
ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO IDN EPDP Working Session (1 of 2)
Saturday, September 17, 2022 - 00:00 to 60:15 KUL

DEVAN REED: Hello, and welcome to IDNs EPDP working group, session one. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real time transcription. Please note the transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN’s multistakeholder model, we ask you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that I will hand the floor over to Donna Austin.

DONNA AUSTIN: Hi Devan. Nice to hear you. Sorry we didn’t see you. Welcome everybody to the IDN EPDP session for today. I’m a little bit taken by surprise here because it’s 9:00 already. Do you have our agenda, Ariel? Okay. All right. As most of you will know, we’ve got three real sessions today. The first two sessions for the 60 minutes this morning are kind of administrative,

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.

I suppose. We want to take you through the chunking exercise, and Dennis said he had to look up the work chunking, so I apologize for that. We were laughing about that yesterday, that we didn't come up with a better word, but hopefully it will make sense when we go through it. Risk management methodology, we will get into that, but I just want to introduce James. Caulfield?

JAMES CAULFIELD: Caulfield.

DONNA AUSTIN: Caulfield. James is from the ICANN Org team, and we thought there might be some value in just understanding a little bit more about risk management and see whether it's appropriate for this group to just, perhaps with some of our recommendations, consider not only where we think there are risks, but how we try to quantify that. That's why James is with us today.

First of all, to kick off, and I thought we might have a few more people in the room today but understanding that it's the first time that Justine and I have been in the room with this group we'd like to go around the room and just introduce folks to one another so that we know, put some faces to the names. If you could introduce yourself and also the group that you are representing, and then once we finish around the room in here, I think we'll go through the virtual room as well.

With that, I'm Donna Austin, obviously the chair of this IDN EPDP working group or team, I think we are. I am the head of registry policy

for GoDaddy Registry. I've been involved in ICANN for a long time, and I've been chairing this group for almost 12 months now. I think I took over when Edmon joined the board. That's about 12 months, I think, Edmon. Welcome everybody. Maybe we'll go that way. Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Good morning, everyone. My name is Justine Chew, if you want to see what I look like, it's for the protocol. You guys selected me as the vice chair of this EPDP, so I'm grateful for that. I am part of the At-Large community, so one of the participants from the ALAC team that's on this EPDP. I've been involved with ICANN off and on since 2012, I think it was. Yes, but more actively since 2017 or 2016, SubPro, RPM.

Anyway, welcome to my city. This is my home city, so I hope you get to see a little bit more than just the convention center. Yes, I think we'll have a good meeting today, reckon.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Hello, I'm Jeff Neuman. There you go, so you can see me, and I'll put this back on. I have my own consulting firm called JJN Solutions. I'm here representing the Intellectual Property Constituency, and I've been involved in ICANN since it started, so in 1998, and actually before then.

Yes, it's good to be back here. I think I was here, although I don't remember if it was in the convention center or just in one of the hotels, but in 2004, so 18 years ago. It's good to be back.

RAZOANA MOSLAM: My name is Razoana Moslam. I'm here from Annalise.ai. That's an artificial intelligence company, but I'm representing today GNSO. I have been involved with ICANN since 2017, first involved as a NextGen, then as a NextGen Ambassador, and then I have been working with GNSO for so long since then. I'm here from Australia. I hope we have a good discussion, and we have a lot of things to discuss and learn through this meeting. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Hello everyone. Edmon Chung here. I'm currently serving as the Board liaison to this IDN EPDP. I have been involved in IDN since its beginnings, and it's also very close to the beginning of ICANN. It's been a long journey. I consider this particular EPDP one of the final stretches of getting IDNs fully implemented at ICANN and at the root, so looking forward to the discussion and completion, actually, I hear, of this work. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Hello everyone. Sorry for being a little bit late. My name is Jennifer Chung. I work for DotAsia Organisation, part of this EPDP as a participant from the RySG. I'm looking forward to working very hard in this particular session. Thanks.

MICHAEL KARAKASH: Hi everyone. It's great seeing you all in person. My name is Michael Karakash, and I work at ICANN Org for the Policy Research and Stakeholder Programs, PRSP team, within the larger GDS team. I am

one of the GDS liaisons on this EPDP focusing on implementation and SubPro subject matter support. Thank you.

