
ICANN76 | CF – ccNSO: ccPDP4 WG on Selection IDN ccTLD Strings

Sunday, March 12, 2023 – 09:00 to 10:00 CUN

KENNY HUANG:

Good morning everyone here and good afternoon, good evening to anyone who joined online remotely. Welcome to the ccPDP 4 working group session. So starting from today's agenda, Kim, can you move to the agenda? Okay, welcome and roll call. And starting from admin matter, starting from action item, do we have any update from the action item?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah, there's a bit of more of the admin matters. Action item was to update the presentation slide deck. It's completed and it will be discussed on the item three of the agenda. The base doc has been updated. It's circulated and that's agenda item four, so that will be the main portion of today's discussion. And the update for the base policy document to include the CS recommendations. Let me briefly explain what I'll do is, as you know, the confusing similarity subgroup has completed its work. And it is not yet included in the base document which the full working group has been working on. I'll include it so we have our first meeting after ICANN 76 with the full working group to run through that updated document.

If time permits, I'll also include a bit of an introduction in that document and a process description. Then you see how it will look like as an initial report. Because to date it's only a base document with the policy recommendation, but it doesn't provide the context in which you've

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.

done your work, nor the process you went through, etc. and the reference to all the documents that you have discussed over time. So that's what you can expect and is an action item for me.

I had hoped to finish it before the meeting, but I couldn't. But that's an action item for me after the ICANN 76 and the first meeting when the full working group will review the CS recommendations. Back to you, Kenny.

KENNY HUANG:

Okay, thank you, Bart. We have quite a lot of action items right now. So I believe you probably can also go to the slide deck to have a look at the presentation slide. We're going to discuss more detail in this meeting, and that's going to be presented on Wednesday meeting report to the community. So the next one will be—are we going to discuss on the slide deck? Okay.

So lots of introduction and the background and additional area main policy things ICANN 75 starting from variant management and review of the decision and confusion similarity. So, Bart can I hand over to you to carry on the review? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

I'll run quickly through it. So this is to update the ccTLD and broader community on Tuesday morning during a update session, which starts at 9:00 AM. So that will be the first formal ccNSO session. You'll have about 30 minutes. The first 15 minutes of that meeting will be a general introduction by Alejandra and Everton on the program of the week. Second part will be on the PDP-3, so on the review mechanism. They

will inform the community that the final report has been submitted to Council, and the Council will take a decision or will start discussing the final report this meeting. And then the remainder of that meeting, of that hour—so that's about 30 minutes, maybe a little bit more—is for this working group to update the community where they are since ICANN 75. So that's the background and etc.

So if you recall, on the previous call, we said—so the initial thought was to have only the areas that this working group has completed since ICANN 75. So that's variant management, review of decisions, and confusing similarity, with the caveat that the full working group has not done it or reviewed the recommendations. And then that you start working on stress testing. And there is a reminder included, and these are at the request of Anil, of, say, the areas that already have been presented to the community where feedback was sought, etc. So that's the basic principles. Selection criteria, deselection, applicability of ccTLD policy. So that's general for those of you who are in the room.

This policy is really about the selection of an IDN ccTLD strings with everything around it. And once that string has been validated, it can be requested for delegation. And the delegation is an ordinary or basic IANA process, as is the transfer, revocation, and retirement of an IDN ccTLD. These are all standard IANA processes. So this builds on top of, or effectively is a foundation to get an IDN ccTLD string delegated. So the selection process, because there is no such thing as the ISO 3166 for IDNs. So that's what we are doing right here.

So that's the bit about the applicability, but that's more for the audience now. Can we go to the next one? So that's the roadmap. It's

just a reminder. We'll not spend too much time on this, but it's more for in the room. Next slide. Where are we now? Again, this is detailing the roadmap. Next slide. So this is an update of, if you recall, we shared this on a webinar, I believe, but also on previous meetings. So what you can see where we are, everything in green has been completed. So that's a good thing. That's always a good sign. Green is a nice color. So you don't have to look at it.

So what you can see, in order to update the basic policy document, so for the full working group, is the confusing similarity discussion and the stress testing. That needs to be completed. Once this is completed, effectively the basic document has been done. The only thing, as I said, what needs to happen is the introduction and the process description today. So this is another way of looking at it. But it shows you we're well underway. Next slide, please.

