
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO: Latin Script Diacritics PDP Working Group (1 of 2)
Saturday, March 7, 2026 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

ANDREA GLANDON

Hello and welcome to the Latin Script Diacritics PDP Working Group Session 1 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, and I will post them in the chat shortly for your reference. Only questions posted in the Zoom chat identified as a question will be read aloud during this session as time permits and when directed by the chair of this 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. And I will now hand it over to Saewon Lee. You may begin.

SAEWON LEE

Thank you for handing it over to me, Andrea, but I'm actually going to hand it back over to Michael.

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.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon. And welcome everybody to our LD PDP meeting, finally back again after a short break. I hope you all enjoyed the break and glad to have you all back on the team. And yeah, with that, next slide, please. As you know, we have just finished the public comment, and this is what we'll be dealing with in this meeting.

So we'll start with SOI updates, and then we will receive an overview of the initial report for the public comments, and then we'll start reviewing the receive public comments. And this will go on for the second session, which is after lunch, and then we will close with the next steps and AOB. Next slide, please. So in case there are any updates, please let us know.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Hi, this is Sebastien Ducos. I've changed my SOI in January as I've joined a registrar Unstoppable Domains. My previous employer, GoDaddy didn't particularly care about this PDP, so I was doing it in my own capacity. My new employer doesn't really care about this PDP, I'm doing it in my own capacity.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks. Any other updates? Okay, then next slide, please. And with that, I'll hand it over to Saewon to walk us through the public comments. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE

Thank you, Michael. I hope everyone can hear me properly. I don't see everyone in the room, but I do hear you very well. So, as Michael said, hi everyone, long time no see. It's great to be back with you all, though I'm not there with all of you in person. I hope this background makes, it feels like I'm with you all. So, this is Saewon Lee from ICANN Org staff for the record. I'm just going to turn to the next slide.

So, as you can see here, before we actually go into looking at each public comment submission itself, I think it will be helpful for everyone just to get provided with a high-level overview of how the public comment took place and obviously how they came in and how they were organized. So, if you see in this slide, staff provided a guided submission form to the community requesting input linked to each specific section, each specific recommendation or output.

And then we ask them to categorize them into five categories. So, as you can see in this slide, you'll see in the middle there on the left, there were two categories that were considered substantive, and on the right, three categories that were considered non-substantive. And you would've all seen this through the public comment review tool as well that I shared with you through the mailing list yesterday. And then you can also see it in the bottom of this slide as well.

And if John or Steve, you can share it in the chat for us, that would be very helpful. We won't be really going through the non-

substantive comments with either no opinion or supporting the recommendation as written. Unless there is a comment that just needs the working group's attention, we won't really be going through them.

So, this obviously means that our attention will mostly be going through the substantive ones or those requiring any wording change for working groups consideration. If you see actually at the top, the input areas, again, we asked for the input on all 54 preliminary recommendations and implementation guidance. And then as our work actually looked into existing work either for guidance or any transferable solutions, we also asked the community to comment on if our applicability was valid and if we had missed anything through looking at existing work.

So, there was a section where we asked for that as well. And also we asked for these actually related to those charter questions with no outputs that we asked for any input. And then specifically we asked for input on the glossary, the stress test, and any other Latin diacritic gTLD issues that we may have missed, the GPI, the Global Public Interest and Human Rights Impact assessment, and any other comments in general.

So with this, you'll see in this slide that we have summarized for you in a snapshot. You can also see this in the public comment review tool as well, and you'll see that in the public comment review tool, by the way, it's in tab three or sheet three, and here you'll see that

we receive 16 submissions and you can see the list of commenters on the right box, the yellow box.

And then we received comments for all 54 preliminary recommendations and implementation guidance. Whether they were substantive or non-substantive, they all received comments. And then out of them, 29 were considered substantive. Other sections also that received comments and that require the attention of the working group as you can see in the bottom, are on EPDP IDNs outputs that were considered not transferred over to our PDP, the Glossary, and Human Rights Impact assessment.

If I'm going too fast, please let me know. If you see in this page, you'll see that we've organized the list of topics or the preliminary recommendations that received a substantial amount of comments, or let's say substantive comments. And this is where the working group will be particularly paying attention to for the next few weeks or months. I'm hoping it will not come to months, but anyways.

And then as you can see at the top, I've marked in red recommendations one and 39, and it was on the scope and the requirements or the definition that the working group had set out for this PDP where we will definitely need to review in detail and take action if necessary to address those substantive concerns. I don't see any questions in the chat, but please do let us know, John, as I really cannot see the room, and unless I missed any hands, please do let us know. But until now, do we have any

questions? And if not, I will hand the floor back over to Michael just in case you want to say something before we go on to the next agenda item.

MICHAEL BAULAND

No, thanks. You can continue, and I see no raised hands in the room. Yeah.

SAEWON LEE

Okay, great. I'll go on to the next slide. So, now we will actually be going into reviewing each public comment received through the initial report public comment period. This also we provided for you in the public comment review tool. You'll see in tab two, sheet two. So, I do want to mention here that as we go through -- okay, before I go on, I think Mark has his hands up.

MARK DATYSGELD

Please finish, Saewon. I'll go right after.

SAEWON LEE

Okay. So, just before I actually go into this slide itself, I do want to mention today that during ICANN85 sessions, because obviously we don't want to go through the spreadsheets for too long, we've provided reviewing of the public comment submissions through these slides. But moving forward during the calls, we will actually be going through the tool itself reviewing each public comment submission. I did want to mention that.