PITINAN KOOARMORNPATANA: Good morning. My name is Pitinan Kooarmornpatana. I'm with ICANN Org, from the IDN team. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Hello, my name is Tomslin Samme-Nlar, and I represent the NCSG, but as an alternate to this team. I'm also the current NCSG Policy Chair and the current Noncontracted Parties House Vice Chair to the GNSO Council. Thanks.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Hello, good morning. My name is Sarmad Hussain, and I'm with the IDN program at ICANN.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Good morning. My name is Michael Bauland, or Michael, easier to pronounce. I am here for the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I've been involved with IDN and ICANN for a few years now. I started more actively with the Latin Label Generation Panel, and with that I'll hand it over to my Label Generation Panel colleague Dennis. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Michael. I'm Dennis Tan, Verisign. I'm working on this IDN EPDP, representing the Registries Stakeholder Group.

ARIEL LIANG:

Hello everyone. This is Ariel Liang. I am the ICANN support staff for this EPDP, and it has been a great pleasure working and supporting your work throughout the last year. I'm finally happy to see everyone face to face, and also the folks online. Thank you for joining us remotely. Also, just before we start, I have a quick reminder. Everyone please login to the Zoom, because for hand raising even for participants in person you have to raise your hand via Zoom. Please login to Zoom. Over to you, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Ariel. Do we have anybody attending virtually that's a member of the group that just wanted to introduce themselves? You don't have to, but if you'd like to that'd be great. Okay, I don't see any hands going up, so we will move on.

Just to recognize that we couldn't do what we're doing without Ariel, Emily who's at the back there, and also Steve Chan who supports this group as well, but he's double booked at the moment. Thanks to the group for keeping Justine and I well-managed and able to introduce stuff every week for this group to discuss.

The first topic we're going to talk about today is what we call chunking. Not exactly easy to understand, but what we've discussed in this group previously, and this came up when we started getting into charter questions that were related to second level issues, Dennis identified that with the same entity principle at the second level, if it is for the registrant, that there are some operational issues that need to be

sorted out as a result of that. Dennis had a conversation with the Contracted Party House TechOps group and they're going to take on some of that work to have a look at the operational issues associated with the same entity principle at the second level.

We recognize that by doing that it could potentially slow down our work. What we discussed among the leadership was, "Is there a way to continue the work and get an initial report out," which I think we're supposed to get out in October. Do I have that right? September? December? December. Sorry, December. What we discussed among leadership is, "Can we break the work into two parts?" The first part will allow us to put out some kind of a draft report in December while that other work on second level questions was going on.

What we've come up with today and what we want to take you through today is what it will look like if we do top level and existing IDN gTLD questions, we just put that into one part. The second part will be related to second level questions. We think by doing that, that gives the CPH TechOps group enough time to look into the operational issues associated with the same entity, but it also allows us to— We're making pretty good progress through the questions related to top level and existing, so we think that we should be able to pull together a draft report, publish an initial report on those charter questions. Then with this part two, once we've got a better understanding from the CPH TechOps group how long that work is going to take we can map out what that's going to look like and then also work through the other second level charter questions as well. It just allows us to be a bit more efficient in our work, and it enables us to develop a product and not be

sitting around twiddling our thumbs waiting for the TechOps group to do their work.

That's what we want to take you through today, and that's the background as to why we think we should do it that way. The other thing that we have to do as well is that we submitted a project plan to the GNSO Council, and we will need to update that as a result of what we're proposing here. We are going to do some work on the timelines because I think our project plan is showing that we're at risk, which we are, of not meeting the schedule at the moment. What we need to do once we've been through this and folks are onboard, we'll go back and review the timelines and then submit that to Council for consideration.

Ariel is going to take us through the two parts, and then we can see what folks think about that when we're done.

I see that Satish has just joined us. Do you want to introduce yourself, Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Donna. Good morning. I am Satish Babu. I'm part of At-Large and a member of the EPDP on IDNs. I live in India. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you. Ariel, over to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Donna. This is what we're proposing in terms of the chunking, and part one of the initial report can include the three groups

of charter questions and related recommendations. Group one is the definition of all gTLDs using RZ-LGR. Group two is the same entity principle at the top level, and group three is the variant implementations impact on the new gTLD application process. Later you can see that the group is already mostly done with these three groups of charter questions, although I do have some parked charter questions that haven't been addressed yet.