So now I'm going to the variant and variant management topic. And my suggestion is, and this was included, is explain again—I know in The Hague, Dennis did a very good job in explaining what variants are and variant management. But now the full working group, just as a reminder. So why is it needed, variant management? And this is, in another way, is trying to find a balance between the legitimate need for variants of an IDN ccTLD to avoid user confusion and the general responsibilities for the security and stability of the DNS. So it's always trying to find that balance between these, I would almost say, opposing forces. Next slide, please.

These are just the definitions and some of the implications. This is direct copy and paste from the basic document. Next slide, please. The root

zone label generation rule and its applicability. Next slide, please. And then variant management. And again, just the core principles of the variant management. First of all, the delegation to the same entity, which, again, needs to be stressed. IDN ccTLD variants, the selected and the variants. And then the limitation of the allocatable variants. So what are the delegatable variants of a selected IDN ccTLD? And again, the definition, etc., and the examples, as you can see. And a little bit of the reasoning why it is limited in this case. Next slide, please.

And then a Q&A with the audience. So we'll have some Zoom polling. And Zoom polling, and I just want to check with you as working group. Zoom polling implies that everybody in the room, ccTLDs and non-ccTLDs, will be able to respond. And whether it's one or two from one ccTLD or more, it doesn't matter. So you have just a temperature of the room of those who are attending, including the, say, the remote participants, because they can participate as well in the Zoom polling. That's it. So it is not a temperature of the room of the ccTLD managers. It is a broad one.

Now, my question for you, are you okay that it's not limited to ccTLD managers, but we seek input from everybody who is attending the session? And I see some people nodding. And let me give you a rationale why we think it is the best opportunity. You always will see, although you can't trace who is responding, if there is a clear split between ccTLDs and non-ccTLDs, you will see it immediately when you see red or say no or in support and do not support. And if you ask, what did you vote? You can ask this. You can see it.

If there is a clear split, that is telling. If it's a mixed bag, so from both ends, people are supportive and non-supportive, then I think that's a clear signal for the working group to revisit some of the recommendations, because both the broader community and the ccTLD community have some concerns, and they don't support it. And if it's the other way around, if, for example, the CCs do not support and only the non-ccTLDs support, again, that's a clear signal for the working group.

So in a way, it assumes we will ask questions what people have voted if there is a clear divergence of the results of the poll questions. So that's why I think it really works, and it makes everybody's life easier, and it's more engaging. So that's for the polling. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH:

Yes, good morning. I hear what you're saying, Bart, and I have a clarifying question, given that we had mixed experiences with another open poll a couple of meetings ago when we were talking about abuse, and there were, of course, different sides of the camp. You said Zoom polling. Is that the hand raising, the open polling, so that everybody sees whether there is a split, or is it the—

BART BOSWINKEL:

No, this is really a poll. So what we will do is we'll show a poll with various questions, and you'll respond to it. So you don't see who votes what, but you will see— Sorry? You can. Yeah. Now, you will see the results, of course, but you can't see who voted what with raising their hands.

PETER KOCH: So how—and I'm not sure I understand your explanation that we would definitely be able to sense a split if there is—

BART BOSWINKEL: The point is, if there is a split, assume only ccTLDs vote against, or the votes against are only ccTLDs, and the votes in favor are non-ccTLDs plus a few ccTLDs. It assumes that whoever is running the polling will ask, explain, please, because this is not a vote. This is just taking the temperature of the room. So you ask, why did you vote, and can you tell me? Then you know if people speak up. Then you know the background.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Okay, with that additional step, it should be okay. Just, again, I'm triggered by that previous experience.

BART BOSWINKEL: Because that is what we didn't do well at the last time. But just one more point about this, because you will see this polling, and we better explain it now. We'll see it in other sessions as well, or in other sections of the presentation. I think it's also a bit of, it's just a signal for this group where people go. Because if you don't take on the signal now, you'll have the same signal at the end, say, with the public comment period. And then it's far more serious, because then you have done your work, and then you really need to go back and understand what it is about. And this is really just a trigger moment, a feedback loop. This is not a vote. I can't stress this enough. This is really a temperature of the room

of those people who are present at this session. That's all. And that's probably, that was, after the experience in The Hague, I think that was one of the caveats. And it's also a bit fear of those others. But that's my personal opinion. I'm sorry. Any other questions around the polling? Maybe a question about the questions themselves. None? Then we'll—sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I provisioned the Zoom polling, and I know there's quite a few. Do you have an idea how long you want to keep each poll up for? A minute each?