And this page itself is us trying to emphasize as a disclaimer so that the working group can remember the key principles as we review the public comment submissions. So, this isn't just for LD PDP, it's for all the PDPs. We just want to ensure that the working group remembers the goal of the public comment review is not to revisit any agreements or rehash everything again or even resetting everything again, unless it is really crucial information that we need to consider for this work.

So, I just want to make sure that we are all in line. And so, I do want to read the disclaimer here and please keep the key principles here in mind. So, if Mark, you're okay, I'll read the disclaimer first and then I'll hand the floor back over to you. Okay, great. First, if suggested edits are minor and editorial in nature, focus on whether you can live with them, either the comments or even just what we have. If suggested edits are substantive, focus on what new information or insights have been provided by the commenter.

If concerns, information, or perspectives have already been considered in the development of the recommendations, consider how the report can strengthen them through the rationale by showing how these have been addressed and why the working group took the approach that it did. Though our PDP is an open model, members should represent the view of their appointing organization where applicable and may be called on to provide the official position of their appointing organization.

Again, this is the important part now is actually the time to make sure that we are aligned as we prepare for the final report. The goal is to make recommendations that achieve consensus support, and if there isn't consensus to change the policy, the existing policy remains in place. Before taking any questions, I do want to hand the floor over to Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD

Thank you very much. This is Mark Datysgeld, vice chair. It's a pleasure to reconvene with everyone in this great group and welcome back. So, I would just like to start with a fun conversation about PDPs. So, I would like to think that we all carry the very fair, open PDP. I would like to say all of us group members, we took in input from a lot of different sources. We talked to many, many people as you know, over the course of this PDP and gathered a lot of input.

And that's how we reached our consensus, which was not even that rough, right? We managed to get our consensus pretty well constrained, and I think that's a win. I think we achieved what is a good victory? As you might have seen, we got a lot of public comments, some of them more substantive, others touching upon things that we discussed that we will go back to them and give them the correct consideration that we need to give them, especially related to the scope of our work.

We know we had this conversation many times about what is the diacritic, what isn't, the composition. We have been there, we'll

come back, not to rehash discussion, but to reassert our positions and understand where we are with that. And you might have noticed that there is a very significant comment from ICANN Org. Very, very, very significant. It contains many pages. And within the scope of the work of the GNSO, ICANN Org had a seat at the table during the entire proceeding of the PDP.

They were the first, they were invited, they had members of ICANN Org here, esteem members, people we respect a lot actually. So, ICANN Org had equal opportunity to participate in every step of the way. And in that sense, ICANN Org in the context of this feedback is just another person entity giving feedback to the PDP. Their feedback is as valuable, as important as any constituency, any individual person, and we will address all of them in the same way, because that is how this process works.

They provided input, we'll go over it with the same fairness as all of it, but we will not attempt to put undue importance in this. We'll put the perfect amount of importance. Because at the end of the day, we need to align between us, the GNSO Council, and the Board, and that's how we'll get this implemented. That's how this would why ICANN Board feedback is very important.

At the end of the day, what we need to get right is to fill every public comment and address them respectfully and with technical accuracy and get this in a way that works for the council and works for the Board. And gladly, we had a champion in the shape of Prudence. Maybe you haven't heard that much on the microphone,

but she was a champion for us in the council. She did everything for this group to work. Unfortunately, she's not liaising exactly anymore, but she's with us, which I'm super happy about. So, thank you again, Prudence.

I've said this in particular, but also now in the open, but we actually got a gift in the figure of Christian Dawson. So, for those who don't know this guy, he was doing universal acceptance and IDN before I was doing this like 10 years ago. When I started on this, he was already in this game. There are some veterans here in the room. Yes, looking at you Sir, who have been around for a long time, and Christian is one of the champions.

So, we get him to liaise with the council now. And again, we have a very strong hand working in the Genal council, so let's keep our focus, our priority. We have a good liaison, we have a good team, everybody did good work, and I would just like to put this emphasis. It's not because we got a gigantic nine-page comment from ICANN Org, that this changes anything meaningfully. We'll treat it with the respect and importance that it needs. Thank you.

SAEWON LEE

Thank you, Mark. Michael, would you like to add anything?

MICHAEL BAULAND

No, thanks. But I see Edmon's hand is up.

EDMON CHUNG

Edmon here. So I guess building on what Mark was saying, I think the ICANN staff input might be slightly different though because it touches on both the core issues. And also, we might want the, sorry, I forgot who the board liaison to us is. Oh, anyway, so I think some of those discussions might need to front run in a little bit with the Board because Ultimately, if the GNSO is all good with it, it goes to the Board, but obviously, I don't think it's a secret.

The staff will also brief the Board on it. If we just in terms of the GNSO side believes is a good policy. I think it's better for us to front run this with the board because some of them are really policy decisions that the Board eventually need to take. So, in part of this process, we should try to engage the board a little bit more.

MARK DATYSGELD

If I may follow up on former board member Edmun Chung, who would know this, Edmun, we count with your guidance and counsel on this to help us get this through. You understand the board procedures and it would be great to keep having input on that. So, yes, for sure. And please help us get this to where we need to get, we don't want to stall the PDP, or it's been so successful so far. So, let's keep winning.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks. Any other comments, question? Then I will hand it back to Saewon. Thanks.

SAEWON LEE

Thank you, Michael. All the important points. Again, all good points to consider as we review through each comment submission. Yes, Alan Barrett is and continues to be our Board liaison. So, for today's two sessions, and we will have to see how fast or slow we go, the leadership team and staff have decided that for many reasons we'll go through the let's say easy breezy ones or non-substantive ones first, try to get them out to the way.

