
ICANN76 | CF – ccNSO: Welcome & Policy Updates
Tuesday, March 14, 2023 – 09:00 to 10:00 CUN

ANDREA GLANDON:

Hello, and welcome to ccNSO Welcome and Policy Session. My name is Andrea, and along with Kim and Bart, we are the remote participation managers 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 chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper format, as I have noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session.

Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, French, and Arabic. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during the session.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu.

Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak, if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

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.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this 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 multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into 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 Alejandra Reynoso. You may begin.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much. Good morning, everyone. Good morning, everybody. Welcome to this ccNSO session in Cancun, Mexico. I'm really pleased to be in this region. There will be interpretation in Spanish, French, Arabic, and English. And the best way of using the interpretation services is through the Zoom channel, and we would like you to participate through Zoom to ask for the floor by raising your hand in the Zoom room.

We are celebrating the 20th anniversary of the ccNSO, and today we will start with the celebrations. So, at the end of the day, there will be a session where we will talk about the 20 years history of the ccNSO, so please attend this meeting. Beyond me, you can see there is a list with all the key events or meetings of the ccNSO, so during the coffee break, come forward and have a look at all these activities on the poster.

These are the highlights for the ccNSO, and this afternoon there will be an activity related to what you can see on this poster, and today's

cocktail party, our friends from NIC Mexico have organized it. They have an amazing meeting for us. We will start at 6:00 PM with a cocktail party to be held at the second floor terrace, and after that, there will be an event elsewhere, outside the Convention Center, so that's why you have received by email a form to subscribe or to register for the meeting. And during the coffee break, you may go to this table in the back to talk to Kim to get your bracelet, which is a light blue one like this one, so go and get your bracelet during the coffee break, please.

I'd like to take the opportunity to ask whether anybody is a newcomer to the ccNSO, if you could please stand up. Welcome. We ask this to get to know the newcomers, to be able to get to you, to introduce ourselves, and to give you a warm welcome, and now I'll give the floor to Everton, the chairman of the chair for this ccNSO meeting.

EVERTON RODRIGUES:

Thanks for joining us here in person, or remotely. I'm Everton Rodrigues from Brazil, and I'll give a brief presentation about our members meeting. Next slide, please. Just before we talk about the schedule itself, I would like to say a few words about our meeting program committee. They come from all over the world, and this growing group coordinates and manages the high-level schedule of the ccNSO-related sessions, including the ccNSO members' meeting agenda at ICANN public meetings. So we have people from North America, Latin America, and Caribbean islands, Africa, Asia Pacific, and Europe. It's a very diverse set of people engaged to make these events take place. So if you have any comments regarding the ccNSO-related sessions, let us know.

Many of the ccNSO MPC members are here in the room and also remotely, so let us know if you have any comments. Next, please.

These meetings also rely on the great support from the ccNSO secretariat, which can be seen in this slide here. There are pictures here in the room, and also virtually. So next slide, please. Well, I would also like to welcome our newcomers to the event. So all of you who are joining us remotely and you're in person, who are here for the first time, welcome. And I'll also use this opportunity to say a few words in Spanish.

To the remote or face-to-face participants, the newcomers, I would like to welcome you. And I'm really pleased to be able to talk in Spanish in Mexico. The availability of interpretation is an excellent tool for us to listen to the presentations, but also to participate, get involved through questions, comments, etc. So you may speak in Arabic, French, Spanish, or English. So let's remember that this is available. Let's speak slowly so that our amazing interpreters can do their excellent job. So this is a reminder for everybody.

ICANN meetings may be difficult for newcomers, but there is a lot of content in the wiki page of the ccNSO and ICANN Learn. So here you can find some useful links to the presentations, the schedule, summaries, calendar, and information for remote participants. Next slide, please.

Okay, so here's an overview of our members meeting agenda from today on. You might have seen it and also put it in your own calendars. Next slide. Now we will start with the policy updates in which ccPDP Review Mechanism and IDN Working Group will present their latest

recommendation and use this session to consult community before finalizing them.

After that, we will have our first ccTLD News Session, chaired by Guðrun Poulsen from .fo and with presentations from .ar, .ze, .ca, .za, .cz, and .ru. After lunch, we will have a plenary, an ICANN plenary, and then our agenda resumes with the governance session, which will have the ccNSO Guideline Review Committee presenting and consulting the community for initial proposals on the role of the ccNSO related to the implementation of policies developed through a ccNSO PDP.

