
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – ccNSO Policy Update
Tuesday, June 14, 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 AMS

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Policy Update session. My name is Joke Braeken. And together with Claudia Ruiz, I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Stephen Deerhake, the chair for this session.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Good afternoon, everybody. Thanks for pitching up. This policy update will be in two parts. The first part will be

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.*

regarding PDP 3, which is the review mechanism that my working group has been toiling away on for some time. The second part will be presented by the PDP 4 people who are working on IDN stuff. I hope to give them the bulk of the time. We have small slide deck for the PDP 3 thing, just to bring you up to speed on where we are. And then we'll turn it over to the PDP 4 folks.

With that, I believe Bernard's going to run through that slide deck. So Bernard, if you're online and ready to go, I can give you the floor.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I will gladly take the floor. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you , sir.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I see we have a hand from Anna. Do we want to deal with that first?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. Let's do that.

ANNA KARAKHANYAN: Oh, no. It's a mistake. Sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Great. Just making sure. A, you know we're watching hands. B, we're more than happy to deal with it. All right. Let me turn on my camera. If we're presenting, it's nice to see who's talking. Hi, everyone. Sorry I can't be there in person. But certainly, I am here in spirit. Next slide, please. All right.

As Stephen has said, we're going to go through this rather quickly. Part of the desk is really intended as a historical record. We will not spend a lot of time on the background slides but we will go through them. So what is the genesis of this working group on review mechanisms? It starts all the way back in RFC 1591 with the IDNB to act as a review panel. So the notion of a review panel for ccTLDs is certainly not new. Next slide, please.

It then continues with the ccNSO FOI, which is the Framework of Interpretation, which basically said that it was consistent with RFC 1591, that the manager has the right to appeal a notice of revocation by the IANA operator. Next slide, please.

2015 also, we'll all remember the great Stewardship Transition where the final report on DTP recommendation, the CWG recommends not including any appeal mechanism that would apply to ccTLD delegations and redelegations in the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. And as we will remember, that CWG report was as a result of a request by the ccNSO. Next slide, please.

2017, the charter for the Working Group Review Mechanism of ccTLDs, with the goal of the working group to report and recommend a policy for a review mechanism with respect to decisions pertaining to delegation, transfer, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs. Next slide, please. The CCPDP-RM, review mechanism, held its first meeting on March 25th, 2020. Next slide, please.

Now, this working group, early on, settled on some principles that it thought were important in developing a review mechanism for ccTLDs. And these are important so we're going to go through them.

Low cost for process. The total cost of the process and costs for individual parties should be as limited as possible in comparison to litigation in courts or the IRP at ICANN, which many people believe is just as costly as the courts.

Limited duration of the process. The total duration of the review mechanism process should be limited to ensure the stability of the DNS and the availability of the ccTLD. There are two reasons here. Part of the limited duration idea is, of course, the longer something takes, the more costly it is. So you want to try to limit the time it takes to resolve a case so that the costs are kept low.

But also, if the operation of a ccTLD is dependent on the decision of a review mechanism, and therefore is blocked until there is a review, you could be creating a problem for the stability of the

DNS and the availability of the ccTLD, which is something that everyone is keenly aware of and no one is interested in causing problems there. Next slide, please.

Our third principle is the accessibility of the process. Non-cost thresholds and barriers should be low and reasonable, ensuring easy access to the procedure to the relevant stakeholders. And this is really key here. Again, we're talking about non-cost thresholds. We want to create a system where you don't necessarily have to have an army of lawyers pouring over paperwork to begin the thing. You want to make this affordable. There is, I would say, always an interest by the members of the working group about what happens. How can a small ccTLD use this practically? So that's really important.

Our final point here, fundamental fairness. We want to make sure that whatever we develop has due process with due notices, opportunity to be heard, being aware a matter is pending, making informed choices, and whether to contest before the appropriate body. So I've got "independent" in there. So really, all the hallmarks of a fair process, making sure everyone is aware of everything, and has due time, and understands the process for getting a fair hearing. Next slide, please.

What's been our progress since ICANN73? The CCPDP-RM received and considered ICANN Legal's response to questions regarding review mechanisms. ICANN Legal also noted that there

was a question regarding the interpretation of the CWG Stewardship Transition Recommendation for ccTLDs and its implementation in the Bylaws. The CCPDP-RM will consider this issue at its upcoming meetings. Next slide, please.

The CCPDP-RM continued the development of a draft review mechanism which meets the CCPDP-RM principles. And the CCPDP-RM expects to finalize the draft review mechanism prior to ICANN75. Next slide, please.