Basically, part one of the initial report can include these three groups of questions, and then part two, that includes group four, the same entity requirements at the second level, and group five, domain lifecycles. That's also very much related to second level IDN registrations. Group six, that's about rights protection mechanism related questions. That's also post-delegation related issues, so that's why we think group six belongs in part two of the initial report. Group seven, that's about IDN implementation guidelines, and as many folks know, that's basically about second level and not really about top level. That's the overview of the proposal.

I can just quickly go through the status of these groups, and then you can see this is group one. That's about RZ-LGR and the definition of all gTLDs. You can see the green cells that indicate that the EPDP team has already addressed the recommendations, the charter questions, and the draft recommendation language is already stable. The gray ones mean there are no recommendations needed for these charter questions, and the yellow ones mean we have some elements of the charter questions that have been parked because we're waiting for inputs, either externally or internally.

You can see for group one we're basically one. There's just one question, that's A7, that's regarding the single character TLDs. The second part of that hasn't been done yet because we need some help from the Chinese, Japanese and Korean Generation Panels for that.

For group two, this is the same entity principle at the top level. We're halfway done. We're a little bit more than halfway done. The ones that are parked are B4 and B4a. That's relating to the application process, the timing and sequence. That's basically a lot related to whether activation of variants can be allowed between application rounds. We're waiting on some additional deliberation on the strawman process flow that our second session is going to cover. That's being parked. Also, D1b, that's also being parked. That's relating to the process by which existing registry operators can apply or request allocatable variants. That's also very much related to the strawman process flow. These are some parked questions, but we understand that they will belong in part one of the initial report because this is all about top level.

For group three, that's related to the variant impact on the new gTLD application process. For this part, we haven't finished yet. We have a lot of things that are in the in-progress status. That's basically some of these orange ones on the top, like D2 and D3. We already have draft recommendations developed, but the group is going through the second reading to make sure we are comfortable with the language. Those are getting close to being finished, but then at the same time we have some blue ones. That means deliberation ongoing. For folks who are familiar with the work, it's a lot related to the string similarity review

discussion. The small group has done a great job working on that, and right now it's for the full group to consider their proposal for the hybrid model. Then we have some additional work that needs to be done to draw a conclusion whether the hybrid model for string similarity review is the way to go. Related to that is the objection process. These are basically deliberation ongoing. Those blue cells indicate the status of these charter questions.

Then we also have a couple of parked questions. That's related to those topics, but the group hasn't really discussed these questions yet because these are contingent on what kind of model we're going to use for string similarity review.

Moving on to part two of the initial report that we're reporting, it's basically covering the second level topic. These questions that are titled with a C, these ones are all related to the same entity principle at the second level. In ICANN74 I believe the group had listened to the presentation from Sarmad's team about second level situations and IDN tables and all these topics. We got started at the background level, but now they're parked because they realized additional data collection effort is needed to facilitate the deliberation of these charter questions. There are a lot of parts that haven't been discussed yet because we need to get the foundation understood, that's C1, C2, and then we can proceed to the next part. That's group four of the charter questions that belong to part two of the initial report.

Group five, that's about the domain name lifecycle. The EPDP team hasn't discussed these yet. They're more deep in the weeds about second level registration.

This is group six and group seven. Group six is about RPMs, the registration dispute resolution, and those mechanisms. The group hasn't discussed, but I do want to make a quick note that ICANN Org's research team did some research about the TMCH and whether they have taken into account variants, and also the language regarding the marks that are registered in the TMCH. They did some investigation into that, and then we do have some data for the EPDP team to look at down the road, but this is not something that needs to be addressed right now.

I'm hearing an echo. Okay, thank you for fixing that.

Just a heads up for the team that we may take a look at that when we go to group six of the charter questions.

Group seven is about the IDN implementation guidelines, and that's also related to second level registrations. That's why we believe these charter questions belong to part two of the initial report.