This session will be followed by the celebrations of the 20 years of the ccNSO, as Alejandra said, in which the former leaders of the ccNSO will review main events and highlights of their terms. So this is the opening celebrations that will occur throughout the year. Next slide, please.

On Wednesday, the day starts with a presentation about the Universal Acceptance Roadmap, in which the roadmap to establish the role for the ccNSO with respect to universal acceptance will be presented by the small group that manages the process, and this will be chaired by Biyi Oladipo. And after lunch, we will have the second ccTLD News Session under the theme Digital Divide and the Impact on ccTLDs. This will be chaired by Anneliese Williams from .au, and we'll have presentations from .br, from .fr, .rw, .in, and .ca.

This session will be followed by the DNS Abuse Standing Committee Update, which will present and discuss their findings from the ccTLD survey on DNS abuse from last November, as well as proposals, and they will also share relevant information and next steps. Next session will be followed by the ccNSO and ccTLD-related Board members, in

which ccTLD and ccTLD-related Board members will discuss and share views on various topics which are relevant from a ccTLD perspective and/or Board perspective. Next slide, please. Last but not least, on Thursday, we will have the ccNSO Council Public Meeting, chaired by Alejandra Reynoso, and an Open MPC Meeting, chaired by me. This one, very specifically, will be held at Cozumel 2 room, and you are all welcome to attend.

So some useful information for all of us, keep calm and stay on time, that's basic for everyone, but should be said, and say your name and the language you will be speaking before you start. Next slide, please. When the meeting is over, a survey will be launched, and we kindly, kindly ask you to answer it as it helps us to make a better meeting in the future. So next slide, please.

If you're still not following our social media channels, or if you haven't received the ccNSO updates, here are some very useful links, and well, that's it from my side, so welcome to the ccNSO, and have a great meeting. Thank you. Hiro, the floor is yours.

HIRO HOTTA:

Thank you. Good morning, all. My name is Hiro Hotta, and I am a NomCom delegate appointed by RSSAC, the Root Server System Advisory Committee to NomCom, and the one appointed by ccNSO is Sophie. Where's Sophie? Yeah. She's another member of NomCom, from, she's from auDA, .au.

As you know, the Nominating Committee is an independent committee tasked with filling open leadership positions on the ICANN Board. Next

slide, please. Yes, and now we are looking for leaders, leading positions in ICANN and ICANN sub-organizations. Yes. For example, two members of the ICANN Board, ICANN Board of directors, solicited from any region. Next, please.

One member of the PTI, public technical identifiers Board of directors, which manages the IANA. And next, please. Three regional representatives to The At-Large Advisory Committee, ALAC. So, three, one from the Africa region, one from Asia, Australia, and Pacific Islands region, AP region, and one from the Latin America and the Caribbean region. So, three are solicited now to the ALAC. And next, please.

And two members of the GNSO, Generic Name Supporting Organization Council, one representing the Contracted Parties House, [inaudible] and one representing the Noncontracted Parties House, the other stakeholders. And next, please.

This is the last one. One member of the Country Code Name Supporting Organization Council. We are a ccNSO registry, so we are not eligible to this position, but other members other than the ccNSO ccTLD will be submitting the application to be on the ccNSO Council from the NomCom. Okay. And next, please.

Yes, this is the summary of what I said. So, total is nine members are solicited. So, you have many options. Next, please.. Yes. And the deadline for the application is around ten days ahead. So, it's short for now, but it has been open for 50 days. But if you or your colleagues are interested in applying to one of the positions, please apply for that. Thank you from NomCom.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Hiro, for alerting us to these positions. So, please, if you know someone who can fill them, tell them. With this, I will ask the rest of the speakers to speak as close to the microphone as possible so the interpreters are not struggling to listen to us. And with this, please, Stephen, can you give us the ccPDP3 update?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Alejandra. First of all, big thanks to the translators. It's a great development. I will do my best to speak slowly so that you can translate without having your heads explode. Also, at the outset, I wish to thank our incredible support staff, Bart, Joke, Kimberly, and of course, Bernard, who was our incredible scribe that got the language down of our discussions in a format that we reached consensus. So, with that, next slide, please.