And then seeing how we go, move over to the tool if necessary and start going through the comments in order. Obviously, we will need to take some time on preliminary recommendation one and 39 and we'll just have to see how we go today. Then I guess we'll get started. So, slides 10 and the next page, 11. As we start from the non-substantive comment, they are from ICANN Org.

So, if you see in this slide here and the next slide, the next two slides, we have three groupings of comments that's about the consistency concept. So, basically the comment is that as our PDP mapped our outputs to those of EPDP IDNs and mirrored the language when we developed our recommendations, they're asking the working group to keep the style of writing consistent or clarify those parts when not consistent or be more precise when things have, let's say, deferred from the original language.

So, if we go into the first one here, the first one is actually pretty simple. This is just requesting consistency in the drafting where all those consistent recommendations mirroring EPDP IDNs content just keeps the same phrase consistent with.

And I must apologize, actually this is on my part because I wanted to change from some recommendations to some recommendations where some of them I used consistent with, some of them I used in line with or in accordance with. And basically, they were asking that we just keep them all the same if we are using consistent with, just to keep everything consistent with so that there's no confusion when it gets to implementation stage.

So, this is actually linked to preliminary recommendations six, implementation guidance eight, preliminary recommendation 47, 48, and 52. I'm not going to read them here just because as I said, this is pretty simple and to do with the drafting style, and there's not really anything to consider other than the fact that it needs to stay aligned -- the consistent with should, that they're asking that it applies to all these five outputs here.

So, unless the working group disagrees with this consistency we'll try to keep the same language. And I see in the chat, Bill adds another way of saying without objection. Again, we can decide what we want to keep for those consistent recommendations. Basically, the request is that we keep them all the same.

I am going to go through all three first before I hand it back over to Michael for discussions and agreement. Oh, okay. Sorry. Bill's actually not objecting to this. But anyways, I'm going to go through all three first, Michael, if that's okay, and then hand it back over to you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yes.

SAEWON LEE

So, the second one in this slide is on the left first. Actually, let's do the right first because this is more simple than the left one. So, the right one, the yellow box, again, this is pretty simple as well in the fact that the comment recognizes preliminary recommendations 35 and 36, that they're quite different from the original EPDP IDNs recommendations.

So rather than currently where we have left out consistent with, adding a term like different from, or something else that clarity exactly that it's a different recommendation from the EPDP IDNs one, and trying to kind of clarify exactly what point is different from EPDP IDNs.

So, Org did state in its comment that they do acknowledge or recognize that we have added a footnote or put it in the rationale where it deferred from, but basically, they're saying that it would be more helpful if the differences are prominent in the recommendation language. The last one, the third one, again, related to the consistency notion in the left green box, is a bit more complex.

So this actually suggests that the term consistent with not be labeled. If they differ from EPDP IDNs, even in the slightest sense, even if it's very minor or even if very minor. And this, as I said, is a

bit more complex because we would actually have to go through each recommendation or implementation guidance for this to see exactly where it deferred and how we want to keep it.

There are a bit more requests from ICANN Org per some of the outputs. So, we will go through one by one. But before we do, related to the other two, let's say relatively simple ones, I do want to stop here first and let Michael have the floor for discussions.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon, for the summary. So, any comments, ideas regarding these comments so far? I see and hear none. My question would be really what does consistent mean? Is it necessarily exactly the same? My personal point of view consistent is if the intention and meaning is the same even if there are small differences which are required to make it the same, but I'm not a linguist. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah, Edmon here. I guess I'd kind of like to ask maybe ICANN team what does it mean? If the working group provides some examples, would that clarify the issue better. What is the actual ask, to change? Because it doesn't look to me that this is a substantive change, which how it's kind of categorized as well. So, would adding examples simply do the job or what are we looking at

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks. Saewon.

SAEWON LEE

To answer Edmon's point first, thank you, Michael. We can actually look into them, but I am actually regretful to say that Ariel Yang, the GDS liaison for our working group is not present today sadly. Hopefully for the next one she will be present to explain further.

But basically, for the first one, it really is just to do with this first one, as I mentioned. Basically, for the five outputs you can see that are linked to this comment, it's just basically updating anything that doesn't say consistent with, but maybe say in accordance with or in line with to change them all back to consistent with, or maybe change them all to, in accordance with, but basically keeping them all the same. So this one I think is, as I said, pretty straightforward. Related to this yellow box.

So, I think it might be easier to just go to, for example recommendation 35 and 36. You'll see here, as you can see, even though it referred to the language in EPDP IDNs, our rules changed or deferred largely from what was set out in EPDP IDNs. And so, basically, here the Org is asking that we add either different from or some kind of a language that states that this is different and actually pointing out which part is different even within the recommendation language.

So, I think that explains the yellow box related to, and I think Sarmad is here to say more. But related to the other green box

here, as I mentioned, we do actually need to go through each recommendation to see which part has changed which part has evolved to determine how the working group would like to go about those. But before Satish, is it okay if we ask Sarmad to add a bit more context if he has any?

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yes, Sarmad, Satish agrees.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

Thank you, and good morning, everyone. This is Sarmad. So, just to add that when we are doing implementation analysis of these recommendations and for implementation, it is helpful to understand that if the recommendation is same as, or if you want to call consistent as the one in IDN EPDP, we can easily go and look at the analysis which we had done for the recommendation in the ID and EPDP PDP and inherit some of that analysis.

For example, as is, if it is the same. If it is different, of course it requires an independent analysis. And then if it is I guess with some overlap, but with some difference, it would mean that though we could look at how the same recommendation was analyzed in IDN EPDP. But that may also require some additional analysis, though obviously on the ICANN part, we could do that without, I guess, making this terminology consistent.