Obviously, if we're saying that we're going to be essentially done by ICANN75, what does this review mechanism look like? Panelists reviewing a case would be certified specialists with respect to ccTLD matters. So we're approaching this from a knowledge of IFO procedures and ccTLDs as opposed to approaching this from a purely legal point of view.

ccTLD managers and applicants for a new ccTLD would be eligible to use this mechanism. Basically, very similar to IFO review concepts, it's those customers of the IFO that can use this. Applications for review can be undertaken without formal legal support. As we said earlier, we want to design something where you don't need an army of lawyers to carry your case forward. Next slide, please.

The objective of the panel is to decide if there were significant issues associated with the IFO decision that is being reviewed. This is important here. This is not the panel, those who will be

doing the review’s job to tell the IFO what to do. And let’s be clear. We’re talking about IFO decisions here. We’re not talking about anything else. So the panel will only decide if there were significant issues which could have changed the outcome of the IFO decision. That’s all.

But if the panel finds there were significant issues and the IFO does not address these, the review mechanism can advise the CEO or the Board, meaning, really, what this comes down to is if there is an issue, everyone will try to work with the IFO and make sure things come out reasonably. But if it’s impossible to reach that decision, then the mechanism is looking at requiring that the IFO includes the review decision in any recommendation it makes to the Board so the Board is aware that there were issues. Next slide, please. I’ll be glad to take questions if there are any.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Not seeing any, Bernie.

BART BOSWINKEL: We see one hand. It’s from Byron.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I’m not seeing it. But Byron, if you’re there, go for it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Byron Holland from .CA. Question about the specialists who would be on the panel. Can you give us a little more detail? Because it says “certified specialists.” Certified, how so? Just a little more color on what that looks like.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. We actually have quite a bit of text on that in the actual proposal. I’m certain you’ll appreciate we’re trying to keep things condensed here. What we’re looking at is people who have 10 to 15 years of practical experience in the arena of ccTLDs and IFO procedures. And the idea for the certification here is that there will be an administrator of the review mechanism. And along with the IFO and the ccNSO, we’ll define a set of criteria that have to be met by these reviewers. And then we’ll certify them if they do meet that. Does that answer your question, Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Any other questions?

ANDREY SHCHERBOVICH: Hello. I am ICANN74 Fellow. I’d like to ask the question, actually. What do you think of perspective of international agreement on the ccTLDs? Because some countries, like Russia, for example,

claiming them as the features of their national sovereignty, which I think is not true. But to avoid actions of the armies of lawyers—I am a lawyer myself—what do you think of the perspective of conclusion of any kind of international agreement of this kind? Thank you very much.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm going to be a little indirect on here. We try to avoid political issues in this forum, as everyone knows. There's a very clear procedure for what is a ccTLD and what is not and has been since RFC 1591. And I think we're sticking to our guns on that one. There's a retirement policy, which is currently before the board. And we're going to hear about how that's progressing a little later. And again, that will clearly spell out how we're dealing with any kind of issues relative to the retirement of ccTLDs. So I think that's the best I can do for the moment, relative to your question. Is that okay?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bernie, we also have a hand up from Eberhard, my vice-chair, who would like to further elaborate on a response to the question. Go ahead, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: Hi there. Let me turn my video on. It doesn't matter. The question is not a question for our group. We don't deal with this decision.

We deal purely with a mechanism that has to be developed or will be developed following a recognition a few years ago that such a mechanism should have happened or should happen.

We are not discussing why a ccTLD may be revoked. We are not discussing under what reasons. We are not discussing what a retirement is. We have discussed what the retirement is in a different group. We are just discussing if there is the decision by the IFO that affects a ccTLD manager, what kind of recourse do they have. That mechanism, as Bernard explained, should be lightweight, and cost-effective, and within the framework of what can be done. There's nothing to do with political decisions as whether a ccTLD should be revoked, transferred, delegated, or retired. It's just after the fact, if it has been done, then what recourse does the manager have?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Eberhard.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard. I don't see any other hands. Are there any questions in the room or remotely? I'm not seeing any, either remotely or in the room. Do you have a comment?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So I will think that I did a stunningly clear presentation and that everyone understands. So I'll hand it back to you, Stephen. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you very much, Bernard. I'd like to point out that the slide deck will be posted shortly in the usual location. Somewhere on the ICANN website is probably the best way to describe it. So that's it for PDP 3, barring any further questions.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe one comment.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. Go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL: This afternoon, after this session, there will be a working group meeting of the PDP 3. One of the items that will be at least discussed, presented is progress. And the hope is that by ICANN75, so in six meetings, the working group will be able to present a very detailed version of its review mechanism to the community prior to a public consultation. Thanks.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. Yes. Hopefully, we will be able to put something before the community sooner rather than later. We're not quite there yet, though. That's about it for the PDP 3 update. So I think I will turn this over now to the PDP 4 people. And they are presenting remote. And I believe it's Kenny that's going to present. Are we ready to go, then, on that?