BART BOSWINKEL: Not more. Yeah. We better warn them in advance, say this will be fairly quick. And as I said, this is just a rough temperature. It is really a rough indication of what is happening. That would be my advice, at least. Any other questions, comments around the polling? See anybody? Okay, thank you. Can we scroll down? So this was the variant management. Then reviews and exclusions, claims, and the exclusion is about the exclusion of everything pertaining to the IDN ccTLD selection from the ICANN independent review procedure and the reconsideration process. And the language here specifically relates to what is in the ICANN bylaws.

For those of you not familiar with it, currently the old disputes and claims relating to delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs, and this is in the ICANN bylaw lingo, are excluded from the IRP and the reconsideration. And if you recall, there was a question from the Council

for this group to respond to it. And we say when we discussed the review, this was the outcome. So that's with respect to the exclusion. So that's why it's exclusion.

Then secondly, with respect to the, and this makes it interesting as you, if you recall, prior to this group, the review mechanism will do its presentation. And this is what makes it so interesting because there are some areas where this group will build upon the outcome of the review mechanism policy development process, only for specific deselection decisions that result in an action of IFO to retire an IDN ccTLD and or its variants. The proposed review mechanism applies.

So this again limits the scope of applicability of the review mechanism. And then with respect to similarity review, again, the second panel or the second procedure is considered a review procedure. And again, with the rationale. So this is everything about the review. Can you go to the next slide? I think I have some more details there, but we can skip this fairly quickly. Applicability. Again, this is more, can you go to the next one? Again, in this case we have, I see there is a difference in font. We can adjust it.

So Q&A again and polling questions. Same procedure, three questions in this case. You can see the answers or the responses people may have. And again, as you can see, this is just a temperature of the room, not a vote. And again, for the full audience. Any questions around review mechanism and the exclusions? No? In the chat or in Skype? Yeah. Then we go to the next one, the confusing similarity validation process.

And the reason why I call this tentative is because the full working group has not signed off on it. They need to discuss it. But at the same time, I

suggest that it is presented because we will not have another opportunity between now and ICANN 77. And hopefully the review by the full group doesn't take too long to sign off on the recommendations of the subgroup. So that was the rationale for including this. So again, Kenny, I don't know if you want to present it or how we want to present it, but make very clear this is tentative. It's still subject to support from the full working group. So criteria [base] for comparison procedures.

Next slide, please. So, again, yeah, people can read. I don't want to spend too much time on this. The slides will be available anyway. But clearly, this goes down the path of to avoid the risk to the stability and security and more the security. And this is more not a technical issue, but this is more a general and operational policy issue. That's why it's so complicated. And then the two other concept that's really important is the difference between no connection and misconnection. And this is to limit or to avoid misconnection resulting from visual similarity of swings. Next slide, please.

The standard, again, it's been in use for quite some time. That's why a brief reference to this is the standard under the fast track process used by the various panels. So there is nothing new in here, especially since the second review or second review of the [inaudible] was introduced. Next slide, please.

And now the important part, which has been recently updated, as you may recall, the base for comparison. The base for comparison is effectively, say, if an IDN ccTLD is requested and its variants, against what will it be and with what will it be compared? So, again, the basis is or the standard set is, as you can see, the first paragraph, any

combinations of two letters, A to Z. So the ASCII CCs, existing TLDs—so TLDs, both ccTLDs and gTLDs that have been delegated and already delegated variants. And then proposed TLDs in the process of string validation that request a delegatable or requested variant label, however defined under the various process.

So this is the standard. What makes it and what took quite some time is the similarity evaluation panel should determine the additional variants of the basic set of strings to be included in the comparison set. So the additional variants could be allocatable and blocked variants of already delegated or in TLDs or in the process of validation. And this is a bit of a tradeoff. It is a procedural solution to something.