But if the working group makes it more precise, that's helpful for us as well. So, it's just a suggestion. As we said, it's non-substantive,

so really obviously up to the working recruit side, but that is some of the motivation behind it. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks, Sarmad. Yeah, I think the inconsistency one and three are quite clear and we might take a look at those inconsistencies too. Satish.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Michael. Satish for the record. So, I don't have any objections in to any of these three cases, but I would like to flag this issue which is that the relation between the PDP and IDNs and the LD PDP is somewhat unusual in the sense there is a lot of dependency on the PDP and IDNs. Now, when you say consistent with, it is actually deepening that dependence.

It's almost saying that the EPDP is coming through into LD PDP directly, and that raises the problem, I mean, a concern that is such a dependence healthy. What would happen if late down the line, something happens to some of the recommendations of the PDP, how will we be affected? So, the dependency is somewhat unusual, and I think we should look into it. Otherwise, on the surface of it, this is fine. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Satish. Valuable points. That's a good question. I think it makes sense to be consistent and to try to stay consistent. So, if there were changes, perhaps, we should do according changes

because in the end, for all parties involved, registries, registrars, registrants, it makes it all much easier if we don't do it differently, but we do it the same way, the technical implementation and the policy and all that. So, for that, we try to be as consistent as possible, but there are some cases that require differences because we just don't deal with variants. James.

JAMES KUNLE

Yeah, thank you very much Chair. So, I'm going to be brief because I'm happy that everybody's towing the same line. And for me, I think based on the nature of the work we're trying to do, we need to be cautious of being consistent. It is very important at this juncture. We should try as much as possible to be precise in everything, so to say. So, I'm not going to dwell so much on that since everybody has already agreed on that. So, I think that is the right way to go, and thank you for giving me the floor.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks. Any other questions, comments? Then I can hand it back to Saewon.

SAEWON LEE

Thank you, Michael. So I think what we can do is, and this will be what will happen moving forward, so basically the public comment submissions that we have reviewed through the deliberations will be obviously updated through the review tool on the working groups discussions and responses. And then a draft will be or let's

say the updated draft will be shared with the working group either through the mailing list or through the next meeting for confirmation.

And so, what we'll do for this grouping of the inconsistency, I think for the first one, the working group agrees to update it to all consistent with. The third one, we will try and see how we can update it based on the suggestion made from ICANN Org. And then now we will go through the linked outputs to the second inconsistency issue. As I said, it's a bit more complex in the sense that there's a bit more context provided for those recommendations that we have labeled as consistent with, but is not seen as consistent with.

So I think we have to go through them one by one to determine what the working group believes is best on how to label them. So, that's what we'll do now. Sorry. So, going back to the tool. Nope. So, I hope you can all see this at one go. The review tool has also been shared with those members through the chat, so please do access it through there. But basically, starting with preliminary recommendation seven, we are not going to go through all this, the comments here, but only related to the consistency notion just to get a bit more background on how we want to or context us to how we want to update it.

So basically, as you can see here in column D, you'll see the suggestion from ICANN Org about updating the consistent or in line or in accordance with where if you see in the current

recommendation, the working group states that our recommendation is in line with final recommendation 3.5 of the EPDP IDNs phase one final report. However, if you see in the substantive comment here, I'm going to highlight it for you and maybe also put it in the chat for you. Okay. It doesn't.

Anyways, so if you see this highlighted portion also in the tool, basically the Org does have an issue with us stating that we are staying consistent with the original EPDP IDNs recommendation because we have actually omitted certain parts of the EPDP IDNs language. And here the certain part is apparently according to the Org's comment, quite crucial in how it deferred from the original EPDP IDNs language. And the part that is seen as, so while ICANN Org does recognize that our concept or LD PDP's concept is not related to or linked as the primary and variant strings, they do think that the LD PDP outputs essentially need to determine the relationship as how it was done in EPDP IDNs.

I'm sorry that I don't have the EPDP IDNs language with me here. If maybe John, you could share the EPDP IDNs language in the chat for us, that would be helpful. But basically, we are missing a component that was actually included in EPDP IDNs final recommendation 3.5, and that part is where EPD, sorry, where ICANN Org is mentioning that we have deferred from the original language.

And so, asking us to not include in line with, but stating either different from and where or how we have deferred and or if we

think that it's something that we can go back to and be consistent with the EPDP IDNs language to also consider that for future considerations. I will try to share the EPDP IDNs language with you here so that we can point that out to you. But while we do that, I am going to hand the floor back over to Michael for any discussions.

MICHAEL BAULAN

Thanks, Saewon. Any questions, comments so far? I think if I remember correctly, while we're waiting here, the things we changed here are only that we changed those that were referring to variants because we don't have variants here. And the intention of our recommendation was to actually require all those reasons that are required from the variant applicants that provide consistent or similar reasons in our case too. Yeah, I see this now, but it's too small on my screen.

SAEWON LEE

Yes, so basically the part that was emitted, and I shared it with you on the chat as well, so the omitted element is related to 3.5.2 explaining how the primary and variant labels are considered the same, and obviously that doesn't apply to LD PDP and that's why it was omitted.

But basically, Org is saying that even though we have omitted the requirement for applicants explaining how the applied-for labels within the set are considered the same, that this key criterion used in the evaluation of variant string applications should be

something that LD PDP again looks into how we want to approach this requirement, and or if we do decide that it's not a necessary component for us, at least in the language mentioning different from and why it is different. Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND Yeah, thanks. Reading this again, I'm just thinking of whether it even makes sense to re-include this and to also require applicants for diacritics to provide reasoning why they think that those strings are the same. Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD Mark Datysgeld. Explain to me like I'm a toddler why this matters. Like why would this matter in any way shape or form?

