking about.

ICANN Org was also present in those discussions. But now after that is closed, we have had a kind of break. It is not easy for us to resurrect the model that we had in our heads. So, here, for example, we have asked for outreach and during the discussions

that we had, there was perhaps a need for such an outreach which is different from the context of the EPDP and IDNS.

I'm not able to kind of at this point correlate these two. So, maybe we have a bit more discussions on this rather than finalize the way we should be handling this. So, just to place on record the fact that personally, I would like to have some more reading up of these recommendations, specifically the EPDP part and our own discussions.

And I would not recommend that we resort to falling back on the PDP recommendations without discussions. Maybe there is a case for that, but only after discussions. Thank you.

LOUIS HOULE

Okay.

MICHAEL BAULAND

So, would you like to do these discussions now or postpone this?

SATISH BABU

So just that I'm not personally prepared, but others may be prepared. So, we could have the discussions right away also.

MICHAEL BAULAND

If you're not prepared, most likely many others are also not prepared. So maybe it's better than to postpone this and give the Working Group a heads up that we will be discussing this in session

X and then everybody can prepare that. So, I guess we postpone this.

SAEWON LEE

And I guess to Satish's point, one thing I do want to mention is, Org's comment isn't for us to stay consistent or go back to the original language. It is just pointing out again, stylistically, whether the consistent with is needed in the recommendation language or not. And for some points, obviously if the language has changed or departed from the original EPDP-IDNs language that we don't use the term consistent with.

So it doesn't necessarily imply that we need to change or revert back to EPDP-IDNs, but just cautioning the use of consistent with. And the second point about the necessary information, we did actually dedicate, we as in the Working Group, dedicated quite a bit of time in evolving the conducting outreach to providing information.

So obviously, as I also shared in the key principles, it doesn't mean that we need to reassess everything and go back to the original, not original, but go back to what we evolved from. So, that's just another point that I want to remind everyone. And Steve also wants to say something.

STEVE CHAN

Yeah, thanks. This is Steve. Just a minor point is that this is a recommendation from IDNs EPDP Phase 2, which hasn't actually

passed Board adoption yet. So, you can't necessarily assume that this recommendation or to revert back would actually be a silver bullet. Anyway, thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks. Good point. Okay, should we continue?

SAEWON LEE

Yes. And obviously anything that's colored, not green, we will come back to. Now 51, again, related to the consistency notion. Our recommendation has omitted the EPDP IDNs language of an indication of the source domain name and initial source domain name of the set. And again, because it's not consistent, ICANN Org would like us to revise the term consistent with, and also mentioned in its comments, clarity on why the initial source domain name was omitted. And I will leave the discussion to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon. Any thoughts, comments?

MARK DATYSGELD

Mark speaking, this has an interdependency actually, right? This is not standalone, just this then. Because I cannot recall off the top of my head, but this is not defined only here. So, it's not a standalone decision.

SATISH BABU

This is Satish jumping in, sorry. If there's omission, which is the issue here, I mean, is there any clarity at this point about this omission, whether it is a substantive thing or is just a kind of clerical or a kind of superficial kind of an omission? Or has it, the fact that we've omitted the source domain names and the initial source domain name is because of a deep-rooted, some kind of logic within the LD PDP. Is there any way to know that now? Can someone update us as to why this omission has happened? Is it an oversight?

MARK DATYSGELD

Mark speaking, we did set this, right? We do have a root domain, so to say, and the variant, this is set somewhere, isn't it? So, maybe this is just not repeating the same concept, but I would need clarity from staff or from my co-host to where this is.

MICHAEL BAULAND

So I'm just put in the original IDN EPDP wording in the chat. And it said, to the account for the same entity principle and its implications for variant domain names, gTLD registry operators should work with ICANN accredited registrars to determine a mechanism to communicate between each other to facilitate the registration and management of variant domain names, including an indication of the source domain names and initial source domain names of the variant domain set.