Yes, that's a quick overview of that. I'm happy to hear any input or questions.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks Ariel. One thing I should have mentioned is one of the other considerations we had in breaking these charter questions into two parts is that part one is really associated with the new gTLD process. My understanding, Edmon you might be able to confirm this, is that I think the Board wants to see this PDP done before they introduce more new

gTLDs. I don't know whether that's said out loud or whether I'm imagining it.

The other piece of this is the new gTLD process and the charter questions that fall within that and those that are post-contracting. We put those into part two. That's the other distinction I wanted to draw about these things. It's not just second level, but it's also those things that happen really post-contracting.

I think maybe, was it F1 and F2? We weren't really sure where they sat within the process, whether that's part of the new gTLD process or whether it's post-contracting or delegation.

In principle do folks think this is a good idea and it makes sense to break the report into two and see how we go and develop timelines accordingly? Does anyone have any thoughts on that? Edmon, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG:

Edmon here. Yes, I did put my hand up in the Zoom as well. In the rare occasion, speaking as Board liaison just in response to Donna's question, I don't think we have talked about the particular item at the Board. I think it's safe to say that the Board doesn't have a position on whether or not there are any dependencies on the new gTLD next round consideration to any other work that is currently being done that is related to new gTLDs. I think that's important to just note.

The other thing I forgot to mention in my introduction is I also try to contribute to this group personally. I guess I'll add a personal note to

the work. Yes, I'll try to be clear when I speak as a Board liaison and when I speak personally. I think splitting it up is a good idea and it gives some visibility to the community about some of the work that has been done. It also, I think logically, separates the two chunks of work. I guess that's why it's called chunking. Yes, I think it's a good idea and putting out a report on it will actually push the discussion forward and also bring people's attention to what we're talking about here.

I wanted to add one thing before we forget. Just before I left Donna with chairing this, we identified a missing piece in the charter, which is the WHOIS impact. The impact on the WHOIS and registration data, especially IDN variant relationships, whether it should show up and how it should show up. When someone is looking up a WHOIS, does it return, also, information about which ones are the IDN variants of a particular registered domain? That I think we were going to slot in to A8, which is the catch-all one, but that is chunked into the first group. We might want to think about how to do that.

That also has an impact on the top level because there is also the IANA WHOIS. I note that it may or may not be appropriate for the GNSO to give a "policy recommendation" to IANA, but we might want to seek IANA's input as to what this group might be able to make suggestions to, as in especially IDN variant TLDs, how they should or should not be represented in the IANA WHOIS, and what might make sense or not make sense. This is, I think, an important piece of the work, although it was unfortunately missed at the charter. I just want to identify this as one of the things that needs to be worked on.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks for the reminder, Edmon, and we'll make sure that we pick that up. Perhaps we need to develop a charter question to ensure that we do that. Thanks for the reminder.

EDMON CHUNG: Quick follow-up. As we are going back to the Council with the adjustment of the timeline, maybe it is good to highlight this particular missing piece as well. Whether there needs to be a complete re-charter, I don't think so. I think the A8 was designed to be a catch-all for this type of situation, but maybe that's something that should be pointed out.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. We can follow-up with Farell on that from a process perspective, but good catch as well. Welcome, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. Apologies for being late.

DONNA AUSTIN: No problem. Any other thoughts on the— Sorry, Jeff. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, thanks. I think Edmon brings up some really good questions. I'd like to see those added to part two because if we just use the logic of part two being after delegation, I believe IANA only produces records for things that have been delegated. I don't think there is anything in IANA that talks about or that shows anything from undelegated strings. I

would just put that in part two, just so we get some things out for part one.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jeff. Bullets from others on the chunking proposal? Looks like we've got thumbs up. I think we will go ahead, we'll update the project plan, and before we send that to Council, I think we'll go through it with the team during one of our upcoming sessions. Is it October we have to get that back to the Council?