MICHAEL BAULAND Just for our case or generally?

MARK DATYSGELD Why does this matter? Like, why the need to justify this?

MICHAEL BAULAND I think the for the variant case, the reasoning was that you should not just activate an arbitrary number of variants. So, the number of variants should be limited and you should also be able to show that those two labels are actually considered the same by the user group, not just activate variants because they are defined as web

variants, but the actual words used should have the same meaning. I don't know whether Anil or Amadeu was first. I'd go with Amadeu. Sorry, Anil.

AMADEU ABRIL

No. Sorry. Amadeu Abril from CORE, for the record. What we are doing here is an exception process to a decision-making procedure that tries to prevent user confusion. If you want the exception to the user confusion principle, I think it's reasonable that you justify why you want to handle those TLDs jointly. I don't think that this is anything that's too much as a requirement.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, sound sensible. Anil.

ANIL JAIN

Thank you. Anil, for the record. The question here is that the recommendations from this PDP and EPDP should be consistent. That is well understood. But my take on this is that in case this PDP has used some other language, which is not the same language which is used in EPDP. However, the both recommendations are consistent with each other.

I think we should go ahead with that. This is first take. And second, of course, we had a detailed discussions in this PDP that we don't deal with the variant and variants, they are not relevant here. So, I

personally feel that we should stand with that stand itself and we should go ahead with the reply of these comments. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Anil. Bill, please.

BILL JOURIS

This is Bill Jouris for the record. If we're going to put language in that says, pardon me, that says the applicant needs to show that things are used interchangeably or whatever, I think we need to have some explanation of what constitutes showing that adequately.

Is it just the applicant says people use it interchangeably and we take their word for it? Or do we need to have some documentation? Or what is our criteria here? If we're going to require somebody to do something, I think we need to be clear on what exactly it is we're requiring them to do. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Bill. And I see Sarmad's head. Yeah, I see also his head in the icon, but I meant his hand. And I think he can respond to that question. Thanks.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

Thank you, Michael. So, again, as you mentioned, the motivation in the IDN EPDP for this recommendation was that the general, I guess, aim is to minimize the number of variants which are actually

delegated. And the motivation really should come from clear need rather than just a desire. And this follows from some advice coming in from SSAC as well.

So, the IDN EPDP working group actually had put in these criteria to elicit details from the applicant on why the string, variant TLD string is needed. And there is supposed to be an independent panel which evaluates each of the four questions in the IDN EPDP phase two recommendation.

And the applicant has to pass through each of those four questions for that variant to be moved ahead and to be delegated. In this case, and then each of those questions obviously are asking about a separate dimension of, I guess, the utility of that string or the need for that variant TLD string as determined by IDN EPDP Working Group.

In this particular case, I guess there are three instead of four, it's missing one, so there are actually two different questions here. First of all, whether this is the same criteria as the one in IDN EPDP. And I guess in that sense, it is missing one criterion. So, it is not exactly equal, even though it may be consistent, but not the same.

And the second question, of course, is a separate question on whether that particular condition should be considered by the working group and added back or dropping that condition is still, I guess, okay. So, just a bit more explanation. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yes, thanks so much for that explanation. That makes sense. Tapani, please.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

Yeah, just a brief note that the Latin diacritic differences in domains would definitely not be simply different spellings of the same word. As a trivial example, my favorite example here is the .chair, which could be spelled differently in, say, Swedish and Icelandic, and I can imagine a company serving these different markets without simply choosing the different diacritics gives a different language version of the same or something like that.

And of course, there are also cases where it brings a completely different word, a completely different meaning as well. So, we should not consider diacritic versions or different diacritic versions as simply like they are variants of the same word because they often are not.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah. So, I think our case is similar to variants in that sense that variants are defined in the LGR, they are very technical concept, but whether two labels or words being variants of each other actually have the same meaning might depend on the word itself or on the language, and it's similar with diacritics there can be labels which are diacritics of each other which have the same meaning, if it's a company or whatever, or if it's a fallback representation like cafe and café with an accent, you might argue that for international

market you leave out the accent, but for the correctly spelled French market you want it in, so you can argue those are the same, but at the same time you could have labels which are diacritics which do not have the same meaning and are usually not understood the same way. So, in that sense, I think it makes sense to bring in the missing clause from the variants in our work. Satish.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Michael. Satish for the record. So, here, the major tension seems to be that variants are technically defined by the root zone LGR, whereas for the LD PDP, these strings are applicant requested. So, that seems to be the major tension. But for me, that is not really a big point of separation because finally, what is the roots zone LGR? It is a community-defined code point relationship.

It is not as if it is a kind of technical standard. It has been defined by communities. So, in that sense, and for the LD PDP, these are also, when you say applicant requested, actually there's a big community behind them. It is not one individual or one party which is requesting this. So, in both cases, it's the community that is defining this, although in different ways. In one sense, it is technically defined.