And our wording is now consistent with final recommendation 14 from the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report to account for the same entity principle and its implication for domain names of an ASCII Latin Diacritic Domain set. gTLD registry operators should work with ICANN accredited registrars to determine a mechanism to communicate between each other to facilitate the registration and management of domain names across the ASCII Latin Diacritic Domain set.

So as far as I read this, this is actually an error and we accidentally omitted the wording about the source domain names because even in the LD set for the second level, you need a source domain name to be able to determine the disposition values of the variants in the second level.

MARK DATYSGELD

Yeah, so non-issue, just an oversight and we can just move on, right? Just correct and move on.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, we should fix it. Then thank ICANN for the diligent check.

SAEWON LEE

Okay, great. Moving on to the last one of this consistency notion. It's related to preliminary recommendation 53. So, again, our language has changed where from EPDP IDNs final recommendation 16, if two or more gTLDs are delegated in order to constitute the set belonging to the same registry operator, it

should be denoted in the ICANN Org and basically in EPDP IDNs, it was if two or more delegated gTLDs belong to the same variant label set in accordance with Root Zone LGR calculation and basically ICANN Org saw the language as different and I'm going to post it in the chat for you for your reference.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon. So, the original wording is if two or more delegated gTLDs belong to the same variant labels set in accordance with Root Zone LGR calculation and our wording is consistent with blah, blah. And then if two or more gTLDs are delegated in order to constitute an ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set belonging to the same registry operator. So, I think we are consistent because we are basically requesting the exact same thing. We just changed the wording from variants to our set. So, I don't see any inconsistency here, even if the wording is not exactly the same unless anybody.

MARK DATYSGELD

Mark speaking, I don't see the need to change this. We're just clarifying something for the scope of what we're doing. So I don't really see like, unless somebody very native in English, like very, very native in English wants to explain how this would materially change something.

-
- MICHAEL BAULAND I see agreement from Satish. Hand is up and he's very, very native in English.
- BILL JOURIS Exactly, I'm very, very native in English. And I don't think we have a problem here.
- MICHAEL BAULAND Okay, great. If Bill's approval is there, I think we're fine. Thanks, Bill.
- SAEWON LEE While we are at agreeing with the consistency notion, I do want to point out the second, again, non-substantive comment from ICANN Org related to this. And this is more related to asking us if we would like to consider changing our wording.
- So with respect to the phrase, if two or more gTLDs are delegated in order to constitute an ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set belonging to the same registry operator, the ICANN Org suggests revising the language to enhance clarity and maybe a bit more concise wording to become if two or more delegated gTLDs belong to an ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set.
- MICHAEL BAULAND Okay, any thoughts? Hearing none here. I see no objection. I personally see no problem with changing it since the intention is

still the same. And if that wording makes it clearer and avoids some doubts or misunderstanding, then why not?

SAEWON LEE

Okay.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, seeing no objection here. I think we can change it. Saewon. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE

So, noted. And that actually concludes for us at least related to the consistency notion recommendations that we needed to go over. So, now something different so that everyone has more to say. So, this is related to preliminary recommendation four.

And like I did before, if we need any reminders and we really do need to go through the recommendations, again, I will be reading the recommendation in full for you. So, this is again related to preliminary recommendation four and it's actually more to do with the immediate next application round term.

So, if you look at the box in the left, again, this is a comment from ICANN Org supporting the recommendation, but with some wording change. Actually, it was more like as a confirmation that they were asking for clarity, but also maybe suggesting a wording change.

So, the Org, though they understand that the first application round will occur following the effective date of the relevant consensus policy resulting from the adoption of the Board and obviously not the 2026 round. It just would like us to be more-clear on exactly what we mean by this.

And two things to note here is one, we do have a footnote in the report related to the SubPro recommendation referring to what it means by the immediate Next Round. And the second part is this was actually raised during the Working Group meeting as well, but again, they are asking for this to be considered.

And another thing to point out is the language in EPDP-IDNs final recommendation 3.3, they actually do use this term as well. And before I hand the floor over to Michael to discuss this issue, I do also want to introduce the box on the right. And this was a comment from Kyionna Blaylock.