KENNY HUANG: Thank you, Stephen. Good morning.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, sir.

KENNY HUANG: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. I'm sorry I couldn't be there in person. I'm happy to give the update, IDN ccPDP 4. Next slide, please. So the topics we will cover—the overall roadmap, the principles and basic criteria selection IDN ccTLD string, deselection of IDN ccTLDs, and variants and variant management. Next slide.

So here's how we go from 2019. We had a fast-track process. And also, we got an IDN ccTLD policy proposal. And we tried to move to the Policy for Selection of IDN ccTLD and inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in ccNSO. Next slide.

So where we go now? From replacing ccPDP 2 and we already moved to a Bylaw change. The Bylaw actually already been officially approved by the ICANN Board in January 2022. So it's officially approved for the Bylaw change. And also, we updated ccNSO internal rules and procedures. And ccPDP 4 also covered issue report. And adopted by ccNSO Council in May 2020. Next slide.

So here is the overall ccPDP 4 progress today. We have full working group and also we have three subgroups that address different issues. We have subgroup for variant management, and subgroup for deselection of IDN ccTLD, and subgroup for confusing similarity. And basically, all the subgroups, including the first one, subgroup of variant management is almost done until the final stage and the subgroup of deselection already complete. And the subgroup of confusing similarity, also in the final review for basic document. Next slide, please.

I'd like to address some of the basic principles and basic criteria for selection of IDN ccTLD strings. Next slide. That was the basic principle underpinning the policy that was approved by the full working group and periodically giving the update in the ICANN meeting. Also get positive feedback from the community.

First principle, and IDN cc TLD string must be associated with a territory. ASCII ccTLD and IDN ccTLD are all country code top-level domains. Preserve security, stability, and interoperability of

the DNS. Requests for the delegation of IDN ccTLDs should be an ongoing process. The number of IDN ccTLDs per territory are determined by criteria. Next slide.

Let's first, basic criteria for selection of an IDN ccTLD string. The most important is the IDN ccTLD string must be a meaningful representation of the name of the territory in the designated language and related script. We cover a list. For example, the underlying principle for the representation of territories in two-letter ASCII code elements is a regional association between the name of the territory and their corresponding code elements.

Also, the principle associated between IDN country code string and the name of the territory should be maintained. So a selected IDN ccTLD must be a meaningful representation of the name of the territory. Next slide.

Other criteria for the selection of the IDN ccTLD string, including additional technical criteria. For example, IDN TLD must comply with IDNA2008—that refers to RFC 5890 until RFC 5895—and its successors. Only one IDN ccTLD string per designated language. Selected IDN ccTLD string must be noncontentious within the territory. So that was the basic [cover] for the other criterion for the selection of the IDN ccTLD string. Next slide.

Right now, I'm going to move to deselection of IDN ccTLDs. I'd like to move to my chair for the subgroup—IDN deselection

subgroup—Anil. He’s going to get into more detail about this topic. Anil, that’s your hint.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you, Kenny. Again, I am also sorry that I am not present in-person at The Hague today. The deselection subgroup started in October 2021. We did various meetings on fortnightly basis. And we completed and submitted the report by Feb ’22 end.

Basically, this is the dovetailed with the proposed retirement policy. And in deselection, we are talking about the trigger events—the events which trigger the retirement policy. And we also talk about the trigger events ccTLD initiates retirement process of the selected IDN ccTLD and its delegated variants. So in this presentation, we will discuss about the trigger event also. And we will also like to take your input—whether you agree with those trigger events or not. Next slide, please.

Basically, there are five trigger events which we have listed—the subgroup has recommended. The first, as Kenny was telling about, the requirement of any IDN ccTLD is a territory. And it should be a clear [inaudible]. And in case this territory is removed from the list of ISO3166, this creates a trigger event for retirement.