So what the panel needs to do to factor in the following criteria, the likelihood of misconnection, so it needs to be probable and not just possible, then the scalability of the comparison. Again, using the example of Pakistani Arabic, if you would include all allocatable and blocked variants, you will end up with 1,200 different variants of Pakistani Arabic. And if you need to compare against 1,200, because it's a manual process at the end, it might take quite some time. And it's just with one IDN ccTLD.

And then, obviously, unwanted side effects, it's a catch-all thing. But the panel will need to provide a rationale why they included one set and not the other. Next slide, please. Who's got his hand up? Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH:

During your presentation, it occurred to me, and this is not so much a question on the substance but on the presentation, at least I think,

ISO 646 basic version, formerly known as ASCII. I mean, it's technically over correct, but I think it could be more helpful if that colloquial word would appear on the slide. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

This is the way it's been described, but just make it the two-letter codes, yeah, ASCII or somewhere in between. I'll do that. Next slide, please. Procedures, again, this is effectively—so adjusting the names of the various procedures and panels, it's copy and paste from the Fast-Track process. These are the current standard panels and procedures under the Fast-Track process. And as you can see, especially the similarity review procedure, why it is still included is it's a very specific area for, say, scientific area. When we talk about cognitive psychology, etc., how people perceive written languages and the results from that research have changed dramatically over time. And it's a very extensive method of evaluation, and so therefore it's only in case it is really requested. So it's not the standard procedure. It's, again, too time-consuming, and the scalability is not very scalable, this method. So that is why it's the similarity review, but it's really looking from another paradigm to confusing similarity. That's the purpose of this second panel. So that's why it's treated as a separate and specific review procedure. And then the third one has been introduced some time ago, I think in 2019 or something. [Sarmad,] do you recall? The [inaudible] it was around Kobe. Yeah. Okay. Next slide, please.

Again, Q&A and polling, same procedure. So with the responses, and now the next slide. Stress testing. This is where the group is at, and I think... Sorry. Go ahead.

IRINA DANELIA: I have a question regarding the previous slide.

BART BOSWINKEL: Can we go back?

IRINA DANELIA: For similarity evaluation procedure and similarity review procedure, is it the same panel?

BART BOSWINKEL: Nope.

IRINA DANELIA: But it appears to have the same name on the slide.

BART BOSWINKEL: Oh, yeah, I see what you mean. So the independent similarity, that should be review panel. Yeah. Thank you for catching this. Currently, it's called the [EPRSRP,] the extended process evaluation thing. Can we scroll down? So, again, Q&A and polling, and that's about it. I think given the length of this presentation already, we just highlight stress testing, that we're going through the process. There are no real results, and maybe just people can say, this is the method we're using as a group.

As you will see, there are far more slides included. My suggestion is just tell people, or maybe, Kenny, you can do it, tell people we'll include the

reminder slides. Can you scroll down? So that's an example of a scenario. We can leave it. Next slide. Next steps, yeah. The reminder, maybe next steps. Kenny, if you can talk to next steps and explain the reminder slide is about what the working group has already achieved to date. So that's the basic principles, selection criteria, deselection applicability of ccTLD policies, and that's about it.

And given that we're already half an hour into this session, I assume, yeah, we don't need to run through it. It is copy and paste from an earlier presentation, but it will be shared online after the session.

KENNY HUANG:

Is it good enough for 30 minutes to run through the whole process? Because a lot of questions [inaudible] from the community, and besides you're going to participate, so you're going to distinguish between ccTLD member and non-ccTLD member to get different response from them.

BART BOSWINKEL:

We'll see, and otherwise we'll stop at one point and say, yeah, next meeting or we do the next webinar. But I think we'll have time. My expectation is people will not diverge too much. That's what I anticipate, especially as these are consensus areas of at least subgroup, but definitely in some areas of the full working group. And if they don't, then it is already worth it to have a discussion why people diverge. It can take quite some time, as you know.

Any questions, comments around the presentation?

PETER KOCH: My comment would not be on the presentation, but on the last discussion that Kenny and you had. There is, of course, this lingering issue why ASCII ccTLDs do not undergo a confusing similarity check, and obviously there are some which, in theory, are confusing. There are many that are confusing, I mean confusingly similar to each other. And, of course, there is an asymmetric treatment now. I don't think we have touched on that in the full working group or in one of the sessions I missed. I'm sorry about that.