This is an individual contributor and he or she actually submitted comments for a majority of the outputs. And it was either supporting the recommendation intent with wording change or requiring a significant change. So, very like a substantive comment, but none of them provided any rationale or any proposed changes for us to consider.

So, including this and moving forward, unless Kyionna raises or suggests the change, proposed change or rationale, I think his or her submissions will just be noted for the record, but really cannot

be discussed further related to the submission itself. So with that, I'll hand the floor back over to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon, and thanks for the explanation about the Kyionna comments. I tend to agree that without any indication of what is the problem here or what should be changed, there's no real point. We can't really react on this. So, either Kyionna is here remotely or someone can provide further input or we will just notice it, but there's nothing we can do about that. Regarding ICANN's suggestion about the immediate next application round, any thoughts or comments from the group? Mark, please.

MARK DATYSGELD

Mark speaking. It would be good to understand what their actual doubt is because I don't see exactly what their doubt is here. What do they want to know from us? Because, yeah, it's easy to just ask something. Hey, is this what you're saying? Okay, but why? With what intent and with what end? So, unless we get clarity, this is a non-question.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks. My understanding is that they are afraid that with immediate next application round, we are referring to the 26th round now, and this might not be possible to have that policy available for that round. But I see we're not talking about any specific round, but we're talking about the immediate next

application round, and that refers to the point in time when this policy becomes active, whenever that may be. But Satish, please.

SATISH BABU

Yeah, I agree with that. Satish, for the record. So, when you say immediate next application round, there are two other timings or timelines. One is the adoption of this recommendation, but the second one is who's reading it and when. If someone is reading it five years from now, what does the immediate Next Round mean, really? So, it is a kind of sliding, it's a moving target. So, I think there is a need to fix it some ways so that from both sides, it's clear. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks. So, I understand that the IDN PDP also has this wording, but maybe it was a bit more-clear then because it was obvious that the IDN PDP was a necessary requirement for the Next Round, and the Next Round can't be started without the IDN PDP to be finished. So, maybe for that reason, it was easier for them to talk about the Next Round. Then it might be for us, but Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD

Mark speaking as an individual group member, as far as I'm concerned, we are still aiming for the immediate Next Round, as far as I understand, according to what we discussed with the Board and our strategy overall, like at some point being included within

this proceeding, how they want to do it, it's up to them. But it's still our goal, right, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Yeah, sorry, I'm not in the zoom room. So, yes, I think that from many discussions with many people, staff side, outside, Board, et cetera, everybody is pretty aligned with this idea. Nobody knows how to square this because we're bending too many rules.

So, it's a question about us being, sorry, a question about us being creative too, suggesting, and I don't know that we have the solutions in this room, but expecting, because everybody's nodding when we say it should be the Next Round, expecting that it will happen is the wrong path. We need to propose, offer a solution, discuss solutions because it's not going to happen on its own.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks for this, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD

And that's why we have Steve. So, I'm pretty sure he'll come up with a banging solution for us and solve every problem. So, that's a non-starter. We already have the solution. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN

I'd love to provide a very much contrary response to that. This is Steve from staff. And say that I think it's actually the opposite. I

don't think it's actually the scope of this PDP to actually make that determination. We try to get our best to get to recommendations as quickly as possible.

And doing that in an efficient, effective manner better enables it, but it doesn't guarantee anything because that round is starting in a handful of months. It makes it very difficult. But I think it ends up serving as potentially a distraction for us to be looking at how to make that happen when it's sort of out of scope for this PDP. Hi, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Yeah, Seb again. I fully agree, Steve. What I meant is in discussions as community members, not as this PDP, absolutely, I hope so.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, yeah. We should really concentrate on the policy and not how the policy is implemented. While we would like to have it implemented quickly some way or other, but this is not our task. Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD

Yeah, Mark speaking. I think we can have both things. We can continue to expedite policy and we can continue engaging with the community and pushing the issue and finding the spaces for dialogue. We can have careers articulating with the GNSO Council.