So, the root zone LGR is a technical document, kind of a technical standard. Whereas for us, there's no such standard. It is a community which is putting up a request. So, these are not really far apart, and I think we can consider this to be approximately the same. It is because the root zone LGR mechanism did not permit

the existence of the diacritics that this exceptional route had to be taken, and we knew right from the beginning it is an exceptional root, it is not surprising, it is nothing new really. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Satish. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG

Edmon here. So, I agree with Satish that it shouldn't be something new, and I agree with you Michael that in the sense that variants can also produce uh different meanings depending on the language and so on. I think it makes sense what, Michael, you suggested, and I don't have the actual text in front of me of what the IDN PDP actually ended up with, but I think something substantially similar would be fine.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks. Any other opinions regarding these four questions? And Saewon just put it in the chat, it was explanation of how the primary and variant labels are considered the same. And so, in our context, it would be an explanation of how the ASCII and the LD labels are considered the same. So, the question would be, should we introduce that since we missed it, or do you think, no, this is not necessary? Mark, please.

MARK DATYSGELD

Mark Datysgeld. I'll look more into the link that Steve sent soon, but in the meantime, can we in general agree that if this comes in, it needs to be simple? That is my only concern, that we don't create some arbitration process on top of another arbitration process. This needs to be relatively simple. I understand the concept behind this. Okay, we don't want to spawn. But at the same time, if we're going to start gating things and creating situations where judgment calls have to be made, that is the quickest way to make this whole process fail.

That is a very surefire way to make this process fail. So, whatever we do, whether the group accepts or not, I would like to suggest that we steer this towards simplicity without creating anything too grandiose behind it. A simple check or like a logical check, something that makes sense, you prove it, okay I've proven it and we move right along. So, that is my personal suggestion.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Mark. I think the way how this is checked is not really in our scope. So, in the IDN EPDP, they just provide an explanation how they are considered the same. And how you do that explanation is up to the applicant. It just must be convincing in some way.

MARK DATYSGELD

But the one who checks is?

MICHAEL BAULAND The one who checks this, that's a panel that is just like all the other application questions.

MARK DATYSGELD The same people, basically?

MICHAEL BAULAND No, that's a different group. This is a group of language script experts who will be checking those questions.

MARK DATYSGELD That's layers of failure being added on top of layers of failure. We need to consider this carefully. It's not as simple as it's made to look, it's adding layers of failure on something that's not supposed to be that complicated. But the group is the one who decides.

MICHAEL BAULAND Yeah, this is just what is currently the case for variants, what I explained. For the LD, we haven't decided yet, but the question is do we want to be consistent with the variants and ask the same questions or do we want to change this and not ask the same questions as for the variants, and if so, why and what are the questions if any we want to ask. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG Yeah, Edmon here. Just quickly in response to Mark. I think the original intent for the IDN EPDP was to make it simpler so that the

evaluators have what is declared by the applicant rather than having to guess what the applicant is thinking about, and I think it applies here. The main thing I think maybe this group needs to really talk about is whether we do allow the situation where it's intended to mean different things, and that's where I think Sarmad is hitting at.

If I recall correctly, IDN EPDP said it's for supporting the linguistic community, and therefore it's not for "gaming where you can actually serve completely different meaning stuff." So, you have to explain how they are actually the same and therefore they're variants. So, the situation where it means different things creates the discussion then was that the situation that it could mean different things could result in sort of a confusion in the user end because they it's a global community, you can't fix it to a particular community.

And here, the question again, comes back to if the applicant is supposed to explain how they are the same, we are in effect, limiting the applicability of situations where certain diacritics might actually be completely different, meaning things where an applicant actually wants to do that for market purposes.

Those are things that I think where the line is drawn and saying, this is supposed to be supportive of assisting the communities that needs these diacritics, just like IDN are. But when you look at a different market, then you get a completely different TLD in

essence is what kind of if I understand what Sarmad is really driving at.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Edmon. Very valuable and good points. The thing is that we want to support TLDs which are in some way the same. That's also why we require this whole same entity principle stuff also as a second level. If they were not considered to be the same, we wouldn't even need the same entity. So, from my point of view, it makes sense to have this requirement here too.

MARK DATYSGELD

Sorry, I put something on chat, but for accessibility, I will bring it to the microphone. So, how it goes in Portuguese, Brazilian Portuguese, it would go like this. Maca means paddock, like the thing that you carry people to the hospital with. And massa, same composition, but with a tilde on the A and a cedilla, that's an apple, right? So, those are, in theory, within our scope, they work within the variant, and yes, they would serve different markets.

One would serve for the hospital community, medical community, and the other for the fruits and vegetables community. So, I guess the real question is, do we care? From my perspective is, do we actually care? Personally, as a group member, I don't care. I think that's legitimate use anyway. But then again, let's bring it to the point, do we care? I think Michael, if you want to correct me or summarize on top, please do.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Mark, and thanks for the great example. Edmon, is that a -
- Okay, thanks. So, yeah, that's a big question, so to say. Do we want to allow these TLD to coexist with different meaning, or is it not the intention of this PDP to allow this? Any thoughts? Bill.

BILL JOURIS

Yeah, Bill Jouris, for the record. With regard to Mark's example, it may well be that there are languages where a diacritic makes a difference, as in the example he gives, but there may be other languages where the two, with and without the diacritic, are used interchangeably. And I think we shouldn't say, no, you can't do that because they're different in one language. I think we have to look at, is there a language, specifically the one of the, would be registrant, registry, sorry, where it does get used interchangeably.

Otherwise, we end up having to go through every language to say, is there someplace that makes a difference? And so, I would rather just say if the applicant can show that it is used interchangeably in his language, we don't really care if there's someplace else where they're not interchangeable. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Bill. And I think that's exactly what the question asked, the applicant should prove in some way that these labels are used interchangeably. But if it's just this case and they can't prove it,

then with the current situation, they are not allowed to proceed. They have to have examples where they are the same. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Yeah, I just wanted to agree with this again. I wasn't part of it, but from what I read of the debates during the Root Zone LGR work, that's exactly where it blocked them, that is exactly where they ended up deciding that variation didn't exist in Latin because the combinations within languages and between languages were just way too complicated.