To recap the key elements of the retirement policy, guiding principles were pretty much the opposite of what the IRP process is. It's low cost. We wanted a limited duration. We wanted to get resolution of the review underway and complete it in a reasonable timeframe. We wanted accessibility of the process. And really, by that, we mean minimize the cost. Again, the opposite of what has been going on with the IRP process. And we also are very strongly committed to fundamental fairness in the review mechanism process. Next slide, please.

So, decisions covered by the review mechanism, delegations of a new ccTLD, and that also includes IDNs, transfers, revocations, and tying

back into the retirement policy, if the IANA function operator refuses to grant an extension to a retirement deadline, the ccTLD manager whose ccTLD is scheduled for retirement can use the review mechanism to contest that decision by the IANA function operator. And the notice of retirement stuff there is pretty straightforward. Next slide, please.

So, to recap the elements, the final slide on this is who can request review. In the case of an existing ccTLD, it's the manager who's subject to the action of the IANA function operator. In the case of a new ccTLD, it's any of the applicants. Because no doubt, if a new ccTLD, whether it's ASCII or IDN, pops up and goes into play, there will be more than one applicant.

Again, with respect to further fleshing out the accessibility criteria we're shooting for, it calls for a minimum application fee for the applicant to use the review mechanism. And it also calls for ICANN to pay the cost for implementing and supporting the review mechanism as well as the reviewer costs. Because there will be a review panel to manage and come to a decision on what's under dispute. Next slide, please.

So, to recap where we started and where we've come to, we opened up for business in November of 2022, as you can see, and we closed in January of 2023. We put it out for public comment. And the comments we got, we got a total of five. One was complete gibberish. And that was not considered. And two from community groups. And upon analysis of the comments, the working group identified no comments which required modifying the draft policy. So we did the public comment. We got some comments. We reviewed them. We determined that nothing

needed to be changed. And so we moved on to the next phase. Next slide, please.

So where we are at this point in time, informing members of the final report which is published, which is what I'm doing now here, and also let you know there will be a members vote upcoming. The timetable of everything is to have hopefully the Council at our meeting two days from now adopt a proposed policy. And that will start off a timeline for the members vote, which we'll get to shortly. Members vote, members report, this is more homework for Bart. If we get a Council decision, this all needs to be conveyed off the draft by the issue manager, must come back to the Council for final approval. I don't see that will be a problem. I assume that's going to happen at our Council's April meeting. At that point, we circulate members report. And again, that's responsibility of our overworked issues manager, Bart. And we expect to have that out by the end of March. Next slide, please.

So the timing of that, getting the report out at the end of March is so that we can kick off the members vote, which is scheduled for the 18th of April as the start date and the 9th of May as an end date. Note the quorum rule that we have. Based on the fundamental rules, we need at least 50% of the members to vote for the election to be valid. And I cannot stress enough, given the size of our membership, which is a testimony to our success, that you all need to vote. I was recently at APTLD, and I stress the same point to those managers who were present there, because there's not that much overlap between the managers that attend APTLD and those who attend here at ICANN.

Also keep in mind that it requires a super majority of the vote. So we have two problems here. One is we need 50% of the vote, and the other is we need 66% to say yes. And I hope we can achieve that. Assuming that we got support from the membership, and I certainly hope we do, our poor beleaguered issues manager gets more homework, which is to prepare the Board report and the outcome of the members vote. This then goes to the Council for a final approval. And we're hoping, based on the timeline that we've developed, that we can schedule that approval vote by the Council at ICANN 77 in Washington in June.

Assuming the Council approves that, then the work of the ccNSO is pretty much complete with respect to the review mechanism. We kick the Board report up to the Board. Hopefully, again, in June, either at ICANN 77, at the end of the meeting, basically, after the Council meets, or shortly thereafter. Next slide, please.

There's no more. We're done. Okay, that's it. Do I take questions now? Are there any questions, either from the people present in the room or those on Zoom? I'm not seeing any hands in the room. Are there any questions on Zoom remotely? Okay, apparently not. So, I'm done. Thank you very much for your time. And I'll turn it over to my colleagues for the PDP4 update. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Stephen. And now I will ask Kenny to talk about the ccPDP4. Thank you.