We can continue to liaise with the Board and continue to move this along. And yeah, I don't disagree.

I think Sebastien has a broader point. We can start now that the momentum is on our side, we can start offering ideas so that the ideas come back to us. We're like, hey, would you like to do this? And we're like, yeah, super. So, it's not mutually exclusive. It might not be the goal of the PDP, but it has been working for us so far, so why stop?

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, there can be many things going on in parallel of course but it's then outside of these PDP sessions. It's next to... yeah. So coming back to the wording here regarding the next application round, Mark suggests to leave it the way it is, whatever the next application round may be.

Any other thoughts, agreements, disagreements? No disagreements, no agreements. So, Satish.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Michael. Satish for the record. So, I agree that the PDP has this phrase, this wording and the reason for that Michael has already mentioned. We do not automatically inherit that aspect of the EPDP. That means we are not one of the milestones within that process, we are outside that. So, if that is so, then the wording may not be appropriate. I mean, just to leave it as it is based on the EPDP.

So we have to see now that ICANN Org just raise this as an issue, we might have to revisit this and decide how best to kind of handle that concern as to if it gets delayed. Like I would still agree with Michael saying that we all want this to get implemented as soon as possible, but that is not this group's responsibility.

We have to get the policy out no matter how long it takes. You know, accelerating that process is not our concern, but we all want to have it as soon as possible that we agree. So, we have to realize these two different positions. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, sounds reasonable. So, maybe leave the wording to stay consistent but have a footnote there that we may clarify which round is meant at the point in time when the policy becomes adopted because then we know which round we refer to. I mean, essentially, it's obvious that when the policy becomes active as soon as it becomes active and for that round, but yeah, Mark agrees here. Satish agrees.

So, let's keep the language for now and have a footnote explaining that it's out of our scope to define exactly which application round this refers to, but this will be visible when it gets adopted.

SAEWON LEE

Okay. Noted.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Can I make just one brief comment on the previous point? From my understanding as when that was discussed in the sub-pro and the implementation of the sub-pro because it was an implementation that was seen. The way subsequent rounds should work is as soon as a round comes to the reveal. So, there's applications. These are revealed. We know exactly the pool of strings that are now going to be taken in that round without contentious or whatever.

We know at least those that are blocked. And then there is a timeframe that happens that allows ICANN to pause the program if they need for technical reasons, a bit of more time to develop systems or whatever they need. If they don't raise that, then the Board has, I think, two meetings to take the decision for a Next Round six months later. And it should go in cycles like that.

The only thing that can interrupt that cycle really is if there is policy that has been voted by the Board, accepted by the GNSO and the Board, but not yet implemented. Any new policy that has been voted by the Board will need to be implemented before a new round happens.

So, if indeed we miss this round, and I just heard there won't be another round afterwards, I live an optimist life. So, I think that we're going to go into certain cycles. But if this is not met, then mechanically there's no other round that's going to happen without it. Well, I don't suppose that the implementation of this is going to last for years, but the Next Round will be dependent on it

because I assume it'll be voted by the Board well before the Next Round is actually to start. Does that make sense?

MICHAEL BAULAND

Not 100% sure what this means. The consequence of your comment is to the language we are using.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

No, no, yeah. For the PDP, it doesn't mean anything because we still need to just work on the policy and concentrate on that. It was just sort of an afterthought on the discussion that we had on the immediacy of the implementation.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, just some background information for the whole group, but nothing we have to act upon now. Okay, thanks. You can breathe. Appreciate it. Back to Saewon, I guess.

SAEWON LEE

Okay, going back to the slides then. Next comment was for recommendation six. Again, from ICANN Org and Kyionna Blaylock. Again, Kyionna Blaylock submitted requiring significant change, but no proposed change or rationale given, so we won't go into that. We'll just go directly into ICANN Org on the left. This was considered non-substantive in the sense that it supports the recommendation intent with just a simple wording change.