And in order to keep a single Latin table, they decided to go away with it. It was either that or then go language per language specific and start establishing. So, if we want to keep that single table and yet go around the LGR problem, I think that we need to indeed go with the suggested and put it on the applicant to demonstrate rather than putting hard rules.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Sebastien. Tapani, please.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

I'm not sure it actually makes sense to require that they demonstrate them in the same thing. We have an interesting case now that omitting the diacritics is used as a substitute for the diacritical word even though it actually means something

completely different. So, is that a problem? Is that actually an acceptable case?

Can you actually accept this case of applying for diacritical domain saying that it means the same even though it actually doesn't because the non-diacritical version has been used as a substitute when you could not get the diacritical one? I can come up with any number of examples if you like. I think you can too. So, does it really matter if they mean the same thing? And where do you draw the line?

Not sure, actually. It means a lake in one language and a sea in another language, and still the same. Are they the same? If the same company uses them, I'm not sure. I don't see. Does it really matter that they mean a difference?

MICHAEL BAULAND

I mean, if you can show that they've been used interchangeably, that's proof enough for this, then you show that they have the same meaning, that people understand that label to mean the same thing because the fallback representation has been used widely and for the real spelled one and I think that's proof enough. But to just have two labels where there's no connection like Mark said here and you might not even have any proof that they have the same meaning, then those possibly should not be allowed to go forward.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

How about the case where no such label has existed in the past and the diacritical means something completely different than the ASCII version, can you still get the both and say that because some people are still likely to use the non-diacritical version and guess it's the same, even though there's no history of such? Again, I'm not sure this requirement is necessary at all.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay. I see a queue now. Sarmad, and then Pitinan, and then Edmon, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

Thank you, this is Sarmad. So, going back to variants, there are two dispositions which a variant may have. A variant can actually exist and can be blocked from delegation, and then a variant could be allocated. And I guess the suggestion has been from the technical community that the allocatable variants should be minimized, and eventually delegations should be minimized. Whereas the block variants should be in some ways maximized.

The reason behind it is that the blocking is motivated by security concerns, meaning that two things which are considered same or could be considered same by a community, if they are delegated to different entities, it can potentially create a situation where it creates user confusion and therefore potentially end user security issues.

So, just by identifying and blocking them en masse addresses the security issue. For a smaller set of or subset of these which are identified as, I guess, variants and potentially should be blocked, there were some arguments that a very small number may actually be needed by the community because they are used interchangeably by the community in their, I guess, daily lives.

And for those small set of variants, the suggestion was to use a different disposition which is allocatable, meaning that those variants could actually be allocated. Of course, I think it was realized that Root Zone LGR does produce, I guess, overproduces allocatable variants, and therefore, this particular recommendation was added by the IDN EPDP Working Group to make sure that only those actually are allocated from the allocatable set, which meet that underlying usability criteria for allocatable variants, which is that there is actually a community which would actually use it in the “same way.”

And therefore, just because two strings are variants of each other but mean totally different things, should really be blocked variants and not really allocatable variants. That was at least the reasoning behind it. In this case as well, I think we have two strings, Latin diacritic versus different diacritical with different diacritics. And reason to allocate diacritic obviously perhaps should be used the same foundation or argument.

As to the question on whether ASCII versus diacritic could be used, I guess an argument could be made by an applicant that even

though the ASCII did not exist before, but the tradition of ASCII representing diacritized marks has existed and make a case, because there is that expectation in the end user community. So, in any case, I think that's at least the motivation behind it. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Sarmad. Pitinan.

PITINAN KOOARMORNPATANA

Thank you, Pitinan, for the record. Actually, just wanted to add on what Samad already mentioned about allocatable and blocked variants. So, basically when we say the same, it doesn't really mean the same. It means actually perceived as the same by the community. So, many of the cases where it's the allocatable is likely to be meaning the same because sometimes it's the character for Chinese characters or the different way of typing the same name, which is the character of Arabic.

But it's also a small portion of Latin as well, which is already allocatable, and the reasoning is for the fallback. So, it's the dotless I and I. So, it's quite similar to this situation, I think. So, it's still maybe useful to explain why these are perceived as the same by the community. Not exactly needs to mean the same, but is perceived as the same. And it has to be able to explain why it serves the community they plan to serve.

So, I would support adding the question, but the details of what to ask in the question may be quite interesting to see from the example from Mark as well. Like if it's not really used as a fallback before, is it still valid in this case? Like totally different meaning, and I'm not very sure what would be that. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Pitinan. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah, Edmon here. Basically agree with what Pitinan and Sarmad said. And in response to Tapani's question, I think as long as the applicant can make a convincing case that they are similarly used by a certain community, I think that's okay. And maybe if I am the applicant, I would probably also note that there are these other meanings of it, but that's not what we are intending to do.