ARIEL LIANG:

This is Ariel. Procedure-wise the Council has a project change request. It's a formal document that we need to clarify the rationale, why we're changing the project and what's the estimated timeline. Then the Council actually needs to review and approve it via, I think, a vote or something like that. It's a rather formal process. At the same time, we need to update the project plan, that's much more detailed, the Gantt charts and stuff. We need to prepare for that following the meeting, and then of course we will circulate the document with the group before we submit that to the Council.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, sounds good. Thanks everybody. We're on time. We'll move on to the second part, which is the risk management methodology, which James is going to help us out with. I just need to confer with Ariel for a minute. All right, thanks. As I said at the beginning, one of the things that we've become aware of as leadership is that there are potentially

a lot of risks associated with the introduction of IDN variants. I think as we've been through some of our work, we have identified some of those risks.

One of the things that struck me when we had the small group on string similarity report back to us is that there are a couple of risks that were identified. One was misconnection, one was denial of service. The conversation that we had with the rest of the team, there was concern. "We're just talking about edge cases. Is it a real risk?" There are differences of opinion about that. We thought it might be worthwhile investigating whether there are any tools that can help us be a little bit more methodical, for want of a better word, to have a look at the risks and try to do some kind of assessment of the likelihood of a risk and the severity. If you think about severity on one axis and likelihood on another, how does that look?

Security and stability of the DNS is probably the most severe risk that we would potentially come across in our work. I think we're always mindful of that. Particularly, we take into consideration SSAC reports and other work that's being done. It's always something that's top of mind, but I think there are other risks that are a little bit more squishy. Another good word.

James works for ICANN, as I said. He's a risk management expert. He's just going to take us through some pretty brief overview. What's risk? What are the things to look for? See how the group feels about introducing some kind of structure to the conversations we have where we're in a position of, "I don't think that's really a risk," but somebody else does think it's a risk. How do we work through that to see whether

we have a big problem or a little problem? If it is a big problem, how do we mitigate that risk? That's a brief outline of what James is going to take us through, and then we'll have a conversation afterwards and just see if this is something we think is worthwhile taking on for some of our work and how best to go about it.

James, with that I'll hand it over to you.

JAMES CAULFIELD:

Great, thank you Donna, for that introduction. Thank you everybody for taking your time. I know it's extremely valuable. For the record, this is James Caulfield, VP Risk Management, ICANN Org. We are going to talk about the varied fundamentals of risk, but one of the most important things in our risk management framework is definitions and getting everybody on the same page so we understand from the same point of view what we're talking about.

I start at the very beginning. What is risk? I think I know what risk is, and everyone probably has their own definition of risk, but so that everyone is on the same page, we define risk as the possibility for events to have an adverse impact on an organization, group, project, etc., to achieve its mission. What's the plan? A risk can even prevent an organization, group or project from continuing to operate. That would be an existential risk.

Important in risk management and defining a risk, it's characterized by uncertainty. We're not sure of everything that could happen with that. Uncertainty has three facets that we look at. The first one is likelihood, often known as probability of something happening. Probability is

simply a number, but likelihood, we like to describe what that likelihood is, not just assign a number.

The severity of the impact of that risk if it occurs. If a risk occurs, there could be variability around, “It’s not going to have much impact,” or it could be world ending depending on what the severity of that impact is.

Also, how effective are controls and mitigations in place? We think we have controls and mitigations, or we may not have any. Will they work as we expect them to? That’s another source of uncertainty.

Risk can have all three of those characteristics or one, but it’s made up by this uncertainty. The more certain a risk is, then it’s not a risk. You should just budget for something that’s a certainty.

We do accept risks. We do manage risks. The point of risk management is not to eliminate risk, but how to best deal with risks that we have. If I could ask for the next slide, please.

We want to have informed decision making. That’s really the point of risk management. We know there are going to be risks, but we want to be informed, and the way we get informed about risk is to articulate the risks and the risk controls. That also gets to having a common understanding and definition of what the risk is, what the controls are, what we think is going to happen.

Adverse events will occur. Like I said, we’re not trying to eliminate everything, but the goal is to have no surprises, so that we’re not

reacting to things as they occur, but they're things that we've thought about and we have a plan. Next slide, please.

How do we articulate our risk? In risk management "articulate" is actually my favorite word. It's articulating, getting it out, getting it on paper, having a consensus, and the basic things that we look at are risk title. That is, what is the name of the risk? What are we going to call this risk? That risk should be the event or the trend of the situation that's going to happen. It could be happening all the time. Some risks are ongoing, they're occurring all the time, or it's very unlikely to happen. We give it that name.