So with respect to the sentence, the applicant is allowed to withdraw an applied for gTLD label from that application. ICANN Org suggests revising this to clarify that only the Latin Diacritic gTLD string may be withdrawn. So, it would change to, or the suggested change would be the applicant is allowed to withdraw an applied for Latin Diacritic gTLD label from that application.

And obviously this is with regard to ASCII gTLD as a requirement for the set and in order to comply with the rules for the set that ASCII gTLD must be present. Again, this is a suggestion from Org, but I will hand the floor back over to Michael for Working Groups discussion.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon, for the summary. Any thoughts here? One question or one thought, one thing we might want to think about is whether we intended to and still intend to allow the withdrawal of the ASCII label in case there's just a single Diacritic label left.

Did we want to allow this? If so, then the language change was suggested by ICANN would make that not possible anymore. If we never intended that to happen, but only wanted to allow the withdrawal of the Diacritic TLDs and always leave the ASCII one then it's most likely fine. Tapani, please.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

I thought the intent was to allow just dropping the ASCII because after all you can apply for the Diacritic only anyway. So, I don't see

any obvious reason not to allow dropping the ASCII and leaving the single Diacritic TLD application to stand. And that's why I understood our discussion back then.

MICHAEL BAULAND

No, okay. So, in case there's just one Diacritic TLD remaining you could withdraw the ASCII. Other thoughts or do other members remember this too or differently? Okay, seeing no comments here.

I think I remember it as Tapani doesn't that since unlike the variant case we have no primary label in our case we thought that we would allow this. Then the question would of course be whether ICANN would want to change this from a wording change to a substantial comment. I guess the person from ICANN who did the comment is Ariel at the group, right? And they're not available right now.

JOHN EMERY

We can just take an action item. Sorry, say one. We can just take an action item to raise this with Ariel next session when she's back.

SAEWON LEE

Also, one context to add the reason that this was also suggested was related to the second sentence within this recommendation where we have a base ASCII gTLD must exist and comply with the rules set under preliminary recommendation one. So based on

that, it was asked that we just make it clear that it's only the Latin Diacritic gTLD that can be withdrawn from the set.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yes, but I think in case the only remaining one is a Diacritic one, then the set gets dissolved and thereby the requirement to have a base ASCII one is not there anymore because we just have a single application. But yeah, let's probably table this for time when we can discuss this.

SAEWON LEE

Okay, I think we may have time for one more. So, the next one is related to Implementation Guidance eight. So, we have a substantive and non-substantive comment here and we'll start with the non-substantive one.

So, Implementation Guidance 8.4, the language to enable the applied for ASCII gTLD string and or the Latin Diacritic gTLD label was asked to be revised to, to enable the applied for strings in an ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set. Again, just to enhance clarity and be concise. So, we'll start with this if the Working Group agrees with this.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon. I want to maybe I quickly read the full 8.4. It's not that long. The applicant must pass each element to enable the applied for ASCII gTLD string and or the Latin Diacritic gTLD labels to proceed to the next stage of the application process. And the

suggested change from ICANN is the applicant must pass each element to enable the applied for strings in the ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set to proceed to the next stage of the application process.

So, instead of having ASCII gTLD string and or Latin Diacritic gTLD labels refer to the ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set. Any thoughts? No thoughts. To me, it sounds okay since it's referring to the same the meaning is the same. It's just using the ASCII Latin Diacritic gTLD set which we have defined beforehand instead of using the wording where we say ASCII gTLD string and or Latin Diacritic.

So, I think it makes it a bit clear to us and unless anybody has a different opinion we could use ICANN's wording here. Seeing no objections and some nodding in the room. So, yeah, let's go with that.

SAEWON LEE

Michael, with like eight minutes left the next part is a bit more substantive where it does require a bit more discussion. Do we want to continue?

MICHAEL BAULAND

Maybe just for interests' sake since we are already with that IG date read it out and then people can start thinking about this for the next session.