The second is the selected or the delegated IDN ccTLD is no longer a meaningful representation of the name of the territory, whether

it is in full or short form the territory has been changed, or part of the name of the territory has been changed, or the short-form designation for the name of the territory has been changed. So in case the IDN ccTLD is no longer representing very clearly the meaningful representation, this brings a trigger event.

The third most important is the language to denote IDN ccTLD string is no longer a designated language. So in case the language is not designated by the sovereign government in that area or the representative, then definitely, this is a trigger event.

The fourth one is the script, which is attached with the language. It is expressed as no longer the script in which the designated language is expressed. So this is the fourth one.

The fifth, which took maximum time in discussion, was the string is no longer supported by significantly interested parties in the territory. Significantly interested parties are defined as per RFC 1591, as interpreted by 2013 Framework of Interpretation. Always include the relevant public authorities. Include other parties involved in original request. The majority of the significantly interested parties, in these cases, are the government and also the people who support a string to be given in a particular script, in a particular language. So these are the five potential trigger events which trigger for the deselection. Next slide, please.

Basically, now the polling question is, all these five, do you support the IDN ccPDP 4 Working Group proposed trigger events?

Now the poll is in front of you. I request all the participants who are available onsite and online—are requested to kindly give your choice on this. And we'll take up the next slide after this particular poll. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Just Kenny and everybody else, before you close the poll, there is a vast majority—as I can read it, 79%—of those who participated in the polling support the trigger events as identified by the working group. 14%, so a few members participating, are not sure. And some—one or two—have no opinion. So that's 7%. So at least there is no objection to the trigger events as identified. So thank you for participating.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you very much. Next slide, please. Now which the is mechanism to confirm the trigger event? Because trigger event has come. Fine. Now we have to do the confirmation, also. ICANN is not expected to actively seek confirmation of the change of status. It means that somebody else has to come to ICANN and give that this trigger event has happened. On its own, we don't support that ICANN should do—exception, removal of the name—except only one thing, which a name is removed of the territory from ISO 3166-1.

The second one is if additional IDN ccTLD string is selected and requested—it means that in addition to the already one—ICANN to seek statement from the ccTLD manager that relevant criteria are still met. It means that we are talking to the existing ccTLD manager, whether the existing IDN ccTLD string is still relevant as per the criteria of delegation. If statement confirms IDN ccTLD string still meets criteria and is provided within three months, a request for additional IDN ccTLD considered to be invalid.

Second, if statement does not confirm relevant delegated IDN ccTLD string still meets criteria, or statement is not provided within the stipulated time of three months, retirement process will be triggered and delegated IDN ccTLD string and its variants will be retired.

Third is ICANN recommended to provide templates for statements of disassociation, statement of designated language, statement of change referenced script, and also statement of deselection by a significantly interested party. So these are the templates which we propose that IDN should recommend on this.

On this also, we need your opinion on what the working group is thinking. Do you feel that they are relevant? Next slide, please. So we are asking from this similar poll. Do you support IDN ccPDP 4 working group proposed mechanism to confirm trigger events. So I request the poll to come. And again, my request to all onsite and online participants to please participate in poll two.

BART BOSWINKEL: Again, thank you for participating. For those who can't see it properly and for the record, the support level is 66%, so two thirds of people participating. And both not sure/no opinion, that group is both a little bit larger than it was before. There is no objection, again, recorded. Thank you again for participating.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Thank you very much. This is all from my side. Back to Kenny. Thank you.

KENNY HUANG: Thank you, Anil. Thank you for your participation in the polling questions. Do you have any other questions?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Are there any questions from the room?

BART BOSWINKEL: This is about the deselection. There will be a follow-up with the variant management.

KENNY HUANG: Okay. Do we just go to variant management?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes please, Kenny.

KENNY HUANG: Okay. We move to the next one. I also request the subgroup chair, variant management, Dennis, who is going to give detail on variant management. Dennis, the floor is there.

DENNIS TAN: Hi, Kenny. Hello. Can you hear me okay?

KENNY HUANG: Yes. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: All right. Let's go on. So variant management basically needs to tackle two questions here. What's the definition of a variant and how those variants need to be managed. So next slide please.

In terms of the first question, what is a variant and how do we generate those, at the outset, variants in the IDN, internationalized domain name, context means a label that is deemed the same to another target label, if you will. This definition varies across scripts. So the way that that has been worked on is for script communities called the generation panels to define the rules to determine what are variants of letters,

characters, glyphs in their own scripts. So the definition of a variant varies from a script to another script.