The next thing we want to look at is consequences. What is the consequence of that event occurring? There's often confusion in risk management. Sometimes people are already thinking ahead to the consequence of what we're concerned about, but what we really want to start with in risk management is what's causing that concern. What is that event that triggers? That is a point where we could intervene. Consequences are once that event occurs.

We also want to look at existing controls. What do we have in place to control or mitigate the risk? We do a risk rating, meaning we come up with if there's a low risk, high risk. We do want to define what a low and high risk are. I have an idea what a low risk is, you have an idea what that is, but we want to define that. Do we need more controls? That's [inaudible]. If we could go to the next slide, please.

Just note, I already mentioned not to get confused between the risk event and consequences. When we look at an event, we don't say it's a

certain kind of risk. It's the event. Often in risk we talk about lack of something. That's a risk. Whatever is lacking is usually control for what we're concerned about. Next slide, please.

On this slide we present the traditional heat map of risks, where we're rating a risk by likelihood to severity. The upper right-hand corner is the greatest risk, generally speaking, because it's a high likelihood and a high severity, and that's a good place to concentrate. We generally agree with that approach, but if you go to the next slide, please, this risk matrix has the very darkest blue in the bottom, in the lower right-hand corner, and that is a very low likelihood but high severity risk. These risks are very often called low probability, high impact risks. Those are particularly concerning because of the low likelihood we often put those aside and don't worry about them, figuring that they'll never happen. "Oh, that'll never happen," but when they do it has a high impact, and because we hadn't prepared it could be too late because we were too complacent in the beginning. Something to keep in mind when we evaluate risks.

That basically covers how we articulate and frame risks. If we can go to the next slide, please, just as an example. As I said, likelihood, we can aside a probability number, but when we look at low, medium, high risks, or whatever level of granularity you want to have, we do want to define descriptively what we mean by a low risk, medium risk, high risk, etc., so that we all understand. Probability is good. People naturally understand probabilities and those kinds of numbers, but it's good to be descriptive so that we all are agreeing what we're talking about.

Then on the last slide, please, it's the same thing with the severity of impact. We say low, medium, high risk, but we also want to define that, and we also want to define the different aspects of that. It can be an operational risk, a reputational risk, a financial risk, that kind of thing. Going through and defining so that everybody agrees and understands what we're talking about. That way we can be consistent.

With that, that's the end of my introduction to risk management. I hope I did okay on time. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thank you, James. One of the challenges for us is that when you're developing policy, being articulate, I suppose, about the severity of the impact or the likelihood is difficult to do because we really don't know until after the effect. I think there would be value in introducing this kind of methodology, for want of a better word, into some of our work when we find ourselves in those discussions about what— If we can use the heat map that James referred to, what's the likelihood and what's the severity? Most importantly, I think, what can we do to mitigate that? When we do identify something that has a high likelihood of happening, but perhaps lower to midlevel severity, what's the mitigation that we can bring into that?

This may not play out in our policy recommendations, but I think it will fall into our rationale for recommendations. When we are trying to explain to people, when they're reading the report, "This seems like a crazy policy recommendation. Did they really think about it," if we have this kind of rigor in our thinking and it's showing in the rationale, I think

it gives us, perhaps the recommendations become more sound because we've been through that process to understand whether what we're doing is— We know there's a possibility that X is going to happen, but we think the likelihood of that is going to be very low, so this is why we're recommending that.

Just some initial thoughts from folks about whether they think this is a good idea and something we can introduce, and if you've got any questions for James at all. I don't know that this has been done in GNSO policy work before. I think, again, we're a little bit going to introduce this as a pilot. It might be something that's adopted more broadly in other PDPs. I don't think this is something we're going to use all the time, but I think there are instances where this will be really helpful for us to overcome some of those conversations where we've identified a risk and some people think the consequences will be horrendous, and others think it's not going to be much different from what happens today. It also helps think through, if this is going to be a big deal, what's the mitigation strategy.