BART BOSWINKEL: Can I give you a procedural response?

PETER KOCH: Sure.

BART BOSWINKEL: Because it's not in the scope of this working group to address it. If it needs to be addressed, people need to go to Council, and then they can start a new PDP, because then you start touching upon the current policies for the delegation, re-delegation of ccTLDs.

PETER KOCH: I think we need to have an offline conversation. Thank you. More seriously, sorry, Kenny, point partly taken, but I guess we're partly talking past each other, and we might discuss that over a—not a Heineken, but something else.

BART BOSWINKEL:

[inaudible] it's the right pace I ran through this slide deck, because it was fairly high, but if not, then let's go to the fun part, the stress testing. So stress testing. In front of you, you have version two, and what I've done is marked in yellow the areas we discussed and which were adjusted after our first real deep dive into the stress testing. And this is a good example of how to read this. This is the eligibility of the application.

So this came out of the discussion of what happens if a ccTLD manager, whether it's an IDN ccTLD manager or regular ccTLD manager, who is a member of the ccNSO, and by virtue of its membership, policies apply, rescinds its membership? Does the policy still apply? And that was a question that was raised under the retirement policy, as you may recall, and we had a discussion, I think, on the last call that you can extend that point, is what happens if an entity who is not a member of the ccNSO applies for an IDN ccTLD? Does the policy apply? Because that's the reverse side of it, or the other side of the coin. Can a non-ccNSO member claim anything under a policy that has been developed by the ccNSO?

And this goes back to the original discussions around the ccNSO when it was created, this has always been lingering, say, the ccNSO is the policy-making body for ICANN regarding ccTLDs. So whatever comes out of the ccTLDs, that is directed at ICANN, not at ccTLDs, but only at ICANN, how to deal with ccTLDs and ccTLD strings in this case. So stepping outside of the policy would even step outside its own policy remit or basic principles. It would apply two sets of policy. So by definition, somebody applying for a ccTLD is bound or has to go through

the process defined by the ccNSO unless it was an already existing policy like RFC 1591, etc. But the same is true, say, with the review mechanism or with retirement. There is a caveat with retirement, but, say, going forward, the retirement policy applies whether you're a member or a non-member.

So that was the background of this answer. So it was discussed, as you can see, in the first meeting, and to be included in the [just proposed] policy means this will be included in the introduction around the scope of the idea, say, of this policy development process. That's the caveat.

So that's the explanation. Now going back to your role, are there any questions around this? So this is effectively the second reading of this proposal, of this stress test. So the scenario stress test is what is applicable. The relevant sections is scope of the policy. So that's Annex C of the bylaws. Assessment is what you see in marked yellow, and then the need to adjust. And then, yeah, the question is any—let me do it the other way around. Are there any questions around the way this is now phrased and framed?

I don't see any hands up. Then use the usual method. If you agree, please check your green marks if you're in the Zoom room, or raise your hand if you're not. If you disagree, then I'll do a separate question. If you agree and you're in the Zoom room with this proposed assessment of the stress test and outcome, please check your green marks. If you disagree, I'll wait. So green marks if you agree. I see some green checks. Okay. And I don't see any people in the room.

So if you disagree, please check your green—or your red marks. And if you disagree and you're not in Zoom in the room here, please raise your

hand now. Okay, no hands. And if you have no opinion, just raise your hand now. So I don't see any hands. Okay, so this is being accepted in second reading. Can we scroll down, please?

Again, this item number two, this was not discussed. That was a stress test. Country name is replaced by other country name in designated language. But what if the English or French name of the country doesn't change but the name of the country changes in the national language? And then you see the relevant sections. And as you can see from the proposed assessment, is only the change in the designated language is relevant and considered a change in a basic requirement for the IDN ccTLD.

The proposed policy deals with this situation in section 131, including when such a change is considered to be a trigger event. And then the proposed assessment result is no adjustment needed of the policy. So again, questions, comments on the proposed text? I don't see any hands. Good.