SAEWON LEE

Okay, so the next page, again we will be skipping Keanu Blaylock's comment in the sense that there was no rationale provided. So, the comments from ICANN Org there were two which are linked but two specifically.

So the first one is relating to the fact that the Implementation Guidance 8 does not address the impact of an evaluation outcome if an applied for ASCII gTLD string in the set fails evaluation. So, basically ICANN Org points out that we have a rule set for when an ASCII gTLD string is not present like in the preliminary recommendation 1.4 and preliminary recommendation 36 but that this is actually related to the post delegation scenarios and not the actual application evaluation scenarios.

S, that's the one point that ICANN Org would like us to reconsider. And then the second point is, again, it is interlinked but it comes to the point where they believe that we didn't apply final recommendation 3.1 from EPDP IDNs, which did refer to this point.

So, final recommendation 3.1 from EPDP IDNs and I'll share this in the chat for you said an application for an allocatable variant label cannot proceed an application for that variant label primary gTLD string. And obviously because our gTLD strings did not act in this relation between primary and variant we did not at the time see this as applicable but because of this evaluation scenario, ICANN Org would like us to revisit and assess whether a corresponding output may be necessary. And as I said, this is a bit more for us to

consider and discuss. So, I don't know if we just want to leave it here as a question for next time.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, that was my intention just since we are already looking at this IG8, look at the comment, read it out but do not discuss this right now. It makes no sense to start a discussion for one, two minutes and then postpone it. So everybody can already think about this and then we can continue or start the discussion for this during the next meeting. And with that, Saewon can go through the next steps, thanks.

SAEWON LEE

Yes, so I do want to briefly walk the Working Group through the proposed work plan for the remaining processes or procedures and also the next steps. So, once again, as you can see in this slide deck a slide page, you'll see that our proposed work plan has not really changed much since we last checked I think last September.

And it has been a little delayed because our Public Comment was published a little later than what we had proposed at the time. But the submission of the final report to the GNSO council still remains at September of this year. And specifically, if you see in the bottom, we plan to complete the review of Public Comments by May of this year and by August I think we can finalize the final report and also conduct a consensus call which means that the council will hopefully consider the report by October of this year.

Again, this is a proposed work plan and hopefully we will or we can beat the clock, let's hope. And then for the next steps we have not yet sent out any calendar invites Anil, I see your hand. Is there a question related to the timeline?

ANIL KUMAR JAIN

Yeah. Thank you, Saewon. Anil for the record. I just want to understand what are the expected deadlines for submission to the Board and approval from the Board approximately?

SAEWON LEE

So, once the GNSO council has considered the final report it's kind of the timeline after that related to the consideration by the Board is out of our hands like in the sense of out of the GNSO support staff's hand but usually the submission of the recommendation report to the Board is literally the month following the council's consideration. So basically by November we will be submitting a recommendation report to the Board but then anything after that like impact analysis and board's consideration I can't really answer at this moment. I hope that answers the question.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN

Thank you, Saewon.

SAEWON LEE

So, just for the next steps again calendar invites have not been sent out yet but our next call is anticipated for 25th of March. We will

resume our calls on the same day. So, Wednesdays, I think it was 1315 UTC and after ICANN85 our meetings will resume on the 25th of March. And so, for then I know the review tool was only shared with the Working Group a day or two ago and a lot of you probably haven't had the time to really absorb the material.

So hopefully by the 25th of March, if you can look into the next sets of comments that we will be going through we will be going through them in order through the tool that would be greatly appreciated but also focusing on preliminary recommendation 1 and 39 as those were the ones that received substantial amount of comments.

I think in the chat there are questions which Michael is answering but I think with that, I am going to hand the floor back over to Michael to close for us.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon. Yeah, so Tapani had a question about the order of things but once the policy becomes active then you can start combining ASCII and Diacritic TLDs but before that you can always apply for one or the other, just not both. We can discuss this in the break if you like or bring it up next session if it's necessary. With that, thank you everybody for your participation and see you all remote at our regular time. Thanks, all, and you can stop the recording now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]