Just interested to hear thoughts from folks, and also, did you have any comments you want to make? If you've got any questions for James while he's here. Sorry, Jeff. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

I think one of the difficulties here is the differences in which we all think something is severe or not. I actually go to a discussion that we've had within the Registry Stakeholder Group where you have certain people that believe things might be an impact to security and stability of the Internet, and others that just disagree about that. There's no way to

prove who's right and who's wrong. What do you do when you have such diametrically opposed beliefs? Again, it's not provable where you are on the spectrum. How do you get to a consensus on a risk analysis when you have such disparate views on the severity of a risk?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Jeff, I think that's correct, and I completely understand where you're coming from, but perhaps the next step is accept that you have differences of opinions across a spectrum, but perhaps, what's the mitigation. What can we do to reduce or address the concern of both ends of the spectrum? Maybe that's something to introduce that might be able to help us. James, I don't know whether you have any thoughts on that, where you do have two dug-in views about risk, how you would go about resolving that.

JAMES CAULFIELD:

Yes, that's a good question because much of what we deal with is subjective. It's not statistically provable or that kind of thing, and it relies on expert professional judgment to decide on those kinds of things. I think in terms of if you can agree on what would happen if an event occurred, and whether that's important or not is maybe different than whether the impact is, but if you could agree what the, "If something happened, this is the consequence," is, that's a good first step.

Then in terms of the controls and the impact, then talk about that. Ultimately, generally speaking in risk management there does need to be a decision-maker. It's either a committee or person who ultimately decides and agrees that is the definition of the risk, and however groups

work through that would be like any disagreement that may be worked on.

JEFF NEUMAN: Can I ask a follow-up to that?

DONNA AUSTIN: Just quick, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: It also depends on, as an organization or community or whatever, how risk tolerant we are. We need to decide as a community, do we want zero risk or as close to zero, or are we okay with some level of risk? Until we establish that, you can do the analysis, but you still, like James said, need a decision-maker to decide what level of risk is acceptable.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jeff. We're just talking about it in the context of the group that we have here and the charter questions that we have that we're trying to address. So far, we haven't really faced that situation where we're at odds with one another. Where we do, I think we've found a good path forward.

I've got Tomslin, Hadia and then Satish. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Donna. First, think it's a very good thing to do for GNSO policy, because it's going to help a lot with what you mentioned about the rationale and even implementation.

I also had a question for James, especially in relation to what Jeff was asking, because James mentioned that then you might want to focus on the consequences of that risk to bring those two different points of view together. Doesn't that mean that you reverse, defining the consequences before you go back and define the name or get a definition of the risk itself so that the groups can agree? It seemed Jeff's question would have been that the two groups could not even agree on what the definition of the risk was.

JEFF CAULFIELD: That's an excellent question, because often people are already concerned about the consequence. They've already jumped to, "We're worried about this," and then it's commonly root cause analysis or the five whys. There's the consequence, but why? Why? When you get to the final why, why is that happening, that's the event, trend, or situation.

DONNA AUSTIN: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I honestly think that is a great way forward. I would also say not only for the rationale, but in some cases it's also good while developing the policy itself. I will give an example, the similarity of variants. I would say that risk management and risk ratings could actually help in the policy

making and in deciding which way to go. As an example, we could try to identify the likelihood or maybe figure out the probability of a user typing in by mistake a blocked variant, and then look into what if this actually happens. What's the severity of that action? How damaging that would be. Not only, I would say, in the rationale, but sometimes also in the policy making, this could help. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Hadia. Satish?

SATISH BABU: At different points when we worked in the last few months on this particular EPDP, we have realized that there are certain consequences which on the face of it appear very risky and we wonder what would happen if that particular thing happened. I think this is a very good way to look at, in a structured manner, all these different potential risks and try to then categorize them. I would say that this is an important thing to do and given the fact that we are doing something new to the root, we have to be very cautious about it. Therefore, I think this is an excellent idea. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Satish. I would add that this may be something that we need to have a further discussion about, how we would apply this methodology. We set some time aside in one of our upcoming calls if we need to do that, and James, I think he's agreed to help us out if we want to take this a little bit further.

There's a question from Anne, who I'm trying to find again. Anne Aikman-Scalese. What sorts of risks and consequences are associated with the implementation of IDN policy coming out of this group?