KENNY HUANG:

Thank you, Chair. And good morning for everyone. And good afternoon, good evening for anyone who joined online remotely. My name is Kenny Huang, Chair of ccPDP4 Working Group. I'm here to help you to deliver ccPDP4 Working Group report. Next slide, please.

So, let's start today's outline agenda, including some basic introduction, and also providing some additional areas since ICANN 75, and including variant management review and confusing similarity. And later, we will conduct a stress test, including some of the policy trigger events that will be conducted in a stress test. And finally, it will be a reminder, and the next step we're trying to do. Next slide, please.

So, here's a basic roadmap that we developed the ccPDP4. It's starting from 2013 IDN ccTLD policy proposal, and also from previous policy adopted by fast track process. Fast track process is not a policy. It's an agreeable mechanism. So, we try to formalize to incorporate, become a formal policy. That's why it goes through the whole policy development process to complete the ccPDP4 task. Especially, we try to deliver the policy for selection of ID and ccTLD string, and also discuss the requirement for the retirement policy. Next slide, please.

This one is talking about continue with the roadmap. So, where are we now? And ccPDP2 closed, and evolution of fast track process, and [inaudible] analysis over overall IDN ccTLD policy that was conducted by ccPDP2 working group. And their job was complete in June 2019. So our mission is try to [inaudible] the task conducted by ccPDP2.

So far, in terms of the governance structure, we proposed a bylaw change process that allow IDN ccTLD to be in ccNSO. And the policy proposal was approved by the ICANN Board, and effective on the 2nd of

June 2022. Another task we are conducting right now is try to deliver an issue report that was adopted by ccNSO Council in May 2020. So, here I'm going to report what happened, and that's progress up to date. Next slide, please.

Can you go back to previous slide? Oh, yeah, should be this one. So, that's an overview of activity and our starting time and ending time. You can see we have ccPDP4 full working group. And based on the mission we require, so we also split into three subgroups. One subgroup is the variant management that has been complete. Another subgroup is deselection of IDN ccTLD, their mission also complete. And the third subgroup is confusing similarity. The task almost finished, so we're going to conduct a confusion similarity discussion in the full working group, and also conduct a stress test starting from January this year. So, that's an overall discussion about ccPDP4 activity and our progress so far.

I'd like to hand over to Bart to continue [inaudible] of discussion, especially regarding to the stress test. Can I hand over to you, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Kenny, and good morning. I want to introduce the three major topics that have been completed since the last ICANN meeting. So, that's around variant and variant management, review of decisions, and the final one was on confusing similarity. Although that's tentative, as Kenny said, the full working group still needs to sign off on it, but this is the opportunity to inform you around confusing similarity. I think that is the main thrust of today's presentation. Next slide, please, going to variant and variant management.

So, why is it needed? I think, let me give you an illustration first and then you understand the issue. I think in The Hague during ICANN 74, there was an extensive introduction into variant and variant management, but to give a recap, if you, for example, would take Pakistan in the Arabic script, and especially due to the nature of the Arabic script, there are different ways and different characters that look alike. And there, as a result, there are about 1,200 different ways to deal and handle Pakistan.

So, if you think about Pakistan and .Pakistan, if all these variants would go into the root—and it's not just Pakistan, and that's an exception, I realize an exception and an outlier—you can imagine the issues. Say the new gTLD had around 1,200 new gTLDs. If all these new GTLDs were IDNs and they all had variants, what would be the difference? It would become unmanageable. So it's trying to strike a balance between the legitimate need for variants—because they are needed for user communities of a specific script, but at the same time, there is a general responsibility around the security and stability of the DNS. And it's between these two, I would say extremes, that the variant management and the variant management subgroup try to strike a balance. Next slide, please.

So, keep this in mind, what I just said. So, what has been included in the proposed policy is a standard definition of variants. And this definition has been derived in close cooperation with the GNSO EPDP because they're looking at the same issues at the same time. And as some of you may recall, the Board asked for close coordination. And I think that has been very helpful. And we achieved, both groups achieved, say, where possible, the same set of recommendations.