And in this regard, on variants, there is a definition of what is a variant and then there's a concept of disposition. That means whether the variant label that is generated or calculated has two possible disposition values, one being allocatable, meaning it is possible for the label to be delegated into the root zone. Remember, we're talking here labels at the top level. The other disposition value, it's "block," meaning that that label must not be delegated because of, most likely, security concerns. So here on this slide, you have an example of what variants are and different disposition values—an example of an Arabic label. So next slide, please.

We'll just talk about a little bit of this. This tool that we're using to generate the variants is the authoritative source in order to create, calculate the variants. It's called the Root Zone Label Generation Ruleset. You may be familiar with the concept of an IDN table. Basically, it's an algorithm that defines the eligibility criteria how IDNs are eligible for registration. The Root Zone LGR is basically the IDN table for their root zone, so for labels at the top level.

The current iteration of the Root Zone LGR is version number five, which is available as of earlier this month. Somebody can drop, maybe, a link to the ICANN website where they can find that

information. The Root Zone LGR Version Five supports 26 scripts. Next slide, please.

Two slides ago, you saw an example of the Arabic script with 80 variants calculated from one single label. So here, we need to think about ways and going into the management of variant sets. We are talking about labels at the top level that are deemed the same. Therefore, how to you manage this number of labels that's supposed to be the same. There are certain expectations from a user standpoint how they should behave and so on and so forth.

So how do you find ways around to limit the potential operational complexities. Let us remember that there is no single standardized uniform operational framework to handle variant domain names. So the implementation is going to vary across different operators, and not just top level but across the registry operators, registrars, registrants, and potentially web hosting providers actually building websites on domain names that are variants of each other.

But here, we're talking about the top level. One of the principles is of the same entity principle. And the same entity principle basically means that if you have two labels to manage that are allocated to a registry operator and they are the same, the registry operator should be the same. That's the same entity principle at the top level. We're talking about the ccTLD operator

in the ccNSO world. And on the GNSO world, we're talking about gTLD registry operators.

But talking about the number. For example, potentially, a label has 80—we saw an example—80 variants that, potentially, a fraction of those could be allocated. Should all those labels need to be allocated or should be allocated. That's a question that the ccTLD operator will need to consider and to manage that complexity.

In terms of ccTLDs, there is an overarching criteria in order to be eligible for an IDN ccTLD string, which is the name, or the string, rather, needs to be a meaningful representation of the name of the country or territory. And it means to be in a designated language or script. Therefore, that provides certain filters, if you will, or more constraints as far as what can be applied for as an IDN ccTLD string.

Therefore, the Variant Management Working Group is leaning towards recommending that not set an arbitrary number but rather default to the eligibility criteria and that will keep the number of allocatable variant labels at the top level to a minimum—again, to manage the operational complexities that variants might introduce. Next slide, please.

Here, let me bring—again, transfer the concept of the same entity principle. So the same entity principle, again, in the ccNSO the same entity is going to be recommended to be the ccTLD operator

and also, by extension, the same backend service provider. A ccTLD operator may be, for example, the end-user facing company offering, doing the marketing. But there is a service provider on the back end. And by extension of the same entity principle, the back end should be the same operating these two TLDs that are variants of each other.

As such, because they are deemed the same, they should be regarded as a set. That means that all the rigor that is put into the primary IDN ccTLD string also applies to the whole set—the primary and the variant labels that are attached to that primary label and all need to be managed as a unit. And therefore, all the policies, lifecycle management features, need to apply for those.

But there are exceptions. These two exceptions are here, highlighted as an example. For example, the eligibility criteria of one string per designated language. Because you have variants now, there may be two or three in the same language. But because they are variants, they should be regarded as one unit instead of three distinct labels.

And also, I'll just talk about the second one is basically the effectuation of the same entity principle, which all variants must be delegated to one and the same ccTLD manager. Next slide. Or I think I'm done. That was the last one. Yep. I think that was it. So back to you, Kenny. Happy to answer any questions as a follow-up.

KENNY HUANG: Any other questions?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Yes, Kenny. There is one question in the chat. Thank you, Kenny. I will read it out loud now. Peter Koch is asking, “To what extent are the LGRs forward-compatible? Could a future label generation rule revision invalidate previously-assigned IDN ccTLDs so that this would constitute a separate trigger event for deselection?”

KENNY HUANG: Dennis, can you help?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you for the question. Yes. That’s a very good question—one also being looked at on the GNSO IDN EPDP. Just as a way of context, Peter is talking about future changes to the Root Zone LGR that might make an existing delegated IDN ccTLD string not valid per the new rules. And what type of changes would these be?