Then the question, if you agree—and I'll do it as separate question—please check your green marks or raise your hand now in the room. Peter, you raised your hand. Okay. If you disagree, please check your red mark or raise your hand in the room now. I don't see any red ones. And if you have no opinion, [inaudible]. No further explanation needed. Raise your hand.

Okay. Thank you. There we go. What if an IDN ccTLD no longer qualifies as an IDN ccTLD? Is retirement needed? Again, section 1.3, section 2, and apply. And that other section, I don't know what I refer to, what it does, so I need to [inaudible] it.

It is a very general statement, however, as general principle change in the basic IDN ccTLD selection requirement could result in a trigger event. ccPDP was tasked to define the trigger events that would start the retirement procedure. So that is an adjustment, if you recall, from the discussion we had with Patricio. This policy is not about—going back toward the discussion, this is not about changing the retirement policy. It only defines the trigger events or tasks.

Any questions around this? And I note the typos. None? Then let me ask the question. If you agree— and so this is first reading. If you agree, please check your green marks. If you disagree, please check your green marks. Or raise your hand if you agree. If you disagree, please check your green, red marks. Jiankang, go ahead.

JIANKANG YAO:

Sorry, I have a little confusion about this sentence. IDN ccTLD no longer qualifies as IDN ccTLD. So that means IDN ccTLD no longer is an ID ccTLD.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah.

JIANKANG YAO:

But if it is IDN ccTLD, when first [inaudible] it said it is IDN ccTLD, but it is no longer IDN ccTLD. But for me, it's a little confusion about this sentence.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, so I'll clarify. So you want to see something inserted that after a change in circumstances, say these basic circumstances, the IDN ccTLD no longer qualifies as such. Does that resolve your issue?

JIANKANG YAO: Yes. Adding this phrasing is better.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, thank you. We'll add it. And again, this is first reading, so you'll see it in the next version. With this in mind, any further questions, comments? If none, then we'll proceed to number three. What if the IDN ccTLD manager refuses to go to the retirement process? Again, this was discussed extensively on the last call when Patricio intervened and very clearly, and I think, as you can see, with the support of everybody, suggested that the retirement process is considered out of scope of the IDN policy effort. A stress test of the retirement policy addresses this specific issue. So there is no need to adjust it. It is effectively out of scope. It is just a reference to the [inaudible] policy document that this has been dealt with. If people are more interested, they have to look it up in the final report. That's the implication.

Any comments, questions around this one? And number four and five, I believe, are similar. Yeah, so we can handle them all in one go. So let's go back to number three. Any questions, comments around number three? If none, then let's go again. If you're in support, please check your green marks. If you disagree, please check your red marks. Or raise your hand now. And if you have no opinion, just raise your hand. Thank you.

And if you agree, I want to do number four or five in the same go because they address the same issues, what happens with retirement, etc. These are post-trigger events, and so not relevant and out of scope of this policy. So any questions, comments around number four or five? I don't see any hands. Good. Again, the usual drill. If you're in favor, please check your green marks or raise your hand now. And if you are opposed, please check your red marks or raise your hand now.

Okay, thank you. So this was, again, first reading. We'll revisit this as a block, maybe turn it around in the second reading if there are any issues. So I don't have to talk that much. So number six was accepted in first reading. As you can see. What if the country name as listed on the standard is changed, English, French. It's a little bit addressed in number one of this list. There's no change of the adjusted policy. It was agreed in first reading. Any objections to this right now? Because it was already, so this is how we're going to do it the second time is my proposal.

Any objections? If you object to the number six in second reading, please check your red marks now. And if you're in favor, please check your green marks. And then no opinion. Raise your hand. Good. So this will now be concluded. We will not revisit this one again.

Number seven, what if the selected IDN ccTLD and all its variants are retired and someone else wants to register a retired label? What happens? The proposed response, so this is principle four applies in section 1.2. If all the criteria are met, including but not limited to the requirements that the new, [to be requested selected IDN ccTLD string]

is a meaningful representation of the name of the territory, etc., then nothing would stand such a request.