Anne, I think Satish just picked up on some of it. What we're doing here is new. We're introducing variants into the root, so there are potential risks associated with that, and we don't always know what they are going into these charter questions, but as we discuss them, we are finding that there are some challenges. With the string similarity review, did you want to take us through this, Ariel? This is a demonstration of Ariel's artistic ability as much as anything else.

In the string similarity discussion that we had and we're still having, there were two risks that were identified. One was misconnection, and the other one was denial of service, not to be confused with denial-of-service attack, DDoS attack. We're not talking about the same thing. Potentially, they are two risks that we could go a little bit further with the methodology that James has talked about today and try to quantify that a little bit more to understand where we think it is on the heat map, and then possible mitigations. Ariel will take us through this example. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Donna. Just for folks who haven't followed the work of the [EPDP] team, we discussed potential risks associated with the introduction of IDN variants. This is the first example, denial of service. Just to explain this illustration, a lady saw a domain name that's being

advertised on the bus. It's art dot [inaudible]. [Inaudible] is the name of an artist. Actually, it's something else, but it's basically an advertising of a domain name, and then she may recognize it as something else because the bus was far away or something. She didn't read the advertisement correctly, and then she associates [inaudible] with a different domain [inaudible], or a different label. It looks very, very similar, so when she went back home and she thought, "I want to check out this website," she typed art dot [inaudible] in her browser. It doesn't exist because she typed something completely different, but it looks very similar. This illustration shows denial of service, meaning the website doesn't exist, the 404 page popped up.

In terms of consequence, it may not be very severe because it's just basically a nuisance or inconvenience, and this user got confused or frustrated because she didn't find the web address she was hoping to find, but no harm was caused.

The second example is called misconnection. That could be potentially more serious. Basically, we're using the same illustration. This user saw a domain name being advertised on the bus. It's art dot [inaudible]. That's the same thing. Then she thought, "This is probably this artist, [inaudible]." It looks very similar to [inaudible], but different. Then she thought, "Maybe this artist is selling some art online." Then she got an email that included the address or the domain name, dot [inaudible], and then she still in her mind thought that's [inaudible] web address. Then she clicked on it and then once she clicked on it—

I'm sorry. Let me just go back to—one moment. I clicked on something wrong. Okay, let me go back to this. Then she clicked on it, it's showing

her a different address, but that’s also another artist trying to sell art, but it’s not the artist that she has in mind. It’s a completely different one. She didn’t really realize that, and she thought, “I want to support the artist I’m a fan of.” She took out her credit card and started buying stuff that doesn’t belong to the artist that she wants to support.

That’s an example of misconnection, and in this case it may not be very, very serious yet, but if you think potentially there could be domain name abuse related situations that can take advantage of the confusing similarity visually among variant IDNs, that could be a more severe consequence. That’s just a very quick illustration of those risks associated with the introduction of IDNs, especially variants.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Ariel. I note that Sarmad has put some text in the chat about what misconnection means. Jeff, just quickly, because I think we finish here at 10:00, yes, two minutes.

JEFF NEUMAN: What I’d like to see and understand is how this is any different than ordinary trademark infringement, which we do not protect. I’ll leave it at that, as a representative of the IPC, because I see this as—thank you, Ariel, for making out the case for why trademark infringement should apply at the top level.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jeff. Just to put this into context, the string similarity review, when you’re talking about IDN variants, the discussion we’ve been

having is the relevance of the source label that's been applied for and any allocatable variants that are also applied for as part of one application. What comes with a source label are allocatable variants and blocked variants, and the conversation we've been having around string similarity is really related to the blocked variants and how they come into play with the string similarity review. That's just to try to put that into context for what we're talking about here.

Emily?

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Donna. We have a comment from Anne Aikman-Scalese in the chat. She says, "Thank you, Ariel, and agreed, Donna. That would be important to map the identified risks and the risk chart James presented." Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

We need to close it now? Thanks everybody. I think we're back here in about 30 minutes. You thought this was good, wait until you see what Ariel comes up with, the flow chart. We'll see you back here in about half an hour folks.

DEVAN REED:

Thank you all for joining. Session one is adjourned. I hope you all have a wonderful rest of your days. You can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]