So, definition of variants is using the root zone LGR, label generation rule. And according to the label generation rule, there will be blocked variants which will never be used, and allocatable variants which could be used. Even then, going back to the example of Pakistan, there are about, as I said, 1,200 variants. I would say 1,192 are blocked. So, that will reduce the number of variants dramatically. But still, you have eight variants. And then there is a question, what to do? And these eight variants are allocatable. So, the implication of using the root zone LGR is that they determine which variant strings are valid. And that's a new thing. And that was not addressed, for example, in the fast-track. Next slide, please.

As I said, the root zone LGR is used to validate strings. That's the implication. And the only thing, not all scripts have been yet included in the root zone LGR. So, it will be revised at times either by adding a new script or a revision of an existing script. And one of the consequences of the revision of the script is that you never know but a variant that was once allocatable might become blocked. And one of the issues is how to deal with such a situation. Again, you can see how the working group is proposing to deal with such a situation is that it is, in principle, grandfathered unless there is a demonstrable risk and threat to the stability of the DNS because that's the ultimate litmus test. The stability of the DNS needs to be paramount. Next slide, please.

As I said, one of the issues was dealing with the number of variants. So, once you have all the, even with the example of Pakistan, you have six allocatable variants. But are all these variants just as relevant? And so, to limit even further and to avoid setting a numerical threshold, the question, say, the working group decided to use the standard

requirement that an allocatable variant has to be a meaningful representation of the name of the territory in the designated language to be eligible to be delegated. So, only if the variant is meaningful representation, it can be used. So, that's following the same basic criteria, if you recall.

So, this would strike the balance really a little bit in the direction of limiting the number of variants. At the same time, it's always easier to be more liberal in the process, a bit of a long-term sunrise process, as you can see, because this is subject to the first review, as will be suggested after five years after implementation, whether it could be more liberal. So, start slowly, start carefully, and then become more liberal if permissible. Next slide, please.

So, just to keep you awake, quick Q&A and polling. You need to be in the Zoom room to respond to this question. Do you support the definition of variants? So, the root zone LGR determines what are variants and what are not variants. Give you a few seconds. Can we close the poll, please? Thank you. So, there is an overwhelming majority, and this is not a vote, this is just taking the temperature of the room for the working group to understand if we're going down the right direction. So, thanks.

The next question, there is a second question as well, and that's really an important one because this is, for example, where the working group deviates from the GNSO EPDP, they have a more liberal approach, this is more restrictive. And the reason to be more restrictive, we can discuss it when the policy is really submitted, but the question is do you support

or not support the limitation of the number of variants? Please, a response.

Again, I see a few persons who do not support. Could you, who voted not support, speak up, please, why you think it's not a wise idea? Or is it remotely? I don't see any hands up. If say why you think you do not support the limitation, if you can type it in chat, I think it's relevant for the working group to understand the reason you do not support the limitation. Thank you. Let's move on to the next slide. We have a lot of grounds to cover.

The next one is a very interesting one. The review and review mechanism. This topic came late in the game as a result of the—if some of you recall, the retirement policy was adopted and one of the open issues at the time was how to handle retirement but also IDN-ccTLD and there was a request from the Council for the IDN working group to deal with review and review mechanism and whether or not issues or claims pertaining to the selection of IDN-ccTLD should be subject to the IRP or reconsideration.

So this little bit is around the review and review mechanism. So starting the main let me check so yeah the conclusion was the main conclusion the IDN-ccTLD selection process should be excluded from the IRP and reconsideration like all claims and disputes with respect to ccTLDs. At the end of the day, IDN-ccTLDs are ccTLDs so where possible, they should be dealt with in the same manner. And again, the way the working group made that decision was, if you go back to the slides from Stephen, they used the same basic principles of fairness, accessibility, duration and cost. And if you would put this in context of the IDN-ccTLD,

it would be completely over the top. So that was the reason to exclude it and build upon the review mechanism. There are other arguments but I will not go into the details. So secondly, as a result the working group also decided to build upon the results up to that point from the review mechanism working group, so PDP3, and again, this relates to specific decisions that may result in the retirement of an IDN-ccTLD or its variants.

And the process—and I think we discussed this in KL—these are what is called the de-selection decisions. In terms of the retirement process, de-selection decisions are the trigger events. So once there is a trigger event or a de-selection procedure completed and the IDN-ccTLD needs to be retired, then the retirement process kicks in and there will be a notice of retirement by the IFO or PTI in this case. So that's an important one.