So implying if a string is retired, somebody else wants to register the retired label, effectively it doesn't exist anymore. There is the assumption, because we talk about IDN ccTLDs, that the new requestor has all the documentation needed, everything else, and that the new requested string is a meaningful representation of that territory. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH:

I have a question that maybe I have missed a discussion in previous sessions. The difference between this and, quote, quote, ASCII ccTLDs is that by ISO 3166 and the procedures there is this cooldown phase of so and so many decades. We don't have this here, so there might be side effects. Were those side effects of removing the TLD and then immediately or more or less pending the procedure and the time it takes delegating it anew and maybe to a different entity and maybe with a completely different country and so on and so forth, was that discussed?

BART BOSWINKEL:

No, but it's a good test. We'll add this. A cooldown period, does that make sense or something? Because at the end of the day, this is really an ICANN policy. So this assumes in a way that—it's very broad. So it assumes that the territory remains, for example, has changed its name fundamentally [or hasn't changed—you can't think of it.] If you really think about it, yeah, what type of situation would apply?

-
- PETER KOCH: Sometimes things change back and forth and you don't know.
- BART BOSWINKEL: It might be useful to have that discussion. We'll include it as a stress test. So thanks for raising this point.
- PETER KOCH: So my point was that in the ASCII case, it's an externally triggered or externally provided pause and we didn't cater for this here. And maybe it's not necessary because you say what is a—
- BART BOSWINKEL: But still just to be on the safe side.
- PETER KOCH: [inaudible] Thank you.
- BART BOSWINKEL: Again, that derives from one of the principles as well. Yep, makes sense. So we'll include it as an additional stress test very specifically. With this in mind—and thanks for the intervention, Peter—any questions, comments around? And we have number seven, additional questions. Yeah, Kenny, go ahead.
- BART BOSWINKEL: Just to continue Peter's question, is the existing dispute resolution process able to handle that kind of issues if the list can actually come

back and forth? And if that's happening, will it cause a dispute? Do we have dispute process to handle that kind of situation? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

No, we don't. It's fairly simple. Again, at the end of the day, it's more, are you eligible for selecting something? What Peter was saying is you can't register, say, in a cooldown period. So once it has been removed from the root zone, and that's after five or ten years, you wait another couple of years before anybody can register. And this is just to avoid any collisions, just that it fades out the original one. So whether there is a dispute resolution necessary is another question. So if you just state clearly there is a cool-down period, so be it.

PETER KOCH:

So this is Peter. I think Kenny has raised an interesting additional stress test. If it is just for the purpose that dispute resolution is probably in the minds of many people, and usually we don't have that because in ASCII land the names don't collide, so that might be interesting to add that. But we need to phrase it. I agree with your assessment, Bart, that that is a different issue, but still interesting.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Just to raise it, as you can see—and this is one of the advantages of having these, and we've seen it before, including stress tests, it's almost like an FAQ, and therefore it's very handy to have it in place. So we'll add that one as well. So that's with respect to number 7. Any additional comments, questions around number 7?

So with this in mind, let me pause here for a moment. So keep in mind that we will add these two different stress tests around, say, 7A and B. Are there any issues with number 7? Because then we don't revisit this because, in effect, it's fairly straightforward. If you agree with this basic assessment, please check your green marks. If you have no opinion, please check your red marks or object. So if you're in favor, as it is, please check your green marks, so then we can do it fairly quickly next time.

Okay, thanks. I don't see any red marks. No. Let's go to number 8. Again, what if a ccTLD manager wishes to retire one of their IDNs due to natural reasons, such as removal of support of the script on the government level, but the ccTLD IDN to be retired is the selected primary IDN ccTLD? So what would happen? So what would happen in general if a selected IDN ccTLD string reaches the trigger event stage?

And then the response is—and there are also examples, 6, 10, and 11 are relevant. If the selected string is to be retired, all delegated variants would follow. By definition, variants are derived from the selected IDN ccTLD string. Hence, the variants follow the fate of the defining selected IDN ccTLD string.

And there is an additional—we'll get to an additional point later, but this is the basic principle. Any questions, comments around this particular stress test? Number 8. Ah, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Bart. Not with regard to the assessment, but with regard to the description of the stress test itself, maybe it should be more clearly explained that it is about the primary for the additional variants.

BART BOSWINKEL: So the impact on the additional—

IRINA DANELIA: Yeah. So the scenario relates to the situation with variant ccTLDs.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe, can you go to stress test number 10? Can you go to the next block on variant? Because there is a related stress test with respect to variants. So EPDP scenario, and I think this is the one. Can you scroll up? No, that's not the one. Can you scroll down? We don't have the time to revisit. Yes, scroll down, please. I know I've added something else.