We cannot forbid people to try to abuse the system, and we don't need to guess what's happening. So, adding the question to have the applicant explain is probably the way to go rather than us trying to anticipate all the possibilities.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks. Satish.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Satish, for the record. I basically agree with these points expressed right now. I think we have a very narrow scope. We don't

have a broad kind of a scope, for example, to state that, okay, in future, this may be used like this. So, I think we have to stick to historic precedent and well-established community presidents only. And anything else, I think we are not prepared to handle that because we have just this one very narrow scope. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Satish. And yeah, seeing that we're moving to the end of the session, I just summarize what I've seen so far that most people tend to agree to have that requirement from the IDN EPDP reintroduced. I think Bill, Edmon, Satish were in favor of that. Tapani was a bit skeptical. Any other people who would like to vote in favor or not? Or it seems the majority is in favor of including that, so anybody who has a problem with that, please.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

I just know that I pretty much agree with Edmon that any such restriction would be very easy to circumvent. If I want to use some diacritical versions of the word with different meaning, I just explain that of course they will be confused with the ASCII one and so it's the same and after I get the domain, then it will be used differently and nothing we can do about it. So, this is not like to have much impact in practice, so I will not object it, just raise it, it doesn't really matter.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay. Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD

Mark speaking as a group member. After hearing all the points, I will agree, but I would like to see some sort of language implying that we don't want this to be some gigantic process. I would like to see some language in which we converge towards making this simpler rather than more complicated, because otherwise we create this rabbit hole that's actually going to harm linguistic communities rather than help them.

So okay, I will concede, we can input, but in the language review, I would like to see something pointing very clearly to ICANN Legal, we want this to be. relatively simple and not some gauntlet that they have to jump through a billion hoops. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Mark. Steve.

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Michael. This is Steve from Staff. And I had mentioned Implementation Guidance⁸, and I think that's probably relevant to the concern you're raising, Mark. Let me see if I can grab it real quick. Sorry, this is actually from, I'm looking at the wrong one. I'm actually looking at the IDN's EPDP one, but it talks about the evaluation panel should apply criteria based on a general standard of reasonableness, and the criteria must be established during implementation.

And so, I think that wording standard of general reasonableness was selected on purpose by the IDNs PDP. I think to your point, Mark, to at least put some friction in the process to avoid overproliferation, but also to not make the process and evaluation overly onerous. So, I think the intention for the IDNs EPDP and for also this group is to strike the balance between avoiding proliferation, but also to not make it a very complicated process. Thanks.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Yeah, sounds good. So, I think we can continue with the next one. Yeah, 10 minutes, we can at least look at that. I think we don't need any closing or AOB. We can leave that for the second session. So, back to Saewon.

SAEWON LEE

Great, thank you. Yeah, so we'll go through this very quickly. Same as recommendation seven. So, IG-11 also had the consistency issue where you apparently the language changed from EPDP IDNs. But together with this, same as recommendation seven, we want to kill two birds with one stone where this part we want to go through.

First of all, actually, if you see Implementation Guidance 11, the parts that have changed is that if you remember this implementation guidance, that we decided to treat the research

not separately with EPDP IDNs but together, and that was the part that we added which, let's say, differed from EPDP IDNs.

The first part that we need to determine is do we want to leave out consistent with or in line with and then add a different from and how it differed from. That's the first point. And then the second point to that is ICANN Org's request here. So, this was more of an assumption asking the working group to confirm whether with respect to the proposed outputs on additional criteria or tests language.

Basically, they wanted the working group to confirm. So, ICANN Org understood this language as that community would be provided an opportunity to comment on those proposed outputs. But any additional criteria or tests resulting from the research would not be required to undergo any policy development process for confirmation and could be implemented directly.

And they just wanted the working group to confirm that this was indeed the case where like EPDP IDNs, the approach is that no additional policy development process will need to be conducted, but it could be implemented directly. So, two points here, as I mentioned, basically, how do you want to deal with the consistency language and whether or not the working group confirms that the proposed outputs on additional criteria or tests does indeed go in line with EPDP IDNs. And I'll hand it back over to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Thanks, Saewon. Can ICANN, if the respective people are here, explain why they think our REC is not consistent or where it is inconsistent. Maybe then it makes it easier for us to decide whether we should leave out the consistent word. Sarmad, please.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

Yeah, so I think Ariel would have been the best person to respond to this, but I can try to take a shot. Basically, I think what is probably intended here is additional analysis in addition to the variants needs to be done. So, there is actually, in some ways, you could say that it is consistent because as we're doing analysis for variant we also want to do analysis for Latin diacritic strings.

But in other ways, it actually could be interpreted differently, where you're saying that in the case of the earlier IDN EPDP, we are doing the analysis for the variants, but in this case in addition to that, we are also requiring analysis for latent diacritic strings. Just I think that may actually be the you know it could be interpreted in those two ways, and again as I said, maybe Ariel would have been a good person to explain this further, but there are two readings there at least the way I see it. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks. That explains it. From my personal view, it's an additional step, but we want it to be the same as for the IDN EPDP, and that's why we say it's consistent with that. But for the variants,

there is certain mechanisms, some certain steps to be taken by ICANN, and we want consistently the same checks test to be done for our cases. So, that's why we said consistent here. But in the end, I don't know. Any other comments here? Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah, Edmon here. I guess we need to ask Ariel. I don't think there's a difference in intent, although it's categorized that way. If staff team wants to make some adjustments to the wording, I'm totally fine with it.

MICHAEL BAULAND

Okay, thanks. Sounds good to check with Ariel once she's available. The second part was about doing that in parallel, I think. And I think we just added that to save resources. If ICANN wants to do that in parallel, they can, but it was not a requirement for us, if I remember right. Any comments here? No.

Everybody's ready for lunch, I guess. Yeah, I see lots of nodding there. Okay, so seeing it's just... who is not ready for lunch? No hand. Okay, we have consensus. With that, I think, and just two minutes left, we can conclude the meeting and reconvene after lunch. I think it's in one hour fifteen. Yeah. So, one hour fifteen break and then back in the same room. Thanks.

JOHN EMERY

Thank you. Please, stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]