And then the similarity review, I'll go into the details, but the working group on confusing similarity and review agreed that the review procedure is a bit of an outlier. You need very, very deep knowledge about what is confusing similarity. You're on the brink of being almost a PhD in confusing or in cognitive psychology to handle it properly, especially if you use the methodology that is currently used in the second panel. And we'll touch upon it a little bit later. Next slide, please.

So this is a high-level overview of what was discussed. So again, I already touched upon it, the slides will be published at the end so I will not go into the details. So this is reconfirming I would say the standard practice by now excluding everything related to ccTLDs including IDN-ccTLDs from the IRP reconsideration. Next slide, please.

The review mechanism. And as I said, the de-selection. So that's the trigger event. And the working group identified effectively a few situations where the review mechanism would be applicable and this builds up on, if you recall, from Stephen's slides, the situation where IFO sends out a notice of retirement for exceptionally reserved names. In that situation, the ccTLD manager could ask for a review mechanism because there might be some confusing. The recommendation of this working group is to use that same type of mechanism and hook into it and build up on that specific situation so there is no need to change the review mechanism at all. This is really building and dovetailing with the review policy.

So the situations are change of name of the territory, change of designated language and change of script or writing system. These are basic requirements. These are the de-selection criteria. Loss of support by the significantly interested parties, so the string has become contentious within the territory. That's another situation that may lead to the de-selection. And again, as a kind of safety valve, the review mechanism is in use.

And then the final one, this relates to the threat of the DNS because of an amendment of the root zone LGR. Only if it's demonstrable and only if there is a real threat, there might be a de-selection. But if there is a de-selection, that decision might be subject to the review. So it is trying to build in as much safety and stability and predictability for all. Next slide, please.

So again, a quiz, polling. I first may I pause here. Are there any questions from you around review mechanism, what I've explained? Yeah, go ahead.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Bart, for the presentation. Can you go back one slide? I just want to confirm my understanding or get it corrected. It's the one with the appeal stuff, the ccPDP 3 review mechanism. I don't know which number slide it is. That one, yeah. So the second bullet point there. Just confirming. So if the IFO makes a decision to sort of remove the IDN ccTLD and SIP, significantly interested parties, become concerned, it's still saying that just the manager can access the appeals mechanism, isn't it? Not those SIP.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Let me to explain it one of the situations for deselection that has been identified is that—let me take a step back. A requirement for an IDN ccTLD is support from the significantly interested parties for the selected string. At one point in time, that support may go. if that's the case then the question is, what do you do? You keep the IDN ccTLD string in the root or you start the deselection process.

So in order to for that to happen, one of the core is that the significantly interested parties need to make very clear that there's a letter of support or the support of the selected string. After that happens, that is considered a trigger event, and that trigger event would cause the deselection. However, in order to ensure that all the documentation is correct, and there is, for example, you can see with significantly

interested parties, if one government department decides against and the other government department doesn't, who the original one was in favor, then you may have an issue. And this is to deal with these situations to allow for a review mechanism, and the standard review mechanism, as devised by the Stephen's group. Does that answer your question? Thank you. To be clear, in this situation, the significantly interested parties do not have access to the review mechanism. It's only the ccTLD management at that point.

Can we go to the polling? There's two slides there. Yeah, there we are. So quickly, and I think this is again important for the review mechanism or for the PDP4. Quick polls. The first one is do you support excluding the IDN-ccTLD from all, from the IRP and reconsideration process? You can close the poll. Again, there's one or two who do not support. Are you willing to speak up why you don't support? Otherwise, please submit either a chat or an email to me or to Kenny. Would be very interested in your views. Thank you.

And the second poll, if you can clear this poll. The second poll is do you support using the CCPDP review mechanism for review of retirement, so the deselections decisions of IDN-ccTLDs and their variants following the de-selection. Again, the poll, please quickly. Yep. Thank you. Again, as I said, this is just the temperature of the room from you.

Now, let's go to probably the most esoteric topic there is in IDN land. It's confusing similarity. And this is about the core of it. Let's go down to the... Can you close the poll, please? Confusing similarity. I will touch briefly upon the criteria, the base for comparison used and the

procedures. Maybe I will skip the procedures because I will start at the end.