Let me just talk through, those who are not familiar with the LGR, the contents of it. So the LGR, or the Label Generation Ruleset, basically has three components. One is the repertoire—basically is the inventory of, let me just call it letters, that are eligible for a

valid label. So that's the repertoire. Second, you have the variant code points, meaning for any given letter, whether it contains or has a variant target.

And lastly, the third component is the whole-label evaluation rules, so rules that apply not at the letter label ... And I'm using "letter" here very freely or broadly because I understand there are characters, ideographs that are not regarded as letters. But just bear with me with this oversimplification.

And the third component is the whole-label evaluation rules which apply to the whole label. One example, not specifically the top-level label, but on second-level labels you cannot have the hyphen in the fourth position, for example. That's a whole-label evaluation rule that applies to second level. On the top level, it may be not to start with a combining mark, for example. So those three components.

The way that the Root Zone LGR is built basically ensures ... And I don't have the data but it works on top of IDNA2008. From there, the script community have selected inventory from a very conservative set of Unicode code points—again, "letters." They have ensured these rules are conservative enough.

So yes, changes might occur in the future. The expectation is that it's going to be additions and not removal of code points. The way that the selection works for the Unicode is the work would not be the latest Unicode version, which means that the letters that are

selected, or the code points that are selected from Unicode, have had certain stability, meaning they have been in Unicode for many versions of it. For example, I think the version that it's working on is version six or seven. I'm happy to be corrected there.

So the way the Root Zone LGR has been constructed ... I don't want to say guaranteed but it has a high level of confidence that in the future, those changes are going to be more likely additions than removals. Therefore, there's certain high confidence that those changes should not be subject to deselection or a trigger event for deselection of either ccTLDs or gTLDs.

However, because as ICANN here, we do not control what the IETF does with the IDNA protocol, or Unicode, what they do with their code points, it is possible that a change might negatively impact the LGR. And in that case, the working group has looked at the issue. Basically, the default behavior is that if there's a change, the string must be grandfathered. That's the default, right now, behavior that we expect and goes into the policy.

However, there's going to be a caveat there to open up the conversation about, or discussion, or deliberation at that point in time, whether the security concern rises to a high threshold that deselection might be the only way to avoid a very high-level threat that could affect the DNS adversely. So I hope that, Peter,

gives you the context and also the answer that you were looking for.

KENNY HUANG: Thank you, Dennis. Bart, I saw your hand. Are you going to add more comment on this question?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, nothing. Thank you.

KENNY HUANG: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Dennis. Peter, I'm not sure whether your question is answered. I guess they really have something uncertain and we try to the best to minimize the potential risk. But somehow, it's probably not only within the scope of the ICANN community. Any further questions? Hearing none, I'd like to move back to the chair. Steven, the floor is yours.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, sir. Thank you guys for a rather detailed presentation on your work. And as you can see from their presentation of the PDP 4 Working Group, they have been very, very busy on some very complicated material. As you can also see, both from the work of PDP 3 and certainly the work of PDP 4 that the work of both groups is based, in part, on the FOI. And actually, PDP 4's

working is in part based on the work of PDP 3. So this stuff has all been building now for quite some time.

Before I close, I would like to thank our staff for all their able work, including our techs in the back, hiding behind their black wall. But before we actually close the session out, Maarten, I believe, wants to say a few words about tonight's event. The floor is yours, sir.

MAARTEN SIMON:

Tonight there will be a ccNSO event organized by SIDN. And we've sent out invites via e-mail to the whole CC list. I hope everyone who replied that they would come, in the meantime, got the message with all the information. Most important thing, buses leave in front of the venue at 18:30. Other important thing is I still have a number of tickets available for people who haven't responded yet. So after this session, please come to me and I'll hand it over.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, sir. One last reminder. Both PDP 3 and PDP 4 are meeting this afternoon. The PDP 3 Working Group on the Review Mechanism is meeting in the Mississippi Room beginning at 3:00 our time. And PDP 4 on the IDN issue is also meeting in the Mississippi Room after we have completed the work of PDP 3 for the day. And their meeting, I believe, will start at 2:30. Mississippi Room is located up one level. If you go to where we had the social

last night and go up those stairs, you'll find it up on that next level. There is also an overflow room, I understand.

And that's it from me, if there's no other business, and I don't see anything in chat or hands. So I believe, at this point, I can declare this meeting closed. I want to thank everyone for pitching up and participating, both in-person and remotely. Thanks again. You'll be hearing from us again at the next ICANN Meeting. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]