Yeah, there you go. Stress test number 8. And I've looked it up in the policy itself. It's not very explicit. It is implied in some areas. What happens if the selected IDN ccTLD string is retired? What happens with the variants or deselected for whatever reasons? And I think for future use, it might be useful to include a general statement. If the selected IDN ccTLD string is retired for whatever reasons, all delegatable or delegated variants which have been delegated follow the fate of the selected IDN ccTLD string.

So there is no ambiguity whether or not the delegatable variants, which have been delegated, can remain in the root zone. And vice versa. If only, for whatever reason a delegatable variant is retired or will be

retired for whatever reason, then it does not affect the selected string. We've touched upon this in the discussions and it's implicit around the confusing similarity.

And then you always have the additional factor—and this goes back to Irina's merger scenario, what happens—because we're talking about delegatable variants. Delegatable variants effectively mean they meet all the criteria with the exception that they're a variant of the selected string. But they need the support of everybody. So if that one is, you can always add the exception if a delegatable variant remains to be supported and meets all the criteria, then it could remain in place. So that's an exception on the general rule. But there is nothing like this in the current policy.

So my question, Kenny, do you think it's wise to include something like this, like a general statement? I think it would make Sarmad's life so much easier. Sarmad, you have your hand up.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

So I was going to suggest that maybe we can, if you're going to add something like that, maybe add one more step or statement, saying what you're suggesting is that if a selected string is undelegated, all its variants will be undelegated, the delegated variants will be undelegated as well. In addition, if there are any remaining undelegated but delegatable variants, then they cannot be also applied for. You know, it's a sort of a theoretical thing, but just to close the...

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah, no, I think it depends a bit on it, but just maybe as a note. But the basic principle is you talk about the deselection. A deselection or a trigger event triggers the retirement of all the delegated variants as well, because that's when the retirement policy kicks in. And once the, I would say, maybe as a note and observation, once the IDN ccTLD or selected IDN ccTLD string is gone, deselected, there is no such thing as delegatable variant anymore. But that's a matter of philosophy, how you want to do it. But at least as a note and observation, so that nobody can apply for them. And they could, but then it's a new process. They're not tied anymore with the original IDN ccTLD string.

So my suggestion—and that's something to include probably in the... I will include a suggestion like this in the document. So the document needs to be updated to that effect. Can we go back up? So Kenny, I think you agree with that approach. And I think we are almost at the top of the hour, aren't we?

So we've covered a lot of grounds today. May I suggest that in the next meeting, we continue this discussion on the stress testing? And can we go back to the agenda, please? Back to you, Kenny.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Okay, so right now we already completed the stress testing and go to the agenda number five. Next meeting, full working group. The first one, we review confusion similarity recommendation. That was on 28th of March. Schedule is 14:00 UTC. Is that correct? Okay.

Next one will be stress testing on 4th of April. And the coming one will be 18th of April, also 14:00 UTC. So [inaudible] review because of the day time, means we've been trying to stick to the 14:00 UTC.

BART BOSWINKEL: So somewhere end of March, early April, the world is going bizarre again because daylight saving kicks in in the various regions at various times.

KENNY HUANG: [inaudible]

BART BOSWINKEL: I think last time we just kept it at 14:00 UTC.

KENNY HUANG: You want to switch it back to 13:00 UTC? Yeah, we can do that. Switch it back to the 13:00 UTC.

BART BOSWINKEL: And when do you want to do this?

KENNY HUANG: When starting to the daylight saving time?

BART BOSWINKEL: It depends on where you live.

KENNY HUANG:

Okay, any suggestion? It's an open question. We can switch it back to 13:00 UTC. It's really back to our original time zone. Okay, so we can switch it back to 13:00 UTC right away, right after next meeting. Okay, so coming to the next one will be any other business. By the way, just a simple reminder, the slide we present today already put in the slide deck, and you can go have a look. I'm going to present on Wednesday a report to the community as well. So any other business? Hearing none, thank you for your participation. I'd like to adjourn the session right now. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]