The procedures, one of the things the working group had to face was and use for its work is the fast track process. As you may recall, that's been devised almost 14 years ago, 15 years ago, and it was one of the highlights, if you look at the overview of the ccNSO. The fast track has evolved and now includes three steps to review a string with respect to confusing similarity. That's the standard evaluation, the extended review, which is a complete different way of looking at the results of the first panel, and then there is a risk mitigation opportunity. So where the IDN-ccTLD manager could... Yep, that's why I'm moving on. The IDN-ccTLD manager has the opportunity to propose risk mitigation measures. There is no change proposed with respect to these procedures and the second one is considered the review mechanism. So that's the procedural side of things.

Now can we go to the criteria, the next slide, and I'll rush this through. What is really important to understand, this is a policy decision and this is really in protecting people to avoid any harm from what is called misconnection. Misconnection meaning that you think you use one domain name and the services provided by somebody with that domain name, but you end up somewhere else as a source for phishing, malware, and whatsoever. So this is really about limiting that risk due to visual confusion of the strings. And you can see there is an example there. This is not about avoiding no connection, so that would result from typos, etc. It's very difficult to perceive or understand the difference between confusing similarity and typos. When you type something wrong, then it's... But the misconnection is—and if no

connection occurs, so be it. No harm is done. Everybody had that experience, they typed in the wrong domain name. So that's the real purpose of it. Next slide please.

The standard for visual similarity validation, that's what we're talking about. Again, there is no change, even this is the standard that has been developed and evolved under the fast track process. So no change, they build upon the existing experience with respect to visual similarity. Next slide please.

The real difference is a result from the introduction of variants. Because it was already difficult to understand confusing similarity with existing and potentially proposed TLDs. So it's across... There is no distinction at this level between ccTLDs and gTLDs. Harm can be resolved from both. In that sense, the DNS doesn't have any preference for ccTLDs or gTLDs.

But because of the inclusion of variants, the base for comparison will expand and you can see, as a result, going back to my Pakistan example, if you would include all the blocked and allocatable variants for Pakistan in the base for comparison, it will explode exponentially. It will grow exponentially. You have to compare against all these variants. So again, there is a need to strike a balance.

So what the working group has proposed is that in principle, all variants that have been delegated are included or are requested are included in the base for comparison. But at the end of the day, that the similarity evaluation panel, so that's the first panel, includes and determines which additional variants they will include in their set to compare against the requested IDN-ccTLD string. And in their inclusion, they

need to think through and they need to provide a rationale, taking into account the likelihood of misconnection, scalability, and unforeseen or unwanted side effects. And then a final requirement, which is not included in the fast track, is that the similarity panel needs to include at least one member who is familiar with the script. So that's the proposal of the subgroup to date. And with this, I'll stop because I'm overrunning. I will not do the Q&A for this one. Go to slide 32, please, for Kenny to raise final words.

KENNY HUANG:

Okay, thank you, Bart. So then reminder, including the basic principle that we have just discussed in the CCPDP 4 working group and including some important selection criterion. And so deselection criterion, applicability of ccTLD policy as well. And next slide. So that's the principle underpinning the policy.

So for example, like IDN-ccTLD string must be associated with the territory. And ASCII ccTLD and IDN-ccTLD are all country called top-level domains and preserve security, stability and interoperability of the DNS, and request for delegation of IDN-ccTLD should be an ongoing process. And can you go to the next slide?

So the next step, including the full working group will discuss confusion similarity because as I mentioned, the major task in confusion similarity subgroup already complete. And they will feedback the final recommendation, policy recommendation to the full working group. So the full working group will focus and discuss on the recommendation.

The full working group also will conclude stress testing and based on the stress testing we have been conducted and also the feedback from today. And starting from probably now, we are starting working on the initial report. So hopefully that will be complete by the end of April this year. And after the initial report has been complete, we'll make it to the public and collect a public comment on the initial report. So theoretically, the time frame will be starting from May and June, 60 days' time frame for public comment. That will be pretty much the next step, the CCPDP 4 going to be done. And that's going to the final stage for CCPDP 4. Thank you, and expecting your question.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, everyone for the updates. And at this point, we are overrunning. So if any questions, please, you have seen the faces behind this very huge work. Thank you so much for such a tremendous amount of work. And please, now we start the coffee break and come back at 10:30 for ccTLD news. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]